# **Evolutionary Aspects of the SRelated Genes of the Brassica Self-Incompatibility System: Synonymous and Nonsynonymous Base Substitutions**

Kokichi Hinata,\* Masao Watanabe,\* Seyei Yamakawa,<sup>†</sup> Yoko Satta<sup>†</sup> and Akira Isogai<sup>†</sup>

*\*Faculty of Agriculture, Tohoku University, Sendai 981, Japan, tGraduate School of Biological Sciences, Nara Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma 630-01, Japan, and \$Max Planck Institute, 0-7400, Tubingen, Germany* 

> Manuscript received September *25,* 1994 Accepted for publication March **28,** 1995

> > ABSTRACT

In the Brassicaceae, self- *us.* nonself-recognition in self-incompatibility is controlled by sporophytic S alleles. Haplotypes specifylng both *SRK* (Sreceptor kinase) and *SLG* (Slocus glycoprotein) are considered to play an important role in the recognition reactions. We compared the nucleotide sequences of *SRK<sup>* $\theta$ *</sup>(Bc)* and *SRK*<sup> $\theta$ </sup>(*Bo*). The number of nonsynonymous substitutions per site  $(P_n)$  was lower, constrained, in the kinase than the receptor domain, while the numbers of synonymous substitutions  $(P_s)$  in the two domains were largely comparable. Pairwise values for *P,* and *P,,* were calculated among 17 operational taxonomic units, including eight *SLGs,* the receptor domains of **two** *SRKs,* four *SRAs* (Srelated A) and three *SR.&* (Srelated **B),** which have high homologies with each other. The values of *P,* and *P,,* of *SLG*  were mostly comparable to those of the receptor domain of *SRK.* Dendrograms constructed on the basis **of** *P,,* and *P,* indicated that *SRA* differentiated first, followed by *SRB.* The differentiation of *SLG* alleles is one of prerequisite factors for the establishment of self-incompatibility, and the allelic differentiation has occurred more than tens of million years ago.

IN the Brassicaceae, self-incompatible plants have a self/nonself recognition system that is sporophytically controlled by multiple alleles at what appears by classical genetics to be a single locus *(3.* Recent studies have revealed that *SLG* (Slocus glycoprotein) and *SRK*  (Sreceptor kinase) are both in linkage with Salleles and are best considered as a haplotype (BOYES and NAS RALLAH 1993; NASRALLAH and NASRALLAH 1993). It was also pointed out that there are other clones, *SRA* (S related **A)** and *SRB* (Srelated **B),** that have high homol*ogy* to *SLG* but segregate at a different locus from **S.**  All of these genes express proteins mainly in mature stigma tissue, in which the self-incompatibility reaction occurs (reviewed by **HINATA** *et al.* 1993). Their evolutionary relationships are important points to be considered for the maintenance of the Sallele polymorphism in this family.

*As* for *S-RNase* genes in solanaceous plants, which express gametophytic self-incompatibility, transformation experiments have indicated that style *S-RNase* plays a direct role in the recognition reaction between pollen tubes and style **(LEE** *et al.* 1994; MURFETI *et al.* 1994). In a study of pairwise comparison between S-RNases cloned from various species in the Solanaceae, CLARK and KAO (1991) pointed **out** that *S-RNasa* have accumulated many synonymous and nonsynonymous base substitutions. They also showed that the level of amino acid constraint was significantly heterogeneous among dif-

*Corresponding uuthor;* **Kokichi Hinata, Faculty of Agriculture,** Te **hoku University, Tsutsumidori-Amamiyamachi, Aobaku, Sendai 981 Japan.** 

**Genetics 140: 1099-1104 (July, 1995)** 

ferent regions of the gene, with some regions being highly constrained and others appearing to be virtually unconstrained. These studies have contributed much toward the understanding of gametophytic self-incompatibility. In the case of sporophytic self-incompatibility, however, only TRICK and **HEIZMANN** (1992) have pointed out that *SLG* and *SRA* in *B. oleracea* have accumulated many nonsynonymous base substitutions. More extensive evolutionary analyses are needed to understand the self-incompatibility in this family.

We have cloned and sequenced *SLG', SRF?* and some other genes in *B. campestris* **(WATANABE** *et al.* 1994). In this report, we compared the nucleotide sequences between Srelated genes, including *SLG, SRK, SRA* and *SRB,* and discussed their variability and relationships with respect to synonymous and nonsynonymous base substitutions.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The DNA sequences used are shown in Table 1. Nucleotide sequence alignments were constructed by first performing an amino acid alignment and then constructing the nucleotide alignment to maximize similarity. Synonymous and nonsynonymous substitutions per site were calculated by using MEGA software **(KUMAR** *et al.* 1993) and other packages that compute synonymous and nonsynonymous differences. These values are represented as  $P_s$  and  $P_n$ , respectively.

## RESULTS

**Synonymous and nonsynonymous changes in the receptor and kinase domains of** *SRKs***:**  $P_s$  and  $P_n$  between *SRF?(Bc)* and *SR&?(Bo)* were calculated for the receptor

TABLE **1** 

**DNA sequences used** 

|                                     | Original notation                                    |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| DNA sequence                        | and reference <sup>a</sup>                           |
| SLG genes                           |  |
| $SLG8$ (B. campestris)              | $S^8$ , DWYER et al. (1991)<br>(X55274)              |
| $SLG9$ ( <i>B. campestris</i> )     | $S9$ , WATANABE et al. (1994)<br>(D30050)            |
| $SLG12$ ( <i>B. campestris</i> )    | $S^{12}$ , Yamakawa et al. (1994)                    |
| $SLG^6$ (B. oleracea)               | S <sup>6</sup> , NASRALLAH et al. (1987)<br>(Y0026)  |
| $SLG13$ (B. oleracea)               | $S^{13}$ , DWYER et al. (1991)<br>(X55275)           |
| $SLG29$ (B. oleracea)               | $S^{29}$ -2, TRICK and FLAVELL (1989)<br>(X16123)    |
| SRK genes                           |  |
| $SRK9$ (B. campestris)              | WATANABE et al. (1994)<br>(D30049)                   |
| $SRK^6$ (B. oleracea)               | STEIN et al. (1991) (M76647)                         |
| SRB-like genes                      |  |
| $SRB2$ ( $\overline{B}$ . oleracea) | SLR2, BOYES et al. (1991)<br>(X57673)                |
| $SLG2A$ (B. oleracea)               | CHEN and NASRALLAH (1990)                            |
| $SLG^5$ ( <i>B. oleracea</i> )      | $S5$ , SCUTT and CROY (1992)<br>(X65814)             |
| SRA genes                           |  |
| $SRA1$ (B. campestris)              | NS <sup>1</sup> , ISOGAI et al. (1991)<br>(X58440)   |
| SRA <sup>3</sup> (B. campestris)    | NS <sup>3</sup> , YAMAKAWA et al. (1993)<br>(D11108) |
| $SRA-S^{63}$ (B. oleracea)          | $S^{63}I$ (BS63-1), Trick (1990)<br>(X52089)         |
| $SRA-S22$ (B. oleracea)             | SLR1, LALONDE et al. (1989)<br>(S44181)              |
| SLG-like genes from                 |  |
| B. napus                            |  |
| $SLG14$ (B. napus)                  | A14, GORING et al. (1992a)<br>(Z11725)               |
| $SLG91$ (B. napus)                  | 910, GORING et al. (1992b)<br>(Z11724)               |

*<sup>a</sup>*Parentheses indicate data base accession number.

and kinase domains separately (Table 2). The values of *P,* for these two domains were 0.208 and 0.217, indicating that they have similar potentials **for** variability. However,  $P_n$  was as low as 0.048 in the kinase domain, while it was 0.120 in the receptor one. The amino acid sequence at the kinase domain appears to be constrained, probably reflecting the maintenance of enzymatic function, while the receptor domain has accumulated nonsynonymous substitutions at a rate as high **as** that of *SLGs,* as will be shown later.

**Comparison between** *SLG, SRA, SRB* **and the receptor domains of** *SRK:*  $P_s$  and  $P_n$  were calculated pairwise among 17 Srelated OTUs (operational taxonomic units).

The values of *P,* between *SLG* alleles ranged from 0.14 to 0.35, and of *P,* from 0.06 to 0.15 (Table 3).

**Comparison of synonymous** *(P.)* **and nonsynonymous (Pn) substitutions per site on the receptor and kinase**  domains of *SRK<sup>9</sup>* (B. campestris) and *SRK<sup>6</sup>* (B. oleracea)



Numbers in parentheses indicate number of sites.

These values were mostly comparable to those of the receptor domains of *SRKs.* 

The values of *P,* and *P,* between *SRBs* were a little lower than those of *SLGs.* In this comparison, *SRB',*   $SLG<sup>2A</sup>$  and  $SLG<sup>5</sup>$  showed high sequence homology, and they were grouped as *SRB* in this context.

The values of *P,* and *P,* between *SRA* alleles were the lowest observed.

 $P_s$  and  $P_n$  are shown for all pairwise comparisons in Figure 1. The *P,* value was generally higher than that of the corresponding  $P_n$ . The correlation coefficient between *P,* and *P,* for intralocus comparisons within *SLGs, SRAs* and *SRBS* was **as** high **as** 0.785. The ratio of *P,* to *P,*  seemed to be very similar among alleles of *SLG, SRAs*  and *SRBs*. However, the ratio of  $P_n$  to  $P_s$  was lower in interlocus than in intralocus comparisons, indicating that the pattern of variation differs within and between loci. The standard errors of  $P_n$  were  $\langle 11\% \rangle$  of  $P_n$  values and those of  $P_s$  were  $\langle 15\% \rangle$  of  $P_s$ , when  $P_n$  or  $P_s$  exceeds 0.1.

Neighbor-joining dendrograms (SAITOU and **NEI**  1987) of 17 Srelated OTUs were constructed on the bases of *P,* and *P,* (Figure 2a, b). Very similar figures were obtained for *P,* and *P,,* though a little difference was observed among the *SLGs.* In either calculation, both trees show three major clusters, corresponding to *SLG, SRB* and *SRA* sequences. *SLG*<sup>2</sup> and *SLG*<sup>5</sup>, pollenrecessive alleles of *SLG,* were included in the *SRB* cluster. The *SRA* cluster appears to have diverged first from the *SLG* and *SRB* clusters, followed by the differentiation of the *SRB* and *SLG* clusters. The receptor domain of *SRK* clustered with the *SLG* group.

The differentiation of *SLG* alleles does not reflect the differentiation of species (Figure 2). The *SRA* sequences show lower allelic differentiation compared to *SLG* and alleles within species group together.

**Highly variable regions:**  $P_s$  and  $P_n$  were calculated at different positions along the sequences within window sizes of **60** bp for eight *SLGs,* three *SRBs* and two *SRh,*  respectively (Figure  $3$  a-c). Other calculations with larger window sizes gave similar results.

As shown in Figure 3a for *SLG,* synonymous, as well as nonsynonymous, substitutions were distributed unevenly through the sequence. *P,* was high at the signal peptide, V1, and 3'-terminal regions. Three *P,* peaks were observed at sites 600 (Vl), 810 (V2) and 930 (V3)

## Brassica Self-Incompatibility 1101

## **TABLE 3**

**Synonymous (upper right) and nonsynonymous (lower left) substitution per site calculated by Jukes-Cantor method** 

|                      | $SLG^8$<br>Bc | $SLG^9$<br>Bc | $SLG^{12}$<br>Bc | $SLG^6$<br>Bo | $SLG^{13}$<br>Bo | $SLG^{29}$<br>Bo | $SLG^{14}$<br>Bn | $SLG^{91}$<br>$B_n$ | $SRK^{9}RD$<br>Bc | $SRK^6RD$<br><b>Bo</b> | SRB <sup>2</sup><br><b>Bo</b> | SLG <sup>2A</sup><br>Bo | SLG <sup>5</sup><br>Bo | SRA <sup>1</sup><br>Bc | $SRA^3$<br>Bc | $SRA-S^{63}$<br>Bo | $SRA-S^6$<br>Bo |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| $SLG^8Bc$            |               | 0.26          | 0.26             | 0.19          | 0.18             | 0.18             | 0.19             | 0.30                | 0.28              | 0.22                   | 0.74                          | 0.76                    | 0.76                   | 0.87                   | 0.89          | 0.87               | 0.86            |
| $SLG^9Bc$            | 0.13          |               | 0.25             | 0.23          | 0.28             | 0.18             | 0.22             | 0.29                | 0.03              | 0.20                   | 0.70                          | 0.70                    | 0.75                   | 0.92                   | 0.89          | 0.92               | 0.91            |
| $SLG^{12}Bc$         | 0.12          | 0.13          |                  | 0.22          | 0.27             | 0.21             | 0.23             | 0.19                | 0.29              | 0.26                   | 0.72                          | 0.65                    | 0.69                   | 0.96                   | 0.92          | 0.90               | 0.87            |
| $SLG^6Bo$            | 0.10          | 0.11          | 0.13             |               | 0.18             | 0.14             | 0.14             | 0.24                | 0.25              | 0.11                   | 0.72                          | 0.75                    | 0.77                   | 0.86                   | 0.85          | 0.82               | 0.85            |
| $SLG^{13}Bo$         | 0.06          | 0.12          | 0.12             | 0.09          |                  | 0.16             | 0.21             | 0.30                | 0.30              | 0.20                   | 0.77                          | 0.76                    | 0.82                   | 1.02                   | 1.00          | 0.97               | 0.98            |
| $SLG^{29}Bo$         | 0.11          | 0.10          | 0.12             | 0.10          | 0.10             |                  | 0.18             | 0.26                | 0.20              | 0.17                   | 0.69                          | 0.71                    | 0.76                   | 0.90                   | 0.87          | 0.91               | 0.90            |
| $SLG^{14}Bn$         | 0.12          | 0.13          | 0.16             | 0.10          | 0.11             | 0.13             |                  | 0.28                | 0.25              | 0.18                   | 0.74                          | 0.82                    | 0.80                   | 0.80                   | 0.79          | 0.81               | 0.81            |
| $SLG^{91}Bn$         | 0.13          | 0.15          | 0.10             | 0.13          | 0.13             | 0.13             | 0.15             |                     | 0.30              | 0.25                   | 0.72                          | 0.70                    | 0.77                   | 0.94                   | 0.91          | 0.96               | 0.92            |
| $SRK^{9}BcRD*$       | 0.13          | 0.01          | 0.14             | 0.12          | 0.13             | 0.11             | 0.13             | 0.15                |                   | 0.20                   | 0.68                          | 0.68                    | 0.74                   | 0.89                   | 0.87          | 0.90               | 0.89            |
| $SRK^6BoRD$          | 0.12          | 0.12          | 0.15             | 0.06          | 0.11             | 0.13             | 0.13             | 0.14                | 0.12              |                        | 0.69                          | 0.72                    | 0.76                   | 0.88                   | 0.87          | 0.87               | 0.87            |
| SRB <sup>2</sup> Bo  | 0.22          | 0.23          | 0.22             | 0.23          | 0.22             | 0.24             | 0.23             | 0.23                | 0.23              | 0.22                   |                               | 0.16                    | 0.15                   | 1.02                   | 1.01          | 1.03               | 1.02            |
| SLG <sup>2A</sup> Bo | 0.21          | 0.21          | 0.21             | 0.21          | 0.20             | 0.22             | 0.21             | 0.22                | 0.21              | 0.20                   | 0.07                          |                         | 0.12                   | 1.07                   | 1.08          | 1.11               | 1.08            |
| SLG <sup>5</sup> Bo  | 0.21          | 0.23          | 0.22             | 0.22          | 0.21             | 0.22             | 0.21             | 0.23                | 0.23              | 0.22                   | 0.08                          | 0.06                    |                        | 1.01                   | 0.98          | 1.05               | 1.04            |
| SRA <sup>t</sup> Bc  | 0.29          | 0.27          | 0.27             | 0.27          | 0.27             | 0.27             | 0.29             | 0.27                | 0.28              | 0.28                   | 0.33                          | 0.33                    | 0.33                   |                        | 0.06          | 0.08               | 0.08            |
| SRA <sup>3</sup> Bc  | 0.29          | 0.27          | 0.27             | 0.28          | 0.27             | 0.27             | 0.30             | 0.28                | 0.28              | 0.28                   | 0.34                          | 0.33                    | 0.34                   | 0.02                   |               | 0.11               | 0.11            |
| $SRA-S^{63}Bo$       | 0.28          | 0.26          | 0.27             | 0.27          | 0.26             | 0.26             | 0.28             | 0.27                | 0.27              | 0.27                   | 0.33                          | 0.33                    | 0.33                   | 0.04                   | 0.04          |                    | 0.01            |
| $SRA-S^{6}Bo$        | 0.28          | 0.27          | 0.28             | 0.27          | 0.27             | 0.27             | 0.28             | 0.27                | 0.28              | 0.28                   | 0.33                          | 0.33                    | 0.33                   | 0.04                   | 0.05          | 0.01               |                 |
|                      |               |               |                  |               |                  |                  |                  |                     |                   |                        |                               |                         |                        |                        |               |                    |                 |

\* Receptor domain was calculated.

in *SLG*, and the peak values of  $P_n$  were mostly comparable to those of *P,,* especially in V2 and V3. Thus, the whole sequence was divided into C1, V1(604-627), C2, V2(855-870), V3(871-982), and C3, as shown in Figure 3a, in which C and V represent conserved and variable regions, respectively. In the C1 region, N-linked glycosylated sites and tryptophane residues were conserved fairly well. Between V2 and V3, cysteine residues were conserved. In the C3 region, cysteine residues were conserved and  $P_n$  was comparatively low. The conserved regions may be important for maintaining the function of this protein and the variable regions for the allelic polymorphism.

The variation at *SRB* showed patterns similar to *SLG,*  but  $P_n$  was higher in V1 than V2 and V3 (Figure 3b). The differences between *SRB* and *SLG* occurred more frequently at he 3'-terminal half, and these sites seemed to characterize the *SRB* sequences.

Fewer nonsynonymous substitutions occurred in *SRA,*  and the variation spectrum was different from *SLG* and *SRB* (Figure 3c). Differences between *SRA* and *SLG* ap peared to be distributed more evenly along the sequences.

#### **DISCUSSION**

According to Nou *et al.* (1993), more than 100 *S*  alleles may exist in *B. campestris.* Stigmatic *SLG* proteins from 30 *S* homozygotes showed different isoelectric points (PI). The high variability of *SLG* observed here



and  $P_n$  in pairwise comparison of intralo-*SRK,*  $\angle$ *i*) and interloci *(SLG:SRA,*  $\Box$ ; *SI,GSRB,* A; *SRA:SRB, 0).*  **SLG: SRA cus** (denoted as *SLG,* ●; *SRA,* ■; *SRB,* ▲;



FIGURE 2.-Dendrograms of OTUs constructed by neighbor-joining method based on *P,* (a) and *P,,* (b).

may explain the polymorphism of the *SLG* protein. Although the estimates of pI values based on amino acid composition of each *SLG* did not always coincide well with the actual pI values, the relative order of the estimated and actual pI values showed full agreement for those proteins whose pI values were known.

High correlations between  $P_n$  and  $P_s$  were observed in allelic comparison within the *SLG, SRB* and *SRA* loci. This may indicate that the nucleotide changes of alleles occurred in a similar fashion in every locus, though the magnitude may differ. On the other hand, the ratio **of**  *P,* to *P,* was higher in within-locus comparisons. This may indicate either that the modes of nonsynonymous substitutions are different among loci, or that the nonsynonymous substitutions are approaching saturation.

The dendrogram indicates that the *SRA* locus differentiated from the other Srelated genes first, and its allelic differentiation occurred rather recently. SRA



FIGURE 3. $-P_s$  ( $\bullet$ ) and  $P_n$  ( $\bullet$ ) along the sequence of eight *SLG* (a), two *SRB* (b) and **two** *SRA (SRA'* and *SRA3)* (c) , calculated on 60-bp window size at 30-bp sliding intervals. Conserved (C1–C3) and variable (V1–V3) regions are indicated in Figure 3a.

does not play a role in the recognition reactions, but its abundant production in the stigma may indicate that it contributes to the pollination process **(WATANBE** *et al.* 1992).

After the divergence of *SRA, SRB* appears to have differentiated from *SLG* and *SRK.* According to BOYES *et al.* (1991), the *SRB* locus is located near *SRA.* It has been shown that *SRB* has high homology to *SLG'Bo* and *SLG2\*Bo,* both of which were cloned from stigmas as pollen-recessive *SLGs* **(CHEN** and NASRALLAH 1990; **SCUTT** and **CROY** 1992). These genes differ from other *SLGs* by many nucleotide differences in the **3'** half of the sequences. One possibility is that the recessive SLG has appeared recently after SLG allelic differentiation. Further studies are needed on this group of genes.

Lastly, SLG and *SRK* appear to have differentiated among Salleles. Together, as a haplotype, they play a role in the recognition reaction in self-incompatibility (NASRALLAH and NASRALLAH 1993). Analysis of the *S9*  genotype in *B. campestris* showed that the receptor domain of SRKand the corresponding SLG have as high as 98% nucleotide identity (WATANBE *et al.* 1994). These authors considered that certain mechanisms act to maintain similarity among the sequences, though the mechanisms are unknown. *P,* and *P,* within the receptor domains of *SRKS* were mostly comparable to those of SLGs. Nonsynonymous substitutions in the kinase domain of SRKseemed to be constrained, as in many plant enzymes. Compared to the kinase domain, a very high level of nonsynonymous base substitutions has accumulated in the SLG and SRK-receptor domains, which play a direct role in the recognition of self and nonself. Substitutions may result in the production of novel *S*  allele classes, and such mutants may be preferentially kept in the population. The relationships between SLG and the corresponding receptor domain of *SRK,* and between the receptor and kinase domains should be studied. It could be the case that the expression of self-incompatibility in the Brassicaceae was established when the interaction between SLGand SRKwas formed.

Allelic differentiation of SLG as well as *SRK* appears to have occurred at a very ancient time, suggesting that self-incompatibility may have been established before the differentiation of species in this family. According to MULLER (1981), only one fossil record from the up per Miocene of France has been published for the family Brassicaceae. The upper Miocene occurred 5-11 million years ago. If the diversification of SLG arose 10 million years ago, and if we take mean values of *P,* and *P,* of SLG to be 0.22 and 0.12, respectively, then the rate of molecular change would be estimated to be 11  $\times$  10<sup>-9</sup>/site/year for synonymous substitutions and 6  $\times$  $10^{-9}$ /site/year for nonsynonymous substitutions. These values are very high compared to those of other plant genes (WOLFE *et al.* 1987; BOUSQUET *et al.* 1992). The fossil record may indicate only the existence of species but not always their origins. If the time of establishment of the self-incompatibility were 50 million years ago, the rates would be  $2.2 \times 10^{-9}$ /site/year for synonymous and  $1.2 \times 10^{-9}$ /site/year for nonsynonymous substitutions. An interesting question is whether the origin of this form of self-incompatibility predates or postdates the origin of the Brassicaceae.

In contrast, the differentiation of alleles of *SRA* appears to have occurred rather recently, because the variation among alleles was inferred to have occurred after the species divergence.

In the *S-RNase* system of the Solanaceae, *P,* and *P,* in the variable region have been estimated **as** 0.4-0.7 and

0.2-0.6, respectively (CLARK 1993). These values are somewhat higher than the values for the Brassicaceae herein calculated. Self-incompatibility may have been independently established in the Brassicaceae at a more recent time than in the Solanaceae.

The variable sites occur unevenly along the length of the sequence. Although the reason is unknown, tryptophane residues were observed to be well conserved in the C1 region. High levels of nonsynonymous substitution within SLG were found in the V1, V2, and V3 regions. The latter two variable regions are located around the first cysteine-conserved cluster. These regions may affect the conformation of this molecule. An interesting open question concerns whether such conformational changes can explain the existence of more than 100 *S* alleles. Some of the conserved regions may be important to the process of recognition.

Allelic differentiation of the haplotype of SLG and *SRK* may play an important role in the establishment of self-incompatibility in these taxa. The self-incompatibility thus established may have played an important role in the species differentiation of this family.

We thank N. TAKAHATA, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, Misima, for valuable suggestions and reading manuscripts; M. K. UYENOYAMA, Duke University, for critical reading of the manuscript and correcting English; and Mr. K. **KIMURA** for help in calculation. This research **was** supported by a Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

## LITERATURE CITED

- BOUSQUET, J., **S.** H. **STRAUSS,** A. H. DOERKSEN and R. A. PRICE, **1992**  Extensive variation in evolutionary rate of *rbcL* gene sequences among seed plants. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **89 7844-7848.**
- BOYES, D. C., and J. B. NASRALLAH, **1993** Physical linkage of the *SLG*  and SRKgenes at the self-incompatibility locus of *Brassica oleracea.*  Mol. Gen. Genet. **236: 369-373.**
- BOYES, D. C., C. H. CHEN, T. TANTIKANJANA, J. J. ESCH and J. **B.**  NASRALLAH, **1991** Isolation of a second Slocus-related cDNA from *Brassica oleracea:* genetic relationships between the **S** locus and **two** related loci. Genetics **127: 221-228.**
- CHEN, **C.** H., and J. B. NASRAI.IAH, **1990** A new class of **S** sequences defined by a pollen recessive self-incompatibility allele of *Brassica oleracea.* Mol. Gen. Genet. **222: 241-248.**
- CLARK, A. *G.,* **1993** Evolutionary inferences from molecular characterization of self-incompatibility alleles, pp. **79-108** in *Mecha*nism *of Molecular Euolution,* edited by N. TAKAHATA and A. **G.**  CLARK. Japan Sci. SOC. Press., Tokyo, Sinauer Associates, MA.
- CLARK, A. *G.,* and T.-H. KAo, **1991** Excess nonsynonymous substitution at shared polymorphic sites among self-incompatibility alleles of Solanaceae. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *88:* **9823-9827.**
- DWER, **IC** *G.,* M. A. BALENT, J. B. NASRALLAH and **M.** E. NASRALLAH, **1991** DNA sequences of self-incompatibility genes from *Brassica campestris* and *Brassica oleracea:* polymorphism predating speciation. Plant Mol. BIOI. **16 481-486.**
- GORING, D. R., P. BANKS, W. D. BEVERSDORF and S. J. ROTHSTEIN, **1992a** Use of the polymerase chain reaction to isolate an **S**  locus glycoprotein cDNA introgressed from *Brassica campestris*  into *E. napus* spp. *ok.era.* **Mol.** Gen. Genet. **234: 185-192.**
- GORING, D. R., P. BANKS, L. FALLIS, C. L. BASZCZYNSKI, W. D. BEVERS **DORF et** *al.,* **1992b** Identification of an Slocus glycoprotein allele introgressed from *B. napus* ssp. *rapijera* to *E.* napus ssp. *ohy era.* Plant J. **2: 983-989.**
- HINATA, K., M. WATANABE, K. TORIYAMA and A. ISOGAI, 1993 A review of recent studies on homomorphic self-incompatibility. Int. Rev. Cytol. **143: 257-296.**
- **ISOGAI,** A., S. YAMAKAWA, H. SHIOZAWA, S.TAKAYAMA, H. TANAKA *et*

*al.,* 1991 The cDNA sequence of NSI-glycoprotein of *Brassica campestris* and its homology to Slocus-related glycoproteins of *B. oleracea.* Plant Mol. Biol. **17:** 269-271.

- KUMAR, S., K. TAMURA and M. NEI, 1993 MEGA: Molecular Evolution*ary Genetics Analysis, version 1.0,* The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA.
- LALONDE, B.A,, M. E. NASRALLAH, K. G. DWYER, C. H. CHEN, B. BARI.OW *et al.,* 1989 A highly conserved *Brassica* gene with homology to the Slocus-specific glycoprotein structural gene. Plant Cell **1:** 249-258.
- LEE, H. S., S. HUANG and T.-H. KAO, 1994 Sproteins control rejection of incompatible pollen in *Petunia inflata*. Nature 367: 560-563.
- MULLER, J., 1981 Fossil pollen records of extant Angiosperms. Bot. Rev. **47:** 1-142.
- MUWETT, J., T. L. ATHERTON, B. Mou, C. S. GASSER, B. A. MCCLURE, 1994 SRNase expressed in transgenic *Nicotiana* causes Sallelespecific pollen rejection. Nature **367:** 563-566.
- NASRALLAH, J. B., and M. E. NASRALIAH, 1993 Pollen-stigma signaling in the sporophytic self-incompatibility response. Plant Cell **5:** 1325-1335.
- NASRALIAH, J. B., T.-H. KAo, C. H. CHEN, M. L. GOLDBERG and M. E. NASRALLAH, 1987 Amino-acid sequence of glycoproteins encoded by three alleles of the Slocus of *Brassica oleracea.* Nature **326:** 617-619.
- Nou, **I. S.,** M. WATANABE, A. **ISOGAI** and K HINATA, 1993 Comparison of Salleles and Sglycoproteins between **two** wild populations of *Brassica campestris* in Turkey and Japan. Sex. Plant Reprod. **6:**  79-86.
- SAITOU, N., and M. NEI, 1987 The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. Mol. Biol. Evol. 4: 406-425.

SCUTT, C. P., and R. R. D. CROY, 1992 An S<sup>5</sup> self-incompatibility

allele-specific cDNA sequence from *Brassica oleracea* shows high homology to the *SLR2* gene. Mol. Gen. Genet. **232** 240-246.

- STEIN, J. C., B. HOWLETT, D. C. BOYES, M. E. NASRALLAH and J. B. NASRAI.LAH, 1991 Molecular cloning of a putative receptor protein kinase gene encoded at the self-incompatibility locus of *Brassica oleracea.* Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *88:* 8816-8820.
- TRICK, M., 1990 Genomic sequence of a *Brassica* Slocus-related gene. Plant Mol. Biol. **15:** 203-205.
- TRICK, M., and **R.** B. FLAVELL, 1989 A homologous *S* genotype of *Brassica* oleraceaexpresses two Slike genes. Mol. Gen. Genet. **218:**  112-117.
- TRICK, M., and P. HEIZMANN, 1993 Sporophytic self-incompatibility systems: *Brassica S* gene family. Int. Rev. Cytol. **140:** 485-524.
- WATANABE, M., I S. Nou, **S.** TAKAYAMA, S. **YAMAKAWA,** A. **ISOGAI** *et al.,*  1992 Variations in and inheritance of NSglycoprotein in selfincompatible *Brassica campestris* L. Plant Cell Physiol. 33: 343-351.
- WATANABE, M., T. TAKASAKI, K. TORNAMA, S. YAMAKAWA, A. **ISOCM** *et al.,* 1994 High degree of homology exists between the protein encoded by *SLG* and the *S* receptor domain encoded by *SRK* in self-incompatible *Brassica campestris* **L.** Plant Cell Physiol. **35:**  1221-1229.
- WOLFE, K H., W.-H. Lr and P. M. *SHARP,* 1987 Rates of nucleotide substitution vary greatly among plant mitochondrial, chloroplast, and nuclear **DNAs.** Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *84:* 9054-9058.
- YAMAKAWA, S., M. WATANABE, A. **ISOGAI,** S. TAKAYAMA, S. SATOH *et al.,*  1993 The cDNA sequence of NS3-glycoprotein from *Brassica*  **34:** 173-175. campestrisand its homology to related proteins. Plant Cell Physiol.
- YAMAKAWA, S., H. SHIBA, M. WATANABE, H. SHIOZAWA, S.TAKAYAMA *et al.,* 1994 The sequences of Sglycoproteins involved in selfincompatibility of *Brassica campestrisand* their distribution among Brassicaceae. Biosci. Biotech. Biochem. **58:** 921-925.

Communicating editor: A. G. **CLARK**