

etal anomalies affecting the axial skeleton of *Tht* heterozygotes (see Figure 4). This mutation was mapped to chromosome 5 (Beechey and Searle 1980) and was further shown to be noncomplementary with a novel insertional mutation *usd^{TgN370Rpw}* that causes defects in the vertebrae of the distal tail (Schrack et al. 1995). When both alleles are present in the same mouse, they lead to a more severe defect in vertebrae at the tip of the tail than does either mutation by itself, suggesting that *usd^{TgN370Rpw}* and *Tht* might be alleles (Schrack et al. 1995). It should now be possible to clone the gene using the *usd^{TgN370Rpw}* transgene insertion and study its aberrant expression in the *Tht* and *usd^{TgN370Rpw}* mutant mice.

From the Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Selby) and the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge, Graduate School for Biomedical Sciences, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. J. J. Schrick is currently at the Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Cincinnati, Ohio. Address correspondence to Paul B. Selby, Risk Analysis Section, Health Sciences Research Division, Oak Ridge Tech Center VI, Mail Stop 6480, 1060 Commerce Park Dr., Oak Ridge, TN 37830. We thank Drs. Liane Russell, Mary Ann Handel, William G. Richards, and Richard P. Woychik for their comments and support of this manuscript. The research was conducted at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, managed by Lockheed Martin Energy Research Corp. for the U.S. Department of Energy under contract no. DE-AC05-96OR22464. Accordingly, the U.S. government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of the contribution, or allow others to do so, for U.S. government purposes.

The Journal of Heredity 1997:88(5)

References

- Beechey CV and Searle AG, 1980. Thick tail: *Tht* Mouse News Lett 62:48.
- Christ B and Witting J, 1992. From somites to vertebral column. *Ann Anat* 174:23-32.
- Conlon FL, Lyons KM, Takaes N, Barth K, Kispert A, Herrmann B, and Robertson EJ, 1994. A primary requirement for *nodal* in the formation and maintenance of the primitive streak in the mouse. *Development* 120: 1919-1928.
- Davis AP and Capecchi MR, 1994. Axial homeosis and appendicular skeleton defects in mice with a targeted disruption of *hoxd-11*. *Development* 120:2187-2198.
- Dietrich S, Schubert FR, and Gruss P, 1993. Altered *Pax* gene expression in murine notochord mutants: the notochord is required to initiate and maintain ventral identity in the somite. *Mech Dev* 44:189-207.
- Dollé P, Izpisua-Belmonte JC, Boncinelli E, and Doboile D, 1991. The *Hox-4.8* gene is localized to the 5' extremity of the *Hox-4* complex and is expressed in the most posterior parts of the body during development. *Mech Dev* 36:3-13.
- Doolittle DP, Davison MT, and Guld JN, 1996. Catalog of mutant genes and polymorphic loci. In: Genetic variants and strains of the laboratory mouse, 3rd ed (Lyon MF, Rastan S, and Searle AG, eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Echelard Y, Epstein DJ, St-Jacques B, Shen L, Mohler J, McMahon JA, and McMahon AP, 1994. Sonic hedgehog, a member of a family of putative signaling molecules, is implicated in the regulation of CNS polarity. *Cell* 75: 1417-1430.
- Kessel M and Gruss P, 1990. Murine developmental control genes. *Science* 249:374-379.
- Kingsley DM, 1994. What do BMPs do in mammals? Clues from the mouse *short-ear* mutation. *TIG* 10:16-21.
- Kispert A and Herrmann BG, 1994. Immunohistochemical analysis of the *Brachyury* protein in wild-type and mutant mouse embryos. *Dev Biol* 161:179-193.
- Koseki H, Wallin J, Witting J, Mizutani Y, Kispert A, Ebensperger C, Herrmann BG, Christ B, and Balling R, 1993. A role for *Pax-1* as a mediator of notochordal signals during the dorsal ventral specification of vertebrae. *Development* 119:649-660.
- Lufkin T, Mark M, Hart C, Dollé P, Lemeur M, and Chambon P, 1992. Homeotic transformation of the occipital bones of the skull by ectopic expression of a homeobox gene. *Nature* 359:835-841.
- Mansour S, Goddard J, and Capecchi M, 1993. Mice homozygous for the targeted disruption of the proto-oncogene *int-2* have developmental defects in the tail and ear. *Development* 117:13-28.
- McLain K, Schreiner C, Yager K, Stock J, and Potter SS, 1992. Ectopic expression of *Hox-2.3* induces craniofacial and skeletal malformations in transgenic mice. *Mech Dev* 39:3-16.
- McLeod MJ, 1980. Differential staining of cartilage and bone in whole mouse fetuses by alcian blue and alizarin red S. *Teratology* 22:299-301.
- Roberts CW, Sonder AM, Lumsden A, Korsmeyer SJ, 1995. Developmental expression of Hox11 and specification of splenic cell fate. *Am J Pathol* 146:1089-1101.
- Rosen V and Thies RS, 1992. The BMP proteins in bone formation and repair. *TIG* 8:97-102.
- Sasaki H and Hogan BLM, 1993. Differential expression of multiple fork head related genes during gastrulation and axial pattern formation in the mouse embryo. *Development* 118:47-59.
- Schoenwolf GC and Smith JL, 1990. Mechanisms of neurulation: traditional viewpoint and recent advances. *Development* 109:243-270.
- Schrack JJ, Dickinson ME, Hogan BLM, Selby PB, and Woychik RP, 1995. Molecular and phenotypic characterization of a new mouse insertional mutation that causes a defect in the distal vertebrae of the spine. *Genetics* 140:1061-1067.
- Selby PB, 1987. A rapid method for preparing high quality alizarin stained skeletons of adult mice. *Stain Tech* 62:143-146.
- Selby PB, 1990. Experimental induction of dominant mutations in mammals by ionizing radiation and chemicals. In: *Issues and reviews in teratology* (Kalter H, ed). New York: Plenum; 5:181-253.
- Taketo M, Schroeder AC, Mobraaten LE, Gunning KB, Hanten G, Fox RR, Roderick TH, Stewart CL, Lilly F, Hansen CT and Overbeek PA, 1991. FVB/N: an inbred mouse strain preferable for transgenic analyses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 88:2065-2069.
- Yamada T, Placzek M, Tanaka H, Dodd J, and Jessel TM, 1991. Control of cell pattern in the developing nervous system: polarizing activity of the floor plate and notochord. *Cell* 64:635-647.
- Wallin J, Witting J, Koseki H, Fritsch R, Christ B, and Balling R, 1994. The role of *Pax-1* in axial skeleton development. *Development* 120:1109-1121.
- Received March 15, 1996
Accepted November 25, 1996
Corresponding Editor: Muriel T. Davison

Inheritance of Body Coloration in the Lyretail Toothcarp (*Aphyosemion australe* Cyprinodontidae)

J. S. Frankel

The lyretail toothcarp (*Aphyosemion australe*) exhibits two body colorations. These are a brown coloration characteristic of *A. australe* and an orange color variant sometimes referred to as the golden lyretail. Segregation patterns observed in the offspring from 11 different matings support the hypothesis that body coloration in *A. australe* is controlled by two autosomal loci acting in a complementary fashion, with dominance at both loci required for the expression of the brown phenotype.

Egg-laying toothcarps in the genus *Aphyosemion* (Cyprinodontidae) exhibit a variety of coloration patterns and body markings (Axelrod and Vorderwinkler 1962; Paysan 1975). The lyretail toothcarp (*Aphyosemion australe*), one of the more common African "nonannual" toothcarps, exhibits two distinct body color phenotypes. Characteristically this species exhibits shades of brown on the epaxial and hypaxial regions of the body with small red spots (Mills 1993). A color variant of *A. australe*, which arose among aquarium stocks of *A. australe* and is sometimes referred to as the golden lyretail, is distinctively orange in color with varying intensities of red spotting on its flanks. Natural populations of this species are almost exclusively comprised of individuals exhibiting the brown phenotype.

As a result of an extensive use of *A. australe* in my laboratory for comparative studies on the regulation and divergence of isozyme loci, I had the opportunity to ascertain the nature of the inheritance of body coloration in the lyretail toothcarp. The present communication reports on these findings.

Materials and Methods

Healthy adults of *A. australe* exhibiting either the brown coloration pattern characteristic of this species or its orange color variant were obtained from Mid-Atlantic Distributors, Inc. (Springfield, Virginia), and maintained in 20 gal capacity holding tanks at 26°C. Sexually mature pairs exhibiting the brown and orange phenotypes were selected at random and placed in 5 gal capacity breeding tanks. All fry were

obtained from natural matings under conditions described by Axelrod and Vorderwinkler (1962). Subsequent to each spawning, the parents were removed from the breeding tank. After leaving their eggshells, fry from each mating were placed in their own 5 gal rearing tank and allowed to develop until their phenotype could be visually determined. Parental and selected F_1 fishes of both phenotypes were subsequently used in a series of 31 matings, and the phenotypic data from all progeny were recorded and subjected to chi-square analysis.

Results and Discussion

Probable genotypes, observed phenotypic frequencies, expected ratios, and probability of fit for *A. australe* analyzed for the inheritance of the brown and the orange (golden lyretail) phenotypes are given in Table 1. All P , F_1 , and F_2 individuals conformed to either the brown or orange phenotype. Parents exhibiting the brown coloration (A1, A2, A3, and A4) were scored as homozygous dominants, since all matings involving these individuals resulted in that phenotype (matings 1–6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 24). Parents exhibiting the orange phenotype (H1, H2, and H3) were scored as homozygous recessives, as all matings between these fishes resulted in all orange fry (matings 7–11). In addition, reciprocal matings between orange and brown parents always resulted in brown progeny (matings 17 and 18). Further, crosses between these F_2 s resulted in a satisfactory fit to a 9 brown : 7 orange ratio of F_2 progeny (matings 19–22), commensurate with a modified 9:3:3:1 ratio resulting from dominant complementary gene action (i.e., $A B$ is required for the brown phenotype). Backcrosses of brown parents consistently bred true (matings 13, 23, 24), while backcrosses of orange parents resulted in a satisfactory fit to the expected 1 brown : 3 orange ratio (matings 25–28).

Complementary gene action as the mode of inheritance of body coloration in *A. australe* is also supported by matings employing F_1 fry presumed to be homozygous recessives (N2). Matings between N2 fishes and heterozygotes (N3 and N4) resulted in a satisfactory fit to the expected 1:3 ratio (matings 29–31), while N2 \times N2 matings and backcrosses of orange

parents (matings 15 and 16, respectively) resulted in the expected orange fry.

In conclusion, the data presented here supports the hypothesis that body coloration in *A. australe* is controlled by two autosomal loci acting in a complementary fashion, with dominance at both loci required for the expression of the brown phenotype. It is interesting to note that a similar mode of inheritance has been observed for the blue and obliterate trunk colorations in the three-spot gourami (*Trichogaster trichopterus* Pallas; Frankel 1992).

From the Department of Biology, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20059.

The Journal of Heredity 1997:88(5)

References

- Axelrod HR and Vorderwinkler W, 1962. Encyclopedia of tropical fishes, 7th ed. Jersey City, New Jersey: T.F.H. Publications.
- Frankel JS, 1992. Inheritance of trunk coloration in the three-spot gourami, *Trichogaster trichopterus* Pallas. J Fish Biol 41:663–665.
- Mills D, 1993. Aquarium fish. London: Dorling Kindersley.
- Paysan K, 1975. Guide to aquarium fishes. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Co.
- Received October 9, 1995
- Accepted November 5, 1996
- Corresponding Editor: Donald C. Morizot

Table 1. Probable genotypes (PG), expected ratios, and probability of fit for matings among brown and orange lyretail toothcarp

Mating no	Parents				Phenotypic frequencies		Expected ratio	P	
	♀	(PG)	♂	(PG)	Brown	Orange			
1	A1	(AABB)	×	A1	(AABB)	33 (N1)	0	1:0	—
2	A2	(AABB)	×	A2	(AABB)	30	0	1:0	—
3	A3	(AABB)	×	A3	(AABB)	25	0	1:0	—
4	A4	(AABB)	×	A4	(AABB)	37	0	1:0	—
5	A1	(AABB)	×	A2	(AABB)	39	0	1:0	—
6	A4	(AABB)	×	A1	(AABB)	25	0	1:0	—
Sum of F ₁ offspring from cross type AABB × AABB						189	0	1:0	—
7	H1	(aabb)	×	H1	(aabb)	0	23 (N2)	0:1	—
8	H2	(aabb)	×	H2	(aabb)	0	30	0:1	—
9	H3	(aabb)	×	H3	(aabb)	0	35	0:1	—
10	H1	(aabb)	×	H2	(aabb)	0	28	0:1	—
11	H2	(aabb)	×	H1	(aabb)	0	32	0:1	—
Sum of F ₁ offspring from cross type aabb × aabb						0	148	0:1	—
12	N1	(AABB)	×	N1	(AABB)	36	0	1:0	—
13	N1	(AABB)	×	A1	(AABB)	30	0	1:0	—
14	A2	(AABB)	×	N1	(AABB)	32	0	1:0	—
Sum of F ₂ and backcross offspring from cross type AABB × AABB						98	0	1:0	—
15	N2	(aabb)	×	N2	(aabb)	0	34	0:1	—
16	H1	(aabb)	×	N2	(aabb)	0	31	0:1	—
Sum of F ₂ and backcross offspring from cross type aabb × aabb						0	65	0:1	—
17	A1	(AABB)	×	H1	(aabb)	25 (N3)	0	1:0	—
18	H3	(aabb)	×	H3	(AABB)	32 (N4)	0	1:0	—
Sum of F ₁ offspring from cross types AABB × aabb and aabb × AABB						57	0	1:0	—
19	N3	(AaBb)	×	N3	(AaBb)	14	10	9:7	.90–.75
20	N4	(AaBb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	21	14	9:7	.50–.25
21	N3	(AaBb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	16	13	9:7	>.90
22	N4	(AaBb)	×	N3	(AaBb)	23	15	9:7	.75–.50
Sum of F ₂ offspring from cross type AaBb × AaBb						74	52	9:7	.75–.50
23	A1	(AABB)	×	N3	(AaBb)	36	0	1:0	—
24	N4	(AaBb)	×	A3	(AABB)	33	0	1:0	—
Sum of backcross offspring from cross types AABB × AaBb and AaBb × AABB						69	0	1:0	—
25	N3	(AaBb)	×	H1	(aabb)	9	25	1:3	.90–.75
26	H3	(aabb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	10	27	1:3	.90–.75
27	N3	(AaBb)	×	H1	(aabb)	4	23	1:3	.25–.10
28	H3	(aabb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	11	26	1:3	.75–.50
29	N3	(AaBb)	×	N2	(aabb)	8	28	1:3	.75–.50
30	N2	(aabb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	6	20	1:3	.90–.75
31	N2	(aabb)	×	N4	(AaBb)	12	29	1:3	.75–.50
Sum of F ₂ and backcross offspring from cross types AaBb × aabb and aabb × AaBb						50	178	1:3	.50–.25

Fish designated (A) are brown parents; fish designated (H) are orange parents; fish designated (N) are first-generation offspring and exhibit either the brown or orange phenotype.