



POLYMORPHISM AMONG DIFFERENT FAMILIES OF DIPTERAN ORDER: COMPARISON OF RAPD DATA

Neelam Bajpai

Department of Zoology

Mahamaya Govt Degree College, Kaushambi (U.P.), India

*Corresponding author: neelambajpai18@gmail.com

Article Info:

Review Article

Received

21.12.2020

Reviewed

20.01.2021

Accepted

12.02.2021

Abstract: Random amplified polymorphic DNA-Polymerase Chain Reaction (RAPD-PCR) data was compared to assess heterozygosity and genetic variability among different members belonging to family Muscidae, Sarcophagidae and Tephritidae. The present review compiles data obtained by ten different RAPD primers. The result shows that *M. domestica* belonging to the family Muscidae have higher heterozygosity value than members belonging to the family Sarcophagidae and Tephritidae which could be depicted by the fact that *Musca* flies have more prominent population thickness.

Keywords: Molecular marker, Muscidae, Primer, RAPD-PCR, Sarcophagidae, Tephritidae.

INTRODUCTION

Dipteran order comprises of insects of great medical, veterinary, forensic and economic importance as the members belonging to this order play a vital role in disease transmission, causing animal tissue myiasis, causing a huge loss of fruits and vegetables as larvae infest wide range of plant species and also members of this order are used to give information related to time along with place of death i.e. in forensic studies (Greenberg, 1971 and 1973; Cornaby, 1974; Jiron and Marin, 1982; Singh *et al.*, 2011; Rawat, 2020).

Now a days, protein based (allozyme) and several DNA based molecular markers (Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA- Polymerase Chain Reaction (RAPD PCR), Polymerase Chain Reaction-Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (PCR RFLP), sequencing of different mitochondrial and nuclear genes, Single Strand Conformation Polymorphism (SSCP), Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP), microsatellites) are frequently used for genetic characterization. These

have been extensively used to detect intra and inter specific genetic variation, pattern of migration, phylogenetic relationships and population structure among members belonging to different Dipteran families (Zheng *et al.*, 2010; Bajpai and Tewari, 2010a; Singh *et al.*, 2012; Bajpai, 2016a & 2016b; Julsirikul *et al.*, 2017; Park *et al.*, 2018; Bajpai, 2019).

Among all other DNA based methods RAPD-PCR and sequencing of mitochondrial COI gene are more frequently used. RAPD-PCR allows DNA polymorphism by using arbitrary primers, however, sequencing requires prior knowledge of the flanking regions of the gene of interest. RAPD-PCR molecular markers are dominant expression marker in which banding patterns are obtained by using arbitrary primers which amplify numerous regions of the genome (Ali *et al.*, 2004; Jain *et al.*, 2010).

In the present review, an attempt has been made to summarize and analyze the polymorphism by

Table 1: Sequence of primers used, number of amplified fragments, average heterozygosity and range of size of fragments among different families of Dipteran order.

S. no.	Primer sequence 5'-3'	Number of amplified fragments in the Family Muscidae				Number of amplified fragments in the Family Sarcophagidae					Number of amplified fragments in the Family Tephritidae		Range of size of amplified fragments (bp)
		<i>M. domestica</i> (Arail)	<i>M. domestica</i> (Prayagraj city)	<i>M. domestica</i> (Jhunsi)	<i>A. orientalis</i>	<i>S. ruficornis</i>	<i>S. argyrostoma</i>	<i>S. dux</i>	<i>S. albiceps</i>	<i>S. knabi</i>	<i>B. cucurbitaceae</i>	<i>B. dorsalis</i>	
1.	TGATCCCTGG	2 (0.25)	2 (0.36)	5 (0.37)	5 (0.11)	2 (0.12)	3 (0.11)	5 (0.38)	2 (0.12)	4 (0.21)	1 (0)	1 (0)	240-2535
2.	AGGGCGTAAG	3 (0.32)	3 (0.38)	3 (0.44)	4 (0.08)	3 (0.09)	4 (0.17)	6 (0.21)	2 (0.08)	2 (0.08)	-	-	237-2163
3.	CAGCCCAGAG	5 (0.37)	2 (0.33)	4 (0.38)	4 (0.09)	5 (0.15)	5 (0.19)	2 (0.06)	3 (0.11)	2 (0.04)	-	-	192-2478
4.	GTCCCGACGA	6 (0.24)	4 (0.27)	6 (0.41)	3 (0.11)	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0.28)	3 (0.09)	-	-	214-2541
5.	GGTGACGCAG	5 (0.35)	2 (0.4)	3 (0.37)	2 (0.12)	5 (0.23)	4 (0.14)	6 (0.22)	2 (0.09)	2 (0.09)	-	-	202-1489
6.	TGGGGGACTC	3 (0.27)	4 (0.33)	5 (0.43)	4 (0.11)	5 (0.12)	7 (0.25)	6 (0.24)	3 (0.07)	1 (0)	-	-	196-2450
7.	GTAGACCCGT	5 (0.34)	5 (0.32)	2 (-0.39)	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1 (0.46)	-	-	144-590
8.	TGCGTGCTTG	3 (0.39)	2 (0.34)	2 (0.43)	6 (0.11)	6 (0.18)	5 (0.13)	3 (0.1)	4 (0.14)	2 (0.07)	4 (0)	4 (0)	100-2039
9.	CTCTGGAGAC	5 (0.21)	4 (0.4)	4 (0.43)	6 (-0.11)	2 (0.12)	2 (0.12)	5 (0.12)	1 (0.19)	4 (0.24)	-	-	179-2334
10.	TCTCCGCTTG	5 (0.31)	4 (0.42)	4 (0.42)	7 (0.12)	5 (0.19)	3 (0.13)	3 (0.14)	4 (0.19)	2 (0)	-	-	207-1638
		Malviya <i>et al.</i> , 2015				Bajpai and Tewari 2010b, Bajpai <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Bajpai, 2016c; Bajpai, 2016 d					Singh <i>et al.</i> , 2011		

*values under square bracket represent average heterozygosity.

data obtained from ten different RAPD-PCR primers in members belonging to Muscidae, Sarcophagidae and Tephritidae families of Dipteran order. In Muscidae family three different populations of *Musca domestica* and one species of *Atherigonia orientalis*, in the family Sarcophagidae five different species of *Sarcophaga* namely *S. ruficornis*, *S. argyrostoma*, *S. dux*, *S. albiceps* and *S. knabi* and in the family Tephritidae two different species namely *Bactrocera dorsalis* and *B. cucurbita* were compared.

Comparison of RAPD-PCR data

In the family Muscidae the minimum number of amplified fragments were two and maximum number of amplified fragment were six while in Sarcophagidae family minimum number of scorable bands were two and maximum number of scorable bands were seven and in the family

Tephritidae minimum and maximum number of a scorable bands were one and four, respectively. The minimum length of amplified fragment was of 100 base pairs from primer number eight and maximum length of amplified fragment was 2541 base pairs obtained by primary number four.

In the family Muscidae three different populations (flies of Jhunsi, Arail and Prayagraj city region) of *Musca domestica* has been analyzed and the value of heterozygosity ranges from 0.21 to 0.44, however, the heterozygosity value of *A. orientalis* ranges from 0.08 to 0.12, while in Sarcophagidae family heterozygosity value ranges from 0.0 to 0.38. However, in Tephritidae family only two primers are capable of producing banding pattern in both the species; with these two primers only single fragment was scorable by primer one and only four bands were scorable by primer number eight. Both primers

produce monomorphic banding pattern in both the genera therefore, heterozygosity value was found to be zero. Table 1 represents sequence of primers used, number of amplified fragments, average heterozygosity and range of size of fragments amplified among different families of Dipteran order.

A higher estimation of heterozygosity value in *M. domestica* population can be depicted by the fact that this fly is having more prominent population thickness when contrasted with *A. orientalis* or by individuals from other two families, since, those species which are distributed over an enormous zone are liable to increased variety of environmental conditions and in this way they are hereditarily more heterogeneous when contrasted with those species which are available in confined zone. More prominent heterogeneity in housefly additionally makes them ready to endure and effectively adapt up to the distinctive ecological and environmental pressure (Li and Graur, 1999; Santos *et al.*, 2005; Sharma *et al.*, 2009; Malviya *et al.*, 2015).

CONCLUSION

The present review strongly confirms the relevance of RAPD-PCR marker as an important molecular method for unravelling genetic relationship among different members belonging to the family Muscidae, Sarcophagidae and Tephritidae of Dipteran order. Since, from all ten primers the families Muscidae and Sarcophagidae produce scorable banding pattern, however, in Tephritidae family only two primers are capable of producing banding pattern. This could be ascribed by the fact that Muscidae and Sarcophagidae are more closely related as compared to the members of the family Tephritidae.

REFERENCES

1. **Ali B. A., Huang T. H., Qin D. N. and Wang X. M.** (2004). A review of Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) markers in fish research. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*. 14(4): 443-453.
2. **Bajpai Neelam** (2016a). DNA based characterization of flesh flies (Sarcophagidae: Diptera). *Int Res J of Biological Sciences*. 5 (10): 35-39.
3. **Bajpai Neelam** (2016b). Mitochondrial DNA based studies in Sarcophagid flies from India. *Res J of Recent Sciences*. 5 (12): 17-20.
4. **Bajpai Neelam** (2016c). Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA based characterization of flesh flies. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. 4 (5): 857-859.
5. **Bajpai Neelam** (2016d). RAPD-PCR based characterization of sarcophagid flies. *The Journal of Zoology Studies*. 3(5): 20-23.
6. **Bajpai Neelam** (2019). Mitochondrial CR and nuclear ITS2 regions analysis in flesh flies. *Int Res J of Biological Sciences*. 8 (4): 16-19.
7. **Bajpai Neelam and Tewari R. R.** (2010a). Mitochondrial DNA sequence based phylogenetic relationship among flesh flies of the genus *Sarcophaga* (Sarcophagidae: Diptera). *J of Genetics*. 89 (1): 51-54.
8. **Bajpai N. and Tewari R. R.** (2010b). Genetic characterization of sarcophagid flies by Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA-Polymerase Chain Reaction. *Natl Acad Sci Lett*. 33(3): 103-106.
9. **Bajpai N., Tewari R. R. and Thakur S.** (2011). Genetic characterization of three *Sarcophaga* species with allozymes and RAPD-PCR markers (Sarcophagidae: Diptera). *Natl Acad Sci Lett*. 34 (1-2): 69-73.
10. **Cornaby B. W.** (1974). Carrion reduction by animals in contrasting tropical habitats. *Biotropica*. 6 (1): 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2989697>
11. **Graur D. and Li W. H.** (1999). Fundamentals of Molecular Evolution. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts. 443p.
12. **Greenberg B.** (1971). Flies and Diseases, Ecology, Classification and Biotic Associations. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 856p.
13. **Greenberg B.** (1973). Flies and Diseases, Biology and Disease Transmission. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 447p.
14. **Jain S. K., Neekhara B., Pandey D. and Jain K.** (2010). RAPD marker system in insect study:

- A review. *Indian Journal of Biotechnology*. 9(1): 7-12.
15. **Jiron L. F. and Marin R. E.** (1982). Moscas Sarcófagidas da Costa Rica (Diptera: Cyclorrhapha). *Rev Biol Trop*. 30 (1): 105-106.
 16. **Julsirikul D., Haymer D. S. and Kitthawee S.** (2017). Genetic structure and diversity of the *Diachasmimorpha longicaudata* species complex in Thailand: SSCP analysis of mitochondrial 16S rDNA and COI DNA sequences. *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology*. 71: 59-68. [10.1016/j.bse.2017.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bse.2017.01.008)
 17. **Malviya S., Tewari R. R. and Agrawal U. R.** (2015). Genetic relationship between the Muscids Using RAPD-PCR as marker. *Int Res J of Biological Sciences*. 4 (1): 66-70.
 18. **Park J. H., Shin S. E., Ko K. S. and Park S. H.** (2018). Identification of Forensically Important Calliphoridae and Sarcophagidae Species Collected in Korea Using SNaPshot Multiplex System Targeting the Cytochrome c Oxidase Subunit I Gene. *BioMed Research International*. Article ID 2953892. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/2953892>
 19. **Rawat S.** (2020). Myiasis, Dipteran flies and their implications in Forensic Entomology. *International Journal of Biological Innovations*. 2(2): 220-224. <https://doi.org/10.46505/IJBI.2020.2219>.
 20. **Santos J. M. M., Rodriguez G. A. D., Maia J. F. and Tadei W. P.** (2005). Variability and genetic differentiation among *Anopheles(Ano) intermedius* Chagas, 1908 and *Anopheles(Ano) mattogrossensis* Lutz and Neiva, 1911 (Diptera: Culicidae) from the Brazilian Amazon. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz*. 100 (6): 631-637. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0074-02762005000600006>.
 21. **Sharma A. K., Mendki M. J., Tikar S. N., Chandel K., Sukumaran D., Parashar B. D., Veer V., Agrawal O. P., Prakash S.** (2009). Genetic variability in the geographical populations of *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say (Diptera: Culicidae) from India based on random amplified polymorphic DNA analysis. *Acta Tropica*. 112 (1): 71-76. [10.1016/j.actatropica.2009.06.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2009.06.014).
 22. **Singh R., Bajpai N. and Tewari R. R.** (2011). Genetic characterization of *Bactrocera* (Dacus) flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) based on RAPD-PCR. *International Journal of Pharma and Biosciences*. 2 (2): 498-503.
 23. **Singh K., Thakur S. and Ramteke P. W.** (2012). Electrophoretic analysis of genetic variability in carrion breeding blow flies *C. megacephala* (Fab.). *Int Res J of Pharma and Bio Sciences*. 3(1): 538-546.
 24. **Zheng X., Hu J., Kunnon S. P. and Xiaoguang C.** (2010). Identification of Necrophagous fly species from 12 different cities in China using ISSR and SCAR markers. *Asian Pacific journal of Tropical Medicine*. 3 (7): 510-514.