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#### Abstract

Summary South East European (SEE) viticulture partially relies on native grapevine varieties, previously scarcely described. In order to characterize old local grapevine varieties and assess the level of synonymy and genetic diversity from SEE countries, we described and genotyped 122 accessions from Albania, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (B\&H), Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Republika Srpska (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Romania on nine most commonly used microsatellite loci. As a result of the study a total of 86 different genotypes were identified. All loci were very polymorphic and a total of 96 alleles were detected, ranging from 8 to 14 alleles per locus, with an average allele number of $\mathbf{1 0 . 6 7}$. Overall observed heterozygosity was 0.759 and slightly lower than expected (0.789) while gene diversity per locus varied between 0.600 (VVMD27) and 0.906 (VVMD28). Eleven cases of synonymy and three of homonymy have been recorded for samples harvested from different countries. Cultivars with identical genotypes were mostly detected between neighboring countries. No clear differentiation between countries was detected although several specific alleles were detected. The integration of the obtained genetic data with ampelographic ones is very important for accurate identification of the SEE cultivars and provides a significant tool in cultivar preservation and utilization.
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## Introduction

The viticulture of South East Europe (SEE) is to some extent "personalized" due to the large number of autochthonous (unique) varieties. Wine production has a significant impact on the economy of the partners countries involved in this study, but it is also tightly connected with the history and tradition of each country. This richness of
native varieties which results in unique wines has great potential for the future of winemaking in Europe. On the other hand, it requires a lot of work in order to properly maintain germplasm, perform clonal selection and ensure high quality plant material production.

Vegetative propagation enabled conservation of cultivars over a long period. At the end of the $19^{\text {th }}$ century, pests and pathogens from America reached Europe (Plasmopara viticola, Uncinula necator, Daktulosphaira vitifoliae) resulting in devastation of many European vineyards and drastically changing the diversity of grapevine (This et al. 2006). In the $20^{\text {th }}$ century, global development of the wine grape industry further restricted the varieties in cultivation and led to the wide diffusion of a small number of French cultivars (CipRIANI et al. 2010). A progressive reduction of the genetic diversity of crop plants is a currently occurring phenomenon and "genetic erosion" especially affects local autochthonous varieties (El Oualkadi et al. 2011). Many local grapevine varieties traditionally grown were abandoned in favor of varieties more adapted to the wine market demand and they have only recently been introduced back into cultivation, in order to locally diversify the market (Cipriani et al. 2010). Grapevine projects around the world are rescuing varieties under risk of extinction and those rescued are preserved in grapevine collections (García-Muñoz et al. 2012). During the long period of cultivation, cultivar names were often changed because of transliteration, substitution of local name, presence of clones within cultivars, poor documentation and lack of knowledge resulting in numerous cultivars that have synonyms and homonyms within and among countries (CiPRIANI et al. 2010, García-Muñoz et al. 2012). The European Vitis Database currently comprises 32,410 accessions from 35 grapevine repositories originating from 22 vine growing nations (Maul et al. 2012). However, from the SEE region only data from Croatia and Moldova are available. Recently, the ampelographic and molecular characterization of local varieties has been done in many European countries, like Spain (Santana et al. 2008, Vilanova et al. 2009, Santana et al. 2010, Martì et al 2011), Italy (Schneider et al. 2001, Torello Marinoni et al. 2009, Cipriani et al. 2010)

Portugal (Lopes et al. 1999), Austria (Sefc et al. 1998), Slovenia (Š̈TAJNER et al. 2011). Similar characterization has also been done recently in countries of the Mediterranean basin like Turkey (Şelli et al. 2007, Boz et al. 2011), Algeria (Laiadi et al. 2009), Tunisia (Zoghlami et al. 2009), Morocco (El Oualkadi et al. 2011) and Cyprus (Hvarleva et al. 2005). In the last few years even larger studies have been performed by Cipriani et al. 2010 and Laucou et al. 2011 but still South East Europe is poorly represented.

Unfortunately, in the SEE countries the level of information on native germplasm and its present preservation status is insufficient and fragmented. In the past years, however, some research has been done on identification and evaluation of genetic diversity of autochthonous grapevine varieties (Maletić et al. 1999, Ladoukakis et al. 2005, Benjak et al. 2005, Gheorghe et al.2008, Stajner et al. 2009, Ghetea et al. 2010). Still, for many old varieties from the SEE region data and/or planting material needed for research, breeding or growing are not available and many of them have unknown genetic profiles. This information could be very important for managing genetic biodiversity as well as for elucidation of genetic relationship between varieties. Generally, most information is usually collected, described, analyzed or preserved following very different methodologies which make its exchange and use very difficult. Thus, there is a great need for regional collaboration in grapevine germplasm analysis in order to make a thorough inventory and an efficient regional plan for germplasm preservation and utilization.

As a part of a regional project (see Acknowledgements) the aim of this study was to perform ampelographic and molecular characterization of some old local grapevine varieties, traditionally grown and supposed to be native in each SEE country. Also, this paper reports an assessment of the level of genetic diversity and elucidates synonymous varieties among regions.

## Material and Methods

Plant material and DNA extraction: Plant tissue for DNA extraction was collected from a total of 122 grapevine accessions originating from seven South East European countries. Number of accessions per country varied between 10 (Albania) and 26 (Romania). Two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Federation of B\&H and Republika Srpska) participated in the SEEDNet project independently with 12 and 13 accessions, respectively (Tab. 1). Young leaves from a single vine were taken during May and June from the official germplasm collections (all the samples from Croatia, Moldova and Romania; and two samples ('Vranec' and 'Kratoshija') from Macedonia) and in all other cases from in-situ vineyards. Variety identification for sampling was performed by experienced ampelographers or viticulturists. DNA was extracted from 20 mg of lyophilized leaf tissue according to Qiagen DNeasy Plant Mini Kit protocol (Qiagen, Germany).

Microsatellite analysis: Analysis was performed using nine microsatellite loci: VVS2 (Тномas and Sсотт 1993), VVMD5, VVMD7, VVMD25, VVMD27,

VVMD28, VVMD32 (Bowers et al. 1996, 1999), VrZAG62 and VrZAG79 (Sefc et al. 1999). This set of highly polymorphic markers was used by the European GrapeGen06 consortium (http://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/grapegen06/accueil.php) as the standard set for the screening of grapevine collections.

PCR amplifications were carried out in Veriti ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Thermal Cycler (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, California, USA). Two multiplex PCR reactions were carried out for five and three of the analyzed SSRs and a singleplex for VVMD5. The first multiplex reaction consisted of VVS2, VVMD7, VVMD27, VrZAG62, VrZAG79 loci. In the second multiplex VVMD25, VVMD28, VVMD32 were amplified.

All forward primers were labeled with 6-FAM, VIC, PET, or NED fluorescent dyes. The reactions were prepared in a final volume of $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, containing 25 ng genomic DNA, 1 U Taq polymerase (Sigma-Aldrich, Germany), 0.2 mM of each dNTP, $0.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of each forward and reverse primer, 2X PCR buffer, 2.5 mM of $\mathrm{MgCl}_{2}$ and 1X Q solution (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Singleplex was performed in a final volume of $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ containing 25 ng genomic DNA, 0.5 U Taq polymerase, 0.2 mM of each dNTP, $0.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of VVMD5 forward and reverse primers, 2X PCR buffer, $2.5 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MgCl}{ }_{2}$ and 1 X Q solution. The following thermal cycling protocol was applied for all loci: precycle $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min ; 35 cycles of denaturation for 1 min at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ of annealing at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and 1 min extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; postcycle of 30 min at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then terminated at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Amplified products were separated using ABI3130 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, USA) with Ge-neScan-500 $\mathrm{LIZ}_{\text {TM }}$ size standard. Sizing of the fragments was performed using GeneMapper 4.0 software (Applied Biosystems). Amplified profiles of reference cultivars were used for sizing the alleles of studied cultivars (This et al. 2004) which were afterwards coded according to GrapeGen06 methodology.

Ampelographic description: Ampelographic datasets were collected during 2009 and 2010 as is specified by the Organisation Internationale da la Vigne et du Vin (Oiv 2001). Four OIV ampelographic descriptors were used to complement this study: OIV-225 (berry color), OIV-223 (berry shape), OIV-204 (bunch density) and OIV-204 (ripening - OIV 304), out of twenty-four ampelographic descriptors used in this project ( $003,004,016$, $065,068,076,079,084,085,151,202,203,204,220,223$, $225,230,236,241,235,504,505$ and 506). Ten readings per each descriptor were taken.

Data analysis: Data analysis was performed using GenAlEx 6.41 (Peakall and Smouse, 2006). The number of alleles per locus ( Na ), observed heterozygosity (Ho) and expected heterozygosity (He) were calculated for every sampled country. Polymorphism information content (PIC) was calculated using The Excel Microsatellite Toolkit 3.1.1. (PARK 2001). Specific alleles were detected using software CONVERT (Glaubitz 2004). Allelic richness was calculated with FSTAT (Goudet 2001). Number of duplicates within and between sampling regions were tested with GenAlEx 6.41. Homonyms were detected by visual inspection. Probability of identity for unrelated gen-

Table 1
Grapevine genetic diversity of South East European countries

| Country | No of accessions | No of alleles | Allelic richness | $\mathrm{Ho}^{\text {a }}$ | $\mathrm{He}^{\text {b }}$ | No of unique genotypes | Specific alleles (locus, allele code) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albania | 10 | 5,67 | 5,54 | 0.821 | 0.731 | 9 (90\%) | VVMD28, $\mathrm{N}+56$ |
| B\&H Federation | 12 | 7 | 6,3 | 0.787 | 0.739 | 8 (66.6\%) | 0 |
| B\&H Republika Srpska | 13 | 6,33 | 5,8 | 0.825 | 0.714 | 8 (61.5\%) | VVS2, N+32 |
| Croatia ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 15 | 6,89 | 5,98 | 0.729 | 0.759 | 15 (100\%) | VVMD7,N+2; ZAG62, N+16; VVMD5, N ; |
| Macedonia ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 14 | 6,56 | 5,86 | 0.777 | 0.768 | 13 (93\%) | VVMD5, $\mathrm{N}+8$; VVMD25, $\mathrm{N}+10 ; \mathrm{N}+16$; |
| Moldova ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 16 | 6,67 | 5,64 | 0.724 | 0.745 | 12 (81.3\%) | VVMD28 $\mathrm{N}+54$ |
| Montenegro | 16 | 4,22 | 3,81 | 0.604 | 0.548 | 6 (37.5\%) | 0 |
| Romania ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 26 | 8,67 | 6,68 | 0.815 | 0.804 | 25 (96\%) | VVMD7, N+26; VVMD27, N+16; VrZAG62, N+18; VrZAG79, N+24; VVMD5, N-2; N+2; VVMD25, N+8; VVMD28, N+2; VVMD32, $\mathrm{N}+9 ; \mathrm{N}+13 ; \mathrm{N}+19 ; \mathrm{N}+39$ |
| Overall | 122 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Observed heterozygosity; ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Expected heterozygosity; ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Samples originate from official germplasm collections, address same as authors'. For Macedonia only two samples originate from official collection. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Samples originate from official germplasm collection: Research and Development Station for Viticulture and Oenology, Dragasani-Valcea Str. Regele, Ferdinand no. 64, Dragasani, County Valcea, 245700, Romania.
otypes, probability of identity for full sibs and frequency of null alleles were calculated using software IDENTITY4 (Wagner and Sefc 1999). Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was used to analyze genetic variability within and between countries, using Arlequin 3.11 software (ExCOFFIER et al. 2005).

## Results and Discussion

Genetic diversity parameters (Tab. 1) were assessed for the analyzed genotypes across all SEE countries. Average number of alleles per sampling country varied between 4.22 (Montenegro) and 8.67 (Romania). Small average number of alleles as well as low values of other parameters for Montenegro plant material can be explained through the small number of different genotypes from this country analyzed in our study. Although initially 16 accessions were analyzed, only six different SSR profiles were detected in Montenegro.

The first step of analysis was limited only to accessions sampled within countries. Number of unique genotypes per country varied between $37.5 \%$ (Montenegro) and $100 \%$ (Croatia). Variation of allelic richness between countries was smaller, from 3.81 (Montenegro) to 6.68 (Romania). Observed heterozygosity was smaller than the expected one in two countries: Croatia and Moldova. For our dataset, analysis revealed that certain alleles can be found only among accessions from a single country, like Romania (twelve specific alleles), Croatia (three specific alleles) and Macedonia (three specific alleles). Information content of a given marker may vary between cultivars from different regions (Lopes et al. 1999) as confirmed by existence of specific alleles in our study.

All loci were very polymorphic and a total of 96 alleles were detected, ranging from 8 to 14 alleles per locus, with an average allele number of 10.67 . Overall observed heterozygosity was 0.790 and slightly lower than expected ( 0.808 ) while gene diversity per locus varied between 0.600 (VVMD27) and 0.906 (VVMD28). The highest
number of alleles was detected at locus VVMD 28 (14). Loci VVMD 25 and VVMD27 had the lowest PIC values, 0.706 and 0.705 respectively. Cumulative probability of identity was $9.42^{\text {e-12 }}$ which indicates very low probability of two different varieties sharing the same genotype (Tab. 2). Microsatellite markers used in this study have been proven as very useful for cultivar identification. Six of them (VVS 2, VVMD 5, VVMD 7, VVMD 27, VrZAG 62 and VrZAG 79) are listed in the OIV primary descriptor list for identification of grapevine cultivars. In the large study of grape genetic diversity published by Laucou et al. (2011) seven of the used markers were the same as in our study. Analyzing 2323 accessions of Vitis vinifera subsp. sativa they detected 12 to 25 alleles per locus and loci VVMD 28 and VVMD 32 were the most polymorphic, as in our study. Comparing allelic richness of nine analyzed loci with a similar study of Sefc et al. (2000) who analyzed cultivars from geographically more distant European countries, we find genetic diversity of South East European countries to be relatively high.

In total 25 accessions showed to be duplicates (identical genotypes) within particular countries. Most of them ('Lipolist', 'Dupčara', 'Žilavka', 'Nadidžar', 'Vranac', 'Kratošija', 'Plavka') consisted of accessions with identical or very similar names having identical SSR profile. Among samples from Albania accessions 'Debine e zeze' and 'Koteke e zeze' had identical SSR genotype. Within samples from Macedonia accessions 'Ohridsko crno' and 'Stanushina' were found to be identical. Pairs of identical genotypes from Moldova were 'Brează' - 'Ciorcuță neagră' and 'Gordin' - 'Galbenă'. Accessions 'Surac' and 'Kadarun' from Republika Srpska as well as 'Krstač' and 'Bijela vinska' from Montenegro were also found to be identical.

A subset of genotypes unique within each country of sampling consisted of 97 accessions and was subjected to further analysis. We searched for identical genotypes between countries and 11 pairs of crossborder synonyms were detected (Tab. 3). Most pairs of cultivars with identical genotype were detected among neighboring countries. Between two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina two pairs

Table 2
Genetic diversity parameters of the nine microsatellite markers used in this study for 86 nonredundant accessions: number of alleles ( Na ), observed heterozygosity (Ho), expected heterozygosity (He), polymorphism information content (PIC), probability of identity for unrelated genotypes ( $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{ID}}$ unrelated), probability of identity for full sibs ( $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{ID}}$ full sib) and frequency of null alleles ( F (null)

| Locus | Na | Ho | He | PIC | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {ID }}$ unrelated | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {ID }}$ full sib | F (null) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VVS 2 | 11 | 0.733 | 0.795 | 0.762 | 0.072 | 0.381 | 0.032 |
| VVMD 5 | 12 | 0.812 | 0.873 | 0.854 | 0.032 | 0.326 | 0.030 |
| VVMD 7 | 11 | 0.774 | 0.732 | 0.687 | 0.115 | 0.432 | -0.027 |
| VVMD 25 | 8 | 0.726 | 0.750 | 0.706 | 0.104 | 0.416 | 0.011 |
| VVMD27 | 9 | 0.600 | 0.750 | 0.705 | 0.106 | 0.415 | 0.083 |
| VVMD 28 | 14 | 0.906 | 0.899 | 0.884 | 0.021 | 0.309 | -0.006 |
| VVMD 32 | 12 | 0.842 | 0.839 | 0.813 | 0.048 | 0.349 | -0.005 |
| vrZAG62 | 9 | 0.849 | 0.790 | 0.760 | 0.072 | 0.385 | -0.035 |
| vrZAG79 | 10 | 0.869 | 0.844 | 0.820 | 0.045 | 0.345 | -0.016 |
| Mean: | 10.67 | 0.790 | 0.808 |  | $9.42^{\mathrm{e}-12}$ | $1.33^{\mathrm{e}-4}$ |  |

Table 3
Identical genotypes (accession names with respective country codes)

```
Debine e zeze (ALB05) Koteke e zeze (ALB06)
Zložder (BIH-FBIH08) Bumba (CRO06)
Ohridsko crno (MKD01) Stanushina (MKD06)
Kratoshija (MKD08) Kratošija (MNE10)a
Vranec (MKD05) Rehuljavi vranac (MNE12)
Razaklija (MNE15) Crven valandovski drenok (MKD10)
Begljarka bela (MKD14) Coarnă albă (ROU01)
Gordin (MDA01) Galbena (MDA02)
Negru batut (MDA04) Bătută neagră (ROU05)
Turba plotnaia belaia (MDA06)
Tamaioasa (MDA08)
Breaza (MDA13)
Krstač (MNE09)
Gordan (ROU12)
Žilavka (BIH-RS12, BIH-RS13)
Plavka (BIH-RS04, BIH-RS05)
Surac (BIH-RS10)
Šljiva (BIH-FBIH06) NN(BIH-RS18)
Cabasma (MDA11)
Tămâioasă românească (ROU17)
Ciorcuta negra (MDA16) Vulpe (ROU07)
Bijela vinska (MNE14)
Gordin (ROU13)
Žilavka(BIH-FBIH10, BIH-FBIH12)
Kadarun crveni (BIH-RS17)
Kadarun (BIH-RS14, BIH-RS15)
Lipolist (BIH-FBIH01, BIH-FBIH04)
Dupčara (BIH-FBIH02, BIH-FBIH09)
Nadidžar (BIH-FBIH03, BIH-FBIH07)
```

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Duplicates (same name and country of origin).
of synonyms were detected. Homonyms were detected based on visual inspection and few cases were observed. Accessions ROU12 and ROU13 from Romania named 'Gordin' and 'Gordan' shared identical genotype but accession MDA01 named 'Gordin' from 'Moldova'showed different SSR profile. The situation is even more complex with accessions named 'Šljiva'. Two accessions from the Federation of B\&H named 'Šljiva' (BIH-FBIH05 and BIH-FBIH06) had different genotypes and did not match the genotype of accession named 'Šljiva' from Croatia (CRO08). However accession BIH-RS18 which was sampled as 'unknown' had the identical genotype as accession BIH-FBIH06. Accessions 'Rezaklija' from Republika Srpska and 'Razaklija' from Montenegro despite the very similar name did not have identical genotypes. It is important to note that cultivar names were often changed during history, because of various reasons, such as lack of knowl-
edge and proper maintenance of grapevine germplasm. In similar studies, the numbers of synonyms and homonyms detected were sometimes even above $30 \%$. Cipriani et al. (2010) found only 745 unique genotypes out of 1005 analyzed accessions, while Laucou et al. (2011) found 2323 different cultivars out of 3727 sativa accessions from the Vassal collection. The results of AMOVA showed no clear differentiation between countries (data not shown). We also analyzed differentiation among three more distinct geographic regions (Moldova-Romania; Albania-Macedonia and B\&H-Croatia-Montenegro) and again no statistically significant difference among them was observed.

The remaining 86 unique SSR genotypes (Tab. 4) represent the nonredundant set of regional genotypes that was used for calculation of above mentioned genetic variation parameters shown in Tab. 2. Only a part of OIV descriptors' results (berry color, berry shape, bunch density and

Tab. 4 continued

ripening) is presented in this paper in order to provide a basic navigation through divergence of analyzed material, as well as their frequencies across region (Tab. 5). Berry color is almost equally split between green yellow (41.8 $\%$ ) and blue black ( $41.0 \%$ ). Most common berry shape was "globose", bunch density was mostly dense to medium dense, while regarding ripening time medium to late varieties predominated.

It was interesting to take a closer look on expression levels of ampelographic data for accessions determined by SSRs as being synonyms or homonyms (data not shown). In case of 'Krstač' and 'Bijela vinska' from Montenegro that had identical SSR genotype, ampelographic results pointed on obvious difference in berry color (green yellow $v s$. grey), as well as in berry shape (narrow elipsoid vs. horn shape). Similarly, synonym pairs 'Plavka' (BiH-RS05) and 'Kadarun crveni' (BiH-RS17) differed in berry color (blue black vs. rose), 'Kadarun' (BiH-RS14) had blue black and 'Surac' (BiH-RS10) green yellow berry color while 'Šljiva' (BiH-FBIH06) had blue black and accession 'NN10' (BiHRS05) had green yellow berry color. These findings will require deeper ampelographic and more SSR analysis work in order to check if the observed diversity was a result of mutation or a human error. Three pairs of homonyms mentioned above had expectedly very similar phenotype what could explain appearance of different names.

An attempt to present diversity of studied accessions by most commonly used OIV descriptors is given in Tab. 5. Since the ampelographic description was performed in different countries by different evaluators (and without referent cultivars in some cases), frequencies of levels' of expression of different characteristics have to be taken by prudence. Still, they represent state of the art and provide a rough insight in overall diversity. Ampelographic description of same (synonym) cultivars performed as described above resulted in slight inconsistencies and pointed on necessity of additional characterization by molecular markers.

## Conclusions

The autochthonous grapevine cultivars from South East Europe analyzed in this study showed relatively high level of diversity in comparison with similar studies. No clear differentiation between countries was detected although several specific alleles were identified. Detected synonyms between neighbouring countries were mostly unknown before, but since South East European countries share common history, certain level of crossing between cultivars can be expected. However, few cases of accessions with identical SSR genotype but different phenotype might be berry color mutants. The obtained results should give a lead to ampelographers in the region to examine the level of phenotypic (di)similarity of detected synonyms and homonyms in more details with more independent samples. Prospection should be continued in the region of South East Europe to get better insight in relationships between cultivars and to preserve the existing germplasm for future generations. Accessions of unique and not previously published genotypes will be added to the European Vitis Database.

Table 5
Frequencies of some OIV characteristics for the 122 grapevine accessions presumed to be autochthonous across South East European countries

| OIV characteristic | ALB | BIH-FBIH | BIH-RS | CRO | MDA | MKD | MNE | ROU | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{n}= \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{n}=16$ | $\mathrm{n}=14$ | $\mathrm{n}=16$ | $\mathrm{n}=26$ | $\mathrm{n}=122$ |
| Berry color - OIV 225 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - green yellow | 40 | 41,7 | 46,2 | 46,7 | 50 | 42,9 | 6,3 | 53,8 | 41,8 |
| 2 - rose | 0 | 16,7 | 15,4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,3 | 3,8 | 4,9 |
| 3 - red | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6,7 | 0 | 7,1 | 6,3 | 3,8 | 4,1 |
| 4 - grey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,3 | 0 | 0,8 |
| 5 - dark red violet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,3 | 12,5 | 0 | 12,5 | 0 | 7,4 |
| 6 - blue black | 50 | 41,7 | 38,5 | 13,3 | 37,5 | 50 | 62,5 | 38,5 | 41 |
| Berry shape - OIV 223 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - obloid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,3 | 7,1 | 0 | 0 | 1,6 |
| 2 - globose | 0 | 0 | 84,6 | 73,3 | 87,5 | 50 | 0 | 73,1 | 50,8 |
| 3 - broad ellipsoid | 30 | 66,7 | 7,7 | 0 | 6,3 | 14,3 | 6,3 | 15,4 | 16,4 |
| 4 - narrow ellipsoid | 70 | 33,3 | 0 | 13,3 | 0 | 7,1 | 37,5 | 0 | 16,4 |
| 5 - cylindric | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,3 | 0 | 0,8 |
| 6 - obtuse ovoid | 0 | 0 | 7,7 | 13,3 | 0 | 21,4 | 0 | 0 | 1,6 |
| 7 - ovoid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43,8 | 3,8 | 9,8 |
| 8 - obovoid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,8 |
| 9 - horn shaped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,3 | 0 | 1,6 |
| 10 - finger shaped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,6 |
| Bunch density - OIV 204 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - very loose | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,8 |
| 3-loose | 50 | 8,3 | 7,7 | 40 | 12,5 | 0 | 0 | 34,6 | 19,7 |
| 5 - medium | 40 | 50,3 | 23,1 | 20 | 37,5 | 64,3 | 12,5 | 11,5 | 29,5 |
| 7 - dense | 10 | 41,7 | 69,2 | 26,7 | 37,5 | 35,7 | 68,8 | 34,6 | 41 |
| 9 - very dense | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,7 | 12,5 | 0 | 18,8 | 19,2 | 9 |
| Ripening - OIV 304 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - very early | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 - early | 0 | 0 | 7,7 | 13,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,8 | 3,3 |
| 5 - medium | 50 | 25 | 76,9 | 60 | 12,5 | 50 | 93,8 | 80,8 | 59 |
| 7 - late | 50 | 75 | 15,4 | 26,7 | 68,8 | 21,4 | 6,3 | 15,4 | 32 |
| 9 - very late | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,8 | 28,6 | 0 | 0 | 5,7 |

## Acknowledgements

The project „Identification, characterization and conservation of old and autochthonous wine varieties in South Eastern European countries" has been conducted during 2009/10 by the working group Fruit Crops and Vitis of the South East European Development Network on Plant Genetic Resources (SEEDNet) funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the consortium has been coordinated by the Swedish Biodiversity Centre (CBM), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.

## Authors' contribution

K. Beleski was the project coordinator and dealt with analysis of overall ampelographic data; M. Žulu Mihaliević performed molecular characterization, preliminary data analysis and wrote the manuscript; S. Šimon participated in molecular characterization and in writing the manuscript, I. Peлट́ supervised final data analysis and made the concept of results and conclusions; all other co-authors participated at national level in ampelographic analysis and gathering plant material for DNA, as well as critical reading of the manuscript.

## References

Benjak, A., Ercisli, S.; Vokurka, A.; Maletić, E., Pejić, I.; 2005: Genetic relationships among grapevine cultivars native to Croatia, Greece and Turkey. Vitis 44,73-77.
Bowers, J. E.; Dangl, G. S; Meredith, C. P.; 1999: Development and characterization of additional microsatellite DNA markers for grape. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 50, 243-246.

Bowers, J. E.; Dangl, G. S; Vignani, R.; Meredith, C. P.; 1996: Isolation and characterization of new polymorphic simple sequence repeat in loci in grape (Vitis vinifera L.) Genome 39, 628-633.
Boz, Y.; Bakir, M.; Celikkol, B. P.; Kazan, K.; Yilmaz, F.; Cakir, B.; Aslantas, S.; Söylemezoglu, G.; Yasasin, A. S.; Özer, C.; Celik, H.; Ergül, A.; Celik, H.; 2011: Generic characterization of grape (Vitis vinifera L.) germplasm from Southeast Anatolia by SSR markers. Vitis 50, 99-106.
Cipriani, G; Spadotto, A.; Jurman, I.; Di Gaspero, D.; Crespan, M.; Meneghetti, S.; Frare, E.; Vignani, R.; Cresti, M.; Morgante, M.; Pezzotti, M.; Pe, E.; Policriti, A.; Testolin, R.; 2010: The SSRbased molecular profile of 1005 grapevine (Vitis vinifera L.) accessions uncovers new synonymy and parentages, and reveals a large admixture amongst varieties of different geographic origin. Theor. Appl. Genet. 121, 1569-1585.
El Oualkadi, A.; Ater, M.; Messaoudi, Z.; Heit, K.; Laucou, V., Boursiquot, J. M.; Lacombe, T., This, P.; 2011: Genetic diversity of Moroccan grape accessions conserved ex situ compared to Maghreb and European gene pools. Tree Genet. Genomics 7, 1287-1298.
Excoffier, L.; Laval, G.; Schneider, S.; 2005: Arlequin ver. 3.0: An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. Evol. Bioinformatics Online 1,47-50.
García-Muñoz, S.; Lacombe, T.; Teresa de Andrés, M.; Gaforio, L.; Muñoz-Organero, G.; Laucou, V.; This, P.; Cabello, F.; 2012: Grape varieties (Vitis vinifera L.) from the Balearic Islands: genetic characterisation and relationship with Iberian Peninsula and Mediterranean Basin. Genet. Res. Crop. Evol. 59, 589-605.
Gheorghe, R. L.; Popescu, C. F.; Pamfil, D.; 2008: Microsatellite fingerprinting of some Vitis vinifera L. cultivars grown in Romania. Bull. UASVM, Horticulture 65(2).
Ghetea L. G.; Motoc, R. M.; Popescu, C. F.; Barbacar, N.; Iancu, D.; Constantinescu, C.; Bărbăriı, L. E.; 2010: Genetic profiling of nine grapevine cultivars from Romania, based on SSR Markers Romanian Biotechnological Letters Vol. 15, No.1.
Glaubitz J. C.; 2004: CONVERT: A user-friendly program to reformat diploid genotypic data for commonly used population genetic software packages. Mol. Ecol. Notes 4, 309-310.

Goudet, J. 2001. FSTAT, a program to estimate and test gene diversities and fixation indices (version 2.9.3). Available from http://www2. unil.ch/popgen/softwares/fstat.htm.
Hvarleva, T.; Hadjinicoli, A.; Atanassov, I.; Atanassov, A.; Ioannou, N.; 2005: Genotyping Vitis vinifera L. cultivars of Cyprus by microsatellite analysis. Vitis 44, 93-97.
Ladoukakis, E. D.; Lefort, F.; Sotiri, P.; Bacu, A.; Kongjika, E.; Roube-lakis-Angelakis, A.; 2005: Genetic characterization of Albanian grapevine cultivars by microsatellite markers. J. Int. Sci. Vigne Vin, 39, 109-119.
Laiadi, Z.; Bentchikou, M. M.; Bravo, G.; Cabello, F; Martínez-ZapaTER, J. M.; 2009: Molecular identification and genetic relationships of Algerian grapevine cultivars maintained at the germplasm collection of Skikda (Algeria).Vitis 48, 25-32.
Laucou, V.; Lacombe, T.; Dechesne, F.; Siret, R.; Bruno, J. P.; Dessup, M.; Ortigosa, P.; Parra, P.; Roux, C.; Santoni, S.; Varès, D.; Péros, J. P.; Boursiquot, J. M., This, P.; 2011: High throughput analysis of grape genetic diversity as a tool for germplasm collection management. Theor. Appl. Genet. 122, 1233-1245.
Lopes, M. S.; Sefc, K. M.; Eiras Dias, E.; Steinkellner, H.; Laimer Câmara Machado, M.; Câmara Machado, A.; 1999: The use of microsatellites for germplasm management in a Portuguese grapevines based on microsatellite markers. J. Biotechno. 127, 34-44.
Maletić, E.; Sefc, K. M.; Steinkellner, H.; Kontić, J. K.; Pejić, I.; 1999: Genetic characterization of Croatian grapevine cultivars and detection of synonymous cultivars in neighboring regions. Vitis 38, 79-83.
Martin, J. P.; Arranz, C.; Castro, I. D.; Yuste, J.; Rubio, J. A.; PintoCarnide, O.; Ortiz, J. M.; 2011: Prospection and identification of grapevine varieties in north Portugal and northwest Spain. Vitis 50, 29-33.
Martínez, L.; Cavagnaro, P.; Boursiquot, J. M.; Agüero, C.; 2008: Molecular Characterisation of Bonarda-type Grapevine (Vitis vinifera L.) Cultivars from Argentina, Italy, and France. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 59, 287-291.
Maul, E.; Sudharma, K. N.; Kecke, S.; Marx, G.; Müller, C.; Audeguin. L.; Boselli, M.; Boursiquot, J. M.; Bucchetti, B.; Cabello, F.; Carraro, R.; Crespan, M.;. De Andrés, M. T.; Eiras Dias, J.; Ekhvaia, J.; Gaforio, L.; Gardiman, M.; Grando, S.; Gyropoulos, D.; Jandurova, O.; Kiss, E. ; Kontic, J.; Kozma, P.; Lacombe T.; Laucou, V.; Legrand, D.; Maghradze, D.; Marinoni, D.; Maletic, E.; Moreira, F.; Muñoz-Organero, G.; Nakhutsrishvili, G.; Pejic, I.; Peterlunger, E.; Pitsoli, D.; Pospisilova, D.; Preiner, D.; Raimondi, S.; Regner, F.; Savin, G.; Savvides, S.; Schneider, A.; Sereno, C.; Simon, S.; Staraz, M.; Zulin, L.; Bacilieri, R.; This, P.; 2012: The European Vitis Database (www.eu-vitis.de) a technical innovation through an online uploading and interactive modification system. Vitis 51, 79-85.
O. I. V.; 2001: $2^{\text {nd }}$ Edition of the OIV Descriptor List for Grape Varieties and Vitis Species O. I. V. (Off. Int. Vigne Vin), Paris.
Park, S. D. E.; 2001: Trypanotolerance in West African Cattle and the Population Genetic Effects of Selection. Ph.D. thesis. Univ. Dublin.
Peakall, R.; Smouse P. E. 2006: GENALEX 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research. Mol. Ecol. Notes 6, 288-295.
Santana, J. C.; Hidalgo, E.; De Lucas, A. I.; Recio, P.; Ortiz, J. M.; Martin, J. P.; Yuste, C. C.; Arranz, C.; Rubio, J. A.; 2008: Identification and relationships of accessions grown in the grapevine (Vitis
vinifera L.) Germplasm Bank of Castilla y Leon (Spain) and the varieties authorized in the VQPRD areas of the region by SSR-marker analysis. Genet. Resour. Crop. Evol. 55, 573-583.
Santana, J. C.; Heuertz, M.; Arranz, C.; Rubio, J. A.; Zapater, J. M. M; Hidalgo, E.; 2010: Genetic structure, origins, and relationships of grapevine cultivars from the Castilian plateau of Spain. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 61, 214-224.
Schneider, A.; Carra, A.; Akkak, A.; This, P.; Laucou, V.; Botta, R.; 2001: Verifying synonymies between grape cultivars from France and Northwestern Italy using molecular markers. Vitis 40, 197-203.
Sefc, K.; Regner, F.; Glössl, J.; Steinkellner, H.; 1998: Genotyping of grapevine and rootstock cultivars using microsatellite markers. Vitis 37, 15-20.
Sefc, K. M.; Regner, F.; Turetschek, E.; Glössl, J.; Steinkellner, H.; 1999: Identification of microsatellite sequences in Vitis riparia and their applicability for genotyping of different Vitis species. Genome 42, 1-7.
Sefc, K. M.; Lopes, M. S.; Lefort, F., Botta, R.; Roubelakis-Angelakis, K. A.; Ibáñez, J.; Pejić, I.; Wagner, H. W.; Glössl, J.; SteinkellNER, H.; 2000: Microsatellite variability in grapevine cultivars from different European regions and evaluation of assignment testing to assess the geographic origin of cultivars. Theor. Appl. Genet. 100, 498-505.
Şelli, F.; Bakir, M.; Inan, G.; Aygün, H.; Boz, Y.; Yașasin, A. S.; Özer, C.; B. Akman, B.; Söylemezoğlu, G.; Kazan, K.; Ergül, A; 2007: Simple sequence repeat-based assessment of genetic diversity in 'Dimrit' and 'Gemre' grapevine accessions from Turkey. Vitis 46, 182-187.
Stajner, N.; Angleova E.; Bozinovic,Z.; Petkov, M.; Javornik, B.; 2009: Microsatellite marker analysis of Macedonian grapevines (Vitis vinifera L.) compared to Bulgarian and Greek cultivars. J. Int. Sci. Vigne Vin 43, 29-34.
Štajner, N.; Rusjan, D.; Korošec-Koruza, Z.; Javornik, B.; 2011: Genetic characterization of old Slovenian grapevine varieties of Vitis vinifera L. by microsatellite genotyping. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 62, 250-255.
This, P.; Jung, A.; Boccacci, P.; Borrego, J.; Botta, R.; Costantini, L.; Crespan, M.; Dangl, G. S.; Eisenheld, C.; Ferreira-Monteiro, F.; Grando, S.; Ibáñez, J.; Lacombe, T.; Laucou, V.; Magalhães, R.; Meredith, C. P.; Milani, N.; Peterlunger, E.; Regner, F.; Zulini, L.; Maul, E.; 2004: Development of a standard set of microsatellite references alleles for identification of grape cultivars. Theor. Appl. Genet. 109, 1048-1058.
This, P.; Lacombe, T.; Thomas, M. R.; 2006: Historical origins and genetic diversity of wine grapes. Trends Genet. 22, 511-519.
Thomas, M. R.; Scott, N. S.; 1993: Microsatellite repeats in grapevine reveal DNA polymorphism when analysed as sequence-tagged sites (STSs). Theor. Appl. Genet. 86, 985-990.
Torello Marinoni, D.; Raimondi, S.; Ruffa, P; Lacombe, T.; Schneider, A.; 2009: Identification of grape cultivars from Liguria (north-western Italy) Vitis 48, 175-183.
Vilanova, M.; De La Fuente, M.; Fernández-González, M.; Masa, A.; 2009: Identification of new synonymies in minority grapevine cultivars from Galicia (Spain) using microsatellite analysis. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 60, 2.
Wagner, H. W. and Sefc, K. M.; 1999: IDENTITY 1.0. Centre Appl. Genet., Univ. Agric. Sci., Vienna.
Zoghlami, N.; Riahi, L.; Laucou, V.; Lacombe, T.; Mliki, A.; Ghorbel, A.; This, P.; 2009: Origin and genetic diversity of Tunisian grapes as revealed by microsatellite markers. Sci. Hortic. 120, 479-486.

Received July 12, 2012

