

Utilizing high-density genotyping data for wheat improvement

Alexander Coulton

A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the
requirements for the awards of degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Life
Sciences

Under the supervision of Professor Keith J. Edwards

University of Bristol
Department of Life Sciences

March 2021

Abstract

Wheat's wide-ranging distribution, in addition to its vast levels of production and consumption make it an essential component of global food security. Ever-increasing population sizes necessitate an increase in global wheat yields to match. This thesis aims to contribute to this goal by addressing a broad range of seemingly disparate themes: evolution, recombination and segregation distortion. What unites these themes is their methodological underpinnings - the use of high-density genotyping arrays, which have undergone considerable development in the past decade.

The genetic diversity of wheat is limited by bottlenecks that have occurred in its evolutionary history, both through polyploidization and domestication. This limitation presents difficulties for future yield increases, potentially increasing wheat's susceptibility to pathogens. One area of interest is the rate of novel polymorphism formation over time. The results presented here indicate that this question will be difficult to answer using molecular clock methodology.

Another route to increasing wheat yield may be the manipulation of wheat recombination distribution, removing large areas of linkage drag in the central regions of chromosomes. Previous work in barley suggests that an increase in environmental temperature could shift recombination distribution inwards. The results presented here suggest that whilst this might be the case for some chromosomes in wheat, for the majority of chromosomes, recombination distribution is unaffected by changes in temperature.

Segregation distortion, a deviation from Mendelian ratios in progeny of a cross, is also investigated here, with a focus on current practices of detection in the literature. My results indicate that many studies have been using inappropriate methods for the detection of segregation distortion.

Also presented in this thesis are novel methods and tools for wheat research, such as the

AutoCloner gene-cloning pipeline, allowing researchers to efficiently clone large numbers of genes in previously unsequenced varieties.

Author's declaration

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the University's Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes and that it has not been submitted for any other academic award. Except where indicated by specific reference in the text, the work is the candidate's own work. Work done in collaboration with, or with the assistance of, others, is indicated as such. Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Professor Keith Edwards for his unending support during my PhD studies, whether that be through technical advice, moral support, providing opportunities to advance my own scientific career through conferences and travel, or simply imparting wisdom acquired through his many years in science. I would also like to thank my secondary supervisors, Gary Barker and Sacha Allen for their wisdom and support, whether that be through general scientific advice, reading manuscripts, providing access to invaluable computing resources, or organising travel and teaching opportunities.

This thesis would also not be possible without the many other members of the lab that provided invaluable knowledge and help during the process - Amanda Burridge for her wealth of knowledge on molecular procedures and help in the lab, Paul Wilkinson for advice and guidance on bioinformatic procedures, Mark Winfield for helpful theoretical discussions in the office.

My family and friends have also been invaluable to me, in particular my father, mother and partner Swetha, who have always been ready to lend an ear when I'm in need of a chat. I'm also thankful to the other members of the Biological Sciences department, whether students or staff, who I've had the pleasure of sharing my time with. I'm always impressed by the friendliness and warmth of the community, as well as the fascinating array of research in the department.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Author's declaration	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vi
Abbreviations	vii
1 General introduction	1
1.1 Wheat and the world	1
1.1.1 Economic importance of wheat	1
1.2 Wheat Evolution	1
1.2.1 Phylogenetic placement of wheat and genome nomenclature . .	1
1.2.2 Overview of close relatives of wheat and estimated time of origin	2
1.3 Phenotypic changes in wheat domestication	3
1.3.1 Wheat breeding strategies	4
1.4 SNP Array development	5
1.5 Wheat Genome Development	6
1.6 Genetic mapping	7
1.6.1 Origin of genetic mapping	7
1.6.2 Producing genetic maps with SNPs	8
1.6.3 Computational stages of genetic mapping	9
1.7 Experimental lines	9
1.8 Computing environment and the R programming language	10
1.9 Segregation Distortion	11

1.9.1	Mendelian genetics	11
1.9.2	Causes of segregation distortion and relation to meiotic drive .	12
1.9.3	Canonical example of segregation distortion	13
1.9.4	Example of segregation distortion in wheat	13
1.9.5	Disparity of in methods of detection between studies	14
1.9.6	Distinction between Bonferroni and FDR multiple testing correction procedures	14
1.10	Phylogenetic inference	16
1.11	QTL Analysis	17
1.12	Recombination	17
1.13	Thesis aims	18
2	The Watkins landraces: their evolutionary history and congruity of genotyping data between platforms	19
2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Methods	21
2.2.1	Phylogenetic analysis	21
	Alignment of paired-end sequence reads and identification of SNPs in exome-capture data	21
	Obtaining homologous sequences from <i>A. tauschii</i>	22
	Supermatrix construction and inference of phylogeny using BEAST	22
	Bootstrap analysis to assess reliability of inferred subclades .	23
	Functional characterization of SNPs	24
	Estimation of the rate of novel polymorphisms in wheat	24
2.2.2	Comparison of Exome and Array data	24
	PCO Analysis	24
	STRUCTURE analysis	25
2.3	Results	25

2.3.1	Phylogenetic analysis	25
	Coverage of exome-capture data	25
	Estimation of the TMRCA of Watkins lines	26
	Functional SNP analysis	29
	Estimation of rate of novel polymorphism accumulation in wheat	29
2.3.2	Comparison of Exome and Array data	30
	PCO analysis	30
	Pairwise differences by variety in genotype values between data types	32
	Comparison of probe distribution	34
	STRUCTURE analysis	35
2.4	Discussion	37
3	Detecting a shift in recombination distribution using high-density genotyping data	41
3.1	Introduction	41
3.2	Materials and Methods	48
3.2.1	Plant cultivation and temperature treatments	48
3.2.2	Sample genotyping	49
3.2.3	Genetic map construction	49
3.2.4	Detection and processing of recombination events	50
3.2.5	Statistical method of detecting differences in recombination distribution between temperature treatments	51
3.2.6	Examination of the influence of genotyping error	53
3.2.7	Examination of the influence of sample size	53
3.2.8	QTL analysis	54
3.2.9	Phylogenetic analysis	55
3.2.10	Gene distribution analysis	56

3.3	Results	56
3.3.1	Gene distribution analysis	56
3.3.2	Apogee X Paragon Results	59
	Processing the data for concordance between genetic and physical maps	59
	Performing comparisons with previously generated F5 Apogee x Paragon map	61
	Examining the effect of temperature on recombination distribution	63
	Examining the effects of temperature on recombination frequency	95
	Investigating genotyping error as a possible cause of the observed effects	98
3.3.3	QTL Analysis	98
3.3.4	Phylogenetic Analysis	102
3.4	Discussion	107
4	Segregation distortion: utilizing simulated genotyping data to evaluate statistical methods	113
4.1	Abstract	113
4.2	Introduction	114
4.3	Materials and Methods	117
4.3.1	Plant cultivation	117
4.3.2	Sample genotyping	118
4.3.3	Genetic Map Construction	118
4.3.4	Simulation of genotyping data	119
4.3.5	Measurement of segregation distortion and p-value adjustment .	120
4.4	Results	120
4.4.1	Validation of Simulation	120
4.4.2	Simulation experiments	124

4.4.3	Effect of segregation distortion on genetic mapping	138
4.4.4	Reanalysis of existing data	142
4.4.5	Cadenza X Avalon Replicates	143
4.4.6	Avalon X Cadenza Replicates	144
4.5	Discussion	145
5	AutoCloner: automatic primer design for full-gene cloning in polyploids	150
5.1	Introduction	150
5.2	Materials and methods	153
5.2.1	Acquisition of homologous sequences via BLAST	153
5.2.2	Extraction of homologues and multiple sequence alignment . .	155
5.2.3	SNP Identification	155
5.2.4	Evaluation of potential primer combinations using Primer3 . .	157
5.2.5	Using Primer3 efficiently	158
5.2.6	Choosing sets of overlapping primers	160
5.2.7	Web interface	162
5.3	Results and Discussion	164
5.3.1	Using AutoCloner to investigate segregation distortion	164
5.3.2	Cloning TraesCS5A01G531300 in Apogee	164
5.3.3	Cloning TraesCS5A01G531700.1 in Apogee	166
5.3.4	Cloning TraesCS5A01G530800 in Apogee	168
5.3.5	Running AutoCloner on 85,040 high-confidence genes	168
5.4	Conclusions	169
6	General Discussion and Conclusions	170

6.1	A lack of known divergence points between the inception of wheat and the proliferation of modern landraces makes dating via molecular clock difficult	171
6.2	Population genetics inferences in wheat are consistent between different sources of genotyping data	172
6.3	The influence of temperature on recombination distribution in wheat is limited	173
6.4	Misconceptions around the analysis of segregation distortion are common in scientific literature	175
6.5	Wheat research can be made more efficient by the development of novel bioinformatics pipelines	177
6.6	Final remarks	178
7	Appendix A - AutoCloner R Code	179
7.1	A.1 AutoCloner BLAST Scaffold parser	179
7.2	A.2 AutoCloner primer selection script	197
8	Bibliography	215

List of Tables

2	Table 3.1 Comparison of clustering of markers between the F2 Apogee X Paragon genetic map generated here and the F5 map generated previously. The first column indicates the linkage group / chromosome from the F2 genetic map, whereas the subsequent “LG” columns indicate linkage groups that share markers with this F2 linkage group. Columns labelled “Num. markers” indicate the number of markers shared between linkage groups. The final column indicates the number of markers in the F2 linkage group that were not present in the F5 genetic map.	62
3	Table 3.2 Examining the effect of removal of pairs of temperature treatments before performing the Kruskal-Wallice test on differences in mean recombination distance (MRD). Significant p-values are highlighted in bold. Bonferroni corrections were performed within chromosome arms.	68
4	Table 3.3 Results of Kruskal-Wallice test for difference in MRD between temperature treatments for individual chromosomes. P-values have undergone a Bonferroni correction for multiple testing within chromosome arms. The short arm of 1A is not included as the marker distribution was not sufficient. Significant p-values ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in bold.	69
5	Table 3.4 Regions containing potential temperature-dependent hotspots, defined as having recombination events in both high temperature treatments, whilst lacking recombination events in both low temperature treatments. Also shown are the number of high-confidence genes within the marker interval from the IWGSC assembly annotation. Negative distances from the centromere indicate that the hotspot occurs on the short arm of the chromosome. (continued below)	93

7	Table 3.5 Table showing significant QTLs for late-filial generation (> F4) RIL populations and DH populations. Numbers have been rounded to three decimal places, so where p-values are listed as 0, represents a value smaller than 0.001. (continued below)	99
8	Table continues below	100
10	Table 3.6 Patristic distances of nodes in the tree constructed from a superalignment of the meiosis gene set. Upper triangle has been removed due to redundancy.	106
11	Table 3.7 Patristic distances of nodes in the tree constructed from a superalignment of the random gene set. Upper triangle has been removed due to redundancy. Interestingly, the distances here are longer than in the meiosis gene set.	107
12	Table 4.1 Measures of segregation distortion for simulations with 224 markers and marker distribution taken from chromosome 1A of a Cadenza X Avalon F2 cross. The last column indicates the mean value across all simulations of the magnitude of distortion at its highest value. Shown in the p-value columns are the number of simulations (out of 1000 performed) that contain significantly distorted markers. Marker set A refers to the full marker set of 224 markers, whilst marker set B refers to the skeleton marker set of 93 markers.	126
13	Table 4.2 Reanalysis of genotyping data from existing studies with corrections for multiple testing. Indicated in columns 3–5 are number of markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion with no correction for multiple testing, the FDR correction and the Bonferroni correction respectively.	143

List of Figures

- 1 **Figure 2.1** Phylogeny of Watkins lines showing time until most recent
common ancestor for each node. The phylogeny was dated using a strict
molecular clock, which was calibrated using the estimated divergence of
Aegilops tauschii and hexaploid wheat of 9000 years before present. Node
labels indicate the location from which each line was collected, as well as
the Watkins number of each line in the format Location_Number. Also
included is Chinese Spring from the IWGSC reference sequence (labelled
IWGSC_CS). Scale bar indicates number of base substitutions per site. 29

2	Figure 2.2 PCO plots comparing array (a) to exome capture data (b). Individual points are labelled with their Watkins variety numeric identifiers. The y-axis on the right plot has been inverted for visual ease of comparison. Points are coloured and shaped by region. Represented are varieties from Asia, Australia, Europe (east), Europe (west), Middle East, North Africa and the USSR. The plots are remarkably similar considering the use of datasets from different labs using different methods to generate them. For example, in each plot, varieties 300 and 299 show the same configuration in relation to the remainder of the varieties, emerging around 0 on the x-axis.	32
3	Figure 2.3 Scatterplot showing pairwise distances between varieties between exome capture data and array data. Also shown is a regression line.	34
4	Figure 2.4 Comparison of probe distribution for chromosome 1A for exome capture data (top) and array data (bottom).	35
5	Figure 2.5 Structure plots for K = 3, showing array (top panel) and exome capture (bottom panel) data. WE = Western Europe, EE = Eastern Europe, U = USSR, ME = Middle East, AS = Asia, NA = North Africa, A = Australia.	37

Figure 3.1 Diagram illustrating the process of recombination between non-sister chromatids during meiosis, adapted from (Marston and Amon 2004). DNA synthesis is denoted by the colour red, whilst 3 prime ends are denoted by half-arrows. (a) Spo-11 creates a double stranded break in the DNA, which is then resected at the 5 prime ends to reveal short overhanging 3 prime tails. (b) One of the overhanging tails begins the process of strand invasion, forming an unstable interaction that can take one of two paths, the first leading to a crossover (CO) event (right) and the second leading to a noncrossover (NCO) event. (c) In the path leading the non-CO event, DNA synthesis begins on the invading strand but the strand is ejected from the non-sister chromatid. Following this, DNA synthesis and ligation of the invading strand to its original location occurs. (d) In contrast to this, in the CO pathway, the interaction between non-sister chromatids is stabilised to form a single-end invasion (SEI) intermediate, which contains a single Holliday junction. DNA synthesis then occurs from the 3 prime tails, after which they are annealed to their original location, but with the strands in the formation of a double Holliday junction (DHJ). The DHJ proceeds to be nicked at the positions indicated by arrows and recombinant DNA molecules are formed. . . .

Figure 3.2 Recombination maps for a Chinese Spring X Paragon F5 mapping population. Positions of centromeres are marked by vertical black lines, as determined by ChIP-Seq data (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). Recombination is mostly absent in regions surrounding the centromeres. Marker positions are denoted by circles. Chromosomes have been selected based on overall marker coverage, whilst markers have been filtered, selecting the longest increasing subsequence of markers that are concordant between genetic and physical maps.

8	Figure 3.3 Comparison of gene and probe distribution in wheat. The left column shows the distribution of high-confidence genes along each of the chromosomes of the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 wheat genome assembly, whilst the right column shows the distribution of Axiom probes from the wheat breeder's 35k array along the genome.	58
9	Figure 3.4 Marker distribution for chromosomes that passed our filtering criteria. (a) Marker distribution before removal of markers with discordant order between genetic and physical maps via the longest increasing subsequence. (b) Marker distribution after removal. Vertical lines represent the entirety of the length of each chromosome, taken from the IWGSC assembly, whilst points represent the positions of markers. Horizontal red lines mark the position of the centromere on each chromosome.	60

10	Figure 3.5 Comparison of marker order and distribution between the filtered F2 Apogee X Paragon genetic map and the F5 genetic map produced by Allen et al. (2016). Points represent markers and their genetic positions (cM) in the respective maps. Some of the markers present in the F2 map are not present in the F5 map due to a difference in marker selection procedure between studies. Centimorgan values have therefore been normalized such that map comparisons start at zero whilst retaining inter-marker distances. Deviations from the diagonal line represent differences in the recombination distribution between maps; perfect adherence to the line represents complete coherence between maps in both marker order and marker distribution. Markers that have an inverted order between maps (markers deviating from monotonicity) are represented as grey triangles, whereas markers that are consistent in order represented as black circles. R ² values of linear regressions of the F5 position as a function of the F2 position are shown in the upper left corner of each plot. Chromosomes are labeled in grey panels above each plot.	64
11	Figure 3.6 Recombination distribution of Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for temperature treatments of 10°C, 14°C, 26°C and 28°C respectively at meiosis. Recombination is measured as the mean distance of recombination events from the centromere of the chromosome in each individual plant to avoid conflation of crossover interference with temperature treatment.	65
12	Figure 3.7 Mean MRD for each chromosome for long and short arms.	66
13	Figure 3.8 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 1A. . .	71

24	Figure 3.19 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 2A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	83
25	Figure 3.20 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 2D with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	84
26	Figure 3.21 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 3A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	85
27	Figure 3.22 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 3B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	86
28	Figure 3.23 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 4A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	87
29	Figure 3.24 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 5A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	88
30	Figure 3.25 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 6B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	89
31	Figure 3.26 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 7A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	90
32	Figure 3.27 Recombination distribution amoung temperature treatments for chromosome 7B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.	91

33	Figure 3.28 Apogee X Paragon genetic map lengths by chromosome across temperature treatments. Chromosome 5A has the largest map length and therefore the highest number of recombination events in all temperature treatments. In some chromosomes, higher temperature treatments have less recombination events overall, such as in chromosome 2D, 6B and 7B.	96
34	Figure 3.29 Mean recombination frequency across all chromosomes for each temperature treatment. Error bars represent \pm s.d. from the mean. Significantly different populations are indicated by asterisks (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$).	97
35	Figure 3.30 QTL Plots for late-filial generation ($> F4$) RIL populations and DH populations. Dashed line indicates a 0.05 significance threshold for the LOD value based on a permutation test, whilst the dotted line indicates a 0.05 significance threshold after Bonferroni correction for the number of phenotypes tested.	102
36	Figure 3.29 Box plots of lengths of gene trees, including wheat varieties Chinese Spring, Paragon, Cadenza, Claire and Robigus as well as Barley (Morex) for meiotic and random gene sets. The left panel includes barley, the right panel does not.	104
37	Figure 3.32 Phylogenies contructed from superalignments of all genes for both meiosis and random gene sets, including barley. Scale bars indicate number of substitutions per site.	105
38	Figure 3.31 Phylogenies constructed from superalignments of all genes for both meiosis and random gene sets, without barley. Scale bars indicate number of substitutions per site.	106

- 39 **Figure 4.1** Comparison of recombination fraction heatmaps for both
empirical (a) (Avalon X Cadenza 1A) and simulated data (b). The
large central red block most likely represents the centromeric region of
the chromosome, as wheat is known to have a lack of recombination in
this area. The pattern of recombination cold spots (represented by red
squares) is largely conserved between empirical and simulated data. The
empirical data has low to medium levels of recombination between dis-
tant markers (represented by yellow regions), whilst the simulated data
shows high levels of recombination (represented by blue regions) 122
- 40 **Figure 4.2** Comparison of empirical data (a) from chromosome 1A of
a Cadenza X Avalon F2 mapping population with 96 individuals to sim-
ulated data (b - d). The simulations each have 96 individuals and were
produced using the marker distribution from the empirical data. The
y-axis shows the segregation ratio of homozygous genotypes, shown here
as a proportion of the total number of homozygous genotypes ((a)/(a
+ b)). The black horizontal line indicates an even 1:1 ratio of homozy-
gous genotypes. Included are simulations of both F2 (b, c) and F6 (d,
e) single seed descent populations for comparison, as well as simulations
exhibiting the least (b, d) and the most (c, e) amount of segregation
distortion out of 1000 simulations. None of the simulations have any
selection pressure applied, so these plots indicate the effect of sampling
error on segregation. Sig. = significance threshold (chi-square test) . . 123

- 41 **Figure 4.3** Effect of population size on the magnitude of distortion. Indicated in the header of each panel is the population size. Segregation ratio is calculated as $(a)/(a + b)$, and each data point is the mean value over 1000 simulations. The simulations have no selection and use the marker distribution from chromosome 1A of the Cadenza x Avalon cross. The shaded area represents the mean segregation ratio value \pm the standard deviation over 1000 simulations. The dashed lines mark the 5% significance threshold for a chi-square test, whilst the dotted line marks a 1:1 segregation ratio. The effect of sampling error on segregation ratio decreases as population size increases 125
- 42 **Figure 4.4** Heatmap of deviation from 1:1 segregation of homozygotes at various population sizes and selection strengths. Lower selection strengths are highly dependent on population size. As population size decreases, the influence of sampling error on segregation ratios increases, leading to high segregation distortion even in the case of weak selection. Each tile is an average value over 20 simulations with 20 markers at evenly spaced intervals, totalling 100 centimorgan. Deviation is calculated as $\Sigma(y - 0.5)^2$ where y is the ratio of homozygous genotypes $(a)/(a + b)$ at an arbitrary locus; a is the number of homozygous genotypes from parent 1, b is the number of homozygous genotypes from parent 2 at an arbitrary locus 128
- 43 **Figure 4.5** Proportion of 1000 simulations containing significantly distorted markers as a function of selection strength for various p-value threshold criteria. Simulations contain 1000 individuals and used the marker distribution of chromosome 1A from the Cadenza X Avalon F2 population. The position of selection was at locus 200 of 224 markers Sim = simulations, sig. = significant, pop. = population 130

44	Figure 4.6 Effect of selection strength and population size on the number of simulations containing distorted markers (as determined by a chi-square test with significance threshold of 0.05 after correction for multiple testing with FDR). Sim = simulations, sig. = significant, pop. = population	131
45	Figure 4.7 Simulation of an F5 RIL population with a selection pressure of strength 1/20 at locus 200. Indicated in the header of each panel is the population size. As the population size increases, the influence of sampling error on segregation of marker decreases, providing increased resolution of genuine selection events. (a) shows the mean magnitude of distortion $((a)/(a + b))$ over 1000 simulations. The shaded area represents \pm the standard deviation of the magnitude of distortion over 1000 simulations. The dashed lines mark the 5% significance threshold for a chi-square test, whilst the dotted line marks a 1:1 segregation ratio. (b) shows the number of simulations in which the peak of distortion occurs at the specified marker. As population size increases, so do the number of simulations in which the genuine selection event emerges as the peak of distortion. Num. = Number, sim. = simulations, dist. = distortion.	132
46	Figure 4.8 Recombination for chromosome 1A of the Avalon X Cadenza cross. The amount of recombination is represented by the slope of the line.	134

54	Figure 5.3 Detailed overview of the SNP categorisation and primer selection process in AutoCloner. Shown is a hypothetical multiple sequence alignment (MSA) containing the sequence to clone (first row), two homeologues (rows 2-3), and a homologue from a second variety (row 4). AutoCloner identifies SNPs in the MSA and identifies which might be suitable for potential primer locations. The SNP at sequence site 3 is a varietal SNP rather than a homeologous SNP and is therefore not suitable. The SNP at sequence site 5 only provides partial specificity and is also not suitable. Whilst the SNP at sequence site 11 provides specificity, however is not present in the second variety, meaning it could be unique to the first variety, and therefore not present in the variety under investigation. The SNP at sequence site 105 does not flank the desired region to clone and is therefore not suitable. Shown at the bottom of the figure are potential primers with 3' ends placed on SNPs deemed viable. Note that some of these include primers that are placed on the same SNP but are different lengths. Primer3 evaluates each of these primers, ultimately assigning each a penalty score. The primers with the lowest penalties are returned to the user. Note that the reverse primers are shown as the reverse complement of the sequence in the MSA.	156
55	Figure 5.4 Flowchart showing the control flow of the AutoCloner pipeline. Names of software packages are shown in italics; box types are indicated in the legend.	161
56	Figure 5.5 Picture of the AutoCloner website job details page. The user has the option to view the BLAST results themselves, as well as choose from all possible primers should the primers selected by AutoCloner not work.	163

57	Figure 5.6 Picture of the AutoCloner website job details page. The AutoCloner website presents the multiple sequence alignment, containing the input sequence, homologues, SNPs and primers, to the user for their own inspection.	163
58	Figure 5.7 Agarose gels showing amplified PCR products for the TraesCS5A01G531300 gene using primers designed by AutoCloner. Details of the primers are shown in table 1. The DNA ladder used was the Quick-Load® Purple 2-log DNA ladder, manufactured by New England Biolabs, containing DNA fragments ranging from 0.1 kb to 10 kb in size. The expected product sizes for T.300.577-1989, T.300.1904-3138, T.300.2632-3437 and T.300.2888-4219 were 1412, 1234, 805 and 1331 bases respectively. A subsequent PCR (not shown) in which the annealing temperature was increased from 58 °C to 60 °C increased the specificity of the T.300.2888-4219 set of primers.	166

Abbreviations

ASY1	Arabidopsis asynaptic 1
AxP	Apogee x Paragon
BAC	Bacterial artificial chromosome
BLAS	Basic linear algebra subprogram
CENH3	Centromere specific histone 3
CO	Crossover
DHJ	Double Holliday junction
DQC	Dish quality control
DSB	Double-stranded break
FAOSTAT	Food and Agriculture Organization Corporate Statistical Database
FDR	False discovery rate
FISH	Fluorescence in-situ hybridization
GC	Guanine-cytosine
HSPs	High-scoring segment pairs
IWGSC	International Wheat Genome Sequencing Consortium
KASP	Kompetitive allele-specific PCR
LOD	Logarithm of odds
MRD	Mean recombination distance
MSA	Multiple sequence alignment
MTP	Microtitre plate
NCO	Non-crossover
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
RAPD	Random amplified polymorphic DNA

RFLP	Restriction fragment length polymorphism
RIL	Recombinant inbred line
Rsp	Responder
SC	Synaptonemal complex
SD	Segregation distortion
SDR	Segregation distortion region
SEI	Single-end invasion
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphism
Sd	Segregation distorter
TM	Melting temperature
TMRCA	Time to most recent common ancestor
WISP	Wheat improvement strategic programme
ZYP1	zipper 1

1 General introduction

1.1 Wheat and the world

1.1.1 Economic importance of wheat

Roughly 9000 years ago in the fertile crescent, located in modern-day Turkey, early farmers developed hexaploid wheat, a plant that would go on to become a staple of the human diet, revolutionizing global agriculture in the process (Lev-Yadun et al. 2000; Salamini et al. 2002; Shewry 2009). In 2018, total wheat production was 734 million tonnes (FAOSTAT, 2020), making it the third highest food crop in terms of production, eclipsed only by rice (782 million tonnes) and maize (1.14 billion tonnes). One of the upcoming challenges of the 21st century is the divergence of human population and crop yield growth trajectories, which if not addressed will result in a global shortage of food supplies in the coming decades. The 2017 UN report of world population prospects projected a global population of 8.5 billion people by 2030, increasing to 9.7 billion by 2050. It is therefore important that society invests into the advancement of wheat research, facilitating the development of tools, such as the recently released IWGSC chromosome-level genome sequence (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018), that will significantly increase our knowledge of wheat, and hopefully allow us to produce varieties that are suited to meeting this increased demand.

1.2 Wheat Evolution

1.2.1 Phylogenetic placement of wheat and genome nomenclature

Wheat, or more formally *Triticum aestivum* L., is an allohexaploid species contained within the Poaceae, or the grass family, which is a large clade containing all three major food crops (wheat, rice and maize) as well as many other common grasses. Wheat is said to have an AABBDD genome constitution, a nomenclature originally derived from hybridization experiments between polyploids and diploid grasses (Kihara 1929; Lilienfeld

1951). Hybridizations in which meiosis proceeded normally, e.g. without nondisjunction of chromosomes and resulting aneuploidy, were said to have homologous genomes (Lilienfeld 1951), and the parents were therefore assigned the same letter / genome designation. From the viewpoint of modern phylogenetics, based on an abundance of genomic sequence data, this concept could be simplified into the dates of divergence between genomes or sequences, however these designations are still useful in a plant breeding context, and have thus remained in widespread usage in the agricultural scientific literature.

1.2.2 Overview of close relatives of wheat and estimated time of origin

Contained within the Poaceae is the Pooideae subfamily, which is comprised of important food crops such as barley, oats, rye and wheat. *Triticum*, the wheat genus, contains many species of varying ploidies and significance to the global economy, including hexaploid bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), used for making bread; tetraploid durum wheat, used for making pasta (*Triticum turgidum* conv. *durum*); tetraploid emmer wheat (*Triticum turgidum* subsp. *dicoccoides*), the wild progenitor of modern cultivated tetraploid wheats; hexaploid spelt (*Triticum spelta*), an important crop in the Bronze age (Salamini et al. 2002) which is now used as a health food; diploid einkorn wheat (*Triticum monococcum* L.), one of the first grasses to be actively cultivated by humans and *Triticum urartu*, the closest living relative of the A subgenome of bread wheat. Another genus that played an important role in wheat evolution is *Aegilops*, commonly known as goatgrasses, with evidence pointing to *Aegilops speltoides* being the closest living relative to the B subgenome of wheat (Petersen and Sutton 2006), and *Aegilops tauschii* the closest relative to the D subgenome of wheat (Luo et al. 2017). A phylogenomic molecular clock analysis of bread wheat and its close diploid relatives (Marcussen et al. 2014) suggests that the D genome lineage of wheat arose around 5.5 million years ago through homoploid hybridization, i.e. where the hybrid retains the same number of chromosomes as the parental species, of the B and A genome ancestors. Later, less than 0.8 million years ago, the A and B genome progenitors underwent

allopolyploid hybridization to form the tetraploid AABB plant, which underwent a subsequent allopolyploid hybridization event with the D genome progenitor. Archaeological evidence suggests this final hybridization event occurred around 9000 years ago, with the occurrence of hexaploid free-threshing wheats at Cafer Höyük that have been radiocarbon-dated to ~8700 years ago (Nesbitt 2001). This order of hybridization is further supported by the relative lack of SNPs in the D genome of bread wheat compared to A and B genomes (Allen et al. 2016), which is congruent with a more recent origin.

1.3 Phenotypic changes in wheat domestication

The process of domestication involves the accumulation of traits that are often detrimental to the selected organism in the wild, but beneficial to humans in terms of agriculture. The first of such traits to be introduced into cultivated wheat was a non-brittle rachis (Charmet 2011), which causes the spikelets to be retained on the spike rather than be dispersed into the environment, meaning yield is increased as much of the edible material of the plant, the kernel, is retained for harvesting. The gene conferring a non-brittle rachis, *Br*, is located on chromosome 2A (Peleg et al. 2011) and has monogenetic inheritance, and would thus be relatively straightforward to select and breed into a population of wheat plants. The second important gene involved in wheat domestication is the *Tg* or Tenacious glume, located on the short arm of chromosome 2D (Sood et al. 2009; Charmet 2011). This controls ease at which the glume, the protective bract covering each spikelet, separates from the grain, thus plants with recessive *tg* are easier to thresh. Perhaps the most important gene involved in the domestication of wheat is the *Q* gene, an APETELATA2-like transcription factor located on chromosome 5A (Simons et al. 2006). This gene is pleiotropic, producing effects on spike length, rachis fragility (and therefore threshability), glume tenacity, spike emergence time and plant height. *Q* is therefore a crucial development in cultivated wheat that significantly enhanced the efficiency with which farmers could harvest their grain. As we can see, one common factor uniting these genes is that they are mostly qualitative traits controlled

by a single locus. We can expect that since there was strong selection for these genes that wheat will have significantly reduced genetic diversity in the regions surrounding these genes in the genome.

1.3.1 Wheat breeding strategies

Although agricultural practices, including the active cultivation of plants for food, date to over 10,000 years ago, breeding based on the theoretical foundation of genetics is very recent. Mendel published his hybridization studies on peas in 1866 (Allen 2003), which were not regarded seriously until around 1900. This provided breeders with more concrete knowledge of inheritance, but even so, breeding was still limited to the selection of plants based on their phenotypic characteristics, and consequently was largely focussed on the selection of qualitative traits underpinned by a small number of genes, such as plant height, which notably was the driving factor behind the massive yield increases of the green revolution. Accurate dissection of quantitative traits, as well as heterozygotes with recessive alleles remained elusive without knowledge of plant genotypes.

The transition from using phenotypic traits to inform plant breeding strategies to molecular markers that survey the genetic material was revolutionary, potentially saving breeders a significant amount of time. Genetic markers allow researchers or breeders to survey large numbers of plants for the trait of interest without having to grow plants to late stages of development. Before examining the current state of wheat breeding, it will be illuminating to review the history of genotyping as a means of providing context. Genetic markers have undergone significant development in the last few decades. The first genetic markers were restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) markers, initially developed in humans (Botstein et al. 1980) and then later for maize (Helenentjaris et al. 1985) and wheat (Chao et al. 1989). These relied on fragmentation of the DNA via restriction enzymes, followed by gel electrophoresis and hybridization of probe sequences to the DNA, which defined polymorphisms. The invention of the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) then opened up several new techniques for producing

genetic markers, such as random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) (Williams et al. 1990), DNA amplification fingerprinting (Caetano-Anollés and Gresshoff 1994), amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) (Barrett and Kidwell 1998), microsatellites (Condit and Hubbell 1991; Devos et al. 1995a). These methods were restricted by their reliance on agarose or polyacrylamide gels, which limit the number of polymorphisms that can be analysed concurrently. Later on it became widely acknowledged that single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), would become the standard (Henry 2001) for human and plant genotyping due to their abundance in the genomes of organisms, meaning that for any particular gene of interest, there would likely be a SNP within close proximity, allowing the inheritance of the gene to be tracked through generations.

Progress in SNP genotyping in wheat has lagged significantly behind humans and other crops due to the complexity and size of the wheat genome in comparison, which is hexaploid and comprises around 16 Gb. The current state of wheat genotyping has seen the emergence of a small number of dominant technologies for surveying SNPs. Kompetitive allele specific PCR (KASP) (Allen et al. 2011; Semagn et al. 2014) provides an efficient, cost-effective method for genotyping samples at a small number of SNP loci. This method is ideal for the situation in which the researcher already has a target gene of interest in the genome. In addition, SNP arrays have also been developed for simultaneous genotyping of large numbers of samples (90 400) and SNPs (35,000 820,000).

1.4 SNP Array development

SNP arrays are ultimately based on the hybridization of DNA fragments of interest to allele-specific probes that are immobilized on a surface. Arrays are typically restricted to biallelic SNPs for ease of detection. Two probes are present for each SNP to be detected, each of which contains a different base at the SNP position, along with identical flanking sequences. These probes have different fluorescent tags attached to them (for example red and green), such that after hybridization, non-hybridized probes will be removed and the genotype of the sample at that allele will be deduced through the colour of

the fluorescent signal. A mixture of the two colours indicates that the sample was heterozygous at that locus. The first SNP array for wheat was described in 2013, and was reliant on the Illumina iSelect technology, comprising 9,000 SNPs (Cavanagh et al. 2013) discovered through transcriptome sequencing of 26 bread wheat accessions. This was later expanded on to produce an array containing 90,000 SNPs (Wang et al. 2014) based on 19 bread wheat varieties. Subsequently, an array was developed with a much higher density of SNPs using Affymetrix Axiom technology, containing 820,000 SNPs discovered via exome capture from 43 bread wheat varieties and relatives, enabling, amongst other typical array applications, the tracking of introgressions from wide crosses in wheat. These SNPs were then filtered to produce a high-quality set of 35,000 optimized for elite UK bread wheat varieties, known as the Wheat Breeders array (Allen et al. 2016). Notably, all of these arrays were built around genic sequences, whether in their full genomic or transcriptomic forms. To address this, a further array was designed and released (Rimbert et al. 2018) that contained 280,226 SNPs, many of which were intergenic, and also utilized the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 chromosome-level genome assembly (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018) as a reference for alignment of sequencing reads.

1.5 Wheat Genome Development

The assembly of a chromosome-level genome for wheat has proven to be a significant challenge for the scientific community. The first attempt at sequencing a complete chromosome of wheat, chromosome 3B, which is two-times bigger than the entire rice genome, came in the form of long insert bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC) libraries (Paux et al. 2008). The Chinese Spring variety of wheat was chosen on the basis of its previous use in cytogenetic studies as well as the availability of aneuploid lines for every chromosome (Endo and Gill 1996). This progressed to a full genome assembly with the rise of next generation sequencing (Brenchley et al. 2012), albeit a highly fragmented version with short contigs. Several further assemblies were then produced ((iwgsc) 2014; Chapman et al. 2015; Clavijo et al. 2017; Zimin et al. 2017) before the

canonical assembly, the International Wheat Genome Sequencing Consortium Reference Sequence v1.0 (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018) was released. As the wheat genome is highly repetitive, not only with duplicate copies of genes due to hexaploidy but also due to a large number of transposable elements, de novo assembly of the genome is very difficult. The authors of the IWGSC assembly therefore used a variety of methods to overcome these difficulties, including traditional next-generation sequencing, Hi-C (Lieberman-Aiden et al. 2009), Bionano optical maps, radiation hybrid maps, genetic mapping and BAC libraries with microtitre plate (MTP) Sanger sequencing. Since the release of the IWGSC assembly, further progress has been made in sequencing other wheat varieties, with the 10 Wheat Genomes project (Walkowiak et al. 2020) providing whole genome assemblies of varieties Mace, Lancer, CDC Landmark, Julius, Norin61, ArinaLrFor, Jagger, Cadenza, Paragon, Robigus and Claire, although at the time of writing, the latter four assemblies are not chromosome-level, and instead are comprised of scaffolds.

1.6 Genetic mapping

1.6.1 Origin of genetic mapping

First conceived by Sturtevant in the fruit fly *drosophila* (Sturtevant 1913), genetic mapping is a method of deducing the linear order of genes or molecular markers on a chromosome via their segregation ratios in the progeny of a biparental cross. It is based on the principle that the number of recombination events that occur between any pair of loci on a single chromosome is proportional to the distance between those loci. Whilst in organisms with smaller genomes, such as the model plant *Arabidopsis*, genetic mapping has been almost completely superseded by more advanced techniques such as whole-genome sequencing, in many crops, including wheat, it remains an important technique for examining the genome, as whole-genome sequencing remains challenging and expensive due to the size of the genome. Genetic mapping has progressed over the years from using phenotypic markers of genes - yellow body, white eyes, vermillion

wings, miniature wings and rudimentary wings were the traits used by Sturtevant - to using molecular markers such as SNPs (Allen et al. 2016, 2011).

1.6.2 Producing genetic maps with SNPs

As genotyping technology has advanced, genetic maps have become increasingly large, now often including thousands of molecular markers per map (Allen et al. 2016). Only SNPs that are polymorphic between parents can be used for the creation of a map. In addition, an ideal SNP would be codominant between parents such that the heterozygotes are able to be distinguished, as this provides more information on recombination events. We can then assign letters to represent the genotype of a sample at any particular SNP, for example an “A” could represent a sample that is homozygous for the allele from the first parent of a biparental cross, likewise a “B” could represent a homozygote of the second parental allele, whilst a “H” could represent a heterozygote. Examination of the genotypes at any pair of adjacent molecular markers in a biparental cross reveals whether a recombination event has occurred between them. There are some exceptions to this, for example when two recombination events occur between a pair of markers (a double recombination event), or when both of the markers are heterozygous and both of the gametes that made up the zygote of the sample underwent recombination between these markers. Genetic mapping becomes feasible when we expand these principles to the population level: if a large proportion of individuals in the population have recombination events between two loci, the loci must be far from each other on the chromosome. This proportion is known as the recombination fraction r , which, in absence of sampling error, ranges from $0 < r < 0.5$. The upper limit is 0.5 due to double recombination events: as the distance between two loci increases, odd and even numbers of crossovers between them become equally likely (Xu 2013).

1.6.3 Computational stages of genetic mapping

After genotyping, genetic mapping involves three primary computational stages, which are the clustering of markers, ordering of markers, and calculation of genetic distance between markers. Of these stages, the ordering of markers is the most computationally intensive, with $n!/2$ potential orders for n markers (Mester et al. 2003). With modern computational hardware it is almost impossible to examine every possible order in a reasonable amount of time, rendering a brute-force approach invalid and turning this into a heuristic optimization problem that must be solved algorithmically. A notable development in this regard is the MSTmap software, which uses an algorithm based on the minimum spanning tree of a graph to determine the order of markers on the map, which not only was shown to be significantly faster than previous methods (Wu et al. 2008), but was also released free-of-charge to the community as open source software, and has since been developed into an R package that simplifies its use even further (Taylor and Butler 2017). Other algorithms of comparable speed, such as MultiPoint (Mester et al. 2015) are proprietary software and have cumbersome graphical interfaces that are difficult to incorporate into automated bioinformatics pipelines. After the inference of both marker clustering and ordering, the calculation of genetic distances between markers is trivial, with either the Haldane or Kosambi mapping functions most often used to convert recombination fractions between markers to units of centiMorgans, the latter accounting for crossover interference.

1.7 Experimental lines

There are several types of experimental line used commonly in wheat research, each with its own advantages and disadvantages depending on the research application. The simplest is an F1 line, which is a cross between two different parental varieties, and is heterozygous at every locus at which the parents differ. Since wheat is self-fertilizing, F1 plants can be selfed to produce F2 lines, which unlike the F1 are genetically different due to the difference in recombination position and frequency between meioses; this

difference forms the basis for creation of a genetic map. With repetition of this selfing process for several generations, the plants eventually become completely homozygous at every locus, and are referred to as recombinant inbred lines (RIL). These lines can be more useful than F2 lines for genetic mapping, as the lack of heterozygosity allows increased detection of recombination events. In addition, they also have a stable genotype, and will not change significantly over generations, meaning they could form useful germplasm for further input to breeding programmes. The obvious downside is that they take much longer than F2 plants to produce. Doubled haploid lines allow researchers to expedite this process significantly, achieving complete homozygosity in a single generation by taking the pollen cells of F1 lines and subjecting them to a chemical treatment, usually with caffeine or colchicine, that disrupt meiosis and cause chromosome doubling. A potential downside of this method is that a selection pressure is applied favouring alleles that allow the pollen to thrive during tissue culture, which are not necessarily beneficial to agronomic and physiological traits in later stages of development. It has been noted in the literature that the tissue culture process during doubled haploid production causes segregation distortion at some loci (Sayed et al. 2002; Adamski et al. 2014). The final type of experimental line which I will mention here is the backcross population, which as the name implies is the hybridization of the progeny of a biparental cross with one of the parents that produced it. Backcrosses have been utilized, amongst other things, in the study of segregation distortion to discover segregation distortion loci and to examine whether the effect of distortion is caused in the female or male gametal development cycle (Kumar et al. 2007).

1.8 Computing environment and the R programming language

The large amount of data produced from high-density SNP arrays necessitate a bioinformatics approach to processing and analysing the data. Since such a large proportion of the work done during the PhD was done in a computational context, it might be illuminating to discuss the choices made in terms of computational environment and hardware used. To support computations, I utilized various high-performance servers,

including a computing cluster located in the Life Sciences building at Bristol, and most importantly a powerful server dubbed “Wilkins”, with ~750 Gb RAM, ~60 simultaneous threads and over 20TB total hard drive space. For the majority of the data analysis I chose the R programming language, an object-oriented, interpreted language, which allows inspection and manipulation of objects in a dynamic manner without compilation of the script being worked on. R offers significant advantages over other languages typically used for data manipulation such as Python, providing native support for tabular data in the form of its dataframe class, and making vectorized computation a central feature of the language - Python requires additional libraries to implement these features. The consequence of this is that computations over entire columns of tabular data are very simple to implement, not even requiring a for loop, and are quick to execute, as the underlying vector calculation is performed in a basic linear algebra subprogram (BLAS) written in a compiled language, such as C++. Finally, R has a wealth of packages that extend its functionality significantly, such as ggplot for plotting, qtl for qtl analysis, ASMap for genetic mapping and Bioconductor for handling genetic sequence data.

1.9 Segregation Distortion

1.9.1 Mendelian genetics

Mendel’s law of segregation states that when two F1 individuals, both heterozygous for the same gene, are crossed together, the gametes produced by these individuals will bear the two alleles in a 1:1 ratio, and furthermore, the progeny of the cross will have a 1:2:1 ratio of homozygotes for the first allele, heterozygotes, and homozygotes for the second allele. This is a fundamental law of genetics which many students of biology will recognise in the form of a Punnett square. With further studies into genetics catalysed by the highly efficient research organism Drosophila, later followed by the revolution in molecular genetics enabling detailed study of crop species, it was revealed that there are many cases in which this law is violated. This violation is referred to as segregation

distortion (SD), or alternatively as meiotic drive. SD is common in wheat and many other crops, although the exact mechanisms causing it have yet to be fully elucidated.

1.9.2 Causes of segregation distortion and relation to meiotic drive

SD can be caused by simple sampling error, or alternatively by the action of a selection pressure at some stage of the developmental cycle, such as during meiosis, gametogenesis, fertilization or zygotic development (Xu 2013; Rick 1963; Gadish and Zamir 1987). One much studied cause of segregation distortion is meiotic drive, initially defined as the manipulation of meiosis (Sandler and Novitski 1957; Buckler et al. 1999), and later broadened to include all of gametogenesis (Zimmering et al. 1970; Lindholm et al. 2016), by selfish genetic elements such that their own frequency of transmission is increased, or conversely, the frequency of transmission of their alleles is decreased. The literature is not in complete consensus regarding the definitions of meiotic drive and segregation distortion, with some authors simply indicating that the two terms are synonymous (Kozielska et al. 2010). In this thesis I will limit the definition of meiotic drive to the developmental stages preceding or up to the completion of gametogenesis, which seems most in line with the original proposal of the term (Sandler and Novitski 1957), differentiating meiotic drive from gamete competition. This could explain the incongruity in the literature, as all cases of meiotic drive are also cases of segregation distortion, but all cases of segregation distortion have the potential to be, but are not necessarily, cases of meiotic drive, requiring further investigation to determine. In any case, meiotic drive is a fascinating form of intra-genomic conflict that is almost anthropogenic in quality, and as such has provoked almost 50 years of study: “Mendelian inheritance is a marvellous device for making evolution by natural selection an efficient process. The Mendelian system works with maximum efficiency only if it is scrupulously fair to all genes. It is in constant danger however, of being upset by genes that subvert the meiotic process to their own advantage” (Crow 1979).

1.9.3 Canonical example of segregation distortion

The canonical example of meiotic drive is the segregation-distorter system in *Drosophila* (Sandler et al. 1959; Larracuente and Presgraves 2012). This system is comprised primarily of two loci, Segregation distorter (*Sd*) and Responder (*Rsp*), both located on autosomal chromosome 2, with several modifier loci that also play a role by either enhancing or reducing the intensity of the driving locus. *Sd* alleles act to distort segregation, whereas their wild-type alleles, *Sd*+, do not. In addition, *Rsp* has both sensitive (*Rsp_s*) and insensitive alleles (*Rsp_i*). *Sd* is usually paired with insensitive *Rsp_i*, whereas wildtype *Sd*+ is usually paired with a sensitive *Rsp_s* allele. In heterozygotes containing *Sd/Sd*+ and *Rsp_i/Rsp_s*, gametes with *Rsp_s* will fail to develop, resulting in close to 100% transmission of the segregation-distorter allele. In addition, individuals with *Sd* and *Rsp_s* on the same chromosome will self-destruct. Collectively, these observations indicate an interaction between the two loci that ultimately produces segregation distortion, however, despite the length of time that this system has been studied, an exact mechanism for how the two loci interact is not entirely clear; there are several competing hypotheses involving nuclear transport and small RNAs respectively (Larracuente and Presgraves 2012).

1.9.4 Example of segregation distortion in wheat

Could segregation distortion in wheat be caused by meiotic drive systems with similar mechanisms to the segregation-distorter system of *Drosophila*? Loegering and Sears (Loegering and Sears 1963) found evidence of a meiotic drive system in wheat in the form of the pollen killer gene *Ki*. Chinese spring was crossed to a substitution line, Timstein-6B, the latter composed of Chinese spring with chromosome 6B substituted for the corresponding chromosome in variety Timstein, shown in previous experiments to contain a resistance gene for stem rust. F1 samples of this cross were then reciprocally backcrossed into Chinese Spring. Whilst the cross in which Timstein-6B was the female parent yielded close to a 1:1 ratio of resistant to susceptible plants, the reciprocal cross showed strong distortion in favour of susceptible plants. Further investigation revealed

that many of the microspores resulting from this cross began to degenerate early in development, suggesting that a meiotic drive gene, *Ki*, was highly linked to the gene conferring stem rust resistance, causing the extreme distortion in plants heterozygous for this gene. Although discovered over 50 years ago, this remains one of the best examples of meiotic drive operating in wheat, and illustrates how meiotic drive and segregation distortion can be detrimental to agronomic aims, in this case reducing the number of progeny with resistance to stem rust.

1.9.5 Disparity of in methods of detection between studies

The increased genotyping capacity in recent years, driven by developments in technology, has led to an increase in the number of loci that supposedly exhibit segregation distortion, with examples found in cotton (Dai et al. 2017), maize (Wang et al. 2012; Lu et al. 2002), potato (Manrique-Carpintero et al. 2016), chickpea (Castro et al. 2011), barley (Li et al. 2010) and wheat (Allen et al. 2016; Gardner et al. 2016; Wingen et al. 2017). There is however a disparity in the statistical methods used to detect segregation distortion, with some authors using a simple chi-square test with a alpha threshold of 0.05, others using multiple alpha thresholds, others using a false-discovery rate multiple-testing correction procedure, and some using the even stricter Bonferroni correction. One of the aims of this thesis will be to identify which of these methods is the most accurate for the detection of segregation distortion when many markers are being tested simultaneously, as is the case with modern high-density genotyping data from e.g. arrays or genotyping by sequencing methods.

1.9.6 Distinction between Bonferroni and FDR multiple testing correction procedures

Statistics is a method of classifying certain experimental results as “significant” if they pass a specified p-value threshold, which by convention is set to 0.05, although this choice was an arbitrary one made by the father of statistics, Ronald Fisher. This

value indicates that a result could be significant by chance, e.g. through sampling error, and the probability of this false-positive result is 1/20. When multiple statistical tests are performed simultaneously, the probability that one of these tests will have a false-positive result increases by a factor, the number of tests being performed. The Bonferroni correction (Bonferroni 1935) is a widely used procedure that accounts for the increasing probability of a false-positive result with increasing number of tests, otherwise known as the family-wise error rate, by dividing the significance threshold , by the number of tests being performed. Although a plausible strategy for small datasets, the Bonferroni has its downsides; it is highly conservative when the number of hypotheses being tested is large, and has been criticised for its low statistical power in these cases (Nakagawa 2004). The advent of large biological datasets, initially in the form of microarray data to assess gene expression, demanded a new multiple testing correction procedure, as it would often be the case that thousands of hypotheses of differential gene expression, one for each gene under analysis, were being tested simultaneously (Storey and Tibshirani 2003). The Benjamini-Hochberg false-discovery rate (FDR) correction (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995) rose to meet this demand, with 63,089 citations on Google Scholar at the time of writing, by reconceptualizing the error to be corrected for away from the family-wise error rate, i.e. the probability of a false-positive, to instead focus on the FDR, which is the proportion of significant results that are incorrectly categorised as significant. It offers a test in which the correction scales to the number of hypotheses - for small numbers it offers a correction similar to the Bonferroni correction, whilst for large numbers it becomes more lenient. The FDR correction can be thought of geometrically as a plot of ranked p-values from smallest to largest. A line is then drawn through the origin with slope $/m$ (m being the number of hypotheses tested), and all p-values beneath the line are retained as significant. Whether this is the most appropriate test for segregation distortion remains to be seen - I will test this hypothesis in chapter 4.

1.10 Phylogenetic inference

Like many fields in biology, increasing availability of sequencing and genotyping data, as well as increasing computational power in recent years, have made viable the field of molecular phylogenetics - the study of evolutionary history through DNA molecules themselves rather than phenotypic characteristics. In this thesis I will utilize phylogenetic methods to examine the evolutionary history of wheat, particularly the landraces: locally adapted cultivars from diverse regions around the globe. As with the ordering of molecular markers in a genetic map, the number of possible rooted topologies for a bifurcating labelled tree rises dramatically with the number of taxa, with $(2n - 3)!!$ possible trees in a tree with n taxa (Felsenstein 1978). It is therefore impossible to examine every topology in a reasonable amount of time, and so algorithms must be used. Two principle methods of phylogenetic inference are generally used, which are maximum likelihood and Bayesian methods.

To construct a phylogeny, it is first necessary to estimate the amount of evolution that has occurred between two sequences (e.g. DNA or amino acid sequences). A naïve assumption would be to simply calculate the number of differences in homologous positions between the two sequences, and indeed this is the foundation of simple phylogenetic methods such as neighbour-joining (Saitou and Nei 1987). However, this calculation ignores the possibility of multiple nucleotide substitutions, or multiple hits, at the same sequence site over time, resulting in a number of hidden mutations, and thus underestimates the total difference between the two sequences (Yang 2014). To account for this, models of sequence evolution are commonly used in maximum likelihood and Bayesian inference, which take into account empirically determined properties of DNA evolution - for example the fact that transversion mutations occur less frequently than transition mutations. Maximum likelihood methods calculate the likelihood for any particular tree, which is the probability of the data (D) given then tree (T) and the model of sequence evolution (M) or $P(D | T, M)$. The likelihood can then be calculated for many trees using an algorithm, and the tree that has the maximum likelihood is reported as the most likely phylogeny for those particular sequences and taxa.

1.11 QTL Analysis

Quantitative trait loci analysis, unlike qualitative traits, focusses on phenotypic traits that are continuously distributed in a population, and are underpinned by the combined action of many different genes, as well as the effects of environment. Many important agronomic and physiological traits in wheat are influenced by QTL, such as plant height, harvest index, thousand grain weight (Tshikunde et al. 2019), recombination frequency, and recombination distribution (Jordan et al. 2018); the latter two will be investigated in this thesis. With high-density molecular marker data and genetic mapping of the genome, it is often the case that some of the molecular markers will be linked to these underlying genes, visible in the data as a correlation between genotype and phenotype. In its simplest form, the identification of a QTL significantly associated with a trait of interest can be done through marker regression, which involves performing an ANOVA at each marker, using genotype categories as predictors and the trait of interest as a response. This method is improved upon by interval mapping, which takes into account missing genotype data at markers via maximum likelihood estimation. Furthermore, the standard interval mapping method is made more computationally efficient by the Haley-Knott regression, which provides a fast and accurate approximation of the results (Broman 2009).

1.12 Recombination

For many millennia, one of the fundamental processes in agriculture has been the crossing of varieties with different phenotypic traits to produce new, hybrid varieties with a mixture of these traits. The molecular process underlying this is meiotic recombination, where chromosomes are shuffled to create new, hybrid chromosomes containing a mixture of alleles from both parents. In wheat and many other important grasses, the distribution of recombination events is limited to the distal ends of the chromosomes, meaning genes surrounding the centromere and in the pericentromeric regions stay in linkage disequilibrium and are not mixed during recombination. One of the foci of

this thesis is to test whether environmental temperature, a factor known to influence recombination, alters the distribution and frequency of recombination events in wheat in a way that could be useful to breeders. Does an increased temperature act to induce recombination events in the pericentromeric regions, breaking up genes that were previously inaccessible to manipulation by breeders? This question is examined in detail in chapter 4.

1.13 Thesis aims

The unifying factor behind some of the seemingly disparate topics discussed here - segregation distortion, recombination, wheat evolution - is the methodology used to investigate them, namely the use of high-density genotyping arrays. The development of the 35k Wheat Breeder's array by my lab has catalyzed the production of a wealth of genotyping data for a variety of experimental wheat populations. The aim of this thesis then is to utilize this data, and indeed produce some of my own, to address topics that are important to the future of wheat research. Key hypotheses that will be investigated are:

- What is the rate of novel polymorphism accumulation in the evolution of wheat?
- How reliable is wheat genotyping data - are inferences made from genotyping data consistent between different genotyping platforms?
- Does environmental temperature affect wheat recombination, and if so, is this effect useful to breeders?
- What is the optimal test for detecting segregation distortion in high-density genotyping data?
- Does segregation distortion affect the genetic mapping process?

In addition to investigating these questions the thesis also aims to provide new tools that are useful to the wheat research community, including the development AutoCloner, a novel tool designed to aid full-gene cloning in wheat.

2 The Watkins landraces: their evolutionary history and congruity of genotyping data between platforms

2.1 Introduction

Archaeological evidence indicates that hexaploid wheat was first produced around 9000 years ago in the fertile crescent (Nesbitt 2001). This event involved the hybridization of a tetraploid progenitor containing what are now referred to as the A and B subgenomes of modern bread wheat with a wild diploid grass related to the modern-day *Aegilops tauschii*, now comprising the D genome of bread wheat (Marcussen et al. 2014).

Before the inception of modern commercial breeding practices, wheat as a species was composed of many locally adapted cultivars known as landraces (Jaradat 2012). Recent research has focussed on the Watkins collection, which consists of landrace cultivars from a broad range of countries, originally collected in the 1930s (Wingen et al. 2014). Modern elite bread wheat varieties suffer from a lack of genetic diversity, which makes them susceptible to evolving biotic stresses such as pathogenic fungi (e.g. karnal bunt, *Tilletia indica* (Reif et al. 2005)), as well as changing environmental conditions such as climate. Research has shown that the Watkins collection is more genetically diverse compared to modern elite varieties (Wingen et al. 2014; Winfield et al. 2017) and could therefore serve as a valuable source of novel alleles for wheat breeding programmes.

Much of the current focus within the wheat community is to improve elite wheats through incorporation of existing genetic variation. The Wheat Improvement Strategic Programme (WISP) (Moore 2015) aims to utilize three primary sources of variation: landraces, synthetic wheats and introgression from wild relatives of wheat. There has however been little investigation to date into the rate at which wheat accumulates novel polymorphisms. This is an interesting question both from a historical perspective as well as in future projections of wheat evolution – if the current pool of genetic diver-

sity, encompassing landraces, synthetics and wild relative introgressions is exhausted, what length of time would it take for new beneficial mutations to accumulate in global germplasm? To answer this question, I first intend to use previously generated exome-capture data of lines from the Watkins collection (Gardiner et al. 2018) to determine the time to most recent common ancestor (TMRCA) of these lines. This will be done using a molecular clock analysis with calibration stemming from the known divergence point of hexaploid bread wheat *Triticum aestivum* and the ancestor of the D genome of wheat, *Aegilops tauschii*, which was around 9000 bp. After obtaining the TMRCA estimate, it will then be possible to form an estimate of how many novel alleles have accumulated in each variety over that period of time.

The concept of a molecular clock was first proposed by Zuckerkandl and Pauling (Zuckerkandl and Pauling 1965), who suggested that constancy in the rate of amino acid substitution between haemoglobin proteins could provide a mechanism with which to estimate the time of divergence between species. Knowing the rate of mutation between two molecules and the number of differences between those molecules, it is possible to calculate the time at which they diverged from each other. In mathematical form, this is represented by the equation $T = rL/2$, where T represents time, r represents the rate of mutation and L represents the combined branch lengths of the phylogeny leading to the common ancestor of both molecules. This concept was bolstered by the suggestion of the neutral theory of evolution, which posits that the majority of differences in nucleotide sequences are in selectively neutral regions (Kimura 1968). Consequently, nucleotide substitution in these regions might operate at a constant clock-like rate, rather than having a rate that shifts over time due to selection.

In addition to the molecular clock analysis, I will also be using the genotyping data generated for the Watkins lines to investigate congruity between data sources (i.e. between array and exome capture). There has been a recent trend towards the use of exome capture data within the wheat research community (Olohan et al. 2018; Gardiner et al. 2019). Exome capture has the potential to provide information on much more sequence variation than array genotyping data at the cost of speed and throughput volume. It

would be of interest to compare these two datatypes to examine whether the increased resolution of exome capture data significantly effects downstream analyses – does it give increased insight that compensates for the increased cost? Whilst (Gardiner et al. 2018) made some comparisons of their dataset to the data of (Winfield et al. 2017), namely noting that European accessions formed separate clusters to Asian and Middle Eastern accessions, they did not use the same method to cluster their SNP data, opting for a hierarchical clustering approach rather than a STRUCTURE-based analysis. STRUCTURE (Porras-Hurtado et al. 2013) is a population genetics software package which aims to infer population structure using a Bayesian clustering approach in conjunction with Markov Chain Monte Carlo estimation. This differs to hierarchical clustering in that the posterior probabilities for a range of K values, or the number of clusters, must be evaluated. In contrast, the hierarchical clustering approach initially assigns each individual to its own cluster, then proceeds to join closely related clusters together. The papers also differ in that only one of them performs a phylogenetic analysis (Gardiner et al. 2018), only one of them performs a principle components analysis (Winfield et al. 2017), and the sample sizes of Watkins lines differ in each. Here I perform a more direct and detailed comparison of array and exome capture datasets in both population genetics and phylogenetic contexts, ensuring the use of the same methodology in each case.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Phylogenetic analysis

Alignment of paired-end sequence reads and identification of SNPs in exome-capture data

Exome capture data for 104 Watkins lines was obtained from the Grassroots Genomics repository (Gardiner et al. 2018). Non-bisulfite-treated paired-end reads were mapped to the IWGSC v1.0 genome assembly of wheat using BWA MEM. Processing of mapping results was performed with Samtools. Reads were filtered so that only mapped reads

and unique reads, defined as reads with a MAPQ value higher than 10, were used. Duplicate reads were removed from the alignment. VCF files were generated using samtools mpileup to calculate genotype likelihoods in conjunction with bcftools call for SNP calling. Only homozygous SNPs with a VCF QUAL value higher than 20 and at least 20x coverage across all varieties were used.

Obtaining homologous sequences from *A. tauschii*

After VCF files were generated for each Watkins line, it was then necessary to determine the genotype values of *Aegilops tauschii* at orthologous positions to the Watkins SNPs. Mummer was initially used in an attempt to align the entirety of the *A. tauschii* genome sequence to the D genome of the IWGSC assembly, but this approach was found to be prohibitively slow due to the size of the sequences involved. In addition, I decided to forgo the use of other commonly used tools for determining orthology such as OrthoMCL, as these are typically designed for the identification of families of orthologues between many species, whereas here we were only dealing with two. My custom pipeline began with the extraction of D-genome subsequences of the IWGSC assembly based on positions that had 20x coverage across all Watkins varieties. A BLAST search of these subsequences was then performed against the *A. tauschii* genome assembly. BLAST does not return full length alignments of query against target, but instead returns a series of local alignments called high-scoring segment pairs (HSPs). The results of the initial BLAST search was therefore used to identify regions in which the homologues was most likely located. HSPs less than 7000 bp apart (a distance determined empirically) were grouped together and their average bitscore was calculated. The group of HSPs with the highest bitscore was determined to be the homologous sequence, and both the lowest and highest base positions of HSPs within the group were used as a coordinate range for sequence extraction from the genome.

Supermatrix construction and inference of phylogeny using BEAST

These extracted *A. tauschii* sequences were then aligned to their corresponding IWGSC

query sequences using MUSCLE. The genotypes and positions of SNPs were determined using R. Unknown genotypes (represented as “N”) and insertions (represented as “-“) were removed from both Chinese Spring and *A. tauschii* sequences. Alignments with more than a 40% difference were excluded as these were likely to be erroneous alignments between sequences that were not truly homologous. A supermatrix containing all of the multiple sequence alignments was then generated containing all 104 Watkins varieties as well as Chinese Spring and *A. tauschii*, which would be used as input to phylogenetic inference software. It is well known that phylogenies inferred using only SNPs without correction for acquisition bias can lead to overestimation of the divergence between taxa (Leaché et al. 2015); we therefore included both SNPs and invariant loci in the supermatrix. Insertions and deletions (indels) were not included in any of the sequences as the differences in source between sequences, namely the full genomic sequence for *A. tauschii* and exome capture data for Watkins varieties may have led to a bias in the length of indels towards *A. tauschii*. BEAST was used to generate the phylogeny and estimate divergence times of each node. A strict clock model was used with a calibration of 9,000 years for the divergence between *A. tauschii* and the rest of the varieties was used. More specifically, the prior used for this calibration was a normal distribution with a mean of 0.009 (measured in millions of years) and a standard deviation of 0.0001. This date was based on the occurrence of hexaploid free-threshing wheats at Cafer Höyük that have been radiocarbon-dated to ~8700 years ago (Nesbitt 2001).

Bootstrap analysis to assess reliability of inferred subclades

Whilst the phylogeny generated with BEAST allowed the dating of particular nodes, it was also important to assess the reliability of the tree topology, as clades with low levels of support would affect the inference of dates of divergence. To do this, a maximum likelihood phylogeny was also generated with IQTREE using a HKY+F model of sequence evolution and 1000 bootstrap trees. Nodes within this tree that had low bootstrap support values could then be disregarded from the dating analysis, whilst nodes with higher bootstrap support would indicate that dating was more reliable.

Functional characterization of SNPs

Functional characterization of SNPs, such as whether they would result in a change in amino acid sequence (missense mutations) or if they were silent with regards to the amino acid sequence, was performed with Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor (McLaren et al. 2016). The predicted effect of missense mutations on protein function was evaluated using SIFT (Vaser et al. 2016). This assigns each mutation a score from 0 to 1, based on how conserved the position is in homologous sequences, with lower scores representing mutations that are more likely to be deleterious to the organism (i.e. positions that are highly conserved in most homologues).

Estimation of the rate of novel polymorphisms in wheat

To estimate the rate at which novel polymorphisms occur during the evolution of wheat, it was first necessary to calculate the TMRCA for each Watkins variety and Chinese Spring. This was done by calculating the cophenetic distance between each variety and CS using the `cophenetic.phylo()` function of the APE package in R. This distance was then divided by two to correct for the inclusion of branches leading to both the Watkins variety and Chinese Spring in the distance value. This calculation returns the period of time over which the observed mutations, whether missense, synonymous or intronic, were estimated to have occurred. The rate of polymorphism can then be calculated by dividing the number of observed polymorphisms by the time over which they occurred, then dividing this by the breadth of sequence with the minimum coverage threshold (20x) in the exome capture dataset to give the number of polymorphisms per year per bp that occurred in a particular Watkins variety.

2.2.2 Comparison of Exome and Array data

PCO Analysis

Array-based genotyping data of the Watkins lines from the Axiom 35k wheat breeder's array (Allen et al. 2016) was obtained from CerealsDB (Wilkinson et al. 2016). To

compare the effect of exome vs array data on population genetic analysis, two methods were used, PCO and STRUCTURE, as in (Winfield et al. 2017). For the PCO analysis, pairwise genetic dissimilarity was calculated between all combinations of Watkins varieties by dividing the total number of genotypes in common between two varieties by the total number of genotypes. Genotypes with missing values were not included in this calculation. This value was then subtracted from 1 to give the dissimilarity score for each pair. Principle coordinates were calculated using the cmdscale function in R.

STRUCTURE analysis

Further to this, a STRUCTURE analysis was also performed, giving information on the number of populations (K). STRUCTURE was automated using StrAuto (Chhatre and Emerson 2017), which parallelizes STRUCTURE, running each iteration of K on a separate core for much faster computation. In addition, StrAuto runs StructureHarvester (Earl and vonHoldt 2012) as part of the pipeline, which calculates the uppermost bound for K using the Evanno method (Evanno et al. 2005). STRUCTURE was run with each individual represented as a diploid to incorporate heterozygosity in the analysis. Values of K ranging from 1 to 10 were tested, with 5 repeats for each value. The ancestry model used was admixture, which assumes that each individual inherits fractions of its genetic composition from a combination of the K populations. A burnin length of 10000 was used for the Markov chain, and the Markov chain was then run for 10000 iterations. CLUMPAK (Kopelman et al. 2015) was used to align STRUCTURE runs across multiple values of K, compensating for label-switching.

2.3 Results

2.3.1 Phylogenetic analysis

Coverage of exome-capture data

15.30 Mbp of the Chinese Spring sequence had at least 20x coverage in all Watkins samples. This equates to 1.28 % of the genomic sequences of the high-confidence gene

set included in the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 assembly, which is 1196.52 Mb in size. To assess the quality of the custom pipeline used to determine homologues between Chinese Spring and *Aegilops tauschii*, the number of mismatching sites between all sequences was calculated — 4% — indicating that the alignments were of high quality. The total number of SNPs found between Chinese Spring and at least one of the other varieties, including *Aegilops tauschii*, was 181043. The mean (\pm s.d.) number of SNPs between lines in the Watkins collection and Chinese Spring was 5962.06 ± 887.32 , whereas the number of SNPs between *A. tauschii* and Chinese Spring was 131042.

Estimation of the TMRCA of Watkins lines

The time to the most recent common ancestor (TMRCA) for the clade containing the wheat varieties, including both Watkins lines and Chinese Spring, was estimated to be 859 years (figure 2.1). The smallest TMRCA for any node in the tree was 237 years (varieties USSR_1990753 and Syria_1190045). This is congruent with our expectation that the dates of divergence should be older than 1930, which is when the Watkins lines were originally collected (Wingen et al. 2014). In addition to the general rate of evolution between Watkins varieties, we were also interested in examining the mutations that could potentially effect protein function, and therefore influence phenotype. We will limit this to the analysis of the D genome, as this is the genome for which we have TMRCA estimates, allowing the association of total number of mutations to time. Of the 16867 genes in the D genome that were at least partially covered by the exome capture data, 6942 contained missense mutations in at least one of the Watkins varieties.

The functional analysis of SNPs between all Watkins varieties and Chinese Spring revealed a total of 9385 unique missense mutations. The mean (\pm s.d.) number of missense mutations per variety was 1747.89 ± 240.7 . The total number of missense mutations shared by all Watkins varieties was 32. In a pairwise comparison of shared missense mutations between all Watkins varieties, the mean \pm s.d. number shared was 640.75 ± 199.53 . The maximum number of shared missense mutations between any two Watkins varieties was 1485, between Watkins 1190044 from Morocco and 1190045 from

Syria. Interestingly, these varieties were located in distinct clades on the maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree, indicating that many of these shared polymorphisms were the result of convergent evolution. This is reinforced by the fact that the sister sample to the Watkins 1190045 sample was Watkins 1190753 from the USSR, with a 100% bootstrap support value in the maximum likelihood tree, and the number of shared missense mutations between Watkins 1190753 and 1190044 was only 434. The similar climate of the countries where these samples originated from (Morocco and Syria) indicates that some of the mutations could be involved in heat or drought tolerance. The minimum number of shared missense mutations between any two Watkins varieties was 328, from Watkins 1190040 from France and Watkins 1190700 from China. These two varieties were located in distant clades on the phylogeny.




Figure 2.1 Phylogeny of Watkins lines showing time until most recent common ancestor for each node. The phylogeny was dated using a strict molecular clock, which was calibrated using the estimated divergence of *Aegilops tauschii* and hexaploid wheat of 9000 years before present. Node labels indicate the location from which each line was collected, as well as the Watkins number of each line in the format Location_Number. Also included is Chinese Spring from the IWGSC reference sequence (labelled IWGSC_CS). Scale bar indicates number of base substitutions per site.

Functional SNP analysis

The majority of the missense mutations were categorised as deleterious by SIFT with mean \pm s.d. SIFT score for all unique missense mutations among all varieties of 0.35 ± 0.36 . This trend was consistent when examining missense mutations within varieties, with the minimum mean SIFT score among all the mutations within a single variety of 0.41 in 1190460, and the maximum of 0.46 in 1190224.

Estimation of rate of novel polymorphism accumulation in wheat

The rate of novel polymorphisms that could affect protein function was estimated by dividing the number of missense mutations between each Watkins variety and Chinese Spring by the respective TMRCA values for each (see methods). The mean \pm s.d. value of this calculation among all Watkins varieties was 2.19 ± 0.3 . This can then be divided by the breadth of the exome that was successfully sequenced in the exome-capture data (3.78 Mb), giving an estimated rate of 0.58 novel missense mutations per Mb per year. Alternatively, if the TMRCA value from the molecular clock analysis is an underestimation of the true value, we can still provide an estimate of the range of values that the number of missense mutations might take by using a range of values for the TMRCA of the Watkins lines based on what is known about the global dissemination of wheat. The minimum value for the TMRCA can be assumed to be 8000 years, since the inception of hexaploid wheat occurred roughly 9000 years ago. Performing the calculation with this new TMRCA estimate gives $1747.89 / 8000 / 3.78 = 0.06$ novel missense mutations per Mb per year. On the other hand, using a younger estimate for

the TMRCA (nonetheless older than the molecular clock estimate) of 4000 years gives a value of $1747.89 / 4000 / 3.78 = 0.12$ missense mutations per Mb per year.

2.3.2 Comparison of Exome and Array data

PCO analysis

The PCO plots revealed remarkable similarity between the exome capture and array datasets (figure 2.2). Both plots show the same broad pattern of clusters, with the Asian and Middle Eastern varieties separated from the European, Australian, USSR-originating varieties along the x-axis, and the y-axis separating western European and North African lines away from Eastern European lines. More specific patterns are also preserved between datasets, such as the positioning of varieties 300 and 299, which in both plots occupy their own space in between Middle Eastern and Western European clusters around 0 on the x-axis, as well as varieties 440 and 749, which lie in between Asian and Eastern European clusters in both plots. There are some varieties which differ in positioning between plots, such the variety 753 from the USSR, which in the array data clusters together with Eastern European lines at the top of the y-axis, whereas in the exome data clusters with Asian lines along the far right of the x-axis, as well as variety 326 from Australia, which in the array data clusters with Western European lines at the bottom of the y-axis, whilst in exome capture data clusters with Eastern European lines at the top of the y-axis.

a**Region**

- Asia
- Australia
- Europe (East)
- Europe (West)
- Middle East
- North Africa
- USSR




Figure 2.2 PCO plots comparing array (a) to exome capture data (b). Individual points are labelled with their Watkins variety numeric identifiers. The y-axis on the right plot has been inverted for visual ease of comparison. Points are coloured and shaped by region. Represented are varieties from Asia, Australia, Europe (east), Europe (west), Middle East, North Africa and the USSR. The plots are remarkably similar considering the use of datasets from different labs using different methods to generate them. For example, in each plot, varieties 300 and 299 show the same configuration in relation to the remainder of the varieties, emerging around 0 on the x-axis.

Pairwise differences by variety in genotype values between data types

Pairwise differences in genotype values between varieties were highly correlated between

data types, as shown in figure 2.3 (Pearson test, $t = 123.94$, $df = 4369$, $p < 2-15$). A linear regression of exome pairwise differences as a function of array pairwise differences revealed that 77.86 % of variation in the exome data was explained by the array data ($R^2 = 0.7786$).




Figure 2.3 Scatterplot showing pairwise distances between varieties between exome capture data and array data. Also shown is a regression line.

Comparison of probe distribution

Probe distribution was also highly similar between the array and exome capture data (figure 2.4). Both datasets contained peaks in numbers of probes at the start of chromosome 1A. Although distribution was similar, exome capture data contained many more probes than the array data (168440 and 35144 respectively).




Figure 2.4 Comparison of probe distribution for chromosome 1A for exome capture data (top) and array data (bottom).

STRUCTURE analysis

The STRUCTURE analysis also revealed a high degree of similarity between exome capture and array datasets, as shown in figure 2.5. In both datasets, around half of the Asian varieties have high degree of membership to the third cluster (K3), as do many of the Middle Eastern, North African and USSR-originating lines. The other two clusters, K1 and K2, largely correspond to Eastern and Western European lines respectively, but

also contain varieties from the other regions. Differences between exome capture and array datasets include Watkins line 753, which in array data has full membership to K1, whereas in exome capture data has full membership to K3, as well as the Australian Watkins line 326, which in array data mostly corresponds to K2, whereas in exome capture data mostly corresponds to K1. These two lines are the same lines that were highlighted as being different between datasets in the PCO analysis, which indicates that the STRUCTURE and PCO methods are largely congruent in their results. The Evanno method (Evanno et al. 2005) for determining the uppermost bound for K in the data revealed that for the array data, the upper bound was 7, whilst for the exome data, the upper bound was 5.




Figure 2.5 Structure plots for $K = 3$, showing array (top panel) and exome capture (bottom panel) data. WE = Western Europe, EE = Eastern Europe, U = USSR, ME = Middle East, AS = Asia, NA = North Africa, A = Australia.

2.4 Discussion

The analyses in this chapter provide novel results covering the evolutionary history of the Watkins landraces in terms of their divergence times. In addition, a direct comparison of two distinct genotyping platforms, high-density arrays and exome-capture

systems, is performed using genotyping data from Watkins lines in a population genetics context. With regards to the evolutionary analysis, the initial stage was to infer a maximum likelihood tree to examine the reliability of the tree topology. In this tree, many of the subclades within the Watkins clade had low bootstrap support values, indicating that the fine-scale topology of the tree is unreliable. This mirrors the findings of Gardiner et al. (2018). The implication of this is that the TMRCA values for these subclades in the maximum-clade consensus tree produced using BEAST are not very useful, as they do not relate to the true topology of the phylogeny. Nonetheless, we can still use the TMRCA value for the Watkins clade as a whole as a useful benchmark of the origin of these varieties.

The results of the TMRCA analysis itself are perplexing, in that they don't conform to our expectations given what is currently known about the evolutionary history of wheat varieties. The tree inferred by BEAST along with the calibration of the molecular clock based on the suspected divergence point of wheat and *Aegilops tauschii* (~ 9000 ybp), produced an estimation of 860 ybp for the date of the most recent common ancestor of all Watkins lines. Taking this at face value, the late divergence of Watkins lines compared to the divergence of hexaploid bread wheat from the D genome ancestor (860 ybp compared to 9000 ybp) indicates that wheat underwent significant genetic changes in those preceding 8200 years. This seems unlikely and is probably an underestimation of the true TMRCA of the Watkins clade, as it is widely believed that the spread of germplasm leading to global landraces occurred from 8000 to 2300 years ago (Balfourier et al. 2019). Indeed archaeological evidence in the form of radiocarbon dated wheat grains has shown that wheat was cultivated in China from at least 4000-5000 years ago (Bonjean and Angus 2001). Whether these were the ancestors of the lines that went on to become Chinese Watkins lines is unknown, but it seems unlikely that these lines, adapted to local environmental conditions, would have been replaced by landraces from elsewhere in the last 500 years, as suggested by the molecular clock analysis.

What could have caused this dramatic difference between the results and our expectations? The inference of the TMRCA may be influenced by different rates of evolution

between *Aegilops tauschii* and *Triticum aestivum*. Since *T. aestivum* is a hexaploid organism, we could hypothesize that the individual sub genomes evolve faster than the diploid genome of *A. tauschii*, as the increased redundancy provided by homeologous copies of each gene reduces the impact of detrimental mutations in individual genes, causing a reduction in stabilizing selection. This is sometimes referred to as mutational robustness (Van de Peer et al. 2009). The calibration of the molecular clock was performed by examining the number of differences in genotype between Chinese Spring and *A. tauschii*, and then equating these differences to a time of ~ 9000 years, which is thought to be when hexaploid bread wheat originated.

Following the hypothesis that these two organisms evolve at a different rate, the differences in genotype then are the result of a mixture of two evolutionary rates, the first, slower rate, which we will name r_1 , operating along the branch of the phylogeny leading to *A. tauschii*, and the second, faster rate, r_2 , operating along the branch leading to *T. aestivum*. As Watkins lines are wheat varieties, they should evolve under the faster rate given the mutational robustness hypothesis, and so any differences in genotype between Watkins lines are the result of r_2 operating along each branch leading to each respective variety. This would lead to an inflation in the difference in genotypes between any pair of Watkins lines when compared to *A. tauschii* for the same time period, and should therefore artificially increase the TMRCA values between pairs of Watkins lines, as the calibration of the phylogeny was based on a combination of rates r_1 and r_2 , rather than r_2 and r_2 (an equal rate of evolution in both species). Whilst the mutational robustness hypothesis is logical, it actually predicts that the inferred TMRCA should be older than the true date, which is the opposite of what is observed here, suggesting that *A. tauschii* actually evolved at a faster rate than the landraces of wheat. Why this is the case is difficult to say, but it is possible that this is due to the constraints on wheat landrace genetic diversity imposed by farming practices, whereas *A. tauschii* is a wild plant free from the constraints of artificial selection. This may have allowed it to accumulate more mutations than wheat landraces, outweighing the mutational robustness that wheat varieties gained as a polyploids.

In addition to the molecular clock analysis, this chapter focuses on exome capture and array based genotyping data - how do they compare to each other in a population genetics context? Does one provide additional information that is missing from the other? The large hexaploid genome of wheat presents many opportunities for off-target hybridization events in arrays and in exome capture, as both use DNA probes to target specific regions of the genome. Does this affect e.g. array-based data more than exome-capture data? Another factor to consider is the lack of a complete, chromosome-level genome assembly at the time of producing one of the more popular wheat arrays, the 35k Wheat Breeder's array (Allen et al. 2016), and so it is likely that many of the probe sequences are actually chimeric, containing sequences from a mixture of wheat's three sub genomes. This means that it is common for probe sequences to have lowest e-value BLAST hits (or highest scoring, best hits) to sequences in a sub-genome that is not the target of probe hybridization itself in the molecular reaction.

The population genetics analysis as a whole, including both STRUCTURE and PCO analysis, show that these factors are not overly impactful on array-based data, as the array and exome capture results were highly similar, both in their broad scale patterns, e.g. the separation of varieties by region along the axes of the PCO plots (figure 2.2), as well as in the minute details, such as the placement of Watkins varieties 300 and 299 (figure 2.2). It is clear then that both array and exome capture data contain much of the same information in a population genetics context even though the array data contained fewer SNPs. This is because a large number of SNPs in the exome capture data are likely to exhibit a high degree of linkage disequilibrium, whereas the SNPs on the array were curated to contain a high degree of genetic information across varieties by selecting those with the highest polymorphic information score.

3 Detecting a shift in recombination distribution using high-density genotyping data

The results described here regarding the effects of temperature on recombination distribution and frequency have been published in the following manuscript:

Coulton, A., Burridge, A., Edwards, K. 2020. Examining the effects of temperature on recombination in wheat. *Frontiers in Plant Science*

Genotyping was performed by Burridge, A. Temperature treatments were performed by Edwards, K.

3.1 Introduction

Meiosis is a specialised type of cell division that leads to the production of haploid gametes. A key feature of meiosis is the process of recombination, where parental genetic material is shuffled together to create chimeric chromosomes, somewhat akin to shuffling a pack of playing cards. Recombination is crucial to the evolution of species, facilitating the spread of beneficial combinations of alleles whilst allowing unfavourable ones to be reduced in the population (Wilkins and Holliday 2009). In addition to its role in the formation of natural populations, meiosis is also exploited in agriculture, where breeders cross different varieties of crops or animals together to produce offspring with a mixture of both parental phenotypic traits (Acquaah 2007). This principle has previously been exploited to produce dramatic yield increases in staple food crops, such as during the green revolution, in which short-stemmed Japanese wheat varieties were crossed with high-yielding American varieties (Russell 1985). This resulted in plants that were less susceptible to lodging (Rajikumara 2008).

The process of recombination occurs during prophase I of meiosis, preceded by DNA replication in S phase. In addition to the shuffling of parental DNA, recombination is also essential to the mechanics of meiosis, both serving to bind homologs together into bivalents and also ensure their correct segregation (Zickler and Kleckner 2015).

Bound homologs impart tension on the meiotic spindle during their alignment along the equator of the cell, triggering chromosome disjunction at anaphase (Zickler and Kleckner 2015). Initially, each pair of sister chromatids is linked together by a linear protein axis from which DNA extends in loops, known as the leptotene subphase of prophase I. During this phase, telomeres cluster together at the nuclear envelope to form a structure known as the bouquet. The respective axes of each pair of homologs will go on to become the lateral elements of the synaptonemal complex (SC), a tripartite, ladder-like structure, visible cytologically, that enables the formation of bivalents through synapsis of homologous chromosomes, formed during the zygotene subphase. The lateral elements are joined together along their lengths by transverse filaments. Once the synaptonemal complex is in place, non-sister chromatids are within close proximity to each other within the cell, allowing the process of recombination to begin. Recombination is initiated through the formation of double-stranded breaks (DSBs) in the DNA via the topoisomerase-like protein SPO11 (Neale and Keeney 2006). Individual DNA strands are then resected, generating overhanging 3' tails. Strand invasion of the non-sister chromatid can then occur, forming a Holliday junction, or a formation in which non-sister chromatid DNA strands are physically crossed over each other. At this stage, various recombination-intermediate molecules are possible, each associated with a different outcome. Double Holliday junctions, formations in which the non-sister chromatid DNA strands cross each other twice, result in crossover (CO) events, visible cytologically as chiasmata, producing hybrid DNA molecules composed of long stretches of DNA from each progenitor molecule / parent (illustrated in figure 3.1). In contrast, when only a single Holliday junction is formed, no crossover occurs, the recombination-intermediate instead being resolved with only a short stretch of DNA exchanged between the non-sister chromatids, known as a gene conversion. The ratio of DSBs to CO events is high, with only a minority of DSBs resulting a CO. In addition, when a CO is formed it prevents further COs occurring in its vicinity, a phenomenon known as crossover interference. Also possible is a non-crossover (NCO) event, where neither a gene conversion or a crossover event results from the DSB (Filippo et al. 2008).




Figure 3.1 Diagram illustrating the process of recombination between non-sister chromatids during meiosis, adapted from (Marston and Amon 2004). DNA synthesis is denoted by the colour red, whilst 3 prime ends are denoted by half-arrows. (a) Spo-11 creates a double stranded break in the DNA, which is then resected at the 5 prime ends to reveal short overhanging 3 prime tails. (b) One of the overhanging tails begins the process of strand invasion, forming an unstable interaction that can take one of two paths, the first leading to a crossover (CO) event (right) and the second leading to a noncrossover (NCO) event. (c) In the path leading the non-CO event, DNA synthesis begins on the invading strand but the strand is ejected from the non-sister chromatid. Following this, DNA synthesis and ligation of the invading strand to its original location occurs. (d) In contrast to this, in the CO pathway, the interaction between non-sister chromatids is stabilised to form a single-end invasion (SEI) intermediate, which contains a single Holliday junction. DNA synthesis then occurs from the 3 prime tails, after which they are annealed to their original location, but with the strands in the formation of a double Holliday junction (DHJ). The DHJ proceeds to be nicked at the positions indicated by arrows and recombinant DNA molecules are formed.

Whilst recombination has previously been harnessed to great effect by breeders, its utility is limited in important staple food crops such as wheat (Saintenac et al. 2009; Choulet et al. 2014), maize (He et al. 2017) and barley (Higgins et al. 2014). The distribution of recombination events in these crops is strongly skewed towards the distal ends of the chromosomes, with little to no crossovers occurring in the region surrounding the centromere, known as the pericentromeric region (Zelkowski et al. 2019). This contrasts with *Arabidopsis*, in which the distribution of COs is much more uniform, with only the centromeric region showing highly reduced numbers of COs (Giraut et al. 2011; Choi et al. 2013). With the advent of a chromosome-level genome assembly for wheat Consortium (IWGSC) et al. (2018), it is now known that genes are distributed somewhat evenly along the chromosomes, with many potentially important genes being found in the pericentromeric region. The limitation in recombination distribution therefore creates a problem for breeders, as it is not possible to break up large central linkage blocks. A central area of current research in crops is to examine the cause of this skewed recombination distribution and, following this, to try and implement measures to induce recombination in the pericentromeric region (Higgins et al. 2012a; Phillips et al. 2015).

Much of the salient research on recombination distribution in cereals has been performed in barley (Higgins et al. 2012b; Phillips et al. 2015), *Hordeum vulgare*, a diploid member of the pooidae subfamily of poaceae, the grasses. The two primary avenues with which to investigate this are cytologically, making extensive use of fluorescent staining in various forms (Higgins et al. 2012b), as well as genetically via SNP genotyping of mapping populations (Phillips et al. 2015). Cytological analysis includes immunofluorescence and fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), the former making use of fluorescent antibodies targeted at homologues of proteins that have been shown to be part of the meiotic apparatus in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, and the latter utilizing labelled DNA probes to target specific regions of the DNA. Notable among these antibodies are *Arabidopsis asynaptic 1* (ASY1), associated with the linear axis formation, and therefore the early stages of synaptonemal complex formation during the G2 phase of meiosis (Higgins et al. 2012b), as well as the *Arabidopsis* SC transverse filament

protein zipper 1 (ZYP1), which allows the monitoring of synapsis. The research in (Higgins et al. 2012b) is of special interest as it presents data that forms the beginning of one of the only mechanistic explanations of the distal distribution of recombination events in crops. By using a telomere FISH-labelled probe in conjunction with ASY1 and ZYP1 antibodies it was found that early synaptonemal complex formation, and hence chromosome synapsis, exhibits a spatiotemporal bias towards the distal ends of the chromosomes. As meiosis proceeds, ASY1 and ZYP1 fluorescent signals extend from the subtelomeric regions to the interstitial regions of the chromosomes. In addition, an antibody for the MutL homolog MLH1, which is involved in the resolution of double Holliday junctions and therefore marks CO sites, was used in conjunction with ZYP1. The authors suggest that at a temperature of 22°C, MLH1 primarily occurred in the distal / subtelomeric regions of the chromosomes. They did not perform a stain that utilized the telomeric FISH-labelled probe in conjunction with the MLH1 antibody, so this distal localization of MLH1 must be inferred from previous experiments that show colocalization of ZYP1 and the telomere probe in early prophase.

Overall, these experiments suggest that the distal distribution of recombination events is primarily due to the spatiotemporal bias of chromosome pairing and synapsis to the distal regions of the chromosomes, facilitating preferential crossover formation in these regions. The authors further hypothesized that crossover interference (Broman et al. 2002), the phenomenon in which one CO prevents further COs from forming in its vicinity, could be one of the factors that prevents further CO formation in the pericentromeric region (Higgins et al. 2012a). This is not a recent hypothesis, being suggested as early as 1993 in a study utilizing C band polymorphism between varieties to assess recombination distribution (Lukaszewski and Curtis 1993). The immediate question that follows from this is: why does chromosome pairing and synapsis occur first in the distal regions of the chromosomes? Interestingly, in a study of rye chromosome 1R (Lukaszewski 2008), which usually has a distal distribution of recombination events, an inversion of the long arm resulted in chiasmata proximal to the centromere, indicating that chiasma formation is not dependent on physical position along the chromosome, but rather some property of individual chromosome segments themselves, whether that

be genetic, epigenetic, or due to the chromatin composition of segments.

Factors shown to be influence meiotic recombination range from internal, genetic factors, such as the FANCM gene, which limits meiotic crossovers in *Arabidopsis* Crismani et al. (2012), to external stresses such as soil magnesium content (Rey et al. 2018) and environmental temperature (Jain 1957; Loidl 1989). Temperature has recently been examined more thoroughly in barley with particular focus on its effect on the distribution of COs (Higgins et al. 2012a; Phillips et al. 2015). Cytological analysis of meiocytes revealed a small but significant reduction in mean chiasma frequency between meiocytes grown at 22°C and 30°C, as well as significantly more interstitial chiasmata for chromosome 5H when grown at 30°C compared to those grown at 22°C (Higgins et al. 2012a). Further research attempted to expand on these results by utilizing SNP genotyping of a mapping population in addition to cytological analysis (Phillips et al. 2015). This method has the potential to provide a more precise evaluation of how large the shift in distribution of recombination events in response to temperature is, expanding on the categorical assignment of recombination events to either “distal” or “interstitial” positions in analysis of cytological data, as well as revealing the genes that are effected by a shift. Unfortunately, the authors did not perform a statistical analysis of the distribution of events in their SNP data, which was not made available for public use. In addition, they did not identify individual chromosomes in their cytological data (Phillips et al. 2015). It is therefore difficult to compare the two studies for consistency in results; these limitations of the literature provide the incentive to explore this topic further.

Existing research in wheat suggests that high temperatures prevent normal meiotic progression and therefore reduces the fertility of plants, with nullisomic lines identifying 5D as one of the chromosomes effecting temperature sensitivity (Draeger and Moore 2017). However, there has yet to be a detailed analysis of the effects of temperature on recombination distribution in wheat. Here we have utilized a high-density SNP genotyping array (Allen et al. 2016) and four F2 mapping populations of an Apogee X Paragon (A x P) cross, each subjected to a different temperature during meiosis (10°C,

14°C, 26°C and 28°C respectively), to examine whether wheat behaves in the same way as barley, and to assess the utility of any shift in distribution to breeders.

Recombination is known to be influenced by external factors such as temperature in many organisms, but are there internal factors also involved, such as particular loci in the genome? It is possible to extract the recombination frequency of each genotyped individual in a mapping population by examining changes in the phase of parental genotypes between clustered, ordered markers in a genetic map. This can then be used as a phenotype in QTL analysis, allowing potential loci involved in the determination of recombination frequency to be identified. Several recombination frequency QTL have already been identified in this manner (Wingen et al. 2017; Gardiner et al. 2019). In addition, it is also possible to extract the distribution of recombination events as a phenotype. So far this has been attempted by dividing the chromosomes into sections comprising the distal (1/3 of chromosome arm away from the centromere) and pericentromeric (2/3 of chromosome arms nearer the centromere) regions and counting the number of events in each (Jordan et al. 2018). In this study, we analyse several mapping populations, including Chinese Spring X Paragon, Apogee X Paragon, Avalon X Cadenza, Opata X Synthetic, Rialto X Savannah, Paragon X Watkins 49 and Paragon X Watkins 94 to try and identify QTL involved in both frequency and distribution of recombination events. For our recombination distribution phenotype we use a different method to the one already mentioned, in which we assign markers positions in the physical wheat genome assembly (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). We then take the average distance of recombination events from the centre (50% mark) of the chromosome and use this as the phenotype for each individual for each chromosome. We hope that this will allow a more precise estimation of the genetic effects of parental alleles on recombination distribution.

Although putative QTL have been identified effecting recombination frequency in wheat, their phenotypic effect is often limited, with a QTL in a Chinese Spring X Paragon population only explaining 6.037% of phenotypic variance (Gardiner et al. 2019). This presents the question: how much genetic variation is there between meiotic genes in

wheat, and is there potential to modify recombination distribution and frequency simply through coordinated breeding of particular varieties? Here we perform a phylogenetic analysis of four wheat varieties and a close relative of wheat, barley, including two gene sets from the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 genome assembly. The first contains homologues of genes that have been functionally characterised to be involved in recombination in *Arabidopsis* (Alabdullah et al. 2019), whilst the second contains a random selection of 5000 genes. We construct a phylogeny based on a superalignment of these genes to test the hypothesis that meiotic genes are generally more conserved than a random selection of genes due to stabilising selection.

3.2 Materials and Methods

3.2.1 Plant cultivation and temperature treatments

F1 seed from a Paragon X Apogee cross were obtained from Dr Peter Jack at RAGT Seeds Ltd. These were randomly separated into four populations and grown initially in uniform conditions. Plants were grown in pots filled with peat-based soil and kept in a glasshouse at 15-25 °C with 16-h light, 8-h dark. Plants were deemed to be undergoing meiosis when the base of the stem showed visible swelling due to the growth of the developing head within the flag leaf sheath, often referred to as the ‘booting’ stage of development (Barber et al. 2015). At this point, they were transferred to temperature-controlled cabinets at 10 °C, 14 °C, 26 °C & 28 °C respectively for around 3 weeks. They were then transferred back to the glasshouse to avoid effects of temperature on pollen tube development. Seeds were then harvested from each of the populations. Leaf-tissue was harvested from F2 plants 12-14 days post-sowing, when the plants were at an early seedling stage. The sizes of the F2 populations were 80, 75, 70 and 78 individuals for temperature treatments of 10°C, 14°C, 26°C and 28°C respectively. DNA was extracted following the protocol in (Pallotta et al. 2003) with minor modifications.

3.2.2 Sample genotyping

DNA concentration was assessed using a Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer and was normalized to 23 ng / μ l ready for analysis with the Axiom® Wheat Breeder’s array (Allen et al. 2016). Sample preparation for array genotyping was performed with the Beckman Coulter Biomek FX. Samples were then genotyped using the Axiom® 35K Wheat Breeders array in conjunction with the GeneTitan® using standard Affymetrix protocols (Axiom® 2.0 Assay for 384 samples P/N 703154 Rev. 2).

Axiom Analysis Suite (version 3.1.51.0) was used to assign genotype calls. Of the 6536 polymorphic SNPs between the two parental varieties present on the array, 2504 codominant SNPs of highest quality were selected through visual inspection of each cluster plot. Only markers with a clear delineation between genotyping clusters representing homozygotes for the Apogee allele, heterozygotes and homozygotes for the Paragon allele were used, and borderline markers were recoded as no-calls as a precaution against genotyping errors that could affect the recombination analysis. A custom R script was used to assign genotype calls to parental varieties, such that an “A” genotype represented an allele from Apogee, whilst a “B” genotype represented an allele from Paragon (supplementary file 1).

3.2.3 Genetic map construction

Data from all four populations was amalgamated and used for initial genetic map construction using MultiPoint Complete (version 4.1). Markers exhibiting large segregation distortion ($2 > 20$), low informativity ($LOD < 7$), and large amount of missing data were removed from dataset before proceeding with genetic map construction. MultiPoint first performs binning of markers that have the same genotype across all individuals. These bins or “skeleton markers” are then clustered based on an initial threshold recombination fraction, in this case 0.2, which was iteratively increased up to a value of 0.34. After clustering, the markers were ordered in MultiPoint using a guided evolutionary strategy optimization algorithm (Mester et al. 2015) in conjunction with a

jackknife resampling strategy to remove any markers that caused unstable regions in the marker order. Genetic distances of markers were estimated from recombination fractions using the Kosambi mapping function.

Only the skeleton markers in this initial genetic map were retained, as these are the only informative markers for evaluating recombination events. The cluster and ordering information from this initial genetic map was applied to the genotyping data from each of the four populations. Assignment of chromosomes to linkage groups was performed both by comparison of linkage groups to previous marker assignments based on nullisomic lines Winfield et al. (2016), as well as BLASTN searches of probe sequences to the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 assembly Consortium (IWGSC) et al. (2018), hereafter referred to as the IWGSC assembly. In all cases, only BLAST hits with an e-value smaller than 10⁻¹⁹ were used. Four further genetic maps were then generated, one for each population, retaining the same clustering and ordering information from the first map, using the quickEst function in the R package ASMap (version 1.0-2) (Taylor and Butler 2017). This allowed comparison of recombination distribution between temperature treatments using centimorgan values of markers. To verify the quality of the genetic maps, we performed a comparison with the Apogee X Paragon F5 map produced by Allen et al., (2016). As these maps both involve the same parental varieties, they should show close resemblance in their clustering of markers, and should also approach colinearity in their ordering of markers, allowing for small perturbations that may be caused by genotyping error or missing data (Hackett and Broadfoot 2003; Wu et al. 2008).

3.2.4 Detection and processing of recombination events

Recombination events were detected by a change in genotype between consecutive markers in the genetic map. Transitions from a homozygous allele for one parent to a homozygous allele for the second parent were scored as two recombination events, as these would have required recombination to occur in this position in both of the gametes that formed the zygote. With the inference of recombination events from SNP data, geno-

typing error has the potential to erroneously inflate the number of events observed. The magnitude of this effect depends on both where the genotyping error occurs and what the erroneous assignment is, either homozygous or heterozygous. For instance, let us consider three markers used to genotype a single individual, M~1, M~2 and M~3. If the genotypes of the markers are A, A, A, (i.e. homozygous for the allele from the first parent) and M2 erroneously changes to B (i.e. homozygous for the allele from the second parent), in an F2 individual, this would indicate that four recombination events have occurred. In order to compensate for potentially erroneous genotypes, genotypes conforming to this three marker scenario where M1 and M3 are within 30 Mb of each other were recoded as no-calls.

3.2.5 Statistical method of detecting differences in recombination distribution between temperature treatments

To test statistically whether there was a shift in distribution of recombination events between treatments, it was necessary to take the mean distance of all recombination events within an individual from the centromere of the chromosome, which we will refer to henceforth as the mean recombination distance (MRD). Positions of centromeres were based on previously published ChIP-seq data for centromere specific histone 3 (CENH3) Consortium (IWGSC) et al. (2018), whilst the position of each recombination event was taken as the midpoint between the two markers exhibiting the genotype change. Recombination events cannot be tested individually as events within a sample are not independent. For example, if two recombination events occur on the same chromosome during a single meiosis, the position of the second event is likely to be influenced by the position of the first due to crossover interference. In SNP data derived from mapping populations, individuals are a product of two meioses, one for each gamete that contributed to the formation of the individual. It is not possible to assign recombination events to one or the other meiosis, and it is therefore not possible to determine which events may have been influenced by crossover interference. For example, if we observe two events at 2% physical distance either side of the centre, and a third event 10%

physical distance from one of the telomeres, we know that it is very unlikely that the two central events occurred in the same meiosis, but we do not know which of them comes from the same meiosis as the distal event. Using individual recombination events then in our statistical analysis could cause conflation of the effects of the treatment, e.g. external temperature during meiosis, on recombination distribution with the effects of crossover interference.

In addition, since wheat chromosomes are not metacentric, with a mean \pm s.d. centromere position of $40.5 \pm 6.14\%$ of the physical sequence for each chromosome Consortium (IWGSC) et al. (2018), we partitioned our measurement of MRD between chromosome arms. Previous work suggests that crossover interference in wheat is strongest at distances smaller than 10 cM, which in addition to the distal distribution of recombination events in wheat, should preclude strong inter-arm effects of crossover interference. MRD was measured in units of percentage physical distance along chromosome arms.

The analysis of recombination distribution was performed using physical distances of markers along the IWGSC assembly as determined by BLAST. This allows us to relate shifts in distribution to genomic features such as genes. Wheat has a recombination distribution that is biased towards the telomeric regions of the chromosomes. This being the case, it was necessary to ensure that genetic map representations of the chromosomes had sufficient marker coverage to detect potential shifts away from the telomeric regions towards the centromeres. To do this, we defined anchor points along the chromosome at 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100 (% physical distance). We then identified the nearest marker to each of these anchor points. If the distance between any of the anchor points and their nearest markers was greater than 25, the chromosome was excluded from the analysis. So for example, if a chromosome consisted of markers at 40, 50, 60, 70, and 80%, it would be excluded as the nearest marker to the first anchor point (0), is 40, which is more than 25% away, precluding the analysis of recombination events at that end of the chromosome. In addition to ensuring adequate coverage, it was also necessary to ensure that the order of markers in the genetic maps and the physical map were concordant, as a discordant order could bias our analysis of recombination

distribution. To do this, the longest increasing subsequence of physical positions of markers was taken for each chromosome, and all markers not included in this sequence were removed.

3.2.6 Examination of the influence of genotyping error

The data was also examined for other potential factors that could cause differences in MRD between temperature treatments. Genotyping error can be assessed with standard quality control variables produced by Axiom Analysis Suite, such as dish QC, which is based on the contrast between probe hybridization signals at non-polymorphic genome locations, and QC call rate, which measures the call rate of a subset of probes for a particular sample (Affymetrix 2015). To assess whether genotyping error influenced recombination distribution, linear regressions were performed against these two variables using MRD as the predictor.

3.2.7 Examination of the influence of sample size

Another possible explanation for any observed shifts in MRD is that the sample sizes of the mapping populations used were too small. The distribution of recombination events may appear to be skewed towards the centromeres simply due to sampling error, i.e. if we happened to produce individuals that had more centromere-proximal events and were not observing the true value of MRD in the population. To test whether this was the case, we utilized simulated genotyping data from PedigreeSim (Voorrips and Maliepaard 2012). This performs a detailed approximation of meiosis including the formation of bivalents, chiasmata, and meiotic divisions for a specified population structure. 200 genotyping datasets were produced, each containing an F2 mapping population of 500 individuals. These had a marker distribution based on chromosome 3B from the Apogee X Paragon F2 genetic map produced here. Further datasets with sample sizes of 250, 100 and 30 individuals were then created by randomly subsetting the original 200 datasets. For each sample size, 100000 random combinations of four

datasets were generated. We then performed a Kruskal-Wallice test on MRD across the whole chromosome, for every combination, for every sample size, examining whether there was an increasing number of significant tests as sample size decreased, which would indicate that sample size has an influence on MRD.

3.2.8 QTL analysis

QTL analysis was performed using the R package rQTL. Marker LOD scores were calculated using the extended Haley-Knott method, and the LOD threshold for significance was calculated through permutation of phenotypes relative to the genotype data, using 1000 permutations. LOD scores were restricted to the markers themselves, with no imputation of genotypes between markers. To account for the testing of multiple phenotypes, a second significance threshold was also calculated which was the initial threshold after Bonferroni correction at $p < 0.05$. Where multiple QTLs were detected for the same phenotype in this initial single QTL model, QTLs were combined into a multi-QTL model to examine the combined effect on phenotype as well as any potential QTL interactions. The recombination frequency phenotype was calculated by examining the genetically clustered and ordered genotyping data for changes in genotype between consecutive markers. For example, consider three markers, M1, M2, and M3, with genotypes A, A and B respectively. We can infer that a recombination event has occurred between markers two and three. If this is an F2 population, this would be considered as two recombination events as recombination would need to occur in both gametes for a transition from being homozygous for the allele from the first parent to homozygous for the allele for the second parent. Likewise, a transition from heterozygous to homozygous would be considered as one recombination event in an F2 population. For the recombination frequency phenotype, genotype data was did not undergo the same filtering as for the recombination distribution phenotype (i.e. taking the subset of markers consisting of the longest increasing subsequence of physical positions relative to the physical genome assembly), as in this case it is not necessary to have strict concordance with the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 physical genome assembly.

3.2.9 Phylogenetic analysis

The aim of the phylogenetic analysis was to determine whether genes involved in meiosis are generally more conserved among wheat varieties than most other genes in the genome. Genes potentially involved in meiosis were taken from (Alabdullah et al. 2019), who searched for orthologues of 103 functionally characterized meiotic genes in model plant species. A random sample of 4600 genes from the genome was used as a comparison gene set. Homologues of these genes were then obtained from genomes of other wheat varieties, as well as the barley genome to provide an idea of the evolution of these genes in a more distantly related grass species. Genome sequences of wheat varieties Robigus, Paragon, Cadenza and Claire were obtained from the Grassroot genomics web page (<http://www.earlham.ac.uk/grassroots-genomics>); the genome for Chinese Spring was the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018); the barley genome was obtained from (Mascher et al. 2017). To obtain homologues from these genomes, a strategy using BLAST was chosen over bioinformatics packages formally used to map CDS sequences to genomic sequences, e.g. Exonerate (Slater and Birney 2005), GMAP (Wu and Watanabe 2005) and genBlastG (She et al. 2011), as these programs were found to be prohibitively slow in producing alignments.

First, BLAST searches of genomic sequences for meiotic genes extracted from the IWGSC assembly against genomic sequences from other samples were performed with default settings, with the `-culling_limit` parameter set to 10. BLAST does not return full length alignments of query against target, but instead returns a series of local alignments called high-scoring segment pairs (HSPs). The results of the initial BLAST search was therefore used to identify regions in which the homologues was most likely located. HSPs less than 7000 bp apart (a distance determined empirically) were grouped together and their average bitscore was calculated. The group of HSPs with the highest bitscore was determined to be the homologous sequence, and both the lowest and highest base positions of HSPs within the group were used as a coordinate range for sequence extraction from the genome. Once all sequences were extracted, a multiple alignment of genomic sequences was produced using MUSCLE (Edgar 2004), and the exonic regions

of the Chinese spring sequence was determined using the GFF3 file containing exon coordinates for each gene. These exonic regions were assumed to be the exonic regions for all sequences. A new multiple alignment was then produced containing only exonic sequences.

To assess the amount of evolution that had occurred for each gene among samples, IQTREE was used to produce gene trees. IQTREE was used with default settings, and therefore for each gene tree inference, an AIC test was performed to identify the best model of sequence evolution.

3.2.10 Gene distribution analysis

In the analysis of recombination with respect to gene distribution, genes were taken from the high-confidence annotation of the IWGSC assembly v1.0 (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). Centromeres were marked according to ChIP-Seq data (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). Where more than one region was specified, the region that correlated with the highest peak of transcriptome element families Cereba and Quinta was taken as the position of the centromere.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 Gene distribution analysis

Whilst the distribution of recombination events is mainly towards the distal ends of the chromosomes (figure 3.2), the distribution of genes is much more even along the chromosomes (figure 3.3). There are also many more genes than probes on the Axiom 35k array. This effect differs among sub-genomes, with the D genome having fewer probes compared to genes than the other genomes (figure 3.3).




Figure 3.2 Recombination maps for a Chinese Spring X Paragon F5 mapping population. Positions of centromeres are marked by vertical black lines, as determined by ChIP-Seq data (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). Recombination is mostly absent in regions surrounding the centromeres. Marker positions are denoted by circles. Chromosomes have been selected based on overall marker coverage, whilst markers have been filtered, selecting the longest increasing subsequence of markers that are concordant between genetic and physical maps.




Figure 3.3 Comparison of gene and probe distribution in wheat. The left column shows the distribution of high-confidence genes along each of the chromosomes of the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 wheat genome assembly, whilst the right column shows the distribution of Axiom probes from the wheat breeder's 35k array along the genome.

3.3.2 Apogee X Paragon Results

Processing the data for concordance between genetic and physical maps

To analyse potential changes in recombination distribution between temperature treatments, it was first necessary to select only the chromosomes that had a sufficient marker distribution to detect an inward shift in recombination distribution. We found that chromosomes 1A, 2A, 2D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 6B, 7A and 7B met our criteria for marker distribution (figure 3.4). These chromosomes contained a total of 444 markers in the initial genetic map prior to any filtering. 870 of these markers had valid BLAST hits to the IWGSC assembly and could therefore be assigned physical positions (figure 3.5a); the remaining markers were discarded. Markers were then filtered further: any markers that had a discordant order between the genetic and physical maps were removed (figure 3.4b), leaving 442 markers, or 44.2 ± 12.15 (mean \pm s.d.) markers per chromosome for further analysis (supplementary file 2). We will refer to this map as the filtered genetic map. Overall marker distribution was generally preserved during this stage, although the number of markers immediately adjacent to the centromere for chromosomes 2A and 6B was noticeably reduced (figure 3.4b). The mean \pm s.d. distance between markers (Mb) was 8.9 ± 26.4 , 17.33 ± 48.5 , 24.39 ± 62.64 , 20.58 ± 42.2 , 15.78 ± 44.34 , 10.71 ± 33.35 , 13.4 ± 22.58 , 20.69 ± 46.89 and 17.3 ± 39.21 for chromosomes 1A, 2A, 2D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 6B, 7A and 7B respectively. Marker density was generally highest at the distal ends of the chromosomes with a drop in the number of markers in regions surrounding the centromeres (figure 3.4).




Figure 3.4 Marker distribution for chromosomes that passed our filtering criteria. (a) Marker distribution before removal of markers with discordant order between genetic and physical maps via the longest increasing subsequence. (b) Marker distribution after removal. Vertical lines represent the entirety of the length of each chromosome, taken from the IWGSC assembly, whilst points represent the positions of markers. Horizontal red lines mark the position of the centromere on each chromosome.

Performing comparisons with previously generated F5 Apogee x Paragon map

Of the 2503 markers selected from Axiom Analysis Suite for the F2 A x P genotyping data produced here, 1563 were present in the final F5 A x P genetic map produced in Allen et al., (2016). For comparison to the F5 A x P map, the filtered F2 map was used due to its importance in subsequent analyses such as assessing MRD. Clustering between genetic maps was highly consistent; none of the linkage groups from the F2 map contained markers that were present in a linkage group that was identified as a different chromosome in the F5 map (table 3.1). To test the concordance of marker distribution and order between maps, linear regressions for each chromosome were performed predicting the genetic position (cM) of a marker in the F5 map based on the position of the marker in the F2 map. All were highly significant ($p < 10^{-16}$ for all chromosomes after Bonferroni correction), with over 96% of the variation in the F5 position being explained by the F2 position for every chromosome tested (figure 3.5). Chromosomes 1A, 2D, 3B, 4A, 5A and 7B had perfectly colinear marker bins between maps. In the six cases where marker order did differ between maps, in chromosomes 2A, 3A, 6B and 7A, it did so in adjacent pairs of markers contained within very small centimorgan windows: the mean \pm s.d. distance (cM) between these inverted pairs of markers was 0.33 ± 0.25 cM. This was expected; it is well known that small genetic distances between markers can influence map ordering algorithms (Hackett and Broadfoot 2003).

Table 3.1 Comparison of clustering of markers between the F2 Apogee X Paragon genetic map generated here and the F5 map generated previously. The first column indicates the linkage group / chromosome from the F2 genetic map, whereas the subsequent “LG” columns indicate linkage groups that share markers with this F2 linkage group. Columns labelled “Num. markers” indicate the number of markers shared between linkage groups. The final column indicates the number of markers in the F2 linkage group that were not present in the F5 genetic map.

A x P F2		A x P F5		A x P F5		A x P F5	
A x P F2	A x P F5	Num	A x P F5	Num	A x P F5	Num	
LG	LG 1	Markers 1	LG 2	Markers 2	LG 3	Markers 3	Not present
1A	1A	44	-	-	-	-	12
2A	2A	24	-	-	-	-	19
2D	2D	12	-	-	-	-	13
3A	3A	28	-	-	-	-	8
3B	3B	35	-	-	-	-	12
4A	4A	34	-	-	-	-	12
5A	5A	34	5A2	11	-	-	22
6B	6B	39	-	-	-	-	12
7A	7A	19	7A3	2	-	-	11
7B	7B	27	-	-	-	-	12

Examining the effect of temperature on recombination distribution

To test whether there was a significant difference in the distribution of recombination events between temperature treatments, the mean recombination distance (MRD; see methods) was calculated for each individual in each treatment. We first examined MRD for all chromosomes at once to see if there was a genome-wide effect of temperature on recombination distribution. In the Apogee X Paragon F2 populations, a Kruskal-Wallace test of the MRD in the long arms of all chromosomes reveals a highly significant difference between all four temperature treatments (10°C , 14°C , 26°C and 28°C) ($\chi^2 = 25.63$, d.f. = 3, $p < 0.0001$). Likewise, this test was highly significant for the short arms ($\chi^2 = 12.13$, d.f. = 3, $p < 0.007$). Temperatures 10°C and 14°C showed evidence of a more distal distribution of recombination events compared to 26°C and 28°C , with mean \pm s.d. MRD values (units are percentage of chromosome arm) of 73.7 ± 15.2 , 74.34 ± 15.56 , 70.19 ± 18.75 and 70 ± 18.03 respectively for long chromosome arms (figure 3.6), and values of 81.48 ± 13.6 , 81.19 ± 14.24 , 77.87 ± 17.52 and 77.99 ± 16.69 for short chromosome arms (figure 3.6).




Figure 3.5 Comparison of marker order and distribution between the filtered F2 Apogee X Paragon genetic map and the F5 genetic map produced by Allen et al. (2016). Points represent markers and their genetic positions (cM) in the respective maps. Some of the markers present in the F2 map are not present in the F5 map due to a difference in marker selection procedure between studies. Centimorgan values have therefore been normalized such that map comparisons start at zero whilst retaining inter-marker distances. Deviations from the diagonal line represent differences in the recombination distribution between maps; perfect adherence to the line represents complete coherence between maps in both marker order and marker distribution. Markers that have an inverted order between maps (markers deviating from monotonicity) are represented as grey triangles, whereas markers that are consistent in order represented as black circles. R² values of linear regressions of the F5 position as a function of the F2 position are shown in the upper left corner of each plot. Chromosomes are labeled in grey panels above each plot.




Figure 3.6 Recombination distribution of Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for temperature treatments of 10°C, 14°C, 26°C and 28°C respectively at meiosis. Recombination is measured as the mean distance of recombination events from the centromere of the chromosome in each individual plant to avoid conflation of crossover interference with temperature treatment.




Figure 3.7 Mean MRD for each chromosome for long and short arms.

To examine whether any one treatment was exerting a strong influence on the Kruskal-Wallace test of MRD, individual treatments were removed before performing the test again. MRD remained significantly different between temperature treatments when any of the individual treatments were removed before the test ($p < 0.005$ for all temperatures in the long arm; $p < 0.05$ for all temperatures in the short arm). We then removed pairs of treatments before performing the test again to examine whether high and low temperature treatments were clustered in their effect on the test (table 3.2). For the long chromosome arms, the test only became insignificant when either both low temperature

treatments (10°C and 14°C) were removed ($\chi^2 = 0.5$, d.f. = 1, $p = 0.48$) or when both high temperature treatments (26°C and 28°C) treatments were removed ($\chi^2 = 0.75$, d.f. = 1, $p = 0.37$). This was also the case for the short chromosome arms (table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Examining the effect of removal of pairs of temperature treatments before performing the Kruskal-Wallice test on differences in mean recombination distance (MRD). Significant p-values are highlighted in bold. Bonferroni corrections were performed within chromosome arms.

Treatments removed	Bonferroni		Bonferroni	
	p-value (long arm)	chisq (long arm)	p-value (long arm)	corrected
				corrected
10°C, 14°C	0.4473	0.5776	1	0.7668
10°C, 26°C	0.00001	19.46	0.00006	0.00627
10°C, 28°C	0.00094	10.95	0.00562	0.02589
14°C, 26°C	0.0003	13.06	0.00181	0.00884
14°C, 28°C	0.00974	6.682	0.05842	0.02821
26°C, 28°C	0.3716	0.7984	1	0.7525

In addition to the genome-level analysis of recombination distribution, we also tested for differences in MRD between temperature treatments for individual chromosomes, which differed in their response to changes in temperature during meiosis. The long arms of chromosomes 1A, 3B, as well as the short arms of chromosomes 2A and 7A showed significant differences in MRD between all temperature treatments as determined by a Bonferroni-corrected Kruskal-Wallice test (table 3.3). The long arm of chromosome 1A was most significant, followed by the short arm of 2A (table 3.3).

Table 3.3 Results of Kruskal-Wallice test for difference in MRD between temperature treatments for individual chromosomes. P-values have undergone a Bonferroni correction for multiple testing within chromosome arms. The short arm of 1A is not included as the marker distribution was not sufficient. Significant p-values ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in bold.

Chromosome	arm)	chisq		chisq		
		p-value (long	(long	p-value	(short	
Chromosome	arm)		arm)	(short arm)	arm)	d.f.
1A		0.00003	28.61			3
2A		0.2165	9.664	0.00032	23.3	3
2D		1	0.5984	1	1.099	3
3A		1	4.971	0.8884	6.281	3
3B		0.04108	13.26	0.9845	6.046	3
4A		1	6.199	0.334	8.477	3
5A		0.3848	8.397	1	2.912	3
6B		1	5.256	1	0.5728	3
7A		0.3354	8.701	0.00485	17.57	3
7B		1	1.95	1	1.74	3

To investigate these chromosome-level differences in recombination distribution between temperature treatments further, we compared the centimorgan distribution of markers between genetic maps (figures 3.7 - 3.16). Examination of the chromosome 7B, which was the least-significant chromosome in our MRD analysis, showed a reduction

in the number of recombination events between temperatures 10°C and 14°C, with little change in the distributions of events between 14°C, 26°C and 28° treatments (figure 3.16). Chromosome 3B on the other hand had a similar distribution of recombination events between temperatures 10°C and 14°C, before expanding in central regions of the genetic map between temperatures 14°C and 26°C (figure 3.11). These differences highlight the fact that temperature does not act equally on all chromosomes during meiosis.




Figure 3.8 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 1A.




Figure 3.9 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 2A.




Figure 3.10 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 2D.




Figure 3.11 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 3A.




Figure 3.12 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 3B. Markers closest to the centromere (the location of which are taken from Consortium (IWGSC) et al., 2018) are highlighted as blue triangles.




Figure 3.13 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 4A.




Figure 3.14 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 5A.




Figure 3.15 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 6B.




Figure 3.16 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 7A.




Figure 3.17 Comparisons of genetic maps for four different temperature treatments in Apogee X Paragon F2 populations for chromosome 7B. Markers closest to the centromere (the location of which are taken from Consortium (IWGSC) et al., 2018) are highlighted as blue triangles.

Whilst we can detect differences MRD between temperature treatments for some chro-

mosomes, it is also important to assess the potential utility of this difference to wheat breeders in terms of its effect on linkage disequilibrium. To do this, we compared chromosome 1A recombination distributions for each treatment (figure 3.17, top four panels), to the distribution of genes along the chromosome (figure 3.17, bottom panel). Higher temperature treatments of 26°C and 28°C appear to induce recombination in regions closer to the centromere from 375 Mb to 461 Mb (markers AX-94621604 and AX-95134433), with a difference of 8.4 cM and 7.7 cM between markers in 26°C and 28°C respectively compared to 1.87 cM and 3.19 cM in 10°C and 14°C treatments. Despite these differences in recombination distribution between treatments, many genes remained highly linked regardless of temperature, for example from 280 to 350 Mb (figure 3.17). Recombination distributions for other chromosomes can be seen in figures 3.18 - 3.26.




Figure 3.18 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 1A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

2A Markers




Figure 3.19 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 2A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.




Figure 3.20 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 2D with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

3A Markers




Figure 3.21 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 3A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

3B Markers




Figure 3.22 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 3B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

4A Markers




Figure 3.23 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 4A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

5A Markers




Figure 3.24 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 5A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.




Figure 3.25 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 6B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

7A Markers




Figure 3.26 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 7A with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.




Figure 3.27 Recombination distribution among temperature treatments for chromosome 7B with high-confidence gene distribution according to the IWGSC assembly for comparison.

Another area of interest was the potential presence of temperature-dependent recombination hotspots, defined here as regions that contained recombination events in the two high temperature treatments, that also lacked recombination events in both lower temperature treatments. There was evidence of these hotspots on chromosomes 1A, 2A, 2D, 3A, 3B, 4A and 6B (table 3.4). The inter-marker areas of these hotspots contained a total of 868 genes. The hotspot with the largest disparity in number of recombination events between temperatures was found on chromosome 3B, spanning from 485.69 Mb to 488.53 Mb, with differences in cM values between flanking markers of 0, 0, 24.04 and 4.95 at temperatures of 10°C, 14°C, 26°C and 28°C respectively. Inspection of the genotype data revealed that these recombination events were not double events, and visual examination of the SNP cluster plots for both flanking markers revealed clearly delineated genotype clusters in both cases, indicating that genotyping error was unlikely to be the cause of this difference. Annotations for the 19 genes within these two makers include DNA-directed RNA polymerase III subunit RPC3, 50S ribosomal protein L15 (putative), Ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme E2, NAC domain protein and an Auxin-responsive protein. The second most notable hotspot was on chromosome 1A, where the 26°C and 28°C treatments have differences of 2.7 and 0.68 cM respectively between markers AX-94909603 and AX-94868310 at 370 Mb (figure 3.17).

Table 3.4 Regions containing potential temperature-dependent hotspots, defined as having recombination events in both high temperature treatments, whilst lacking recombination events in both low temperature treatments. Also shown are the number of high-confidence genes within the marker interval from the IWGSC assembly annotation. Negative distances from the centromere indicate that the hotspot occurs on the short arm of the chromosome. (continued below)

Chromosome	Marker before	Marker after	Physical	Physical	Phys difference	
			position 1st	position 2nd		
93	3B	AX.94485572	AX.94437683	485.7	488.5	2.84
	1A	AX.94909603	AX.94868310	368.2	370.1	1.9
	2D	AX.95199672	AX.94641475	73.59	74.94	1.35
	1A	AX.95255804	AX.94907922	572.4	574.5	2.13
	3A	AX.94606333	AX.95008057	479.8	485	5.22
	4A	AX.95111935	AX.94478215	140.7	164.4	23.69
	3A	AX.95164207	AX.94393045	168.8	391.5	222.7
	2D	AX.94482198	AX.94457291	620.3	621.1	0.8
	6B	AX.94451495	AX.94896306	474.2	476.7	2.5
	6B	AX.95123143	AX.94403686	549.2	556	6.76
	1A	AX.94445422	AX.94987165	505.7	506.9	1.18
	6B	AX.94946141	AX.95110233	562.5	563.1	0.58
	2A	AX.94514944	AX.94536561	605	605.2	0.18

10°C cM difference	14°C cM difference	26°C cM difference	28°C cM difference	Number of genes	Distance from centromere
0	0	24.04	4.95	19	140.7
0	0	2.7	0.63	28	156.2
0	0	1.42	1.31	16	-194.2
0	0	1.36	2.47	37	360.4
0	0	1.36	0.6	40	164
0	0	1.36	1.89	117	-113.5
0	0	1.34	0.62	508	-38.24
0	0	0.7	0.66	20	352.2
0	0	0.69	1.23	18	150.2
0	0	0.68	0.62	44	227.3
0	0	0.68	0.64	11	293.3
0	0	0.67	0.62	3	237.5
0	0	0.67	0.64	7	264.4

Examining the effects of temperature on recombination frequency

Recombination frequency varied between temperature treatments, with total map lengths of 1377.43, 1213.2, 1279.8 and 1071.65 cM for 10°C, 14°C, 26°C and 28°C degree treatments respectively. Chromosome 5A had the highest number of recombination events in all temperature treatments (figure 3.27). An ANOVA of recombination frequency in individuals across all chromosomes between populations revealed significant differences between temperature treatments 10°C and 14°C ($p < 0.0001$), 10°C and 28°C ($p < 0.00001$) as well as 26°C and 28°C ($p < 0.001$) as determined by a Tukey post-hoc test (figure 3.28). The frequency of recombination events follows a U-shaped pattern between temperatures 10°C, 14°C and 26°C, before declining between 26°C and 28°C (figure 3.28). The mean \pm s.d. number of recombination events across all individuals was 21.83 ± 5.32 .




Figure 3.28 Apogee X Paragon genetic map lengths by chromosome across temperature treatments. Chromosome 5A has the largest map length and therefore the highest number of recombination events in all temperature treatments. In some chromosomes, higher temperature treatments have less recombination events overall, such as in chromosome 2D, 6B and 7B.




Figure 3.29 Mean recombination frequency across all chromosomes for each temperature treatment. Error bars represent \pm s.d. from the mean. Significantly different populations are indicated by asterisks (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$).

Investigating genotyping error as a possible cause of the observed effects

Genotyping error was found not to influence MRD. Linear regressions of standard sample quality control metrics (either dish quality control (DQC) or quality control call rate) as the explanatory variable and MRD as the dependent variable for each chromosome were all non-significant. R^2 values for each chromosome were all smaller than 0.026, meaning that less than 2.6% of the variation in MRD was explained by these variables in every case.

In addition, the simulation experiment indicated that sample size does not influence MRD either. For sample sizes of 500, 250, 100 and 30, 6.29%, 3.01%, 7.15% and 2.03% of the 100000 combinations of samples exhibited significant differences in MRD, as shown by a Kruskal-Wallace test. If sample size had an effect, we would expect these percentages to show a consistent trend, i.e. increasing or decreasing with sample size. It should also be noted that these percentages are close to the expected number of false-positives (5%) at this alpha threshold (0.05).

3.3.3 QTL Analysis

No significant QTL were found for recombination frequency in any of the populations analysed. Significant QTLs for MRD were found in the Opata X Synthetic population on chromosome 1A (phenotype MRD 5A), as well as the Paragon X Watkins 94 population on chromosome 1A (MRD 7A). The increasing effect came from Opata and Watkins 94 respectively for these QTLs, meaning that these parental genotypes yielded MRDs that were further away from the centre of the chromosome. The O x S QTL accounted for the highest phenotypic variance of any single QTL (24.906%). None of these QTL were significant after Bonferroni correction for the number of phenotypes tested.

Table 3.5 Table showing significant QTLs for late-filial generation (> F4) RIL populations and DH populations. Numbers have been rounded to three decimal places, so where p-values are listed as 0, represents a value smaller than 0.001. (continued below)


Population	Phenotype	Chromosome	Position (cM)	LOD	% Phenotypic Variance
A x P F5	MRD.6B	4A	28.6	2.833	4.781
O x S	MRD.5A	1A	73.97	3.615	24.93
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	72.11	3.057	5.237
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	72.49	3.279	5.626
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	72.68	3.187	5.455
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	74.05	3.053	5.234
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	74.43	3.148	5.392
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	74.62	3.346	5.722
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	75	3.572	6.097
CS x P	MRD.2D	6B	75.19	3.671	6.264
A x C DH	MRD.3A	5A	10.15	3.045	12.07
A x C DH	MRD.7B	3A	77.41	3.553	14.82

Table continues below


p-value (chi-square)	p-value F	AA Mean	BB Mean	AA SE	BB SE	Position
						Previous
						Marker (cM)
0	0	42.03	38.98	0.581	0.589	28.44
0	0	38.49	31.12	1.116	1.244	72.17
0	0	41.13	37	0.737	0.801	71.73
0	0	41.18	36.89	0.732	0.804	72.11
0	0	41.17	36.95	0.736	0.8	72.49
100	0	41.08	36.96	0.73	0.811	72.68
0	0	41.08	36.88	0.725	0.818	74.05
0	0	41.13	36.79	0.721	0.82	74.43
0	0	41.22	36.75	0.724	0.811	74.62
0	0	41.26	36.73	0.726	0.807	75
0	0	42.16	45.48	0.609	0.603	8.463
0	0	39.65	43.87	0.679	0.732	66.42

	Physical position of marker before marker	Physical position of marker before (bp)	Position of marker after (cM)	LOD of next marker	Physical position of next marker (%)	Physical position of next marker (bp)
LOD previous marker	(%)	(bp)	(cM)			
2.614	80.88	602245890	30.08	2.103	80.97	602911128
2.058	84.88	504243610	74.83	2.93	86.92	516373177
2.871	89.55	645661984	72.49	3.279	90.35	651418713
3.057	89.89	648086087	72.68	3.187	91.06	656511775
3.279	90.35	651418713	74.05	3.053	91.38	658818903
3.187	91.06	656511775	74.43	3.148	91.44	659233712
3.053	91.38	658818903	74.62	3.346	91.59	660381093
3.148	91.44	659233712	75	3.572	92.03	663531485
3.346	91.59	660381093	75.19	3.671	92.05	663669873
3.572	92.03	663531485	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.89	0.699	4959413	13.65	2.373	1.135	8059358
1.76	94.73	711296348	84.81	1.5	97.34	730849182

A x P F5: 6B



O x S: 5A



CS x P: 2D




Figure 3.30 QTL Plots for late-filial generation (> F4) RIL populations and DH populations. Dashed line indicates a 0.05 significance threshold for the LOD value based on a permutation test, whilst the dotted line indicates a 0.05 significance threshold after Bonferroni correction for the number of phenotypes tested.

3.3.4 Phylogenetic Analysis

The mean \pm s.d. length of gene trees for the meiotic gene set and the random gene set were 0.172 ± 0.221 and 0.227 ± 0.306 respectively. When barley was removed from the analysis, the mean and \pm s.d. length of gene trees decreased in all cases to 0.011 ± 0.051

and 0.03 ± 0.17 for meiotic and random gene sets respectively. The tree length was not significantly different between both gene sets (t-test, $t = -4.36$, d.f. = 476.21, $p = 0.00002$), and this remained the case when barley was removed from the analysis (t-test, $t = -5.01$, d.f. = 1235.78, $p = 0$, Mann-Whitney U test $W = 745407$, $p = 0.03069$). Boxplots of tree lengths are shown in figure 3.29. In both phylogenies constructed from superalignments of the respective sets of genes, barley was by far the most distantly related compared to all of the wheat varieties (figure 3.30). For the tree constructed from the superalignment of the meiosis gene set, the patristic distances between pairs of nodes (table 3.5) were mostly shorter than the distances in the random gene set (table 3.6). Phylogenies without barley are shown in figure 3.31.




Figure 3.29 Box plots of lengths of gene trees, including wheat varieties Chinese Spring, Paragon, Cadenza, Claire and Robigus as well as Barley (Morex) for meiotic and random gene sets. The left panel includes barley, the right panel does not.




Figure 3.32 Phylogenies constructed from superalignments of all genes for both meiosis and random gene sets, including barley. Scale bars indicate number of substitutions per site.




Figure 3.31 Phylogenies constructed from superalignments of all genes for both meiosis and random gene sets, without barley. Scale bars indicate number of substitutions per site.

Table 3.6 Patristic distances of nodes in the tree constructed from a superalignment of the meiosis gene set. Upper triangle has been removed due to redundancy.

	Chinese Spring	Cadenza	Robigus	Claire	Paragon	Barley
Chinese						
Spring						
Cadenza	0.004771					
Robigus	0.003206	0.003568				
Claire	0.003906	0.004269	0.001992			
Paragon	0.003563	0.005323	0.003758	0.004458		
Barley	0.1786	0.1815	0.1799	0.1806	0.1803	

Table 3.7 Patristic distances of nodes in the tree constructed from a superalignment of the random gene set. Upper triangle has been removed due to redundancy. Interestingly, the distances here are longer than in the meiosis gene set.

	Chinese					
	Spring	Cadenza	Robigus	Claire	Paragon	Barley
Chinese						
Spring						
Cadenza	0.01274					
Robigus	0.01243	0.01079				
Claire	0.01272	0.01108	0.007815			
Paragon	0.01341	0.00848	0.01146	0.01175		
Barley	0.4259	0.4296	0.4293	0.4296	0.4303	

3.4 Discussion

The data presented here is the first detailed analysis of the effect of environmental temperature during meiosis on the distribution and frequency of recombination events in wheat. Our data, based on high-density SNP genotyping of four Apogee X Paragon mapping populations, each subjected to a different temperature during meiosis, reveal a clear effect of temperature on the distribution of recombination events. This effect is visible, although subtle, in figure 3.6, where higher temperature treatments appear to have a more distal distribution of events in both short and long arms of the chromosomes. In figure 3.6, there are some MRD values that appear to be within 25% of the centromere, which contrasts with evidence from previous studies (Saintenac et al. 2009; Choulet et al. 2014) that the distribution of recombination in wheat is limited to the distal ends of the chromosomes. These MRD values are most likely artefacts of the method used here to measure recombination, where the position of recombination is assigned as the midpoint between two markers, in conjunction with the reduced marker density in centromeric regions after filtering (figure 2). This should not have any impact on the analysis of the relative difference in recombination distribution between

temperature treatments, as all treatments used the same genetic map with the same distribution of markers. The statistical analyses of MRD for individual chromosomes show that the effect of temperature on recombination distribution is limited to specific chromosomes/chromosome arms, suggesting that chromosomal structure may influence the susceptibility of chromosomes to changes in temperature. This mirrors results from barley (Higgins et al. 2012a; Phillips et al. 2015).

A comparison of the Apogee X Paragon F2 genetic map produced here to the F5 genetic map of the same cross from Allen et al., (2016) shows a high degree of similarity in the clustering (table 3.1), ordering (figure 3.5) and genetic distribution (figure 2) of markers, indicating that the genetic map is robust. Noticeable in the comparison of clusters however is that some of the chromosomes in the F5 map, such as 5A and 7A, are split into multiple linkage groups. This could explain the markers that are present in our map that are not present in the map of Allen et al., as these were most likely resolved as smaller linkage groups in the latter, which were then discarded. Our marker selection process was more stringent than in Allen et al., (2016) as we only used codominant markers that were categorized as “Poly high resolution”, the highest quality marker categorization in Axiom Analysis Suite Bassil et al. (2015), whereas multiple categories of marker were used in the map of Allen et al. In addition, in this study the SNP cluster plots for each marker were visually inspected and only markers with a clear delineation between genotyping clusters representing homozygotes for the Apogee allele, heterozygotes and homozygotes for the Paragon allele were used.

Our confidence in the validity of the results are increased by the fact that differences in MRD between treatments only become non-significant when two treatments are removed, either both of the low temperature treatments (10°C and 14°C) or both of the high temperature treatments (26°C and 28°C). This effect was less pronounced in the short arms of chromosome, indicating that perhaps temperature have less of an effect on these regions. However, this could also simply be the result of lower marker density in short chromosome arms. It is clear the observed shifts in recombination distribution are not due to genotyping error, as the results of linear regressions of standard quality

control metrics against MRD were all non-significant. Furthermore, the results of the simulation experiment show that the differences in MRD observed in the Apogee X Paragon crosses were not the result of sampling error due to small population size.

In order to perform a statistical analysis on the differences in distribution of recombination events between temperature treatments, it was necessary to associate genetic maps to the physical wheat genome assembly. To do this we devised a method that utilizes the longest increasing subsequence of BLAST positions of marker sequences to the IWGSC assembly, allowing the measurement of MRD in each individual. This unfortunately comes with a caveat, in that markers that do not conform to this sequence must be removed, which reduces the density of markers in certain regions (figure 3.4). This is one of the primary limitations of using MRD and means that our ability to precisely localize certain recombination events is reduced. The reason for the reduction in marker density is likely due to structural differences between varieties Apogee and Paragon, used here to generate the genetic maps, and Chinese Spring, the only wheat variety currently to have a completely publicly-available, chromosome-level genome assembly. A reanalysis of the data could provide further information should a chromosome-level genome assembly of either Apogee or Paragon be released in the future. Despite these caveats, the data has sufficient marker density to inform our picture of recombination distribution in many chromosomal regions (figure 3.4). The process used in this study conforms closely to the process that a wheat breeder might implement in their development of new varieties, and so has direct bearing on the applications of temperature in wheat.

In addition to the effect of temperature on the distribution of recombination events, we also observed an effect on the frequency of recombination events. Recombination frequency followed a U-shaped response from 10° to 26°C (figure 3.28), which is consistent with results in Arabidopsis presented by Lloyd et al. (2018). This is followed by a dip at 28°C, which differs from the results in Arabidopsis. Lloyd et al. (2018) suggest that this effect is primarily produced by changes in class I interfering crossovers and speculate that recombination may be minimized in organisms that are already well-adapted to

their environment and living in optimal conditions.

The number of recombination events that occurred in each gamete can be estimated by dividing the mean number of recombination events across all individuals by the number of chromosomes, then dividing that by two (as each zygote is composed of two gametes). This gives us an estimate of 1.09 recombination events per gamete. This is lower than published counts of chiasmata per bivalent in wheat, which are around 2.3 (Miller and Reader 1985). There are several factors that contribute to this underestimation. Firstly, double recombination events that occur in between marker positions are not detectable using SNP data. In addition, in a sequence of heterozygous genotypes, if both gametes have a recombination event between the same two markers, the recombination event will not be detected. Finally, in some of the chromosomes analysed, there were a lack of markers at the very distal ends of the chromosomes (figure 3.5), and so recombination events that occurred in these regions could not be detected.

Our data indicate that increasing the temperature during meiosis could have some limited use to breeders in breaking up centromeric linkage blocks. We observed four chromosome arms with significant shifts in recombination distribution between temperature, and several putative temperature-dependent recombination hotspots (table 3.4). Included in the 3B temperature-dependent hotspot were putative genes influencing plant development, including a NAC domain protein (Puranik et al. 2012) as well as an auxin-responsive protein (Teale et al. 2006). Despite these points, there are still many genes that remain highly linked in regions closer to the centromere on many chromosomes. To achieve thorough mixture of these genes in progeny of crosses, it will be important for breeders to explore other avenues of manipulating recombination distribution. One potential option is to produce fusion proteins linking SPO-11, the protein that initiates recombination through production of double-stranded breaks in the DNA, to other DNA targeting proteins, such as Zinc finger elements, Transcription activator-like elements or dead Cas9. Research in yeast using these methods revealed a 2.3 to 6.3-fold increase in COs near targeted regions (Sarno et al. 2017). Applications of this technique to agriculture outside of research could however be limited due to

increasingly strict legislation, such as the 2018 European Union ruling in case C-528/16 that organisms edited using directed mutagenesis methods such as CRIPR-Cas9 will be officially classified as genetically modified organisms.

If breeders do decide to utilize temperature as a means of altering recombination distribution, they will also have to consider the loss in fertility of wheat plants at higher temperatures of meiosis (Draeger and Moore 2017). These elevated temperatures would therefore need to be employed strategically and transiently in between generations that are grown at lower temperatures. It would be of interest to examine the epigenetic effects of elevated temperature during meiosis, such as whether there are any lasting changes inherited by progeny, and whether these changes are detrimental to plant growth.

Interestingly, the results of our QTL analysis yielded no significant QTLs for recombination frequency or MRD after Bonferroni correction for the number of phenotypes tested. This is in contrast to other studies such as (Gardiner et al. 2019), where a significant QTL, albeit accounting for only a small proportion of phenotypic variance (6.037%), was found in the same Chinese Spring X Paragon population analysed here. This difference between studies suggests that the processing performed in (Gardiner et al. 2019) in which markers were grouped into large bins might have effected the analysis, and indeed no difference was found when the authors attempted to validate their CO frequency QTL using Cadenza TILLING populations containing knockout mutations for the most likely gene candidate driving this QTL. There are two possible explanations for the lack of QTL detected, either our method is lacking in statistical power or that there is no genetic component involved in either recombination frequency or distribution in the varieties tested. To assess the latter hypothesis, we performed a phylogenetic analysis of homologues of genes that have been functionally characterized to be involved in meiosis in *Arabidopsis*. On the whole, the meiotic gene set was more conserved than the random gene set. However, when barley was included in the analysis, we observed far more variation in meiotic genes between barley and wheat than between any two wheat varieties. This suggests that the conservation of wheat genes

involved in meiosis is largely due to the fact that they diverged fairly recently. The difference between meiotic and random gene sets in the phylogenies where barley was excluded suggests that stabilising selection also plays a role.

The phylogenetic analysis provides insight into the evolutionary constraints (or lack thereof) operating on meiotic genes, and therefore the potential for genetic control of recombination in wheat. The fact that the meiotic genes are similarly distant between barley and wheat in both meiotic and random gene sets indicates that there is potential for genetics to influence recombination, as if there was strong stabilizing selection operating at these loci we would expect barley to be more closely related to wheat in the meiotic gene set compared to the random gene set. However, the closeness of the meiotic genes in wheat varieties suggests that there simply hasn't been enough time in the history of wheat for this deviation to occur, which could explain the lack of QTL influencing recombination. This would be congruent with evidence on the inception of all modern bread wheat at a relatively recent point in history around 10,000 years ago.

In conclusion, the work here shows that temperature has a subtle effect on the frequency and distribution of recombination events in wheat. The analysis of recombination distribution in comparison to gene distribution indicates that the utility of this effect may be limited, with large amounts of genes remaining under strong linkage, and thus inaccessible to manipulation by breeders. Future work involving cytological analysis of wheat meiocytes subjected to different temperatures would be of interest, as the principle of consilience asserts that confidence in a result increases when reached independently through different methods.

4 Segregation distortion: utilizing simulated genotyping data to evaluate statistical methods

All results described here have been published in the following manuscript:

Coulton, A., Przewieslik-Allen, A., Burridge, A., Shaw, D., Edwards, K., Barker, G., 2020. Segregation distortion: Utilizing simulated genotyping data to evaluate statistical methods. PLoS ONE

4.1 Abstract

Segregation distortion is the phenomenon in which genotypes deviate from expected Mendelian ratios in the progeny of a cross between two varieties or species. There is not currently a widely used consensus for the appropriate statistical test, or more specifically the multiple testing correction procedure, used to detect segregation distortion for high-density single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) data. Here we examine the efficacy of various multiple testing procedures, including chi-square test with no correction for multiple testing, false-discovery rate correction and Bonferroni correction using an in-silico simulation of a biparental mapping population. We find that the false discovery rate correction best approximates the traditional p-value threshold of 0.05 for high-density marker data. We also utilize this simulation to test the effect of segregation distortion on the genetic mapping process, specifically on the formation of linkage groups during marker clustering. Only extreme segregation distortion was found to effect genetic mapping. In addition, we utilize replicate empirical mapping populations of wheat varieties Avalon and Cadenza to assess how often segregation distortion conforms to the same pattern between closely related wheat varieties.

4.2 Introduction

Segregation distortion is the phenomenon in which alleles in the progeny of a cross between two varieties or species deviate from expected Mendelian ratios. In an F2 population originating from a biparental cross, the expected ratio of genotypes AA:AB:BB (progeny homozygous for the allele from the first parent, heterozygotes and progeny homozygous for the allele from the second parent) in absence of segregation distortion is 1:2:1. Segregation distortion is observed across a wide range of taxa, including animals such as *Drosophila* (Lyttle 1993; Phadnis and Orr 2009) and mice (Silver 1993), as well as crop species, including cotton (Dai et al. 2017), maize (Wang et al. 2012; Lu et al. 2002), potato (Manrique-Carpintero et al. 2016), chickpea (Castro et al. 2011), barley (Liu et al. 2010) and wheat (Allen et al. 2016; Gardner et al. 2016; Wingen et al. 2017). The primary explanation of the cause of segregation distortion is a selection pressure operating against one of the parental alleles at some stage of the development cycle, whether at meiosis through meiotic drive (Lyttle 1993), through male gamete competition (Dai et al. 2017), or at the level of the zygote. An example of this is the pollen killer gene in wheat (Loegering and Sears 1963), for which there is an allele that causes pollen cells to degenerate until unviable, leading to an over representation of the non-deleterious allele.

Segregation distortion can be problematic for crop breeders, who wish to generate varieties with novel genotypic compositions that are better suited to meeting the various aims of modern agriculture, such as increased yields or improved resistance to biotic or abiotic stresses. Distorted segregation at a locus could skew most lines in a recombinant inbred line population (RIL) away from the desired genotype, requiring breeders to create larger numbers of lines to compensate. It would be useful if we could attribute regions of segregation distortion to causative loci in the genome, as this would allow breeders to plan for the occurrence ahead of time. One important obstacle to this goal is another potential cause of segregation distortion: sampling error. With small RIL population sizes, it is possible that a specific parental allele is, by chance, sampled more often than its alternative in the progeny, leading to a distorted ratio of segregation.

Conflating this for distortion caused by a selective pressure would be problematic, as the same pattern of distortion in the progeny would not be repeated if the RIL population was recreated. Planning for this distortion in breeding programmes would therefore be counterproductive. How much of the segregation distortion typically observed in RIL populations is due to chance?

Distinguishing distortion caused by selection from that caused by chance is difficult, because both have the potential to produce similar patterns of segregation in the progeny of a cross. What we can assume though is that if the selection strength is high enough, the intensity of distortion produced would be unlikely to have occurred by chance. This is complicated by the fact that the effects of chance change with population size, being more prevalent when population size is small, and eventually evening out as population size becomes larger. Our sole detection criterion for separating selection from chance as the cause of segregation distortion then is the amount of distortion as a function of the population size. This leads to an important question: at what stage do we say that enough distortion is present for the event to be caused by selection? If we make our detection criteria too lenient, then we increase the risk of type I errors (false positives), whilst stricter criteria increase the risk of type II errors (false negatives). What is the optimal place to draw this proverbial line in the sand when detecting segregation distortion?

The diversity of criteria used in the literature reflect the difficulty of answering this question. Some authors settle for a simple chi-square test with the minimum significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ (Li et al. 2015; Allen et al. 2016; Lu et al. 2002; Takumi et al. 2013; Avni et al. 2014), others report multiple significance thresholds (Thompson et al. 1991; Peng et al. 2000; Singh et al. 2007; Adamski et al. 2014; Manrique-Carpintero et al. 2016), whilst others use corrections for multiple testing, including false discovery rate (FDR) (Gardner et al. 2016; Wingen et al. 2017; Seymour et al. 2017) and the even stricter Bonferroni correction (Manninen 2000; Dai et al. 2017). This inconsistency has the further implication that many of the studies on segregation distortion are not comparable, which is problematic for the general advancement of our knowledge of

segregation distortion. It interferes with our ability to assess hypotheses such as: (i) levels of segregation distortion differ between different species, (ii) segregation distortion increases with the genetic distance between parents.

To circumvent the conflation between selection and chance, it would be useful if we could observe the processes that lead to the final genotypic composition of a RIL population. Whilst this is infeasible to achieve with real organisms, it is possible in an in-silico simulation of a RIL population. Here we utilize PedigreeSim (Voorrips and Maliepaard 2012), which computationally models single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genotype data from a RIL population, starting with recombination between homologues during meiosis, generation of gametes and fusion of gametes to form a zygote. This process can be repeated for the desired number of filial generations. The simulation allows us to control multiple parameters that could influence segregation distortion, such as the number of SNP markers used, the position of selection in the genome, the strength of selection in the genome, the distribution of SNP markers, and the size of the population. We can also examine the interaction between different parameters, such as population size and selection. With knowledge of the parameters that produced the final genotyping dataset, we can then attempt to identify the appropriate threshold to detect segregation distortion by examining the performance of various statistical tests. For example, when a selection pressure of strength X is applied at a locus, in what proportion of simulated populations is this locus identified as being significantly distorted for a given statistical test and population size?

In addition to the simulation experiments performed, we also wanted to investigate how much of the purported segregation distortion typically observed in real populations is the result of random chance rather than a consistent selection pressure. To examine this, we produced replicate populations of the same cross between varieties Avalon and Cadenza. These consisted of two F2 populations with Avalon as the female parent, and two F2 populations with Cadenza as the female parent, with each population containing around 96 lines. We were then able to compare replicate populations and test whether they showed any consistency in the regions exhibiting segregation distortion,

which if they did would imply that the distortion was the result of a selection pressure rather than random chance. There is a trend in the literature of removing markers exhibiting segregation distortion before the construction of a genetic map (Allen et al. 2016; Roorkiwal et al. 2018; Liu et al. 2016). It has already been shown by a previous simulation that segregation distortion does not affect the order of a genetic map (Hackett and Broadfoot 2003). High levels of segregation distortion can however effect the estimation of recombination frequency between a pair of markers (Lorieux et al. 1995), which is used in the clustering stage of genetic map construction. Here we use our simulation to examine whether clustering of markers is significantly affected by segregation distortion in modern genetic mapping software such as MSTMap (Wu et al. 2008).

Finally, after identifying appropriate statistical tests for the detection of segregation distortion from these experiments, we perform a reanalysis of some existing genotyping datasets from populations of hexaploid and tetraploid wheat (Allen et al. 2016; Avni et al. 2014). This allows us to highlight important regions of segregation distortion that could be the subject of further investigation, potentially leading to the identification of the genomic position and mechanism of a causative locus of segregation distortion in wheat.

4.3 Materials and Methods

4.3.1 Plant cultivation

For the replicate empirical mapping populations, we generated F2 plants using bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) varieties Avalon and Cadenza in reciprocal crosses. All plants were grown in uniform conditions at the same time using pots filled with peat-based soil and kept in a glasshouse at 15-25 °C with 16-h light, 8-h dark. Leaf-tissue was harvested from F2 plants two weeks after sowing. DNA was extracted following the protocol in (Pallotta et al. 2003) with minor modifications.

4.3.2 Sample genotyping

DNA concentration was assessed using a Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer and was normalized to 23 ng / μ l ready for analysis with the Axiom® Wheat Breeder’s array. Sample preparation for array genotyping was performed with the Beckman Coulter Biomek FX. Samples were then genotyped using the Axiom® 35K Wheat Breeders array in conjunction with the GeneTitan® using standard Affymetrix protocols (Axiom® 2.0 Assay for 384 samples P/N 703154 Rev. 2).

4.3.3 Genetic Map Construction

Axiom Analysis Suite (version 3.1.51.0) was used to assign genotype calls using the Axiom Best Practices Genotyping Workflow. There were 3044 SNPs polymorphic between the parental varieties, Avalon and Cadenza, that were deemed suitable for genetic mapping. These were designated as PolyHighResolution, which is the category assigned to markers that are clearly codominant, by Axiom Analysis Suite and had a minor allele frequency > 0.1 . The minor allele frequency criterion served as a simple metric to remove markers with highly erroneous cluster plots from the analysis. Cluster plots of the probes that did not meet the minor allele frequency criterion were inspected by eye to ensure that no genuine cases of segregation distortion were omitted.

To create the genetic map, the genotyping data from the Cadenza X Avalon population was used. The ASMap package in R, an implementation of the MSTmap algorithm, was used for clustering, ordering and calculation of genetic distance between markers. Various values for the clustering parameter were tested during the creation of the genetic map. The final value used was 10-25, which returned several linkage groups that contained around 200 markers, which is in accordance with other genetic maps of wheat produced with the 35k Wheat Breeder’s array (Allen et al. 2016). Chromosome assignment to linkage groups was based on information from nullisomic lines from CerealsDB (Wilkinson et al. 2016) as well as a BLAST search of probe sequences against the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 sequence (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018) (hereafter re-

ferred to as the IWGSC assembly). Markers were assigned physical locations based on a BLAST search of probe sequences against the IWGSC assembly. Any linkage groups that spanned less than 80% of the physical distance of the chromosome were removed from the analysis, as we were interested in observing patterns of segregation along the entire length of the chromosome. Linkage groups representing the following chromosomes were retained: 1A, 1B, 1D, 2A, 2B, 2D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A.

4.3.4 Simulation of genotyping data

Genotyping data from a single seed descent population were simulated using PedigreeSim (Voorrips and Maliepaard 2012) in conjunction with a custom wrapper script written in R (Coulton 2019). The R script provides the capability to apply a selection pressure of a specified strength on gametes of a parental genotype at a locus. For example, we could apply a negative selection pressure of strength 1/20 at marker 200 against gametes with a “B” genotype, meaning that these gametes would be 5% less viable than gametes with an “A” genotype at this locus. We would therefore expect this selection pressure to produce a 100:95 ratio of A:B gametes. PedigreeSim allows the input of markers at specified centimorgan positions, meaning that we were able produce simulations that had the marker distribution of wheat chromosomes. For many of the simulations, we used the existing genetic map from the Cadenza X Avalon population to provide these marker positions so that the segregation distortion data were comparable to empirical populations of wheat. When performing simulations, we ran 1000 simulations for each unique set of parameter values unless otherwise stated.

To examine the effect of segregation distortion on genetic map construction, we simulated two chromosomes using the centimorgan positions from chromosomes 1A and 6B of the Cadenza X Avalon genetic map, which were chosen based on marker density. Before genetic map construction, the order of markers in the genotyping data was scrambled to ensure that this information was not being used by the mapping software. Firstly, we tested clustering when one selection pressure resulting in the highest level

of distortion (0:0:1 ratio of AA:AB:BB genotypes) was applied to chromosome 1A at marker 200. We then tested clustering when each chromosome had a selection pressure applied at marker 30 and 200 of chromosomes 6B and 1A respectively in favour of the same parental allele. We also tested the effect of segregation distortion on map length using selection pressures of varying strengths at the positions previously mentioned.

4.3.5 Measurement of segregation distortion and p-value adjustment

To measure segregation distortion, we used a variety of methods. These include the magnitude of distortion, referred to here as M, which is defined as $a/(a + b)$ where a and b represent the number of plants with homozygous A and B genotypes respectively at an arbitrary locus. M ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 meaning no A genotypes are present and 1 meaning no B genotypes are present. For F2 populations, we use a chi-square goodness-of-fit test to measure deviation from a 1:2:1 ratio of AA:AB:BB genotypes, whilst for F6 populations, we measured deviation from a 1:1 ratio of AA:BB genotypes. Adjusted p-values were produced using the `p.adjust` function in R with either the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for false discovery rate (FDR) correction or the Bonferroni correction.

4.4 Results

4.4.1 Validation of Simulation

Simulated data closely resembled empirical data from the Cadenza X Avalon mapping population. The mean (\pm s.d.) number of crossover events per plant for chromosome 1A was 2.72 ± 3.31 , and 2.59 ± 1.31 in empirical and simulated populations respectively, each population containing 96 individuals. There was no significant difference between the number of crossover events in individuals between empirical and simulated data as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test ($p = 0.07$). The mean (\pm s.d.) length of simulated genetic maps over 1000 simulations, using 96 individuals and the marker distribution from chromosome 1A of the Cadenza X Avalon genetic map, was 130.9

\pm (7.3) centimorgans (cM), whilst the length of the empirical map was 130.48 cM. Simulated data closely conformed to the expected levels of heterozygosity for each filial generation (which should reduce by half for each generation in selfing organisms), with mean (\pm s.d.) values over 1000 simulations of 49.96 (\pm 1.73)%, 25 (\pm 1.42)%¹²¹, 12.47 (\pm 0.97)%¹²², 6.24 (\pm 0.7)%¹²³, 3.13 (\pm 0.48)% for F2, F3, F4, F5 and F6 generations respectively.

In the recombination frequency heatmaps (figure 4.1) of empirical and simulated data, the regions of low recombination between closely linked markers along the diagonal are largely preserved, whilst in the simulation, recombination frequency rises faster than in the empirical data with increasing distance between markers. This is to be expected, as recombination frequency (or a proxy measure, in this case the hamming distance for MSTmap) is used in the clustering stage of genetic map construction, meaning we do not expect to see pairs of markers above a particular recombination frequency threshold together in a single linkage group of the empirical data. Segregation of genotypes across markers in the simulated data are more autocorrelated than in empirical data, with values of 0.95 ± 0.03 (averaged over 1000 simulations with populations of 96 individuals and no selection) and 0.875 respectively (figure 4.2). This is expected as the empirical data contains both genotyping errors and missing data whilst the simulated data does not.




Figure 4.1 Comparison of recombination fraction heatmaps for both empirical (a) (Avalon X Cadenza 1A) and simulated data (b). The large central red block most likely represents the centromeric region of the chromosome, as wheat is known to have a lack of recombination in this area. The pattern of recombination cold spots (represented by red squares) is largely conserved between empirical and simulated data. The empirical data has low to medium levels of recombination between distant markers (represented by yellow regions), whilst the simulated data shows high levels of recombination (represented by blue regions)




Figure 4.2 Comparison of empirical data (a) from chromosome 1A of a Cadenza X Avalon F2 mapping population with 96 individuals to simulated data (b - d). The simulations each have 96 individuals and were produced using the marker distribution from the empirical data. The y-axis shows the segregation ratio of homozygous genotypes, shown here as a proportion of the total number of homozygous genotypes ($(a)/(a+b)$). The black horizontal line indicates an even 1:1 ratio of homozygous genotypes. Included are simulations of both F2 (b, c) and F6 (d, e) single seed descent populations for comparison, as well as simulations exhibiting the least (b, d) and the most (c, e) amount of segregation distortion out of 1000 simulations. None of the simulations have any selection pressure applied, so these plots indicate the effect of sampling error on segregation. Sig. = significance threshold (chi-square test)

4.4.2 Simulation experiments

Initially, we ran simulations using the marker distribution for chromosome 1A of the Cadenza X Avalon cross for population sizes of 96, 300, 1000 and 10000, all with 224 markers and no selection applied. M decreased with increasing population size, whilst the proportion of simulations that contained markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion stayed relatively constant, as shown in Table 4.1. To test the effect of marker binning on the detection of segregation distortion, simulated genotyping datasets with a reduced marker set (93 markers) containing only skeleton markers were produced. Only the FDR and Bonferroni corrections showed any differences between marker sets (table 4.1). Increasing population sizes decrease the variance in segregation between simulations, but also make chi-square significance criteria more sensitive (figure 4.3). Filial generation did not influence the number of simulations that exhibited significant segregation distortion (table 4.1) according to a chi-square test, (comparison of F2 and F6 with population size 300, $\chi^2 = 0.004$, df = 1, p = 0.95).




Figure 4.3 Effect of population size on the magnitude of distortion. Indicated in the header of each panel is the population size. Segregation ratio is calculated as $(a)/(a + b)$, and each data point is the mean value over 1000 simulations. The simulations have no selection and use the marker distribution from chromosome 1A of the Cadenza x Avalon cross. The shaded area represents the mean segregation ratio value \pm the standard deviation over 1000 simulations. The dashed lines mark the 5% significance threshold for a chi-square test, whilst the dotted line marks a 1:1 segregation ratio. The effect of sampling error on segregation ratio decreases as population size increases

Table 4.1 Measures of segregation distortion for simulations with 224 markers and marker distribution taken from chromosome 1A of a Cadenza X Avalon F2 cross. The last column indicates the mean value across all simulations of the magnitude of distortion at its highest value. Shown in the p-value columns are the number of simulations (out of 1000 performed) that contain significantly distorted markers. Marker set A refers to the full marker set of 224 markers, whilst marker set B refers to the skeleton marker set of 93 markers.

Population Size	Marker set	Filial Generation	P < 0.05	P < 0.01	P < 0.001	P < 0.05 (FDR Correction)	P < 0.05 (Bonferroni Correction)	Mean magnitude of peak distortion
96	A	2	561	162	16	18	4	0.1415
300	A	2	561	163	28	26	4	0.08122
1000	A	2	557	177	24	27	7	0.04366
10000	A	2	557	183	28	28	6	0.01377
96	A	6	602	179	27	30	7	0.1099
300	A	6	563	167	19	33	1	0.06153
1000	A	6	570	215	35	38	5	0.0343
10000	A	6	583	208	26	28	3	0.01085
96	B	2	561	162	16	22	8	0.1415
300	B	2	561	163	28	25	13	0.08122
1000	B	2	557	177	24	26	15	0.04366
10000	B	2	557	183	28	29	17	0.01377

In simulations containing a single marker for a population size of 1000, 5.2% exhibited significant segregation distortion, which is concordant with a chi-square alpha threshold of 0.05. Where two markers were placed near each other at centimorgan positions of 59 and 60, 5.4% of simulations contained markers with significant segregation distortion. Increasing the distance between these two markers by placing them at 20 and 60 centimorgans resulted in 9.2% of simulations containing markers with significant segregation distortion. The difference in number of simulations containing segregation distortion between these proximal and distal marker distributions was significant ($\chi^2 = 9.89$, df = 1, p = 0.002).

To assess the effects of population size and selection strength on deviation from a 1:1 ratio of homozygous genotypes, and therefore segregation distortion, we ran a set of simulations in which both these parameters varied (figure 4.4). Population size ranged from 10 to 2000, whilst selection strength ranged from 1/20 to ½. As selection strength increases, the effect of population size on the deviation from 1:1 decrease. Simulations with population sizes less than 80 are very susceptible to distortion regardless of the selection strength.




Figure 4.4 Heatmap of deviation from 1:1 segregation of homozygotes at various population sizes and selection strengths. Lower selection strengths are highly dependent on population size. As population size decreases, the influence of sampling error on segregation ratios increases, leading to high segregation distortion even in the case of weak selection. Each tile is an average value over 20 simulations with 20 markers at evenly spaced intervals, totalling 100 centimorgan. Deviation is calculated as $\Sigma(y - 0.5)^2$ where y is the ratio of homozygous genotypes $(a)/(a + b)$ at an arbitrary locus; a is the number of homozygous genotypes from parent 1, b is the number of homozygous genotypes from parent 2 at an arbitrary locus

We examined the performance of various p-value thresholds and multiple testing procedures on the detection of segregation distortion at a range of selection strengths, with

a population of 1000 individuals per simulation (figure 4.5). 56.1% of simulations contained significantly distorted markers when a p-value threshold of 0.05 was used with no selection, compared to 3% at p-value thresholds of $p < 0.001$, $p < 0.05$ (FDR corrected) and $p < 0.05$ (Bonferroni corrected). As shown in Fig 4.5, $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.05$ (FDR corrected) are almost equivalent for this distribution of markers. All the detection criteria reach saturation (100% of simulations having markers with significant segregation distortion) at a selection strength of 0.25. As expected, the Bonferroni test is strictest regardless of selection strength.




Figure 4.5 Proportion of 1000 simulations containing significantly distorted markers as a function of selection strength for various p-value threshold criteria. Simulations contain 1000 individuals and used the marker distribution of chromosome 1A from the Cadenza X Avalon F2 population. The position of selection was at locus 200 of 224 markers Sim = simulations, sig. = significant, pop. = population

In addition to the type of statistical test used, population size also influences the number of simulations exhibiting significant segregation distortion. As population size increases, so does the ability to reliably detect smaller selection strengths (figure 4.6). At a selection strength of 1/20, 60.3%, 66.2%, 85% and 100% of simulations contained markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion under a chi-square test with alpha threshold 0.05 for population sizes of 96, 300, 1000 and 10000 respectively (figure 4.7).




Figure 4.6 Effect of selection strength and population size on the number of simulations containing distorted markers (as determined by a chi-square test with significance threshold of 0.05 after correction for multiple testing with FDR). Sim = simulations, sig. = significant, pop. = population




Figure 4.7 Simulation of an F5 RIL population with a selection pressure of strength 1/20 at locus 200. Indicated in the header of each panel is the population size. As the population size increases, the influence of sampling error on segregation of marker decreases, providing increased resolution of genuine selection events. (a) shows the mean magnitude of distortion ((a)/(a + b)) over 1000 simulations. The shaded area represents \pm the standard deviation of the magnitude of distortion over 1000 simulations. The dashed lines mark the 5% significance threshold for a chi-square test, whilst the dotted line marks a 1:1 segregation ratio. (b) shows the number of simulations in which the peak of distortion occurs at the specified marker. As population size increases, so do the number of simulations in which the genuine selection event emerges as the peak of distortion. Num. = Number, sim. = simulations, dist. = distortion.

To test whether local recombination rate in the region of selection effected the detection of segregation distortion, we performed additional simulations with selection at marker 100 of chromosome 1A. This marker is located in a region of low recombination (figure 4.8), which contrasts with previous simulations where selection was at marker 200, located in a region of high recombination. The only statistical test that was affected by recombination rate in the region of selection was the FDR correction, which was consistently more powerful at all values of selection strength for population sizes 96, 300 and 1000 (figure 4.9).




Figure 4.8 Recombination for chromosome 1A of the Avalon X Cadenza cross. The amount of recombination is represented by the slope of the line.




Figure 4.9 Examining the effect of selection position on the number of simulations containing significantly distorted markers. Position 100 is in a region of low recombination, whereas position 200 is in a region of high recombination. Columns are separated by the type of statistical test performed, whereas rows are separated by population size. The FDR correction has consistently more power when selection is in position 100. sig. = significant, dist. = distorted, S. = selection, Pos. = position.

These results contrast with the effect of local recombination rate on the detection of segregation distortion regions (SDRs), defined here as 2 or more consecutive markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion. The total number of SDRs generated among all 1000 simulations is generally higher when selection is positioned at marker 100 com-

pared to marker 200 (figure 4.10 (a)). An exception to this occurs at very high selection strengths (0.5), as these cause the entire chromosome to become one SDR at position 100, resulting in fewer, albeit larger in number of markers, SDRs overall. Changing the measure of SDRs to the number of simulations containing at least one SDR (figure 4.10 (b)). causes both selection positions to perform almost analogously when using no multiple testing correction and a detection threshold of $p < 0.001$. In comparison, the FDR correction for multiple testing results in a greater difference between positions.




Figure 4.10 Comparison of the effect of selection position on formation of segregation distortion regions (SDRs). Selection position 100 is in a region of low recombination, whereas position 200 is a region of high recombination. (a) shows the total number of SDR among 1000 simulations as a function of selection strength, whereas (b) shows the number of simulations with at least 1 SDR. Shown in the panel titles are the thresholds / type of statistical tests used to detect segregation distortion. num. = number, sim. = simulations.

To examine the effect of selection strength on the position of maximum distortion, we performed simulations with a selection pressure at locus 200 of 224, using the marker distribution from Cadenza X Avalon 1A and a population size of 300 individuals. Selec-

tion strength ranged from 1/20 to $\frac{1}{2}$. As expected, the number of markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion increased with the selection pressure, with mean values of 30.83 and 177.45 at selection pressures of 1/20 and $\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. The percentage of simulations at which the peak of segregation distortion occurred within 10 markers of the applied selection pressure was 52% for a selection pressure of 1/10, which gradually increased: 64.9%, 78.2%, 92.7% and 99.7% for pressures of 1/8, 1/6, 1/4, and $\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. This was also affected by population size, with higher population sizes having an increasing number of simulations exhibiting peak segregation distortion at the selection locus when selection strength was fixed to 1/20 (figure 4.7 (b)).

4.4.3 Effect of segregation distortion on genetic mapping

In the simulations with a single selection pressure of strength 1 at locus 30 of chromosome 6B and no selection pressure on 1A, yielding a genotype ratio of 0:0:300 at the locus under selection, MSTMap was able to construct the genetic map with perfect clustering and ordering of marker bins using a clustering parameter of 10-43. The second simulation contained two selection pressures, one positioned at marker 30 of chromosome 6B and the other positioned at marker 200 of chromosome 1A, both favouring the same parental genotype. MSTMap was able to construct genetic map with perfect clustering and ordering of marker bins (using clustering parameter 10-45) up to a selection pressure of 1/1.11, which yielded genotype ratios of 1:31:268 (test of deviation from 1:2:1 ratio: $\chi^2 = 664.07$, $df = 2$, $p < 10^{-15}$) and 2:32:266 (test of deviation from 1:2:1 ratio: $\chi^2 = 650.29$, $df = 2$, $p < 10^{-15}$) for the markers under selection respectively. When the selection strength for this configuration was increased to 1/1.105, yielding genotypes ratios of 0:27:273 and 1:28:271 respectively, MSTMap was unable to cluster markers correctly for any of the clustering parameters tested, which ranged from 10-40 to 10-50. For example, using a clustering parameter of 10-45 yielded two linkage groups, the first consisting of markers 1 to 167 of chromosome 1A, the second consisting of a concatenation of 1A markers 168 to 223 and all the markers on 6B (figure 4.11).




Figure 4.11 Effect of segregation distortion on genetic mapping. (a) When no selection is applied, two linkage groups representing simulated chromosome 1A and chromosome 6B are formed with perfect order of marker bins. (b) When a strong selection pressure of 1/1.11 is applied at locus 30 and 200 of 6B and 1A respectively, the recombination fractions between markers at these loci and surrounding markers are lowered, but not enough to disrupt clustering or ordering of the markers. (c) When a strong enough selection pressure of 1/1.105 is applied such that one of the loci has zero A genotypes, the recombination frequencies of markers under selection are low enough such that chromosomal fragments experiencing segregation distortion are concatenated into the same linkage group. White lines delineate linkage groups

Moving the position of one of the two selection pressures from a region of high recombination (marker 200 on chromosome 1A, (figure 4.8)) to a region of low recombination (marker 100 on chromosome 1A, (figure 4.8)), had little effect on genetic map construction, with MSTMap producing a map with perfect clustering and ordering of marker bins at a selection strength of 1/1.2, yielding genotype ratios of 2:50:248 and 2:55:243 at marker 30 of chromosome 6B and marker 100 of chromosome 1A respectively. MSTMap was unable to cluster markers correctly when selection strength was increased to 1/1.1, yielding genotype ratios of 0:29:271 and 0:31:269 for the respective markers under selection. When the position of selection on chromosome 6B was also moved to a region of low recombination (from marker 30 to marker 110, (figure 4.12)), MSTMap produced a map with perfect clustering and ordering of marker bins at a selection strength of 1/1.2, and failed to cluster markers correctly when the strength was increased to 1/1.1.




Figure 4.12 Recombination for chromosome 6B of an Avalon X Cadenza cross. The amount of recombination is indicated by the slope of the line.

Similarly to the results from the F2 population, in a simulation of an F8 SSD population with the same selection positions and a selection strength of 1/1.3, which yielded AA:BB genotype ratios of 28:272 (chi-square test of deviation from 1:1 ratio, $\chi^2 = 198.45$, df = 1, $p < 10^{-15}$) and 31:269 (chi-square test of deviation from 1:1 ratio, $\chi^2 = 188.81$, df = 1, $p < 10^{-15}$) for the respective markers under selection, MSTmap was able to produce perfect clustering and ordering of marker bins with a clustering parameter of 10-42.

Extreme segregation distortion caused a significant shortening of map length for simulated chromosome 6B (t-test, $t = -27.57$, $df = 176.43$, $p < 10^{-15}$) by around 20 cM, with a selection pressure of 1 producing a map length of 140.14 ± 3.92 compared to 159.07 ± 5.64 with no selection applied. Less extreme selection pressures of 1/3, 1/5, 1/7 and 1/9 produced mean map lengths over 100 simulations of 153.04 ± 4.64 , 155.08 ± 4.4 , 155.39 ± 4.68 and 156.77 ± 3.95 respectively. Likewise, for simulated chromosome 1A, extreme distortion shortened the map length significantly (t-test, $t = -5.17$, $df = 197.72$, $p < 10^{-6}$), but with a smaller effect size than for 6B, with selection pressure of 1 producing a mean map length of 127.39 ± 4.81 compared to 130.84 ± 4.64 cM with no selection.

4.4.4 Reanalysis of existing data

We reanalysed data from (Allen et al. 2016; Avni et al. 2014), both of which used the minimum chi-square threshold of $p < 0.05$ to detect regions of segregation distortion (table 4.2). As expected, in both cases we observe a large reduction in the number of markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion when corrections for multiple testing are applied.

Table 4.2 Reanalysis of genotyping data from existing studies with corrections for multiple testing. Indicated in columns 3–5 are number of markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion with no correction for multiple testing, the FDR correction and the Bonferroni correction respectively.

Author	Population	Mapping	P <	P < 0.05	P < 0.05
		0.05	(FDR)	(Bonferroni)	
Allen et al., 2016	Avalon X Cadenza	487	5	5	
‘’	Savannah X Rialto	230	0	0	
‘’	Opata X Synthetic	346	0	0	
‘’	Apogee X Paragon	320	35	21	
‘’	Chinese Spring X Paragon	774	0	0	
Avni et al., 2014	Svevo X Zavitan	3789	1771	150	

Markers that were still classified as significantly distorted in the Avalon X Cadenza population under Bonferroni correction were located on chromosomes 2A and 2D, whilst in the Apogee X Paragon population these were found on chromosomes 2D, 3B, 6A and 6B. Likewise, for the Svevo X Zavitan population, markers still significantly distorted under Bonferroni correction were found on chromosomes 2B and 3B.

4.4.5 Cadenza X Avalon Replicates

In the Cadenza X Avalon F2 replicates, there are 453 (14.88%) markers that exhibit significant segregation distortion ($p < 0.05$) in at least one of the replicates. Only 14 markers showed significant segregation distortion in both replicates. When both datasets were combined, 253 markers showed significant distortion. In the combined dataset, 173 of the 253 distorted markers were also distorted in one of the two original replicate datasets, whilst 80 were not. In the first and second replicates, 187 and 280

markers exhibited significant distortion respectively. In the first replicate, there were 22 SDRs, comprised of 161 markers in total. The mean \pm sd length of the SDRs was 7.32 ± 5.57 markers. In the second replicate, there were 31 SDRs comprised of 238 markers in total. The mean \pm s.d. length of the SDRs was 7.68 ± 10.46 . Three of the SDRs on chromosomes 1D, 5B and 1A respectively overlapped between replicates; the lengths of the overlaps were 4, 2 and 2 markers respectively.

4.4.6 Avalon X Cadenza Replicates

In the Avalon X Cadenza F2 replicates, there are 510 (16.75%) markers that exhibit significant segregation distortion ($p < 0.05$) in at least one of the replicates. Only 38 markers showed significant segregation distortion in both replicates. When both datasets were combined, 173 markers showed significant distortion. In the combined dataset, 120 of the 173 distorted markers were also distorted in one of the two original replicate datasets, whilst 53 were not. In the first and second replicates, 193 and 355 markers exhibited significant distortion respectively. In the first replicate, there were 15 SDRs comprised of 155 markers total. The mean \pm s.d. length of the segregation distortion regions was 10.33 ± 8.81 . In the second replicate, there were 20 SDRs comprised of 328 markers total. The mean \pm s.d. length of the segregation distortion regions was 16.4 ± 32.49 . Six of the SDRs overlapped between replicates, these were all located on chromosome 6B and had widths of 8, 4, 8, 2, 4 and 4 markers respectively, (figure 4.13). The overlapping region did not have a skew towards the same parental genotype in each replicate.




Figure 4.13 Comparison of segregation ratios on chromosome 6B for Cadenza X Avalon (a, b) and Avalon X Cadenza (c, d) replicates. Markers exhibiting significant segregation distortion as determined by a chi-square goodness of fit test for deviation from a 1:2:1 ratio of AA:AB:BB genotypes are highlighted by asterisks at the base of each plot. Black horizontal lines mark the expected transition from one genotype to the next under a 1:2:1 ratio. Markers are ordered on the x-axis as in the genetic map produced from the first replicate Cadenza X Avalon population

4.5 Discussion

Comparisons between the simulated data and the empirical data from the Cadenza X Avalon F2 mapping population show that the simulator is accurate in terms of map

length produced, number of recombination events per individual, degree of segregation distortion and recombination frequency heatmap. We can therefore be confident that the subsequent simulation experiments are an adequate representation of reality.

It is clear a priori that when we test for segregation distortion, the probability of a false-positive result increases with the number of markers, as multiple inferences are being made simultaneously. What complicates the calculation of how much more likely a false-positive result is with increasing number of markers, and therefore how strict our correction for multiple testing should be, is the marker distribution along the chromosome. All markers are ultimately linked together to varying degrees by the process of recombination, so not all the statistical tests performed are completely independent. Markers adjacent to each other at short genetic intervals along the chromosome segregate in a highly linked manner. This is confirmed by our simulation experiments with different distributions of two markers, one in which the markers are close together and one in which they are further apart, with the latter yielding almost double the amount of simulations containing markers that were significantly distorted. Interestingly, the chi-square test performs as expected when only one marker is used on the chromosome with no selection, with around 5% of simulations showing a false-positive result, which corresponds to the traditional alpha threshold of 0.05.

The FDR correction procedure reassuringly produced an alpha threshold that is only slightly stricter than the traditional 5% in the simulated chromosome 1A described earlier, as shown in table 1. The Bonferroni correction is only appropriate when statistical tests are completely independent from one another, which is not the case for highly linked markers. The Bonferroni test would therefore be appropriate if markers were on different chromosomes, or if they were located at large distances from each other on the same chromosomes. For high-density SNP data obtained from microarrays this is often not the case, and therefore the Bonferroni correction is often too strict, as shown by the results in table 1, where in the F2 population of 300 individuals only 4 simulations show significant segregation distortion, where we would expect around 50 if the test corresponded to the usual 0.05 alpha threshold. The fact that 56% of simulations

without any selection pressure show significant segregation distortion according to the chi-square test at the minimum p-value threshold ($p < 0.05$) should definitively rule out the use of chi-square without correction for multiple testing, or inclusion of lower thresholds, in future studies that utilize high-density genotyping data. The perfect multiple testing procedure for segregation distortion would be one that considers the distribution of markers on the chromosome such that the alpha threshold is adjusted depending on the degree of linkage between each marker. However, seeing as the FDR correction for multiple testing is only marginally more conservative than the traditional alpha threshold of 0.05, and taking into account the fact that the traditional alpha threshold was chosen arbitrarily (Wasserstein et al. 2019), the use of FDR as a new standard for the detection of segregation distortion seems appropriate.

One focus in the literature is the identification of segregation distortion loci. Our simulation experiments with a range of selection strengths show that resolution of selection events is increased with population size. This is because the effects of sampling error are neutralized as population size increases. Sampling error could lead to the erroneous conclusion that a segregation distortion locus is present by shifting the segregation of a marker away from expected Mendelian ratios. Conversely, it can make markers under true selection pressures appear as normally segregating. It can also skew the peak of segregation distortion away from a true selection locus at smaller selection strengths. To correctly identify the causative locus in this case then would require a wider search than is initially implied by the segregation data. These results emphasize the significance of sampling error in segregation distortion studies. In addition, our results show that local recombination rates in the region of selection have little influence on the detection of segregation distortion.

It has long been known that segregation distortion effects the estimation of recombination fraction between markers (Lorieux et al. 1995). However, there does not seem to be a practical guide in the literature that can assist researchers in knowing what degree of distortion will affect the mapping process. Our simulation experiments on the effect of segregation distortion on genetic mapping show that only very extreme dis-

tortion effects the formation of linkage groups during the clustering of markers, as well as map length, meaning that markers experiencing moderate distortion can be retained in genetic maps. This conclusion persists regardless of selection position, whether in a region of high or low recombination. This result will be useful to future studies, as markers that would have previously been discarded will give us more information on potentially useful genomic regions of many crop species. In the re-analysis of data from Allen et al (Allen et al. 2016) and Avni et al (Avni et al. 2014), it is interesting to note that the latter had many more markers exhibiting segregation distortion both before and after corrections for multiple testing. The former study used varieties of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) whilst the latter involved a cross between durum wheat (*Triticum turgidum* L. subsp. *durum*) and a wild relative of durum wheat, wild emmer (*Triticum turgidum* L. subsp. *dicoccoides*). It has been noted elsewhere in the literature that the degree of segregation distortion often increases with genetic distance of the parents (Liu et al. 2010). One hypothesis is that with increasing genetic distances, the fitness benefits conferred to the progeny of biparental crosses become increasingly different between parental alleles. If this is indeed the case, the description of a true segregation distortion locus in closely related crop varieties, including its mechanism of action, is a much more difficult task than in more distantly related crosses. Indeed, our best descriptions of segregation distortion loci are from crosses between rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) subspecies *indica* and *japonica* (Yang et al. 2012), as well as *Drosophila pseudoobscura* subspecies *pseudoobscura* and *bogotana* (Phadnis and Orr 2009). To detect a true segregation distortion locus in closely related wheat varieties then would require population sizes large enough to detect much smaller selection strengths, as indicated in figure 4.6, as well as replicate populations to confirm the effect on segregation is due to selection. An exception to this statement may be in the production of doubled haploid mapping populations, where differences in amenability to doubled haploidy between closely related varieties has the potential to produce segregation distortion that is stronger than in an SSD population structure (Sayed et al. 2002).

When identifying segregation distortion in empirical populations, it is often convenient to assess segregation in terms of SDRs, as multiple consecutive markers exhibiting

significant segregation distortion provide us with more confidence that the distortion observed is not due to erroneous genotype assignment. The fact that we only observed a few SDR overlaps that were distorted towards the same parent between replicates in our empirical populations shows that legitimate segregation distortion between varieties of wheat is rare. Our simulation experiments also confirm the intuitive deduction that the number of SDRs should increase when selection occurs within regions of low recombination. In conclusion, the results presented here emphasize the importance of using appropriate statistical methods when detecting segregation distortion. We must be sure that the observed distortion is due to a genuine selection pressure before we can commence further research into identifying the loci that are driving the distortion. We recommend that studies utilizing high-density genotyping data use an FDR correction for multiple testing when checking for segregation distortion, and that population size should be as high as possible to increase the chances of discovering genuine segregation distortion loci. Figure 4.6 serves as a guide for the appropriate population size to detect various selection strengths. For example, to reliably detect a selection strength of 1/10 at the 0.05 p-value threshold, a population size slightly bigger than 1000 individuals is required. As a result of our reanalysis of existing data based on these principles, we have discovered a candidate segregation distortion region on chromosome 3B of a cross between wheat varieties Apogee and Paragon that is likely to be caused by a genuine selection event. We hope that future studies of segregation distortion will also consider the findings presented here.

5 AutoCloner: automatic primer design for full-gene cloning in polyploids

All results described here have been published in the following manuscript:

Coulton, A., Edwards, K., 2020. AutoCloner: automatic homologue-specific primer design for full-gene cloning in polyploids. BMC Bioinformatics

5.1 Introduction

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) is a procedure that allows the amplification of small amounts of DNA into millions or billions of copies, originally conceived by Kary Mullis in the 1980s (Mullis 1990). There are four primary reagents required for the PCR. The first of these is the template sequence to be amplified, which is usually obtained using a simple DNA extraction procedure (e.g. (Edwards et al. 1991)). In addition, two short oligonucleotide sequences, ranging from 15 - 30 bases in length, are also required. These must be complementary to the template sequence, as well as positioned such that they are flanking the template sequence. The first hybridizes at the start of the sequence to the sense strand of the DNA double helical structure, whilst the second hybridizes at the end of the sequence, to the anti-sense strand. For this reason these oligonucleotides are referred to as the forward primer and the reverse primer respectively. The third key reagent for PCR is a thermostable DNA polymerase, originally isolated from thermophilic bacterium *Thermus aquaticus*. Finally, PCR also requires a pool of free nucleotides that serve as base material for DNA synthesis.

The reaction itself consists of three stages: denaturation, annealing, and extension. The basis of change between these stages is a change in temperature of the reaction tube, done using a thermocycler machine. During the denaturation stage, temperature increases to around 94°C for 1 minute, which is enough to separate the individual strands of the DNA double helix, and thus making them free for hybridization to their respective primers (Lorenz 2012). Following this, temperature is lowered to around 52°C

for 30 seconds to allow annealing of primers to the template DNA. Finally, during the extension stage, temperature is raised to around 75°C, which is the optimal temperature for the thermostable DNA polymerase to synthesize the new DNA strands. These three stages are cycled through and repeated many times during the PCR, such that by the end of the reaction, the concentration of the target DNA outnumbers the concentration of the sample DNA by many orders of magnitude.

Cloning of genetic sequences via polymerase chain reaction (PCR) is a routine operation in biological research. In agricultural research specifically, this procedure facilitates the connection between varietal sequence differences and important phenotypic traits such as disease resistance, yield, and abiotic stress tolerance. This process is significantly complicated in polyploid crops due to the presence of multiple closely-related subgenomes, meaning that allele-specific primers must be used to prevent cloning of non-target sequences such as homeologues and paralogues. Although there already exists a tool for designing primers for use in Kompetitive allele specific PCR (KASP) assays in polyploids, PolyMarker (Ramirez-Gonzalez et al. 2015), this only considers flanking sequences of 100 bases either side of a varietal SNP. This limitation means that it cannot be used to clone entire genes, as the mean \pm s.d. length of a high-confidence gene in the IWGSC RefSeq v1.0 (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018) wheat genome assembly is 3065 ± 3957 bases. There are currently no software packages to assist allele-specific primer design for the cloning of entire genes or other genomic sequences of interest, and indeed current practice within the community is to carry out this lengthy process manually (Babben et al. 2015, 2018; wheat-training.com).

For example, consider the situation in which a researcher has a gene sequence from a single wheat variety and is interested in how this sequence differs between varieties. To assess this, they could design several pairs of allele-specific primers whose products overlap, covering the entire gene region, and then sequence these products after performing PCR. This primer design process involves several stages. First, the wheat genome must be queried for closely related alleles to the sequence of interest. Once homologues have been identified and extracted, they must be arranged into a multiple

sequence alignment. This alignment must then be scanned for SNPs to serve as the 3' bases of primers, which can then be designed using the appropriate primer-design software. In total, this is a lengthy process that would be significantly improved via the use of an automated tool. Here we present AutoCloner, (illustrated in figure 5.1) a fully automated allele-specific primer design pipeline that includes a simple web interface for users. Although developed in the context of wheat, AutoCloner can easily be configured to work with any species for which a genome assembly is available. It requires only a single input, the sequence of interest to clone.




Figure 5.1 Schematic detailing AutoCloner, a homologue-specific primer design pipeline for polyploids. (a) The user inputs a DNA sequence which they wish to clone in a variety for which this sequence is unknown. (b) AutoCloner finds flanking regions and homologues through BLAST, generates a multiple sequence alignment with Muscle and scans the alignment for SNPs. (c) The best possible combination of primers, whose overlapping products span the entire input sequence, are returned by the pipeline via Primer3.

5.2 Materials and methods

5.2.1 Acquisition of homologous sequences via BLAST

AutoCloner first searches for homologues of the user input sequence by performing a BLASTN search of the input sequence against the latest IWGSC (International Wheat Genome Sequencing Consortium) RefSeq wheat genome assembly (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018). Alternatively, AutoCloner can use any genome that the user has specified in the configuration file, and could therefore be used for any species where homologous sequences with high similarity are common. The tabular output files of the BLAST search are parsed and used as a basis for sequence extraction from the genome assembly (for code see appendix A.1). BLAST breaks up query sequences into high-scoring pairs (She et al. 2011), and as such it is necessary to examine groups of hits when using BLAST to extract homologues rather than individual hits. Here

a group of BLAST hits are defined as hits with the same query and subject sequence that are within 1000 bases of each other (figure 5.2). The group of BLAST hits that is most closely related to the input sequence is assumed to be the genomic representation of that sequence and is used to obtain the flanking regions of DNA. The next three, or alternatively the number specified by the user, best groups of hits are also used for sequence extraction and are assumed to be close homologues of the input sequence, providing their within-group average bitscore exceeds 200. This threshold means that only hits with a reasonable amount of sequence similarity are retained.




Figure 5.2 Schematic detailing BLAST parser. Although BLAST has returned three separate hits between these two homologues, these hits are actually within 1000 bases of each other, and so are grouped together, including the interstitial bases between hits, as one homologue by AutoCloner for sequence extraction.

Further input parameters to the pipeline include the amount of sequence to extract that flanks the input sequence, namely the start buffer (-s) and end buffer (-e) parameters, which default to 1000 nucleotides. The maximum product length and minimum product length parameters specify the maximum and minimum sizes of overlapping PCR products enclosed by the primers produced by the pipeline. To ensure memory is used efficiently during sequence extraction, AutoCloner makes fasta indices of any genome assemblies that are specified in the configuration file. AutoCloner also has the capability to include more than one genome if there are genome sequences available for more than one variety within the species. If this is the case, one sequence from each of the additional genomes is also extracted to increase the reliability of SNP identification in later stages, ensuring that varietal SNPs are not used as a basis for primer design.

5.2.2 Extraction of homologues and multiple sequence alignment

The extracted sequences must then be arranged into a multiple sequence alignment, which is used to identify SNPs between the sequence of interest and its homologues. AutoCloner uses Muscle (Edgar 2004), or alternatively Dialign (Al Ait et al. 2013), to achieve this. Dialign is useful when multiple homologues and partial homologues, i.e. sequences of different lengths, are present in the sequence set extracted from the BLAST results, as it allows specification of anchors that inform the alignment. A single-nucleotide mismatch at the 3' end of the primer significantly decreases the efficacy of Taq polymerase in the PCR reaction (Ayyadevara et al. 2000), and so the SNP locations can be evaluated as potential primer locations. It is unlikely that each of these locations will have the ideal sequence characteristics for a primer, such as adequate GC content, low probability of hairpin structures and an ideal melting temperature (TM). When performing this process manually, it is common for a researcher to evaluate multiple locations before finding one that is adequate for a primer. This is time consuming and can also produce sub-optimal results due to human error. It is for this reason that AutoCloner integrates Primer3 to evaluate each possible primer.

5.2.3 SNP Identification

Once the multiple sequence alignment has been produced, it can then be scanned for SNPs that could serve as potential locations for homologue-specific primers. Each SNP is evaluated based on various criteria, including whether the SNP provides complete chromosome specificity, and whether the SNP is in a suitable location. If more than one genome has been included in the sequence extraction process, varietal SNPs will also be identified. For example, if producing primers in wheat for the Apogee variety, the primary genome could be Chinese Spring (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018), whilst the secondary genome could be Paragon (Walkowiak et al. 2020). If the SNP is chromosome-specific and is present in both varieties, it is more likely to also be present in Apogee. A diagram of the SNP selection process is shown in figure 5.3.




Figure 5.3 Detailed overview of the SNP categorisation and primer selection process in AutoCloner. Shown is a hypothetical multiple sequence alignment (MSA) containing the sequence to clone (first row), two homeologues (rows 2-3), and a homologue from a second variety (row 4). AutoCloner identifies SNPs in the MSA and identifies which might be suitable for potential primer locations. The SNP at sequence site 3 is a varietal SNP rather than a homeologous SNP and is therefore not suitable. The SNP at sequence site 5 only provides partial specificity and is also not suitable. Whilst the SNP at sequence site 11 provides specificity, however is not present in the second variety, meaning it could be unique to the first variety, and therefore not present in the variety under investigation. The SNP at sequence site 105 does not flank the desired region to clone and is therefore not suitable. Shown at the bottom of the figure are potential primers with 3' ends placed on SNPs deemed viable. Note that some of these include primers that are placed on the same SNP but are different lengths. Primer3 evaluates each of these primers, ultimately assigning each a penalty score. The primers with the lowest penalties are returned to the user. Note that the reverse primers are shown as the reverse complement of the sequence in the MSA.

5.2.4 Evaluation of potential primer combinations using Primer3

AutoCloner evaluates all possible combinations of primers at the SNP locations that fall within the user-specified minimum and maximum product size ranges by utilizing Primer3 (Untergasser et al. 2012). The Primer3 output parameter PRIMER_PAIR_PENALTY is used to select the best primers. PRIMER_PAIR_PENALTY is a composite score calculated for each primer that corresponds to the overall quality of the primers: the lower the value the better. This score is made up of several factors. Primer melting temperature, the temperature at which primers dissociate from the template DNA, is calculated using thermodynamic formulae that take into account factors such as the concentration of divalent cations in the solution (Koressaar and Remm 2007). This value is compared to the optimal melting temperature (set at 60°C), with large deviations resulting in higher penalties. Primer melting temperature is used to derive the primer annealing temperature, the temperature at which oligos bind to the template DNA. Sub- and super-optimal annealing temperatures have a negative effect on primer specificity to the target sequence (Rychlik et al.). Primer length is also taken into account, which optimally should be 20 bases. This is long enough to provide target specificity and short enough not to dramatically effect the efficiency of primer annealing (Dieffenbach et al. 1993). Primer GC content is closely linked to melting temperature, and should be around 60%. The probability of the formation of primer-dimers and hairpin structures (intermolecular and intramolecular secondary structures respectively) is another important factor that could negatively effect the reaction, and therefore the penalty score.

Using these principles, it is therefore possible to predict the likelihood of a successful PCR ahead of time. The PRIMER_PAIR_PENALTY metric allows AutoCloner to select optimal sets of forward and reverse primers. These sets are chosen such that they have overlapping products that cover the entire input sequence. These overlapping products allow the input sequence to be cloned and sequenced in its entirety. In addition to the primers intended for PCR, several within-product primers are also selected for Sanger sequencing of large products. AutoCloner also allows the user to input their own

multiple sequence alignment instead of a single sequence using the -a option; in this case the initial stages of the pipeline are skipped and the alignment is immediately scanned for SNPs. Note that if this is the case, AutoCloner expects the multiple alignment to 1) be in Fasta format with gaps indicated by “-“ and 2) for the sequences to be in the following order: sequence to be cloned, same sequence but with flanking regions included, then any homologues.

5.2.5 Using Primer3 efficiently

One aspect that had to be considered when writing the AutoCloner pipeline was how to call Primer3 in a manner that would be most computationally efficient. This task is constrained by the options presented by the Primer3 developers that determine Primer3’s mode of operation, namely the PRIMER_TASK configuration tag. The relevant values for PRIMER_TASK include “generic”, which gives Primer3 free rein to pick and return only the best primer pairs it finds in the provided input sequence, unconstrained by position. This can be further modified to suit our needs (i.e. forcing the 3’ ends of primers to be located at SNPs) by SEQUENCE_FORCE_LEFT-END and SEQUENCE_FORCE_RIGHT-END parameters. An additional possible value for PRIMER_TASK is the “pick_primer_list” option, which causes Primer3 to return a list of all possible primers in the input sequence.

Given these possibilities, a naive view would suggest that first the multiple sequence alignment should be scanned for SNPs, then a new instance of Primer3 should be called for each one of these SNPs using the “generic” value for PRIMER_TASK. This could be achieved using the SEQUENCE_FORCE_LEFT-END and SEQUENCE_FORCE_RIGHT-END parameters for forward and reverse primers respectively. This could save on the unnecessary computation of primers at invalid, non-SNP locations. This approach works when the number of SNPs is low, however was found to be poor in practice, as the inefficiency of calling Primer3 in separate instances significantly lengthened the computation when the number of SNPs, and therefore potential primer locations, was high. A better approach is simply to force

Primer3 to generate primers at every single base location of the input sequence using the “pick_primer_list” value for PRIMER_TASK, then perform filtering of these primers to include only those that are in valid locations. This is much faster in the case where the number of SNPs is high, and only slightly slower than running separate Primer3 instances when the number of SNPs is low. This is largely due to the fact that Primer3 is written in C / C++, compiled languages optimized for faster computation. Figure 5.4 shows the AutoCloner control flow.

5.2.6 Choosing sets of overlapping primers

Sanger sequencing and PCR both become less accurate after a certain number of bases. To clone large genes then, it is necessary to perform sequencing and PCR with smaller, overlapping subsections of the gene which can be pieced together later using sequence alignment software. To achieve this, AutoCloner uses the following while loop algorithm (for code see appendix A.2):

Variables:

- Minimum SNP coordinate (S_m)
- Maximum SNP coordinate (S_M)
- Maximum product size (P)
- Forward primer coordinate (S_F)
- Reverse primer coordinate (S_R)

Algorithm:

- Set $S_m = 0$
- Set $S_M = \text{Position of the start of the gene}$
- Set $S_R = \text{Position of the start of the gene}$
- While $S_R < \text{Position of the end of the gene}:$
 - Find SNP within interval (S_m, S_M) with minimum primer penalty score. This is the position of the first forward primer (S_F).
 - Find SNP within interval $(S_F, S_F + P)$ with minimum primer penalty score. This is the position of the first reverse primer (S_R).
- * While no SNPs within interval $(S_F, S_F + P)$ and $P < \text{sequence length}$,
 - set $P = P + 10$
 - Set $S_m = S_F$
 - Set $S_M = S_R$




Figure 5.4 Flowchart showing the control flow of the AutoCloner pipeline. Names of software packages are shown in italics; box types are indicated in the legend.

5.2.7 Web interface

In order to maximise ease-of-use for wheat researchers, we designed a web interface for AutoCloner using the Django web development framework for Python. This site integrates into the popular wheat-resource website CerealsDB (Wilkinson et al. 2016). The web interface requires either a single sequence to be input by the user, or a multiple sequence alignment. The user can also specify all other pipeline parameters via the web interface, such as start and end buffers, minimum and maximum product sizes, and which alignment software to use. Once submitted, the sequence is entered into a queue for processing by AutoCloner. When the pipeline has finished processing the sequence, the user is forwarded to the Details page (figure 5.5) in which the details of their primers are displayed, with options to download the primer information as a CSV file as well as download the multiple sequence alignment in either fasta or clustal format. As well as showing optimal primer pairs chosen by the pipeline, a list of all possible primers (at all SNP locations) is also shown in case any of the primers do not work. The multiple sequence alignment is displayed directly on the website using MSA (Yachdav et al. 2016), a Javascript web component (figure 5.6). To maximise ease of use, the website was designed not to require any login details or personal information from the user. The website features two modes of running the pipeline. The first is a fully automatic mode in which all stages of the pipeline are run without user interaction. The second is a guided mode in which the user can inspect all found homologues and the multiple sequence alignment and choose to remove any unwanted homologues from the alignment before designing primers. This is useful as it gives the user more control over the primer design process, allowing them to debug errors in the pipeline when homologue classification is too lenient.

AutoCloner calculated primer pairs											
All possible primers											
Forward Primers		Reverse Primers									
	Position	MSA Position	Penalty	Sequence	TM	GC	Self any TH	Self end TH	Hairpin	End Stability	Orientation
946	3361	1.49091	CTAGTCCCTCCAACCATTCCC	59.509	57.143	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.97	F	

Figure 5.5 Picture of the AutoCloner website job details page. The user has the option to view the BLAST results themselves, as well as choose from all possible primers should the primers selected by AutoCloner not work.



Figure 5.6 Picture of the AutoCloner website job details page. The AutoCloner website presents the multiple sequence alignment, containing the input sequence, homologues, SNPs and primers, to the user for their own inspection.

5.3 Results and Discussion

5.3.1 Using AutoCloner to investigate segregation distortion

It is well established that a DNA mismatch at the 3' end of the primer significantly reduces the efficiency of Taq polymerase in a PCR, with previous research suggesting the magnitude of this effect could as much as a 100-fold decrease (Ayyadevara et al. 2000). This principle serves as the basis for the design of homologue-specific primers. We used AutoCloner to investigate potential gene candidates underpinning a region of segregation distortion on chromosome 5A of a Chinese Spring X Paragon F5 mapping population (Allen et al. 2016). This region lacked distortion in an Apogee X Paragon F5 mapping population (Allen et al. 2016). Sequences for this region in both Chinese Spring and Paragon were available, whilst no sequencing data was available for Apogee. We therefore formulated the hypothesis that since there was a lack of distortion in the Apogee X Paragon population, any potential causative gene would have the similar or identical sequences between Apogee and Paragon, and different sequences between Chinese Spring and Paragon. Therefore, sequencing data for Apogee could highlight (or eliminate) genes worthy of further investigation.

5.3.2 Cloning TraesCS5A01G531300 in Apogee

The first gene we cloned was TraesCS5A01G531300, a 2.4 kb High Confidence gene from the IWGSC assembly (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018), with a BLAST search identifying 2 homeologues on chromosomes 4B and 4D (the result of a well-known translocation between 5A and 4A (Devos et al. 1995b)), as well as a partial homologue on 5B, with homology beginning 325 bases into the gene and extending throughout the gene until ~10 bases downstream. Sequence identity, not including regions of outside of the HSPs identified by BLAST, between TraesCS5A01G531300 and each of the three homologues was 93.36%, 93.91% and 80.58% respectively, whereas GC content for TraesCS5A01G531300 and each of the homologues was 49.67%, 49.51%, 49.67% and 49.4% respectively. These GC values are close the average GC percentage of all

110790 HC genes in the IWGSC assembly (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018), which is $51.43\% \pm 10$ (mean \pm s.d.). AutoCloner returned four overlapping pairs of primers whose products covered the entire gene length (table 5.1). DNA was extracted following the protocol in (Edwards et al. 1991). All of the primers produced amplicons from the desired locus in the genome (figure 5.7), and the entire gene sequence was obtained via Sanger sequencing of these products. The resulting sequence was identical to the sequence in Chinese Spring apart from one non-synonymous single nucleotide variant.

Table 5.1 List of primers designed by AutoCloner to amplify and sequence TraesCS5A01G531300 in Apogee. Oligo names succeeded by an F are forward primers, whilst an R indicates a reverse primer. Both primers for PCR and primers for Sanger sequencing are included.

Oligo Name	Type	Sequence (5'->3')
T.300.577-1989.F	PCR	AGACTTCCTGAACACGGCACAA
T.300.577-1989.R	PCR	CTTCTTGATGGCGCGGCATATAT
T.300.1904-3138.F	PCR	TAGGTTGACGTCATCGAACAGCAG
T.300.1904-3138.R	PCR	CGGGTGAGAAGCAAGGACTC
T.300.2632-3437.F	PCR	CCATGGTGAGGTTGAGGTCC
T.300.2632-3437.R	PCR	GGTGCAGCAAGAGTACGGAG
T.300.2888-4219.F	PCR	CGGACGATGACAACAGGGAG
T.300.2888-4219.R	PCR	CCCTGCTCTCTCTCTCTCTCT
T.300.577-1989.split2.F	Sanger	CTCGAACTCGCTATTGGGCT
T.300.577-1989.split3.F	Sanger	AGTCAAGGTACAATATGTGACTGA
T.300.1904-3138.split2.F	Sanger	CCGTGAAGTACCGAAACCCA
T.300.1904-3138.split3.F	Sanger	TAACGAACCTGGTGCCTTCG
T.300.2632-3437.split2.F	Sanger	TCAGGTCTTGGCCAGTTTC
T.300.2888-4219.split2.F	Sanger	GTGGAGACATGGAGGAGCAC
T.300.2888-4219.split3.F	Sanger	ACCAACACTCAAGCAAAGGGA




Figure 5.7 Agarose gels showing amplified PCR products for the *TraesCS5A01G531300* gene using primers designed by AutoCloner. Details of the primers are shown in table 1. The DNA ladder used was the Quick-Load® Purple 2-log DNA ladder, manufactured by New England Biolabs, containing DNA fragments ranging from 0.1 kb to 10 kb in size. The expected product sizes for T.300.577-1989, T.300.1904-3138, T.300.2632-3437 and T.300.2888-4219 were 1412, 1234, 805 and 1331 bases respectively. A subsequent PCR (not shown) in which the annealing temperature was increased from 58 °C to 60 °C increased the specificity of the T.300.2888-4219 set of primers.

5.3.3 Cloning *TraesCS5A01G531700.1* in Apogee

The second gene cloned in Apogee was *TraesCS5A01G531700.1*, a 3.6kb gene on chromosome 5A with homeologues on 4B and 4D, as well as a partial 2kb parologue on

chromosome 5A, and smaller 600 bp homologous regions on 2D and 5D. We obtained a complete sequence of the coding region (introns defined by pairwise alignment to the IWGSC gene model) using four sets of overlapping primers produced by AutoCloner. All the amino acid substitutions present between the Chinese Spring and Paragon coding sequences of TraesCS5A01G531700.1 are also present between the Apogee and Paragon sequences. The Apogee sequence also contains some additional substitutions with Paragon between positions 35-69 (table 2).

Table 5.2 Amino acid substitutions between Paragon and Chinese Spring coding sequences of TraesCS5A01G531700.1. AA = Amino acid; “first variety” refers to the first variety listed in the corresponding “Comparison” column for each row.

Comparison	Position	AA in first variety	AA in second variety
Paragon & Chinese Spring	270	M	T
Paragon & Chinese Spring	292	Q	P
Paragon & Chinese Spring	552	I	V
Paragon & Chinese Spring	731	P	H
Paragon & Chinese Spring	760	A	V
Paragon & Apogee	35	L	F
Paragon & Apogee	64	F	V
Paragon & Apogee	66	E	K
Paragon & Apogee	69	E	A
Paragon & Apogee	270	M	T
Paragon & Apogee	292	Q	P
Paragon & Apogee	552	I	V
Paragon & Apogee	731	P	H
Paragon & Apogee	760	A	V

Comparison	Position	AA in first variety	AA in second variety
Chinese Spring & Apogee	35	L	F
Chinese Spring & Apogee	64	F	V
Chinese Spring & Apogee	66	E	K
Chinese Spring & Apogee	69	E	A

5.3.4 Cloning TraesCS5A01G530800 in Apogee

Also cloned was TraesCS5A01G530800, a 551 bp gene on chromosome 5A. The gene was cloned using a single set of flanking primers produced by AutoCloner, and the gene sequence was found to be identical between Apogee, Paragon and Chinese Spring. This sequence had homologues that encompassed the entire gene on chromosomes 5D, 4B and 4D, as well as 17 small sequences of around ~250 bases with high similarity to the flanking region downstream of the input sequence.

5.3.5 Running AutoCloner on 85,040 high-confidence genes

In addition to the sequences evaluated in the context of segregation distortion, AutoCloner was also run using all high-confidence gene sequences from the IWGSC assembly under 10,000 bases, amounting to a total of 85,040 genes. These alignments and primer sets are available to view on the AutoCloner website. For 30,186 of the genes, the top two homologous sequences identified by the pipeline were homeologues from the corresponding subgenomes and chromosomes (e.g. for an input sequence on 3A, sequences from 3B and 3D were most closely related). Also of interest was the composition of these alignments in terms of number of regions, not strictly limited to homeologues,

that contained high sequence identity to the input sequence. The mean \pm s.d. number of these highly similar sequences, detected via BLAST HSPs, was 10.4 ± 7.47 per alignment. When limited to sequences that covered over 70 % of the input sequence, flanking regions of 1 kb upstream and downstream included, this number reduced to 2.4 ± 2.24 per alignment, indicating that the majority of genes only have a few close homologues that extend over large regions. The smaller regions with high sequence identity should not be problematic for allele-specific cloning if they do not fully encompass the PCR product. Even so, the AutoCloner web interface includes a “Guided Mode”, allowing the user to manually inspect alignments and remove (or retain) sequences before SNP calling and primer design should these regions be of interest.

5.4 Conclusions

Whilst the scientific community has made incredible progress in producing genomic sequences for many different crop species, we are a long way from having a complete pangenome encompassing every single variety within each species. Until this time, cloning of genes will remain an important technique for assessing genetic variation, and AutoCloner makes this process significantly faster and easier than current methods.

6 General Discussion and Conclusions

Presented in this thesis are analyses of wheat evolution (Chapter 2), recombination (Chapter 3) and segregation distortion (Chapter 4). These seemingly disparate topics are linked by their methodological underpinnings, namely the combined use of mapping populations and high-density genotyping arrays to investigate genetic features at a genomic scale. Interest in array development for wheat has seen a significant increase in recent years, resulting firstly in the development of the lower density 9k iSelect (Cavanagh et al. 2013), before progressing on to more advanced, denser arrays with 90k (Wang et al. 2014), 820k (Winfield et al. 2016) 35k (Allen et al. 2016) and 280k (Rimbert et al. 2018) SNPs respectively. These new genotyping technologies have in turn catalysed the production of a wealth of new genotyping data for wheat, making much of this thesis possible.

The findings presented here should help direct future research themes, prompting investigation into other avenues of influencing wheat recombination (in addition to temperature), as well as correct misconceptions among some researchers regarding the detection of segregation distortion, emphasizing the importance of correction for multiple testing. Additionally, the comparison of exome-capture and array-based genotyping data in Chapter 2 should add to general confidence around array usage, with high concordance between datasets from disparate technologies. Finally, the methods and tools generated during this thesis, including AutoCloner (Chapter 5), should be useful to other students of crop genetics, making common research processes such a full-gene cloning more efficient.

6.1 A lack of known divergence points between the inception of wheat and the proliferation of modern landraces makes dating via molecular clock difficult

One of the central foci of contemporary wheat research is the species' limited genetic diversity compared to wild relatives. This is largely the result of the various genetic bottlenecks that have occurred during the history of wheat, including several initial polyploidization events, e.g. the hybridization of tetraploid and diploid ancestors, as well as strong selection pressures during domestication, imbuing wheat with desirable agronomic traits such as a non-brittle rachis and free-threshing characteristics (Dubcovsky and Dvorak 2007). This limited diversity has the potential to stifle future yield increases as well as increase susceptibility to pathogens. Related to this limited genetic diversity is the question of novel allele accumulation: at what rate do novel polymorphisms accumulate in wheat over time? Answering this question could allow us to predict future levels of genetic diversity, potentially informing breeding practices. Whilst there are many studies aiming to assess the overall levels of genetic diversity in wheat (Allen et al. 2011; Lai Kaitao et al. 2014; He et al. 2019; Pont et al. 2019), few have attempted to assess changes in genetic diversity over time.

In chapter 2, scientific interest in the Watkins lines has been leveraged to try and estimate the rate of novel allele accumulation in wheat. The Watkins lines are an ideal collection to examine this question as they are comprised of landraces, locally grown cultivars that have not been subjected to modern breeding practices designed to artificially induce novel variation, such as X-ray mutagenesis. In absence of a series of time-separated wheat samples stretching back to wheat's origin, I've attempted to answer this question using one of the only well-estimated divergences in wheat's history, the hybridization of tetraploid and diploid ancestors to make up hexaploid wheat. It has been shown through both hybridization experiments and genome analysis that this diploid progenitor was most closely related to modern day goat grass, *Aegilops tauschii*. In theory then, if we compare the D genome of the Watkins wheat varieties to *A.*

tauschii and use the date of their divergence, estimated to be ~ 9000 years ago based on archaeological data, to calibrate a molecular clock, we can estimate the rate of novel polymorphism.

Whilst the logical nature of this method is enticing, in reality, the assumption of an equal evolutionary rate between the D genome of wheat and *A. tauschii* is too simplistic, resulting in an estimate of TMRCA for the Watkins lines that seems too young based on what we know of historic wheat trade. Further insight into this question will need to arise through different methodologies, perhaps involving longitudinal study design with time-series genotyping data.

6.2 Population genetics inferences in wheat are consistent between different sources of genotyping data

Many of the conclusions generated in this thesis stem from SNP genotyping data generated from arrays, either in their 35k (Allen et al. 2016) or 820k (Winfield et al. 2017) formats. This data is produced initially through complex procedures in the lab, including DNA extraction, amplification and hybridization, followed by extensive bioinformatics pipelines that calculate quality control metrics both at the level of the sample and at the level of the probe, subsequent clustering of probe groups based on their fluorescent signals and assignment of genotypes informed by probe-specific priors. Also performed is extensive filtering of probes depending on the analysis, such as the exclusion of those with monomorphic genotypes across all samples in a recombination analysis, and more generally the exclusion of probes with signs of off-target hybridization, an important consideration in wheat due to its hexaploid nature, and therefore presence of homeologues within the genome. This long, complicated pipeline increases the opportunity for error compared to simpler procedures such as a PCR, and indeed previous authors have assessed the reliability of microarrays (Jaksik et al. 2015), finding problems with the assignment of probes to genes (Dai et al. 2005), errors in evaluation of background signal (Kroll et al. 2008), and effects of distinct probe features on data

processing algorithms (Wu et al. 2004).

With these considerations in mind, Chapter 2 includes an investigation into the reliability of array data by performing common population genetics analyses, PCO and STRUCTURE, with datasets generated using different genotyping methods, both array and exome-capture. These genotyping methods have been performed independently by different groups on the same set of lines, the Watkins collection. We would therefore expect that if the genotyping method did have an influence on the results that the PCO and STRUCTURE plots would show clear differences, whether that be in the placement of individual samples, or in the overall clustering of samples. This however did not turn out to be the case, with PCO and STRUCTURE plots appearing highly similar to each other between datasets. Both datasets produced similar broad patterns of clusters by region, with Asian and Middle Eastern varieties separated from European, Australian and USSR-originating varieties along the x-axis (figure 2.2), as well as similar placement of individual lines such as the positioning of Watkins lines 299 and 300 between Western European and Middle Eastern clusters (figure 2.2). Overall, the results of this analysis are highly reassuring, showing the arrays produce reliable, reproducible results.

6.3 The influence of temperature on recombination distribution in wheat is limited

Wheat, along with many other staple food crops such as barley and maize, has recombination events that are distributed in an inverted bell curve along the chromosomes, the nadir typically occurring in the region surrounding the centromere (Zelkowski et al. 2019). In contrast, recent advances in wheat genome knowledge, including the development of multiple chromosome-level genome assemblies (Consortium (IWGSC) et al. 2018; Walkowiak et al. 2020), highlight the comparatively even distribution of genes along the chromosomes. These contrasting distributions present a problem for breeders: how is it possible to manipulate genes in the central regions of the chromosomes without

bringing along large amounts of unwanted genetic material in the process, i.e. to avoid linkage drag? To achieve this, the distribution of recombination events would need to be modified.

There are multiple avenues with which this could be achieved. Environmental effects, such as soil magnesium content (Rey et al. 2018), and temperature (Jain 1957; Loidl 1989), have long been known to influence recombination. Recent research on barley using immunofluorescent staining techniques suggests that temperature could be effective in shifting the distribution of recombination inwards in cereals (Higgins 2013; Higgins et al. 2012a), however research in wheat specifically remains limited. The primary aim of chapter 3 was to examine this effect in wheat.

As with much of the thesis, the analysis of recombination was achieved through the utilization of high-density array genotyping data. After treating F2 Apogee X Paragon lines with four respective temperatures during meiosis, their progeny were genotyped and polymorphic markers were clustered and ordered to create a genetic map. In this way, recombination events can be observed via the transition between parental genotypes in neighbouring markers on the map. The results revealed that recombination distribution on the majority of chromosomes was not affected by changes in environmental temperature, with only long arms of 1A and 3B, as well as the short arms of 2A and 7A showing significant changes in distribution (table 3.3). Closer examination of chromosome 1A showed that higher temperature treatments had a slight inward shift in the distribution of recombination events, although much of the region immediately surrounding the centromere remained highly linked regardless of temperature (figure 3.18). In addition to changes in distribution, recombination frequency was also shown to be significantly affected by environmental temperature, with a U-shaped curve observed from temperatures 10°C to 26°C before a dip at 28°C (figure 3.29). Future work in the area will involve a similar investigation using immunofluorescent techniques, as has been done in barley (Higgins 2013), to compliment the methodology used here.

Whilst environmental factors have been shown to play an important role in the distribution and frequency of recombination events in many species, also important are

internal, genetic factors, such as the FANCM gene, which limits meiotic crossovers in *Arabidopsis* (Crismani et al. 2012). In light of this, in chapter 3 I conducted a search for novel genetic factors influencing recombination frequency and distribution using a QTL analysis of previously published genetic maps (Allen et al. 2016). Whilst this search highlighted some potential candidates initially, after statistical correction for the number of phenotypes tested, none of the QTL appeared to be significant. Additionally, I attempted to assess the maliability of genes involved in meiosis. Are meiotic genes subject to harsher stabilizing selection than the rest of the genome due to their important function within wheat, or is there room for novel polymorphisms in these genes, and consequently potential for the manipulation of recombination through genetic modification? The results of this analysis showed that appear to be slightly more conserved in wheat compared to a random sample of genes, when we examine homologues of these genes in barley, they have accumulated many new polymorphisms since the divergence of barley and wheat. This indicates that there is room for genetic modification of meiotic genes without disastrous consequences for the organism, and that perhaps this could be a future route to the manipulation of recombination.

6.4 Misconceptions around the analysis of segregation distortion are common in scientific literature

Mendel's law of segregation states that gametes have an equal chance of inheriting either of the two parental alleles for a particular gene. Exceptions to this law occur when selection operates in favour of one parental allele during the developmental cycle, causing deviation from the Mendelian ratio of offspring, known as segregation distortion. This phenomenon is common in wheat and many other species, and is often highlighted in studies of high-density genotyping data (Allen et al. 2016; Gardner et al. 2016). Initially, my study of segregation distortion was aimed at finding potential causative genes underlying these regions in wheat. However, during my evaluation of the literature I noticed inconsistencies between authors in their methods of detecting segregation distortion.

Segregation distortion data consists of counts of categories, specifically genotypes, amongst samples in a breeding population. The statistical test used to assess this is therefore a chi-squared test. In the age of single-gene genetics assessed through phenotype, this test alone would be entirely sufficient to examine segregation distortion. However, the development of high-density arrays means that thousands to hundreds of thousands of molecular markers are now genotyped simultaneously. A chi-squared test must be performed for each marker, and therefore we are now faced with the problem of correcting for multiple testing. This is further complicated by the fact that markers are subject to different degrees of genetic linkage depending on their position relative to each other on the chromosome. Markers that are closer together exhibit strong genetic linkage, i.e. a small chance of an inter-marker recombination event, and therefore often show the same pattern of segregation, and as such are not independent in a statistical sense. My analysis into the literature showed that there was no consensus among authors on the most appropriate multiple-testing procedure to account for this - Chapter 4 aims to elucidate.

The primary means used to investigate this was simulated genotyping data. This allowed a selection pressure of known strength to be applied to a particular marker, followed by an examination of how effective detection of segregation distortion was with various statistical procedures. The results indicate that the false-discovery rate (FDR) procedure is most effective, offering a balance between no correction for multiple testing, and the more extreme control of familywise error rate offered by the Bonferroni procedure. This is ideal for data in which events are linked to varying degrees rather than fully independent, such as markers on a chromosome. When I reanalysed datasets from published studies that had not used multiple-testing correction procedures in their analyses, I found that much of the reported segregation distortion was caused by sampling bias rather than a genuine selection pressures in the developmental cycle (table 4.2). These results were reinforced by an examination of replicate empirical populations, which had few regions of segregation distortion in common.

Another interesting outcome of my investigation into segregation distortion were the

results on the effects of segregation distortion on genetic mapping. It is common for authors to remove markers exhibiting segregation distortion before the genetic mapping process (Allen et al. 2016; Roorkiwal et al. 2018; Liu et al. 2016), as it is thought that they may interfere with the clustering or ordering processes of mapping. I found that contrary to this belief, segregation distortion only effects genetic mapping at extreme selection pressures, meaning that many markers that would have previously been removed before the mapping process can now be retained.

6.5 Wheat research can be made more efficient by the development of novel bioinformatics pipelines

PhD theses typically aim to investigate novel questions, making original contributions to the field of study. In the process of doing this, it is often the case that existing methods, whether laboratory procedures or bioinformatics pipelines, are not fit for purpose. In my search for a causative gene underlying regions of segregation distortion in wheat, I devised an experiment that would eliminate candidates based on sequence differences between varieties. This required the sequencing of a large number of genes that were not available in public sequence repositories.

The process of gene cloning in wheat is complicated by wheat's hexaploid genome, meaning that PCR primers must be orientated such that their 3' tail lands on a SNP unique to the homologue of interest, preventing similar sequences from other subgenomes from also being amplified. This process involves various stages, including extraction of the sequence of interest and all homologues from an existing wheat genome assembly, multiple sequence alignment of these homologues, scanning of the alignment for SNPs, evaluation of all possible primer locations to optimize PCR-specific variables, and finally choosing optimal combinations of forward and reverse primers for gene cloning. Previous practice within the wheat community was to carry out each of these stages manually, a very time-consuming process when applied to a large number of genes. To make this more efficient, I developed AutoCloner, a fully-automated gene-cloning bioin-

formatics pipeline with a convenient web interface for use by the research community. I utilized AutoCloner to successfully sequence various genes from the Apogee wheat variety, shedding light on the potential causes of segregation distortion in a region of chromosome 5A.

6.6 Final remarks

Most salient of the findings presented here are the results of the recombination analysis, which highlight the future importance of gene-editing technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 in addressing linkage drag in wheat. If these technologies can be recognized as safe both by science and by legislation, they could play a crucial role in future yield improvement. In addition, the work on segregation distortion should educate researchers on the most appropriate methods for detection of distortion, ensuring only regions of true distortion are investigated. I also hope that other researchers wishing to clone genes in wheat find AutoCloner as useful as I did when seeking to clone a large number of genes in unsequenced varieties.

Another important outcome of this PhD is my own personal growth as a scientist and an independent thinker. Research rarely conforms to the course set out in initial plans, and it is during these deviations that we uncover the questions of real interest, and begin to design solutions to elucidate them.

7 Appendix A - AutoCloner R Code

7.1 A.1 AutoCloner BLAST Scaffold parser

The primary purposes of the following script are to perform two actions. Firstly, the BLAST tabular output is parsed to identify which groups of hits correspond to homologues of the input sequence, primarily achieved by the parse.scaffold.blast function. These homologues are then extracted from the genome of interest by the extract.sequence function. Additionally, if Dialign is to be used for the multiple sequence alignment, an anchor file is setup based on BLAST coordinates to inform Dialign of the relative positions of the sequences in the alignment.

```
1 # BLAST PARSER FOR SCAFFOLDS
2 write("blast.scaffold.parser.rscript.R", p("jobs/", opt$sequence.name, "←
  /pipeline.checkpoint.txt"))
3 gene.name <- opt$sequence.name
4 fa.path1 <- opt$fasta.path
5 input_sequence <- readDNAStringSet(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/seq/extended/←
  seqs/input_seq.fa"))
6
7 #   ←
----- ←
8 #   DEFINE FUNCTIONS ←
9
10 sort.blastdf <- function(blastdf) {
11   # first clusters BLAST hits by chromosome, then sorts by the start ←
     location of each hit within clusters
12   # blastdf - a dataframe containing BLAST output in tabular format
13   sorted <- newdf(colnames(blastdf), no.rows = T)
14   blastdf$orientation <- "F"
15   rev.coords <- which(blastdf$sstart > blastdf$send)
```

```

16  blastdf$orientation[rev.coords] <- "R"
17
18  rev.starts <- blastdf$sstart[rev.coords]
19  rev.ends <- blastdf$send[rev.coords]
20
21  blastdf$sstart[rev.coords] <- rev.ends
22  blastdf$send[rev.coords] <- rev.starts
23
24  # do some sorting
25  for (i in unique(blastdf[, 2])) {
26    temp <- blastdf[blastdf[, 2] == i, ]
27    temp <- temp[sort(as.numeric(temp[, 9]), index.return = T)$ix, ]
28    sorted <- rbind(sorted, temp)
29  }
30  return(sorted)
31 }
32
33 parse.scaffold.blast <- function(blastdf1, dist.threshold) {
34  # parses a BLAST dataframe of a short query sequence against a genome ←
35  # assembly
36  # composed of scaffolds or chromosomes. If the assemblie is ←
37  # chromosomal, the parser will split
38  # the chromosome up into groups of hits where hits are more than ←
39  # dist.threshold bp apart.
40  # returns a dataframe containing the best groups of hits (average ←
41  # bitscore higher than 200, individual hits no more than ←
42  # dist.threshold bp apart)
43  # args:
44  # blastdf1 - a BLAST dataframe imported using read.blast()
45  # dist.threshold - Integer; the maximum number of bases between two ←
46  # hits for them to be considered part of the same group
47
48  blastdf_orig <- blastdf1
49  blastdf1 <- sort.blastdf(blastdf1)
50
51  unique.groups <- convert.to.character.data.frame(unique(blastdf1[, ←

```



```

78
79      all.rows <- 1:(length(sstart) + 1)
80      all.rows <- all.rows[-which(all.rows %in% unlist(groups2))]
81      all.groups <- lapply(all.rows, function(x) x)
82      all.groups <- c(all.groups, groups2)
83  } else {
84      all.rows <- 1:(length(sstart) + 1)
85      all.groups <- lapply(all.rows, function(x) x)
86  }
87
88  all.groups
89 }
90
91 split.temp.df <- function(temp.df, orientation1) {
92   temp.df.corrected <- temp.df[which(temp.df$orientation == ↵
93     orientation1), ]
94   # determine whether there is more than one locus involved in this ↵
95   # group of hits
96   correct.groups <- split.numeric.vectorv2(temp.df.corrected$sstart, ↵
97     temp.df.corrected$send, dist.threshold)
98   for (x in 1:length(correct.groups)) {
99     temp.df.corrected$sseqid[correct.groups[[x]]] <- paste0(↵
100       temp.df.corrected$sseqid[correct.groups[[x]]], ".!!$", ↵
101         orientation1, x)
102   }
103
104   temp.df.corrected
105 }
106
107 rev.orientation.coords <- which(temp.df$orientation == "R")
108 forward.orientation.coords <- which(temp.df$orientation == "F")
109 if (length(rev.orientation.coords) > 0) {
110   temp.df[rev.orientation.coords, ] <- split.temp.df(temp.df, "R")
111 }
112
113 if (length(forward.orientation.coords) > 0) {
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900

```

```

109   temp.df[forward.orientation.coords, ] <- split.temp.df(temp.df, "F")
110   }
111 # if two groups of hits are present in the same scaffold / ↵
112   chromosome,
113 # these hits will no longer be ordered by bitscore due to ↵
114   sort.blastdf()
115
116 temp.df.unique.scaffolds <- unique(temp.df$sseqid)
117 mean.bitscores <- unlist(lapply(temp.df.unique.scaffolds, function(x)
118   {
119     temp.df.filtered <- filter(temp.df, sseqid == x)
120     mean(as.numeric(temp.df.filtered$bitscore))
121   }))
122
123 transformation.coords <- sort(mean.bitscores, decreasing = T, ↵
124   index.return = T)$ix
125
126 transformation.coords2 <- unlist(lapply(temp.df.unique.scaffolds[
127   transformation.coords], function(x) {
128     which(x == temp.df$sseqid)
129   }))
130
131 temp.df <- temp.df[transformation.coords2, ]
132
133 check.group.orientation <- split(temp.df, factor(temp.df$sseqid, ↵
134   levels = unique(temp.df$sseqid)))
135
136 check.group.orientation <- lapply(check.group.orientation, function(←
137   x) {
138   # if HSPs are near to each other but in different orientations, ↵
139   separate them into different groups

```

```

134     same.orientation <- (length(unique(x$orientation)) == 1)
135
136     if (same.orientation == F) {
137
138         group1 <- x[which(x$sstart < x$send), ]
139         group1$sseqid <- paste0(group1$sseqid, "_1")
140
141         group2 <- x[which(!x$sstart < x$send), ]
142         group2$sseqid <- paste0(group2$sseqid, "_2")
143
144         x <- bind_rows(group1, group2)
145
146     }
147
148     x
149 }
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163

```

CONCATENATE GROUPS OF HITS TOGETHER INTO potential.homeologues ↵
DATAFRAME

```

150     temp.df2 <- filter(temp.df, sseqid == unique(temp.df$sseqid)[i2])
151     temp.df2$qseqid <- as.character(temp.df2$qseqid)
152     temp.df2$sseqid <- as.character(temp.df2$sseqid)

153

154     group.orientation <- temp.df2$orientation[1]

155

156     # populate potential.homeologues dataframe where average bitscore ↵
157     # is higher than 200
158
159     if (mean(temp.df2) > 200) {
160
161         # if this is in normal orientation, do x...
162
163         potential.homeologues <- add_row(potential.homeologues)
164         potential.homeologues$query[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- ↵
165             temp.df2[1, 1]
166
167         potential.homeologues$scaffold[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- ↵
168             temp.df2[1, 2]
169
170         potential.homeologues$start[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- min(↵
171             temp.df2$sstart)
172
173         potential.homeologues$end[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- max(↵
174             temp.df2$send)
175
176     }
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184

```

```

          temp.df2$send)

164 potential.homeologues$avg.bitscore[nrow(potential.homeologues)] ←
      <- mean(temp.df2$bitscore)

165 potential.homeologues$max.bitscore[nrow(potential.homeologues)] ←
      <- max(temp.df2$bitscore)

166 potential.homeologues$avg.percent.identical[nrow(←
      potential.homeologues)] <- mean(temp.df2$←
      percentage.identical)

167 if (group.orientation == "F") {
168   potential.homeologues$rev.comp[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <-←
      F
169 } else {
170   potential.homeologues$rev.comp[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <-←
      T
171 }
172
173 potential.homeologues$query.start[nrow(potential.homeologues)] ←
      <- min(temp.df2$qstart)
174 potential.homeologues$query.end[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- ←
      max(temp.df2$qend)
175 potential.homeologues$num_hsp[nrow(potential.homeologues)] <- ←
      nrow(temp.df2)
176 }
177 }
178 }

179
180
181
182 potential.homeologues$length <- as.numeric(potential.homeologues$end) ←
      - as.numeric(potential.homeologues$start)
183 potential.homeologues$groupid <- potential.homeologues$scaffold
184 potential.homeologues$scaffold <- multi.str.split(←
      potential.homeologues$scaffold, "\\\.\\\\!\\\\!\\\\\$", 1)
185 potential.homeologues$homo_length <- potential.homeologues$query.end -←
      potential.homeologues$query.start
186

```

```

187  # try and identify the matching genomic sequence to the input sequence←
188  # - avg.bitscore sometimes fails here
189  # e.g. if there is a small exon seperated by an intron from the main ←
190  # sequence, it will bring the avg.bitscore down
191  identi.coord <- which.max((potential.homeologues$homo_length / length(←
192  # input_sequence[[1]])) * (potential.homeologues$←
193  # avg.percent.identical / 100))
194  g <- 1:nrow(potential.homeologues)
195  g <- g[-identi.coord]
196  potential.homeologues <- potential.homeologues[c(identi.coord, g), ]
197
198
199
200
201
202  existing.homeologue.files <- grep("potential_homeologues", list.files(←
203  p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results/")))
204  if (length(existing.homeologue.files) == 0) {
205    write.csv(potential.homeologues, p("jobs/", gene.name, " /←
206    blast.results/potential_homeologues1.csv"), row.names = F)
207  } else {
208    write.csv(potential.homeologues, p("jobs/", gene.name, " /←
209    blast.results/potential_homeologues", (length(←
210    existing.homeologue.files) + 1), ".csv"), row.names = F)
211
212 }

```

```

213
214
215
216 extract.sequence <- function(genome1, blast.df.parsed, row.coords, ←
217   start.buffer, end.buffer) {
218   # extracts a related sequence from a genome assembly
219   # args:
220   # genome1 - DNAStringSet object containing the genome assembly of ←
221   # interest
222   # blast.df.parsed - dataframe produced by parse.scaffold.blast()
223   # row.coords - Numeric vector; the row coordinates of the sequences to←
224   # used in blast.df.parsed
225   # start.buffer - Integer; how much extra sequence before the start ←
226   # indicated in blast.df.parsed to extract
227   # end.buffer - Integer; how much extra sequence after the end ←
228   # indicated in blast.df.parsed to extract
229
230   # parse the original scaffold name from blastdf1.parsed (remove the ←
231   # appended position in kb)
232   original.scaf.names <- multi.str.split(blast.df.parsed$scaffold, ".\$!"←
233   , 1)
234
235   genome2 <- genome1[match(original.scaf.names[row.coords], names(←
236     genome1))]
237
238   for (i in 1:length(row.coords)) {
239     # check if start.buffer reaches before the start of the scaffold, ←
240     # and likewise if end.buffer extends bigger than the total length
241     extract.start <- (as.numeric(blast.df.parsed$start[i]) - ←
242       start.buffer)
243     if (extract.start < 1) extract.start <- 1
244     extract.end <- (as.numeric(blast.df.parsed$end[i]) + end.buffer)
245     if (extract.end > length(genome2[[i]])) extract.end <- length(←
246       genome2[[i]])
247     print("extract.start")
248     print(extract.start)

```

```

238     genome2[[i]] <- genome2[[i]][extract.start:extract.end]
239     if (blast.df.parsed$rev.comp[i] == T) genome2[[i]] <- ↵
240         reverseComplement(genome2[[i]])
241
242 # append the start coordinate (in kb) of the blast hit to the name of ↵
243 # the sequence for identification later
243 names(genome2) <- paste(blast.df.parsed$scaffold[row.coords], ".${!}", ↵
244 round(as.numeric(blast.df.parsed$start[row.coords]) / 1000)), sep=↵
245 = " ")
246 print("genome2")
247 print(genome2)
246 genome2
247 }
248
249 #   ↵
----- ↵
250 # BEGIN PROCESSING ↵
250 #####  

251
252
253 number.genomes <- max(na.omit(unique(as.numeric(multi.str.split(←
254 config.variables, "_", 2)))))
254
255 main.processing <- function() {
256   extract.sequence.w.flanking.regions <- function(genome.number) {
257     # read the configuration file
258
259     config.variables <- multi.str.split(config.file, "=", 1)
260     # begin by parsing the config file for the genome name, fasta file ↵
261       path and blastdb path
261     config.settings <- config.file[grep(genome.number, config.variables)←
262     ]
262
263     config.settings.temp <- config.settings[[1]]

```

```

264 genome.name <- strsplit(config.settings.temp[1], "=")
265 genome.name <- genome.name[[1]][2]
266
267 config.settings.temp <- config.settings[[2]]
268 fa.path <- strsplit(config.settings.temp[1], "=")
269 fa.path <- fa.path[[1]][2]
270
271 config.settings.temp <- config.settings[[3]]
272 blastdb.path <- strsplit(config.settings.temp[1], "=")
273 blastdb.path <- blastdb.path[[1]][2]
274
275 blast.files <- list.files(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results"), ↵
276   pattern = paste0(genome.number, ".*?.blast"))
277
278 blastdf1 <- tryCatch(read.blast(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results/"), ↵
279   blast.files[1])), error = function(e) {
280   write("No BLAST hits for this sequence", p("jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/error.txt"))
281   stop("No BLAST hits for this sequence")
282 }
283
284 blastdf1$sstart.mb <- blastdf1$sstart / 1000000
285 blastdf1$send.mb <- blastdf1$send / 1000000
286 blastdf_orig <- read.blast(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results/"), ↵
287   blast.files[1]))
288
289 # read the fasta index for this particular genome
290 fasta.index1 <- read.csv(p("./fasta.indexes/", genome.name, ".fa.idx"), ↵
291   stringsAsFactors = F, header = T)
292
293 print("opt$cds.max.intron.size")
294 print(opt$cds.max.intron.size)
295
296 blastdf1.parsed_orig <- parse.scaffold.blast(blastdf1, opt$cds.max.intron.size)[[1]]
297 blastdf1.parsed <- parse.scaffold.blast(blastdf1, opt$cds.max.intron.size)[[1]]

```

```

cds.max.intron.size) [[1]]

294
295     original.scaf.names <- multi.str.split(blastdf1.parsed$scaffold, ".\$"
296                                         !", 1)
297
298     fasta.index1$offset <- as.numeric(fasta.index1$offset)

299     genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match <- readDNAStringSet(<-
300                                         fasta.index1[match(original.scaf.names[1], multi.str.split(<-
301                                         fasta.index1$desc, " ", 1)), ])
300     names(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match) <- multi.str.split(names<-
301                                         (genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match), " ", 1)
301     template_sequence_genomic <- extract.sequence(<-
302                                         genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match, blastdf1.parsed[1, ], 1, <-
303                                         opt$start.buffer, opt$end.buffer)

302
303     opt$fasta.path <- p("jobs/", gene.name, "/seq/extended/seqs/<-
304                                         input_w_flanking.fa")
304     query.fa.path <- p("jobs/", gene.name, "/seq/extended/seqs/<-
305                                         input_w_flanking.fa")
305     writeXStringSet(template_sequence_genomic, p("jobs/", gene.name, "/<-
306                                         seq/extended/seqs/input_w_flanking.fa"))

306
307     input_sequence <- readDNAStringSet(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/seq/<-
308                                         extended/seqs/input_seq.fa"))

308
309     # SECOND BLAST WITH FLANKING REGIONS OF INPUT SEQUENCE INCLUDED
310     source("scripts/perform.blast.rscript.R")
311 }

312
313     extract.homologues <- function(genome.number, number.to.extract, <-
314                                         setup.dialign.anchors) {
314         if (missing(setup.dialign.anchors)) setup.dialign.anchors <- T
315         if (missing(number.to.extract)) number.to.extract <- "all"
316
317         config.variables <- multi.str.split(config.file, "=", 1)

```

```

318 config.settings <- config.file[grep(genome.number, config.variables)←
319   ]
320 config.settings.temp <- config.settings[[1]]
321 genome.name <- strsplit(config.settings.temp[1], "=")
322 genome.name <- genome.name[[1]][2]
323
324 # read the fasta index for this particular genome
325 fasta.index1 <- read.csv(p("./fasta.indexes/", genome.name, ".fa.idx"←
326   ), stringsAsFactors = F, header = T)
327
328 ##### ITERATION TWO #####
329 blast.files <- list.files(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results"), ←
330   pattern = paste0(genome.number, ".*?.blast"))
331
332 blastdf0 <- read.blast(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/blast.results/"), ←
333   blast.files[grep(paste0(genome.number, ".*?w_flanking"), ←
334     blast.files)])
335
336 # SEQUENCE EXTRACTION WITH FULL TEMPLATE (INCLUDING FLANKING REGIONS←
337   )
338 blastdf1.parsed <- parse.scaffold.blast(blastdf0, opt$←
339   cds.max.intron.size)
340
341 fasta.index1$offset <- as.numeric(fasta.index1$offset)
342 genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match <- readDNAStringSet(←
343   fasta.index1[match(unique(blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$scaffold), ←
344     multi.str.split(fasta.index1$desc, " ", 1)), ])
345 names(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match) <- multi.str.split(names(←
346   genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match), " ", 1)
347 sequences <- DNAStringSet()
348 if (number.to.extract == "all") number.to.extract <- nrow(←
349   blastdf1.parsed[[1]])
350
351 # SEQUENCE EXTRACTION
352 for (i in 1:number.to.extract) {

```

```

# MASKING OF INTER-HSP DISTANCES WITHIN THE SAME GROUP WITH NS
rev.comp <- blastdf1.parsed[[1]][i, ]$rev.comp
rchr <- blastdf1.parsed[[1]][i, ]$scaffold
temp.df <- blastdf1.parsed[[2]][which(blastdf1.parsed[[2]]$sseqid == blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$groupid[i]), ]
chr <- blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$scaffold[i]
# remove any _ concatenations that distinguished groups in orientation check
# chr = strsplit(chr, "_")
# chr = chr[[1]][1]

if (nrow(temp.df) == 1) {
  # if only 1 HSP, just add it to the list of sequences
  if (rev.comp == F) sequences <- c(sequences, DNAStringSet(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][temp.df$sstart[1]:temp.df$send[1]]))
  if (rev.comp == T) sequences <- c(sequences, DNAStringSet(reverseComplement(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][temp.df$sstart[1]:temp.df$send[1]])))
} else {
  if (opt$mask.inter.hsp.distances == F | i == 1) {
    # extract sequences without masking inter HSP distances with Ns if this option is false
    if (rev.comp == F) sequences <- c(sequences, DNAStringSet(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][min(temp.df$sstart):max(temp.df$send)]))
    if (rev.comp == T) sequences <- c(sequences, DNAStringSet(reverseComplement(genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][min(temp.df$sstart):max(temp.df$send)])))
  } else {
    temp.df <- temp.df[sort(temp.df$sstart, index.return = T)$ix, ]
    if (rev.comp == T) temp.df <- temp.df[sort(temp.df$sstart, index.return = T, decreasing = T)$ix, ]
  }
}

```

```

366     group.subsequences <- DNAStringSet()
367     subseq.differences <- as.numeric()
368     for (x in 1:nrow(temp.df)) {
369       if (all(temp.df$sstart < temp.df$send)) {
370         if (nrow(temp.df) == 0) browser()
371         if (rev.comp == F) group.subsequences <- c(←
372           group.subsequences, DNAStringSet(←
373             genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][temp.df$←
374               sstart[x]:temp.df$send[x]]))
375         if (rev.comp == T) group.subsequences <- c(←
376           group.subsequences, DNAStringSet(reverseComplement(←
377             genome.assembly.subset.genomic.match[[chr]][temp.df$←
378               sstart[x]:temp.df$send[x]])))
379       }
380     }
381     # combine HSPs with interleaving regions masked by Ns
382     subseq.gaps <- lapply(subseq.differences, function(x) ←
383       DNAStringSet(DNAString(paste(rep("N", 100), collapse = "")←
384         )))
385     subsequences.w.gaps <- DNAStringSet()
386     for (x in 1:length(group.subsequences)) {
387       subsequences.w.gaps <- c(subsequences.w.gaps, ←
388         group.subsequences[x])
389       if (x != length(group.subsequences)) subsequences.w.gaps <- ←
390         c(subsequences.w.gaps, subseq.gaps[[x]])
391     }
392     masked.subsequence <- DNAStringSet(DNAString(do.call(paste0, ←
393       lapply(subsequences.w.gaps, as.character))))

```

```

390         sequences <- c(sequences, masked.subsequence)
391     }
392   }
393 }
394
395 if (nrow(blastdf1.parsed[[1]]) <= 1 & genome.number == 1) {
396   write("No homologues found", p("jobs/", gene.name, "/error.txt"))
397   stop("No homologues found")
398 }
399 # else if(nrow(blastdf1.parsed[[1]] < 1)){
400 # write('No homologues found', p("jobs/", gene.name, "/error.txt"))
401 # stop('No homologues found')
402 #
403
404 names(sequences) <- paste0(blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$scaffold, "_",
405                             blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$query.start)[1:number.to.extract]
406
407 # sequences = c(DNAStringSet(input_sequence), sequences)
408
409 if (setup.dalign.anchors == T) {
410   # SETUP ANCHOR POINTS FOR DALIGN
411   coord.query.start <- c(1, sort(blastdf1.parsed[[1]]$query.start[2:-
412                                         number.to.extract], index.return = T)$ix + 1) # order the
413                                         sequences by query start position
414   blastdf1.parsed[[1]] <- blastdf1.parsed[[1]][coord.query.start, ]
415
416   sequences <- sequences[coord.query.start]
417
418   dalign.df1 <- blastdf1.parsed[[1]]
419   dalign.df1$dalign1 <- 1 # position of the first sequence to be
420                           anchored
421   dalign.df1$dalign2 <- 1:nrow(dalign.df1) # position of the
422                           second sequence to be anchored
423   dalign.df1$dalign3 <- dalign.df1$query.start # beginning
424                           position of the anchor point in sequence 1
425   dalign.df1$dalign4 <- 1 # beginning position of the anchor point

```

```

        in sequence 2

420     dialign.df1$dalign5 <- 5 # length of anchor
421     dialign.df1$dalign6 <- 20 # anchor priority
422     dialign.df1 <- dialign.df1[-1, ]
423
424     dialign.df1 <- dialign.df1[, grep("dalign", colnames(dalign.df1) <-
425             )]
426
427     new_dalign_anchors <- dialign.df1
428
429     new_dalign_anchors[, 1] <- new_dalign_anchors[, 1]
430     new_dalign_anchors[, 2] <- new_dalign_anchors[, 2]
431 } else {
432     new_dalign_anchors <- "No anchors"
433 }
434
435 # system(p("scripts/run.dalign.sh jobs/", gene.name, "/"))
436 return(list(sequences, new_dalign_anchors))
437 }

438 sequences <- lapply(1:number.genomes, function(genome.number) {
439     if (genome.number == 1) {
440         extract.sequence.w.flanking.regions(genome.number)
441         return(extract.homologues(genome.number))
442     } else {
443         return(extract.homologues(genome.number, number.to.extract = 1, <-
444             setup.dalign.anchors = F))
445     }
446 })
447 if (number.genomes > 1) {
448     # combine genome sequences from the other genomes
449     other.genome.seq <- lapply(sequences[2:number.genomes], function(x) <-
450         {
451             x[[1]]
452         })

```

```

452
453     other.genome.seq <- do.call(c, other.genome.seq)
454
455     # all.seq = c(input_sequence, sequences[[1]][[1]][1], ←
456     #   other.genome.seq, sequences[[1]][[1]][2:length(sequences)←
457     #   [[1]][[1]]])
458
459     all.seq <- c(input_sequence, other.genome.seq)
460
461     dialign_anc <- sequences[[1]][[2]]
462     dialign_anc$dalign1 <- dialign_anc$dalign1 + 1
463     dialign_anc$dalign2 <- dialign_anc$dalign2 + length(←
464     #   other.genome.seq) + 1
465
466 } else {
467     all.seq <- c(input_sequence, sequences[[1]][[1]])
468     dialign_anc <- sequences[[1]][[2]]
469     dialign_anc$dalign1 <- dialign_anc$dalign1 + 1
470     dialign_anc$dalign2 <- dialign_anc$dalign2 + 1
471
472 }
473
474
475 main.processing()

```

7.2 A.2 AutoCloner primer selection script

The following listing is an excerpt from the primer selection script of AutoCloner, showcasing two functions, grab.homeologous.snps_new (line 1) and find.best.primers (line 111). The first scans the multiple sequence alignment and returns coordinates of SNPs between the various homologues. The latter is used for primer selection, acting as an interface to Primer3, both through generation of input files and parsing of output files, as well as containing the algorithm that generates sets of overlapping PCR products through selection of optimal primers.

```
1 grab.homeologous.snps_new <- function(input.row, template.row, ↵
2   homologue.rows, multiple.alignment, ↵
3   perform.masking, mask.bin.size, ↵
4   mask.threshold, ↵
5   allow.hyphens.in.mask, ↵
6   allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection) { ↵
7
8   # gets homeologous snps when there is only one genome ↵
9   # takes a DNAMultipleAlignment object and returns a numeric vector of ↵
10  # the column coordinates containing homeologous SNPs ↵
11  # args: ↵
12  # input.row - Integer; the row of the sequence inputted by the user (usually 1) ↵
13  # template.row - Integer; the row of the sequence to design primers (from (usually 2)) ↵
14  # homologue.rows - numeric vector containing the row coordinates of the homologous sequences (either paralogous or homeologous) ↵
15  # multiple.alignment - DNAMultipleAlignment class ↵
16  # perform.masking - Boolean, indicates whether sequences of low similarity to template should be masked ↵
17  # allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection - Boolean, indicates whether hyphens in homologues (not the template sequence) will be considered SNPs ↵
18  if (missing(perform.masking)) perform.masking <- opt$perform.masking ↵
19  if (missing(mask.bin.size)) mask.bin.size <- opt$mask.bin.size
```

```

14  if (missing(mask.threshold)) mask.threshold <- opt$mask.threshold
15  if (missing(allow.hyphens.in.mask)) allow.hyphens.in.mask <- opt$←
16    allow.hyphens.in.mask
16  if (missing(allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection)) ←
17    allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection <- opt$←
18    allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection
19
20 # NB. Insertions "-" in the template sequence cannot be allowed when ←
21   classifying SNPs, as these
22 # will be subsequently removed by ←
23   get.coordinates.after.removing.hyphens(), meaning that the
24 # program maps the primers to the wrong locations in the final ←
25   multiple sequence alignment output.
26
27 mult.align.mat1 <- convert.to.character.data.frame(as.data.frame(←
28   as.matrix(multiple.alignment)))
29
30 perform.masking.function <- function(msa.matrix1, mask.bin.size, ←
31   mask.threshold, allow.hyphens.in.mask) {
32
33   # mask.threshold - integer, underneath what percentage of similarity←
34     should masking be performed?
35
36   #           e.g. 40 - when bins have less than 40% nucleotides in ←
37     common, mask them
38
39   if (missing(mask.bin.size)) mask.bin.size <- 10
40
41   if (missing(mask.threshold)) mask.threshold <- 40
42
43   if (missing(allow.hyphens.in.mask)) allow.hyphens.in.mask <- F
44
45
46   msa.matrix1.orig <- msa.matrix1
47
48   start.sequence.bins <- seq(1, ncol(msa.matrix1), mask.bin.size)
49
50   end.sequence.bins <- c((start.sequence.bins[2:length(←
51     start.sequence.bins)] - 1), ncol(msa.matrix1))
52
53
54   # performing masking of regions with low sequence identity (in bins ←
55     of 10)
56
57   bin.dfs1 <- lapply((2 + number.genomes):nrow(msa.matrix1), function(←
58     z) { # lapply across rows

```

```

37     bin.similarities <- unlist(Map(function(x, y) {
38         template.bin.seq <- msa.matrix1[2, x:y]
39         target.bin.seq <- msa.matrix1[z, x:y]
40
41         if (allow.hyphens.in.mask == F) {
42             if ((length(which(template.bin.seq == "-")) > 3) | length(←
43                 which(target.bin.seq == "-")) > 3) {
44                 return(10)
45             } # don't include bins with hyphens in masking
46         }
47
48         length(which(msa.matrix1[2, x:y] == msa.matrix1[z, x:y]))
49     }, start.sequence.bins, end.sequence.bins))
50
51     bin.df1 <- data.frame(start.sequence.bins, end.sequence.bins, ←
52         bin.similarities)
53     colnames(bin.df1) <- c("sbin", "ebin", "nsim")
54
55     # mask bins with less than 4 nucleotides in common with the ←
56         template sequence
57     mask.threshold2 <- (mask.bin.size / 100) * mask.threshold
58     bin.df1 <- bin.df1[which(bin.df1$nsim < mask.threshold2), ]
59
60     unlist(Map(function(x, y) {
61         seq(x, y, 1)
62     }, bin.df1$sbin, bin.df1$ebin))
63 )
64
65     print("Performing sequence masking")
66     # mask regions with low sequence identity
67     for (i in 1:length(bin.dfs1)) {
68         msa.matrix1[(i + 2), bin.dfs1[[i]]] <- "U"
69     }
70
71     msa.matrix1
72 })

```

```

70
71  if (perform.masking == T) mult.align.mat1 <- perform.masking.function(←
72    mult.align.mat1, mask.bin.size, mask.threshold, ←
73    allow.hyphens.in.mask)
74
75  counter1 <- 1
76  g <- lapply(mult.align.mat1, function(x) {
77    if (x[2] == "-") {
78      return(0)
79    } # return 0 if template sequence has an insertion
80
81    if (allow.hyphens.for.snp.detection == F) {
82      if ("-" %in% x[3:length(x)]) {
83        return(0)
84      }
85    }
86
87    if (number.genomes == 1) {
88      if (x[template.row] %in% x[homologue.rows]) {
89        snp <- 0
90      } else {
91        snp <- 1
92      }
93    } else {
94      if (length(unique(x[template.row:(template.row + number.genomes - ←
95        1)]))) == 1) { # if all varieties have the same base
96        if (x[template.row] %in% x[homologue.rows]) {
97          snp <- 0
98        } else {
99          snp <- 1
100        }
101      }
102      snp <- 0 # no SNP if varietal genomes have different bases
103    }
104  }
105  counter1 <- counter1 + 1

```

```

103     snp
104   })
105
106   unlist(g)
107 }
108
109
110
111 find.best.primers <- function(multiple.alignment, ←
112   template.sequence.row.number, snp.coords.after.filter, ←
113   start.coord.after.filter, end.coord.after.filter, ←
114   product.size.range, span.whole.gene, start.buffer, homologous.snps, ←
115   coords) {
116
117   # Automatically obtains primer sequences
118
119   # args:
120
121   # multiple.alignment - a DNAMultipleAlignment object
122
123   # template.sequence.row.number - Integer; the multiple alignment row ←
124     of the sequence to use as a template in primer3
125
126   # snp.coords.after.filter - Numeric vector; obtained using ←
127     grab.homeologous.snps() and then ←
128     get.coordinates.after.removing.hyphens()
129
130   # start.coord.after.filter - Integer; position of the first base of ←
131     the start codon after removing hyphens
132
133   # end.coord.after.filter - Integer; position of the final base in the ←
134     coding sequence after removing hyphens
135
136   # product.size.range - a numeric vector with two elements, the first ←
137     being the minimum product size, the second the maximum
138
139   # span.whole.gene - Boolean; should the product size span the entire ←
140     gene with only one set of primers?
141
142   # start.buffer - Integer; how many bases before the start of the gene ←
143     should be allowed in the product?
144
145
146   if (missing(span.whole.gene)) span.whole.gene <- F
147
148   if (missing(start.buffer)) start.buffer <- start.coord.after.filter
149
150
151   list.best.primer.start.coords <- as.numeric()

```

```

127  list.best.primer.end.coords <- as.numeric()
128  mult.align2 <- conv.mult.align.dnastringset(multiple.alignment)
129
130  generate.primer3.input.files <- function(template.sequence2, p3.seqid,←
131      product.size.min, product.size.max, left.end.coord,←
132          right.end.coord, f.or.r) {
133
134      # args:
135
136      # template.sequence2 - a DNAString object without inserts ("-"s)
137      # p3.seqid - character string indicating name of sequence (used both←
138          inside the primer3 input file and in the title of the primer3 ←
139          input file)
140
141      # f.or.r - "F" for forward primer, "R" for reverse primer
142
143      # primer3 variables:
144
145      p3.template <- as.character(template.sequence2)
146      p3.product.size.range <- "100-10000"
147
148      # note here that line breaks "\n" have to be added in manually as
149      # writeLines automatically adds a line break to the end of every ←
150          line,
151
152      # whilst primer3_core will not accept a file in which the last line
153      # has a line break on it
154
155      if (f.or.r == "F") {
156
157          primer3.input <- c(
158              p("SEQUENCE_ID=", p3.seqid, "\n"),
159              p("SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE=", p3.template, "\n"),
160              p("PRIMER_PRODUCT_SIZE_RANGE=", p3.product.size.range, "\n"),
161              p("SEQUENCE_FORCE_LEFT_END=", left.end.coord, "\n"),
162              "="
163          )
164
165      } else if (f.or.r == "R") {
166
167          primer3.input <- c(
168              p("SEQUENCE_ID=", p3.seqid, "\n"),
169              p("SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE=", p3.template, "\n"),
170              p("PRIMER_PRODUCT_SIZE_RANGE=", p3.product.size.range, "\n"),
171              p("SEQUENCE_FORCE_RIGHT_END=", right.end.coord, "\n"),
172              "="
173          )
174
175      }
176
177  }

```

```

159         " = "
160     )
161 } else {
162   primer3.input <- c(
163     p("SEQUENCE_ID=", p3.seqid, "\n"),
164     p("SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE=", p3.template, "\n"),
165     p("PRIMER_PRODUCT_SIZE_RANGE=", p3.product.size.range, "\n"),
166     p("SEQUENCE_FORCE_RIGHT_END=", right.end.coord, "\n"),
167     p("SEQUENCE_FORCE_LEFT_END=", left.end.coord, "\n"),
168     " = "
169   )
170 }
171 if (f.or.r == "F" | f.or.r == "R") {
172   output.filepath <- file(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/",
173                           primers/input/primer3.", p3.seqid, ".", f.or.r, ".txt"), "wb")
174 } else {
175   output.filepath <- file(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/",
176                           primers/input/primer3.", p3.seqid, ".txt"), "wb")
177 }
178 writeLines(primer3.input, output.filepath, sep = "")
179 close(output.filepath)
180 "Done"
181 }
182
183 # make primers for all possible SNPs, then evaluate
184 template.sequence <- mult.align2[[template.sequence.row.number]]
185
186 template.sequence2 <- remove.inserts(template.sequence)
187 generate.all.primer.penalties <- function(x) {
188   print("Generating primer3 files")
189   print("Running primer3")
190
191   primer3.forward.input <- c(
192     p("SEQUENCE_ID=AllForwardPrimers"),
193     p("SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE=", template.sequence2, ""),
194     "PRIMER_TASK=pick_primer_list",

```

```

193 "PRIMER_PICK_RIGHT_PRIMER=0",
194 p("PRIMER_NUM_RETURN=", (length(template.sequence2) * 6)),
195 "="
196 )
197
198 writeLines(primer3.forward.input, p("jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
199           input/forwardprimers.txt"))
200
201 primer3.reverse.input <- c(
202   p("SEQUENCE_ID=AllReversePrimers"),
203   p("SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE=", template.sequence2, ""),
204   "PRIMER_TASK=pick_primer_list",
205   "PRIMER_PICK_LEFT_PRIMER=0",
206   p("PRIMER_NUM_RETURN=", (length(template.sequence2) * 6)),
207   "="
208 )
209
210 writeLines(primer3.reverse.input, p("jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
211           input/reverseprimers.txt"))
212
213 system(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/run.primer3.sh ←
214           ", "jobs/", gene.name))
215 print("Finished")
216
217 # PARSE LEFT PRIMERS
218
219 primer3.forward.output <- readLines(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
220           output/forwardprimers.txt.output.txt"))
221 pos1 <- primer3.forward.output[grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*=", ←
222           primer3.forward.output)]
223
224 pos2 <- multi.str.split(pos1, "=", 2)
225 pos3.1 <- multi.str.split(pos2, ",", 1)
226 pos3.2 <- multi.str.split(pos2, ",", 2)
227 pos4 <- as.numeric(pos3.1) + (as.numeric(pos3.2)) - 1 # translate ←
228           primer3 coordinate to SNP coordinate (add length to starting pos←

```

```

    - 1)

223
224 PRIMER_LEFT_X_PENALTY <- as.numeric(multi.str.split(←
  primer3.forward.output[grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_PENALTY=", ←
  primer3.forward.output)], "=?", 2))
225 PRIMER_LEFT_X_SEQUENCE <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[←
  grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_SEQUENCE=", primer3.forward.output)], "←
 =?", 2)
226 PRIMER_LEFT_X <- pos2
227 PRIMER_LEFT_X_TM <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[grep("←
  PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_TM=", primer3.forward.output)], "=?", 2)
228 PRIMER_LEFT_X_GC_PERCENT <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[←
  grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_GC_PERCENT", primer3.forward.output)], "←
 =?", 2)
229 PRIMER_LEFT_X_SELF_ANY_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[←
  grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_SELF_ANY_TH", primer3.forward.output)], "←
 =?", 2)
230 PRIMER_LEFT_X_SELF_END_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[←
  grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_SELF_END_TH", primer3.forward.output)], "←
 =?", 2)
231 PRIMER_LEFT_X_HAIRPIN_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.forward.output[←
  grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_HAIRPIN_TH", primer3.forward.output)], "←
 =?", 2)
232 PRIMER_LEFT_X_END_STABILITY <- multi.str.split(←
  primer3.forward.output[grep("PRIMER_LEFT_[0-9]*_END_STABILITY", ←
  primer3.forward.output)], "=?", 2)
233
234 left.parsed <- data.frame("name1", pos4, PRIMER_LEFT_X_PENALTY, ←
  PRIMER_LEFT_X_SEQUENCE, PRIMER_LEFT_X, PRIMER_LEFT_X_TM, ←
  PRIMER_LEFT_X_GC_PERCENT, PRIMER_LEFT_X_SELF_ANY_TH, ←
  PRIMER_LEFT_X_SELF_END_TH, PRIMER_LEFT_X_HAIRPIN_TH, ←
  PRIMER_LEFT_X_END_STABILITY)
235 colnames(left.parsed)[1:2] <- c("p.name", "pos")
236 left.parsed <- left.parsed[sort(left.parsed$pos, index.return = T)$←
  ix, ]
237 left.parsed <- left.parsed[which(left.parsed$pos %in% ←

```

```

        snp.coords.after.filter), ]
238 nrow(left.parsed)
239 left.parsed2 <- split(left.parsed, left.parsed$pos)
240 left.parsed2 <- lapply(left.parsed2, function(x) {
241   x[which.min(as.numeric(x$PRIMER_LEFT_X_PENALTY)), ]
242 })
243
244 left.parsed3 <- bind_rows(left.parsed2)
245
246 left.parsed3$MSA.pos <- which(homologous.snps == 1)[which(←
247   snp.coords.after.filter %in% left.parsed3$pos)]
248 left.parsed3 <- left.parsed3[, c(1, 2, 12, 3:11)]
249 colnames(left.parsed3)[4] <- "pen"
250 colnames(left.parsed3)[5:ncol(left.parsed3)] <- gsub("X", "0", ←
251   colnames(left.parsed3)[5:ncol(left.parsed3)])
252
253 # PARSE RIGHT PRIMERS
254
255 primer3.reverse.output <- readLines(p("jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
256   output/reverseprimers.txt.output.txt"))
257 pos1 <- primer3.reverse.output[grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*=", ←
258   primer3.reverse.output)]
259 pos2 <- multi.str.split(pos1, "=", 2)
260 pos3.1 <- multi.str.split(pos2, ",", 1)
261 pos3.2 <- multi.str.split(pos2, ",", 2)
262 pos4 <- (as.numeric(pos3.1) - as.numeric(pos3.2)) + 1 # translate ←
263   primer3 coordinate to SNP coordinate
264
265 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_PENALTY <- as.numeric(multi.str.split(←
266   primer3.reverse.output[grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_PENALTY=", ←
267   primer3.reverse.output)], "=", 2))
268 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SEQUENCE <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output[←
269   grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_SEQUENCE=", primer3.reverse.output)], ←
270   "=", 2)
271 PRIMER_RIGHT_X <- pos2

```

```

264 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_TM <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output[grep("←
265   PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_TM=", primer3.reverse.output)], "=" , 2)
266 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_GC_PERCENT <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output[←
267   grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_GC_PERCENT", primer3.reverse.output)], ←
268   "=" , 2)
269 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SELF_ANY_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output←
270   [grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_SELF_ANY_TH", primer3.reverse.output)←
271   ], "=" , 2)
272 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SELF_END_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output←
273   [grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_SELF_END_TH", primer3.reverse.output)←
274   ], "=" , 2)
275 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_HAIRPIN_TH <- multi.str.split(primer3.reverse.output[←
276   grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_HAIRPIN_TH", primer3.reverse.output)], ←
277   "=" , 2)
278 PRIMER_RIGHT_X_END_STABILITY <- multi.str.split(←
279   primer3.reverse.output[grep("PRIMER_RIGHT_[0-9]*_END_STABILITY", ←
280   primer3.reverse.output)], "=" , 2)

right.parsed <- data.frame("name1", pos4, PRIMER_RIGHT_X_PENALTY, ←
  PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SEQUENCE, PRIMER_RIGHT_X, PRIMER_RIGHT_X_TM, ←
  PRIMER_RIGHT_X_GC_PERCENT, PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SELF_ANY_TH, ←
  PRIMER_RIGHT_X_SELF_END_TH, PRIMER_RIGHT_X_HAIRPIN_TH, ←
  PRIMER_RIGHT_X_END_STABILITY)

colnames(right.parsed)[1:2] <- c("p.name", "pos")
right.parsed <- right.parsed[sort(right.parsed$pos, index.return = T)←
  ]$ix, ]
right.parsed <- right.parsed[which(right.parsed$pos %in% ←
  snp.coords.after.filter), ]
nrow(right.parsed)
right.parsed2 <- split(right.parsed, right.parsed$pos)
right.parsed2 <- lapply(right.parsed2, function(x) {
  x[which.min(as.numeric(x$PRIMER_RIGHT_X_PENALTY)), ]
})
right.parsed3 <- bind_rows(right.parsed2)

```

```

283 right.parsed3$MSA.pos <- which(homologous.snps == 1)[which(←
284   snp.coords.after.filter %in% right.parsed3$pos)]
285 right.parsed3 <- right.parsed3[, c(1, 2, 12, 3:11)]
286 colnames(right.parsed3)[4] <- "pen"
287 colnames(right.parsed3)[5:ncol(right.parsed3)] <- gsub("X", "0", ←
288   colnames(right.parsed3)[5:ncol(right.parsed3)])
289 #####
290 if (!file.exists(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
291   penalties))) dir.create(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
292   primers/penalties"))
293 write.csv(left.parsed3, p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
294   primers/penalties/forward.all.pen.csv"), row.names = F)
295 write.csv(right.parsed3, p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
296   primers/penalties/reverse.all.pen.csv"), row.names = F)
297
298 return(list(left.parsed3, right.parsed3))
299 }
300
301 generate.best.primer.set <- function(forward.all.pen, reverse.all.pen, ←
302   forward.coord.used, reverse.coord.used, iteration) {
303   if (missing(forward.coord.used)) forward.coord.used <- as.numeric()
304   if (missing(reverse.coord.used)) reverse.coord.used <- as.numeric()
305   if (missing(iteration)) iteration <- 1
306
307   if (length(forward.coord.used) > 0) forward.all.pen <- ←
308     forward.all.pen[-which(forward.all.pen$pos %in% ←
309       forward.coord.used), ]
310   if (length(reverse.coord.used) > 0) reverse.all.pen <- ←
311     reverse.all.pen[-which(reverse.all.pen$pos %in% ←
312       reverse.coord.used), ]
313
314   best.primer.file.end.coord <- as.numeric(start.coord.after.filter)
315
316   forward.primer.positions <- list()
317   reverse.primer.positions <- list()

```

```

308
309     minimum.snp.coord <- 0
310     maximum.snp.coord <- start.coord.after.filter
311
312     # run loop to get pairs of primers
313
314     while (best.primer.file.end.coord < end.coord.after.filter) {
315         valid.fwd.coords <- which(forward.all.pen$pos < (maximum.snp.coord←
316             - 1) & forward.all.pen$pos > minimum.snp.coord)
317
318         while (length(valid.fwd.coords) == 0) {
319             maximum.snp.coord <- maximum.snp.coord + 10
320             valid.fwd.coords <- which(forward.all.pen$pos < (←
321                 maximum.snp.coord - 1) & forward.all.pen$pos > ←
322                 minimum.snp.coord)
323             print("No SNPs found for forward primer, expanding start buffer"←
323                 )
324
325             # add stop condition
326             if (maximum.snp.coord > max(coords$snp.coords)) {
327                 if (iteration == 1) {
328                     write("No valid forward primer coordinates", p("jobs/", ←
329                         gene.name, "/primers/error.txt"))
330                     return(as.numeric())
331                 } else {
332                     return(as.numeric())
333                 }
334             }
335
336             f.primer.candidates <- forward.all.pen[which(forward.all.pen$pos <←
337                 (maximum.snp.coord - 1) & forward.all.pen$pos > ←
338                 minimum.snp.coord), ]
339             f.primer.candidates <- f.primer.candidates[which(←
340                 f.primer.candidates$pen == min(f.primer.candidates$pen)), ]

```

```

336  # debugging
337  valid.rev.coords <- which(reverse.all.pen$pos > (←
338      f.primer.candidates$pos + product.size.range[1]) & ←
339      reverse.all.pen$pos > best.primer.file.end.coord & ←
340      reverse.all.pen$pos < (f.primer.candidates$pos + ←
341      product.size.range[2]))
342
343  while (length(valid.rev.coords) == 0) {
344      product.size.range[2] <- product.size.range[2] + 10
345      valid.rev.coords <- which(reverse.all.pen$pos > (←
346          f.primer.candidates$pos + product.size.range[1]) & ←
347          reverse.all.pen$pos > best.primer.file.end.coord & ←
348          reverse.all.pen$pos < (f.primer.candidates$pos + ←
349          product.size.range[2]))
350
351  print("No SNPs found for reverse primer, expanding maximum ←
352      product size")
353
354  # add stop conditions
355  if (product.size.range[2] > length(template.sequence)) {
356      if (iteration == 1) {
357          write("No valid reverse primer coordinates", p("jobs/", ←
358              gene.name, "/primers/error.txt"))
359          return(as.numeric())
360      } else {
361          return(as.numeric())
362      }
363  }
364
365  r.primer.candidates <- reverse.all.pen[which(reverse.all.pen$pos >←
366      (f.primer.candidates$pos + product.size.range[1]) & ←
367      reverse.all.pen$pos > best.primer.file.end.coord & ←
368      reverse.all.pen$pos < (f.primer.candidates$pos + ←
369      product.size.range[2])), ]
370
371  r.primer.candidates <- r.primer.candidates[which(←
372      r.primer.candidates$pen == min(r.primer.candidates$pen)), ]

```

```

357
358     forward.primer.positions <- c(forward.primer.positions, list(←
359         f.primer.candidates))
360
361     reverse.primer.positions <- c(reverse.primer.positions, list(←
362         r.primer.candidates))
363
364     best.primer.file.start.coord <- as.numeric(f.primer.candidates$pos←
365         )
366
367     best.primer.file.end.coord <- as.numeric(r.primer.candidates$pos)
368
369     minimum.snp.coord <- best.primer.file.start.coord
370     maximum.snp.coord <- best.primer.file.end.coord # The name of this←
371         variable originates from the first iteration. Of cause this ←
372         is not truly the start.coord.after.filter on subsequent ←
373         iterations
374
375     }
376
377
378     library(dplyr)
379
380
381     forward.primer.positions <- lapply(forward.primer.positions, ←
382         function(x) x[1, ])
383
384     forward.primer.positions <- bind_rows(forward.primer.positions)
385     forward.primer.positions$orient <- "F"
386
387
388     reverse.primer.positions <- lapply(reverse.primer.positions, ←
389         function(x) x[1, ])
390
391     reverse.primer.positions <- bind_rows(reverse.primer.positions)
392     reverse.primer.positions$orient <- "R"
393
394
395     p3.input.files.to.rm <- list.files(p(project.path, "jobs/", ←
396         gene.name, "/primers/input/"), full.name = T)
397
398     p3.output.files.to.rm <- list.files(p(project.path, "jobs/", ←
399         gene.name, "/primers/output/"), full.name = T)
400
401
402     lapply(p3.input.files.to.rm, file.remove)
403     lapply(p3.output.files.to.rm, file.remove)

```

```

383
384     Map(function(f.primer1, r.primer1) {
385         generate.primer3.input.files(template.sequence2, p((f.primer1 + 1)←
386             , "-", (r.primer1 + 1)), 100, 750, f.primer1, r.primer1, "B")
387     }, forward.primer.positions$pos, reverse.primer.positions$pos)
388
389     system(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/run.primer3.sh ←
390             , "jobs/", gene.name))
391
392     output.files <- list.files(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
393             primers/output/"))
394
395     output.files <- output.files[sort(as.numeric(multi.str.split(←
396             multi.str.split(output.files, "-", 1), "\\.", 2)), index.return ←
397             = T)$ix]
398
399     output.files.numbered <- paste0(1:length(output.files), output.files←
400             )
401
402     list.best.primer.start.coords <- c(list.best.primer.start.coords, ←
403             forward.primer.positions$pos)
404     list.best.primer.end.coords <- c(list.best.primer.end.coords, ←
405             reverse.primer.positions$pos)
406
407     # see if any sets have already made, if so make new set directory
408     i <- max(as.numeric(multi.str.split(list.files(p(project.path, "jobs←
409             /", gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/")), "set", 2))) + 1
410     if (is.na(i) | i == -Inf) i <- 1
411
412     if (!dir.exists(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
413             best.primers/set", i))) {
414         dir.create(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
415             best.primers/set", i))
416     }
417
418     Map(function(x, best.primer.file, fpos1, rpos1) {
419         file.copy(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/output/", ←

```

```

        x), p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/best.primers<-
        /set", i, "/", best.primer.file))

408 multiple.alignment.coord1 <- which(homologous.snps == 1)[which(<-
        fpos1$pos == coords$snp.coords)]
409 multiple.alignment.coord2 <- which(homologous.snps == 1)[which(<-
        rpos1$pos == coords$snp.coords)]
410 # add multiple sequence alignment coordinates to the best primer3 <-
        output file
411 system(p("echo multiple.alignment.forward.coord=", <-
        multiple.alignment.coord1, " >> ", project.path, "jobs/", <-
        gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/set", i, "/", <-
        best.primer.file))
412 system(p("echo multiple.alignment.reverse.coord=", <-
        multiple.alignment.coord2, " >> ", project.path, "jobs/", <-
        gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/set", i, "/", <-
        best.primer.file))
413 system(p("echo SEQUENCE_TEMPLATE_REV_COMP=", as.character(<-
        reverseComplement(template.sequence2)), " >> ", project.path, <-
        "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/set", i, "/", <-
        best.primer.file))
414 system(p("echo gene.start.coord=", start.coord.after.filter, " >> <-
        ", project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/<-
        set", i, "/", best.primer.file))
415 system(p("echo gene.end.coord=", end.coord.after.filter, " >> ", <-
        project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/best.primers/set", <-
        i, "/", best.primer.file))
416 }, output.files, output.files.numbered, split(<-
        forward.primer.positions, forward.primer.positions$pos), split(<-
        reverse.primer.positions, reverse.primer.positions$pos))

417 # convert primer3 coordinates (coordinates from the sequence without
418 # insertions) to coordinates in the multiple sequence alignment
419
420 return(list(best.primer.start.coords, <-
        list.best.primer.end.coords))
421 }
422

```

```

423  print("Performing best primer selection")
424  # if(1 == 2){ #toggle to skip caching
425  if (file.exists(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/←
426    penalties/forward.all.pen.csv")) & file.exists(p(project.path, "←
427    jobs/", gene.name, "/primers/penalties/reverse.all.pen.csv"))) {
428    forward.all.pen <- read.csv(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
429      primers/penalties/forward.all.pen.csv"), stringsAsFactors = F, ←
430      header = T)
431    forward.all.pen <- forward.all.pen[, 1:4]
432    reverse.all.pen <- read.csv(p(project.path, "jobs/", gene.name, "/←
433      primers/penalties/reverse.all.pen.csv"), stringsAsFactors = F, ←
434      header = T)
435    reverse.all.pen <- reverse.all.pen[, 1:4]
436  } else {
437    penalties1 <- generate.all.primer.penalties(1)
438    forward.all.pen <- penalties1[[1]][, 1:4]
439    reverse.all.pen <- penalties1[[2]][, 1:4]
440  }
441  used.coords1 <- generate.best.primer.set(forward.all.pen, ←
442    reverse.all.pen)
443  if (length(used.coords1) > 0) generate.best.primer.set(←
444    forward.all.pen, reverse.all.pen, used.coords1[[1]], used.coords1[[2]], 2)
445}

```

8 Bibliography

Acquaah G (2007) Principles of plant genetics and breeding. Blackwell Pub, Malden, MA ; Oxford

Adamski T, Krystkowiak K, Kuczyńska A et al (2014) Segregation distortion in homozygous lines obtained via anther culture and maize doubled haploid methods in comparison to single seed descent in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Electronic Journal of Biotechnology 17:6–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejbt.2013.12.002>

Affymetrix (2015) Axiom Genotyping Solution Data Analysis Guide. 93

Alabdullah AK, Borrill P, Martin AC et al (2019) A co-expression network in hexaploid wheat reveals mostly balanced expression and lack of significant gene loss of homologous meiotic genes upon polyploidization. bioRxiv 695759. <https://doi.org/10.1101/695759>

Al Ait L, Yamak Z, Morgenstern B (2013) DIALIGN at GOBICSMultiple sequence alignment using various sources of external information. Nucleic Acids Research 41:W3–W7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkt283>

Allen AM, Barker GLA, Berry ST et al (2011) Transcript-specific, single-nucleotide polymorphism discovery and linkage analysis in hexaploid bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Plant Biotechnology Journal 9:1086–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7652.2011.00628.x>

Allen AM, Winfield MO, Burridge AJ et al (2016) Characterization of a Wheat Breeders' Array suitable for high-throughput SNP genotyping of global accessions of hexaploid bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). Plant Biotechnology Journal n/a–n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12635>

Allen GE (2003) Mendel and modern genetics: The legacy for today. Endeavour 27:63–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-9327\(03\)00065-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-9327(03)00065-6)

Avni R, Nave M, Eilam T et al (2014) Ultra-dense genetic map of durum wheat wild

emmer wheat developed using the 90K iSelect SNP genotyping assay. Molecular Breeding 34:1549–1562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11032-014-0176-2>

Ayyadevara S, Thaden JJ, Shmookler Reis RJ (2000) Discrimination of Primer 3'-Nucleotide Mismatch by Taq DNA Polymerase during Polymerase Chain Reaction. Analytical Biochemistry 284:11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1006/abio.2000.4635>

Babben S, Perovic D, Koch M, Ordon F (2015) An Efficient Approach for the Development of Locus Specific Primers in Bread Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) And Its Application to Re-Sequencing of Genes Involved in Frost Tolerance. PLOS ONE 10:e0142746. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142746>

Babben S, Schliephake E, Janitzka P et al (2018) Association genetics studies on frost tolerance in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Reveal new highly conserved amino acid substitutions in CBF-A3, CBF-A15, VRN3 and PPD1 genes. BMC Genomics 19:409. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-4795-6>

Balfourier F, Bouchet S, Robert S et al (2019) Worldwide phylogeography and history of wheat genetic diversity. Science Advances 5:eaav0536. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav0536>

Barber H, Carney J, Alghabari F, Gooding M (2015) Decimal growth stages for precision wheat production in changing environments? Annals of Applied Biology 166:355–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12207>

Barrett BA, Kidwell KK (1998) AFLP-Based Genetic Diversity Assessment among Wheat Cultivars from the Pacific Northwest. Crop Science 38:1261–1271. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1998.0011183X003800050025x>

Bassil NV, Davis TM, Zhang H et al (2015) Development and preliminary evaluation of a 90 K Axiom SNP array for the allo-octoploid cultivated strawberry *Fragaria ananassa*. BMC Genomics 16: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-015-1310-1>

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society:

Series B (Methodological) 57:289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>

Bonferroni CE (1935) Il calcolo delle assicurazioni su gruppi di teste. Tipografia del Senato

Bonjean AP, Angus WJ (2001) The World Wheat Book: A History of Wheat Breeding. Lavoisier

Botstein D, White RL, Skolnick M, Davis RW (1980) Construction of a genetic linkage map in man using restriction fragment length polymorphisms. American Journal of Human Genetics 32:314–331

Brenchley R, Spannagl M, Pfeifer M et al (2012) Analysis of the bread wheat genome using whole genome shotgun sequencing. Nature 491:705–710. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11650>

Broman K (2009) A Guide to QTL Mapping with R/qtl. Springer

Broman KW, Rowe LB, Churchill GA, Paigen K (2002) Crossover Interference in the Mouse. Genetics 160:1123–1131

Buckler ES, Phelps-Durr TL, Buckler CS et al (1999) Meiotic drive of chromosomal knobs reshaped the maize genome. Genetics 153:415–426

Caetano-Anollés G, Gresshoff PM (1994) DNA Amplification Fingerprinting Using Arbitrary Mini-hairpin Oligonucleotide Primers. Nature Biotechnology 12:619–623. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt0694-619>

Castro P, Rubio J, Cabrera A et al (2011) A segregation distortion locus located on linkage group 4 of the chickpea genetic map. Euphytica 179:515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10681-011-0356-7>

Cavanagh CR, Chao S, Wang S et al (2013) Genome-wide comparative diversity uncovers multiple targets of selection for improvement in hexaploid wheat landraces and cultivars. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 110:8057–8062. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1217133110>

Chao S, Sharp PJ, Worland AJ et al (1989) RFLP-based genetic maps of wheat homeologous group 7 chromosomes. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 78:495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00290833>

Chapman JA, Mascher M, Buluç A et al (2015) A whole-genome shotgun approach for assembling and anchoring the hexaploid bread wheat genome. *Genome Biology* 16:26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-015-0582-8>

Charmet G (2011) Wheat domestication: Lessons for the future. *Comptes Rendus Biologies* 334:212–220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crvi.2010.12.013>

Chhatre VE, Emerson KJ (2017) StrAuto: Automation and parallelization of STRUCTURE analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* 18:192. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-017-1593-0>

Choi K, Zhao X, Kelly KA et al (2013) Arabidopsis meiotic crossover hot spots overlap with H2A.Z nucleosomes at gene promoters. *Nature Genetics* 45:1327–1336. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2766>

Choulet F, Alberti A, Theil S et al (2014) Structural and functional partitioning of bread wheat chromosome 3B. *Science* 345:1249721. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1249721>

Clavijo BJ, Venturini L, Schudoma C et al (2017) An improved assembly and annotation of the allohexaploid wheat genome identifies complete families of agronomic genes and provides genomic evidence for chromosomal translocations. *Genome Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.217117.116>

Condit R, Hubbell SP (1991) Abundance and DNA sequence of two-base repeat regions in tropical tree genomes. *Genome* 34:66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1139/g91-011>

Consortium (IWGSC) TIWGS, Investigators IR principal, Appels R et al (2018) Shifting the limits in wheat research and breeding using a fully annotated reference genome. *Science* 361: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar7191>

Coulton A (2019) PedigreeWrapper. GitHub

- Crismani W, Girard C, Froger N et al (2012) FANCM Limits Meiotic Crossovers. *Science* 336:1588–1590. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1220381>
- Crow JF (1979) Genes That Violate Mendel's Rules. *Scientific American* 240:134–147
- Dai B, Guo H, Huang C et al (2017) Identification and Characterization of Segregation Distortion Loci on Cotton Chromosome 18. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 7: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.02037>
- Dai M, Wang P, Boyd AD et al (2005) Evolving gene/transcript definitions significantly alter the interpretation of GeneChip data. *Nucleic Acids Research* 33:e175–e175. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gni179>
- Devos KM, Bryan GJ, Collins AJ et al (1995a) Application of two microsatellite sequences in wheat storage proteins as molecular markers. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 90:247–252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00222209>
- Devos KM, Dubcovsky J, Dvořák J et al (1995b) Structural evolution of wheat chromosomes 4A, 5A, and 7B and its impact on recombination. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 91:282–288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00220890>
- Dieffenbach CW, Lowe TM, Dveksler GS et al (1993) General concepts for PCR primer design. *PCR Methods Appl* 30–37
- Draeger T, Moore G (2017) Short periods of high temperature during meiosis prevent normal meiotic progression and reduce grain number in hexaploid wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 130:1785–1800. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-017-2925-1>
- Dubcovsky J, Dvorak J (2007) Genome Plasticity a Key Factor in the Success of Polyploid Wheat Under Domestication. *Science* 316:1862–1866. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1143986>
- Earl DA, vonHoldt BM (2012) STRUCTURE HARVESTER: A website and program for visualizing STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method. *Conservation Genetics Resources* 4:359–361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-011-9548-7>

- Edgar RC (2004) MUSCLE: Multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput. *Nucleic Acids Research* 32:1792–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkh340>
- Edwards K, Johnstone C, Thompson C (1991) A simple and rapid method for the preparation of plant genomic DNA for PCR analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research* 19:1349
- Endo TR, Gill BS (1996) The Deletion Stocks of Common Wheat. *Journal of Heredity* 87:295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a023003>
- Evanno G, Regnaut S, Goudet J (2005) Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software structure: A simulation study. *Molecular Ecology* 14:2611–2620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02553.x>
- Felsenstein J (1978) The Number of Evolutionary Trees. *Systematic Biology* 27:27–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2412810>
- Filippo JS, Sung P, Klein H (2008) Mechanism of Eukaryotic Homologous Recombination. *Annual Review of Biochemistry* 77:229–257. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.biochem.77.061306.125255>
- Gadish I, Zamir D (1987) Differential zygotic abortion in an interspecific *Lycopersicon* cross. *Genome* 29:156–159. <https://doi.org/10.1139/g87-026>
- Gardiner L-J, Joynson R, Omony J et al (2018) Hidden variation in polyploid wheat drives local adaptation. *Genome Research* 28:1319–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.233551.117>
- Gardiner L-J, Wingen LU, Bailey P et al (2019) Analysis of the recombination landscape of hexaploid bread wheat reveals genes controlling recombination and gene conversion frequency. *Genome Biology* 20:69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1675-6>
- Gardner KA, Lukas WM, Mackay IJ (2016) A highly recombinant, high-density, eight-founder wheat MAGIC map reveals extensive segregation distortion and genomic locations of introgression segments. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 14:1406–1417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12504>

Giraut L, Falque M, Drouaud J et al (2011) Genome-Wide Crossover Distribution in *Arabidopsis thaliana* Meiosis Reveals Sex-Specific Patterns along Chromosomes. PLOS Genetics 7:e1002354. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002354>

Hackett CA, Broadfoot LB (2003) Effects of genotyping errors, missing values and segregation distortion in molecular marker data on the construction of linkage maps. Heredity 90:33–38. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.hdy.6800173>

He F, Pasam R, Shi F et al (2019) Exome sequencing highlights the role of wild-relative introgression in shaping the adaptive landscape of the wheat genome. Nature Genetics 51:896–904. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0382-2>

He Y, Wang M, Dukowic-Schulze S et al (2017) Genomic features shaping the landscape of meiotic double-strand-break hotspots in maize. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114:12231–12236. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1713225114>

Helentjaris T, King G, Slocum M et al (1985) Restriction fragment polymorphisms as probes for plant diversity and their development as tools for applied plant breeding. Plant Molecular Biology 5:109–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00020093>

Henry RJ (2001) R.J. Henry - Plant Genotyping. The DNA Fingerprinting of Plants- CABI (2001).Pdf

Higgins JD (2013) Analyzing Meiosis in Barley. In: Pawlowski WP, Grelon M, Armstrong S (eds) Plant Meiosis: Methods and Protocols. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, pp 135–144

Higgins JD, Osman K, Jones GH, Franklin FCH (2014) Factors Underlying Restricted Crossover Localization in Barley Meiosis. Annual Review of Genetics 48:29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-genet-120213-092509>

Higgins JD, Perry RM, Barakate A et al (2012a) Spatiotemporal Asymmetry of the Meiotic Program Underlies the Predominantly Distal Distribution of Meiotic Crossovers in Barley. The Plant Cell Online 24:4096–4109. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.112.102483>

- Higgins JD, Perry RM, Barakate A et al (2012b) Spatiotemporal Asymmetry of the Meiotic Program Underlies the Predominantly Distal Distribution of Meiotic Crossovers in Barley. *The Plant Cell* 24:4096–4109. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.112.102483>
- (iwgsc) TIWGSC (2014) A chromosome-based draft sequence of the hexaploid bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) genome. *Science* 345:1251788. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251788>
- Jain HK (1957) Effect of high temperature on meiosis in *Lolium*: Nucleolar inactivation. *Heredity* 11:23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.1957.3>
- Jaksik R, Iwanaszko M, Rzeszowska-Wolny J, Kimmel M (2015) Microarray experiments and factors which affect their reliability. *Biology Direct* 10:46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13062-015-0077-2>
- Jaradat AA (2012) Wheat Landraces: Genetic Resources for Sustenance and Sustainability
- Jordan KW, Wang S, He F et al (2018) The genetic architecture of genome-wide recombination rate variation in allopolyploid wheat revealed by nested association mapping. *The Plant Journal* 95:1039–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.14009>
- Kihara H (1929) Conjugation of Homologous Chromosomes in the Genus Hybrids *Triticum* X *Aegilops* and Species Hybrids of *Aegilops*. *Cytologia*
- Kimura M (1968) Evolutionary Rate at the Molecular Level. *Nature* 217:624–626. <https://doi.org/10.1038/217624a0>
- Kopelman NM, Mayzel J, Jakobsson M et al (2015) Clumpak: A program for identifying clustering modes and packaging population structure inferences across K. *Molecular ecology resources* 15:1179–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12387>
- Koressaar T, Remm M (2007) Enhancements and modifications of primer design program Primer3. *Bioinformatics* 23:1289–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm091>
- Kozielska M, Weissing FJ, Beukeboom LW, Pen I (2010) Segregation distortion and

the evolution of sex-determining mechanisms. *Heredity* 104:100–112. <https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2009.104>

Kroll KM, Barkema GT, Carlon E (2008) Modeling background intensity in DNA microarrays. *Physical Review E, Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* 77:061915. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.77.061915>

Kumar S, Gill BS, Faris JD (2007) Identification and characterization of segregation distortion loci along chromosome 5B in tetraploid wheat. *Molecular Genetics and Genomics* 278:187–196. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00438-007-0248-7>

Lai Kaitao, Lorenc Michał T., Lee Hong Ching et al (2014) Identification and characterization of more than 4 million intervarietal SNPs across the group 7 chromosomes of bread wheat. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 13:97–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12240>

Larracuente AM, Presgraves DC (2012) The Selfish Segregation Distorter Gene Complex of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 192:33–53. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.112.141390>

Leaché AD, Banbury BL, Felsenstein J et al (2015) Short Tree, Long Tree, Right Tree, Wrong Tree: New Acquisition Bias Corrections for Inferring SNP Phylogenies. *Systematic Biology* 64:1032–1047. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syv053>

Lev-Yadun S, Gopher A, Abbo S (2000) The Cradle of Agriculture. *Science* 288:1602–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.288.5471.1602>

Li C, Bai G, Chao S, Wang Z (2015) A High-Density SNP and SSR Consensus Map Reveals Segregation Distortion Regions in Wheat. *BioMed Research International*

Li H, Kilian A, Zhou M et al (2010) Construction of a high-density composite map and comparative mapping of segregation distortion regions in barley. *Molecular Genetics and Genomics* 284:319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00438-010-0570-3>

Lieberman-Aiden E, Berkum NL van, Williams L et al (2009) Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome.

Science 326:289–293. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1181369>

Lilienfeld FA (1951) H. Kihara: Genome-Analysis in Triticum and Aegilops. X. Concluding Review. *Cytologia*

Lindholm AK, Dyer KA, Firman RC et al (2016) The Ecology and Evolutionary Dynamics of Meiotic Drive. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 31:315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.02.001>

Liu M, Stiller J, Holušová K et al (2016) Chromosome-specific sequencing reveals an extensive dispensable genome component in wheat. *Scientific Reports* 6:36398. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep36398>

Liu, Guo, Yuan (2010) Progress of Segregation distortion in Genetic Mapping of Plants
Lloyd A, Morgan C, Franklin C, Bomblies K (2018) Plasticity of Meiotic Recombination Rates in Response to Temperature in *Arabidopsis*. *Genetics genetics*.300588.2017. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.117.300588>

Loegering WQ, Sears ER (1963) Distorted Inheritance of Stem-Rust Resistance of Timstein Wheat Caused by a Pollen-Killing Gene. *Canadian Journal of Genetics and Cytology* 5:65–72. <https://doi.org/10.1139/g63-010>

Loidl J (1989) Effects of elevated temperature on meiotic chromosome synapsis in *Alonium Ursinum*. *Chromosoma* 97:449–458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00295029>

Lorenz TC (2012) Polymerase Chain Reaction: Basic Protocol Plus Troubleshooting and Optimization Strategies. *Journal of Visualized Experiments : JoVE*. <https://doi.org/10.3791/3998>

Lorieux M, Perrier X, Goffinet B et al (1995) Maximum-likelihood models for mapping genetic markers showing segregation distortion. 2. F2 populations. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 90:81–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00220999>

Lu H, Romero-Severson J, Bernardo R (2002) Chromosomal regions associated with segregation distortion in maize. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 105:622–628. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-002-0970-9>

- Lukaszewski AJ (2008) Unexpected behavior of an inverted rye chromosome arm in wheat. *Chromosoma* 117:569–578. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00412-008-0174-4>
- Lukaszewski AJ, Curtis CA (1993) Physical distribution of recombination in B-genome chromosomes of tetraploid wheat. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 86:121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00223816>
- Luo M-C, Gu YQ, Puiu D et al (2017) Genome sequence of the progenitor of the wheat D genome *Aegilops Tauschii*. *Nature* 551:498–502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24486>
- Lyttle TW (1993) Cheaters sometimes prosper: Distortion of mendelian segregation by meiotic drive. *Trends in Genetics* 9:205–210. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9525\(93\)90120-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9525(93)90120-7)
- Manninen OM (2000) Associations between anther-culture response and molecular markers on chromosomes 2H, 3H and 4H of barley (*Hordeum vulgare L.*). *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 100:57–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001220050008>
- Manrique-Carpintero NC, Coombs JJ, Veilleux RE et al (2016) Comparative Analysis of Regions with Distorted Segregation in Three Diploid Populations of Potato. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics* 6:2617–2628. <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.116.030031>
- Marcussen T, Sandve SR, Heier L et al (2014) Ancient hybridizations among the ancestral genomes of bread wheat. *Science* 345: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1250092>
- Marston AL, Amon A (2004) Meiosis: Cell-cycle controls shuffle and deal. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* 5:983–997. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm1526>
- Mascher M, Gundlach H, Himmelbach A et al (2017) A chromosome conformation capture ordered sequence of the barley genome. *Nature* 544:427–433. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22043>
- McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE et al (2016) The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biology* 17:122. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-0974-4>
- Mester D, Ronin Y, Minkov D et al (2003) Constructing large-scale genetic maps using

an evolutionary strategy algorithm. *Genetics* 165:2269–2282

Mester D, Ronin Y, Schnable P et al (2015) Fast and Accurate Construction of Ultra-Dense Consensus Genetic Maps Using Evolution Strategy Optimization. *PLOS ONE* 10:e0122485. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0122485>

Miller TE, Reader SM (1985) The effect of increased dosage of wheat chromosomes on chromosome pairing and an analysis of the chiasma frequencies of individual wheat bivalents. *Canadian Journal of Genetics and Cytology* 27:421–425. <https://doi.org/10.1139/g85-062>

Moore G (2015) Strategic pre-breeding for wheat improvement. *Nature Plants* 1:1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2015.18>

Mullis KB (1990) The Unusual Origin of the Polymerase Chain Reaction. *Scientific American* 262:56–65

Nakagawa S (2004) A farewell to Bonferroni: The problems of low statistical power and publication bias. *Behavioral Ecology* 15:1044–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arh107>

Neale MJ, Keeney S (2006) Clarifying the mechanics of DNA strand exchange in meiotic recombination. *Nature* 442:153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04885>

Nesbitt M (2001) Wheat evolution: Integrating archaeological and biological evidence. 25

Olohan L, Gardiner L-J, Lucaci A et al (2018) A modified sequence capture approach allowing standard and methylation analyses of the same enriched genomic DNA sample. *BMC Genomics* 19: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-4640-y>

Pallotta M, Warner P, Fox R et al (2003) Marker assisted wheat breeding in the southern region of Australia. In: Proceedings of the 10th international wheat genetics symposium, Paestum, Italy. Istituto Sperimentale per la Cerealicoltura Roma, Italy, pp 789–791

Paux E, Sourdille P, Salse J et al (2008) A Physical Map of the 1-Gigabase Bread Wheat

Chromosome 3B. *Science* 322:101–104. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1161847>

Peleg Z, Fahima T, Korol AB et al (2011) Genetic analysis of wheat domestication and evolution under domestication. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 62:5051–5061. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err206>

Peng J, Korol AB, Fahima T et al (2000) Molecular Genetic Maps in Wild Emmer Wheat, *Triticum dicoccoides*: Genome-Wide Coverage, Massive Negative Interference, and Putative Quasi-Linkage. *Genome Research* 10:1509–1531. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.150300>

Petersen OH, Sutton R (2006) Ca²⁺ signalling and pancreatitis: Effects of alcohol, bile and coffee. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* 27:113–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2005.12.006>

Phadnis N, Orr HA (2009) A Single Gene Causes Both Male Sterility and Segregation Distortion in *Drosophila* Hybrids. *Science* 323:376–379. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1163934>

Phillips D, Jenkins G, Macaulay M et al (2015) The effect of temperature on the male and female recombination landscape of barley. *New Phytologist* 208:421–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13548>

Pont C, Leroy T, Seidel M et al (2019) Tracing the ancestry of modern bread wheats. *Nature Genetics* 51:905–911. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0393-z>

Porras-Hurtado L, Ruiz Y, Santos C et al (2013) An overview of STRUCTURE: Applications, parameter settings, and supporting software. *Frontiers in Genetics* 4: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2013.00098>

Puranik S, Sahu PP, Srivastava PS, Prasad M (2012) NAC proteins: Regulation and role in stress tolerance. *Trends in Plant Science* 17:369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2012.02.004>

Rajikumara S (2008) Lodging in cereals - a review. *Agricultural Reviews* 29:55–60

Ramirez-Gonzalez RH, Uauy C, Caccamo M (2015) PolyMarker: A fast polyploid

primer design pipeline. *Bioinformatics* 31:2038–2039. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv069>

Reif JC, Zhang P, Dreisigacker S et al (2005) Wheat genetic diversity trends during domestication and breeding. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 110:859–864. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-004-1881-8>

Rey M-D, Martín AC, Smedley M et al (2018) Magnesium Increases Homoeologous Crossover Frequency During Meiosis in ZIP4 (Ph1 Gene) Mutant Wheat-Wild Relative Hybrids. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 9: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00509>

Rick CM (1963) Differential Zygotic Lethality in a Tomato Species Hybrid. *Genetics* 48:1497–1507

Rimbert H, Darrier B, Navarro J et al (2018) High throughput SNP discovery and genotyping in hexaploid wheat. *PLOS ONE* 13:e0186329. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186329>

Roorkiwal M, Jain A, Kale SM et al (2018) Development and evaluation of high-density AxiomCicerSNP Array for high-resolution genetic mapping and breeding applications in chickpea. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 16:890–901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12836>

Russell GE (1985) Progress in Plant Breeding - 1. Butterworths, LONDON

Rychlik W, Spencer WJ, Rhoads RE Optimization of the annealing temperature for DNA amplification in vitro. 4

Saintenac C, Falque M, Martin OC et al (2009) Detailed Recombination Studies Along Chromosome 3B Provide New Insights on Crossover Distribution in Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Genetics* 181:393–403. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.097469>

Saitou N, Nei M (1987) The neighbor-joining method: A new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 4:406–425. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a040454>

Salamini F, Özkan H, Brandolini A et al (2002) Genetics and geography of wild cereal domestication in the near east. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 3:429–441. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg817>

Sandler L, Hiraizumi Y, Sandler I (1959) Meiotic Drive in Natural Populations of *Drosophila Melanogaster*. I. The Cytogenetic Basis of Segregation-Distortion. *Genetics* 44:233–250

Sandler L, Novitski E (1957) Meiotic Drive as an Evolutionary Force. *The American Naturalist* 91:105–110. <https://doi.org/10.1086/281969>

Sarno R, Vicq Y, Uematsu N et al (2017) Programming sites of meiotic crossovers using Spo11 fusion proteins. *Nucleic Acids Research* 45:e164–e164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx739>

Sayed H, Kayyal H, Ramsey L et al (2002) Segregation distortion in doubled haploid lines of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) Detected by simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers. *Euphytica* 125:265–272. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015861610226>

Semagn K, Babu R, Hearne S, Olsen M (2014) Single nucleotide polymorphism genotyping using Kompetitive Allele Specific PCR (KASP): Overview of the technology and its application in crop improvement. *Molecular Breeding* 33:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11032-013-9917-x>

Seymour DK, Chae E, Ariöz BI et al (2017) The genetic architecture of recurrent segregation distortion in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *bioRxiv* 158527. <https://doi.org/10.1101/158527>

She R, Chu JS-C, Uyar B et al (2011) genBlastG: Using BLAST searches to build homologous gene models. *Bioinformatics* 27:2141–2143. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr342>

Shewry PR (2009) Wheat. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 60:1537–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp058>

Silver LM (1993) The peculiar journey of a selfish chromosome: Mouse t haplotypes

and meiotic drive. *Trends in Genetics* 9:250–254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9525\(93\)90090-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9525(93)90090-5)

Simons KJ, Fellers JP, Trick HN et al (2006) Molecular Characterization of the Major Wheat Domestication Gene Q. *Genetics* 172:547–555. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.105.044727>

Singh K, Ghai M, Garg M et al (2007) An integrated molecular linkage map of diploid wheat based on a *Triticum boeoticum* T. *Monococcum* RIL population. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 115:301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-007-0543-z>

Slater GS, Birney E (2005) Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison. *BMC bioinformatics* 6:31–31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-6-31>

Sood S, Kuraparth V, Bai G, Gill BS (2009) The major threshability genes soft glume (sog) and tenacious glume (Tg), of diploid and polyploid wheat, trace their origin to independent mutations at non-orthologous loci. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 119:341–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-009-1043-0>

Storey JD, Tibshirani R (2003) Statistical significance for genomewide studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100:9440–9445. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1530509100>

Sturtevant AH (1913) The linear arrangement of six sex-linked factors in *Drosophila*, as shown by their mode of association. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 14:43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.1400140104>

Takumi S, Motomura Y, Iehisa JCM, Kobayashi F (2013) Segregation distortion caused by weak hybrid necrosis in recombinant inbred lines of common wheat. *Genetica* 141:463–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10709-013-9745-2>

Taylor J, Butler D (2017) R Package ASMap: Efficient Genetic Linkage Map Construction and Diagnosis. *Journal of Statistical Software* 79: <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v079.i06>

Teale WD, Paponov IA, Palme K (2006) Auxin in action: Signalling, transport and the

control of plant growth and development. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* 7:847–859. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm2020>

Thompson DM, Chalmers K, Waugh R et al (1991) The inheritance of genetic markers in microspore-derived plants of barley *Hordeum vulgare* L. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 81:487–492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00219438>

Tshikunde NM, Mashilo J, Shimelis H, Odindo A (2019) Agronomic and Physiological Traits, and Associated Quantitative Trait Loci (QTL) Affecting Yield Response in Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.): A Review. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 10: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.01428>

Untergasser A, Cutcutache I, Koressaar T et al (2012) Primer3New capabilities and interfaces. *Nucleic Acids Research* 40:e115–e115. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks596>

Van de Peer Y, Maere S, Meyer A (2009) The evolutionary significance of ancient genome duplications. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 10:725–732. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2600>

Vaser R, Adusumalli S, Leng SN et al (2016) SIFT missense predictions for genomes. *Nature Protocols* 11:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2015.123>

Voorrips RE, Maliepaard CA (2012) The simulation of meiosis in diploid and tetraploid organisms using various genetic models. *BMC Bioinformatics* 13:248. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-13-248>

Walkowiak S, Gao L, Monat C et al (2020) Multiple wheat genomes reveal global variation in modern breeding. *Nature* 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2961-x>

Wang G, He QQ, Xu ZK, Song RT (2012) High segregation distortion in maize B73 x teosinte crosses. *Genetics and Molecular Research* 11:693–706. <https://doi.org/10.4238/2012.March.19.3>

Wang S, Wong D, Forrest K et al (2014) Characterization of polyploid wheat genomic diversity using a high-density 90 000 single nucleotide polymorphism array. *Plant*

Biotechnology Journal 12:787–796. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12183>

Wasserstein RL, Schirm AL, Lazar NA (2019) Moving to a World Beyond “ $p < 0.05$ ”. *The American Statistician* 73:1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2019.1583913>

wheat-training.com Designing genome specific primers in polyploid wheat

Wilkins AS, Holliday R (2009) The Evolution of Meiosis From Mitosis. *Genetics* 181:3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.099762>

Wilkinson PA, Winfield MO, Barker GLA et al (2016) CerealsDB 3.0: Expansion of resources and data integration. *BMC Bioinformatics* 17: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-016-1139-x>

Williams JGK, Kubelik AR, Livak KJ et al (1990) DNA polymorphisms amplified by arbitrary primers are useful as genetic markers. *Nucleic Acids Research* 18:6531–6535. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/18.22.6531>

Winfield MO, Allen AM, Burridge AJ et al (2016) High-density SNP genotyping array for hexaploid wheat and its secondary and tertiary gene pool. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 14:1195–1206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12485>

Winfield MO, Allen Alexandra M., Wilkinson Paul A. et al (2017) High-density genotyping of the A.E. Watkins Collection of hexaploid landraces identifies a large molecular diversity compared to elite bread wheat. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 16:165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12757>

Wingen LU, Orford S, Goram R et al (2014) Establishing the A. E. Watkins landrace cultivar collection as a resource for systematic gene discovery in bread wheat. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 127:1831–1842. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-014-2344-5>

Wingen LU, West C, Leverington-Waite M et al (2017) Wheat Landrace Genome Diversity. *Genetics* 205:1657–1676. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.116.194688>

Wu TD, Watanabe CK (2005) GMAP: A genomic mapping and alignment program for

mRNA and EST sequences. *Bioinformatics* 21:1859–1875. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bti310>

Wu Y, Bhat PR, Close TJ, Lonardi S (2008) Efficient and Accurate Construction of Genetic Linkage Maps from the Minimum Spanning Tree of a Graph. *PLoS Genetics* 4: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000212>

Wu Z, Irizarry RA, Gentleman R et al (2004) A Model-Based Background Adjustment for Oligonucleotide Expression Arrays. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 99:909–917. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000000683>

Xu S (2013) Principles of Statistical Genomics. Springer New York, New York, NY

Yachdav G, Wilzbach S, Rauscher B et al (2016) MSAViewer: Interactive JavaScript visualization of multiple sequence alignments. *Bioinformatics* 32:3501–3503. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btw474>

Yang J, Zhao X, Cheng K et al (2012) A Killer-Protector System Regulates Both Hybrid Sterility and Segregation Distortion in Rice. *Science* 337:1336–1340. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1223702>

Yang Z (2014) Molecular evolution: A statistical approach, First edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York, NY, United States of America

Zelkowski M, Olson MA, Wang M, Pawlowski W (2019) Diversity and Determinants of Meiotic Recombination Landscapes. *Trends in Genetics* 35:359–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2019.02.002>

Zickler D, Kleckner N (2015) Recombination, Pairing, and Synapsis of Homologs during Meiosis. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology* 7:a016626. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a016626>

Zimin AV, Puiu D, Hall R et al (2017) The first near-complete assembly of the hexaploid bread wheat genome, *Triticum aestivum*. *GigaScience* 6:1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/gix097>

Zimmering S, Sandler L, Nicoletti B (1970) Mechanisms of Meiotic Drive. *Annual Re-*

view of Genetics 4:409–436. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ge.04.120170.002205>

Zuckerkandl E, Pauling L (1965) Molecules as documents of evolutionary history. Journal of Theoretical Biology 8:357–366. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(65\)90083-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(65)90083-4)