Title: Characterization of microsatellite markers for the duckweed *Spirodela polyrhiza* and *Lemna minor* tested on samples from Europe or the United States of America.

Running title: *Spirodela polyrhiza* and *Lemna minor* microsatellites

Authors: Jae E. Kerstetter[1,2], Andrea L. Reid[3], Joshua T. Armstrong [1,4], Taylor A. Zallek[1], Trapper T. Hobble[1], and Martin M. Turcotte[1]

[1] Department of Biological Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 15260
[2] Department of Entomology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA 08901
[3] Department of Geodesy and Geomatics Engineering, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB, Canada
[4] Center for Environmental Studies, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA 23284

Corresponding author: Martin Turcotte turcotte@pitt.edu

Keywords: Lemnaceae, simple sequence repeats, genotyping, genetic identification, molecular markers

Abstract

Microsatellite primers are a valuable tool to use for both observational and experimental studies in numerous taxa. Here, we develop 18 and 16 microsatellite markers for the widespread duckweeds *Lemna minor* and *Spirodela polyrhiza,* respectively. All 18 *L. minor* primers and 12 of the 16 *S. polyrhiza* primers amplified polymorphic loci when tested on samples from Europe or Western Pennsylvania, USA.

Introduction

The globally distributed duckweed family (Lemnaceae) or subfamily (Lemnoideae) is composed of 36 species (Bog *et al.* 2020) of very small floating or submerged aquatic plants (Landolt, 1986; Sree *et al.* 2016). Duckweeds have a long history of scientific study given their highly specialized morphology, widespread distribution, high abundance, and production of the world's smallest flowers (Jacobs, 1947; Hillman 1961; Landolt, 1986; Landolt, 1992). More recently, there has been an explosion in research interest given their potential applied uses including for agricultural feed (Cheng and Stomp, 2009), bioremediation (Gupta and Prakash, 2013; Ekperusi *et al*. 2019), and biofuel production (Cui and Cheng, 2015). Furthermore, their use as a model system to experimentally study numerous topics in ecology and evolutionary biology is quickly expanding (Laird and Barks, 2018). This growing basic and applied interest stems from their ability to reproduce clonally very quickly with population doubling times in as littles as 1.5 days (Ziegler *et al*. 2015). In addition, they are amenable to large scale manipulative experiments in both the lab and field mesocosms (Armitage and Jones, 2019; Hart *et al.* 2019; Tan *et al*. 2021; O'Brien *et al.* 2022), and have growing genomic data and tools (Wang *et al*. 2014; Ho *et al*. 2019; Xu *et al.* 2019; Cao *et al*. 2020) and characterization of their

microbiome and herbivore communities (Acosta *et al*. 2020; Subramanian and Turcotte, 2020). Finally, duckweed express variation in numerous traits across species and among genotypes (clonal lineages) within species (Van Steveninck *et al.* 1992; Hart *et al*. 2019; Chen *et al*. 2020; Hitsman and Simons, 2020; Anneberg *et al.* 2023). Therefore, being able to identify genotypes may also be beneficial in many ecological studies to assess differences in traits among genotypes and to determine how these genotypes may respond to different environmental conditions.

Genetic markers, such as microsatellite markers, are important tools to study population genetics. Microsatellites, also known as simple sequence repeats 'SSRs', are tandem repeats two to 10 base pairs in length, that are flanked by conserved sequences and occur ubiquitously throughout eukaryotic genomes (Tautz and Renz, 1984). They are highly informative as locus-specific genetic markers due to their high abundance, high reproducibility, co-dominance, and polymorphic nature (Morgante and Olivieri, 1993; Powell *et al.* 1996). The length of the sequence repeats can be determined through PCR amplification using primers specific to their flanking regions; variation in PCR product length is a function of the number of repeated sequences. The high levels of polymorphisms observed in SSR markers (Tautz, 1989; Schlötterer and Tautz, 1992) and the relative ease of detection of these polymorphisms by PCR amplification has led to the wide applications of microsatellites as genetic markers (Vieira *et al.* 2016). Such within species markers have numerous applications including quantifying biogeographic distributions, population genetic structure, evolutionary history, and mating systems.

Moreover, a growing number of experimental evolution studies use such markers to track changes in genotypic composition of asexually reproducing populations over multiple generations (e.g., Turcotte *et al.* 2011; Agrawal *et al.* 2013; Hart *et al.* 2019) in large replicated experiments for which genotype-by-sequencing remains too costly. These cost savings are magnified when several loci can be genotyped in the same reaction (multiplexed; Markoulatos *et al.* 2002). Here, we report on the development of new microsatellite markers for two commonly studied and widespread duckweed species: the common duckweed *Lemna minor* (L. Schleid) and the greater duckweed *Spirodela polyrhiza* (L. Schleid)

With the growing interest in duckweed, microsatellite markers have been developed for a few duckweed species. Wani *et al.* (2014) developed nine polymorphic and 24 monomorphic haplotype cpDNA-based microsatellite primers for *L. minor*. Xu *et al.* (2018) developed 60 microsatellite primers for *Spirodela polyrhiza*, 19 of which were polymorphic within three populations of *S. polyrhiza* from China. Feng *et al.* (2017) developed three microsatellite primers for the identification of *S. polyrhiza* and *Landoltia punctata* haplotypes. More recently, Fu *et al.* (2020) developed 70 microsatellite primers within coding regions for *L. gibba.* It is important to continue developing and reporting new microsatellite markers as populations can differ in which markers function (e.g. due to null alleles) and are polymorphic (Chapuis and Estoup, 2007).

Here we report the successful development of 18 *L. minor* and 16 *S. polyrhiza* microsatellite markers. A small subset of these microsatellite primers were used to differentiate genotypes in our experimental studies on evolutionary-coexistence (Hart *et al.* 2019). In addition, we report genotyping results using these markers on individuals sampled in Europe and the United States of America (USA).

Materials & Methods:

Sample Collection

Our objective when sampling was not to genetically characterize duckweed populations, but instead find genotypes that differ in ecologically relevant traits to use in various experiments. Thus, we genotyped few individuals from numerous bodies of water in various locations. Primers were developed at ETH Zurich (Europe) and the University of Pittsburgh (USA), and thus were tested on different collections of duckweeds. We collected duckweeds from numerous still bodies of water (e.g. ponds, lakes, wetlands) primarily in Switzerland and Western Pennsylvania (USA), however a few samples were also collected from the Netherlands and Germany. In addition, some European duckweed samples were obtained from the Landolt Duckweed Collection (formerly in Zurich, Switzerland) were included (see Supplemental Tables S1 and S2 for collection locations). Given the two-part development of the primers, some duckweed samples were only tested on the primers developed in that country (as noted in Tables S1 & S2).

Duckweeds mostly reproduce clonally via meristematic pockets from which clonal daughters emerge, creating clonal clusters of 1-8 individuals that eventually split into smaller clusters (Landolt, 1986). We sampled single duckweed clusters and established isofemale laboratory colonies from these clusters. We then sterilized each colony using sodium hypochlorite following a method adapted from Barks *et al.* (2018). From each colony, we put single individuals into individual sterile petri dishes (one individual per dish) containing sterile 0.5 strength Schenk and Hildebrandt growth medium (containing macro- and micronutrients as described by Schenk and Hildebrandt, 1972) supplemented with sucrose (6.7 g/L), yeast extract (0.067 g/L), and tryptone (0.34 g/L) for 24 hours to encourage algal and bacterial spore germination. Then each individual was exposed to one of an array of concentrations of sodium hypochlorite (0.3% or 0.5%) for varying amounts of time (3 or 6 minutes for *L. minor*, 4 or 7 minutes for *S. polyrhiza* respectively), then rinsed with autoclaved distilled water and allowed to grow (Barks *et al.* 2018). Sterile colonies were maintained in sterile 0.25 strength Schenk and Hildebrandt media (1972) without the additional supplements in room temperature laboratories or growth chambers under plant grow lights. These collections do not reproduce sexually under lab conditions.

Microsatellite Marker Development

A total of 18 *L. minor* and 16 *S. polyrhiza* microsatellite markers were developed across Europe or the USA. We downloaded the whole genome shotgun sequence data for *S. polyrhiza* strain 7498 from the National Center for Biotechnology Information's GenBank database (accession ATDW01000001.1) deposited by Wang *et al.* (2014). For *L. minor,* a draft genome (strain 8627) was downloaded from www.lemna.org on October 16th 2015 (genome draft lm8627.ASMv0.1) A recent study using Tubulin Based Polymorphism suggests that this lineage is in fact an interspecific hybrid of *L. japonica* and *L. turionifera* both closely related to *L. minor* (Braglia *et al.* 2021). The species identity for most samples on which we report below have been confirmed using morphology and/or barcoding (Fazekas *et al.* 2012; Barks *et al.* 2018). While some microsatellite markers are known to amplify across more than one duckweed species (Xu

et al. 2018), we have not yet explicitly tested these markers against other species. Using MSATCOMMANDER (version 1.0.8, Faircloth 2008), we identified microsatellite loci using the default settings, except we avoided mononucleotide repeat motifs. We then selected loci that would produce products of different lengths, had different motif lengths, and were found on different contigs. The 5' end of forward primers were labeled with one of several fluorescent dyes from various suppliers.

Primers developed at ETH Zurich were M13-tailed to reduce cost during development (Boutin-Ganache *et al.* 2001). This entailed adding the full or a partial M13 sequence of TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGT for the *S. polyrhiza* primers and GGAAACAGCTATGACCAT for *L. minor* primers to the 5' end of the forward primer. The M13-labeled forward primers were used in combination with a M13 primer that had the same sequence but was fluorescently dye-labeled at its 5' end. Some primers amplified less polymorphic loci or did not amplify as consistently as others. For these primers, we only have fragment lengths that include the M13 tail (see Tables 1 & 2), and we estimate that this lengthens the PCR product by 12-19 base pairs. For most primers however, following initial testing with M13, we ordered new labeled primers that did not include the M13 tail.

At least 20 duckweed samples were tested using each primer. European duckweed samples were tested across 7 *L. minor* and 16 *S. polyrhiza* primers, and USA duckweed samples were tested across 15 *L. minor* and 4 *S. polyrhiza* primers (see Tables S1 and S2 for details).

Table 1: *Lemna minor* microsatellite markers and motifs including optimized $MgCl_2$ concentrations and annealing temperatures (T_A). In addition, we report marker success rate which is the number of samples successfully genotyped divided by those attempted, the number of unique alleles, and number of unique genotypes for each primer. Average heterozygosity (H) is the fraction of individuals that are heterozygotic for each primer. See Table S1 for specific allele values. Alleles lengths with an * denote that these lengths include the M13 tail sequence.

Primers	Forward Primer (5'-3') Reverse Primer (5'-3')	Motif	$MgCl_2$ (mM)	T_A (°C)	Observed Product Length	Marker Success Rate	Unique Alleles	Unique Genotypes	Average H
LmR.1.A	F: GTTCCTAAGGATTCATCACC R: TACGAGGAGGGACACGAG	AAG	2.0	60	178-185*	75/81	2	2	0
LmR.4.A	F: AGTGGCTACGAACGGAAGAG R: AGAGGAACGTTGTGTCTGGG	AAG	0.9	63	219-234	28/28	5	5	0.036
LmR.4.B	F: CTTATTGGATCTTCGCGCCG R: AAGATATCTGACGGCGTTGG	AG	1.2	63	366-392	28/28	6	6	0.071
LmR.5.C	F: GATGCCAGTAGATCCGGC R: ACGCCTGAACACGATTGATG	AGAT	2.0	60	320-444	104/109	25	41	0.846
LmR.8.B	F: TGTACTCATCTGTGGGCGAG R: AACAATTTGGCCACCGTCAG	AGAT	1.2	63	306-376	28/28	10	9	0.036
LmR.8.C	F: GACAACTTAGGGTGCACGC R: GGAGTGAGAGCTGAGGACTG	AGG	1.2	60	435-450	28/28	3	3	0
LmR.10.A	F: TCCTTTCTCGTGTCTCCCAG R: ATGCCCGACCTAGTCC	AG	2.0	60	222-254*	31/81	4	5	0.032
LmR.10.C	F: CTCTCCTTTCTCCTCCACGG R: ATCGCAACCCTCTAGCCG	AGAT	2.0	60	179-254*	79/81	4	4	0.278
LmR.12.B	F: TCTCTGCTGACCGACTCAAG R: GCCGTTGGATCTTTCTCACG	AT	1.2	60	274-320	27/28	8	9	0.111
LmR.14.A	F: TCGCACTAGAGAGATGGGTG R: TCCCATTACCAGGATGCGAG	AAT	1.2	60	261-270	24/28	3	3	0.042
LmR.14.B	F: CATGCCAGGTAAATGCCCTC R: TCGAGCTCCTTCTCCAAACC	ATC	0.9	63	430-440	28/28	3	3	0
LmR.14.C	F: TTCGTCGAGGGTATGAGCTG R: TCTCTTATTTGACACGCGCG	AG	0.9	63	162-178	28/28	7	7	0.036
LmR.15.A	F: GTGACAGCGTATCCTTGTGC R: CAGCGGCAAGATCATCAAG	ATC	1.2	60	222-285	109/109	13	15	0.578
LmR.15.B	F: TCGAGCTAATCAGTGGAGCC R: GAGTGCTCGGCTTGACTTTC	AG	1.2	60	170-210	104/109	13	25	0.692
LmR.15.C	F: CATGTTCCCACCCACTTGAC R: AAGGAAGAGGGAGCAAGGG	AT	1.2	60	368-400	109/109	14	26	0.743
LmR.26.B	F: GTGTCTCCGAGAGCCTACAG R: TTTAAAGCTCGGTGGGTCCC	AG	1.2	63	283-329	28/28	10	7	0.964
LmR.31.A	F: GGTGATCTCAGGTAGCCGAG R: TGAGATCACCACTGTCTGCC	AAG	0.9	63	402-432	26/28	5	6	0.077
LmR.31.B	F: AGTCGGCATAGTACTTCCCG R: CTTCTTCAAGACCGTTCCGC	AAG	1.2	63	155-239	28/28	7	9	0.071

Table 2: *Spirodela polyrhiza* microsatellite markers and sampling results as described in Table 1 with allele calls in Table S2.

Primers	Forward Primer (5'-3') Reverse Primer (5'-3')	Repeat Motif	$MgCl_2$ (mM)	T_A (°C)	Observed Product Length	Marker Success Rate	Unique Alleles	Unique Genotypes	Average H
Sp.1035	F: TGCTTGGTCACTCTTGTCTG R: CGATTCCTAGCTCCTCTGC	AT	1.2	60	361-369	42/42	4	5	0.381
Sp.1467	F: AGTTGAGGAAGCTTCATGG R: ATTACCTCCAGCACCTCTCC	AG	2.0	58	386-411*	9/20	5	4	0.444
Sp.2597	F: TCCCATTCACCACAGTCTCC R: TCATTCCACCACGTCCCAC	AT	2.0	58	397-399*	14/20	2	2	0.071
Sp.5050	F: ATTAACCTTGGGCGCAGAG R: TAGCAGCAGAGTGTGAGGG	AAT	2.0	58	287*	14/20	1	1	0
Sp.5250	F: AAACGAGACCTCCTACGCC R: GCCTGCGAGTAATATGTGC	ATGCCC	2.0	58	385*	19/20	1	1	0
Sp.7286	F: CGAATATGCCGAGGAATGC R: TCCTCGATCTGCCGCTTTAG	CG	1.2	60	386-394	42/42	5	7	0.310
Sp.7688	F: AATGGTTGACTCGACGCTG R: TCACACCGCCATAATTTCGC	AGC	2.0	58	199-211*	19/20	2	2	0.158
Sp.7814	F: AGTGTAGGGTGCAGCTGTG R: TTCGTGAAAGGCCTAGCAC	AG	1.2	60	220-228	42/42	5	6	0.095
Sp.7908	F: GAGACACATCATTGCCAGC R: TAATGCAGGCCACACAACC	AG	2.0	58	234-236	20/20	2	2	0.850
Sp.8563	F: GTATTGGGTGGGCAAATCG R: AAGGGATAGGGTCGTGTCC	AG	2.0	58	350-354*	14/20	3	4	0.071
Sp.8910	F: CCTTCCCTACGTTGACTCCC R: GCGTTTCTCTGATCAGCACC	ACG -> CGT	2.0	58	358	20/20	1	1	0
Sp.9307	F: GGGAGCGAGCTGTATGAAG R: TTTCAACACCCTCACCATGC	AG	2.0	58	450-452*	9/20	2	3	0.444
Sp.9311	F: GTGAGAAAGGAAAGGTGGC R: TGCTCAGGATTCTATGGGCC	AG	2.0	58	253-255*	10/20	2	3	0.400
Sp.Pso27	F: AAGGGTTTCAGTGCGGACG R: CTCGCCTTCTCGTACATCATC	AAG	2.0	58	133*	9/20	1	1	0
Sp.Pso31	F: TCCACCGTCTCCCTGTAATG R: CCACTCCCTCGTCGTGAAG	AAG	1.2	60	240-270	32/42	7	7	0.406
Sp.Pso32	F: TGCTGGCGATGTCAATGTTG R: CTTCAGCACCAAGAGAGCTC	ATC	2.0	58	377-380*	19/20	2	3	0.895

Microsatellite Amplification and Optimization

All duckweed collections were extracted and genotyped at least twice by first sampling 4 to 10 individuals from each monoclonal collection and lyophilizing them for 24 hours. We then extracted DNA using a modified CTAB-based method by Healey *et al.* (2014). Each microsatellite primer was first optimized for annealing temperatures and Magnesium chloride ($MgCl_2$) concentration. The most commonly used PCR recipes and thermocycler conditions are presented here, and any primer specific differences are listed in Tables 1 and 2. For primers developed in Europe, the conditions were the following: PCR amplification was conducted in 15 µL volume reactions containing 3 µL of template DNA, 3µL of 5X Colorless GoTaq Flexi buffer (Promega, USA), 2.0 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.2 mM dNTP mix, 0.05 µM of forward primer, 0.2 µM of reverse primer, 0.2 µM of M13 tagged with a fluorescent probe (e.g.: 5' 6-FAM or 5' HEX), and 1 unit of GoTaq G2 Flexi DNA Polymerase (Promega, USA). DNA concentrations was rarely quantified as amplification was often successful across a range of values (e.g. 2- 40 ng/µL). Thermocycling conditions for both *S. polyrhiza* and *L. minor* from Europe that were M13 tagged were: initial denaturing at 94°C for 5 min, followed by 30 cycles of 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 60°C**,** 1 min at 72°C, followed by eight M13 cycles consisting of 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 53°C**,** 1 min at 72°C, followed by a final extension at 72°C for 10 minutes. For all primers developed in the USA, the conditions were the following: PCR amplification was conducted in 15 µL volume reactions containing 3 µL of template DNA, 3µL of 5X Colorless GoTaq Flexi buffer (Promega, USA), 1.2 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.2 mM dNTP mix, 0.08 µg/µL of Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA), 0.2 µM of each forward and reverse primer, and 1 unit of GoTaq G2 Flexi DNA Polymerase (Promega, USA). Thermocycling conditions for *S. polyrhiza* were: initial denaturing at 94°C for 5 min, followed by 34 cycles of: 1 min of denaturing at 94°C, 1 min of annealing at 60°C, and 1 min of extension at 72°C, followed by a final extension at 72°C for 10 minutes. For *L. minor*, touchdown PCR was employed: with an initial denaturation of 94 °C for 5 min, followed by five cycles of denaturation (94 °C, 1 min), annealing (67 °C, 1 min; decreasing by 1 °C per cycle), and extension (72 °C, 1 min). Then 25 cycles of 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 63°C, and 2 min at 72°C, followed by a final extension at 72°C for 15 minutes.

Fragment length analyses for all primers were conducted on ABI 3730 Genetic Analyzers (Applied Biosystems) at either the ETH Zurich Genetic Diversity Center (Switzerland), Keck DNA Sequencing Lab at Yale University (USA), or the University of Pittsburgh Genomics Research Core (USA), using either GeneScan™ 500 or 600 LIZ™ Dye Size Standards (Applied Biosystems). Allele calls were made using either Geneious (version 9.1.6, Keaser *et al.* 2012) or GeneMarker software (version 3.0.0, SoftGenetics, State College, Pennsylvania).

Results and Discussion

We successfully developed 18 *L. minor* and 16 *S. polyrhiza* microsatellite primers (Tables 1 & 2) which were tested on samples of duckweeds from Europe or Western Pennsylvania (USA). Some markers were easier to utilize than others (Tables 1 & 2). All markers amplified in some samples; of these, all 18 *L. minor* primers and 12 of the 16 *S. polyrhiza* primers amplified polymorphic loci, having more than one allele. Moreover, these polymorphic loci differ in product length and can be used in multiplex reactions to increase efficiency and lower genotyping costs. We also found that some loci were much more polymorphic than others. For

L. minor, these include loci amplified by primers LmR.5.C, LmR.8.B, LmR.15.A, LmR.15.B, LmR.15.C, and LmR.26.B, some of which showed high allele richness even when tested on only 28 samples (Table 1). For *S. polyrhiza* these included loci amplified by primers Sp.1467, Sp.7286, Sp.7814, and Sp.Pso31 (Table 2). Monomorphic loci may still be useful in different duckweed populations (Chapuis and Estoup, 2007). Many microsatellite loci also showed heterogeneity (Tables S1 and S2) which helps make the primers more informative to distinguish genotypes. We note that some primers developed in one continent were not tested on samples from the other continent (see footnotes in Tables S1 &S2); we suspect these primers will work across continents given patterns observed in the others, but this remains to be tested.

Comparing between species, we see that although we tested less samples of *S. polyrhiza,* it still has much lower allelic and genotypic richness across most primers. This is consistent with our own recent large-scale sampling (Hobble *et al. In prep)* as well as other studies using different genotyping methods, that similarly found low genetic diversity in *S. polyrhiza* (Bog *et al.* 2015; Xu *et al.* 2015; Feng *et al.* 2017). It has been hypothesized that this low genetic variation in *S. polyrhiza* is due to its low mutation rate (Xu *et al.* 2019). In addition, primers differed greatly in average observed heterozygosity, but species had similar mean heterozygosities (0.256 for *L. minor* and 0.283 for *S. polyrhiza*). Given that our sampling was designed to find unique genotypes (shallow and widespread) and not characterize populations, we limit our discussion or quantification of population genetic indices. The primers we developed can help researchers address various ecological and evolutionary questions as well as better identify and catalogue genotypes for applied activities.

Supplemental Table Captions

Table S1: *Lemna minor* sample collection sites and allele lengths.

Table S2: *Spirodela polyrhiza* sample collection sites and allele lengths.

Acknowledgements

We thank Walter Lämmler for sharing duckweed lineages from the Landolt Duckweed Collection. We are grateful to the former Levine Plant Ecology Group at ETH Zurich and the Turcotte Lab for their assistance in maintaining collections. We thank ETH Zurich Genetic Diversity Center and Mary Janecka for help troubleshooting primer development. M.M.T. was supported by the ETH Zurich Center for Adaptation to Changing Environments and now by an NSF grant DEB-1935410.

References

Acosta K., Xu J., Gilbert S., Denison E., Brinkman T., Lebeis S., and Lam E. (2020). Duckweed hosts a taxonomically similar bacterial assemblage as the terrestrial leaf microbiome. PLOS ONE 15, e0228560. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0228560

Agrawal A. A., Johnson M. T. J., Hastings A. P., and Maron J. L. (2013). A field experiment demonstrating plant life-history evolution and its eco-evolutionary feedback to seed predator populations. *The American Naturalist* 181, S35–S45. doi:10.1086/666727

Anneberg T. J., O'Neill E. M., Ashman T.-L., and Turcotte M. M. (2023). Polyploidy impacts population growth and competition with diploids: multigenerational experiments reveal key life history tradeoffs. *New Phytologist* n/a. doi:10.1111/nph.18794

Armitage D. W., and Jones S. E. (2019). Negative frequency-dependent growth underlies the stable coexistence of two cosmopolitan aquatic plants. *Ecology* 100, e02657. doi:10.1002/ecy.2657

Barks P. M., Dempsey Z. W., Burg T. M., and Laird R. A. (2018). Among-strain consistency in the pace and shape of senescence in duckweed. *Journal of Ecology* 106, 2132–2145. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12937

Bog M., Lautenschlager U., Landrock M. F., Landolt E., Fuchs J., Sowjanya Sree K., Oberprieler C., and Appenroth K.-J. (2015). Genetic characterization and barcoding of taxa in the genera Landoltia and Spirodela (Lemnaceae) by three plastidic markers and amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP). *Hydrobiologia* 749, 169–182. doi:10.1007/s10750-014-2163-3

Bog M., Sree K. S., Fuchs J., Hoang P. T. N., Schubert I., Kuever J., Rabenstein A., Paolacci S., Jansen M. A. K., and Appenroth K.-J. (2020). A taxonomic revision of Lemna sect. Uninerves (Lemnaceae). *TAXON* 69, 56–66. doi:10.1002/tax.12188

Boutin-Ganache I., Raposo M., Raymond M., and Deschepper C. F. (2001). M13-tailed primers improve the readability and usability of microsatellite analyses performed with two different allele- sizing methods. *BioTechniques* 31, 25–28. doi:10.2144/01311bm02

Braglia L., Lauria M., Appenroth K. J., Bog M., Breviario D., Grasso A., Gavazzi F., and Morello L. (2021). Duckweed species genotyping and interspecific hybrid discovery by tubulin-based polymorphism fingerprinting. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 12, 625670. doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.625670

Cao X. H., Fourounjian P., and Wang W. (2020). The Duckweed Genomes. (Switzerland: Springer Cham), 185 p. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-11045-1

Chapuis M.-P., and Estoup A. (2007). Microsatellite null alleles and estimation of population differentiation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 24, 621–631. doi:10.1093/molbev/msl191

Chen D., Zhang H., Wang Q., Shao M., Li X., Chen D., Zeng R., and Song Y. (2020). Intraspecific variations in cadmium tolerance and phytoaccumulation in giant duckweed (*Spirodela polyrhiza*). *J Hazard Mater* 395, 122672. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122672

297 Cheng J. J., and Stomp A.-M. (2009). Growing duckweed to recover nutrients from wastewaters
298 and for production of fuel ethanol and animal Feed. *CLEAN – Soil, Air, Water* 37, 17–26.
299 doi:10.1002/clen.200800210
300
301 Cui W., and Cheng J. J. (2015). Growing duckweed for biofuel production: a review. *Plant*
302 *Biology* 17, 16–23. doi:10.1111/plb.12216
303
304 Ekperusi A. O., Sikoki F. D., and Nwachukwu E. O. (2019). Application of common duckweed
305 (*Lemna minor*) in phytoremediation of chemicals in the environment: State and future
306 perspective. *Chemosphere* 223, 285–309. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.02.025
307
308 Fazekas A. J., Kuzmina M. L., Newmaster S. G., and Hollingsworth P. M. (2012). DNA Barcoding
309 Methods for Land Plants. In *DNA Barcodes: Methods and Protocols*. (Totowa, NJ USA: Humana
310 Press), 223–252. doi:10.1007/978-1-61779-591-6_11
311
312 Feng B., Fang Y., Xu Z., Xiang C., Zhou C., Jiang F., Wang T., and Zhao H. (2017). Development of
313 a new marker system for identification of *Spirodela polyrhiza* and *Landoltia punctata*.
314 *International Journal of Genomics* 2017, e5196763. doi:10.1155/2017/5196763
315
316 Fu L., Ding Z., Kumpeangkeaw A., Tan D., Han B., Sun X., and Zhang J. (2020). De novo assembly,
317 transcriptome characterization, and simple sequence repeat marker development in duckweed
318 Lemna gibba. *Physiol Mol Biol Plants* 26, 133–142. doi:10.1007/s12298-019-00726-9
319
320 Gupta C., and Prakash D. (2013). Duckweed: an effective tool for phyto-remediation.
321 *Toxicological & Environmental Chemistry* 95, 1256–1266. doi:10.1080/02772248.2013.879309
322
323 Hart S. P., Turcotte M. M., and Levine J. M. (2019). Effects of rapid evolution on species
324 coexistence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, 2112–2117.
325 doi:10.1073/pnas.1816298116
326
327 Healey A., Furtado A., Cooper T., and Henry R. J. (2014). Protocol: a simple method for
328 extracting next-generation sequencing quality genomic DNA from recalcitrant plant species.
329 *Plant Methods* 10, 21. doi:10.1186/1746-4811-10-21
330
331 Hillman W. S. (1961). The Lemnaceae, or duckweeds. *Bot. Rev* 27, 221–287.
332 doi:10.1007/BF02860083
333
334 Hitsman H. W., and Simons A. M. (2020). Latitudinal variation in norms of reaction of phenology
335 in the greater duckweed *Spirodela polyrhiza*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 33, 1405–1416.
336 doi:10.1111/jeb.13678
337
338 Ho E. K. H., Bartkowska M., Wright S. I., and Agrawal A. F. (2019). Population genomics of the
339 facultatively asexual duckweed *Spirodela polyrhiza*. *New Phytologist* 224, 1361–1371.
340 doi:10.1111/nph.16056

Jacobs D. L. (1947). An ecological life-history of *Spirodela polyrhiza* (greater duckweed) with emphasis on the turion phase. *Ecological Monographs* 17, 437–469. doi:10.2307/1948596

Kearse M., Moir R., Wilson A., Stones-Havas S., Cheung M., Sturrock S., Buxton S., Cooper A., Markowitz S., Duran C., Thierer T., Ashton B., Meintjes P., and Drummond A. (2012). Geneious Basic: An integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 28, 1647–1649. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts199

Laird R. A., and Barks P. M. (2018). Skimming the surface: duckweed as a model system in ecology and evolution. *Am J Bot* 105, 1962–1966. doi:10.1002/ajb2.1194

Landolt E. (1986). Biosystematic investigations in the family of duckweeds (Lemnaceae). Vol. 2, The family of Lemnaceae—A Monographic Study, Vol. 1 (Zürich, ETH Zürich), 566 p.

Landolt E. (1992). Lemnaceae duckweed family. *Journal of the Arizona-Nevada Academy of Science* 26, 10–14.

Markoulatos P., Siafakas N., and Moncany M. (2002). Multiplex polymerase chain reaction: A practical approach. *J Clin Lab Anal* 16, 47–51. doi:10.1002/jcla.2058

Morgante M., and Olivieri A. M. (1993). PCR-amplified microsatellites as markers in plant genetics. *Plant J* 3, 175–182.

O'Brien A. M., Yu Z. H., Pencer C., Frederickson M. E., LeFevre G. H., and Passeport E. (2022). Harnessing plant-microbiome interactions for bioremediation across a freshwater urbanization gradient. *Water Research* 223, 118926. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118926

Powell W., Machray G. C., and Provan J. (1996). Polymorphism revealed by simple sequence repeats. *Trends in Plant Science* 1, 215–222. doi:10.1016/1360-1385(96)86898-1

Schenk R. U., and Hildebrandt A. C. (1972). Medium and techniques for induction and growth of monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous plant cell cultures. *Can. J. Bot*. 50, 199–204. doi:10.1139/b72-026

Schlötterer C., and Tautz D. (1992). Slippage synthesis of simple sequence DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res* 20, 211–215.

Sree K. S., Bog M., and Appenroth K. J. (2016). Taxonomy of duckweeds (Lemnaceae), potential new crop plants. *Emirates Journal of Food and Agriculture* 291–302. doi:10.9755/ejfa.2016-01-038

Subramanian S. K., and Turcotte M. M. (2020). Preference, performance, and impact of the water-lily aphid on multiple species of duckweed. *Ecological Entomology* 45, 1466–1475. doi:10.1111/een.12932

Tan J., Kerstetter J. E., and Turcotte M. M. (2021). Eco-evolutionary interaction between microbiome presence and rapid biofilm evolution determines plant host fitness. *Nat Ecol Evol* 5, 670–676. doi:10.1038/s41559-021-01406-2

Tautz D. (1989). Hypervariability of simple sequences as a general source for polymorphic DNA markers. *Nucleic Acids Res* 17, 6463–6471.

Tautz D., and Renz M. (1984). Simple sequences are ubiquitous repetitive components of eukaryotic genomes. *Nucleic Acids Res* 12, 4127–4138.

Turcotte M. M., Reznick D. N., and Hare J. D. (2011). The impact of rapid evolution on population dynamics in the wild: experimental test of eco-evolutionary dynamics. *Ecology Letters* 14, 1084–1092. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01676.x

Van Steveninck R. F. M., Van Steveninck M. E., and Fernando D. R. (1992). Heavy-metal (Zn, Cd) tolerance in selected clones of duck weed (*Lemna minor*). *Plant and Soil* 146, 271–280.

Vieira M. L. C., Santini L., Diniz A. L., and Munhoz C. de F. (2016). Microsatellite markers: what they mean and why they are so useful. *Genet Mol Biol* 39, 312–328. doi:10.1590/1678-4685-GMB-2016-0027

Wang W., Haberer G., Gundlach H., Gläßer C., Nussbaumer T., Luo M. C., Lomsadze A., Borodovsky M., Kerstetter R. A., Shanklin J., Byrant D. W., Mockler T. C., Appenroth K. J., Grimwood J., Jenkins J., Chow J., Choi C., Adam C., Cao X.-H., Fuchs J., Schubert I., Rokhsar D., Schmutz J., Michael T. P., Mayer K. F. X., and Messing J. (2014). The Spirodela polyrhiza genome reveals insights into its neotenous reduction fast growth and aquatic lifestyle. *Nat Commun* 5, 3311. doi:10.1038/ncomms4311

Wani G., Shah M., Reshi Z., Atangana A., and Khasa D. (2014). CPDNA microsatellite markers for lemna minor (ARACEAE): Phylogeographic Implications. *Applications in plant sciences* 2,. doi:10.3732/apps.1300099

Xu N., Hu F., Wu J., Zhang W., Wang M., Zhu M., and Ke J. (2018). Characterization of 19 polymorphic SSR markers in Spirodela polyrhiza (Lemnaceae) and cross-amplification in Lemna perpusilla. *Applications in Plant Sciences* 6,. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aps3.1153

Xu Y., Ma S., Huang M., Peng M., Bog M., Sree K. S., Appenroth K.-J., and Zhang J. (2015). Species distribution, genetic diversity and barcoding in the duckweed family (Lemnaceae). *Hydrobiologia* 743, 75–87. doi:10.1007/s10750-014-2014-2

Xu S., Stapley J., Gablenz S., Boyer J., Appenroth K. J., Sree K. S., Gershenzon J., Widmer A., and Huber M. (2019). Low genetic variation is associated with low mutation rate in the giant duckweed. *Nat Commun* 10, 1243. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09235-5

Ziegler P., Adelmann K., Zimmer S., Schmidt C., and Appenroth K.-J. (2015). Relative in vitro growth rates of duckweeds (Lemnaceae) - the most rapidly growing higher plants. *Plant Biol* 17, 33–41. doi:10.1111/plb.12184