High-Resolution Genetic Map for Understanding the Effect of Genome-Wide Recombination Rate on Nucleotide Diversity in Watermelon

Umesh K. Reddy,^{*,1,2} Padma Nimmakayala,^{*,1} Amnon Levi,[†] Venkata Lakshmi Abburi,* Thangasamy Saminathan,* Yan. R. Tomason,* Gopinath Vajja,* Rishi Reddy,* Lavanya Abburi,* Todd C. Wehner,[‡] Yefim Ronin,[§] and Abraham Karol[§]

*Gus R. Douglass Institute, Department of Biology, West Virginia State University, Institute, West Virginia 25112-1000, [†]U.S. Vegetable Laboratory, USDA-ARS, 2875 Savannah Highway, Charleston, South Carolina 29414, [‡]Department of Horticultural Science, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7609, and [§]Institute of Evolution, Haifa University, Haifa 31905, Israel

ABSTRACT We used genotyping by sequencing to identify a set of 10,480 single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers for constructing a high-resolution genetic map of 1096 cM for watermelon. We assessed the genome-wide variation in recombination rate (GWRR) across the map and found an association between GWRR and genome-wide nucleotide diversity. Collinearity between the map and the genome-wide reference sequence for watermelon was studied to identify inconsistency and chromosome rearrangements. We assessed genome-wide nucleotide diversity, linkage disequilibrium (LD), and selective sweep for wild, semi-wild, and domesticated accessions of *Citrullus lanatus* var. *lanatus* to track signals of domestication. Principal component analysis combined with chromosome-wide phylogenetic study based on 1563 SNPs obtained after LD pruning with minor allele frequency of 0.05 resolved the differences between semi-wild and wild accessions as well as relationships among worldwide sweet watermelon. Population structure analysis revealed predominant ancestries for wild, semi-wild, and domesticated water-melons as well as admixture of various ancestries that were important for domestication. Sliding window analysis of Tajima's *D* across various chromosomes was used to resolve selective sweep. LD decay was estimated for various chromosomes. We identified a strong selective sweep on chromosome 3 consisting of important genes that might have had a role in sweet watermelon domestication.

KEYWORDS

high-density genetic map genotyping by sequencing genome-wide recombination rate linkage disequilibrium selective sweep watermelon

Watermelon belongs to the genus *Citrullus* Schrad. Ex Eckl. et Zeyh., which thrives in the Kalahari Desert (Namibia and Botswana) and is indigenous to southern Africa (Whitaker and Bemis 1976). The genus comprises four known diploid (n = 11) species (Dane and Liu 2007;

Reddy et al. 2013). Among them is the annual Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum et Nakai, which is indigenous to arid sandy regions of southern Africa (Meuse 1962; Robinson and Decker-Walters 1999). C. lanatus var. lanatus Schrad. Ex Eckl. et Zeyh and C. lanatus var. citroides (L.H. Bailey) are two botanical varieties (Levi et al. 2013). C. lanatus var. lanatus includes the wild and semi-wild mucosospermus (egusi types) and sweet vulgaris forms. The wild mucosospermus forms and the Tsamma types (citroides) look similar, except that in var. lanatus, the stomata have one pair of subsidiary cells as compared with three pairs in the Tsamma melon (Botha 1982). However, the types are quite diverse at the molecular and cytological levels (Nimmakayala et al. 2010; Reddy et al. 2013).

The Plant Genetic Resources Conservation Unit (PGRCU; Griffin, GA), US Department of Agriculture–Agricultural Research Services (USDA-ARS), maintains more than 1650 US plant introductions of *Citrullus lanatus var. lanatus* (Levi *et al.* 2013). Nimmakayala *et al.* (2014) performed the most recent diversity analysis using 134 single

Copyright © 2014 Reddy et al.

doi: 10.1534/g3.114.012815

Manuscript received June 18, 2014; accepted for publication September 7, 2014; published Early Online September 15, 2014.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Unported License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by/3.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Supporting information is available online at http://www.g3journal.org/lookup/ suppl/doi:10.1534/g3.114.012815/-/DC1

¹These authors contributed equally to this work.

²Corresponding author: 25 Barron Drive, Gus R. Douglass Institute, Department of Biology, West Virginia State University, Institute, WV 25112. E-mail: ureddy@ wvstateu.edu

nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) from 130 cultivars from Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas and concluded seven different clusters, with no clear distinction of accessions by collection site or geographical identity. These findings agreed with those of previous studies (Levi *et al.* 2001, 2013; Nimmakayala *et al.* 2011; Romão 2000; Zhang *et al.* 2012) concluding a molecular diversity of 2–4% for cultivated watermelon.

Although we previously sampled 130 accessions of watermelon, we did not include wild and semi-wild forms of var. *lanatus* and therefore could not address major population–genetic inferences important to association genetics study. In the current study, we analyzed genome-wide diversity using a larger SNP dataset involving a robust collection of representative cultivated, wild, and semi-wild watermelon accessions from across the world. Unlike most studies focused on building maps with mapping populations developed from *lanatus* and *citroides* (Nimmakayala *et al.* 2014; Ren *et al.* 2012; Sandlin *et al.* 2012), we used a mapping population derived from a cross between sweet and unsweet accessions belonging to *C. lanatus* var. *lanatus*.

Genotyping by sequencing (GBS) is a next-generation sequencingbased method that takes advantage of reduced representation to allow for high-throughput genotyping of large numbers of individuals with a large number of SNP markers (Glaubitz et al. 2014; Sonah et al. 2013). The relatively straightforward, robust, and cost-effective GBS protocol is being applied to numerous species (Elshire et al. 2011; Glaubitz et al. 2014). Previous studies of barley and wheat (Mascher et al. 2013; Poland et al. 2012; Sim et al. 2012) demonstrated the use of SNPs generated by GBS technology to build high-density genetic maps. Poland et al. (2012) stressed the importance of high-density maps in defining collinearity with existing physical maps and for providing valuable tools for anchoring and ordering the whole-genome sequence. Inconsistencies in the currently available watermelon wholegenome sequence or future sequencing efforts targeting the whole genome of watermelon require a genome-wide high-density map for assembly. Such a map would be useful for revealing minor alterations that occur because of inversions and translocations in the genomes of diverse collections of watermelon. Also, a collinearity study of genetic and physical maps would help resolve inconsistencies resulting from the resequencing efforts in various watermelon accessions.

Poland *et al.* (2012) indicated the importance of high-density maps contributing to fundamental knowledge about genome structure. Such maps are also needed for genomic research into haplotypic imputation of missing data and integration with whole-genome shotgun sequencing contigs and BAC-end sequences to anchor and order the reference genomes. Combining whole-genome resequencing and genome-wide association study (GWAS) would help identify markers for quantitative trait loci (QTL); however, recombination mapping is still needed for validating previously identified markers, identifying new markers, and map-based cloning approaches.

Association mapping with diverse genotypes in plants is a new and powerful tool with promising results for identifying functional variation in both known and unknown genes associated with important agronomic and economic traits (Yan *et al.* 2009). Linkage disequilibrium (LD) is a key factor in determining the number of markers needed for GWAS and genomic selection. LD breakdown is affected by many genetic and nongenetic factors, including recombination, drift, selection, mating patterns, and admixture (Flint-Garcia *et al.* 2003; Yan *et al.* 2009; Yu and Buckler 2006). In this study, we aimed to characterize genome-wide LD in the watermelon genome and understand how LD is influenced by recombination rate and selective sweep.

In terms of genomic prediction or GWAS, understanding the landscape of recombination is of interest because the linkage phase between the marker and favorable QTL allele is crucial when predicting breeding values across diverse gene pools (Bauer *et al.* 2013; de Roos *et al.* 2009; Ren *et al.* 2012). In this study, we sought to associate the genome-wide variation in recombination rate (GWRR) and nucleotide diversity across the watermelon genome.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We included 86 accessions of *C. lanatus* var. *lanatus* representing 22 wild, 13 semi-wild (egusi), and 51 sweet watermelons from a world-wide geographical area (Supporting Information, Table S1). To build a genetic map, 113 F_2 progenies were obtained from a single F_1 plant of a cross between accessions PI#482362 (egusi type), a white-flesh unsweet watermelon from Zimbabwe, and PI#270306 (sweet watermelon; plant ID, Mangara), a red-flesh watermelon from Zaire, kindly provided by Dr. Robert Jarret (PGRCU, USDA-ARS, Griffin, GA).

SNP identification with GBS

Genomic DNA isolation involved use of the DNeasy plant mini kit (QIAGEN, Germany) and GBS followed the protocol of Elshire et al. (2011). Briefly, genome complexity was reduced by digesting total genomic DNA from individual samples with use of the ApeKI methylation-sensitive restriction enzyme. A suitable restriction enzyme for watermelon is ApeKI, a type II restriction endonuclease that recognizes a degenerate 5-bp sequence (GCWGC, where W is A or T), which creates a 5' overhang (3 bp) and is partially methylationsensitive (will not cut if the 3' base of the recognition sequence on both strands is 5-methylcytosine). Digested products were then ligated to adapter pairs with enzyme-compatible overhangs; one adapter contained the barcode sequence and a binding-site Illumina sequencing primer (Illumina Inc., USA). Then, samples were pooled, purified, and amplified with primers compatible with the adapter sequences. Temperature cycling consisted of 72° for 5 min, 98° for 30 s, followed by 18 cycles of 98° for 30 s, 65° for 30 s, and 72° for 30 s, with a final Taq extension step at 72° for 5 min. These amplified sample pools constitute a sequencing "library." Libraries were purified and 1 µL was loaded onto an Experion automated electrophoresis station (BioRad, Hercules, CA) for evaluation of fragment sizes. Libraries were considered suitable for sequencing if adapter dimers (~128 bp in length) were minimal or absent and most of the other DNA fragments were between 170 and 350 bp. If adapter dimers were present in excess of 0.5% (based on the Experion output), libraries were constructed again by using a few DNA samples and decreasing adapter amounts. The PCR primers also added 3' sequences complementary to the solidphase olignucleotides that coat the Illumina sequencing flow-cell. After PCR, pooled products were purified; GBS "library" fragment size distributions were checked on a BioAnalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Inc., USA). Products were quantified and diluted for sequencing by use of Illumina HiSequation 2500. A bioinformatics pipeline, TASSEL-GBS, designed for efficient processing of raw GBS sequence data into an SNP genotype file (Glaubitz et al. 2014) was used. Barcoded sequence reads were processed and collapsed into a set of unique sequence tags, with one TagCounts file produced per input FASTQ. Chromosomal assignment and position on the physical map of candidate genes, GBS markers, were deduced by using the draft whole-genome sequence for watermelon (www.icugi.org).

Genetic diversity and population structure analysis

To determine the appropriate population structure in the collection, we used different methodologies and software packages (Nimmakayala *et al.* 2014). For quantitative assessment of the number of groups in the panel, we used Bayesian clustering analysis with a model-based approach implemented in STRUCTURE v2.2 (Pritchard et al. 2000). This approach involves use of multi-locus genotypic data to assign individuals to k clusters or groups without prior knowledge of their population affinities. The program was run for k-values 1 to 9, with 100,000 burn-in iterations, followed by 500,000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo iterations for accurate parameter estimates with a high-performance cluster. To verify the consistency of the results, we performed three independent runs for each k. An admixture model with correlated allele frequencies was used. The optimal k value was determined by use of an *ad hoc* statistic, Δk (Evanno et al. 2005). The number k in each dataset was evaluated by Δk values estimated with the software Structure Harvester to visualize STRUCTURE output and implement the Evanno method. In a second approach, we performed principal component analysis (PCA) with the SNP and Variation Suite (SVS v7.7.6) (Golden Helix, Inc., Bozeman, MT, www.goldenhelix.com). In a third approach, we constructed a neighborjoining (NJ) dendrogram based on Nei's genetic distance matrix by using TASSEL v3.0 (http://www.maizegenetics.net) (Bradbury et al. 2007).

Analysis of nucleotide diversity and selective sweep differentiation between domesticated and semiwild watermelon

Observed nucleotide diversity (π), expected nucleotide diversity (θ), and Tajima's *D* were estimated by using TASSEL v3.0 with a slidingwindow approach representing π , θ , and Tajima's *D* along all 11 watermelon chromosomes, similar to that described previously (Guo *et al.* 2013; Korneliussen *et al.* 2013). To identify potential selective sweep, we compared nucleotide diversity between populations of modern cultivars (*C. lanatus* var. *vulgaris*) and semi-wild accessions (*C. lanatus* var. *mucosospermus*).

Construction of a large-scale genetic map with SNP markers

Linkage analysis and map construction of SNPs generated by GBS involved use of MultiPoint (http://www.multiqtl.com) based on reduction



Figure 1 Principal component analysis (PCA) based on the first two components showing distribution of sweet, semi-wild, and wild watermelons by using 1563 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) generated by genotyping by sequencing (GBS). See Table S1 for a list of accessions and Table S2 for respective eigen values to locate individual accessions on the graph.

Table	1 Mean nucleo	tide diversity (o	bserved π and	expected θ) am	ong semi-wild ¿	and cultivated v	/atermelon acro	oss various chroi	mosomes		
Type	Chr. 1	Chr. 2	Chr. 3	Chr. 4	Chr. 5	Chr. 6	Chr. 7	Chr. 8	Chr. 9	Chr. 10	Chr. 11
Wild π	0.17 ± 0.03	0.17 ± 0.04	0.22 ± 0.07	0.18 ± 0.04	0.18 ± 0.03	0.16 ± 0.04	0.18 ± 0.04	0.19 ± 0.03	0.18 ± 0.04	0.16 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.03
Cult. #	0.15 ± 0.04	0.14 ± 0.05	0.11 ± 0.04	0.15 ± 0.04	0.16 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.05	0.17 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.03	0.17 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.04	0.15 ± 0.04
Wild 0	0.21 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.02	0.23 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.01	0.22 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.03	0.22 ± 0.01
Cult. 0	0.20 ± 0.03	0.19 ± 0.05	0.17 ± 0.05	0.20 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.01	0.21 ± 0.01	0.21 ± 0.01	0.21 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.02

Data are mean ± SD. Cult., cultivated; Wild, semi-wild

of the mapping problem to the traveler salesperson and solution heuristic algorithms based on Evolutionary Strategy optimization (Korol 2009; Mester et al. 2003, 2004). GBS resulted in a disproportion between the high number of scored markers for the mapping populations and population size. MultiPoint analysis allows for selecting the most informative markers for building a reliable skeletal map, whereas other markers are anchored to a skeletal framework map (Mester et al. 2003). For building a skeleton map, we selected error-free markers based on the presence of "twins" (i.e., markers with zero distance) in the dataset. This approach derives from the expectation that because of genotyping errors, the probability of finding false recombinants between absolutely linked markers is higher than observing absolute linkage for closely (but not absolutely) linked markers. The major steps of the algorithm for building ultra-dense genetic maps implemented in MultiPoint include: a "delegate" marker selected from each twin group (including markers with zero distance); except for the twins of various groups, all remaining markers are moved to a heap; delegate markers are ordered to linkage groups (LGs); possible gaps in the LGs are filled by using markers from the heap that belong to twin groups of lower size or singleton markers; and map stability is tested by jack-knife resampling followed by removal of markers violating local map stability and/or monotony (i.e., deviation from the expected increase of recombination rate between a marker and its subsequent neighbors along the map). The last step attaches the markers from the heap to the skeletal map. Each heap marker is attached to the skeletal map if its distance to the closest interval does not exceed the length of this interval. The genetic linkage map was graphically displayed by use of MapChart2.2 (Voorrips 2002).

Recombination landscape

The recombination landscape was revealed by estimating the GWRR (in cM per Mbp) with the physical position of the watermelon genome sequence assembly. The number of recombination events per individual were estimated chromosome-wise by using Monte Carlo EM Cycle of Gibbs sampling available in the maximum likelihood mapping algorithm of JoinMap v4 (Van Ooijen 2006).

RESULTS

SNP identification and molecular diversity and population structure

The sequencing of the *Ape*KI GBS libraries yielded 182 million reads per lane, before any processing. The TASSEL-GBS pipeline for identifying and calling SNPs allowed for simultaneous SNP discovery from various samples. A total of 67,897 SNPs were initially identified; 13,693 SNPs were selected by a cutoff of minor allele frequency (MAF) ≥ 0.01 . In total, 10,370 of 13,693 SNPs genotyped had a call rate of >85%. Chromosomes 1 to 11 contained 1061, 1069, 1045, 570, 1043, 903, 776, 651, 950, 801, and 775 SNPs, respectively. A set of 726 SNPs could not be assigned to any chromosome. A total of 1563 SNPs survived filtering at MAF ≥ 0.05 , with deviation from Hardy Weinberg equilibrium (at P > 0.01) and LD pruning (at 0.05) to remove identical SNPs, for a final 190, 172, 107, 81, 162, 160, 146, 118, 152, 139, and 137 SNPs on chromosomes 1 to 11, respectively.

PCA of the 1563 SNPs revealed two dimensions, clustering according to cultivated, semi-wild, and wild accessions (Figure 1 and Table S2). We constructed 11 NJ trees with various chromosome-specific SNPs separately to resolve the differences among sweet,



Figure 2 Population structure for k = 4. Clusters are separated by vertical lines with cluster colors indicating various ancestries. Red was predominant in wild, yellow was predominant in semi-wild, and green was predominant in cultivated watermelon. Cultivated watermelon represented most of the green and, to a lesser extent, purple, yellow, and red clusters.

semi-wild, and wild watermelon and to understand the effect of various chromosome-specific SNPs on the clustering pattern. All chromosome-specific phylograms clearly separated wild, semi-wild, and sweet watermelon types into distinct clusters, so domestication of sweet watermelon is a genome-wide process. Chromosome-specific trees resolved sweet watermelons into a variable number of subclusters ranging from 2 to 10 (Figure S1A and Figure S1B). Despite no clear pattern of clustering based on geographic distribution, most of the US cultivars were grouped into a subcluster in all chromosome-specific trees.

Observed nucleotide diversity was mapped against the physical map to show the pattern of distribution. Nucleotide diversity varied within and across the chromosomes. Mean and SD of nucleotide diversity (observed and expected) for cultivated and semi-wild watermelon are provided in Table 1. The difference in nucleotides between semi-wild and cultivated watermelon was largest for the chromosome 3 as compared with the other chromosomes, so this chromosome harbors mutations and genes of importance for the process of domestication. Moreover, nucleotide diversity was the least in chromosome 3, which supports this chromosome harboring signals of domestication (Figure 5).

We used a model-based approach to population structure analysis to analyze the entire panel of 86 sweet watermelon accessions (Figure 2). Mean LnP(K) and ΔK values are in Figure S2. K-4 was the most appropriate clustering for this population, with ΔK value 1100. We used the population structure to analyze ancestry rather than clustering. The ancestry distribution of K-4 (red, yellow, purple, and green) revealed its origin from wild-type watermelons. Red was predominant in wild, yellow was predominant in semi-wild, and green was predominant in cultivated watermelon. Cultivated watermelon represented most of the green and, to a lesser extent, purple, yellow, and red ancestry.

High-density genetic map

We mapped 10,480 SNPs into a genetic linkage map using a mapping population that contained 113 progenies generated from a cross of egusi and sweet watermelon. Chromosome distribution of 547 skeletal markers is provided in Figure 3, A and B. To select skeletal markers, SNPs violating map stability on mapping were removed and linkage groups were reanalyzed several times until the map showed complete stability. Use of MultiPoint allowed for detection and removal of markers violating the order stability and monotonic growth of distances in the skeleton map. After cleaning, markers from the heap were checked as candidates for filling-in the gaps. The map showed a strong threshold of the absolute linked markers and showed very good correspondence between the map characteristics (the number of skeletal markers and length of the map). Chromosomes 1 to 11 contained 55, 61, 38, 38, 66, 40, 52, 47, 55, 51, and 44 skeletal markers, respectively, with genetic lengths (cM) 107.4, 112, 88.7, 79.1, 122.3, 103.8, 81.2, 94.2, 106.1, 104.9, and 96.9, respectively (Figure 3, A and B). In addition, the current map defined 3821 recombination events within the skeletal map. The skeletal map for chromosomes 1 to 11

Chr. 1	Chr. 2	Chr. 3	Chr. 4	Chr. 5	Chr. 6
S1_145728 0.0	S2_471040 0.0	S3_201814	S4 4827501 - 0.0	S5 729789 S5 729817 → 0.0	86_3667654 4.0
S1_168714	S2 2174879 S2 21748501	83_201789		55 954261 - 4.2	S6_2128807 4.7
S1_168648	S2 2174868 S2 2174880 4.3	83_232590 3.4		55 1054056	86_953947 - 6.1
S1_1686751	S2 2786400 S2 3153911	S3_992460	S4 4827505 - 5.0	S5_1714219	86_557503
51_640906	(a) 2(a) (a) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b	83_983397	-	S5 2291998 11 5	S6_1270302
S1_19455901	52_3606241 10.2	S3_1320609 6.9		\$5 3727023 14.7	S6_1270285 11.2
S1 1945516 8.6	S2 3855444 S2 3855440 14 4	S3_1895677 8.7		S5 3941732 S5 3941725 16.1	S6_12703101
S1 1945512	32_3033444 32_30334401 14.4	S3_2668132	S4 5098833 - 12 2		S6_3661785
S1_2200677	10.0 Increases 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	S3_3323939	12.2	\$5 5139926	S6_4696091
S1_2200674 9.5	S2_4585652	83_332390/1	S4_5302904 15.5	S5 5500994 S5 5500975 25.1	86_46058391
S1_2200681	S2_5116778 S2_5116762 22.0	83_357/425 16.9	S4_53028901		S6_4917402 21.8
S1_2925403	S2 5715439 24.8	S3_35//4241	S4_5944340 18.8	S5 6292246 S5 6292256 → 30.6	S6_588/18126.1
S1_3817387	_	S3_37309277 21.0	54_59443481	85_6685505	S6 6820872 28 0
S1_5146021 // 17.8	S2_5965351 S2_5965398 → 29.0	35_5892577 21.0	S4_12183296	S5 7955282 S5 7955279 36.8	S6 6801017 20.0
S1_5980570 - 22.2		S3_4617129 25.1	84_12183275 23.7	55 8440390 \ 40.4	30_0801017 29.8
S1_6300847		\$3 4842097 - 27 8	S4_12183280	S5_9941690 S5_9941656	S6 85772201
S1 6300795		55_4642657	84_14746864 26.9	85_9941669 85_9941681 44.0	S6_8577219 35.9
S1_6537750 28.6	S2_9387686 S2_9387685 - 38.2	83_5504242		S5_10489693 45.8	
S1_6831240	S2_9515053 S2_9515061 - 39.2	83_5504228		S5 13530925 S5 13530937 b c 52 3	
S1_6662273 30.8	S2_8645909 S2_11053633 41.4	83_6927345	84_15932116 31.9	\$5 19322462 53.7	
S1_66622751	82_190/558/ - 43.6	S3_77701221 55.5	84 16224307 - 34 7	85 22197600 - 55.5	
S1_/591522]/ \ 32.6	S2 21273799 48.2	S3_13839525 38.8		85_23550394 58.6	
S1 19755414 A3.9	S2 21841022	53_138395051	84_17437915 37.4	S5_23855086 S5_23855065 59.5	
S1_12907944 / \	S2 21926776 52.8	55_19904258	S4_18034646	S5_24515687 S5_24515645 64.4	S6 19202915 \ (56.8
S1_12907966 47.8	S2_22716422 55.3	S3_23518836 45.9	S4_18034668 40.6	85_24621558 69.5	S6 19309597
S1_12907941	S2_22977597 58.6	S3_23518848		85_24951530 72.3	s6_19200001 59.0
	S2_23498680 61.0		84_18277715 44.4	S5_25018043 S5_25018019 73.7	86_19403111
S1_26230937 60.0	S2_23676459 S2_23676421 62.0	S3_24499898	S4_18585054 46.3	S5_26231598 S5_26447351 77.4	S6_22502928
S1_27255401	S2_23879792 62.4	62 25 4207 C2	84 19114403 50.5	S5_25973059 S5_26231626	S6_225029271
S1_27255405	S2 25148535 S2 25148573 66.4	S3_25740413 55.1	84 207159261	S5_2//23035 S5_2//2304/h 83.4	S6_22861333 65.6
S1_27255403	S2_25258740 S2_25258751 - 68.7	S3_264619891	84 20075280	\$5 28482277 \$5 284822791	S6_23001457 67.5
S1_27255410 65.5	S2_25800513 70.1	S3_26461982 59.8	84 20726260	S5 28482276 S5 28482278 87 0	S6_230014241
S1_27255408	\$2 26693319 \$2 26693305b C747	S3_26507326 61.2	84_20772712	S5 28482275	S6_230432081
S1 27255406	S2_26937810 S2_26937825 75.6		S4_21796639 54.7	85_28536014 88.8	S6 23043292 70.9
S1 27854770 // 66.6	S2 27187274 S2 27187280 77.4	S3_26827130 64.9	84_22302598 58.0	S5_29582429 S5_29582417 94.6	S6 240236411//
S1_28176492 //	S2 28475285 S2 28475283		84_22505340 60.8	S5_30218846 S5_30218852 97.0	S6 24023629 // N° 73.3
S1_28519053 J 73.5	S2_28475316		S4_225053211 00.0	\$5_30815831 102.5	S6 24486690 /// \\ = + 0
S1_29098325	S2_29477540 S2_29477514 83.0		S4_22675671 64.0	S5_31188314 S5_31188313 103.9	S6_24486712 / \ \ [*] 74.8
S1_29098326 76.9	S2_29837528 86.3		84_22840463 66.8	S5_31638960 106.2	86_25427538
S1_29098328	S2_30628774 S2_30628757 - 89.5	S3_27905987	84_23405021	\$5 32562748 \$5 325627291	S6_25572653
S1_29321847	S2_30937311 S2_30937308	83_278563691	54 23466674 69.9	\$5_32562749 110.2	S6_26872211 / 88.1
S1 30250270 //- 81.5		S3_28771225	S4_234000831 S4_238743541	S5 33203159 S5 332031681/L	S6_26913750 90.0
S1_31073116 /// 85.6	S2 31638034 S2 31638010 96.1	S3_28695089 80.7	54 23874395 72.7	- S5_33203172	
S1_31560095 // 88.0		S3_28771040	S4 24255626 73.2	85_33625602 / 117.1	SC 20100010 1000
S1_31771265 / 90.4	S2_31883174 99.8		S4 240878001	85_33631074 122.3	50_20480010
51_324/23/8 94.1	\$2 32813849 \$2 32813865	62 2955(750 00 7	S4 24087791 75.9		S6_26473073 103.8
S1_33686630		35_26550/50	84_23742738 79.1		S6_264730661 C 105.0
S1 33796098 101.4	\$2 34266922 \$2 34266915				
S1_33841305 104.1	02_0420022 02_042009101 108.5				
S1_33841318 ~~ 107.4	82_34345619				

Figure 3 (A and B) Genetic map showing positions of skeletal markers on which a high-density genetic map is constructed.

Chr. 7	Chr. 8	Chr. 9	Chr. 10	Chr. 11
\$7 323982	S8 4256286 - 0 6	S9 2484831	S10 890891 × Z 0.0	S11 26725302 - 0.0
s7 ⁻ 323991 \	S9 3452011 - 4 2	S9 [−] 248494 \ (^{0.0}	S10 890906 0.6	
87_333453 V (3.8	S8 7499681 4.5	89 426459 \	S10 ⁸⁹⁰⁹²⁰ 3.4	S11_26725310
S7_427531 \\ // 6.1	S8 749967 7.6	89 ⁴ 26444 ∏\\cord f ^{5.7}	S10_932968 5.7	S11_26182926 7.8
S7_506531 _{// 7.5	S8 11463941	S9_514577 [\ / 10.2	S10_82783 ∑ [∠ 9.0	S11_26130619 10.6
87_985570 W_// 10.7	S8 1146403 8.9	89_514570 \\\ // ^{10.2}	S10_3227051	S11_25816231
S7_3461500	88 2413026	$\frac{89}{522701}$	\$10_3227062 12.2	S11_25816234
S7_3117894	S8_2413073	S9_5227281	S10_32270471	
57_4045726	S8_12145831 / / \	S9_868670		S11_23897756 / 18.9
S7_5067929	S8_12145832 / 14.5	S9 100003/1 S9 1211108 - 16 2	S10_30494401 S10_43862011	S11_23600206 - 20.2
S7_5156531 2 - 20 2	S8_5286831 / 17.6	S9_17093061	\$10_4386288 21.4	S11_23056739
S7_6597051	S8_52868091	89 1709305	S10_43002001	S11_23056746
S7 8937867 1 29.2	<u>88_14574769</u>	89 2584947 26.4	S10_5712009	S11 ²²⁹²⁵¹²¹ 24.8
87 13142339	58_145/4/681	89 4115557	S10_61250701	S11_22613023 27.1
87_16199916	S8 15785741 25.9	89 4104238	\$10 ⁻ 6125075 ¹ /1 \\ ^C 26.2	811_22416446 29.4
87_16199939	S8 166269611	89_4104253 29.1	\$10_6190970 ⁷	S11_22207286
87_16199937	S8 16626985 31.0	89_4104257	S10_10389346	S11_22207303
87_19110905	88 17470018	89_4862119	\$10_10389358	S11_22207259
S7_20414531 38.2	S8 17470028 55.6	S9_4954740	S10_12129453 - 38.3	S11_2220/620 - 35.9
87_21023001	S8_17710056 / 38.0	89_49546881	S10_11350865	S11_21181930 S11_21181904
S7_21025020 42.5	88_17710032 [/ ⁻ 58.9	$59_{6303630}$ (45.7	S10_113508261	S11_211819041 S11_2005624
87 22651291	S8_18332012 // 1 41 6	S9_69060591	S10_14436946 42.0 S10_15401724	S11_143659
87 22651317		S9_6906040	S10_15750099	S11 1147012
87 22546612	<u>88_18615683</u>	89 7185356 \\ / 54.2	S10_16369228	S11 ⁻ 1146998 ⁻ S11 ⁻ 1146998 ⁻
87_22546638 W // ^{45.0}	58_18615660 / \ \ 43.5	S9 80972851	S10 19023994 //	_
S7_23267001	S8_196046891/	S9_8097286 _// 57.1	\$10_19024027 [//\$1.3	S11 14691292
S7_23266994	88 19604703 A 49.0	89_9547296	S10_19110988 /// /// 53 2	\$11_14691253 57.3
87_27185295	S8 203255951/ \	S9_10835728	S10_191110191/////\ 55.2	811_14691258
S7_26866677	S8 20325574 54.7	<u>S9_108358211</u>	S10_19569792 J// 54.6	811 15237559 61.9
S7_28394297	88_22729598	<u>89_11372471</u> 64.8	S10_22122380 // (\ 58.3	S11 15612102
S7_255500901	88_22729600	S9_13899136	S10_22547307 62.0	
87 30434771	S8_23239535	S9_13899172	S10_223472891	S11 1(025021 (0.5
\$7 30434794	88_23239556 65.8	S9_14005681 69.7	S10_23347648	511_10955021 69.7
87 30213171	58_232395311	S9 183570631	S10 24273707 68.6	S11_17699117 73.8
87_30213165	S8 23234090 69.5	89 ⁻ 18357065 ⁻	S10 ² 4330143 ^J / 71.1	S11_17821997
87_29746328	S8 237891541/	S9_22947481	S10_25407029 // _/ \	S11_17821999
87_29746326 63.6	88 23789152 73.2	S9_22947497[/ \\ ¹ 5.7	S10_25407034 [// \\ 75.8	S11_18091289 78.4
87_29746321	S8 256587911	S9_29630676 77.5	S10_25589721 // \\ 80.0	\$11_18945461 81.7
S7_29746291	88_25658782	S9_30489087	S10_26002100 S10 82.7	\$11_19686322 85.4
S7_29600404 9 65.8 S7_20012082 (0.0	S8_25925039 / \ e1 7	S9_304890781/	810_26910410 S10_26910300	811_19956016 87.7
S7_29012085 7	88_25925032	S9_30/06091 9 83.8 S9_31046415	S10_269103991//	
87 288542491	S8_26133088	S9_311820061//	S10_27487154	S11_20932062
S7 28854273 72.2	88_261330951	89 31182029 // 1/ 88.9	S10_279119741/	S11_20925475
S7 28854264 //		\$9 ⁻ 314573321// \\	\$10 ²⁷⁹¹¹⁹⁹⁸ // \\ 95.6	S11_20914812
87_28923967 ^J / \\ 73.1	S8_26136572 <u>→</u> 94.2	89_314572921/LI\ ^{90.8}	S10 ²⁷⁹⁵⁷⁹⁰⁹ 98.5	S11 20949214 96.9
87_28691355 / _ \ _{76.0}		89_32265974 ^J /\ 96.4	S10_28265309	0.7
87_28691335		S9_33285389 / 101.0	S10_28265293	
S7_28781922 S 81.2		S9_34241613		
		S9_342416121/		
		59_34904925 / 106.1		

89 34904933

Figure 3 Continued.

contained 406, 339, 240, 219, 450, 257, 305, 391, 464, 373, and 388 recombination events, respectively. Each recombination bin or skeletal marker segregated with multiple add-on markers, for a high-density genetic map. Of note, chromosomes 3, 4, and 6 contained the least skeletal markers and fewer recombination events as compared with the other chromosomes, perhaps because of recombination suppression. In contrast, chromosomes 5, 2, and 9 possessed multiple recombination bins, so they contained hot spots of recombination. The entire length of the genetic map was 1096.53 cM. Keeping the framework markers as anchors, 9933 add-on SNPs were incorporated across the lengths of various chromosomes, for a high-density genetic map. Add-on SNPs were 1171, 819, 766, 558, 1332, 822, 874, 644, 1054,

1023, and 870 on chromosomes 1 to 11, respectively, for a high-density genetic map (add-on markers anchored to skeletal markers are in Supplementary Materials). Clearly, a large set of the remaining addon markers could also be attached to the corresponding interval or marker on the skeleton map (Figure S3-1, Figure S3-2, Figure S3-3, Figure S3-4, Figure S3-5, Figure S3-6, Figure S3-7, Figure S3-8, Figure S3-9, Figure S3-10, and Figure S3-11). Total add-on or anchor markers are in Table S3, Table S4, Table S5, Table S6, Table S7, Table S8, Table S9, Table S10, Table S11, Table S12, and Table S13. Skeletal markers are framework markers with high confidence.

We examined the collinearity of genetic and physical maps for various chromosomes (Figure 4). Markers on chromosomes 3, 5, 7, and 10 were highly co-linear in terms of physical location. Chromosomes 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9 moderately agreed with the watermelon reference sequence. Chromosome 11 showed the highest disagreement between the genetic and physical map on either side of the chromosome; it contained a large segment that was not collinear with the physical map. We observed 17 major genome rearrangements or disagreements across all chromosomes.

GWRR

We estimated GWRR using the formula cM/Mb (Figure 5). We observed wide variation of GWRRs within and among the chromosomes. Mean GWRR for chromosomes 1 to 11 was estimated at 1.25, 1.09, 1.04, 1.25, 1.37, 1.34, 1.06, 1.18, 1.00, 1.15, and 1.49, respectively (Figure 6, A and B). GWRR ranges were 0.32–2.8, 0.03–3.8, 0.09–1.69, 0.28–3.6, 0.02–3.6, 0.21–3, 0.12–2.96, 0.12–3.85, 0.12–1.97, 0.03–3.45, and 0.04–3.80, respectively. Twelve hot spots of recombination containing GWRR in the range of 2 to 4 were distributed on chromosomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 11 (Figure 5). Chromosomes 3, 5, 9, and 10 did not show GWRR >2, so this part of the genome may be less recombinant. However, a trend was noted whereby the hot spots of recombination (peak of GWRR) correspond to the increase in nucleotide diversity (π) on chromosomes 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11 (Figure 5), so the recombination landscape was an important factor shaping the cultivar divergence on these chromosomes.



Figure 4 Collinearity between genetic and physical maps (markers that are distant from the "line of best fit" are not collinear).

Characterization of genome-wide LD

We conducted extensive LD analysis (Figure 6) showing that the extent and LD decay varied along chromosomes, with regions of high LD interspersed with regions of low LD. LD blocks are cold spots of recombination or spots of recombination suppression. We noted mean LD decay when testing SNPs with MAF of 0.05. Chromosomes 1 to 11 contained 11, 10, 10, 5, 9, 12, 7, 7, 13, 6, and 13 blocks with mean block size 1.43 Mb or 1.33 cM. The total lengths of LD blocks in cM were 14.77, 16.81, 18.20, 11.20, 9.0, 11.64, 9.54, 12.38, 19.63, 8.56, and 11.50 cM, respectively, with LD scaffold sizes (in Mb) 7.9, 6.18, 7.06, 4.09, 4.31, 5.84, 4.88, 3.50, 7.94, 6.62, and 7.78, respectively. Of note, the GWRR within blocks were 0.95, 0.86, 0.78, 0.93, 1.09, 0.99, 1.02, 0.94, 1.01, 1.00, and 0.96, respectively, as compared with the mean GWRR (1.2).

Characterization of selective sweep and domestication signature

We identified selection signatures across genomic regions in various chromosomes using Tajima's *D*. Mean estimated Tajima's *D* for every 100-kb window across the length of various chromosomes for sweet and semi-wild watermelon is provided in Figure 7. We identified a strong domestication signature on chromosome 3. We also estimated the observed and expected nucleotide diversity (π and θ) of semi-wild and cultivated watermelon, which suggested the narrowing of genetic diversity in sweet watermelon. The mean observed nucleotide diversity ranged from 0.163 \pm 0.044 (chromosome 6) to 0.217 \pm 0.072 (chromosome 3) for semi-wild accessions as compared with 0.147 \pm 0.043 (chromosome 1) to 0.170 \pm 0.046 (chromosome 9) for sweet watermelon accessions. Differences in both observed and expected nucleotide diversities for semi-wild compared with sweet watermelon on chromosome 3 contrast with those for the other chromosomes (Table 1).

DISCUSSION

Genotyping by sequencing

Many of the challenges with complex crop genomes can be overcome by GBS (Glaubitz *et al.* 2014). This protocol is a multiplexed, highthroughput, and low-cost method to explore the genetic diversity in populations (Elshire *et al.* 2011). In this article, we report a robust set of 10,480 SNPs included in a high-density genetic map and 1563 SNPs in a diversity panel. Before this report, Sandlin *et al.* (2012) and Nimmakayala *et al.* (2014) developed 1073 and 384 SNPs, respectively, for watermelon and showed their use in genetic mapping and genetic diversity studies. Guo *et al.* (2013) resequenced 20 watermelon accessions comprising sweet, semi-wild, and wild watermelon to identify 6,784,860 candidate SNPs and 965,006 small insertions/deletions (indels).

Use of high-density genetic maps in genomic research

Genotyping samples of a large population by sequencing presents some advantages over conventional genotyping methods. For example, GBS does not require previous characterization of polymorphisms for detection. Neves *et al.* (2013) showed that this advantage is of greater importance for a segregating population because even if previously characterized polymorphisms are available, the sites that will segregate in a single biparental segregating population and have potential to be mapped are unknown. Sub-centimorgan genetic maps such as that developed for watermelon in the current research provide a valuable resource for gene positioning on chromosomes and a guide for the assembly of a reference pine genome (Neves *et al.*



Physical Distance (Megabase)

Figure 5 Distribution of genome-wide recombination rate (GWRR) and observed nucleotide diversity (π) along chromosomes in the watermelon genome. In each plot, the horizontal axis (in Mb) represents the physical distance (PD) along the reference chromosomes and the vertical axis (cM/Mb) represents the genetic-to-physical distance ratio (green) and log -2 transformed values of nucleotide diversity (π).

2013). High-density maps can contribute to a fundamental knowledge of genome structure and have numerous applications in breeding programs to enable genomic selection and precise mapping of agronomically important genes for marker-assisted selection (Hahn *et al.* 2014; Poland *et al.* 2012). Linkage maps are indispensable tools to study virtually every aspect of genome biology. Genomic features associated with the GWRR include GC content, gene density, gene expression, epigenetic modifications, nucleosome formation, repetitive element composition, isochore structure, and patterns of genetic variation and differentiation within and between populations (Tortereau *et al.* 2012). Thus, increasingly dense recombination maps have been constructed in the "post-genomic era" for species such as human and mouse, focusing on identifying hot spots of recombination and, recently, variation in the use of these hot spots between populations (Paigen and Petkov 2010).

In this study of the watermelon genome, we identified the most robust skeletal markers with strong linkages and high confidence levels. This skeletal map further allowed for incorporating hundreds of add-on SNPs and gave a picture of haplotypic diversity and genome structure across the populations. This high-density genetic map will be of use in correcting the existing reference genome sequence for watermelon and assembly of future whole-genome resequencing endeavors. Such an approach of contextually ordering the reference sequence assisted by GBS maps will, in turn, enable better SNP calling in future GBS datasets and haplotypic imputation of missing data (Poland *et al.* 2012; Tortereau *et al.* 2012). GBS methods have vastly improved the resolution and accuracy of genetic linkage maps by increasing both the number of marker loci and the number of individuals genotyped at these loci (Holeski *et al.* 2014). Our high-density recombination map of the watermelon genome has substantially higher resolution than previously published maps. A major goal is to characterize broad patterns and features of genomes, including linkage and recombination rate variation. This high resolution allowed us to reveal low and high GWRRs across the genome, for insight into the association of nucleotide diversity levels with high and low GWRRs. In addition to their use in checking the assembly of genome sequences, high-density maps can help in understanding the evolution of understudied genomes by analysis of recombination (Tortereau *et al.* 2012; Van Elferink *et al.* 2010; Vingborg *et al.* 2009; Wong *et al.* 2010).

LD, recombination rate, and nucleotide diversity

We found extensive LD across all chromosomes of watermelon. LD must be characterized before association study. In addition to LD variation between subpopulations, LD can vary greatly across a genome, often as a result of variation in recombination rates (Marsden *et al.* 2014). Our knowledge of recombination rates and patterns in plants is far from comprehensive (Gaut *et al.* 2007). However, compelling evidence indicates a central role for recombination, via its effect on mutation and selection, in the evolution of plant genomes (Gaut *et al.* 2007). Much additional study of recombination



Figure 6 Linkage disequilibrium decay as measured by r^2 averaged in distance intervals across the 11 watermelon chromosomes.

in watermelon is needed to investigate these ideas further. Finally, one must test for evidence of population structure, which results in allele frequency differences between subpopulations. Unless controlled for, such population structure may cause spurious LD between unlinked markers, thus resulting in false associations and/or inflated true associations (Lewis and Knight 2012). In the current study, levels of nucleotide diversity varied significantly both within and between chromosomes. We observed lower diversity combined with low recombination rate on chromosome 3, which showed selective sweep and signals of domestication. We noted a trend of suppressed recombination resulting in reduced diversity within and across the chromosomes. Li *et al.* (2014) hypothesized that an increasing number of recombinations in genomic areas that have undergone selective sweeps might be an important aspect of breaking the current yield barriers in breeding.

Location of selective sweep across the genome

Guo et al. (2013) studied selective sweep in the watermelon genome by scanning genetic diversity ($\pi_{mucosospermus}/\pi_{sweet watermelon}$) among six accessions of C. lanatus subsp. mucosospermus and 11 accessions of sweet watermelon to identify domestication signals. The authors identified 108 regions (7.78 Mb) containing 741 candidate genes under selective sweep across the genome. Guo et al. (2013) further characterized a large region on chromosome 3 (from \sim 3.4 to \sim 5.6 Mb) with the highest nucleotide divergence among subsp. mucosospermus accessions as compared with sweet watermelon. This region contained the genes for regulating carbohydrate use, sugar-mediated signaling, carbohydrate metabolism, response to sucrose stimulus, regulation of nitrogen-compound metabolism, cellular response to nitrogen starvation, and growth. However, the study involved small sample sizes, which can suggest bias due to narrow genetic diversity, limited population history, selection timing, phasing error, and false LD resolution (Granka et al. 2012; Qanbari et al. 2012; Tang et al. 2007). In addition, selective sweep reduces variability around a selected site: new

mutations would gradually appear at low frequencies, eventually causing a frequency spectrum (Oleksyk *et al.* 2010). Alternatively, balanced selection maintains a high proportion of frequency polymorphisms, thereby shifting the spectrum to the intermediate frequencies (Oleksyk *et al.* 2010).

A shift in frequency spectrum would cause changes in the occurrence of ancestral and derived alleles, necessitating use of the Tajima's *D* test, an approach that compares the mean pair-wise difference between sequences in a population sample (π) with the number of differences estimated by using the number of polymorphic sites (*s*). Tajima's *D* is 0 for neutral variation, positive when an excess of rare polymorphism indicates positive selection, and negative with an excess of high-frequency variants, which indicates balanced selection (Tajima 1989). We used Tajima's *D* test to confirm the highest signal of purifying selection on chromosome 3, which provides strong evidence for the genes with important roles in ripening, sugar-mediated signaling, and carbohydrate transport and fruit development, as being important for sweet watermelon domestication.

CONCLUSIONS

This study provided a high-density genetic map of *C. lanatus* var. *lanatus* containing a set of 10,480 SNPs and further characterized genomic features such as GWRR, LD, and selective sweep across the genome. High-density maps can be used in breeding programs for genomic selection and precise mapping of agronomically important genes for marker-assisted selection. The extent of LD is a key factor in determining the number of markers needed for GWAS and genomic selection. Our research provides resources for association mapping to identify functional variation associated with important agronomic and economic traits in watermelon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was supported by the USDA-NIFA (no. 2013-38821-21453), NSF-EPSCOR (no. 1003907), Gus R. Douglass Institute, and



Figure 7 Genome-wide window-based Tajima's *D* of cultivated (blue) and semi-wild watermelon (red) across various chromosomes. If Tajima's D is negative for blue and positive for red, then that region of the genome is under selective sweep. Note two dark lines on chromosome 3 that showed strong signal for selective sweep.

NIH (no. P20RR016477). The authors are grateful to R. Jarret, PGRCU, and USDA-ARS (Griffin, GA) for providing the seeds for the germplasm accessions. The authors are thankful to S. Malkaram for population structure analysis on High Performance Computer.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bauer, E., M. Falque, H. Walter, C. Bauland, C. Camisan *et al.*,
 2013 Intraspecific variation of recombination rate in maize. Genome Biol. 14: R103.
- Botha, F. C., 1982 Water Conservation in the fruit of the tsamma of the Kalahari. Veld & Flora 68: 66–67.
- Bradbury, P. J., Z. Zhang, D. E. Kroon, T. M. Casstevens, Y. Ramdoss et al., 2007 TASSEL: software for association mapping of complex traits in diverse samples. Bioinformatics 23: 2633–2635.
- Dane, F., and J. Liu, 2007 Diversity and origin of cultivated and citron type watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus*). Genet. Resour. Crop Evol. 54: 1255–1265.
- de Roos, A., B. Hayes, and M. Goddard, 2009 Reliability of genomic predictions across multiple populations. Genetics 183: 1545–1553.
- Elshire, R. J., J. C. Glaubitz, Q. Sun, J. A. Poland, K. Kawamoto *et al.*, 2011 A robust, simple genotyping-by-sequencing (GBS) approach for high diversity species. PLoS ONE 6: e19379.
- Evanno, G., S. Regnaut, and J. Goudet, 2005 Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software structure: a simulation study. Mol. Ecol. 14: 2611–2620.
- Flint-Garcia, S. A., J. M. Thornsberry, E. S. Buckler IV, 2003 Structure of linkage disequilibrium in plants*. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. 54: 357–374.
- Gaut, B. S., S. I. Wright, C. Rizzon, J. Dvorak, and L. K. Anderson,2007 Recombination: an underappreciated factor in the evolution of plant genomes. Nat. Rev. Genet. 8: 77–84.
- Glaubitz, J. C., T. M. Casstevens, F. Lu, J. Harriman, R. J. Elshire *et al.*, 2014 TASSEL-GBS: A high capacity genotyping by sequencing analysis pipeline. PLoS ONE 9: e90346.
- Granka, J. M., B. M. Henn, C. R. Gignoux, J. M. Kidd, C. D. Bustamante *et al.*, 2012 Limited evidence for classic selective sweeps in African populations. Genetics 192: 1049–1064.
- Guo, S., J. Zhang, H. Sun, J. Salse, W. J. Lucas *et al.*, 2013 The draft genome of watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus*) and resequencing of 20 diverse accessions. Nat. Genet. 45: 51–58.
- Hahn, M. W., S. V. Zhang and L. C. Moyle, 2014 Sequencing, assembling, and correcting draft genomes using recombinant populations. G3 (Bethesda) 4: 669–679.
- Holeski, L. M., P. Monnahan, B. Koseva, N. McCool, R. L. Lindroth *et al.*, 2014 A high-resolution genetic map of yellow monkeyflower identifies chemical defense QTLs and recombination rate variation. G3 (Bethesda) 4: 813–821.
- Korneliussen, T. S., I. Moltke, A. Albrechtsen, and R. Nielsen, 2013 Calculation of Tajima's D and other neutrality test statistics from low depth next-generation sequencing data. BMC Bioinformatics 14: 289.
- Korol, A., D. Mester, Z. Frenkel, Y. Ronin 2009 Methods for Genetic Analysis in the Triticeae. Springer, New York.
- Levi, A., J. Thies, W. P. Wechter, H. Harrison, A. Simmons et al., 2013 High frequency oligonucleotides: targeting active gene (HFO-TAG) markers revealed wide genetic diversity among *Citrullus* spp. accessions useful for enhancing disease or pest resistance in watermelon cultivars. Genet. Resour. Crop Evol. 60: 427–440.
- Levi, A., C. Thomas, A. Keinath, and T. Wehner, 2001 Genetic diversity among watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* and *Citrullus colocynthis*) accessions. Genet. Resour. Crop Evol. 48: 559–566.
- Lewis, C. M., and J. Knight, 2012 Introduction to Genetic Association Studies. Cold Spring Harbor protocols 3: 297–306.
- Li, Y.-H., Y.-L. Liu, J. C. Reif, Z.-X. Liu, B. Liu *et al.*, 2014 Biparental resequencing coupled with SNP genotyping of a segregating population offers insights into the landscape of recombination and fixed genomic regions in elite soybean. G3 (Bethesda) 4: 553–560.
- Marsden, C. D., Y. Lee, K. Kreppel, A. Weakley, A. Cornel *et al.*, 2014 Diversity, differentiation, and linkage disequilibrium: Prospects

for association mapping in the malaria vector Anopheles arabiensis. G3 (Bethesda) 4: 121–131.

- Mascher, M., S. Wu, P. S. Amand, N. Stein, and J. Poland, 2013 Application of genotyping-by-sequencing on semiconductor sequencing platforms: A comparison of genetic and reference-based marker ordering in barley. PLoS ONE 8: e76925.
- Mester, D. R. Y., D. Minkov, E. Nevo, and A. Korol, 2003 Constructing large-scale genetic maps using an evolutionary strategy algorithm. Genetics 165: 2269–2282.
- Mester, D. R. Y., E. Nevo, and A. B. Korol, 2004 Fast and high precision algorithms for optimization in large-scale genomic problems. Comput. Biol. Chem. 28: 281–290.
- Meeuse, A. D., 1962 The Cucurbitaceae of Southern Africa. Bothalia 8: 1-11.
- Neves, L. G., J. M. Davis, W. B. Barbazuk and M. Kirst, 2013 A high-density gene map of Loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) based on exome sequence capture genotyping. G3 (Bethesda) 113.008714.
- Nimmakayala, P., N. Islam-Faridi, Y. Tomason, F. Lutz, A. Levi et al., 2011 Citrullus, pp. 59–66 in Wild Crop Relatives: Genomic and Breeding Resources. Springer, New York.
- Nimmakayala, P., Y. R. Tomason, J. Jeong, S. K. Ponniah, A. Karunathilake et al., 2010 Genetic reticulation and interrelationships among *Citrullus* species as revealed by joint analysis of shared AFLPs and species-specific SSR alleles. Plant Genetic Resources 8: 16–25.
- Nimmakayala, P., V. L. Abburi, A. Bhandary, L. Abburi, V. G. Vajja et al., 2014 Use of VeraCode 384-plex assays for watermelon diversity analysis and integrated genetic map of watermelon with single nucleotide polymorphisms and simple sequence repeats. Mol. Breed. .10.1007/ s11032-014-0056-9
- Oleksyk, T. K., M. W. Smith, and S. J. O'Brien, 2010 Genome-wide scans for footprints of natural selection. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 365: 185–205.
- Paigen, K., and P. Petkov, 2010 Mammalian recombination hot spots: properties, control and evolution. Nat. Rev. Genet. 11: 221–233.
- Poland, J. A., P. J. Brown, M. E. Sorrells, and J.-L. Jannink, 2012 Development of high-density genetic maps for barley and wheat using a novel twoenzyme genotyping-by-sequencing approach. PLoS ONE 7: e32253.
- Pritchard, J., M. Stephens, N. Rosenberg, and P. Donnelly, 2000 Association mapping in structured populations. Am. J. Hum. Genet. 67: 170–181.
- Qanbari, S., T. M. Strom, G. Haberer, S. Weigend, A. A. Gheyas *et al.*, 2012 A high resolution genome-wide scan for significant selective sweeps: An application to pooled sequence data in laying chickens. PLoS ONE 7: e49525.
- Reddy, U., N. Aryal, N. Islam-Faridi, Y. Tomason, A. Levi *et al.*,
 2013 Cytomolecular characterization of rDNA distribution in various *Citrullus* species using fluorescent in situ hybridization. Genet. Resour.
 Crop Evol. 60: 2091–2100.
- Ren, Y., H. Zhao, Q. Kou, J. Jiang, S. Guo *et al.*, 2012 A high resolution genetic map anchoring scaffolds of the sequenced watermelon genome. PLoS ONE 7: e29453.
- Robinson, R., and D. Decker-Walters, 1999 *Cucurbits*. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxford, UK.
- Romão, R., 2000 Northeast Brazil: A secondary center of diversity for watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus*). Genet. Resour. Crop Evol. 47: 207–213.
- Sandlin, K., J. Prothro, A. Heesacker, N. Khalilian, R. Okashah et al., 2012 Comparative mapping in watermelon. [*Citrullus lanatus* (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai] Theor. Appl. Genet. 125: 1603–1618.
- Sim, S.-C., G. Durstewitz, J. Plieske, R. Wieseke, M. W. Ganal *et al.*, 2012 Development of a large SNP genotyping array and generation of high-density genetic maps in tomato. PLoS ONE 7: e40563.
- Sonah, H., M. Bastien, E. Iquira, A. Tardivel, G. Légaré et al., 2013 An improved genotyping by sequencing (GBS) approach offering increased versatility and efficiency of SNP discovery and genotyping. PLoS ONE 8: e54603.
- Tajima, F., 1989 Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA polymorphism. Genetics 123: 585–595.
- Tang, K., K. R. Thornton, and M. Stoneking, 2007 A new approach for using genome scans to detect recent positive selection in the human genome. PLoS Biol. 5: e171.

- Tortereau, F., B. Servin, L. Frantz, H.-J. Megens, D. Milan et al., 2012 A high density recombination map of the pig reveals a correlation between sex-specific recombination and GC content. BMC Genomics 13: 586.
- van Elferink, M., G. As, T. Veenendaal, R. Crooijmans, and M. Groenen, 2010 Regional differences in recombination hotspots between two chicken populations. BMC Genet. 11: 11.
- Van Ooijen, J., 2006 JoinMap 4, Software for the calculation of genetic linkage maps in experimental populations, Kyazma BV, Wageningen, Netherlands.
- Vingborg, R., V. Gregersen, B. Zhan, F. Panitz, A. Hoj et al., 2009 A robust linkage map of the porcine autosomes based on gene-associated SNPs. BMC Genomics 10: 134.
- Voorrips, R. E., 2002 MapChart: Software for the graphical presentation of linkage maps and QTLs. J. Hered. 93: 77–78.

- Whitaker, T. W., and W. P. Bemis, 1976 Cucurbits, pp. 64–69 in *Evolution* of crop plants, edited by N. W. Simmonds Longman, London.
- Wong, A., A. Ruhe, B. Dumont, K. Robertson, G. Guerrero et al., 2010 A comprehensive linkage map of the dog genome. Genetics 184: 595–605.
- Yan, J., T. Shah, M. L. Warburton, E. S. Buckler, M. D. McMullen *et al.*, 2009 Genetic characterization and linkage disequilibrium estimation of a global maize collection using SNP markers. PLoS ONE 4: e8451.
- Yu, J., and E. S. Buckler, 2006 Genetic association mapping and genome organization of maize. Curr. Opin. Biotechnol. 17: 155–160.
- Zhang, H., H. Wang, S. Guo, Y. Ren, G. Gong *et al.*, 2012 Identification and validation of a core set of microsatellite markers for genetic diversity analysis in watermelon, *Citrullus lanatus* Thunb. Matsum. & Nakai. Euphytica 186: 329–342.

Communicating editor: D. Zamir