Dissertation Defense

Kirk Gosik

2017-02-07

Contents

Conclusions   **39**

Abstract

Knowledge about how changes in gene expression are encoded by expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) is a key to construct the genotype-phenotype map for complex traits or diseases. Traditional eQTL mapping is to associate one transcript with a single marker at a time, thereby limiting our inference about a complete picture of the genetic architecture of gene expression. Here, I present an innovative application of variable selection approaches to systematically detect main effects and interaction effects among all possible loci on differentiation and function of gene expression. Forward-selection-based procedures were particularly implemented to tackle complex covariance structures of gene-gene interactions. We reanalyzed a published genetic and genomic dataset collected in a mapping population of Caenorhabditis elegans, gaining new discoveries on the genetic origin of gene expression differentiation, which could not be detected by a traditional one-locus/one-transcript analysis approach.

Update (This is from Han Hao's proposal, update for yours)

In this proposal, we focus on developing computational frameworks for QTL mapping in different types of functional valued traits. In Chapter 2, we deal with the situation where the trait values follow a parametric trend. A Richard curve is used to model plant height growth, and QTLs are examined for their association with the onset, offset and duration of the developmentaol process. In Chapter 3, the trait values do not have a specific mathematical form. The shape of leaf is modelled in a nonparametric way, and QTLs are examined for their association with shape development. In Chapter 4, we study the interaction between two functional valued traits. The growth of two interacting traits is modelled with a differential equation system,

and QTLs are examined for their association with the type and intensity of such interaction.

```r
devtools::install_github("rstudio/bookdown")
```

Chapter 1

Introduction

You can label chapter and section titles using `{#label}` after them, e.g., we can reference Chapter 1. If you do not manually label them, there will be automatic labels anyway, e.g., Chapter 2.2.

Figures and tables with captions will be placed in `figure` and `table` environments, respectively.

```r
par(mar = c(4, 4, .1, .1))

plot(pressure, type = 'b', pch = 19)
```

Reference a figure by its code chunk label with the `fig:` prefix, e.g., see Figure 1.1. Similarly, you can reference tables generated from `knitr::kable()`, e.g., see Table 1.1.

```r
knitr::kable(
  head(iris, 20), caption = 'Here is a nice table!',
  booktabs = TRUE
)
```

You can write citations, too. For example, we are using the **bookdown** package (Xie, 2016) in this sample book, which was built on top of R Markdown and **knitr** (Xie, 2015).

Figure 1.1: Here is a nice figure!

Table 1.1: Here is a nice table!

Sepal.Length	Sepal.Width	Petal.Length	Petal.Width	Species
5.1	3.5	1.4	0.2	setosa
4.9	3.0	1.4	0.2	setosa
4.7	3.2	1.3	0.2	setosa
4.6	3.1	1.5	0.2	setosa
5.0	3.6	1.4	0.2	setosa
5.4	3.9	1.7	0.4	setosa
4.6	3.4	1.4	0.3	setosa
5.0	3.4	1.5	0.2	setosa
4.4	2.9	1.4	0.2	setosa
4.9	3.1	1.5	0.1	setosa
5.4	3.7	1.5	0.2	setosa
4.8	3.4	1.6	0.2	setosa
4.8	3.0	1.4	0.1	setosa
4.3	3.0	1.1	0.1	setosa
5.8	4.0	1.2	0.2	setosa
5.7	4.4	1.5	0.4	setosa
5.4	3.9	1.3	0.4	setosa
5.1	3.5	1.4	0.3	setosa
5.7	3.8	1.7	0.3	setosa
5.1	3.8	1.5	0.3	setosa

Chapter 2

High Dimensional eQTL

2.1 Motivation

Since activation or inhibition of gene expression causes change in phenotypic formation, the identification of expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) that regulate the pattern of gene expression is essential for constructing a precise genotype-phenotype map (Emilsson et al. 2008; Cookson et al. 2009; Nica and Dermitzakis 2013). With the advent and development of various biotechnologies, it has become possible that genome-scale marker and expression data can be generated, providing an important fuel to systematically study the biological function of any types of cellular components in an organism (Kim et al. 2014; Fairfax et al. 2014; Lee et al. 2014). Several genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have been initiated to map a complete set of eQTLs for the abundance of genome-wide transcripts whose expression levels are related to biological or clinical traits (Nica and Dermitzakis 2013; Li et al. 2013; Koopmann et al. 2014). Statistical analysis and modeling are playing an increasing role in mapping and identifying the underlying eQTLs from massive amounts of observed data (Kendziorski et al. 2006; Chun and Keles 2009; Sun 2012; Flutre et al. 2013).

A typical eQTL mapping approach is to associate a gene transcript with a single marker such as single

nucleotide polymorphism (SNP). By analzying the significance of all these markers one by one adjusted for multiple testing, one can count significant loci that contribute to variation of expression by the gene. This marginal approach based on a simple regression model has been instrumental for the identifcation of eQTLs in a variety of organisms (Rockman et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2014). However, there are two major limitations for the results by such a marginal analysis: First, it does not take into account the dependence of different markers, thus a significant association detected by one marker may be due to the other markers that are linked with it. The marginal marker analysis cannot separate the confounding effect of eQTLs due to marker-marker dependence or linkage (Wu et al. 2007). Second, an eQTL may act through its interaction with other eQTLs and environmental factors. Because of their paramount importance in affecting complex diseases and traits, gene-gene interactions, or epistatic effects, and gene-environment interactions have been studied intensively in modern biological and medical research (Cheverud and Routman 1995; Moore 2003; van Eeuwijk et al. 2010; Mackay 2014)

These two limitations can be overcome by analyzing all markers and their pairwise interactions simultaneously through formulating a high-dimensional regression model. Although it can infer a complete picture of the genetic architecture of gene expression, this endeavor is highly challenged by the curse of dimensionality, i.e., the number of predictors far exceeds the number of observations. The past decade has witnessed the tremendous development of variable selection models for high-dimensional data analysis, such as LASSO (Tibshirani 1996), SCAD (Fan and Li 2001), Dantzig selector (Candes and Tao 2007), elastic net (Zou and Hastie 2005), minimax concave penalty (MCP) (Zhang 2010) among others. Many methods possess favorable theoretical properties such as model selection consistency (Zhao and Yu 2006) and oracle properties (Fan and Lv 2011). When the number of predictors is much larger than the number of observation, sure screening is a more realistic goal to achieve than oracle properties or selection consistency (Fan and Lv 2008; Wang 2009). Sure screening assures that all important variables are identified with a probability tending to one, hence achieving effective dimension reduction without information loss and providing a reasonable starting point for low-dimensional methods to be applied.

More recently, Hao and Zhang (2014) extended variable selection approaches to jointly model main and

interaction effects from high-dimensional data. Based on a greedy forward approach, their model can identify all possible interaction effects through two algorithms iFORT and iFORM which have been proved to possess sure screening property in an ultrahigh-dimensional setting. In this article, we implement and reform Hao and Zhang's model to map the genetic architecture of eQTL actions and interactions for gene expression profiles. This model is modified to accommodate to the feature of a genetic mapping or GWAS design in which molecular markers as genetic predictors are discrete although some additional continuous predictors can also be considered. We expand Hao and Zhang's regression model to include discrete components. Also, for an F2 or a natural population with three genotypes at each locus, we need to estimate a total of eight genetic effects for a pair of markers, which are additive and dominant effects at each locus, and additive additive, additive dominant, dominant additive and dominant dominant effects between the two loci (Fisher 1918). Thus, if the number of markers is p, a total number of predictors including all main and two-way interaction terms is 2p2. For a typical moderate-sized mapping study, in which several thousands of markers are genotyped on a few hundred individuals, consideration of pair-wise genetic interactions will quickly make the dimension of predictors an ultrahigh one.

By modeling all markers jointly at one time under an organizing framework, the modified model can detect all possible significant eQTLs and their epistasis. An eQTL can be either a cis-QTL, coming from the same physical location as the gene expression, or a trans-QTL, coming from other areas of the genome. Our model can more precisely discern these two different types of eQTLs and their interactions than traditional marginal analysis. By reanalyzing a published data collected in a mapping population of C. elegans (Rockman et al. 2010), the new model has validated previous results by the marginal approach, meanwhile obtained new discoveries on the genetic origin of gene expression differentiation, which could not be detected in a traditional way.

Add a paragraph to motivation section Continue on about the rest of the chapter as an overview

2.2   Methods

2.2.1   Experimental design

Consider an experimental population for genetic studies of complex traits, such as the backcross and F2 initiated from two inbred lines, full-sib family derived from two outcrossing parents, or random samples drawn from a natural population. These types of populations are used specifically for different species. Although they have different levels of complexities for statistical modeling, the genetic dissection of different populations underlies a similar principle. For the purpose of simplicity, we consider a backcross design in which there are only two genotypes at each marker.

Suppose the backcross contains n progeny, each of which is genotyped by p markers, such as single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), distributed over different chromosomes. The number of SNPs p should be large enough to completely cover the entire genome at an adequate depth so that we can possibly capture all possible genetic variants. An increasing body of evidence suggests that significant SNPs associated with complex traits or diseases are more likely to be eQTLs (Li et al. 2013). Hence the identification of eQTLs is an important first step toward the genetic dissection of end-point phenotypes. For this reason, we assume that genome-wide gene transcripts have been available for the assumed study population. Assume that all progeny are recorded for the same organ by microarray, leading to expression abundance data of m gene transcripts. We purport to identify all possible genetic variants including main effects and interaction effects of SNPs that contribute to each gene transcript.

2.2.2   Adaptation of iFORM procedure

The marker and gene transcript data of the study population can be denoted as (xi,yi) (i = 1, ..., n) which are independent and identically distributed copies of (X,Y), where $X=(X\_1,..,X\_p)^T$ is a p-dimensional predictor vector and Y is the response, expressed by a linear regression model:

$Y=\_0+\_1 X\_1+ +\_p X\_p+$ (1) The 's are the coefficients for the genetic effects of each marker. Like

most genome-wide datasets, the number of markers here grossly outnumbers the number of observations, p >> n. Therefore, selection procedures would need to be implemented in order to fit a linear regression model such as (1). We are already at the point of high-dimensional data but if we want to include epistatic effects between different markers as predictors as well it would increase the amount of predictors by $(p^2+p)/2$. The resulting linear model would grow to be, $Y= \beta_0+ \beta_1 X_1+ \dots + \beta_p X_p+ \beta_{11} X_1^2+ \beta_{12} X_1 (X_2)+ \dots + \beta_{pp} X_p^2+ \epsilon$, (2) where β's are the coefficients for the epistatic effects for all the quadratic and two-way interactions between the markers. For convenience we will assume that the markers and the transcripts are standardized before running the selection procedure. Therefore, $E(X_{ij})=0, \operatorname{Var}(X_{ij})=1, E(Y_i)=0$ and $\operatorname{Var}(Y_i)=1$ for $i=1,\dots,n$; $j=1,\dots,p$. Also, the quadratic and two-way interaction effects will be centered which we will write as $Z_i=(\dots, X_{ik} X_{il}-E(X_{ik} X_{il}),\dots)^T$. By doing so we would eliminate the need for an intercept in regression model (2). This would reduce the model to the form, $Y=X^T \beta +Z^T \gamma$ (3)

Some notations that will be used to define the elements of Han and Zhang's (2014) iFORM procedure are as follows.

$P_1=\{1,2,\dots,p\}$ $P_2=\{(k,l): 1 \le k \le l \le p\}$. which are the index sets for the linear and two-way interactions terms, respectively. The significant main effects for the markers and their interaction effects are $T_1=\{j: \beta_j \ne 0, j \in P_1\}, T_2=\{(j,k): \gamma_{jk} \ne 0, (j,k) \in P_2\}$. For any model M, $|M|$ will be used to denote the number of predictors contained in the model. The true model size would be indicated by $|T_1|=p_0$ and $|T_2|=q_0$ or together would be $|T|=d_0=p_0+q_0$. For the procedure, three sets will be used throughout. The sets are M for the model set, C for the candidate set of predictors and S for the solution set of predictors currently selected in the model.

There are two principles that are used in the selection procedure when considering interactions as candidates for selection into the final model. The first is considering the principle of marginality. The principle states that it is inappropriate to model interaction terms when the main effects contributing to the interaction have either not been included in the model or are deleted because their effects become marginal by the inclusion of the interaction effect. The second principle important to the procedure is the heredity principle. The strong case of the principle states that an interaction effect should not be considered unless both the contributing

main effects are in the model (Zhao et al. 2009; Yuan et al. 2009; Choi et al. 2010). This would translate to

$\beta_{jk} \neq 0$ only if β_j , $\beta_k \neq 0$ $1 \leq j,k \leq p$ for model (2). By including both principles during the selection process it allows for dynamically including both main effects and interactions effects. The interaction effects can only be considered between the main effects currently selected into the solution set of the model according the discussed principles. A more formal description of the procedure is given below.

2.2.3   iFORM

Hao and Zhang (2014) formulated an interaction forward selecting procedure under the marginality principle (iFORM). The procedure's initial step starts with the empty set for both the solution set and the model set, $S_0 = \emptyset$ and $M_0 = \emptyset$. The candidate set contains all main effects at the beginning, $C_0 = P_1$, for each of the markers as a possible eQTL. Typical forward selection procedures are carried out to start the selection. Each marker is tested individually using a marker regression. The marker that results in the lowest residual sum of squares is the marker selected from the candidate set into the solution set as an eQTL. This is then iterated again for a selection of another marker into the model set. Once there are at least two main effects selected into the solution set, using the strong heredity principle, the quadratic and two-way interactions are then created and placed into the candidate set as possible eQTLs for selection in the next step. This process continues selecting main effects or the newly created interaction effects into the solution set. If another main effect is selected into the solution set, then the candidate set grows with the creation of all possible two-way interactions of the main effects that are currently in the solution set. This is continued until a designated stopping value, say d. For the number of predictors placed into the model set from the solution set the Bayesian information Criterion was used, $BIC_2 (M) = \log(\hat{\sigma}_M^2) + n^{(-1)} |M| (\log(n) + 2\log(d^*))$, where $\hat{\sigma}_M^2$ is the sample variance for the given model, $|M|$ is the size of the model or the number of predictors selected into the given model, and n is the sample size. The d^* term is the number of predictors in the full model. This was proposed as BIC_2 by Chen and Chen (2008) which they derived to help control the false discovery rate in high dimensional data situations. They also showed that it was selection consistent if $d = O(n^\kappa)$ *for some $\kappa > 0$. The only difference between the traditional BIC calculation and the BIC_2 is*

the additional term involving 2log(d). Ignoring the BIC, the most the number of steps in the solution path is of size n. The parameter d controls the overall length of the solution path. In practice, the exact number of predictors to include, say d_0, in the true model is unknown. We want to make d large enough to include d_0 but not so large as to fit the model to the point where it becomes oversaturated. Using the BIC_2 should help avoid such a matter as well. It is reasonable to assume that d_0 is much smaller than n in high dimensional sparse regression problems (Fan and Lv 2008). Since this is the case, for the purposes of our model, d was set to be no larger than n/loga(n). Generally, the BIC_2 should reach minimum, indicating the optimal stopping point, before the designated stopping value, is reached.

Some considerations There were some considerations and pre-processing steps taken before the iFORM procedure was implemented. The first consideration was to see if there were any exact duplicate markers in the dataset. One drawback that could arise with marker datasets when attempting to run multiple linear regression is the possibility of duplicate markers in the dataset. If two different markers would happen to have exactly the same genotypes for each subject it would show up as an exact linear combination of each other if both markers were to be placed in the linear model. Including redundant markers in a linear model would not add any additional information and therefore should not be included in the candidate set during the selection procedure. This also reduces the dimension slightly when there are duplicate markers in the dataset.

Another consideration made is the type of coding used for the genotypes. At any given eQTL, the jth eQTL, say, there are two possible genotypes: Q_j Q_j and Q_j q_j, making the total number of possible QTL genotypes in the population 2^m. The goal of a genetic model is to relate the 2^m possible genotypic values to a set of genetic parameters, such that these parameters are interpretable in terms of main and epistatic effects of the m eQTL. A genetic model is to use orthogonal contrast scales because it is consistent in the sense that the effect of a eQTL is consistently defined whether the genetic model includes one, two, three, or more eQTL (Kao and Zeng 2002; Zeng et al. 2005). The orthogonal contrasts for the genetic model can be expressed by $x_{ij} = (1/2$ if homozygote Q_j Q_j@-1/2 if heterozygote Q_j q_j) Typically in an inbred line backcross population a given genotype is coded with a 0 and 1. However there are two draws backs to this coding when considering the selection procedures discussed above. The first issue comes with not including

an intercept in model (2). If this is the case each of the predictors would need to be centered making the

coding to -1/2 and 1/2 instead of 0 and 1. Besides meeting the assumptions of the model that the predictors

are centered, it is also beneficial for the interaction effects as well. If the coding would remain at 0's and 1's,

the interaction coding would also consist of 0's and 1's. This could propose a problem because three out of

the four scenarios of epistasis between markers would result in a coding of 0 for the level in the interaction

effect. This has the potential to falsely skew the data of no additive effect for interactions terms because

of the sparseness of coding. By centering the coding to (-1/2,1/2), it would result in an interaction effect

being coded as (-1/4,1/4). This coding would happen for different scenarios for each of the levels. The -1/4

could arise when the interaction is made up of a homozygote interacting with a heterozygote genotype. A

coding of 1/4 would arise by either a homozygote interacting with another homozygote genotype, or when

a heterozygote interacts with another heterozygote genotype.

2.3   Application

2.3.1   Simulation Results

Simulations studies were conducted to test the theoretical properties of the selection procedures and the

results (Tables 1 -3). The results were compared to several other commonly used methods for eQTL map-

ping. In each of the examples the response was generated from model (2) with $=1,2,$and 3 for the random

error with a sample size of n=200. The X_i's were all independently and identically distributed realiza-

tions generated from Binomial(0.5) and then orthogonal contrasts were made making each x_ij (-1/2,1/2).

The true $=(3,0,0,3,0,3,3,0$ *493), therefore making T_1={1,4,6,7} and p_0=4. The relevant interactions*

were set to the pairs T_2={(1,6),(1,7),(4,7),(4,7)} and q_0=4 all with __jk=3 where (j,k) T_2. There

were several methods compared during each of the simulations (Tables 1 -3). The methods that were used

to model the data were single marker analysis, forward selection involving only main effects (FS), forward

selection involving all main effects and interaction (FS2) and the iFORM procedure. Several outcomes were

evaluated to compare across each of the models. The outcomes are separated into three parts. The first

part focuses on the selection of main effects, the second part focuses on the selection of interaction effects and the third part is the overall model performance. Simulations of M=100 replicates were run and the outcomes considered include Convergence Probability (Cov) $(m=1)^M$ $I(T\; \hat{T})/M$ *Percentage of correct zeros (Cor0)* $(m=1)^M$ $(j=1)^p$ $I((\_j\;)\hat{}=0, \_j=0)/[M(p-p\_0)]$ *Percentage of incorrect zeros (Inc0)* $(m=1)M$ $(j=1)^p$ $I((\_j\;)\hat{}=0, \_j\; 0)/[M(p\_0)]$ *Exact Selection probability (Exact)* $\_(m=1)^M$ $I(T=\hat{T}\;)/M$ *The average model size Mean Square Error (MSE) Adjusted R-square Computation Time in seconds*

In each instance of the simulation, the iFORM procedure was closest to the simulated data, indicated as Oracle. Single marker analysis was conducted on each of the main effects individually and the significant markers were then designated as eQTLs. When comparing the single marker analysis, we can see it rarely designated the full set of main effects as significant from the simulated data. Also, no consideration for interactions could be assessed in single marker analysis. The iFORM procedure contains the identified main effects over 90% of the time across all simulations. The procedure also includes interaction selection. The interaction screening shares a similar success rate where the interaction effects are correctly selected over 90% of the time as well. Focusing on the computation time, we observed only a few seconds, on average, increase than running single marker analysis. The final models selected by the iFORM procedure had similar adjusted R-square values as the Oracle results, on average. Looking at the exact selection percentage, we can see that the vast majority of the time the correct predictors were selected and indicated as significant each time. To compare the interaction screening effectiveness, forward selection was implemented on both the main effects and interactions effects. The time it took to create the design matrix in order to implement forward selection was not included in the computation time. As can be seen from the results, using forward selection on the full set of main effects and pair-wise interactions took substantially longer to run on average than any of the other methods, including the iFrom procedure. Another drawback to implementing forward selection on such a large set seemed to come with over fitting the model. The selection included the maximum number of predictors allowed by the designated stopping value and did not use the BIC criteria for final model selection. This resulted in 19 additional predictors selected (Tables 1 -3). This increased the adjusted R-square value of the final model, however this is suspected because of over fitting the data and not to be a true prediction of the response.

2.3.2   Real Data Analysis

Rockman et al. (2010) reported an eQTL mapping study of C. elegans using 208 recombinant inbred advanced intercross lines (RIAIL) from a cross between the laboratory strain, N2, and a wild isolate from Hawaii, CB4856. Abundances of 20,000 gene transcripts were measured by microarray in developmentally synchronized young adult hermaphrodites of these lines, providing a genome-wide coverage of C. elegans from WormBase, a public C. elegans genome database. The microarray data was preprocessed through a normal–exponential convolution background correction and normalized using quantile standardization. Although they are closely related, the two strains used for the cross are considered relatively divergent for C. elegans. The two strains differ roughly at approximately 1 base pair per 900. Their RIAILs were genotyped at 1454 ordered single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers that cover the whole genome of C. elegans including five autosomes (denoted as I – V) and one sex chromosome (denoted as X).

Rockman et al. (2010) used a classic interval mapping approach to detect 2309 eQTLs by testing and scanning associations of each SNP with each gene transcript over the entire genome. Rockman et al.'s analysis allowed a rectangular map of eQTL positions   gene positions to be constructed (Fig. 1), from which one can identify cis-eQTLs on the diagonal and trans-eQTLs off the diagonal. However, because their association analysis was conducted individually for each SNP, the detection of eQTLs was based on the marginal effects of individual eQTLs, which may lead to two issues being unsolved. First, of those eQTLs detected for the same gene transcript, some may include confounded effects by others. Second, the effects of genetic epistasis may take place but were not detected. By analyzing all SNPs simultaneously under a single framework, the high-dimensional model, iFORM, implemented in this study can more precisely characterize the genetic machineries underlying variation in each gene transcript. More specifically, we treat each transcript as a response with all SNP markers and their interactions as predictors by building a big regression model. Significant predictors were then selected based on the iFORM procedure. A final model including both main and interaction effects can be evaluated by calculating adjusted R-square values

Figure 2 illustrates the map of how a particular gene transcript is controlled by its eQTLs through main

effects and interaction effects. For clarity of our presentation, we only chose one representative gene transcript from each chromosome. For example, gene transcript A_12_P103290 located at position $2069088 - 2069147$ of chromosome I was detected to be controlled by main effects due to X2_13516256 eQTLs on chromosomes II and X4_15632637 eQTLs on chromosome IV and X2_13516256:X4_15632637 interactions between some of these eQTLs on these two chromosomes.

iFORM provides the estimates of each effect (either main effect or interaction effect), standard errors of each estimate and the significance tests of each effect. As an example, Table 4 gives the result of how gene transcript A_12_P103290 can be predicted by its eQTLs and their interactions. It can be seen that the final predictive model (adjusted R2 = 0.896) contains 14 markers which exert their main effects and/or interaction effects on the transcript. Of the 14 final markers, a half shows significant main effects ($p <$ 0.05), with several (i.e., X_14636404, X4_15568674, X4_15632637 and X_14542103) explaining about 5% heritability (defined as a proportion of genetic variance due to a predictor over the total phenotypic variance). Of these final markers, we identified eight significant epistatic interactions. Each epistasis accounts for $4.6 - 5.5\%$ heritability (Table 4).

It is interesting to note that all predictors jointly contribute to 62.6% heritability for transcript A_12_P103290, of which main effects account for 26.7% and epistatic effects account for 35.9%. It is very surprising that epistasis contributes to more than a half of heritability. Of the eight epistatic interactions, only one occurs due to the interaction between two significant eQTLs, X_14542103 and X4_13532205 (Table 4). All the remaining is due to interactions between one significant eQTL and one non-significant marker. Some eQTLs, such as X_14542103 and X_14636404, produce epistasis with a greater frequency than others. Despite their involvement in the final predictive model, some markers were tested to be insignificant in terms of both main and interaction effects, suggesting that they regulate a gene transcript in a subtle but important fashion. In summary, iFORM can not only provide an estimate of the overall heritability of gene transcript A_12_P103290 (i.e., the sum of individual heritabilities explained by each predictor), but also chart a detailed picture of how each genetic variant contributes to transcript variation. In particular, iFORM can characterize epistasis and its role in trait control, thus equipped with a capacity

to retrieve so-called missing heritabilities (Manolio et al. 2009), a significant issue arising from current genome-wide association studies.

Through analyzing associations between all markers and each transcript by iFORM, we can identify the difference of cis- and trans-eQTLs for a particular transcript. For example, of the eQTLs affecting A_12_P103290, we detected that X1_2068168 is a cis-eQTL, whereas all others are trans-eQTLs (Table 4). We list the number and distribution of these two types of eQTLs and the pattern of how they interact with each other to determine gene transcripts (Table 5). By detecting cis-eQTLs and trans-eQTLs, iFORM detected that genetic interactions take place mostly between trans-eQTLs.

2.4   Discussion

With the recent development of genotyping and sequencing techniques, the collection of genome-wide genetic and genomic data from any tissue of an organism has been made much easier and more efficient. Because of this, genetic studies of complex diseases or traits have developed during the past decade to a point at which we can draw a complete picture of genetic architecture for disease or trait formation and progression by genome-wide association studies (GWAS) (Mackay et al. 2009). Traditional marginal analysis based on simple regression has been instrumental for the detection of important genetic variants or quantitative trait loci in a variety of organisms, but its bottleneck has emerged quickly due to its limitation in precisely and comprehensively charting genetic control landscapes. Many GWAS studies published are bothered by missing heritabilities because of their incapacity to detect genome-wide epistasis and genotype environment interactions (Manolio et al. 2009).

Epistasis is a phenomenon by which the influence of a gene on the phenotype depends critically upon the context provided by other genes (Cheverud and Routman 1995). It has been increasingly recognized that epistasis is an important source for trait variation (Moore 2003; Carlborg and Haley 2004; Cordell 2009), thus inclusion of epistasis would enhance the prediction accuracy of phenotypic performance and shed more light on the global genetic architecture of trait control (Mackay 2014). However, epistasis is extremely hard to

detect as an interaction term, whose inclusion may complicate the inference of the predictive model (Carlborg and Haley 2004; Mackay 2014). Thanks to recent progresses in high-dimensional data modeling, we have been able to implement several cutting-edge statistical models for systematical detection and characterization of genome-wide epistasis.

Hao and Zhang (2014) proposed a new high-dimensional model, iFORM, that can tackle an issue of interaction selection simultaneously from a large pool of continuous predictors. This model is based on forward-selection-based procedures, characteristic of computational feasibility and efficiency. The authors further proved that the detection of interactions by iFORM is consistent, even if the dimension increases exponentially for a sample size. As one of the first attempts to introduce high-dimensional models into genetic studies, we modified iFORM to accommodate to the discrete nature of molecular markers. Our simulation studies indicate that iFORM can provide reasonably accurate and precise estimates of genetic main effect and interaction effects. Also, it shows greater power to detect significant genes and their interactions which may not be detected by traditional single marker analysis.

We applied iFORM to re-analyze gene expression data in an eQTL mapping study (Rockman et al. 2010). While our results confirmed those by the traditional approach, the new model provides some new findings including new eQTLs and epistasis, thus allowing a complete set of genetic variants to be characterized. As an important tool to understand the genetic mechanisms underlying both complex traits and diseases, eQTL mapping has been widely used to identify key regulatory pathways toward endophenotype and end-point phenotypes (Schadt et al. 2005; Emilsson et al. 2008; Cookson et al. 2009; Pickrell et al. 2010; Nica and Dermitzakis 2013). A typical eQTL study may not only include a large number of molecular markers as like in a GWAS, but also record tens of thousands of gene transcripts throughout the entire genome. Our current version of iFORM can only take into account one gene transcript as a response at a time, thus having a limitation to model the correlation and dependence among different genes. It is our next step to formulate a multivariate multiple regression model by which to test how an individual predictor, main effect or epistatic effect, pleiotropically affects correlated expression profiles of different genes.

Given the complexity of biological phenomena, pair-wise epistasis may be insufficient to explain phenotypic

variation. Imielinski and Belta (2008) argued that high-order interactions among more than two genes may provide a key pathway toward complex traits. Three-way interactions have been detected in trait control (McMullen et al. 1998; Stich et al. 2007). A model for modeling three-way interactions has been developed in a case-control GWAS design (Wang et al. 2010) and a genetic mapping setting (Pang et al. 2012). It is crucial to extend iFORM to map main effect, two-way epistasis and three-way epistasis in an eQTL mapping study although no substantial change is needed in the computational algorithm, except for an enlarged test set and extra computing time. Our work is based on a backcross population in which there are only two genotypes at a locus. The backcross population can facilitate our estimation and test of genetic effects owing to a smaller number of parameters at each locus or locus pair, but its utility is very limited in the F2 design of model systems and natural populations of outcrossing species such as humans. A more general model of iFORM should consider three genotypes at each locus, which provides estimates of additive and dominant effects at each locus and four types of epistasis, i.e., additive additive, additive dominant, dominant additive and dominant dominant, between each pair of loci (Fisher 1918). Each of these epistatic types may affect a phenotype through a different pathway.

With continuous falling of sequencing price, we will have desirable opportunities to study the dynamic behavior and pattern of gene expression profiles across time and space scales (Viñuela et al. 2010; Ackermann et al. 2013). Many previous studies suggest that gene expression during cell and organ development may follow a particular form, which can be quantified by mathematical equations (Kim et al. 2008). For example, abundance of gene expression may change periodically in human's brain during circadian clock. Many researchers used Fourier's series approximation to model the periodic changes of gene expression by estimating the period and amplitude of the cycles (Li et al. 2010). By integrating Fourier series into iFORM, we will be able to map dynamic eQTLs for gene expression and make a quantitative prediction of temporal and spatial patterns of genetic control by eQTLs.

Chapter 3

High-order Epistatic Networks

3.1 Motivation

Quantitative traits are very difficult to study because these traits are controlled by many genes that interact in a complicated way (Nelson et al. 2013; Mackay 2014). Genome-wide mapping and association studies increasingly available due to next-generation high-throughput genotyping techniques have proven to be useful for characterizing gene-gene interactions, coined epistasis, that contribute to phenotypic variation (Cordell 2009; Van Steen 2012; Wei et al. 2014). Powerful statistical methods have been developed to analyze all possible markers simultaneously, from which to search for a complete set of epistasis for quantitative traits (Li et al. 2015: Gosik et al. 2016). The joint analysis of all markers is particularly needed to chart an overall picture of genetic interactions, in comparison with computationally less expensive marginal analysis.

Epistasis reported in the current literature is mostly due to interactions between two genes. However, a growing body of evidence shows that genetic interactions involving more than two loci play a pivotal role in regulating the genetic variation of traits (Wang et al. 2010; Dowell et al. 2010; Pang et al. 2013; Taylor and Ehrenreich 2015). For example, in a mapping population deriving from crossing two chicken lines, three-locus interactions were detected to determine body weight (Pettersson et al. 2011). A mapping

study established by two yeast strains identified genetic interactions involving five or more loci for colony morphology (Taylor and Ehrenreich 2014). Other studies have demonstrated that high-order epistasis is of critical importance in regulating metabolic networks in yeast (Weinreich et al. 2013) and Escherichia coli and Saccharomyces cerevisiae (Imielinski and Belta 2008; He et al. 2010), whereas lower-order (pairwise) epistasis may be insufficient to explain metabolic variation for these organisms.

The theoretical models of high-order epistasis have well been established by mathematical biologists (Hansen and Wagner 2001; Beerenwinkel et al. 2007). These models provided a foundation to interpret high-order epistasis from a biological standpoint. A few statistical models have been derived to estimate and test high-order epistasis in case-control designs (Wang et al. 2010) and population-based mapping settings (Pang et al. 2013). Wang et al. (2015) developed a Bayesian version of detecting high-order interactions for both continuous and discrete phenotypes. However, these models were based on a marginal analysis, thus less powerful to illustrate a global view of genetic control mechanisms due to high-order epistasis.

In this article, we deploy a variable selection procedure within a genetic mapping or association setting to characterize the genetic architecture of complex traits composed of main effects of individual genes, pairwise epistasis between two genes, and three-way epistasis among three genes. The model was built on greedy interaction screening forward selection developed under the marginality principle (named iFORM) by Hao and Zhang (2014). These approaches, proved to possess sure screening property for ultrahigh-dimensional modeling, have been implemented to model the genetic architecture of main effects and pairwise epistasis due to eQTLs for gene transcripts (Gosik et al. 2016). Here, we extend the implementation of iFORM to systematically capture three-way interactions that are expressed among all possible markers studied. To show the statistical power of the extended model, we performed computer simulation studies. The model was further validated through analyzing a real data of genetic mapping for shoot growth in a woody plant, mei (Prunus mume). The model should be used in any other mapping or association studies of quantitative traits.

Add a paragraph to motivation section Continue on about the rest of the chapter as an overview

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Mapping and association studies

Genetic mapping and association studies are two types of designs used to dissect quantitative traits. The former is based on a controlled cross derived from distinct parents, whereas the latter samples different genotypes from a pool of accessions or a natural population. In both types of design, a set of individuals are sampled to be phenotyped for quantitative traits of interest and genotyped by molecular markers distributed throughout the entire genome. For a particular genetic experiment, the number of markers is much larger than that of samples, thus, it is impossible to estimate the genetic effects of all markers simultaneously using traditional regression models. This issue becomes much intractable when we aim to estimate genetic interactions of different orders. To tackle the issue of the number of predictors $>>$ the number of samples, several variable selection approaches have been implemented in association studies. One approach is forward selection which was shown to be robust for estimating pairwise interactions of predictors (Hao and Zhang 2014). With sure screening properties and controlling for false positives, this approach, named iFORM, performs very well in capturing important information in explaining the response variable. On top of these nice theoretical properties it is computationally efficient by using ordinary least squares calculations and only requiring a predetermined set up steps. Here, we extended the iForm procedure to include HGI's to capture more relevant information. In the following sections, the notation and model set-up will be introduced. After this theoretical properties will be explored. Finally simulated and real data analysis will be conducted to help confirm the theoretical properties and show the feasibility of using the model for screening across whole genomes to more precisely explain phenotypes of interest.

3.2.2 Epistatic model

Consider a linear model that underlies the true genotype-phenotype relationship. Assume that the phenotype, as the response of the model, is controlled by a set of p SNPs that act singly and/or interact with each

other. These main and interaction effects of markers, i.e., the predictors of the model, need to be estimated.

Let $Y = (y_1, ..., y_n)^T$ denote the phenotypic value of n samples from a mapping or association population.

When considering pairwise and three-way interactions, the linear model is expressed as $Y = +X^T +Z^T +W^T + $ (1) where $X=(X\_1,...,X\_p)^T$ is the design matrix that specifies the genetic effects of each

marker $= (1, ..., p)$, $Z=(X\_j X\_k)^T$ (1 j k p) is the design matrix that specifies the epistatic effects

between two markers, expressed in , $W=(X\_j X\_k X\_l)^T$ (1 j k l p) is the design matrix that specifies

the epistatic effects among three markers, expressed in , and $\sim N(0, {}^2)$ is the residual error normally

distributed with mean zero and variance ^{2}. We denote the index sets for the linear, order-2 and order-3

effects in equation (1), respectively, as $P\_1=\{1,2,...,p\}$

$P\_2=\{(j,k):1 j k p\}$ $P\_3=\{(j,k,l):1 j k l p\}$ With the significant main, order-2 interaction and order-3 interaction effect sets being, $T\_1=\{j: \_j 0,j P\_1\}$ $T\_2=\{(j,k): \_jk 0,(j,k) P\_2\}$ $T\_3=\{(j,k,l): \_jkl 0,(j,k,l) P\_3$

}

The true size of T_1, will be p_1 and similarly for T_2 and T_3 will have sizes p_2 and p_3 respectively.

There will be a total of 3 sets referred to throughout the procedure, the candidate set C, the selection set S

and the model set, M. The candidate set is the set of all possible predictors at a given step in the selection

process. The selection set contains the predictors that have previously been selected from the candidate set

from each iteration of the procedure. Finally, the model set is the final model that is fit from the selection

set at the end of the procedure. The BIC is used to determine the optimal cutoff for the final model size.

3.2.3   iForm with high-order epistasis

The iForm procedure is a forward selecting procedure. In traditional forward selection the procedure starts

with the empty set and then iterates through the entire set of possible predictors in C and selects the best

predictor and includes it in S at the end of each step. The best predictor can be determined in many ways

but usually is defined by the predictor that results in the least amount of error. For our purposes we use

the residual sum of squares. This continues with selecting the best predictor from C at each step until a

designated stopping criterion is met or until some information criterion is met. Common information criteria

used for selecting predictors to be in M are AIC, BIC, R^2 and Mallow's C_p statistic.

The iForm procedure for high-order epistatic detection parallels the forward selection procedure, but C will grow dynamically with the creation of order-2 and order-3 interaction effects between main effects that were included from previous iterations of the procedure. There are three steps to the model selection. The first step is to initialize the 3 sets mentioned above. The sets, S and M are set to the empty set while the candidate set, C, is first set to P_1, all the main effects. The next step starts the forward selection procedure selecting predictors from C. The selected predictor will be a main effect at the first step. At subsequent steps, after interaction effects are included, selected predictors could be either be a main effect, order-two or order-three interaction effect. The final step involves repeating the second step until a designated stopping criterion is met. This can be a certain amount of predictors to be considered in the final model, or it can be based off of other factors such as the sample size. The designated stopping criterion will be denoted as d. For our purposes we use d as a function of the sample size, d = n/lo g_2a(n). The procedure will run up until d iterations, and the optimal model will then be constructed from the selection set. This is done by an information criterion. Here we used the Bayesian Information Criterion proposed by Chen and Chen (2008) denoted as the BIC_2. This was derived by them to control the false discovery rate in high dimensional model selections.

BIC_2 (M^)=loga(^_M^2)+n^(-1) |M^ |*(loga(n)+2loga(d^*)) (2)*

Once the selection procedure is done and there are d predictors in the selection set the BIC is used to determine the cutoff value for the optimum number of predictors in the model set. Then linear regression is performed on the model set.

Two guiding principles are used to help dynamically select the main effects and epistasis effects throughout the procedure. The first is the marginality principle, which states that an effect will not be removed from the model once it has been selected. A previous selected effect may become marginal by the inclusion of subsequent effects. This especially can be the case when an interaction effect is included. One of the parent effects may become less significant or even not significant at all by considering both in the model. The

next principle we state as the heredity principle but has also been referred to in other work as the hierarchy principle (Bien et al 2013 and Lim and Hastie 2014).

The heredity (hierarchy) principle help reduce the search space by making the assumption that previously selected main effects would be involved in the interaction effects. By considering this principle it substantially reduces the search space making this feasible for ultra-high dimensional situations. Even larger than ram datasets can be used with efficient memory mapping of the dataset while running the procedure. The weak version of the heredity principle for three-way interactions states that at least one of the main effects needs to be selected into the model to consider an interaction effect that contains that predictor. Considering a moderately high set of predictors say p = 5000, if trying to include all order-2 interactions upfront, will make the candidate set be as high as 12,498,000. This alone could exceed most ram requirements of standard computers. This is before even stepping up to order-3 interactions. The weak heredity principle would decrease the candidate set substantially. Assuming a sample size of n = 200, would give a cut off of n/ lo g_2a(n) =200/lo g_2a (200) =26 steps in the procedure. This would give a maximum of approximately 135,000 candidate predictors. This gives a 100 fold decrease in the candidate set. This could substantially make ultra-high dimensional analysis more feasible and also speed it up in the process. This is the weak case. If considering the strong case the decrease in candidate space is even more apparent. Aside from the efficiency by lowering the search space of the candidate set, the heredity principle is usually taken into account by researchers when selecting models involving the consideration for interaction effects.

3.2.4   Theoretical Properties

The theoretical properties of the iForm procedure with high-order epistasis follow closely with the forward selection procedure. Hao and Zhang (2014) summarize forward selection nicely as follows. At each step, the response is regressed on the most correlated covariate, and the residual is calculated and used as the new response in next step. After the most correlated covariate (say, X1) is selected, all other covariates are regressed on X1, and then the covariates are substituted by the corresponding normalized residuals, which are used as the new covariates in next step. By viewing forward selection in this sense the computational

complexity of the procedure depends upon the size of the candidate set. The candidate set in the iForm's case does grow dynamically at each step, by at most the number of predictors currently selected in C for each step. If we denote the current size of the candidate set as m then each iteration of the procedure grows with complexity of $O(nm)$, where n is the sample size. Leaving the selection unrestricted we would not be able to fit more than n predictors for a linear model and therefore n would be the most main effects that would be able to be selected. Considering the weakest form of the heredity principle at the current iteration there would be at most $p+(n(n-1)(n-2))/6$ predictors in the candidate set. This would make the total complexity of the selection procedure to be $nO(n(p+n(n-1)(n-2)))=O(n^3 p+n^5)$. This makes the total complexity grow linearly as p grows.

The theoretical properties of the iForm procedure show sure screening properties (Fan et al. 2007). By this we mean that all the import predictors, whether that is a main effect or epistatic effect will be selected with probability tending to 1. This is important to capture as much of the signal as possible through all the noise that comes with $p >> n$ or ultra-high dimensional situations. It is also important not to 'over-fit' the model with unnecessary predictors that actually explain more noise in the data that the model is being fitted on than the actual signal you would like to pick up on.

To show the property from above the following conditions would need to be met for regulatory purposes. Hao and Zhang (2014) showed how under these conditions sure screening properties for interaction models like FS2 and iForm are satisfied. This also applies to order-3 interaction models like FS3 and iForm with higher order epistasis, like we do with the high-order epistasis model. The following assumptions need to be met for these conditions. The first is that the $X=(X\_1,…,X\_p)^T$ are jointly and marginally normal with independent normally distributed error. Next we would need the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix to be positive and bounded by two constants 0

Chapter 4

iForm Functional Mapping (A computational method)

4.1 Motivation

(The genetic architecture of shoot-root covariation during seedling emergence of a dessert tree, Populus euphratica)

Since most traits associated with growth and development can be better described by a dynamic process (Hernandez (2015), Muraya et al. (2017)), it is more biologically meaningful to map these traits as growth curves (Sun and Wu, 2015). Several approaches have integrated growth equations into the likelihood of genetic mapping, leading to the birth of a so-called functional mapping model (Ma et al., 2002; Wu and Lin, 2006; Li and Sillanpaa, 2015; Muraya et al., 2016). Functional mapping allows the developmental change of genetic control to be characterized across time and space (He et al., 2010; Li and Wu, 2010). By modeling the longitudinal mean-covariance structures using a set of parsimonious parameters, functional mapping has proven of great statistical power in gene identification and the utilization of sparse phenotypic data (Hou

et al., 2005, 2006). An alternative to functional mapping is to map growth QTLs by estimating growth parameters for each genotype based on growth equations and associating these parameters with markers (Wu et al., 2002).

from research statement

Treating the molecular biology of an organisim as a complex trait, it would be likely that the expression profiles of certain genes, proteins or other metabolites would follow a more functional or dynamic phenotype. This information could be lost or greatly limited by treating the response as a single static predictor. In an attempt to capture all relevant information available I am currently extending the procedure further to include the entire growth function as a phenotype. The mean growth curve is estimated for the sample and then orthogonal polynomials are used to assist in fitting the genetic effects for each marker or interaction between the markers. This would allow the genetic effect some flexibility over time and give a more representative fit. I anticipate submitting a third manuscript in late spring around this topic. This could also be used with other semi parametric functions to model dynamics or other types of non-linear functions that characterizes the biological systems being evaluated.

4.1.1   Update

(This is from Han Hao's proposal, update for yours)

Changes in developmental timing and rate, named as heterochrony, have long been believed to be a major force in the evolution of phenotype (Gould, 1977; Wilson et al., 1988). It has been observed that relatively few genetic changes in heterochrony through the endocrine regulation of metamorphosis can cause profound morphological consequences (Moss, 2007). For example, although humans and chimpanzees are closely related, their skull shape and brain growth are different dramatically during early development (Rice, 2002; Mitteroecker et al., 2004; King, 2004). A recent phylogenic investigation revealed that changes in developmental timing are a crucial step for birds to evolve from dinosaurs (Bhullar, 2012). The consequence of these changes leads birds to take months to reach sexual maturity, allowing them to retain the physical character-

istics of baby stages characterized by dinosaurs that take years to mature. One question that naturally arises from these evolutionary divergences is what mechanisms are implicated for heterochrony and the change of biological clock.

Many studies have pursued to identify the molecular control of developmental timing; mostly using Caenorhabditis elegans as an example, these studies have identified heterochronic genes that orchestrate the timing of cell divisions and fates during development regulated by microRNAs and their targets (Ambros, 2000; Rougvie, 2001; Pasquinelli and Ruvkun, 2002; Banerjee and Slack, 2002; Moss, 2007). Focusing on particular pathways causing heterochonic changes, none of these studies has provided an entire picture of the genetic control of heterochrnoy. Furthermore, the effects of heterochronic genes on the evolution of complex phenotypes have not been quantified, limiting the inference and prediction of evolutionary changes.

In this chapter, we develop a general framework for characterizing the genetic architecture of heterochrony based on widely used genetic mapping approaches. Genetic mapping has been proved to be powerful for mapping and studying quantitative trait loci (QTLs) involved in complex traits (Lander and Botstein, 1986), and has been increasingly integrated with network biology to better elucidate the mechanisms of the way QTL acts and interacts with other factors (Wang et al., 2012b). In the decade, genetic mapping has developed to a point at which this approach can characterize QTLs that control the process of development, leading to the birth of functional mapping (Ma et al., 2002; Wu and Lin, 2006; Li and Wu, 2010). Functional mapping implements mathematical aspects of developmental principles into a mapping framework, equipped with a capacity to study the interplay between QTLs and development. Here, we extend functional mapping to characterize QTLs controlling heterochrony (named hQTLs), specified by three parameters (i) the onset of a particular process, (ii) its offset, and (iii) the rate at which the process proceeds. By using growth equation as an example, we exemplify the procedure of model derivations as well as the practical use of the model in hQTL detection. In the end, we discuss an issue of how hQTLs can be integrated with developmental evolutionary biology (evo-devo), a fast-growing discipline of biology in the recent years.

Add a third paragraph to motivation section Continue on about the rest of the chapter as an overview

4.2   Methods

4.2.1   Functional Mapping

4.2.1.1   Update

(This is from Han Hao's proposal, update for yours)

Functional mapping is a group of methods used for mapping QTLs related to functional valued traits that are measured over a certain time period. These function-valued traits are widely seen in growth analysis, shape analysis, network analysis, and clinical trials. By integrating functional features with genetic analysis, functional mapping methods often help to increase the statistical power and the biological relevance between the detected QTLs and biological traits. Functional mapping methods were first developed using parametric curves to describe the functional valued traits, such as growth curves or pharmacodynamic models (Ma et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005). Later, semi-parametric and non-parametric models were introduced for complex traits that do not have specific mathematical forms (Das et al., 2011, 2013).

The key of functional mapping methods is the modelling of both functional means and the covariance structure across measurements from the same individual. When modelling the functional means, biological background is first examined to select the best function, either parametric or non-parametric. The covariance structure is usually modeled by parsimonious and flexible approaches such as autoregressive, antedependence, or nonparametric structures. The functional means and covariance structures can be integrated into a likelihood function, then hypothesis testing can be performed with a likelihood ratio testing approach.

4.2.2 Legendre Polynomials

4.2.3 Model

4.2.3.1 BIC

From the book BibTex **?**{wu2006nonparametric, title={Nonparametric regression methods for longitudinal data analysis: mixed-effects modeling approaches}, author={Wu, Hulin and Zhang, Jin-Ting}, volume={515}, year={2006}, publisher={John Wiley & Sons} }

Similarly, following the classical BIC rule (Swartz 1978), we can define the BIC rule for the cubic MESS model as

$$BIC(\lambda, \lambda_v) = -2 * LogLik + log(n) * (df + df_v)$$

n is the number of subjects

$$\lambda = smoothing paramter$$

$$\lambda_v = smoothing paramter, number of knots in the cubic spline$$

4.3 Application

4.3.1 Simulation Studies

4.3.2 Worked Example

Chapter 5

Conclusions

5.1 Summary

5.2 Conclusions

5.3 Future Steps

5.3.1 Aim 1

5.3.2 Aim 2

5.3.3 Aim 3

We have finished a nice book.

Conclusions

Bibliography

Hernandez, K. M. (2015). Understanding the genetic architecture of complex traits using the function-valued approach. *New Phytologist*, 208(1):1–3.

Muraya, M. M., Chu, J., Zhao, Y., Junker, A., Klukas, C., Reif, J. C., and Altmann, T. (2017). Genetic variation of growth dynamics in maize (zea mays l.) revealed through automated non-invasive phenotyping. *The Plant Journal*.

Xie, Y. (2015). *Dynamic Documents with R and knitr*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, 2nd edition. ISBN 978-1498716963.

Xie, Y. (2016). *bookdown: Authoring Books and Technical Documents with R Markdown*. R package version 0.3.8.