

# REML IMPLEMENTATIONS OF KERNEL-BASED MULTI-ENVIRONMENT GENOMIC PREDICTION MODELS

KILLIAN A.C. MELSEN<sup>1\*</sup>, SALVADOR GEZAN<sup>2</sup>, FRED A. VAN EEUWIJK<sup>1</sup>,  
AND CAREL F.W. PEETERS<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** High-throughput pheno-, geno-, and envirotyping allows routine characterization of plant varieties and the trials they are evaluated in. These datasets can be integrated into statistical models for genomic prediction in several ways. One approach is to create linear or non-linear kernels which are subsequently used in reproducing kernel hilbert spaces (RKHS) regression. Software packages implementing a Bayesian approach are typically used for these RKHS models. However, they often lack some of the flexibility offered by dedicated linear mixed model software such as ASReml-R. Furthermore, a Bayesian approach is often computationally more demanding than a frequentist model. Here we show how frequentist RKHS models can be implemented in ASReml-R and extend these models to allow for heterogeneous (i.e., trial-specific) genetic variances. We also show how an alternative to the typically Bayesian kernel averaging approach can be implemented by treating the bandwidth associated with the non-linear kernel as a parameter to be estimated using restricted maximum likelihood. We show that these REML implementations with homo- or heterogeneous variances perform similarly or better than the Bayesian models. We also show that the REML implementation comes with a significant increase in computational efficiency, being up to 12 times faster than the Bayesian models while using less memory. Finally, we discuss the significant flexibility provided by this approach and the options regarding further customization of variance models.

*Key words:* GBLUP; Genomic prediction; Genotype-by-environment interaction; Linear mixed model

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Genomic prediction has had a significant impact on the field of plant breeding since its introduction around 2000 [1, 2]. It allows for more efficient allocation of resources within a breeding program and an increased rate of genetic gain. Genomic prediction in the most basic form involves training a linear mixed model (LMM) assuming that yield or another trait of interest is a function of additive genomic marker effects. A pedigree or genomic relationship matrix is used to model relationships between evaluated varieties. The model can then be used to obtain predictions for new varieties if the genomic marker profiles or pedigrees of the new varieties are known.

LMMs are commonly used to analyze multi-environment trial (MET) data. Here, varieties are evaluated in several trials that represent the target population of environments, i.e., the set of environments where the varieties might be grown by farmers [3]. These data can be analyzed using multivariate linear mixed models by considering the evaluations of varieties in different trials as multiple traits. One difficulty in this setting is that covariances between trials must typically be estimated from the data. While the assumption of a simple covariance structure with few parameters to simplify this task can work, complex genotype by environment (GxE) interaction patterns typically require more flexibility [4]. However, these flexible covariance structures can be hard to estimate and typically require large amounts of data.

<sup>1</sup>MATHEMATICAL & STATISTICAL METHODS GROUP (BIOMETRIS), WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY & RESEARCH, PO BOX 16, 6700 AA, WAGENINGEN, THE NETHERLANDS

<sup>2</sup>VSN INTERNATIONAL, 2 AMBERSIDE HOUSE, WOOD LANE, HP2 4TP, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, UNITED KINGDOM  
*E-mail addresses:* \*killian.melsen@wur.nl.

The increasing use of high-throughput technologies in recent years has provided a possible solution to the problems associated with the estimation of large numbers of covariance parameters. While high-throughput methods for characterizing varieties using genomic markers were relatively common, methods characterizing environments were not. Cheap sensor technology has made high-resolution longitudinal data on variables such as temperature, soil water potential, humidity, solar radiation, and others available to many breeding programs [5]. Furthermore, hyperspectral or near infra-red (NIR) imaging using drones or aircraft allows characterization of not just environments, but individual varieties grown within environments [6, 7].

While there are several ways of incorporating this high-throughput data in genomic prediction, methods using (averaged) kernels as substitutes for the between-trial correlations such as those proposed by de Los Campos *et al.* [8] and Jarquín *et al.* [9] have been a commonly used choice. While the kernel-based methods used to model relationships between varieties based on markers have received widespread attention, the use of kernels derived from environmental variables to model correlations between environments have received relatively little [10]. The benefit of the second approach is that complex covariance structures describing genotype by environment interaction patterns do not need to be estimated from the data. This is especially useful in sparse testing settings where there may be many trials and limited overlap between trials in terms of evaluated varieties. Furthermore, predictions into new environments where no varieties have been evaluated can be made in a straightforward way if environmental data is available.

While the mentioned kernel methods often work well, the need to implement them in software such as BGLR (Bayesian generalized linear models, [11]) has a few drawbacks. It can take a significant amount of time to collect posterior samples and kernels that need to be pre-computed require large amounts of memory. Furthermore, the Gaussian kernel averaging (KA) approach proposed by de Los Campos *et al.* [8] is inherently constrained by the bandwidth values that are specified a priori. Finally, these models typically assume the same genetic variance for all environments.

Here we show how the kernel-based models, including an alternative to kernel averaging for a Gaussian kernel, can be fit using the LMM software ASReml-R by treating the bandwidths as parameters to be estimated using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) [12, 13]. We show that this approach comes with a considerable decrease in computational burden. We also highlight the flexibility of this approach and potential to fit other kernels and variance structures by extending the kernel-based models to allow for trial-specific genetic variances.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we provide a short introduction to modeling multi-environment trial data using LMMs and the relevant covariance structures. We then describe the kernel-based approaches, including Gaussian KA, and introduce the REML implementations of these models as well as the extension allowing for heterogeneous genetic variances. Section 3 then provides details and results on two applications showing differences between models in terms of accuracy and computational complexity. Finally, we discuss several possible further extensions in section 4.

## 2. MODELS

**2.1. General model.** We focus on multi-environment trial data, i.e., data containing phenotypic measurements on multiple varieties in multiple locations and years (trials). Let  $\mathbf{y}$  be the vector of these measurements (BLUEs, best linear unbiased estimates) where the  $n$  varieties are nested

within the  $p$  trials:

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{11} \\ y_{21} \\ \vdots \\ y_{n1} \\ y_{12} \\ \vdots \\ y_{np} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By employing a two-stage modeling approach where individual trials are first analyzed to obtain the BLUEs in  $\mathbf{y}$ , the data can generally be analyzed with LMMs of the following form:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

where  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{np \times (p+1)}$  is a design matrix for the fixed effects (typically the overall intercept and trial means) and  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+1) \times 1}$  is the vector containing the estimates for these effects. The vector  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{(np) \times 1}$  contains the residuals which, for ease of notation, are assumed to be independently and identically distributed with mean 0 and variance  $\sigma_{\epsilon}^2$ . Note however that this assumption is not required and more complex residual covariance structures can be used as well. The design matrix  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{np \times np}$  links records to the variety-by-trial (or GxE) BLUPs (best linear unbiased predictions) in  $\mathbf{u}$  which have mean zero. It is the covariance matrix of this vector  $\mathbf{u}$  that we are primarily concerned with. In a general form this covariance matrix can be represented as

$$\text{Var}(\mathbf{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \otimes \mathbf{G},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  is the between-trial covariance matrix and  $\mathbf{G}$  is a correlation scale matrix specifying the additive genetic relationships between varieties within trials. Examples of the latter are genomic (kinship) and pedigree based relationship matrices or a kernel obtained from a distance matrix and bandwidth. In the remainder, we will assume that  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{K}$ , i.e., the kinship or genomic relationship matrix. The between-trial covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  can be modeled in several ways. It can be estimated from the data using unstructured, factor analytic, or compound symmetry structures where the number of parameters to be estimated depends on the structure used [13]. Another option involves computing a correlation matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  from trial-level environmental or phenomics data and assuming the same variance for all trials:

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{K}).$$

This model is easily implemented in several software packages. An alternative to using a correlation matrix is to use a Gaussian kernel involving a squared Euclidean distance matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  which is transformed to the correlation scale using a bandwidth parameter  $\vartheta$  [8]:

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}} \otimes \mathbf{K}).$$

In their paper, de Los Campos *et al.* [8] state that the bandwidth parameter may be chosen using cross-validation or Bayesian methods [14], but immediately note that treating  $\vartheta$  as a parameter to be estimated in a Bayesian model is computationally prohibitive. As an alternative they suggest evaluating model performance over a grid of  $M$  bandwidth values or to fit a random term for each  $\vartheta_m$  in a grid  $\theta = \{\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_M\}$  using closure properties of positive definite functions [15]. This second alternative is known as kernel averaging (KA) and can be written in LMM notation as

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{u}_m + \boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_m \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_m^2 e^{-\vartheta_m \mathbf{D}} \otimes \mathbf{K})$ . As a result,

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{u}_m = \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathbf{K}),$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_m^2$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_m^2 \tilde{\sigma}^{-2} e^{-\vartheta_m \mathbf{D}}$ . The variance components  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_M^2$  can thus be viewed as weights used to obtain a final kernel  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$  which is an approximation to the optimal kernel  $\mathbf{C}$ .

Here we propose treating the unknown bandwidth  $\vartheta$  from (2) as a parameter to be estimated using REML (restricted maximum likelihood). This eliminates the need to specify a grid of bandwidths and is significantly faster than a Bayesian approach. We also propose a simple extension that allows for trial-specific genetic variances as opposed to a single common variance as used in kernel (averaging) and REML-based environmental correlation matrix models (1, 2, 3).

**2.2. Single variance REML Gaussian kernel.** Here we provide a direct alternative to the KA model, with the bandwidth  $\vartheta$  and single variance  $\sigma^2$  being estimated using REML:

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma \otimes \mathbf{K}),$$

where  $\Sigma = \sigma^2 e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}}$ . To implement the model using (4) in ASReML-R we need the derivatives of  $\Sigma$  with respect to the single variance and bandwidth. These are easily obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma^2} &= e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}} \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \vartheta} &= -\sigma^2 \mathbf{D} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can then use the `own()` function available in ASReML-R together with a custom variance function for the implementation (see Supplementary Material (SM) Listing 1). This variance function must be defined with the two arguments `order` and `kappa`. The number of levels in the factor will be available inside the variance function through `order` while the parameters are stored in `kappa`. The variance function must return a list with the covariance matrix and its derivatives with respect to all parameters in `kappa`.

**2.3. Multi variance REML Gaussian kernel.** We can easily extend the previous variance model by allowing for environment specific variances. Consider again

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma \otimes \mathbf{K}),$$

where  $\Sigma = \mathbf{ss}^\top \circ e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}}$  and  $\mathbf{s} = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p]^\top$  contains the standard deviations. To implement the model using (5) we again need the derivatives of  $\Sigma$  with respect to the bandwidth and variances:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \vartheta} &= -\sigma^2 \mathbf{D} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}} \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_1^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_1^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{1,2}} & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_1^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{1,p}} \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_1^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{2,1}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_1^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{p,1}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_2^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{1,2}} & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{2,1}} & 1 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_2^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{2,p}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_2^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{p,2}} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_p^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_p^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{1,p}} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_p^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{2,p}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_p^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{p,1}} & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_p^{-1} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}_{p,2}} & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{D}_{i,j}$  is the squared Euclidean distance between trial  $i$  and trial  $j$ . These derivatives are subsequently returned from the custom variance function (SM Listing 2).

**2.4. Multi variance environmental correlation matrix.** The final example is a simple extension of model (1) that allows for environment-specific variances, rather than a single variance, to be used with a known environmental correlation matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ :

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}_{np}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma \otimes \mathbf{K}),$$

where  $\Sigma = \mathbf{ss}^\top \circ \mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{s} = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p]^\top$ . The implementation is shown in SM Listing 3 and the required derivatives are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_1^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{1,2} & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{1,p} \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{2,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{p,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_2^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{1,2} & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{2,1} & 1 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{2,p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p \sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{p,2} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \\ \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \sigma_p^2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{1,p} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{2,p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 \sigma_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{p,1} & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2 \sigma_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{p,2} & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_{i,j}$  is the correlation between trial  $i$  and trial  $j$ . These are just three examples, but note that variance models can be fully customized following the programming framework presented in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. General framework of specifying custom variance functions in ASReml-R. The `own()` function can be used inside the `asreml()` call to use a custom variance model. Arguments `obj`, `fun`, `init`, `type`, and `con` are used to specify the data factor, name of the custom variance function, initial values for the (variance) parameters, types of parameters, and parameter constraints. The custom variance function itself must have arguments `order` and `kappa` which contain the number of factor levels and parameters, respectively.

### 3. APPLICATIONS

**3.1. Australian sorghum data.** This simulated dataset contains simulated sorghum yield measurements on 1500 varieties in four environments (Dalby wet, Dalby dry, Emerald wet, Emerald dry) and three managed plant densities, replicated twice [16]. Simulated yields were produced using APSIM [17]. Different heritabilities were achieved by adding various levels of noise to the simulated genetic values. We subsetted the data to 277 early varieties ( $mtu < 150$ ) and focused on data from the managed plant density of 7.5 and heritability of 0.3. We averaged the replicated yield measurements to obtain BLUEs. A kinship matrix was obtained from SNP markers included with the data.

**3.1.1. Construction of environmental correlation matrix.** We use the simulated genetic values to obtain the true genetic correlation matrix of environments. We did not consider models using Gaussian kernels for this dataset as there were strong negative correlations and a Gaussian kernel only produces non-negative correlations for any bandwidth value. Using the true correlation matrix allows us to illustrate the benefit of allowing for heterogeneous variances (model (6)) as opposed to a single genetic variance for all environments (model (1)). As the correlation matrix is unknown in real-world settings and must typically be estimated from environmental or phenomics data, we also evaluated model performance using several weighed averages of the true correlation matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  and a random correlation matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{C} + \lambda\tilde{\mathbf{C}},$$

for  $\lambda \in \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ .

**3.1.2. Cross-validation setup.** We evaluated prediction accuracy in a sparse testing setting that requires predicting missing variety-environment combinations. We constructed 1000 training datasets for each level of noise by randomly selecting five varieties as checks with yield measurements in all four environments. The remaining 272 varieties had yield measurements in two of the four environments. This corresponds to 564 records, or 51% of the 1108 variety-environment combinations. The reported accuracies are averaged within-environment Pearson correlations between predicted and simulated genetic values as well as averaged within-environment root mean squared errors (RMSE).




FIGURE 2. Accuracies for the different models using an environmental correlation matrix in the Australian wheat belt sparse testing scenario. Values shown above boxplots are mean accuracies.

3.1.3. *Results.* There is a clear impact of the level of noise on the prediction accuracy with mean accuracies dropping by approximately 0.15 when going from the true correlation matrix to a mostly random correlation matrix (Figure 2). The models assuming a single genetic variance for all environments perform similarly, whether implemented in BGLR or ASReml-R. Allowing for heterogeneous variances in combination with the environmental correlation matrix clearly and consistently improves model performance in terms of correlation and RMSE at all noise levels.

3.2. **DROPS.** The second dataset contains corn yield measured for 246 hybrids across 29 environments and is part of the drought-tolerant yielding plants (DROPS) EU project [5]. The 29 environments are combinations of 10 locations in Europe and Chile, 2 years, and 2 management practices (rain-fed and irrigated), with a total of 15 unique location-year combinations. Here, we focus on the rain-fed environments only, reducing the number of considered environments to 15 and the total number of records to 3690. In addition to yield measurements, the dataset also contains daily measurements on environmental variables for all 15 rain-fed environments throughout the local growing season. A kinship matrix was obtained from SNP markers included with the data.

3.2.1. *Construction of environmental correlation and distance matrix.* We first converted the day-based timeline to a growing degree day (GDD) timeline by using daily minimum and maximum air temperature in °F to calculate the daily accumulated GDDs using the standard formula for corn:

$$GDD = \frac{t_{min} + t_{max}}{2} - 50$$

$$t_{min} = \begin{cases} 50, & \text{if } t_{min} < 50 \\ t_{min}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$t_{max} = \begin{cases} 86, & \text{if } t_{max} > 86 \\ t_{max}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Using a GDD-based timeline ensures the measurements of other environmental variables are aligned between environments with regards to growth stages of the crop. Doing this revealed that not all environments accumulated the same number of GDDs during the growing season.

The crop grown in Kar13 (Karlsruhe, 2013) accumulated only 2025 GDDs while the crop in Cam12 (Campagnola, 2012) accumulated 3009 GDDs.

We then used 12 scaled and centered environmental variables (minimum, maximum and mean air humidity, accumulated rainfall, maximum windspeed, reference evapotranspiration, accumulated global radiation and intercepted radiation, leaf to air and leaf to leaf vapour pressure deficit, mean meristem temperature at maximum daily air temperature, and mean night temperature) for further analysis. We fit piecewise constant regressions of each variable in each environment on accumulated GDDs with breakpoints every 100 GDDs, extracting the intercepts to be used as variables in constructing the environmental correlation and distance matrices. We discarded the intercepts for 0-100 GDDs and 2100-3100 GDDs as these numbers of accumulated GDDs did not occur in every environment, resulting in 20 intercepts for each of the 12 variables in each environment. The environmental correlation matrix was then constructed as  $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} q^{-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{X}$  is a  $q \times p$  matrix with environments in the columns and scaled intercepts in the rows and  $q$  is the total number of intercepts (240 in this case). We also constructed an environmental distance matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  such that  $\mathbf{D}_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^q (\mathbf{X}_{k,i} - \mathbf{X}_{k,j})^2$ .

**3.2.2. Cross-validation setup.** We evaluated prediction accuracy in a sparse testing setting similar to the one for the Australian sorghum data. We created 250 training datasets with six check varieties. The remaining 240 varieties had yield measurements in three of the 15 environments, corresponding to 810 records, or 22% of the 3690 variety-environment combinations. Reported accuracies are averaged within-environment Pearson correlations and RMSEs. Runtimes were measured on an i5-13600KF CPU with 32GB of RAM in Windows subsystem for linux 2 running Ubuntu 22.04, R 4.4.1, and the Intel oneMKL BLAS and LAPACK libraries (single-threaded).

**3.2.3. Results.** While the dataset contains yield measurements from trials across Europe and Chile, there is relatively little genotype by environment interaction as indicated by the relatively high performance of the model containing a main effect only (Figure 3). Taking GxE into account does improve model performance in terms of both correlation and RMSE, however. Correlations are highest for the models using Gaussian kernels (BGLR KA and single and multi variance REML-K), with no meaningful differences between them. Looking at correlations, allowing for heterogeneous variances on top of the Gaussian kernel does not result in an improvement. While the differences are small, RMSE is lowest for the multi variance REML-K model, which models heterogeneous variances. The model using a REML kernel combined with heterogeneous variances is thus competitive or slightly better than alternatives. The estimates for the bandwidth obtained from this model also support the idea that there is little genotype by environment interaction in this dataset. We obtained bandwidth values between 0.026 and 0.122 with a mean bandwidth of 0.078 over the 250 cross-validation sets. Applying the mean bandwidth to the environmental distance matrix computed from environmental variables results in a correlation matrix with a minimum, maximum, and mean correlation between environments of 0.74, 0.95, and 0.86, respectively. This is approaching the main effects model where correlations between environments are essentially assumed to be 1 and is a good indicator of the lack of large GxE interactions.

In addition to performing well, the maximum likelihood based models are significantly faster to fit than the Bayesian models (Figure 3), while providing the same or higher accuracies. The runtimes for the models using a Gaussian kernel where the bandwidth is estimated using REML are of the same order of magnitude as those of the standard factor analytic models. Furthermore, the REML implementation uses less memory as it does not require computing the eigenvalue decompositions of the multiple kernels associated with all bandwidth values.




FIGURE 3. Accuracies and runtimes for the different models in the DROPS sparse testing scenario. Gray areas separate reference models, environmental correlation based models, and environmental distance based models using a Gaussian kernel. KA = kernel averaging, REML-K = REML kernel. Values shown above boxplots are median accuracies and runtimes. Eigenvalue decompositions were not included in the runtimes for BGLR.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Genotype by environment interactions are common in the breeding of field crops. Several models including these interactions in genomic predictions have been proposed, with maximum likelihood estimation of structured covariance matrices and Bayesian implementations of kernel (averaging) being two commonly used frameworks [12, 8, 9]. Here we made an effort to combine aspects from both frameworks by introducing REML implementations of several kernel based models with homo- and heterogeneous variances for multi-environment trial data. We have shown that treating the bandwidth of a Gaussian kernel as a parameter to be estimated using REML and allowing for trial-specific variances improves G $\times$ E predictions.

The benefit of modeling heterogeneous variances can be explained from a shrinkage perspective. Assuming a common genetic variance for all trials results in equal shrinkage in all trials if

the residual variances are assumed to be equal. Heterogeneity of genetic variance is well known to be a contributor to GxE interactions, and modeling trial-specific rates of shrinkage should improve predictive performance, as also shown in this paper [18, 19].

In addition to implementing kernel-based models with heterogeneous variances, we provided a REML implementation of Gaussian kernel-based models where we treat the bandwidth of the kernel as a parameter to be estimated. This has two key advantages over the kernel averaging approach proposed by de Los Campos *et al.* [8]. First, kernel averaging requires a grid of bandwidth values to be chosen, which might not be trivial. While increasing the density of the grid might sound like a solution, it significantly increases the computational burden. Second, the minimum and maximum values in the chosen grid, combined with the non-linear nature of the Gaussian kernel, inherently constrain the possible values that the average kernel  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$  can take, while in reality all bandwidth values  $\vartheta \in (0, \infty]$  are valid. In fact, as  $\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow 0} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}} = \mathbf{J}_p$  and as  $\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\vartheta \mathbf{D}} = \mathbf{I}_p$ , where  $\mathbf{J}_p$  is an all-ones matrix. The first situation is equivalent to a model containing only a variety main effect, ignoring GxE. The second situation corresponds to fitting a GxE model with diagonal variance structure, meaning no information is borrowed between environments. In our implementation, we only constrain the bandwidth to be positive allowing any kernel between these two extremes to be obtained.

While we focused on two basic extensions to kernel-based models, we also highlighted the flexibility of ASReML-R as a tool for fitting linear mixed models with complex, customizable variance structures. These tools allow for several further extensions. First, there are a number of alternative kernels in addition to the Gaussian and linear kernels described here [20]. As the relative performance of different kernels typically depends on the data, the relatively efficient REML implementation of these kernels may provide a convenient way of choosing the optimal one based on cross-validation which may be computationally infeasible within the Bayesian framework. Another extension worth looking into is the combination of kernels with structured correlation or covariance matrices implemented in ASReML-R for genotype by environment by management prediction. While using unstructured or higher-order factor analytic matrices for both the environment and management factors quickly becomes infeasible, combining a kernel for the environments with an unstructured matrix for the managed treatments will result in a model that is easier to fit.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This paper provides restricted maximum likelihood implementations of several kernel-based genomic prediction models. We also extend these models by allowing for trial-specific genetic variances instead of a single, common variance. We show that these REML implementations are computationally efficient compared to fitting the models within a Bayesian framework. We also show that models allowing heterogeneous genetic variances outperform models with a single genetic variance that are otherwise identical. Finally, we provide example code on how to implement these custom variance models in ASReML-R, as well as some information on how to implement other variance models to explore further possible extensions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bernardo, R. (1994). Prediction of Maize single-cross performance using RFLPs and information from related hybrids. *Crop Science* **34**, 20–25. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1994.0011183X003400010003x>
- [2] Meuwissen, T.H., Hayes, B.J., and Goddard, M.E. (2001). Prediction of total genetic value using genome-wide dense marker maps. *Genetics* **157**, 1819–1829. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/157.4.1819>
- [3] Piepho, H., and Williams, E. (2024). Factor-analytic variance-covariance structures for prediction into a target population of environments. *Biometrical Journal* **66**, e202400008. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.202400008>
- [4] Malosetti, M., Ribaut, J., and van Eeuwijk, F.A. (2013). The statistical analysis of multi-environment data: modeling genotype-by-environment interaction and its genetic basis. *Frontiers in Physiology* **4**, 44. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2013.00044>

- [5] Millet, E.J., Kruijer, W., Coupel-Ledru, A., Prado, S.A., Cabrera-Bosquet, L., Lacube, S., Charcosset, A., Welcker, C., van Eeuwijk, F., and Tardieu, F. (2019). Genomic prediction of maize yields across European environmental conditions. *Nature Genetics* **51**, 952–956. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0414-y>
- [6] Krause, M.R., González-Pérez, L., Crossa, J., Pérez-Rodríguez, P., Montesinos-López, O., Singh, R.P., Dreisigacker, S., Poland, J., Rutkoski, J., Sorrells, M., Gore, M.A., and Mondal, S. (2019). Hyperspectral reflectance-derived relationship matrices for genomic prediction of grain yield in wheat. *G3* **9**, 1231–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.118.200856>
- [7] DeSalvio, A.J., Adak, A., Murray, S.C., Jarquín, D., Winans, N.D., Crozier, D., and Rooney, W.L. (2024). Near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy phenomic prediction can perform similarly to genomic prediction of maize agronomic traits across environments. *The Plant Genome* **17**, e20454. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tpg2.20454>
- [8] de los Campos, G., Gianola, D., Rosa, G.J.M., Weigel, K.A., and Crossa, J. (2010). Semi-parametric genomic-enabled prediction of genetic values using reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces methods. *Genetics Research* **92**, 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672310000285>
- [9] Jarquín, D., Crossa, J., Lacaze, X., Cheyron, P.D., Daucourt, J., Lorgeou, J., Piraux, F., Guerreiro, L., Pérez, P., Calus, M., Burgueño, J., and de los Campos, G. (2014). A reaction norm model for genomic selection using high-dimensional genomic and environmental data. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* **127**, 595–607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-013-2243-1>
- [10] Costa-Neto, G., Fritsche-Neto, R., and Crossa, J. (2021). Nonlinear kernels, dominance, and envirotyping data increase the accuracy of genome-based prediction in multi-environment trials. *Heredity* **126**, 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41437-020-00353-1>
- [11] Pérez, P., and de los Campos, G. (2014). Genome-wide regression and prediction with the BGLR statistical package. *Genetics* **198**, 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.114.164442>
- [12] Gilmour, A.R., Thompson, R., and Cullis, B.R. (1995). Average information REML: An efficient algorithm for variance parameter estimation in linear mixed models. *Biometrics* **51**, 1440–1450. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2533274>
- [13] Butler, D.G., Cullis, B.R., Gilmour, A.R., Gogel, B.G., and Thompson, R. (2023). ASReml-R Reference Manual Version 4.2. *VSN International Ltd., Hemel Hempstead, UK* <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.114.164442>
- [14] Mallick, B.K., Ghosh, D., and Ghosh, M. (2005). Bayesian classification of tumours by using gene expression data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **67**, 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00498.x>
- [15] Shawe-Taylor, J. and Cristianini, N. (2004). Kernel methods for pattern analysis. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK*.
- [16] Powell, O., McLean, G., Brider, J., Hammer, G., Cooper, M. (2023). In silico sorghum GxExM dataset for prediction algorithm comparisons. *figshare. Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.23789685.v7>
- [17] Holzworth, D., Huth, N.I., Fainges, J., Brown, H., Zurcher, E., Cichota, R., Verall, S., Herrman, N.I., Zheng, B., and Snow, V. (2018). APSIM Next Generation: Overcoming challenges in modernising a farming systems model. *Environmental Modelling & Software* **103**, 43–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.02.002>
- [18] van Eeuwijk, F.A., Bustos-Korts, D.V., and Malosetti, M. (2016). What should students in plant breeding know about the statistical aspects of genotype x environment interactions? *Crop Science* **56**, 2119–2140. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2015.06.0375>
- [19] Okeke, U.G., Akdemir, D., Rabbi, I., Kulakow, P., and Jannink, J. (2017). Accuracies of univariate and multivariate genomic prediction models in African cassava. *Genetics Selection Evolution* **49**, 88. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12711-017-0361-y>
- [20] Montesinos-López, A., Montesinos-López, O.A., Montesinos-López, J.C., Flores-Cortes, C.A., de la Rosa, R., and Crossa, J. (2021). A guide for kernel generalized regression methods for genomic-enabled prediction. *Heredity* **126**, 577–596. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41437-021-00412-1>

## Supplementary Material: Custom covariance matrices for GxE data in ASReml-R

### S.1. CODE

LISTING 1. Single variance REML kernel implementation in ASReml-R

```
# Single variance, REML bandwidth using environmental distance matrix De:
vf <- function(order, kappa) {
  # Compute kernel from distance matrix and bandwidth:
  X <- exp(-kappa[1] * De)
  # Compute covariance matrix from kernel and single variance component:
  V <- kappa[2] * X
  # Derivative with respect to the bandwidth parameter:
  bwderiv <- -kappa[2] * De * exp(-kappa[1] * De)
  # Derivative with respect to the variance component is the kernel:
  return(list(V, bwderiv, X))
}
fit <- asreml(fixed = Y ~ 1 + Env,
  random = ~ own(Env, "vf", rep(0.5, 2), rep("V", 2), rep("P", 2)):vm(Gen, K),
  residual = ~ units,
  data = data)
```

LISTING 2. Multi variance REML kernel implementation in ASReml-R

```
# Multi variance, REML bandwidth using environmental distance matrix De:
vf <- function(order, kappa) {
  # Compute kernel from distance matrix and bandwidth:
  X <- exp(-kappa[1] * De)
  # Compute covariance matrix from correlation matrix and variance components:
  S <- outer(sqrt(kappa[-1]), sqrt(kappa[-1]))
  V <- S * X
  # Derivative with respect to the bandwidth parameter:
  bwderiv <- -S * De * exp(-kappa[1] * De)
  # Derivatives with respect to the variance components:
  vars <- kappa[-1]
  derivs <- vector("list", order)
  i <- 1
  for (i in 1:order) {
    derivs[[i]] <- matrix(0, order, order)
    entries <- numeric(order)
    j <- 1
    for (j in 1:order) {
      if (j == i) {
        entries[j] <- 1
      } else {
        d <- 0.5 * sqrt(vars[j]) * X[i,j] / sqrt(vars[i])
        entries[j] <- d
      }
    }
    for (j in 1:order) {
      derivs[[i]][i,j] <- derivs[[i]][j,i] <- entries[j]
    }
  }
  return(c(list(V, bwderiv), derivs))
}
init <- rep(0.5, nrow(De) + 1)
types <- rep("V", (nrow(De) + 1))
constraints <- rep("P", (nrow(De) + 1))
fit <- asreml(fixed = Y ~ 1 + Env,
  random = ~ own(Env, "vf", init, types, constraints):vm(Gen, K),
  residual = ~ units,
  data = data)
```

LISTING 3. Multi variance environmental correlation matrix implementation in ASReml-R

```

# Multi variance using environmental correlation matrix C:
vf <- function(order, kappa) {
  # Compute covariance matrix from correlation matrix and variance components:
  S <- outer(sqrt(kappa), sqrt(kappa))
  V <- S * C
  # Derivatives with respect to the variance components:
  derivs <- vector("list", order)
  i <- 1
  for (i in 1:order) {
    derivs[[i]] <- matrix(0, order, order)
    entries <- numeric(order)
    j <- 1
    for (j in 1:order) {
      if (j == i) {
        entries[j] <- 1
      } else {
        d <- 0.5 * sqrt(kappa[j]) * C[i,j] / sqrt(kappa[i])
        entries[j] <- d
      }
    }
    for (j in 1:order) {
      derivs[[i]][i,j] <- derivs[[i]][j,i] <- entries[j]
    }
  }
  return(c(list(V), derivs))
}
init <- rep(0.5, nrow(C))
types <- rep("V", nrow(C))
constraints <- rep("P", nrow(C))
fit <- asreml(fixed = Y ~ 1 + Env,
  random = ~ own(Env, "vf", init, types, constraints):vm(Gen, K),
  residual = ~ units,
  data = data)

```