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#### Abstract

The genetic diversity, structure analysis, and marker-trait association for total flavonoid content (TFC) and anthocyanin content (AC) were studied in rice using 79 germplasm lines with 210 polymorphic microsatellite markers. Among the landraces studied, RG83 (RPHP 93) had the highest level of TFC ( 227.78 QE/100g) and RG126 (Kallimadayan) contained the highest level of AC ( 0.416 CE/100g). The STRUCTURE analysis grouped the studied landraces into three genetic structure groups which nearly matched the geographical distance. The results of the marker-trait associations study using MLM with PCA and kinship indicated that the SSR markers RM287 and RM19358 were closely associated with AC while another two markers RM452 and RM 2197 were closely linked with TFC and these two markers were found to be in the genomic regions related to the candidate genes for TFC and AC biosynthesis. In addition, the markers RM10961, RM5963, and RM559 were also found to have significant marker-trait associations with both AC and TFC.
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## Introduction

The bioactive compounds such as total flavonoid content (TFC) and anthocyanin content (AC) in rice grains reduce the risk of developing many chronic diseases by their antioxidant capacity (Shen et al. 2009). Improving the therapeutic traits along with yield and cooking quality of rice varieties would help to address most of the present-day health conflicts as rice is the most produced and consumed cereal. However, breeding efforts to improve the therapeutic value of rice are very much limited compared to other traits. Molecular Marker Assisted Breeding is a better choice for realizing rapid trait improvement and, therefore, the present study was taken up to find the SSR markers closely associated with TFC and AC through using MLM (Mixed Linear Model) with PCA (Principal Component Analysis) and kinship analysis.

## Materials and methods

A panel comprised of 79 rice accessions of landraces and exotic collections from different regions conserved at the Ramaiah Gene Bank, Department of Plant Genetic Resources, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University (TNAU) was utilized for the present study (Table 1). The panel entries were grown in kharif 2020 at Paddy Breeding Station, TNAU, Coimbatore,
by following recommended agronomic practices and the harvested seeds were used for the analysis of TFC and
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Table 1. Details of rice accessions and mean values of total flavonoid and anthocyanin contents

| Genotype code | Genotypes | Origin/source | Parentage | Total flavonoid (QE/100g) | Anthocyanin (CE/ 100g) | Genotype code | Genotypes | Origin/source | Parentage | Total flavonoid (QE/100g) | Anthocyanin (CE/ 100g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RG1 | Mapillai Samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 100.79 | 0.368 | RG107 | RH2-SM-1-2-1 | Tamil Nadu | Swarna/ <br> Moroberekan | 164.29 | 0.292 |
| RG2 | CK 275 | Tamil Nadu | CO(R) $50 \times$ Kavuni | 69.05 | 0.292 | RG109 | Vadival | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.198 |
| RG3 | Senkar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 100.79 | 0.232 | RG110 | Norungan | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 164.29 | 0.262 |
| RG4 | Murugankar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 132.54 | 0.268 | RG115 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 43 \text { (EC } \\ & 728788-117759) \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | - | 148.41 | 0.246 |
| RG6 | CHIR 5 | West Bengal | Improved chinsurah | 132.54 | 0.269 | RG117 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 65 \text { (EC 72904- } \\ & 120958 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | GODAHEENATI/ IRGC31393-1 | 148.41 | 0.23 |
| RG7 | Kudaivazhai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 164.29 | 0.292 | RG118 | Ponmani Samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.337 |
| RG9 | Kuruvaikalan-jiyam | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.251 | RG126 | Kallimadayan | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 132.54 | 0.416 |
| RG12 | Vellaichithiraikar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.288 | RG132 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 33 \text { (EC } \\ & 728938-117935 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Jamaica | WC3397 | 69.05 | 0.287 |
| RG15 | Palakachaka | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 132.54 | 0.261 | RG160 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG 72(EC 728650- } \\ & \text { 117587) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TD 25/IRGC } \\ & 32351-1 \end{aligned}$ | 53.17 | 0.225 |
| RG17 | Sivapuchithiraikar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.212 | RG161 | Panamarasamba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.305 |
| RG18 | CHIR 11 | West Bengal |  | 132.54 | 0.272 | RG162 | IR 64 | IRRI, Philippines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IR 5857-33-2-1/ } \\ & \text { IR 2061-465- } \\ & 1-5-5 \end{aligned}$ | 180.16 | 0.307 |
| RG20 | Kalvalai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.308 | RG163 | Mikkuruvai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.274 |
| RG22 | IR36 | IRRI, Philippines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IR1561-228-12/ } \\ & \text { IR1737//CR94-13 } \end{aligned}$ | 100.79 | 0.184 | RG176 | Kodai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 100.79 | 0.295 |
| RG25 | Sornakuruvai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 100.79 | 0.318 | RG182 | ARB 59 | Karnataka | Variety | 53.17 | 0.226 |
| RG32 | Thogai samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.305 | RG184 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG 28(EC 728892- } \\ & 117880) \end{aligned}$ | Indonesia | Seratoeshari | 100.79 | 0.187 |
| RG34 | RPHP 125 | Uttar Pradesh |  | 69.05 | 0.212 | RG188 | RPHP 8 | Andhra Pradesh | 24(K) | 148.41 | 0.253 |
| RG39 | KattuPonni | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 180.16 | 0.313 | RG191 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG 15(EC 728910- } \\ & 117901 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | China | Sze guenzim | 132.54 | 0.282 |
| RG41 | Godavari samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 100.79 | 0.259 | RG192 | Nootripathu | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.273 |
| RG42 | Earapalli samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.262 | RG26 | Rascadam | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.222 |
| RG44 | Mangan samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.272 | RG33 | Malayalathan samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.266 |
| RG45 | RPHP 105 | Manipur | Moirangphou (Land races) | 148.41 | 0.256 | RG63 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG71 (EC728651- } \\ & \text { 117588) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | TEPI BORO/ IRGC27519-1 | 69.05 | 0.207 |
| RG48 | Kalarkar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.248 | RG69 | RPHP 48 | Uttarakhand | Bindii | 69.05 | 0.256 |


| RG50 | Sornavari | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.332 | RG83 | RPHP 93 | Uttarkhand | Type-3 Dehraduni basmati | 227.78 | 0.212 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RG51 | RPHP 134 | Kerala | Njavara (Landrace) | 53.17 | 0.215 | RG105 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 6 \text { (EC 729592- } \\ & 121642) \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOM CAU } \\ & 70:: I R G C 8227-1 \end{aligned}$ | 116.67 | 0.292 |
| RG53 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IR 68144-2B-2-2-3- } \\ & 1-127 \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | IR72 x Zawa bonday | 116.67 | 0.246 | RG116 | RPHP 27 | IRRI, Philippines | Azucena | 180.16 | 0.268 |
| RG55 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 67 \text { (EC729050- } \\ & \text { 120988) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | IR77384-12- <br> 35-3-12-1B/ <br> IRGC117299-1 | 116.67 | 0.307 | RG127 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 10 \text { (EC } \\ & 729686-121743 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | Hasan seralir/ GC79564-C1 | 69.05 | 0.224 |
| RG57 | RPHP 103 | Uttarkhand | Pant Sugandh Dhan 17 (Pusa Basmathi 1 from Pusa 167/Karnal local) | 100.79 | 0.225 | RG134 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 9 \text { (EC 729601- } \\ & \text { 121651) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | Gemjyajyanam/ IRGC32411-C1 | 211.90 | 0.235 |
| RG58 | Kodaikulathan | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.249 | RG190 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 26 \\ & \text { (IC0590943- } \\ & 121899) \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | Basmati 370/ <br> IRGC 3750-1 | 148.41 | 0.33 |
| RG59 | RPHP 68 | Odhisa | Subadhra | 84.92 | 0.247 | RG68 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG63 (EC 728711- } \\ & 117674 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | Caawa/Fortuna | 100.79 | 0.307 |
| RG60 | Rama kuruvaikar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 116.67 | 0.217 | RG112 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 35 \text { (EC } \\ & 728858-117843) \end{aligned}$ | Cote D'ivoire | Pate blane MN1 | 132.54 | 0.273 |
| RG66 | Seevanasamba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.274 | RG113 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 45 \text {-(EC } \\ & 728768117736) \end{aligned}$ | Puerto Rico | Fortuna | 164.29 | 0.262 |
| RG67 | RPHP 106 | Manipur | Akutphou (Lang phou/IR 1364-37-3-1) | 180.16 | 0.33 | RG123 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 2 \text { (EC 729808- } \\ & 121874 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | BLUEBONNET <br> 50/IRGC1181 | 100.79 | 0.274 |
| RG72 | Aarkadukichili | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.345 | RG124 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 29 \text { (EC } \\ & 728925-117920 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | TO/782-20-1 | 164.29 | 0.239 |
| RG74 | ARB 65 | Karnataka | Variety | 69.05 | 0.162 | RG130 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 39 \text { (EC } \\ & 728779-117750 \end{aligned}$ | Honduras | Honduras | 84.92 | 0.313 |
| RG76 | Mattakuruvai | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.246 | RG131 | RPHP 90 | Andhra Pradesh | 24K | 116.67 | 0.256 |
| RG77 | Karuthakar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 84.92 | 0.292 | RG141 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG44 (EC 728762- } \\ & 117729 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | U. S.A. | Edith | 164.29 | 0.218 |
| RG92 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG 49(EC 729102- } \\ & \text { 121052) } \end{aligned}$ | IRRI, Philippines | Menakely/ <br> IRGC51021-1 | 100.79 | 0.179 | RG181 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG 52(EC 728756- } \\ & 117723 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Brazil | Dourado agulha | 69.05 | 0.253 |
| RG99 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 31 \text { (EC728844- } \\ & 117829 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Colombia | Oryzica llanos 5 | 180.16 | 0.275 | RG189 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IG } 41 \text { (EC } \\ & 728800-117776 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Indonesia | Kaniranga | 69.05 | 0.225 |
| RG102 | Varakkal | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 69.05 | 0.225 |  |  |  | Mean | 105.01 | 0.26 |
| RG103 | Mattaikar | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 148.41 | 0.252 |  |  |  | Range | $\begin{aligned} & 53.17 \\ & -227.78 \end{aligned}$ | 0.16-0.42 |
| RG106 | Katta samba | Tamil Nadu | Landrace | 53.17 | 0.316 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Details of genetic analysis of 210 SSR loci across the 79 rice accessions

| Marker | Chr. No | Major Allele Frequency | Allele No | Gene Diversity | Heterozygosity | PIC | Marker | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chr. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Major Allele Frequency | Allele No | Gene Diversity | Heterozygosity | PIC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RM6784 | 1 | 0.32 | 5 | 0.77 | 0.03 | 0.73 | RM3777 | 5 | 0.72 | 5 | 0.45 | 0 | 0.42 |
| RM1 | 1 | 0.35 | 4 | 0.72 | 0.1 | 0.67 | RM5874 | 5 | 0.55 | 3 | 0.53 | 0.01 | 0.42 |
| RM1067 | 1 | 0.38 | 5 | 0.71 | 0.1 | 0.66 | RM5973 | 5 | 0.76 | 4 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.37 |
| RM8136 | 1 | 0.52 | 6 | 0.67 | 0.08 | 0.63 | RM5994 | 5 | 0.73 | 3 | 0.42 | 0 | 0.37 |
| RM3694 | 1 | 0.54 | 5 | 0.65 | 0.18 | 0.61 | RM5575 | 5 | 0.78 | 5 | 0.38 | 0.01 | 0.35 |
| RM243 | 1 | 0.41 | 4 | 0.66 | 0.77 | 0.6 | RM3322 | 5 | 0.77 | 3 | 0.38 | 0 | 0.35 |
| RM5 | 1 | 0.44 | 4 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 0.58 | RM17898 | 5 | 0.77 | 3 | 0.38 | 0 | 0.35 |
| RM6321 | 1 | 0.57 | 4 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.49 | RM6034 | 5 | 0.71 | 3 | 0.42 | 0 | 0.34 |
| RM1247 | 1 | 0.47 | 3 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.46 | RM17956 | 5 | 0.72 | 4 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.43 |
| RM237 | 1 | 0.49 | 3 | 0.56 | 0.87 | 0.46 | RM574 | 5 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.29 |
| RM24 | 1 | 0.53 | 4 | 0.55 | 0.63 | 0.46 | RM1024 | 5 | 0.83 | 4 | 0.3 | 0.04 | 0.28 |
| RM1282 | 1 | 0.54 | 3 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.44 | RM161 | 5 | 0.84 | 4 | 0.29 | 0.04 | 0.27 |
| RM283 | 1 | 0.71 | 4 | 0.47 | 0.03 | 0.43 | RM7434 | 6 | 0.42 | 6 | 0.72 | 0.23 | 0.67 |
| RM259 | 1 | 0.68 | 4 | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.43 | RM19708 | 6 | 0.51 | 4 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 |
| RM12269 | 1 | 0.61 | 3 | 0.5 | 0.03 | 0.41 | RM19469 | 6 | 0.47 | 3 | 0.61 | 0.04 | 0.52 |
| RM128 | 1 | 0.72 | 3 | 0.44 | 0 | 0.4 | RM5963 | 6 | 0.54 | 4 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.51 |
| RM10916 | 1 | 0.73 | 4 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.39 | RM19358 | 6 | 0.54 | 4 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.5 |
| RM3362 | 1 | 0.77 | 3 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.32 | RM19642 | 6 | 0.61 | 3 | 0.55 | 0.03 | 0.49 |
| RM12261 | 1 | 0.82 | 4 | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.3 | RM19320 | 6 | 0.66 | 4 | 0.51 | 0.01 | 0.47 |
| RM312 | 1 | 0.84 | 3 | 0.28 | 0.04 | 0.26 | RM19329 | 6 | 0.7 | 4 | 0.48 | 0.03 | 0.45 |
| RM238 | 1 | 0.94 | 3 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.12 | RM314 | 6 | 0.54 | 3 | 0.54 | 0.75 | 0.44 |
| RM324 | 2 | 0.39 | 6 | 0.74 | 0.08 | 0.7 | RM19319 | 6 | 0.51 | 3 | 0.53 | 0.81 | 0.43 |
| RM12793 | 2 | 0.58 | 4 | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.53 | RM162 | 6 | 0.73 | 4 | 0.44 | 0.01 | 0.41 |
| RM71 | 2 | 0.47 | 3 | 0.6 | 0.39 | 0.52 | RM584 | 6 | 0.57 | 3 | 0.51 | 0.71 | 0.4 |
| RM555 | 2 | 0.55 | 4 | 0.58 | 0.04 | 0.51 | RM19346 | 6 | 0.72 | 3 | 0.42 | 0.13 | 0.37 |
| RM12350 | 2 | 0.53 | 3 | 0.58 | 0.03 | 0.5 | RM19520 | 6 | 0.79 | 3 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.32 |
| RM341 | 2 | 0.47 | 3 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.5 | RM19620 | 6 | 0.85 | 4 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.26 |
| RM12369 | 2 | 0.57 | 4 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.49 | RM11 | 7 | 0.34 | 5 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.7 |
| RM211 | 2 | 0.66 | 4 | 0.52 | 0.06 | 0.47 | RM21867 | 7 | 0.44 | 3 | 0.65 | 1 | 0.58 |
| RM110 | 2 | 0.68 | 4 | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.43 | RM125 | 7 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.64 | 0.92 | 0.58 |
| RM12363 | 2 | 0.55 | 3 | 0.53 | 0.01 | 0.42 | RM21041 | 7 | 0.58 | 5 | 0.61 | 0.03 | 0.57 |
| RM233 | 2 | 0.57 | 3 | 0.52 | 0.76 | 0.42 | RM118 | 7 | 0.47 | 5 | 0.61 | 0.76 | 0.54 |
| RM236 | 2 | 0.51 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.99 | 0.37 | RM248 | 7 | 0.65 | 4 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.47 |
| RM48 | 2 | 0.51 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.99 | 0.37 | RM21866 | 7 | 0.68 | 5 | 0.5 | 0.03 | 0.47 |
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AC. The TFC and TAC were estimated as per the methods suggested by Woisky and Salatino (1998) and Fuleki and Francis (1968), respectively. The DNA from the leaf tissues was isolated by CTAB method (Doyle and Doyle 1987). The details of the genetic analysis of 210 polymorphic SSR loci across the 79 rice accessions are given in Table 2.

The basic statistics of the marker allele was executed using GenAIEx 6.5 (https://biology-assets.anu.edu.au/ GenAIEx/Welcome.html). The SSR scores were used to create a data matrix to analyze genetic relationships using the DARwin program version 2.11a (http://darwin.cirad.fr/). The dendrogram was constructed based on a neighbor-joining algorithm using the marker data for all the rice genotypes following unweighted pair group method analysis (UPGMA) (Gawel and Jarret 1991). The population structure was executed using STRUCTURE HARVESTER (2.3.4) (Earl and VonHoldt 2012) to identify the subpopulation. The number of subpopulations is represented by K, was identified by a model-based approach. The analysis was executed using CLUMPAK for K 1-10 and five independent runs were assessed for each $K$ value. The best $K$ value was determined by $\Delta K$ given by Evanno et al. (2005) based on second-order change of likelihood function with respect to $K$ found by Structure. The graph plotted for K vs $\Delta \mathrm{K}$ showed best K . We used a burn-in period of 100,000 steps followed by 100,000 Monte Carlo Markov Chain replicates, as suggested by Pritchard et al. (2003).

The marker-trait association was done using the software program TASSEL 4.0.1. (http://www.maizegenetics.net). GLMs with Q, GLM with PCA (Principal Component Analysis) (Price et al. 2006), MLM with Q + K, and MLM with PCA+K matrix (Kinship matrix for family relatedness estimates) (Yu et al. 2006) were used to test marker-trait associations (MTAs). The physical distance of the genomic region adjacent (1 Mb up and down) to the significant markers from the MTA was determined by integrating the genetic distance of the


Fig. 1. (a) Frequency distribution of total flavonoids in rice germplasm, (b) Frequency distribution of anthocyanin in rice germplasm


Fig. 2. (a) Magnitude of delta K from STRUCTURE analysis of 79 germplasm, where delta Kmean (|L" $(\mathrm{K}) \mid) / \mathrm{sd}(\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{K})$.(b) and (c) Population structure of 79 rice accessions. Population structure of all genotypes was divided based on genetic diversity detected by 214 SSR markers with K=2 (b) and $\mathrm{k}=3$ (c). Three subpopulations were represented in (c) by different colours viz., subpopulation 1 ( 59 genotypes), subpopulation 2 ( 10 genotypes), subpopulation 3 ( 10 genotypes). (d) A phylogenetic tree representing genotypic diversity computed by neighbour -joining algorithm (DARwin UP)
makeup between accessions with high anthocyanin and those without it. Similar results were also reported by Bastia et al. (2022) while grouping of rice germplasm based on six antioxidant traits including flavonoid and anthocyanin content, clear distinguishing was obtained only at $\mathrm{K}=4$.

In the present study, the three sub-populations, named OS1, OS2 and OS3, comprised 59, 10 and 10 accessions respectively. OS1 predominantly consists of genotypes with high anthocyanin content, while OS3 and OS2 primarily contain medium and low anthocyanin genotypes, respectively. Additionally, these sub-populations were clearly categorized into three distinct groups based on their geographical origin also. It clearly shows that each subpopulation is diverse from the others. The red bar inferred ancestry genotypes of OS1 were mainly associated to Indian origin genotypes and a majority of the genotypes,
encompassing genotypes with high anthocyanin content and total flavonoid content clustered in OS1 were landraces of Tamil Nadu, India. Most of the genotypes within the light green bar category (OS2) were IRRI lines from the Philippines, with a minority originating from India. Approximately half of the genotypes within OS2 exhibited low grain total flavonoid content ( $<100 \mathrm{QE} / 100 \mathrm{~g}$ ) and low anthocyanin content (<0.262 CE/100 g). The entire group represented by the blue bar (OS3) comprised exotic lines. The genotypes within OS3 fell into the medium grain total flavonoid content range (100-200 QE/100 g) and moderate anthocyanin content (0.33-. 26 CE/100g).When the NJ (neighbor-joining) tree was constructed, three branches (I, II and III), as well as sub-branches in each main branch, were evident in the tree (Fig. 2d). The population structure analysis of barley genotypes revealed that the most evident level of


Fig. 3. (a) The Manhattan plot of the AC and TFC -SSR marker association. (b) Quantile-quantile (QQ) plot of the data shown in the Manhattan plot of MLM (PCA+K)
differentiation for TFC was obtained at k=7 (Han et al. 2018). On the other hand, the dendrogram constructed using the UPGMA clustering algorithm grouped the rice accessions into three clusters which did not show relevance to their centre of development.

## Marker trait associations (MTA)

The association between SSR markers and the phenotypic data of the two therapeutic traits (TFC and AC) was examined by four different models viz., GLMs with Q, GLM with PCA, MLM with $Q+K$ and MLM with PCA+K. Further, these four models were compared for the best fit and the MLM with PCA+K model was the better model fitted for the reducing false positive association results. Table 3 shows an overview and details of MTAs for MLM with PCA+K model with cut-off $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ and $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ (Fig. 3a). Quantile-quantile (QQ) plot of the data shown in the Manhattan plot of MLM (PCA + K) depicted in Fig. 3b shows the normal distribution of the traits among the germplasm. In total, 14 significant MTAs (TFC-8; AC-6) distributed on Chromosomes (Chr.), 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12 were detected at $\mathrm{P}<0.05$, with marker $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ranging from 9.5 to $22.7 \%$ for AC and 6.2 to $24.8 \%$ for TFC, respectively. Out of all these markers, two SSR markers viz., RM287 (Chr. 11) and RM19358 (chr 6) were more associated with AC while another two SSR markers, RM452 (Chr. 2) and RM2197 (Chr. 12) for TFC. Bastia et al. (2022) have reported three SRR markers associated with flavonoid content through both GLM (General Linear Model) and MLM approaches in rice.

The significantly associated markers, RM287 and

RM19358, identified through this study were found nearer to the candidate genes related to the synthesis of AC. When the sequential positions of these markers were hit in the genomic regions of rice sequence available in the NCBI database, the marker RM287 (Chr. 11: 16.77 Mb ) identified for high AC was found to be associated with the gene at the position LOC9266684:14.28-14.29 Mb which encodes the enzyme probable 2-oxoglutaratedependent dioxygenase ANS. This enzyme plays a key role in the biosynthetic pathway of flavonoids, especially anthocyanins. It is understood that another gene CHS, encoding Chalcone synthase enzyme is involved in the biosynthesis of phenyl propanoid compounds which form the precursors of both flavonoids and anthocyanins. It was also observed, that, the marker RM287 was found intermediate to the two genes encoding ANS and CHS enzymes which are essential for the biosynthesis of flavonoid and anthocyanin. It was observed that another significantly associated marker RM19358 (Chr. 6: 2.2 Mb ) was found in proximity to the gene at the position LOC43401082: $2.394-2.397 \mathrm{Mb}$ encoding for the enzyme, Anthocyanin 5 aromatic acyl transferase, crucial for the biosynthesis of flavonoids (Jiang et al. 2013). As the two significant markers, RM287 and RM19358 have been confirmed to be linked to the candidate genes responsible for the biosynthesis of TFC and AC, these markers could be used for improving therapeutic traits in high-yielding rice varieties through Marker Assisted Breeding methods. Oh et al. (2018) identified four potential genes implicated in encoding proteins within

Table 3. Marker-trait associations and marker effect derived from 210 SSR markers and 79 rice accessions

| GLM (PCA) |  |  |  |  |  |  | MLM (PCA+K) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trait | Marker | Chr | Pos | marker_F | P | $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ | Marker | Chr | Pos | marker_F | p | $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ |
| AC | RM5963 | 6 | 8,814,621 | 4.17491 | 0.0093 | 0.163 | RM5963 | 6 | 8814621 | 3.85402 | 0.0136 | 0.177 |
|  | RM287 | 11 | 16,767,319 | 2.73394 | 0.0150 | 0.218 | RM10916 | 1 | 15,069,064 | 3.87464 | 0.0274 | 0.128 |
|  | RM10916 | 1 | 15,069,064 | 3.32189 | 0.0444 | 0.114 | RM287 | 11 | 16,767,319 | 2.43301 | 0.0281 | 0.227 |
|  | RM19358 | 6 | 2,200,330 | 3.2473 | 0.0449 | 0.082 | RM6034 | 5 | 7,034,255 | 3.13595 | 0.0508 | 0.095 |
|  | RM6321 | 1 | 42,923,127 | 2.72215 | 0.0517 | 0.110 | RM6321 | 1 | 42,923,127 | 2.68354 | 0.0542 | 0.109 |
|  | RM12369 | 2 | 1,306,615 | 2.72215 | 0.0517 | 0.110 | RM12369 | 2 | 1,306,615 | 2.68354 | 0.0542 | 0.109 |
| TFC | RM2197 | 12 | 27,350,686 | 7.66234 | 0.0082 | 0.140 | RM2197 | 12 | 27,350,686 | 7.46486 | 0.0090 | 0.148 |
|  | RM452 | 2 | 9,563,257 | 3.27763 | 0.0105 | 0.188 | RM452 | 2 | 9,563,257 | 3.13007 | 0.0134 | 0.217 |
|  | RM11 | 7 | 19,256,914 | 2.69834 | 0.0132 | 0.254 | RM231 | 3 | 2,432,425 | 2.62976 | 0.0313 | 0.180 |
|  | RM231 | 3 | 2,432,425 | 2.99336 | 0.0169 | 0.177 | RM559 | 4 | 35,151,595 | 3.35837 | 0.0406 | 0.093 |
|  | RM48 | 2 | 36,318,532 | 5.51783 | 0.0216 | 0.069 | RM14606 | 3 | 6,351,926 | 4.3284 | 0.0414 | 0.062 |
|  | RM416 | 3 | 31,248,603 | 4.56104 | 0.0361 | 0.057 | RM11 | 7 | 19,256,914 | 2.18081 | 0.0416 | 0.248 |
|  | RM215 | 9 | 21,189,110 | 2.9996 | 0.0365 | 0.111 | RM259 | 1 | 7,445,627 | 2.79552 | 0.0471 | 0.120 |
|  | RM259 | 1 | 7,445,627 | 2.97316 | 0.0381 | 0.116 | RM110 | 2 | 1,326,947 | 2.79552 | 0.0471 | 0.120 |
|  | RM110 | 2 | 1,326,947 | 2.97316 | 0.0381 | 0.116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM205 | 9 | 22,720,624 | 3.0541 | 0.0382 | 0.163 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM14241 | 3 | 124,844 | 2.93748 | 0.0401 | 0.120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM3507 | 8 | 6,158,070 | 2.93748 | 0.0401 | 0.120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM5963 | 6 | 8,814,621 | 2.67811 | 0.0547 | 0.110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | GLM (Q) |  |  |  |  |  | MLM ( $\mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{K}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Marker | Chr | Pos | marker_F | P | $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ | Marker | Chr | Pos | marker_F | p | $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ |
| AC | RM5963 | 6 | 8814621 | 4.44024 | 0.0066 | 0.166 | RM5963 | 6 | 8814621 | 3.75694 | 0.0148 | 0.166 |
|  | RM287 | 11 | 16767319 | 2.73962 | 0.0143 | 0.215 | RM10916 | 1 | 15069064 | 3.77506 | 0.0292 | 0.120 |
|  | RM10916 | 1 | 15069064 | 3.67003 | 0.0320 | 0.120 | RM287 | 11 | 16767319 | 2.39616 | 0.0295 | 0.215 |
| TFC | RM11 | 7 | 19256914 | 2.8666 | 0.0086 | 0.261 | RM2197 | 12 | 27350686 | 6.816 | 0.0119 | 0.130 |
|  | RM2197 | 12 | 27350686 | 7.29266 | 0.0094 | 0.127 | RM559 | 4 | 35151595 | 4.10084 | 0.0205 | 0.109 |
|  | RM559 | 4 | 35151595 | 4.76882 | 0.0113 | 0.114 | RM231 | 3 | 2432425 | 2.74774 | 0.0250 | 0.179 |
|  | RM231 | 3 | 2432425 | 3.14109 | 0.0128 | 0.179 | RM452 | 2 | 9563257 | 2.69286 | 0.0275 | 0.177 |
|  | RM452 | 2 | 9563257 | 3.08831 | 0.0140 | 0.177 | RM11 | 7 | 19256914 | 2.32054 | 0.0295 | 0.250 |
|  | RM20952 | 1 | 100 | 3.45032 | 0.0213 | 0.132 | RM20952 | 1 | 100 | 2.90989 | 0.0407 | 0.119 |
|  | RM18858 | 5 | 23176482 | 3.45032 | 0.0213 | 0.132 | RM18858 | 5 | 23176482 | 2.90989 | 0.0407 | 0.119 |
|  | RM536 | 11 | 8985132 | 2.91863 | 0.0286 | 0.165 | RM259 | 1 | 7445627 | 2.76005 | 0.0485 | 0.112 |
|  | RM19346 | 6 | 1908016 | 3.61378 | 0.0320 | 0.091 | RM110 | 2 | 1326947 | 2.76005 | 0.0485 | 0.112 |
|  | RM259 | 1 | 7445627 | 3.04142 | 0.0345 | 0.115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM110 | 2 | 1326947 | 3.04142 | 0.0345 | 0.115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM312 | 1 | 100 | 2.6206 | 0.0417 | 0.126 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM14612 | 3 | 6534336 | 2.83827 | 0.0448 | 0.116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM15221 | 3 | 17398962 | 2.83827 | 0.0448 | 0.116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM19329 | 6 | 1697615 | 2.83827 | 0.0448 | 0.116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM14241 | 3 | 124844 | 2.78772 | 0.0473 | 0.111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RM3507 | 8 | 6158070 | 2.78772 | 0.0473 | 0.111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

the anthocyanin biosynthesis pathway. These genes include Os01t0372500 (ANS1) on chromosome 1, responsible for encoding Leucoanthocyanidin dioxygenase 1. Remarkably, during our gene annotation study, we found that marker RM10916 (Chr.1) also codes for the same protein, aligning with their findings. Furthermore, another marker, RM559 (Chr.4), exhibited marker-trait associations with anthocyanin content (AC) and total flavonoid content (TFC) and encodes Flavanone-3-dioxygenase1. Interestingly, this coincides with the previously reported candidate gene Os04t0662600 on chromosome 4 , which encodes the same protein as identified by Oh et al. (2018) in their gene expression study pertaining to anthocyanin and TFC in rice. Moreover, the marker RM5963, which displayed a significant marker-trait association with therapeutic traits in the present study, also encodes a similar protein found in the candidate gene Os06t0192100 located on chromosome 6, as reported by both Oh et al. (2018) and Oikawa et al. (2015). This particular protein plays a vital role in anthocyanin biosynthesis. Given that our findings align with the transcriptome study results of Oh et al. (2018), it underscores the validity of the identified marker-trait associations through this study. Shao et al. (2011) conducted research in which they employed association mapping to discover SSR markers associated with the total phenolic content in rice through association mapping of pigmented and non-pigmented rice genotypes. Furthermore, Fathima et al. (2022) have also reported the identification of molecular markers that are linked to flavonoids and anthocyanins in rice. Similarly, Oh1 et al. (2021) found molecular markers in citrus that can be used to detect the genes responsible for anthocyanin pigment production. A similar study conducted by Gupta et al. (2023) identified the SRR markers associated with total flavonoid content in lentils using association mapping. Thus, through this present study the SSR markers, RM287 and RM19358 have been identified to be linked with the anthocyanin and RM452 and RM2197 flavonoid content and hence could be validated in different genetic backgrounds. In addition, the markers RM10961, RM5963 and RM559 were also found to have significant marker-trait associations with both AC and TFC.
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