

Revealing the missing heritability via cross-validated genome-wide association studies

Xia Shen

Division of Computational Genetics, Department of Clinical Sciences, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Box 7078, SE-750 07 Uppsala, Sweden.

Correspondence to: xia.shen@slu.se

Presented here is a simple method for cross-validated genome-wide association studies (cvGWAS). Focusing on phenotype prediction, the method is able to reveal a significant amount of missing heritability by properly selecting a small number of loci with implicit predictive ability. The results provide new insights into the missing heritability problem and the underlying genetic architecture of complex traits.

Recently, the case of missing heritability has drawn a lot of attention in genetics of complex traits^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7}. It has been widely noticed that for many complex traits, the loci uncovered by means of *e.g.* genome-wide association studies (GWAS) could only explain a minor proportion of the phenotypic variance, even though the observed heritability of the trait is much higher. Strategies have been proposed to search for the sources of such missing heritability⁴, *e.g.* capturing additive genetic variance using polygenic effects across the genome^{5,8} and mapping quantitative trait loci (QTL) using a powerful design⁷. However, even the use of all the genomic variants could not fully explain the missing heritability. Here, I propose a simple method to perform association mapping based on genomic variants' predictive ability, explain the reason why the estimation of narrow sense heritability using all the markers across the genome is not reliable, and show that the underlying

25 heritability can be much higher than the conventional estimate and can even be well captured by a
26 rather small number of QTL.

27

28 Forty-nine traits in *Arabidopsis thaliana*⁹ (9 flowering, 21 developmental, 12 defense and 7
29 ionomics) were analyzed, with the sample size varied from 84 to 194 inbred lines. The *Arabidopsis*
30 accessions were genotyped using a 250K SNP (single nucleotide polymorphism) array, where
31 216,130 SNPs were available in the analysis. Instead of screening the genome using ordinary
32 GWAS p -values, each SNP was assessed for their individual predictive ability by a 5-fold cross
33 validation, *i.e.* the samples were split into a training (80%) and a test (20%) set for five replicates,
34 without overlap among the five test sets. A linear regression of the phenotype on the SNP genotype
35 was fitted in the training set for each marker, and the estimated model was used to perform out-of-
36 sample prediction in the test set. The predictive ability of an individual SNP was evaluated via an
37 R^2 , which is the squared correlation coefficient between the true phenotypic measurements and their
38 predicted values in each of the five test sets. The mean of the five R^2 values, denoted as R^2_{SNP} ,
39 provided an estimate of the proportion of phenotypic variance captured by the SNP. It should be
40 noted that such a predictive ability measurement is not a function of the p -value in ordinary GWAS
41 (*e.g.* **Fig. 1**). Namely, the p -values obtained in GWAS tend to under-estimate the predictive
42 performance of the SNPs. Comparison of the association results based on p -values and R^2_{SNP} for all
43 the analyzed traits are given in **Supplementary Figure 1-49**.

44

45 For each trait, among the top 0.05% of the SNPs ($n = 108$) that had the highest R^2_{SNP} , the best
46 subset with no more than 5 SNPs was selected by a forward stepwise selection procedure, based on
47 a cross-validated assessment of their joint predictive power¹⁰. In order to compare the narrow sense
48 heritability explained by the selected subset of SNPs (h^2_{QTL}) with that explained by the entire
49 genome (h^2_{G}), another 5-fold cross validation was conducted. Both a random effects model using

50 only the selected SNPs (the QTL) as explanatory variables and a whole-genome ridge regression
51 (SNP-BLUP^{11,12}) were fitted in the training sets and used for predicting the phenotypic values in the
52 test sets. h^2_{QTL} and h^2_{G} were estimated as the mean of the corresponding five squared correlation
53 coefficients between the true and the predicted values⁵. For most traits, as shown in **Figure 2**, the
54 small number of QTL had substantial advantage over the whole genome in terms of captured
55 narrow sense heritability. The results indicated similar genetic architecture for the traits that belong
56 to the same type. For instance, the defense and ionomics traits showed rather sparse architecture,
57 whereas the flowering traits tended to be more polygenic. Interestingly, two gene expression traits
58 of *FRI* and *FLC*, although regarded as flowering-related, appeared to have sparse architectures. For
59 all the analyzed traits, details about the selected QTL and the heritability estimates are provided in
60 **Supplementary Table 2**.

61
62 As a proof of concept, the results clearly showed that assessing the total narrow sense heritability
63 using a large number of markers across the genome^{5,7,8} is not a valid approach. The main reason is
64 that one has to substantially sacrifice the precision of the estimated QTL effects when incorporating
65 too many markers as explanatory variables. When the QTL effects or the effects of the SNPs
66 tagging the causal loci are properly estimated, the heritability inherited by the causal loci can be
67 much better revealed than the entire genome. The results indicated that most of the missing
68 heritability was missed by improper analytical methods. Beyond statistical significance in GWAS,
69 more functional loci of complex traits can actually be revealed via assessments based on predictive
70 performance.

71 **Methods**

72 **Software & URLs.** The *Arabidopsis thaliana* GWAS data set is available at: [https://](https://cynin.gmi.oeaw.ac.at/home/resources/atpolydb)
73 cynin.gmi.oeaw.ac.at/home/resources/atpolydb. All the analysis was conducted in R¹³: [http://](http://www.R-project.org/)
74 www.R-project.org/. The association mapping based on cross-validated R^2_{SNP} has been
75 implemented in the “cvGWAS” package: <https://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/cvgwas/>. The forward
76 stepwise selection procedure was executed by the “FWDselect” package¹⁴: [http://cran.r-project.org/](http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FWDselect/)
77 [web/packages/FWDselect/](http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FWDselect/). The random QTL effects model was fitted by the “hglm” package¹⁵:
78 <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/hglm/>. The whole-genome ridge regression (SNP-BLUP)
79 was fitted by the “bigRR” package¹²: <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/bigRR/>.

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Comparison of the SNPs predictive ability and p -values for *FRI* gene expression.

The predictive ability is assessed by R^2_{SNP} (“Proportion of phenotypic variance explained via CV”), where CV stands for “cross validation”. The p -values were obtained using Wilcoxon test. The horizontal line indicates the Bonferroni-corrected genome-wide significant threshold, and the vertical line shows the cut-off that determines which SNPs are to be passed onto the forward selection procedure.

Figure 2: Comparison of the narrow sense heritability captured by the selected QTL (h^2_{QTL}) and the whole genome (h^2_{G}). Each colored point represents an analyzed trait. The color of each point shows the type of the trait, where blue, red, green and pink refer to flowering, developmental, defense and ionomics traits, respectively. The size of each point is proportional to the number of QTL selected (from 2 to 5). The cross on each point shows the standard error estimates based on the cross validation. The dashed line indicates equality of h^2_{QTL} and h^2_{G} as a visual guide.

Supplementary Table 1-2 and **Supplementary Figure 1-49** are available as Supplementary Information from the journal website.

References

1. Maher, B. *Nature* **456**, 18-21 (2008)
2. Manolio, T. A. et al. *Nature* **461**, 747-753 (2009)
3. Slatkin, M. *Genetics* **182**, 845-850 (2009)
4. Eichler, E. E. et al. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**, 446-450 (2010)
5. Makowsky, R. et al. *PLoS Genet.* **7**, e1002051 (2011)
6. Zuk, O., Hechter, E., Sunyaev, S. R. & Lander, E. S. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 1193-1198 (2012)
7. Bloom, J. S. et al. *Nature* **494**, 234-237 (2013)
8. Yang, J. et al. *Nat. Genet.* **42**, 565-569 (2010).
9. Atwell, S. et al. *Nature* **465**, 627-631 (2010).
10. Miller, A. Chapman & Hall (2002).
11. Meuwissen, T. H. E., Hayes, B. J. and Goddard, M. E. *Genetics* **157**, 1819-1829 (2001).
12. Shen, X., Alam, M., Fikse, F. and Rönnegård, L. *Genetics* **193**, 1255-1268 (2013).
13. R Core Team. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria (2013).
14. Sestelo, M., Villanueva, N. M. and Roca-Pardinas, J. Discussion Papers in *Statistics and Operation Research*, 13/02 (2013).
15. Rönnegård, L., Shen, X. and Alam, M. *The R Journal* **2**(2), 20-28 (2010).

Acknowledgement

X.S. is funded by a Future Research Leaders grant from Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SSF) to Örjan Carlborg.

Figure 1





Figure 2



This document contains the Supplementary Information for

Revealing the missing heritability via cross-validated genome-wide association studies

by Shen, X. (2013)

Remarks:

- The Excel table format of **Supplementary Table 2** can be downloaded at: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B2ixEvB0Gwt6SWhZcW1KQmx2Wmc/edit?usp=sharing>
- In **Supplementary Figure 1-49**, the horizontal dashed line in each top panel is the Bonferroni-corrected genome-wide significance threshold, and the vertical is the cut-off for selecting candidate SNPs to be passed onto the forward selection procedure. The phenotypic variance explained in the bottom panels was estimated by R^2_{SNP} .
- The link provided in **Methods** for the package “cvGWAS” is the project home page. For package download: https://r-forge.r-project.org/R/?group_id=1694. If the package is being built on R-Forge, refer to <https://r-forge.r-project.org/scm/viewvc.php/pkg/R/cvscore.R?view=markup&revision=2&root=cvgwas> for the source code of the main function `cvscore()`, which is a directly usable add-on function for the GWA analysis package **GenABEL** (Aulchenko 2007 Bioinformatics).

Supplementary Table 1: Phenotypes analyzed.Refer to Atwell *et al.* (2010) for further details about phenotype description and scoring.

Phenotype	ID	Type	Sample size	Description	Growth Conditions
SD	3	Flowering	162	Days to flowering time (FT) under Long Day (LD) and Short Day(SD) +/- vernalization.	18°C, 8 hrs daylight.
FT10	5	Flowering	194	Flowering time (FT)	10°C, 16 hrs daylight.
FT16	6	Flowering	193		16°C, 16 hrs daylight.
FT22	7	Flowering	193		22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Emco5	9	Defense	86	Disease presence or absence following inoculation with each isolate.	20-22°C, 10 hrs daylight, 70% humidity.
Emwa1	10	Defense	85		
Hiks1	12	Defense	84		
Lithium (Li7)	14	Ionomics	93	<i>In planta</i> ion concentration.	20°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Sulfur (S34)	19	Ionomics	93		
Potassium (K39)	20	Ionomics	93		
Manganese (Mn55)	22	Ionomics	93		
Iron (Fe56)	23	Ionomics	93		
Cobalt (Co59)	24	Ionomics	93		
Zinc (Zn66)	27	Ionomics	93		
AvrRpm1	33	Defense	84	Hypersensitive response.	20°C, 12 hrs daylight.
FLC	43	Flowering	167	FLC and FRI gene expression.	Growth in greenhouse, ~20-22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
FRI	44	Flowering	164		
8W GH LN	46	Flowering	163	LN at FT.	20-22°C, natural light from the middle of October 2002 till March 2003, vernalized (8 wks, 4°C, 8 hrs daylight).
0W GH LN	48	Flowering	135		20-22°C, natural light from the middle of October 2002 till March 2003.
FT Diameter Field	58	Flowering	180	Plant diameter at flowering (field).	Growth in field or greenhouse (20°C, 16 hrs daylight), started in October.

Phenotype	ID	Type	Sample size	Description	Growth Conditions
At1	65		175		
At1 CFU2	66		175		
As CFU2	68		175		
Bs	69		175		
Bs CFU2	70		175		
At2	71		175		
At2 CFU2	72		175		
As2	73		175		
DW	76	Developmental	95	Dry weight of plants.	Plants were grown for 7 weeks at 23°C.
Silique 22	159	Developmental	95	Silique length.	22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Germ 10	161	Developmental	177	Days to germination.	Stratified for 3 days at 4°C in the dark, followed by growth at 10°C with 16 hrs daylight.
Germ 16	162	Developmental	176		Stratified for 3 days at 4°C in the dark, followed by growth at 16°C with 16 hrs daylight.
Width 10	164	Developmental	176	Plant diameter.	10°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Width 16	165	Developmental	175		16°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Width 22	166	Developmental	175		22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Chlorosis 16	168	Developmental	176	Visual chlorosis presence.	16°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Anthocyanin 10	170	Developmental	177	Visual anthocyanin presence.	10°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Anthocyanin 16	171	Developmental	176		16°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Anthocyanin 22	172	Developmental	177		22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Leaf serr 10	173	Developmental	174	Level of leaf serration.	10°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Leaf roll 16	177	Developmental	176	Level of roll presence.	16°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Rosette Erect 22	179	Developmental	176	Presence of rosette erectness.	22°C, 16 hrs daylight.
Seedling Growth	272	Developmental	101	Seedling growth rate.	Seeds were grown for one week in the greenhouse under long day (16 hours light).

Phenotype	ID	Type	Sample size	Description	Growth Conditions
Vern Growth	273	Developmental	111	Vegetative growth rate during vernalization.	Seeds were grown for one week in the greenhouse under long day (16 hours light), vernalized for 4 weeks (4°C, 16h light, 50% relative humidity).
After Vern Growth	274	Developmental	111	Vegetative growth rate after vernalization.	Seeds were grown for one week in the greenhouse under long day (16 hours light), vernalized for 4 weeks (4°C, 16 hrs light, 50% relative humidity) and then returned to greenhouse.
Secondary Dormancy	277	Developmental	94	Decrease in germination rate after prolonged exposure to cold temperature.	Fully after-ripened seeds were treated with a 1 and 6-week long exposure to 4°C.
Germ in dark	278	Developmental	94	Germination in the dark.	4°C, in the dark.
DSDS50	279	Developmental	110	Duration of seed dry storage required for 50% of the seeds to germinate.	Dry storage, followed by 25°C, 12 hrs day, 20°C, 12 hrs night for 1 week.
Storage 56 days	283	Developmental	111	Primary dormancy.	56 days dry storage.

Supplementary Table 2 Summary of selected QTL for each analyzed trait and the heritability estimates compared to those by the whole genome.

h2 Narrow-sense heritability estimated as the mean of the squared correlation coefficients between the true and the predicted phenotype in a 5-fold cross validation.
 For h2_QTL, a random effects model using only the QTL as explanatory variables were fitted. For h2_GENOME, a whole-genome ridge regression using all the SNPs were fitted.
 se Standard error estimated via a 5-fold cross validation.

TRAIT	TYPE	SELECTED SNPS (QTL)		h2_QTL	se(h2_QTL)	h2_GENOME	se(h2_GENOME)
		CHROMOSOME	POSITION				
SD	Flowering	1	4593289	0.6063	0.0690	0.6517	0.0355
		1	18903090				
		3	18923922				
		3	18929030				
		4	16084919				
FT10	Flowering	2	13151174	0.5796	0.0432	0.5825	0.0370
		4	16017869				
		5	6534392				
		5	18607728				
FT16	Flowering	1	6369609	0.6448	0.0771	0.6328	0.0758
		2	9611587				
		3	23090917				
		4	12519944				
FT22	Flowering	1	6369765	0.5255	0.0701	0.6045	0.0690
		4	12519944				
		5	2551768				
		5	2554284				
		5	6844135				
Emco5	Defense	1	1430178	0.4539	0.0138	0.0768	0.0355
		2	4185247				
Emwa1	Defense	1	17250538	0.6452	0.0632	0.1221	0.0316
		2	13008747				
		2	17934073				
		4	8196803				
		5	25721325				
Hiks1	Defense	1	22583408	0.4195	0.0971	0.1581	0.0652
		5	9299223				
		5	10841701				
		5	17477817				
Li7	Ionomics	1	11096840	0.4292	0.1103	0.1824	0.0621
		3	10620051				
		4	15226225				
S34	Ionomics	2	621979	0.4796	0.0691	0.0358	0.0143
		2	5755893				
		3	22362360				
		4	7788807				
		5	10133357				
K39	Ionomics	1	10146885	0.5541	0.0468	0.1006	0.0493
		1	17666204				
		1	28516934				
		4	6786084				
		5	11291662				
Mn55	Ionomics	1	8502187	0.5565	0.0329	0.1146	0.0414


		1	13853615				
		1	29996840				
		3	20599509				
Fe56	Ionomics	3	7092529	0.5229	0.0522	0.0425	0.0142
		3	7918007				
		3	16718549				
		4	795370				
		5	5611234				
Co59	Ionomics	3	13135745	0.5556	0.0998	0.0600	0.0251
		3	20321272				
		4	5514273				
		4	7592626				
		4	8569114				
Zn66	Ionomics	1	21179549	0.6129	0.0855	0.0305	0.0067
		2	6367225				
		2	7419526				
		3	9969573				
		5	26078291				
avrRpm1	Defense	2	17504634	0.3796	0.0636	0.1607	0.0729
		3	2270902				
FLC	Flowering	1	19790829	0.6054	0.1047	0.3710	0.0579
		4	1507838				
		5	5883775				
		5	10172996				
		5	24786228				
FRI	Flowering	1	5989995	0.4252	0.0966	0.1771	0.0630
		4	268809				
8W GH LN	Flowering	1	2005921	0.5711	0.0653	0.4772	0.0918
		2	1977590				
		3	12358261				
0W GH LN	Flowering	1	2005921	0.6312	0.0361	0.5086	0.0639
		3	14131141				
		4	16309006				
		5	18625726				
FT Diameter Field	Flowering	2	8405178	0.3911	0.0424	0.1886	0.0262
		2	14616766				
		4	15770883				
		5	433959				
		5	26809133				
At1	Defense	1	16010365	0.3588	0.0551	0.0457	0.0218
		3	2613557				
		4	10057494				
		5	19958648				
At1 CFU2	Defense	1	6629169	0.3444	0.0756	0.0375	0.0194
		1	7898750				
		1	8237125				
		4	12080070				
As CFU2	Defense	1	2275779	0.3674	0.0308	0.0063	0.0045
		1	22984248				
		4	5814807				
		4	17180545				

		5	10058335				
Bs	Defense	1	8298611	0.3664	0.0642	0.0251	0.0102
		1	28757586				
		3	23000304				
		4	18459798				
Bs CFU2	Defense	1	17212115	0.3688	0.0847	0.0547	0.0230
		1	19333698				
		2	17078909				
		4	10857336				
At2	Defense	1	16776084	0.3845	0.1021	0.0613	0.0158
		1	18397234				
		4	6262290				
		5	555655				
At2 CFU2	Defense	1	25379336	0.2893	0.0569	0.0124	0.0059
		2	8414639				
		3	12697805				
		5	19565066				
As2	Defense	1	18040347	0.3115	0.0324	0.0173	0.0046
		2	16474284				
		4	5004139				
DW	Developmental	3	1801701	0.6587	0.0513	0.1186	0.0204
		3	6145352				
		3	14997936				
		3	20154975				
		4	17026991				
Silique 22	Developmental	1	2968159	0.5579	0.0354	0.2079	0.0453
		2	17801496				
		4	403634				
		5	17364116				
		5	18640009				
Germ 10	Developmental	1	1429372	0.4449	0.0381	0.0581	0.0039
		1	9638902				
		3	6487689				
		3	15305943				
		4	179908				
Germ 16	Developmental	1	1551963	0.4554	0.0778	0.1082	0.0439
		1	10488901				
		2	10188094				
		4	9061476				
		5	17648491				
Width 10	Developmental	1	21041405	0.5254	0.0641	0.2292	0.0627
		3	20976454				
		5	6373912				
		5	14131512				
		5	16952385				
Width 16	Developmental	1	12615860	0.4068	0.0359	0.1812	0.0651
		3	15719656				
		3	20882629				
		5	18262951				
Width 22	Developmental	1	21752821	0.4021	0.0610	0.0991	0.0513
		1	24461138				


			3	15753112				
			4	15083851				
			4	17570674				
Chlorosis 16	Developmental		1	23272710	0.4038	0.0305	0.0115	0.0048
			1	30244136				
			2	15088120				
			4	9996734				
			5	6416385				
Anthocyanin 10	Developmental		1	1921764	0.4588	0.0871	0.1232	0.0755
			1	4865222				
			2	1937020				
			2	17731129				
			3	8594331				
Anthocyanin 16	Developmental		3	7931982	0.3999	0.0442	0.0407	0.0188
			3	17584494				
			3	18237858				
			5	14776227				
			5	18408198				
Anthocyanin 22	Developmental		1	16933062	0.3841	0.0630	0.1058	0.0583
			2	18684705				
			3	18230944				
			5	26305400				
Leaf serr 10	Developmental		1	21866684	0.3992	0.0317	0.1721	0.0534
			1	25545686				
			3	711663				
			5	809032				
Leaf roll 16	Developmental		1	1543644	0.3579	0.0836	0.1223	0.0593
			1	12541124				
			5	9691412				
Rosette Erect 22	Developmental		1	10702954	0.4682	0.0760	0.1833	0.0574
			4	158958				
			4	5423725				
			5	15438762				
			5	17474995				
Seedling Growth	Developmental		1	1409102	0.5260	0.0797	0.0298	0.0190
			1	3351283				
			2	5985892				
			3	1193580				
Vern Growth	Developmental		1	22861979	0.6022	0.0722	0.1161	0.0399
			1	25496457				
			3	10027171				
			4	16443666				
			5	21775600				
After Vern Growth	Developmental		3	11799463	0.3852	0.0926	0.0788	0.0207
			4	7543367				
			4	17416904				
Secondary Dormancy	Developmental		1	22945590	0.6968	0.0445	0.2840	0.0689
			3	15137506				
			3	16164636				
			3	22951949				
			5	6097616				

Germ in dark	Developmental	1	10725637	0.6287	0.0516	0.1960	0.0418
		4	7403647				
		5	10511334				
		5	22310661				
DSDS50	Developmental	1	1045551	0.6611	0.0555	0.2830	0.0569
		1	11593466				
		2	10750002				
		3	21285974				
		4	14688343				
Storage 56 days	Developmental	1	863771	0.6353	0.0230	0.3598	0.0424
		1	19520347				
		2	883192				
		2	5713096				
		5	15859708				


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 1 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for SD


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 2 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FT10


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 3 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FT16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 4 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FT22


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 5 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Emco5


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 6 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Emw1


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 7 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Hiks1


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 8 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Li7


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 9 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for S34


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 10 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for K39


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 11 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Mn55


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 12 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Fe56


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 13 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Co59


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 14 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Zn66


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 15 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for *avrRpm1*


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 16 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FLC


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 17 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FRI


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 18 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for 8W GH LN


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 19 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for 0W GH LN


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 20 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for FT Diameter Field


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 21 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for At1


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 22 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for At1 CFU2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 23 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for As CFU2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 24 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Bs


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 25 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Bs CFU2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 26 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for At2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 27 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for At2 CFU2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 28 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for As2


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 29 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for DW


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 30 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Silique 22


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 31 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Germ 10


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 32 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Germ 16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 33 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Width 10


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 34 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Width 16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 35 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Width 22


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 36 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Chlorosis 16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 37 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Anthocyanin 10


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 38 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Anthocyanin 16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 39 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Anthocyanin 22


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 40 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Leaf serr 10


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 41 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Leaf roll 16


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 42 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Rosette Erect 22


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 43 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Seedling Growth


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 44 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Vern Growth


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 45 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for After Vern Growth


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 46 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Secondary Dormancy


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 47 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Germ in dark


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test




Predictive ability assessed by cross validation




Supplementary Figure 48 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for DSDS50


Comparison of p -values and predictive ability



Genome-wide association mapping via Wilcoxon test



Predictive ability assessed by cross validation



Supplementary Figure 49 - Results of GWAS p -values and cross-validated predictive ability for Storage 56 days