International Journal of Pharmacognosy and Life Science

E-ISSN: 2707-2835
P-ISSN: 2707-2827
www.pharmacognosyjournal.com
IJPLS 2024; 5(2): 01-04
Received: 02-04-2024
Accepted: 06-05-2024

Kwame Ofori
Department of Crop Science, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana

Corresponding Author:
Kwame Ofori
Department of Crop Science, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana

Comparative genomics of fruit firmness in cherry tomato and other tomato varieties

Kwame Ofori

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/27072827.2024.v5.i2a.118

Abstract
Fruit firmness is a crucial trait affecting the shelf life, transportability, and consumer preference of tomatoes. This research paper delves into the comparative genomics of fruit firmness in cherry tomatoes and other tomato varieties. By analyzing the genetic basis of this trait, we aim to identify key genes and molecular pathways involved in regulating fruit firmness. The study employs advanced genomic techniques, including whole-genome sequencing, gene expression profiling, and quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping, to unravel the genetic determinants of fruit firmness. Our findings provide valuable insights for breeding programs aimed at enhancing fruit quality and extending the shelf life of tomatoes.

Keywords: Tomato, cherry tomato, fruit firmness, comparative genomics, whole-genome sequencing, gene expression, QTL mapping

Introduction
Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) is one of the most important and widely cultivated vegetable crops globally, prized for its nutritional value, culinary versatility, and economic significance. Among the various quality traits that influence consumer preference and marketability, fruit firmness stands out as a critical attribute. Fruit firmness affects the texture, mouthfeel, and overall sensory experience of tomatoes, playing a vital role in determining their shelf life and resistance to mechanical damage during harvesting, transportation, and storage.

Fruit firmness is a complex trait influenced by both genetic and environmental factors. The cell wall structure and composition, primarily involving pectin, cellulose, and hemicellulose, are crucial determinants of fruit firmness. The modification and degradation of these cell wall components during fruit ripening are tightly regulated by various enzymes, including expansins, pectin methylesterases, and polygalacturonases. Understanding the genetic basis and molecular mechanisms underlying fruit firmness can provide valuable insights for breeding programs aimed at developing tomato varieties with improved firmness and extended shelf life.

Cherry tomatoes (*Solanum lycopersicum* var. *cerasiforme*) and other commercial tomato varieties exhibit significant variability in fruit firmness, making them ideal candidates for comparative genomic studies. Advances in high-throughput sequencing technologies and bioinformatics tools have enabled the comprehensive analysis of genetic variations and gene expression patterns associated with complex traits like fruit firmness. By leveraging these technologies, this study aims to elucidate the genetic determinants and regulatory networks that contribute to fruit firmness in tomatoes.

Objectives
The primary objectives of this study are to compare the genomic profiles of cherry tomato and other tomato varieties with respect to fruit firmness, identify key genes and genetic markers associated with this trait, and explore the molecular pathways and regulatory networks involved in the development and maintenance of fruit firmness.

Materials and Methods
This study used a variety of tomato plants, including cherry tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*

var. *cerasiforme*) and several commercial tomato varieties known for their differing levels of fruit firmness. The commercial varieties included 'Beefsteak' (*Solanum lycopersicum* 'Beefsteak'), 'Roma' (*Solanum lycopersicum* 'Roma'), and 'Heirloom' (*Solanum lycopersicum* 'Heirloom'). These varieties were sourced from commercial seed suppliers: 'Beefsteak' and 'Roma' seeds were obtained from Johnny's Selected Seeds, and 'Heirloom' seeds were sourced from Baker Creek Heirloom Seeds.

These plants were cultivated in a controlled greenhouse environment at the Agricultural Research Facility of the University of California, Davis, to minimize environmental variability. Fruits were harvested at the mature green and breaker stages to capture the critical phases of firmness development.

Genomic DNA was extracted from young leaf tissues using a modified cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) method. The DNA samples were then quantified and assessed for quality using a NanoDrop spectrophotometer and agarose gel electrophoresis. High-quality DNA samples were subjected to whole-genome sequencing using the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform, generating 150 base pair paired-end reads.

The raw sequencing data underwent quality control using FastQC and Trimmomatic to remove low-quality reads and adapter sequences. Clean reads were aligned to the reference tomato genome (SL3.0) using the Burrows-Wheeler Aligner (BWA-MEM). Variant calling was performed with the Genome Analysis Toolkit (GATK) to identify single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) and insertions/deletions (indels). The variants were annotated using SnpEff based on the SL3.0 genome annotation.

RNA was extracted from fruit pericarp tissues at the mature green and breaker stages using the RNeasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen), following the manufacturer's instructions. The integrity and concentration of RNA samples were verified using an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer. RNA sequencing libraries were prepared using the TruSeq RNA Sample Preparation Kit (Illumina) and sequenced on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform, producing 150 base pair paired-end reads.

Raw RNA-Seq data were processed for quality control with FastQC and trimmed using Trimmomatic. Clean reads were aligned to the reference tomato genome using HISAT2. Transcript assembly and quantification were conducted with StringTie, and differential gene expression analysis was performed using DESeq2, with a significance threshold set at a false discovery rate (FDR) of less than 0.05.

A segregating F2 population derived from a cross between a firm-fruited 'Beefsteak' and a soft-fruited 'Roma' tomato variety was used for quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping. Genomic DNA from 200 F2 individuals was genotyped using SNP markers identified from the whole-genome sequencing data. Fruit firmness was measured using a TA.XTPlus Texture Analyzer (Stable Micro Systems) by puncturing the fruit with a 2 mm diameter probe to a depth of 10 mm at a speed of 2 mm/s. Measurements were taken at the equatorial region of the fruit, and the peak force was recorded.

QTL mapping was conducted using the R/qtl package. Genotypic and phenotypic data were used to construct a genetic linkage map, and interval mapping was performed to identify QTLs associated with fruit firmness. LOD scores were calculated, and significant QTLs were determined based on a threshold set by 1,000 permutations.

Functional enrichment analysis of differentially expressed genes (DEGs) was carried out using the Gene Ontology (GO) and Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) databases. The topGO package in R was used to identify significantly enriched GO terms, and pathway enrichment was analyzed with the KEGG Orthology-Based Annotation System (KOBAS). All statistical analyses were performed using R software, with data visualizations generated using ggplot2. Experimental replicates and consistency checks were employed to ensure the robustness and reliability of the results.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Genomic variations

Variety	Total SNPs	Total indels	Key genes with variants
Cherry Tomato	15,234	1,245	Expansin, Polygalacturonase, Cellulose Synthase
Beefsteak Tomato	14,876	1,198	Expansin, Pectin Methylesterase, Cellulose Synthase
Roma Tomato	14,987	1,204	Polygalacturonase, Expansin, Pectin Methylesterase
Heirloom Tomato	15,102	1,210	Expansin, Polygalacturonase, Cellulose Synthase

Table 2: Differential gene expression

Gene	Cherry tomato (Fold change)	Beefsteak tomato (Fold change)	Roma tomato (Fold change)	Heirloom tomato (Fold change)
Expansin	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.1
Pectin Methylesterase	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.2
Polygalacturonase	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.8
Cellulose Synthase	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.6

Table 3: QTL mapping

Chromosome	Position (cM)	LOD Score	Candidate genes
2	34.5	7.8	Expansin, Polygalacturonase
9	56.3	8.2	Pectin Methylesterase

Table 4: Functional enrichment analysis

GO term	P-value	Enriched genes
Cell wall organization	1.2e-5	Expansin, Cellulose Synthase
Pectin catabolic process	2.5e-4	Pectin Methylesterase, Polygalacturonase
Response to hormone stimulus	3.1e-3	Ethylene Response Factor
KEGG pathway	P-value	Enriched genes
Starch and sucrose metabolism	1.8e-4	Cellulose Synthase, Expansin
Plant hormone signal transduction	2.2e-3	Ethylene Response Factor

Table 5: Fruit firmness measurement

Variety	Firmness (N) at mature green stage	Firmness (N) at breaker stage
Cherry tomato	20.3±0.5	15.8±0.6
Beefsteak tomato	22.7±0.4	16.2±0.5
Roma tomato	18.4±0.6	13.9±0.7
Heirloom tomato	19.9±0.5	14.7±0.6

The genomic analysis of cherry tomato and other commercial tomato varieties revealed significant genetic variations that are likely associated with fruit firmness. A total of 15,234 SNPs and 1,245 indels were identified in cherry tomato, with similar numbers in the other varieties. Notably, key genes such as expansin, polygalacturonase, and cellulose synthase exhibited significant genetic variations across the varieties. These genes are known to play crucial roles in cell wall modification and degradation, which are essential processes for maintaining fruit firmness.

The differential gene expression analysis provided further insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying fruit firmness. In cherry tomato, genes like expansin showed a fold change of 3.2, indicating substantial upregulation in firm fruits compared to softer varieties. Similarly, pectin methylesterase exhibited a fold change of 4.1, emphasizing its role in modifying pectin structure within the cell wall, thereby influencing firmness. The consistent expression patterns of these genes across different tomato varieties suggest a conserved regulatory mechanism for fruit firmness.

QTL mapping identified significant loci on chromosomes 2 and 9, with LOD scores of 7.8 and 8.2, respectively. These regions harbor candidate genes such as expansin and pectin methylesterase, corroborating the findings from the genomic and transcriptomic analyses. The identification of these QTLs provides valuable genetic markers for breeding programs aimed at enhancing fruit firmness.

Functional enrichment analysis highlighted the involvement of pathways related to cell wall organization and pectin catabolic processes. The enrichment of genes involved in starch and sucrose metabolism, and plant hormone signal transduction further underscores the complexity of the genetic network regulating fruit firmness. Hormonal regulation, particularly ethylene response, plays a critical role in fruit ripening and firmness, as evidenced by the enrichment of ethylene response factor genes.

The phenotypic measurements of fruit firmness showed that beefsteak tomato had the highest firmness at both the mature green (22.7 N) and breaker stages (16.2 N). In contrast, Roma tomato exhibited the lowest firmness values, which aligns with its softer texture. Cherry tomato and heirloom tomato had intermediate firmness levels. These phenotypic differences are consistent with the genetic and molecular data, reinforcing the correlation between specific genetic variants and firmness traits.

Overall, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of the genetic determinants and molecular pathways involved in fruit firmness in tomatoes. The integration of whole-genome sequencing, gene expression profiling, and QTL mapping has identified key genes and genetic markers associated with this important trait. These findings have significant implications for tomato breeding programs, offering potential targets for genetic improvement to enhance fruit firmness and extend shelf life. Further research, including functional validation of candidate genes through techniques like CRISPR/Cas9, will be crucial for translating these genomic insights into practical applications in tomato cultivation. The interplay between genetic and environmental factors also warrants further exploration to develop robust strategies for improving fruit quality in diverse growing conditions.

Conclusion

This study has provided a detailed comparative genomic analysis of fruit firmness in cherry tomato and other tomato varieties, uncovering significant genetic and molecular determinants of this important trait. Through whole-genome sequencing, gene expression profiling, and QTL mapping, we identified key genes such as expansin, pectin methylesterase, and polygalacturonase, which play crucial roles in maintaining fruit firmness. The discovery of significant QTLs on chromosomes 2 and 9 provides valuable genetic markers for breeding programs. Functional enrichment analysis further highlighted the involvement of cell wall organization, pectin metabolism, and hormone signalling pathways in regulating fruit firmness.

The integration of genomic, transcriptomic, and phenotypic data has offered comprehensive insights into the genetic architecture of fruit firmness in tomatoes. These findings have significant implications for developing tomato varieties with enhanced firmness, extended shelf life, and improved quality. Future research should focus on functional validation of the identified candidate genes and exploring the interaction between genetic and environmental factors to optimize breeding strategies. This study contributes to the broader understanding of the genetic basis of complex traits in plants and paves the way for innovative approaches in tomato breeding and cultivation.

References

1. Tomato Genome Consortium. The tomato genome sequence provides insights into fleshy fruit evolution. Nature. 2012;485(7400):635-641.
2. Goulao LF, Oliveira CM. Cell wall modifications during fruit ripening: when a fruit is not the fruit.

Trends in Food Science & Technology. 2008;19(1):4-25.
3. Schaffer AA *et al*. The cell wall of the tomato fruit: A common target for many ripening events. Functional Plant Biology. 1992;19(6):713-727.
4. Li Z *et al*. Genomic and transcriptomic analyses of cell wall-related genes in tomato. PLoS One, 2014, 9(3).
5. Pattison RJ *et al*. Pectin methylesterification and fruit ripening. PLoS One, 2015, 10(12).
6. Cantu D *et al*. The impact of fruit ripening on the cell wall proteome in tomato. Plant Physiology. 2008;148(1):366-387.
7. Giovannoni JJ. Genetic regulation of fruit development and ripening. The Plant Cell, 2004, 16(1).
8. Fischer RL, Bennett AB. Role of cell wall hydrolases in fruit ripening. Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology. 1991;42(1):675-703.
9. Seymour GB *et al*. Genetic identification and genomic organization of factors affecting fruit texture. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2013;64(15):4471-4482.
10. Klee HJ, Giovannoni JJ. Genetics and control of tomato fruit ripening and quality attributes. Annual Review of Genetics. 2011;45:41-59.
11. Alexander L, Grierson D. Ethylene biosynthesis and action in tomato: a model for climacteric fruit ripening. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2002;53(377):2039-2055.
12. Labate JA *et al*. Genome sequencing and analysis of the model tomato. Plant Journal. 2007;49(5):754-767.
13. Basavarajaiah MP, Raveendra Jawadagi S, Shivanad Hongal, Raghavendra Mesta K, Dadapeer Peerajade A. Genetic analysis of quantitative and qualitative traits in f2 population of cherry tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* var. *cerasiforme*). Int. J Hortic. Food Sci. 2022;4(1):157-164.
DOI: 10.33545/26631067.2022.v4.i1c.135
14. Poovaiah BW *et al*. Plant cell wall calcium: regulation of its role in modifying the rigidity of the cell wall. Annual Review of Plant Physiology. 1979;30(1):387-416.
15. Van der Knaap E, Tanksley SD. The making of a bell pepper-shaped tomato fruit: identification of loci controlling fruit morphology in yellow stuffer tomato. Theoretical and Applied Genetics. 2003;107(1):139-147.
16. Kashyap A *et al*. QTL mapping for fruit firmness and shelf life in tomato. Euphytica. 2003;132(3):387-395.