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#### Abstract

RAPD-PCR was performed using ten random primers to identify the genetic diversity among Rahmani, Chios and their crosses. The appearance of bands on gels would reflect the differences between genotypes of the examined animals. The differences would be detected by number and size of present or absent bands with each primer which could be used as positive or negative genetic markers to distinguish between breeds and their crosses. Primers A7, C7 and C1 were used for fingerprinting to identify the Rahmani breed, where they produced bands of 454 and 724 bp , respectively only with Rahmani breed. Presence of band at 410 bp with primer A9 would be used as a genetic marker for Chios breed. The presence of bands $1634,1105,223$ and 187 bp with primer B17 and also bands $735,683,425$ and 395 bp with primer A9 could be used as a fingerprinting for cross ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{C}$ $1 / 2 \mathrm{R}$ ). Presence of bands 173 , 132 and 122 bp with primer A5 would be used as a genetic marker for the reciprocal cross ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{R} 1 / 2$ C). The results of molecular DNA of the experimental sheep breeds and their crosses, showed that polymorphism within crosses is higher than polymorphism within the pure breeds of Rahmani and Chios. Fragments generated by primers showed a polymorphism ratio of $10.8 \%$ between Rahmani and Chios and $25 \%$ between crosses ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{C} 1 / 2 \mathrm{R}$ and $1 / 2 \mathrm{R} 1 / 2 \mathrm{C}$ ). Also, the similarity between Rahmani and Chios breeds was $89.1 \%$, while it was $75 \%$ between crosses. The results asserted that fingerprinting (RAPD-PCR genetic marker) technique would be a useful tool to differentiate sheep breeds and their crosses.
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## INTRODUCTION

Based on the phenotypic character, Egyptian sheep were classified into five breeds (Salah, et al., 2010) some of them are Rahmani and others are Chios. Genetic improvement of farm animal is of economic importance, especially in reproductive performance and quantity of meat and wool (Ali, 2003). Information of genetic relationships in sheep within and between species has several important applications for genetic improvement and in breeding programs (Rao, et al., 1996). Application of the random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) technique has greatly increased the ability to understand the genetic relationships within species at the molecular level. Polymorphism at the DNA level is frequently used as genetic markers for herd studies in domestic animals. Genetic marker and variation detected at the loci reflect the level of variation in the entire genome (Okumus and Mercan, 2007). The DNA-RAPD assay which is short oligonucleotide primers of arbitrary sequence to amplify genomic DNA by PCR enables the approach for identifying genetic markers (Eman, et al., 2008). RAPD was utilized in breeds genetic studies in most species, including farm animals like cattle (Sharma, et al., 2004), buffalo (Saifi, et al., 2004), goat (Chen, et al., 2001), chicken (Okumus and Kaya, 2005) and sheep (Okumus and Mercan, 2007). The investigation of genetic diversity and similarity among and within breeds is necessary be providing useful genetic information essential for developing affective management plans for the conservation and improvement of these genetic resources. Furthermore, there is a worldwide recognition of the need for the conservation of livestock diversity (FAO, 1995) and for the genetic characterization of breeds and populations including their genetic differentiation and relationships. Genetic analysis of livestock species could be performed by the use of polymorphic markers such as restriction fragment
length polymorphisms (RFLPs) and microsatellites (Rincon, et al., 2000 and Dalvit, et al., 2008). However, their use is limited since designation of these genetic markers is expensive technically demanding (Beuzen, et al., 2000). Markers have been used for genotype identification (Tinker, et al., 1993), construction of genetic maps (Maddox and Cockelt, 2007), analysis of the genetic relationships within and among species (Salhi-Hanachi, et al., 2006) and measurement of genetic diversity (Hussein, et al., 2005). The RAPD technique has also been used in analysis of genetic variations between different breeds of fish (Ambak, et al., 2006), chicken (Okumus and Kaya, 2005), ducks (Gholizadeh, et al., 2007), cattle (Devrin and Kaya, 2006 and Hassen, et al., 2007), buffalo and goat (AbdelRahmen and Elsayed, 2007 and Yadav and Yadav, 2007) and sheep (Kumar, et al., 2008 and Kunene, et al., 2009). Genetic diversity of indigenous sheep breeds in Egypt has not been sufficiently studied. The objective of this study was to provide information on the molecular level about genetic structure and diversity of some Egyptian breeds employing RAPD-PCR molecular assay.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals: A total of 32 ewes and one ram of Rahmani $(\mathrm{R})$ and 30 ewes and one ram of Chios (C) sheep were used as parent of animals. Crosses and reciprocal crosses were made between the two breeds of sheep. Ewes of each breeds were divided at random into two main groups, ewes of the first group of each breed were housed and mated to rams of Rahmani breed, while the second group of each breed were housed and mated to rams of Chios breed. According to the system of mating applied, four mating groups were obtained. Two of them produced purebred lambs of Rahmani (RR) and Chios (CC), while the other two produced crossbred lambs of Rahmani rams X Chios ewes ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{R} 1 / 2 \mathrm{C}$ ) and Chios rams
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X Rahmani ewes (1⁄2C ½R). All animals were apparently healthy and free from any clinical disorders or diseases. DNA Extraction: Total genomic DNA was extracted from whole sheep blood samples of the four groups of mating: 4 blood samples were collected from each Rahmani ( RR ), Chios (CC), and their progenies ( $1 / 2 R$ $1 / 2 C$ ) and ( $1 / 2 C^{1 / 2} R$ ) with total 16 samples. Total genomic DNA was extracted using a modification of Helms method (Helms, 1990) as follows: $5-10 \mathrm{ml}$ of venous blood was obtained from every selected animal. Blood samples were taken in standard heparinized vacutainer tubes. The tubes were vertically stored in the refrigerator to separate the plasma as a yellow layer on the top of the tubes. About 400-500 $\mu$ l of buffy coat was taken in 2.0 ml Eppendorf tube, then 1.5 ml of cold buffer-A ( 0.32 M sucrose, 10 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl}, \mathrm{pH} 7.6,5$ $\mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MgCl}_{2}, 1 \%$ Triton-x-100) was added and mixed well. The tubes were spined at 1500 rpm for 15 minutes at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then keep the pellet. One ml of cold buffer-B ( 25 mM EDTA, $\mathrm{pH} 8.0,75 \mathrm{mM} / 1 \mathrm{~L} \mathrm{NaCl}$ ), $1 / 10$ volume of $10 \%$ SDS and $1 / 100$ volume of proteinase-K were added and gently mixed and incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. One third volume of NaCl was added and centrifuged at 6000 rpm for 15 minutes. The supernatant was taken in new tube and an equal volume of bufferequilibrated phenol was added and centrifuged at 7000 rpm for 10 minutes. The upper aqueous phase was transferred into a new tube, and an equal volume of chloroform/isoamylalcohol was added and centrifuged at 7000 rpm for 15 minutes. The upper aqueous phase was transferred into a new 1.5 ml Eppendorf tube and $1 / 10$ volume of 3 M Sodium acetate and 1.5 volumes of cold Isopropanol were added and incubated at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours, then centrifuged at 7000 rpm for 20 minutes and the pellet was washed twice by $500 \mu \mathrm{l}$ cold $70 \%$ Ethanol then dried and dissolved in 30-100 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ TEbuffer. Samples concentration was adjusted at $25 \mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{l}$ using TE buffer pH 8.0.
PCR conditions for RAPD analysis (Finger printing): PCR for RAPD analysis was performed using 25 ng of pooled genomic DNA of each four mating group samples. The PCR mixture and amplification conditions were prepared according to Williams et al., (1990) with minor modifications. The contents of PCR mixture are shown in Table (1).
Table 1: contents of PCR mixture for RAPD analysis

| $\mathbf{2 . 5} \mathbf{~ m M ~ d N T P s}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{l}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| 10X reaction buffer $+\mathrm{MgCl}_{2}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |
| 15 ng primer | $3.0 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |
| 25 ng template DNA | $1.0 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |
| 5 units Taq (super thermal) | $1.0 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $15.0 \mu 1$ |
| Total volume | $25.0 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |

Ten decamer random primers, obtained from Operon Technologies Inc. USA, were used for DNA amplification. Primer codes and sequences are listed below:
RAPD analysis Primer AO6: (5'-GGTCCCTGAC-3')
RAPD analysis Primer AO7: (5'-GAAACGGGTG-3')
RAPD analysis Primer AO9: (5'-GGGTAACGCC-3')
RAPD analysis Primer BO3: (5'-CATCCCCCTG-3')
RAPD analysis Primer B17: (5'-AGGGAACGAG-3')
RAPD analysis Primer CO1: (5'-TTCGAGCCAG-3')

RAPD analysis Primer CO7: (5'-GTCCCGACGA-3')
RAPD analysis Primer C12: (5'-TGTCATCCCC-3')
RAPD analysis Primer EO5: (5'-TCAGGGAGGT-3')
RAPD analysis Primer GO3: ( 5 '-GAGCCCTCCA-3')
DNA amplification cycles: The Thermocycler (MWGBIOTECH, Germany) was programmed as follows: PreDenaturation (one cycle) at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , followed by 40 cycles of: Denaturation at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , Annealing at $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 50 seconds, Extension at $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min and Final Extension at $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min . then the samples were held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The amplified DNA fragments were separated on $1.5 \%$ agarose gel, stained with Ethidium bromide, visualized on a UV Transilluminator and photographed.
Molecular analyzes: RAPD-PCR profiles were analyzed using Gene profiler 3.1 software. The banding profiles were scored (using 1kb DNA Ladder RTU, promega) in binary manner ( 1,0 ) where (1) indicates band presence, while (0) indicates band absence. The scored binary profiles were analyzed by unweighted pair-group method based on arithmetic mean (UPGMA) to estimate similarity, genetic distances and reconstruct the dendogram.

## RESULTS

Genetic diversity of Rahmani, Chios and their crosses was studied using Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) technique. Ten oligodecamers arbitrarily primers A6, A7, A9, B3, B17, C1, C7, C12, E5 and G3 were used in the present investigation to generate RAPD profiles from four samples [Rahmani RR (1), Chios CC (3), cross CR (4) and cross RC (6)]. All primers were amplified successfully on the genomic DNA from taken pooled samples yielding distinct RAPD patterns (Figures 1, 2 and Table 2). The number of the amplified fragments per primer varied between 8 (C7) and 24 (B17), with an average 15.3 bands per primer. Each of these fragments has a size ranged from 1634 to 122 base pairs (bp). A total number of 129 bands were amplified, with 66 bands being monomorphic ( $51.2 \%$ ) and the other 63 bands were polymorphic with a polymorphism ratio of $48.8 \%$. For Rahmani and Chios a total number of 110 bands were amplified, with 99 bands being monomorphic ( $90.0 \%$ ) and the other 11 bands were polymorphic ( $10.0 \%$ ). While, the crosses between Rahmani and Chios have a total number of 124 bands with 93 bands being monomorphic ( $75 \%$ ) and the other 31 bands were polymorphic ( $25 \%$ ). Primer B17 generated the largest number of fragments (24), while primer C7 generated the lowest number of fragments (8). The ten primers produced a total number of 346 bands in the four samples. Primer G3 produced 34 fragments in all four samples. It reacted with samples generating 13 bands ranged in size from 862 to 223 bp . The number of bands generated by this primer varied among samples, where the highest number was ten observed in sample 6 (RC), while the lowest number was seven in sample 1 (RR). Primer A7 produced 41 fragments in the four samples. It generated 15 bands ranged in size from 562 to 151 bp . The lowest number of fragments generated by this primer was eight observed in samples 1 and 3, while the highest number was 13 in sample 6. It generated fragment with size 454 bp present only in sample number 1 .



Figure 1: Agarose-gel electrophoresis of RAPD products generated in the examined samples: $M=$ DNA marker. (A) Primers B3 (lanes 1, 2, 3 and 4), A6 (lanes 5, 6, 7 and 8) and A9 (lanes 9, 10, 11 and 12). (B) Primers C12 (lanes 1, 2, 3 and 4), C7 (lanes 5, 6, 7 and 8), E5 (lanes 9, 10, 11 and 12) and C1 (lanes 13, 14, 15 and 16)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { M } 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & M\end{array}$


Figure 2: Agarose-gel electrophoresis of RAPD products generated by primers G3 (lanes $1,2,3$ and 4), A7 (lanes 5, 6, 7 and 8) and B17 (lanes 9, 10, 11 and 12) in the examined samples. $M=D N A$ marker.
Primer B17 produced 59 fragments in the four samples. It reacted with samples generating 24 bands ranged in size from 1634 to 187 bp . The lowest number of fragments generated by this primer was 12 observed in sample 6 , while the highest number was 18 in sample 4. Fragments of size 1634, 1105, 223 and 187 bp were generated only with sample 4 and absent in all other three samples. Also, bands with size 672 and 318 bp were only present in samples 1 and 6 , respectively. Meanwhile, fragments with size 1418, 1274, 747 and 721 bp were only absent in sample 6 . Also, band with size 862 bp was only absent in sample number 4.

The results of RAPD analysis obtained by primer E5 are illustrated in Figure (1-B) and Table 2. Primer E5 produced 44 fragments in the four samples. It generating 20 bands ranged in size from 1067 to 122 bp . The lowest number of fragments generated by this primer was nine observed in sample 1 , while the highest number was 14 in sample 6 . This primer was only generated fragments in size of $334,297,218,173,132$ and 122 bp with sample number 6 . The results obtained by primer B3 are illustrated in Figure (1-A) and Table 2. Primer B3 produced 48 bands in the four examined samples. It generating 18 fragments ranged in size from 1098 to 137 bp . The number of fragments generated by this primer varied among samples where the lowest number was ten observed in sample 6 (cross $\mathrm{RC}^{\text { }}$ ),
while the highest number was 14 in sample 1(Rahmani $\mathrm{RR}^{\circ}$ ). Primer C 12 produced 45 bands in the four samples (Figure 1-B and Table 2). It generating 16 bands ranged in size from 783 to 148 bp .

The lowest number of fragments generated by this primer was ten observed in samples 1 and 3 , while the highest number was 13 in sample 6 . The fragment with size 574 bp was absent only in sample number 4 and present in all other three samples. The results of RAPD analysis of four examined samples, obtained by primer A6, are illustrated in Figure 1-A and Table 2. Primer A6 produced 49 bands in the four samples. It generating 15 fragments ranged in size from 1270 to 177 bp . The number of fragments generated by this primer varied among samples from ten in samples 4 (cross $\mathrm{CR}^{\rho}$ ) and 6 (cross $\mathrm{RC}^{\circ}$ ) to 15 in sample 1 (Rahmani $\mathrm{RR}^{\circ}$ ). Meanwhile, only one fragment with molecular weight 295 bp generated only with sample number (1) and no fragment in the same size was detected with the other three samples. Primer A9 produced 43 bands in the four samples. It reacted with samples generating 15 fragments ranged in size from 1058 to 212 bp . The lowest number of fragments generated by this primer was ten observed in samples 1 (Rahmani $\mathrm{RR}^{+}$), while the highest number was 12 in sample 4 (cross $\mathrm{CR}^{+}$). Meanwhile, this primer produced fragments with size 735, 683, 425 and 410 bp only with sample number 3 . Moreover, fragments with size 762 bp and 635 bp were absent only in sample number 4. Primer C1 produced 35 bands (Figure 1-B and Table 2). It generated nine fragments ranged in size from 846 to 297 bp . The number of bands generated was eight in sample 1 and nine in samples 3, 4 and 6 . Fragment with size 334 bp was absent only with sample number 1. Primer C7 produced 29 bands (Figure 1-B and Table 2). It generated eight fragments ranged in size from 724 to 210 bp . The number of fragments generated by this primer was eight in sample 1 and seven in samples 3,4 and 6 . Fragment with size 724 bp was detected only with sample number 1 . The summary of bands, produced by different primers, could be used as genetic markers (fingerprinting) to distinguish Rahmani, Chios and their reciprocal crosses are illustrated in table (3).

Table 2: Summary of all fragments generated by the assay of the ten primers, and their molecular weight in all four samples where $(+)$ means presence and (-) means absence.

| Primer code | M.W. <br> (bp) | Samples |  |  |  | Primer code | M.W. <br> (bp) | Samples |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| B17 | 1634 | - | - | + | - | E5 | 552 | - | - | + | - |
| B17 | 1418 | $+$ | + | + | - | A6, A9 | 549 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 1274 | $+$ | + | + | - | B17 | 543 | + | + | + | + |
| A6 | 1270 | + | + | - | - | C12 | 511 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 1105 | - | - | + | - | B3 | 510 | + | + | + | + |
| B3 | 1098 | + | + | - | - | A7 | 505 | + | + | + | + |
| E5 | 1067 | + | $+$ | - | - | G3 | 505 | - | + | - | + |
| A9 | 1058 | + | + | + | + | E5, A6, C1 | 492 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 1029 | $+$ | $+$ | - | - | G3 | 488 | - | + | - | + |
| B3 | 984 | + | + | - | - | B17 | 471 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 925 | - | - | + | + | A9 | 457 | + | + | + | + |
| A6 | 915 | $+$ | + | - | - | C7 | 455 | + | + | + | + |
| B3 | 882 | $+$ | + | - | - | E5 | 455 | - | - | + | - |
| B17 | 862 | $+$ | + | - | + | A7 | 454 | + | - | - | - |
| G3 | 862 | + | + | - | - | B3 | 441 | + | + | - | - |
| A9 | 850 | + | + | + | + | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C12, E5, } \\ & \text { B17, G3 } \end{aligned}$ | 438 | + | + | + | + |
| C1 | 846 | $+$ | + | + | $+$ | A6 | 425 | + | + | + | + |
| B3 | 820 | $+$ | $+$ | - | - | A9 | 425 | - | - | $+$ | - |
| E5 | 814 | + | + | - | - | A7 | 423 | - | + | + | + |
| B17 | 803 | $+$ | + | - | - | A9 | 410 | - | $+$ | - | - |
| B3 | 790 | $+$ | + | - | - | E5, C12, C1 | 405 | + | + | + | + |
| C12 | 783 | + | + | - | - | B3 | 395 | + | + | + | + |
| A9 | 762 | + | $+$ | - | + | A9 | 395 | - | - | + | - |
| B17 | 747 | $+$ | + | + | - | A7, B17 | 394 | + | + | + | + |
| A9 | 735 | - | - | + | - | G3 | 380 | + | + | + | + |
| C7 | 724 | $+$ | - | - | - | C7 | 375 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 721 | $+$ | + | + | - | A6, A9 | 367 | + | + | + | + |
| B3 | 708 | + | + | - | - | E5, C12, C1 | 360 | + | + | + | + |
| C12 | 697 | $+$ | + | - | - | G3, A6, B3 | 354 | + | + | + | + |
| C1 | 697 | $+$ | + | + | + | A7, B17 | 342 | + | + | + | + |
| G3 | 696 | $+$ | + | - | - | C1 | 334 | - | + | + | + |
| A6 | 683 | + | + | - | - | E5 | 334 | - | - |  | + |
| A9 | 683 | - | - | + | - | G3 | 330 | - | - | + | + |
| B17 | 672 | $+$ | - | - | - | A7 | 330 | + | + | - |  |
| E5 | 645 | + | + | + | + | C12 | 321 | + | + | + | + |
| C12 | 645 | $+$ | + | - | - | B17 | 318 | - | - | - | + |
| C1 | 645 | $+$ | + | + | + | A9, A6 | 317 | + | + | + | + |
| B3 | 635 | + | - | + | - | C7 | 309 | + | + | + | + |
| A9 | 635 | + | + | - | + | A7 | 307 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 626 | + | + | + | + | G3, B17 | 307 | - | - | + | + |
| G3 | 626 | $+$ | + | - | - | B3 | 306 | - | - | + | + |
| C7 | 620 | $+$ | + | + | + | C1, C12 | 297 | + | + | + | + |
| A6 | 612 | $+$ | + | - | - | E5 | 297 | - | - | - | + |
| C1 | 597 | $+$ | + | + | $+$ | A6 | 295 | + | - | - | - |
| B3 | 590 | + | + | + | + | A7 | 286 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 583 | + | + | - | - | E5 | 275 | + | + | + | + |
| C12 | 574 | + | + | - | + | A6 | 274 | + | + | + | + |
| E5 | 574 | $+$ | + | - | - | C12 | 264 | - | - | + | + |
| G3 | 562 | + | + | + | + | B17 | 257 | - | - | + | + |
| A7 | 562 | + | + | - | $+$ | B3, A9 | 255 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 562 | - | - | + | + | C7 | 254 | + | + | + | + |
| C7 | 552 | + | + | + | + | E5 | 254 | - | + | - | + |

Table 2: (Continuo) Summary of all fragments generated by the assay of the ten primers, and their molecular weight in all four samples where (+) means presence and (-) means absence.

| Primer code | $\begin{gathered} \text { M.W. } \\ \text { (bp) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Samples |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Primer } \\ \text { code } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { M.W. } \\ \text { (bp) } \end{gathered}$ | Samples |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| G3 | 248 | - | - | $+$ | + | B17 | 187 |  |  | + |  |
| C12 | 245 | - | - | + | + | B3 | 183 | - | - | + | + |
| A6 | 237 | + | + | + | + | C12 | 179 | - | - | + | + |
| A7 | 231 | - | - | + | + | A6 | 177 | + | + | + | + |
| B17 | 223 | - | - | + | - | E5 | 173 | - | - | - | + |
| G3 | 223 | - | - | + | + | A7 | 168 | - | - | + | + |
| B3 | 220 | + | + | + | + | B3 | 164 | - | - | + | + |
| E5 | 218 | - | - | - | + | A7 | 151 | - | - | + | + |
| C12 | 218 | - | - | + | + | C12 | 148 | - | - | + | + |
| A7 | 215 | - | - | + | + | E5 | 142 | - | - | + |  |
| A6, A9 | 212 | + | + | + | + | B3 | 137 | - | - | + | + |
| C7 | 210 | + | + | + | + | E5 | 132 | - | - | - | + |
| C12 | 210 |  | - | + | + | E5 | 122 | - | - | - | + |
| A7 | 208 | - | - | + | + | Total $=346$ | 108 | 85 | 86 | 88 | 87 |
| A7, E5 | 187 | - | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Genetic similarity and cluster analysis based on RAPD results:

Pairwise genetic similarity (GS) was estimated for the ten combined primers as presented in Table 4. The results showed that the highest percentages of similarity were $89.1 \%$ between samples 1 and 3 and 75 $\%$ between samples 4 and 6.

A dendogram, indicating genetic relationships between the four sheep samples, was generated by cluster analysis (UPGMA) with the RAPD data (Figure 3). Sheep samples were classified into two groups. The first group containing samples 1 (Rahmani $\mathrm{RR}^{+}$) and 3 (Chios $\mathrm{CC}^{\circ}$ ) with genetic similarity of 89.1 , both are races. The second group containing samples 4 (cross $\mathrm{CR}^{+}$) and 6 (cross $\mathrm{RC}^{+}$) with genetic distance of 75, both are heterozygous produced by reciprocal crosses [ $\left(1 / 2 \mathrm{C}^{1 / 2} \mathrm{R}\right.$ ) and ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{R}^{1 / 2} \mathrm{C}$ )].
Table 3: Summary of the molecular marker (Fingerprinting) produced by different primers used with Rahmani, Chios and their reciprocal crosses.

| their reciprocal crosses. |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Breed | Primer code | Band size in bp |
|  | A6 | 295 |
|  | C7 | 724 |
|  | A7 | 454 |
| RR | B17 | 672 |
| CC | A9 | 318 |
|  |  | 410 |
|  | A9 | 735 |
|  |  | 683 |
|  |  | 425 |
|  |  | 395 |
|  |  | 552 |
|  |  | 455 |
| CR |  | 142 |
|  |  | 1634 |
|  |  | 1105 |
|  |  | 223 |
|  |  | 187 |
|  | E5 | 297 |
|  |  | 218 |
| RC |  | 173 |
|  |  | 132 |
|  |  | 122 |
|  |  | 672 |
|  |  | 318 |

Table 4: The similarity matrix in percentage, among the examined sheep samples based on RAPD band pattern analysis and Jaccard index.

| band pattern analysis and Jaccard index. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Samples | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| 1 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 89.1 | 100 |  |  |
| 4 | 50.4 | 50.7 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 50.7 | 56.6 | 75 | 100 |

UPGMA


Figure 3: UPGMA dendrogram of the four sheep samples based on values of genetic distances calculated from of all ten primers.

## DISCUSSION

To identify the genetic diversity among Rahmani, Chios and their crosses, RAPD-PCR was performed using ten random primers. After estimation of genetic similarity, cluster analysis and establishment of dendrogram, samples are classified into two distinct groups. The first group containing parent breeds (Rahmani RR and Chios CC) and the second group compromise the two hybrids (CR and RC). These results indicated that polymorphism within genomic of hybrids is higher than polymorphism within genomic of races as indicated by the results of similarity (GS), where similarity between races was 89.1 $\%$ and between crosses was $75 \%$. These results are in agreement with those found by Doloksaribu et al., (2000), Boujenane and Kansari (2002), Hassen et al., (2004) and Abd Allah (2009). Also, fragments generated by primers show a polymorphism ratio of $10.8 \%$ for varieties and 25 \% for crosses. Complete analysis of the resulted bands elucidate interesting findings, eight primers out of ten can be used as genetic markers to distinguish between varieties and/or hybrids. Primers A7, C7 and C1 can be used to identify the Rahmani variety, where presence of bands 454 bp and 724 bp used as a positive genetic marker with primers A7 and C7, respectively. While, absence of bands 423 bp and 334 bp can be used as a negative genetic marker with primers A7 and C1, respectively. These results are in harmony with those reported by Rajendra and Ashok (2011) and Sukumar et al., (2012). Presence of band 410 bp with primer A9 can be used as a positive genetic marker to distinguish Chios variety. Also, presence of bands $1634,1105,223$ and 187 bp with primer B17 and bands 735, 683, 425 and 395 bp with primer A9 can be used as a positive genetic markers to distinguish the hybrid CR. While, presence of bands 173 , 132 and 122 bp with primer A5 can be used as a positive genetic markers to distinguish the hybrid RC. So, RAPDPCR can be used as a tool to distinguish between varieties and / or hybrids in sheep breeds. It is simple, easy, rapid and cheap method to distinguish between individuals in
the sheep breeds. Moreover, genetic markers may provide useful information at different levels: population structure, phylogenetic relationships and patterns of historical biogeography.
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لتحديد الاختلافات الور اثثة بين اغنام الرحمانى و الكيوس والهجن بينهما وكذلك الهجن العكسية لهما تم تحليل الـ DNA المستخلص من دماء كل حيوان على
 اللختبره. والاختلافات بين النتر اكيب الور اثية يمكن تحديدها بواسطة حجم وعدد الحزم الور اثية النى تظهر مع كل باديئ ويمكن استخدامها كبصمة وراثية لللففرقه بين السلالات والهجن بينهما. اظهرت النتائج ان البصمة الور اثية لسلالة الرحمانى أمكن تحديدها بواسطة استخدام الباديئ (A7) وكنلك الباديئ (C7) (C7) حيث تظهر الحزم الور اثية بحجم 454 و و 724 (زوج من القو اعد) بالتتابع. بينما ظهور الحزم الور اثثية 410 باستخدام الباديئ (A9) يككن استخدمها كبصمة وراثية لسلالة

居 122 bp
 سلالات الرحمانى والكيوس كانت 89.1\% وبين الهجينين (2/1 كيوس 2/1 رحمانى) و (2/1 رحمانى 2/1 كيوس) كانت 75\% وايضا وجد ان درجه اختلاف الاشكال للشظايا الناتجة كانت بنسبة 10.8\% بين سلالتي الرحمانى والكيوس وبين الهجينين (2/1 كيوس 2/1 رحمانى ) و (2/1 رحمانى 2/1 كيوس) كانت بنسبه 25\%.بذلك نستخلص ان البصمة الور اثية بو اسطة تقتية تعدد اشكال الاكثار العشوائي للـ RAPD) DNA) ذات فائدة لتمييز السلالات وهجنهما العكبية

