

### Modelling Epistasis

Fisher (1918) first partitioned the genetic variance using the least squares principle  
variance components:  
additive, dominance, and epistatic effects

Cockerham (1954) partitioned two-gene epistasis into four variance components  
– additive × additive  
– additive × dominance  
– dominance × additive  
– dominance × dominance

Mather Jinks (1982) model based on RI ( $F_\infty$ )  
usual model developed in genetics classes  
 $G_2 = \mu + a$ ,  $G_1 = \mu + d$ ,  $G_0 = \mu - a$   
does not extend well to epistasis  
estimates of  $a$ ,  $d$  depend on interactions

### Gene effects and variances with epistasis under the least square genetic model

$G_{jl}^{ik}$  genotypic value for offspring from male gamete  $A_i B_k$  with female gamete  $A_j B_l$   
assume no maternal effects:  $G_{jl}^{ik} = G_{ik}^{jl}$

model effects classified in two ways  
within columns: loci effects  $g_j^i, g_l^k$   
loci interaction ( $g_j^i g_l^k$ )  
within rows: gametic effects  $g^{ik}$  and  $g_{jl}$   
gametic interaction ( $g^{ik} g_{jl}$ )

$$G_{jl}^{ik} = \mu + g_j^i + g_l^k + (g_j^i g_l^k) + g^{ik} + g_{jl} + (g^{ik} g_{jl}) + a^i + a^k + (a^i a^k) + a_j + a_l + (a_j a_l) + (a^i a_l) + (a_j a^k) + (a^i a_l^k) + (a_j^k a^k) + (a_j a_l^k) + (a_j^k a_l) + (a_j^k a_l^k)$$

### connections between gametic effects and loci effects

all epistatic effects represent interactions among nonallelic genes  
interactions among loci

each gametic effect contains average effects and additive by additive effect

gamete interactions include dominance effects and remaining epistatic effects ( $a \times d, d \times a, d \times d$ )

assume random mating and linkage equilibrium  
allow different frequencies in male, female gametes  
 $P_{jl}^{ik} = p^i p_j p^k p_l, \sum p^i = \sum p_j = \sum p^k = \sum p_l = 1$

recall least squares genetic model from 4.1, 4.4

### effects in terms of genetic means $G$ 4-factor factorial design

additive main effects

$$a^i = G_{..}^i - G_{..}, \quad a^k = G_{..}^k - G_{..}$$

$$a_j = G_{.j} - G_{..}, \quad a_l = G_{.l} - G_{..}$$

dominance as two-allele intralocus interactions

$$d_j^i = G_{.j}^i - G_{..}^i - G_{.j} + G_{..}, \quad d_l^k = G_{.l}^k - G_{..}^k - G_{.l} + G_{..}$$

additive × additive two-loci interactions

$$(a^i a^k) = G_{..}^{ik} - G_{..}^i - G_{..}^k + G_{..}, \quad (a^i a_l) = G_{.i}^l - G_{..}^l - G_{.i} + G_{..}, \quad \dots$$

additive × dominance three-factor interactions

$$(a^i d_l^k) = G_{.i}^{kl} - G_{..}^{kl} - G_{.i}^k - G_{.i}^l + G_{..}^k + G_{..}^l + G_{.i} - G_{..}, \quad \dots$$

$$(d_j^i a^k) = G_{.j}^{ik} - G_{..}^{ik} - G_{.j}^i - G_{.j}^k + G_{..}^i + G_{..}^k + G_{.j} - G_{..}, \quad \dots$$

dominance × dominance four-factor interaction

$$(d_j^i d_l^k) = G_{.jl}^{ik} - G_{..}^{ik} - G_{.j}^{ik} - G_{.l}^{ik} - G_{.j}^k + G_{..}^k + G_{.j}^i + G_{.l}^i + G_{.j}^k + G_{.l}^k + G_{.j}^i + G_{.l}^i + G_{.j}^k + G_{.l}^k - G_{..}^i - G_{..}^k - G_{.j} - G_{.l} + G_{..}$$

sum-to-zero side constraints imposed:

$$\sum_i p^i (a^i a^k) = \sum_k p^k (a^i a^k) = \dots = \sum_j p_j (d_j^i d_l^k) = 0$$

**total variance  $\sigma_G^2$**

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_G^2 &= \sum_{i,j,k,l} p^i p_j p^k p_l (G_{ijl}^{ik} - \mu)^2 \\ &= \left[ \sum_i p^i (a^i)^2 + \sum_k p^k (a^k)^2 + \sum_j p_j (a_j)^2 + \sum_l p_l (a_l)^2 \right] \\ &+ \left[ \sum_{i,j} p^i p_j (d_j^i)^2 + \sum_{k,l} p^k p_l (d_l^k)^2 \right] + \left[ \sum_{i,k} p^i p^k (a^i a^k)^2 \right] \\ &+ \left[ \sum_{j,l} p_j p_l (a_j a_l)^2 + \sum_{i,l} p^i p_l (a^i a_l)^2 + \sum_{j,k} p_j p^k (a_j a^k)^2 \right] \\ &+ \left[ \sum_{i,k,l} p^i p^k p_l (a^i d_l^k)^2 + \sum_{i,j,k} p^i p_j p^k (d_j^i a^k)^2 \right] \\ &+ \left[ \sum_{j,k,l} p_j p^k p_l (a_j d_l^k)^2 + \sum_{i,j,l} p^i p_j p_l (d_j^i a_l)^2 \right] \\ &+ \left[ \sum_{i,j,k,l} p^i p_j p^k p_l (d_j^i d_l^k)^2 \right] \\ &= \sigma_a^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{aa}^2 + \sigma_{ad}^2 + \sigma_{dd}^2 \end{aligned}$$

**Model I: Fisher (1918) Cockerham (1954)  
orthogonal partition of genetic variance**

consider  $F_2$  population in H-W equilibrium  
regress genotypic value  $G$   
on quadratic in number of copies of allele  $A$   
linear contrast  $\sim$  additive effect  
quadratic contrast  $\sim$  dominance effect

Genotype	AA	Aa	aa
Genotypic value	$G_2$	$G_1$	$G_0$
Frequency	$p^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$2pq = \frac{1}{2}$	$q^2 = \frac{1}{4}$
linear $w_1$	1	0	-1
quadratic $w_2$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$

Model I:  $G_i = \mu + a \times w_{1i} + d \times w_{2i}$   
 $G_2 = \mu + a - \frac{1}{2}d$ ,  $G_1 = \mu + \frac{1}{2}d$ ,  $G_0 = \mu - a - \frac{1}{2}d$   
with  $\mu = p^2 G_2 + 2pq G_1 + q^2 G_0$   
orthogonal genetic model for  $F_2$  population

$$Cov(w_1, w_2) = 0$$

linear and quadratic effects are uncorrelated  
call these additive and dominance (why?)

**Model I regression coefficients**

Model I:  $G_i = \mu + \beta_{Gw_1} \times w_{1i} + \beta_{Gw_2} \times w_{2i}$

$$\beta_{Gw_1} = \frac{p^2 G_2 - q^2 G_0}{p^2 + q^2} = \frac{1}{2}(G_2 - G_0) = a$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{Gw_2} &= \frac{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 G_2 + \frac{1}{2}2pq G_1 - \frac{1}{2}q^2 G_0}{\frac{1}{4}p^2 + \frac{1}{4}2pq + \frac{1}{4}q^2} \\ &= (G_1 - \frac{1}{2}G_2 - \frac{1}{2}G_0) = d \end{aligned}$$

**Model I variance components**

$$\sigma_G^2 = \sigma_{w_1}^2 + \sigma_{w_2}^2 - 2Cov(w_1, w_2) = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 0$$

$$\sigma_1^2 = 2pq[p(G_2 - G_1) + q(G_1 - G_0)]^2 = \frac{1}{8}[G_2 - G_0]^2$$

$$\sigma_2^2 = p^2 q^2 [G_2 - 2G_1 + G_0]^2 = \frac{1}{16}[G_2 - 2G_1 + G_0]^2$$

Model I due to Fisher (1918)

differs from usual model in quantitative genetics

**Model II: Mather Jinks (1982)**

Genotype	AA	Aa	aa
Genotypic value	$G_2$	$G_1$	$G_0$
Frequency	$p^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$2pq = \frac{1}{2}$	$q^2 = \frac{1}{4}$
linear $v_1$	1	0	-1
quadratic $v_2$	0	1	0

Model II:  $G_i = \mu + a \times v_{1i} + d \times v_{2i}$   
 $G_2 = \mu + a$ ,  $G_1 = \mu + d$ ,  $G_0 = \mu - a$

$$Cov(v_1, v_2) = 0 \text{ but } E(v_2) = 1/2 \neq 0$$

Model I and II give identical results for single marker  
or single locus analysis: same estimates of  $a$  and  $d$ .

They give same analysis for multiple loci if no  
epistatic terms are in the model.

With epistasis in the model, Model I extends in  
natural way but Model II has different estimates of  $a$   
and  $d$ .

**Model I: Fisher (1918) Cockerham (1954)  
orthogonal partition of genetic variance**

drop assumption of H-W equilibrium

Model I:  $G_i = \mu + \beta_{Gw_1} \times w_{1i} + \beta_{Gw_2} \times w_{2i}$   
 $w_1, w_2$ : linear, quadratic orthogonal polynomials  
 based on genotype frequencies  $f_k$

$$\sum_{i=0}^2 f_i w_{1i} = \sum_{i=0}^2 f_i w_{2i} = \sum_{i=0}^2 f_i w_{1i} w_{2i} = 0$$

Genotype	AA	Aa	aa
Genotypic value	$G_2$	$G_1$	$G_0$
Frequency	$f_2$	$f_1$	$f_0$
$w_1$	$2f_0 + f_1$	$f_0 - f_2$	$-(2f_2 + f_1)$
$w_2$	$-1/(8f_2)$	$1/(4f_1)$	$-1/(8f_0)$

linear steps

$$w_{12} - w_{11} = (2f_0 + f_1) - (f_0 - f_2) = f = 1$$

$$w_{11} - w_{10} = (f_0 - f_2) + (2f_2 + f_1) = f = 1$$

**partition into variance components**

$$\sigma_G^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2$$

with

$$\sigma_t^2 = [Cov(G, w_t)]^2 / \sigma_{w_t}^2 = \beta_{Gw_t}^2 \sigma_{w_t}^2$$

and

$$G = \mu + \beta_{Gw_1} w_1 + \beta_{Gw_2} w_2$$

$$\sigma_k^2 = \left( \sum_{i=0}^2 f_i G_i w_{ki} \right)^2 / \left( \sum_{i=0}^2 f_i w_{ki}^2 \right), \quad k = 1, 2$$

**F<sub>2</sub> based epistatic model (Cockerham model)**

9 genotypes in an F<sub>2</sub> population

need 8 genetic parameters for complete description

assume Hardy-Weinberg and linkage equilibrium

Cockerham (1954)'s orthogonal partition of genetic variance

leads to definition of genotypic value  $G_{ij}$

$$G_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum_{t=1}^8 \beta_{Gw_t} w_{tij}$$

eight orthogonal scales or contrasts  $w_t$

Four are marginal scales (Model I)

four are interaction scales made from these marginal

scales: linear ~ additive, quadratic ~ dominance

interaction scales:

$w_5 = w_1 \times w_3$	linear × linear	additive × additive
$w_6 = w_1 \times w_4$	linear × quadratic	additive × dominance
$w_7 = w_2 \times w_3$	quadratic × linear	dominance × additive
$w_8 = w_2 \times w_4$	quadratic × quadratic	dominance × dominance

**epistasis model**

$$G_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_{Gw_1} w_{1ij} + \beta_{Gw_2} w_{2ij} + \beta_{Gw_3} w_{3ij} + \beta_{Gw_4} w_{4ij} \\ + \beta_{Gw_5} w_{1ij} w_{3ij} + \beta_{Gw_6} w_{1ij} w_{4ij} + \beta_{Gw_7} w_{2ij} w_{3ij} + \beta_{Gw_8} w_{2ij} w_{4ij}$$

with

$$w_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } AA \\ 0 & \text{for } Aa \\ -1 & \text{for } aa \end{cases} \quad w_2 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} & \text{for } AA \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{for } Aa \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \text{for } aa \end{cases}$$

$$w_3 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } BB \\ 0 & \text{for } Bb \\ -1 & \text{for } bb \end{cases} \quad w_4 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} & \text{for } BB \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{for } Bb \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \text{for } bb \end{cases}$$

$$w_5 = w_1 w_3, \quad w_6 = w_1 w_4, \quad w_7 = w_2 w_3, \quad w_8 = w_2 w_4$$

matrix notation

$$G = W\beta$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_{22} \\ G_{21} \\ G_{20} \\ G_{12} \\ G_{11} \\ G_{10} \\ G_{02} \\ G_{01} \\ G_{00} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ 1 & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \beta_4 \\ \beta_5 \\ \beta_6 \\ \beta_7 \\ \beta_8 \end{bmatrix}$$

Genotypic values, frequencies, and eight orthogonal scales for  $F_2$  populations

Scale	AABB	AABb	AAbb	AaBB	AaBb	Aabb	aaBB	aaBb	aabb
$G$	$G_{22}$	$G_{21}$	$G_{20}$	$G_{12}$	$G_{11}$	$G_{10}$	$G_{02}$	$G_{01}$	$G_{00}$
$f$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$
$W_1$	1	1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1
$W_2$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
$W_3$	1	0	-1	1	0	-1	1	0	-1
$W_4$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
$W_5$	1	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	1
$W_6$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
$W_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
$W_8$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$

Definition of genetic parameters

Parameters	Definition
$\mu = \beta_0$	mean
$a_1 = \beta_1$	additive effect of locus A
$d_1 = \beta_2$	dominance effect of locus A
$a_2 = \beta_3$	additive effect of locus B
$d_2 = \beta_4$	dominance effect of locus B
$i_{aa} = \beta_5$	additive $\times$ additive effect of locus A and B
$i_{ad} = \beta_6$	additive $\times$ dominance effect of locus A and B
$i_{da} = \beta_7$	dominance $\times$ additive effect of loci A and B
$i_{dd} = \beta_8$	dominance $\times$ dominance effect of loci A and B

$$\beta = W^{-1}G$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \beta_4 \\ \beta_5 \\ \beta_6 \\ \beta_7 \\ \beta_8 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{16} \\ -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} \\ -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} & -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{16} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G_{22} \\ G_{21} \\ G_{20} \\ G_{12} \\ G_{11} \\ G_{10} \\ G_{02} \\ G_{01} \\ G_{00} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\beta = W^{-1}G$$

$$\beta_0 = \frac{G_{22}}{16} + \frac{G_{21}}{8} + \frac{G_{20}}{16} + \frac{G_{12}}{8} + \frac{G_{11}}{4} + \frac{G_{10}}{8} + \frac{G_{02}}{16} + \frac{G_{01}}{8} + \frac{G_{00}}{16} = G.$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{G_{22}}{8} + \frac{G_{21}}{4} + \frac{G_{20}}{8} - \frac{G_{02}}{8} - \frac{G_{01}}{4} - \frac{G_{00}}{8} = \frac{G_2 - G_0}{2}$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{G_{11}}{4} + \frac{G_{12}}{8} + \frac{G_{10}}{8} - \frac{G_{22}}{16} - \frac{G_{21}}{8} - \frac{G_{20}}{16} - \frac{G_{02}}{16} - \frac{G_{01}}{8} - \frac{G_{00}}{16}$$

$$= \frac{2G_1 - G_2 - G_0}{2}$$

$$\beta_3 = \frac{G_{22}}{8} + \frac{G_{12}}{4} + \frac{G_{02}}{8} - \frac{G_{20}}{8} - \frac{G_{10}}{4} - \frac{G_{00}}{8} = \frac{G_2 - G_0}{2}$$

$$\beta_4 = \frac{G_{11}}{4} + \frac{G_{21}}{8} + \frac{G_{01}}{8} - \frac{G_{22}}{16} - \frac{G_{12}}{8} - \frac{G_{02}}{16} - \frac{G_{20}}{16} - \frac{G_{10}}{8} - \frac{G_{00}}{16}$$

$$= \frac{2G_1 - G_2 - G_0}{2}$$

$$\beta_5 = \frac{(G_{22} - G_{02}) - (G_{20} - G_{00})}{4} = \frac{(G_{22} - G_{20}) - (G_{02} - G_{00})}{4}$$

$$\beta_6 = \frac{(2G_{21} - G_{22} - G_{20}) - (2G_{01} - G_{02} - G_{00})}{4}$$

$$\beta_7 = \frac{(2G_{12} - G_{22} - G_{02}) - (2G_{10} - G_{20} - G_{00})}{4}$$

$$\beta_8 = \frac{2(2G_{11} - G_{21} - G_{01}) - (2G_{12} - G_{22} - G_{02}) - (2G_{10} - G_{20} - G_{00})}{4}$$

$$= \frac{2(2G_{11} - G_{12} - G_{10}) - (2G_{21} - G_{22} - G_{20}) - (2G_{01} - G_{02} - G_{00})}{4}$$

**orthogonality and variance components**

regression coefficient  $\beta_{Gw_t}$  associated with scale  $w_t$  is corresponding genetic effect by orthogonality each effect contributes to its variance component

$$\sigma_G^2 = \frac{1}{2}a_1^2 + \frac{1}{4}d_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}a_2^2 + \frac{1}{4}d_2^2 + \frac{1}{4}i_{aa}^2 + \frac{1}{8}i_{ad}^2 + \frac{1}{8}i_{da}^2 + \frac{1}{16}i_{dd}^2$$

no covariance between different effects

**comparison with Mather and Jinks model**

extend Model II to include epistasis

$$G_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum_{t=1}^8 \beta_{Gw_t} v_{tij}$$

$v_1, \dots, v_4$  defined by Model II,  $v_5, \dots, v_8$  below Mather Jinks (1982 *Biometrical Genetics*) model:

$$G_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_{Gv_1} v_{1ij} + \beta_{Gv_2} v_{2ij} + \beta_{Gv_3} v_{3ij} + \beta_{Gv_4} v_{4ij} + \beta_{Gv_5} v_{1ij} v_{3ij} + \beta_{Gv_6} v_{1ij} v_{4ij} + \beta_{Gv_7} v_{2ij} v_{3ij} + \beta_{Gv_8} v_{2ij} v_{4ij}$$

$$v_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } AA \\ 0 & \text{for } Aa \\ -1 & \text{for } aa \end{cases} \quad v_2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } AA \\ 1 & \text{for } Aa \\ 0 & \text{for } aa \end{cases}$$

$$v_3 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } BB \\ 0 & \text{for } Bb \\ -1 & \text{for } bb \end{cases} \quad v_4 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } BB \\ 1 & \text{for } Bb \\ 0 & \text{for } bb \end{cases}$$

$$v_5 = v_1 v_3, \quad v_6 = v_1 v_4, \quad v_7 = v_2 v_3, \quad v_8 = v_2 v_4$$

$$G = V\beta$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_{22} \\ G_{21} \\ G_{20} \\ G_{12} \\ G_{11} \\ G_{10} \\ G_{02} \\ G_{01} \\ G_{00} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu \\ a_1 \\ d_1 \\ a_2 \\ d_2 \\ i_{aa} \\ i_{ad} \\ i_{da} \\ i_{dd} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\beta = V^{-1}G$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \beta_4 \\ \beta_5 \\ \beta_6 \\ \beta_7 \\ \beta_8 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G_{22} \\ G_{21} \\ G_{20} \\ G_{12} \\ G_{11} \\ G_{10} \\ G_{02} \\ G_{01} \\ G_{00} \end{bmatrix}$$

**Mather Jinks model derivation**

start with four homozygote genotypes ( $G_{22}, G_{20}, G_{02}, G_{00}$ )  
population of recombinant inbred lines,  $RI=F_\infty$ )  
define  $\mu, a_1, a_2$  and  $i_{aa}$  for RI lines

$$\mu = \frac{1}{4}G_{22} + \frac{1}{4}G_{20} + \frac{1}{4}G_{02} + \frac{1}{4}G_{00}$$

consider heterozygote genotypes  
add terms  $d_1, d_2, i_{aa}, i_{ad}, i_{da}$  and  $i_{dd}$

**usually called  $F_\infty$  metric model**

(Va der Veen 1959 *Genetica* 30: 201-232)  
not based on population with nine genotypes observed  
not based on orthogonal partitions of genetic effect and variance

### F<sub>∞</sub> metric model applied to F<sub>2</sub> population

$v_2$  and  $v_8$  are not independent  
neither are  $v_4$  and  $v_8$

Thus some genetic effects defined by the model do not only contribute to their own genetic variance component.

We prefer Cockerham model, also called F<sub>2</sub> metric model, for analyzing QTL epistasis in an F<sub>2</sub> population.

Note: Estimates of  $i_{aa}$ ,  $i_{ad}$ ,  $i_{da}$ , and  $i_{dd}$  are the same under both models, but those of  $a_1$ ,  $d_1$ ,  $a_2$  and  $d_2$  are different.

### Examples of analysis

As an example, we showed the epistatic analysis of two QTL in a series of experiments of introgressing maize allele into teosinte genetic background (Doebley, Stec, and Gustus 1995 *Genetics* 141:333-346). Two QTL, one located on chromosome arm 1L and one on 3L, were introgressed by repeated backcross to teosinte and then intercrossed to produce an F<sub>2</sub> population to have these two QTL segregating simultaneously in teosinte background. We showed the mean values and sample sizes of the nine genotypes and the analyses of gene effects on three traits.

### Mean value and sample size of two unlinked QTL genotypes for trait 1 (John Doebley)

	bb	Bb	BB
aa	17.98 (10)	54.57 (21)	47.80 (11)
Ab	40.94 (24)	47.55 (42)	83.62 (20)
AA	61.11 (3)	66.50 (22)	101.65 (8)

### Estimate and test of gene effects: Trait 1

Effect	Estimate	S.E.	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
$a_1$	15.11	4.47	3.41	0.0008
$d_1$	-3.92	5.84	-0.67	0.5035
$a_2$	19.46	4.42	4.40	0.0001
$d_2$	-5.66	5.84	-0.97	0.3336
$i_{aa}$	2.68	7.07	0.38	0.7054
$i_{ad}$	-18.28	8.87	-2.06	0.0411
$i_{da}$	3.75	8.85	0.42	0.6725
$i_{dd}$	-18.13	11.68	-1.55	0.1227

### Mean value and sample size of two unlinked QTL genotypes for trait 4 (John Doebley)

	bb	Be	BB
aa	4.46 (12)	3.05 (22)	2.09 (11)
Aa	3.23 (26)	2.02 (46)	1.12 (21)
AA	1.43 (7)	1.08 (25)	1.00 (9)

### Estimate and test of gene effects: Trait 4

Effect	Estimate	S.E.	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
$a_1$	-1.01	0.09	-10.67	0.0001
$d_1$	-0.06	0.13	-0.43	0.6712
$a_2$	-0.88	0.09	-9.29	0.0001
$d_2$	-0.17	0.13	-1.29	0.1994
$i_{aa}$	0.48	0.14	3.45	0.0007
$i_{ad}$	0.05	0.19	0.25	0.8017
$i_{da}$	-0.36	0.19	-1.89	0.0606
$i_{dd}$	0.03	0.26	0.11	0.9126

**Mean value and sample size of two unlinked QTL genotypes for trait 9 (John Doebley)**

	bb	Bb	BB
aa	7.32 (12)	0.41 (21)	1.12 (10)
Aa	1.34 (26)	0.22 (46)	0.28 (21)
AA	0.79 (7)	0.00 (25)	0.00 (9)

**Estimate and test of gene effects: Trait 9**

Effect	Estimate	S.E.	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>a</i> <sub>1</sub>	-1.06	0.29	-3.68	0.0003
<i>d</i> <sub>1</sub>	-0.74	0.39	-1.88	0.0621
<i>a</i> <sub>2</sub>	-1.14	0.28	-3.98	0.0001
<i>d</i> <sub>2</sub>	-1.35	0.39	-3.42	0.0008
<i>i</i> <sub>aa</sub>	1.35	0.43	3.16	0.0019
<i>i</i> <sub>ad</sub>	1.71	0.57	2.98	0.0033
<i>i</i> <sub>da</sub>	1.22	0.57	2.13	0.0346
<i>i</i> <sub>dd</sub>	1.52	0.79	1.93	0.0550

**Issues on detecting QTL epistasis**

- How to detect and analyze QTL epistasis is a very important issue for QTL mapping analysis. If we know where QTL are located, we can build appropriate genetic and statistical models to test and estimate the effects and interactions of QTL at the locations. But the problem is we do not know where QTL are, and the analyses of QTL effects and interactions are complicated by the search for QTL.
- A common practice to detect QTL epistasis in many published QTL mapping analyses is to perform pairwise marker interaction analysis and to compare the percentage of significant marker pairs on interaction at a given significance level with that expected at the null hypothesis of no interaction.

This analysis, of course, does not analyze interaction of individual QTL. It generally has low power to detect QTL epistasis because of segregation between markers and QTL and possible aggregation and *cancellation* effects from multiple QTL. Also some interactions at some regions can be swamped by the huge number of possible pair-wise tests of markers.

- An appropriate method to analyze QTL epistasis is to integrate QTL epistatic effects in the analysis of QTL and to search and map multiple QTL including epistasis simultaneously. Multiple interval mapping discussed below is such a method.