Identification of novel genes significantly affecting growth in catfish through GWAS analysis
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Abstract
Growth is the most important economic trait in aquaculture. Improvements in growth-related traits can enhance production, reduce costs and time to produce market-size fish. Catfish is the major aquaculture species in the United States, accounting for 65% of the US finfish production. However, the genes underlying growth traits in catfish were not well studied. Currently, the majority of the US catfish industry uses hybrid catfish derived from channel catfish female mated with blue catfish male. Interestingly, channel catfish and blue catfish exhibit differences in growth-related traits, and therefore the backcross progenies provide an efficient system for QTL analysis. In this study, we conducted a genome-wide association study for catfish body weight using the 250 K SNP array with 556 backcross progenies generated from backcross of male F1 hybrid (female channel catfish × male blue catfish) with female channel catfish. A genomic region of approximately 1 Mb on linkage group 5 was found to be significantly associated with body weight. In addition, four suggestively associated QTL regions were identified on linkage groups 1, 2, 23 and 24. Most candidate genes in the associated regions are known to be involved in muscle growth and bone development, some of which were reported to be associated with obesity in humans and pigs, suggesting that the functions of these genes may be evolutionarily conserved in controlling growth. Additional fine mapping or functional studies should allow identification of the causal genes for fast growth in catfish, and elucidation of molecular mechanisms of regulation of growth in fish.
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Introduction
Growth is an economically important trait in aquaculture because it directly contributes to fish production. Improvements in growth-related traits could reduce time and costs to produce market-size fish. Consequently, the economic significance of growth has prompted continuous studies of its genetic basis. In those studies, genes within the somatotropic axis and transforming growth factor superfamily have been targeted as candidate genes in finfish growth (De-Santis and Jerry 2007). The somatotropic axis, consisting of growth hormone (GH), insulin-like growth factors (IGF-I and IGF-II), growth hormone-releasing hormone (GHRH), growth hormone inhibiting hormone (GHIH or somatostatin), their associated carrier proteins and receptors, plays a critical role in the metabolic regulation and physiological process (Renaville et al. 2002; De-Santis and Jerry 2007). This axis is responsive to the external environments, such as nutrient intake and culture conditions, and subsequently...
results in the accretion of protein and adipose to be associated with growth rate (De-Santis and Jerry 2007; Richmond et al. 2010). Most of those genes have been demonstrated to be associated with growth enhancement in different fish species (Du et al. 1992; Kang et al. 2002; Tao and Boulding 2003; Wargelius et al. 2005; Hu et al. 2013; Tsai et al. 2014; Feng et al. 2015). Furthermore, there are also other hormones, such as gonadotropin, glucocorticoids and thyroid hormone, involved in modulating the expression of GH or IGF to indirectly regulate growth (Sternberg and Moav 1999; Wong et al. 2006).

Growth factors and myogenic regulatory factors (MRF) were also widely accepted as growth-modulating genes functioning on myogenesis (De-Santis and Jerry 2007). Myostatin (MSTN), also called growth differentiation factor 8 (GDF-8), was originally recognized as a negative regulator of skeletal muscle mass in mice and then was found to be associated with growth traits in fish (McPherron and Lee 1997; Sánchez-Ramos et al. 2012; Sun et al. 2016). Moreover, members of MRF, including myogenin, myogenic differentiation (MyoD), myogenic factor 5 (myf5) and myogenic regulatory factors (MRF4), are expressed in skeletal muscle cells and play essential roles in regulating muscle development and growth (Weintraub 1993; Tan and Du 2002; Tan et al. 2006).

In addition to the hormones and peptides within the somatotropic axis and the transforming growth factor superfamily, other genes may also significantly affect growth through other physiological networks modulating energy metabolism and muscle growth. Although it is not practically feasible and cost-effective to detect every single gene and their functions, advances in genetic technologies have facilitated greater level of understanding of genetic variations underlying growth-related traits. Quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping and genome-wide association studies (GWAS) allowed identification of markers associated with traits of interest. Recently, GWA studies of growth-related traits have been carried out in Atlantic salmon (Gutierrez et al. 2015; Tsai et al. 2015), and several QTL linkage mapping analyses of growth have been conducted in other fish species including orange-spotted grouper (Yu et al. 2016), sea bass (Xia et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2015; Louro et al. 2016), common carp (Laghari et al. 2013, 2014; Ly et al. 2016; Peng et al. 2016), turbot (Robledo et al. 2016), bighead carp (Fu et al. 2016), large yellow croaker (Ye et al. 2014) and tilapia (Liu et al. 2014a). These studies reported a host of candidate genes associated with growth-related traits, whereas not many genes were identified within somatotropic axis and transforming growth factor family (Moghadam et al. 2007; Wang et al. 2008; Wringe et al. 2010; Sánchez-Molano et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2014a; Louro et al. 2016; Peng et al. 2016) (Table S1). Interestingly, quite a few novel genes were considered as candidate genes based on their association with growth traits and their functions related to metabolism and growth (Table S1), demonstrating the complexity of genes involved in growth of fish.

In the United States, catfish is the major aquaculture species, accounting for 65% of the US finfish production in 2008 (FAO 2016). Some growth-related genes have been characterized in channel catfish (Ictalurus punctatus) including IGF-I, GHRH, MSTN and pituitary adenylate cyclase activating polypeptide (PACAP), but in most cases their functional relationships with growth were not demonstrated (McRory et al. 1995; Small and Nonneman 2001; Kocabas et al. 2002; Clay et al. 2005; Small and Peterson 2005). Growth hormone gene was demonstrated to have a positive effect on growth of channel catfish through gene transfer (Dunham et al. 1991; Silverstein et al. 2000), and IGF-II was found to be expressed higher in the fast-growing fish (Peterson et al. 2008). Overall, the genes affecting growth in catfish were not well studied.

GWAS analyses have been successfully conducted in catfish for disease resistance against columnaris disease (Geng et al. 2015), against enteric septicemia of catfish (ESC) (Zhou et al. 2017), heat tolerance (Jin et al. 2016), head size (Geng et al. 2016), body conformation (Geng et al. 2017) and hypoxia tolerance (Wang et al. 2016a; Zhong et al. 2017). Furthermore, our high-density 250K SNP array (Liu et al. 2014b), generated by including SNPs from channel catfish and blue catfish and also interspecific SNPs, has been validated with wild populations and backcross families. At the same time, it was also utilized to genotype three full-sibling channel catfish families (576 fish in total, 192 individuals from each family) to construct the high-resolution genetic linkage map (Li et al. 2014) used in this study. In order to utilize GWAS to identify QTL associated with growth traits in catfish using the high-density 250K SNP array and to scan for candidate genes using the high-quality reference genome sequences (Liu et al. 2016), we have exploited the interspecific hybrid catfish system (Dunham and Masser 2012). Here we report a GWA study using the backcross progeny populations generated from backcross of male F1 hybrid (female channel catfish × male blue catfish) with female channel catfish.

Materials and methods

Ethics statement

All procedures involving the handling and treatment of fish were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) at Auburn University prior to the initiation of the experiments.
Experimental fish

A total of 556 1-year-old backcross progenies generated from backcrossing male F1 hybrid catfish (female channel catfish × male blue catfish) with female channel catfish were randomly obtained from Auburn University Fish Genetics Facility. All the female channel catfish were from Marion strain including the female parents of F1 hybrid. The 556 fish were from nine families (Table 1), in which two hybrid males were mated with three and six channel catfish females, respectively. The fish were cultured together, and IBS kinship matrix based on their genotypes was used to assign them to each family (Geng et al. 2015). After 1-year culture, body weight was measured as phenotypic data.

DNA isolation, genotyping and quality control (QC)

Blood sample (0.5–1 mL) was collected in a 1-mL syringe and immediately expelled into a 50-mL tube containing 10 mL of cell lysis solution (Qiagen). To start DNA isolation, 200 µL of blood in cell lysis buffer was combined with 400 µL of fresh cell lysis buffer and 3 µL of fresh proteinase K (20 mg/mL) in the tube. After incubation at 55 °C for 2 h, protein precipitation solution (Qiagen) was added to extract the proteins. DNA was precipitated by cold isopropanol, washed by 70% ethanol and then resuspended in TE buffer (pH 8.0). The integrity of DNA samples was checked by 1% agarose gel electrophoresis stained with ethidium bromide. After quantified by Nanodrop (Thermo Scientific), DNA samples were diluted to 50 ng/µL.

The genotyping was performed using the catfish 250K SNP array (Affymetrix) (Liu et al. 2014b) at GeneSeek (Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). No samples were excluded due to low quality or low call rate (< 0.95). A total of 192,204 SNP markers retained after filtering out SNPs with genotyping error based on Mendelian laws, a call rate < 0.95 or minor allele frequency < 0.05.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using the SVS software package (SNP & Variation Suite, version 8.4.4). Linkage disequilibrium (LD) pruning was conducted with a window size of 50 SNPs, a step of 5 SNPs and r² threshold of 0.5, generating 7692 independent SNPs and LD blocks for this population. Principal component analysis was conducted using these independent SNP markers. Wright’s Fst statistics were calculated between each pair of nine families using all the independent SNPs, ranging from 0 (no genetic divergence between families) to 1 (complete isolation from the other families) (Wright 1949; Nei 1973).

To efficiently correct family structure in the association test, Efficient Mixed-Model Association ExPedited (EMMAX) analyses (Kang et al. 2010) in SVS software package using first ten principal components as covariates was conducted for genome-wide association analysis. The model is listed as follows:

\[ Y = Xb + Zu + e, \]

where \( Y \) is the vector of phenotype (body weight); \( X \) is the matrix of fixed effects including first ten principal components; \( b \) is the vector representing the coefficients; \( Z \) is the matrix of random effect; \( u \) is the coefficient vector, \( \text{Var}(u) = \sigma_u^2 G \) where \( \sigma_u^2 \) represents the additive genetic variance and \( G \) stands for the genomic kinship matrix; \( e \) is the vector of random residuals.

Manhattan plots of the calculated −log₁₀(P value) results for each SNP were generated using SVS software package. Genetic marker map was constructed from channel catfish genetic map (version Coco 1.0) (Liu et al. 2016) due to similar genome architectures of channel catfish and blue catfish (Liu et al. 2003; Kucuktas et al. 2009). Threshold P value for genome-wide significance was calculated based on Bonferroni correction with the estimated number of 7692 independent SNPs and LD blocks (Duggal et al. 2008). Thus, the genome-wide significance threshold was 0.05/7692 = 6.5e−6 (−log₁₀(P value) = 5.19). “Suggestive association” allows one false-positive effect in a genome-wide test, indicating the threshold P value was 1/7692 = 1.3e−4 (−log₁₀(P value) = 3.89).

Although EMMAX could efficiently correct family structure and perform GWAS analysis with great power, additional models are still required to provide support for the GWAS results. Family-based association test for quantitative traits (QFAM) in PLINK (Abecasis et al. 2000; Purcell et al. 2007) and family-based score test for association (FASTA) in GenABEL (Aulchenko et al. 2007; Chen and Abecasis 2007) were conducted separately to validate the identification of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 The pedigree information and phenotypic data of catfish samples in this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F225_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F230_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F213_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F214_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F215_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F221_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F223_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F231_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F220_7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QTLs from EMMAX. QFAM has been proved to provide enough statistical power for GWAS analysis in catfish family-based samples (Geng et al. 2016, 2017; Zhou et al. 2017), and FASTA could utilize both genomic kinship matrix and pedigree kinship matrix to perform GWAS analyses based on polygenic mixed model (Chen and Abecasis 2007). Manhattan plots were produced using qqman (Turner 2014) and GenABEL, respectively.

Conditional analyses were carried out to examine the correlation of the SNPs associated with body weight. The most significant SNP on each linkage group was separately included in the association analysis as a covariate. Manhattan plots were generated using SVS software package to observe the $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})$ of the other SNPs.

**Candidate genes**

The genes within the significantly associated genomic region (~1 Mb) with body weight were identified using the catfish reference genome (Liu et al. 2016) and examined for candidate genes according to their functions. Genomicus v85.01 (Muffato et al. 2010) was used to construct the synteny of several identified genes from pig and human to provide evidence for orthology. The genes closest to the suggestive SNPs were also examined and analyzed for their functions in growth.

## Results

### Phenotypic variation

The final data used for the GWAS contained 192,204 QC-filtered SNPs genotyped in 556 fish from nine families with body weight measured approximately 1-year post-hatching. The nine families are described in Table 1, from which 10–106 individuals were used in this study. The Wright’s $F_{st}$ statistics between each pair of families ranged from 0.03 to 0.34 (Table S2), indicating their relatively high genetic relatedness. Body weight was measured as phenotypic data ranging from 13 to 180 g with an average of 51 g (Table 1).

### Genomic regions associated with body weight

A Manhattan plot based on EMMAX method is shown in Fig. 1, identifying 22 SNPs on linkage group 5 significantly associated with body weight ($-\log_{10}(P\text{-value}) > 5.19$). These SNPs are located in a genomic region from 5,450,551 to 6,564,089 bp, spanning approximately 1.1 Mb. As shown in Table 2, their minor allele frequencies ranged from 0.06 to 0.49. The most significant SNP explained 6.72% of phenotypic variation.

Four genomic regions on linkage group 1, 2, 23 and 24 were found to be suggestively associated with body weight ($-\log_{10}(P\text{-value}) > 3.89$), but were not statistically significant at the genome level. As shown in Table 3, linkage group 1 harbored quite a few SNPs in a long-range genomic region from 1,777,673 to 3,935,580 bp, with $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})$ ranging from 3.90 to 4.51. Similarly, linkage group 23 and

---

**Fig. 1** Manhattan plot of genome-wide association analysis for body weight by EMMAX in SVS. The red solid line indicates the genome-wide significant threshold: $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})=5.19$. The black solid line indicates the threshold for the significance of “suggestive association”: $-\log_{10}(P\text{-value})=3.89$. (Color figure online)
**Table 2** The significantly associated SNPs for growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNP ID</th>
<th>Linkage group</th>
<th>Position (bp)</th>
<th>MAF&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>log&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;(P value)</th>
<th>PVE&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AX-85292442</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,450,551</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.21E−06</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-86103013</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,513,789</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>6.18E−06</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85395390</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,538,164</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.37E−06</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85355896</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,559,855</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7.21E−07</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85407973</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,563,633</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>9.15E−07</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85345660</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,664,085</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.49E−07</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85302783</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,702,991</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.82E−07</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85226693</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,734,708</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.55E−07</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85934069</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,734,825</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>7.85E−10</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85265654</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,757,941</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3.82E−08</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85190477</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,910,432</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.75E−08</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85411013</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,086,388</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.14E−06</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85243796</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,185,149</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.90E−07</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85412389</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,409,325</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.32E−07</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85240146</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,414,367</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.81E−07</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85335866</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,417,114</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7.93E−07</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85263876</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,461,776</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.22E−06</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85301761</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,484,466</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>7.17E−07</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85404447</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,498,364</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4.15E−06</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85315779</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,516,984</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.30E−06</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-86020715</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,543,107</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.87E−06</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85945508</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,564,089</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.16E−06</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> LG linkage group  
<sup>b</sup> MAF minor allele frequency  
<sup>c</sup> PVE phenotypic variation explained

**Table 3** The suggestively associated SNPs for growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNP ID</th>
<th>Linkage group</th>
<th>Position (bp)</th>
<th>MAF&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>log&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;(P value)</th>
<th>PVE&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AX-85224792</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,777,673</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.25E−04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85291341</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,901,215</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.04E−04</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85267456</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,923,556</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8.33E−05</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85399862</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,211,229</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.09E−05</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85352659</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,724,541</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.07E−04</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85444694</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,988,826</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.07E−04</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85405675</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,334,074</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.21E−04</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85338398</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,440,382</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.01E−04</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85219473</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,935,580</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>8.58E−05</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-86013626</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>961,642</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.22E−04</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85213196</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,265,035</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.66E−05</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85352267</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,311,535</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.66E−05</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-86101139</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,312,292</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.25E−04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85201015</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,644,603</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.27E−04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85954590</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17,073,975</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.51E−06</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX-85383871</td>
<td>LG&lt;sup&gt;a24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17,357,183</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.07E−04</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> LG linkage group  
<sup>b</sup> MAF minor allele frequency  
<sup>c</sup> PVE phenotypic variation explained
24 contained several SNPs reaching suggestive genome-wide significance, spanning short ranges from 21,265,035 to 21,644,603 bp and from 17,073,975 to 17,357,183 bp, respectively. There is one SNP at position 961,642 bp on the linkage group 2 suggestively associated with growth.

Manhattan plots based on QFAM and FASTA methods (genomic kinship matrix) are shown in Fig. 2, identifying the same genomic region significantly associated with body weight on linkage group 5. This further confirmed the accuracy of EMMAX and the significance of this region on linkage group 5 in catfish growth. Genomic regions on linkage group 1, 23 and 24 were also found to be suggestively associated with body weight by both methods (Fig. 2). Differently, QFAM identified a wider region on linkage group 1, while FASTA identified more regions on linkage groups 3, 14, 16, 17 and 22 reaching suggestive association threshold. Compared with the results based on genomic kinship matrix, FASTA using pedigree kinship matrix could not effectively detect the QTL significantly associated with body weight (Figure S1). Genomic kinship matrix seems to provide better estimate of a covariance between individuals and thus has more power to detect QTL in GWAS analysis.

**Correlation of the SNPs associated with growth**

Conditional analyses were conducted to evaluate the correlation of the SNPs associated with body weight (Geng et al. 2015). The $- \log_{10}(P \text{ value})$ of the associated SNPs dropped below 2.5 after the most significant SNP (AX85934069) on linkage group 5 was included as a covariate while the other SNPs remained unchanged on the other linkage groups (not shown), which indicated the strong correlations of the associated SNPs with body weight. Similarly, there were also strong correlations among those associated SNPs on the other linkage groups. These correlations suggested that the associated SNPs in the same genomic region are most likely associated with a single QTL; they were significant simply because of their linkage. Therefore, the most significant SNP was selected to represent the genomic region to obtain the ratio of

\[\text{ratio} = \frac{\text{QTL effect on body weight}}{\text{SNP effect on body weight}}\]

\[\text{ratio} = \frac{-\log_{10}(P \text{ value})_{\text{QTL}}}{-\log_{10}(P \text{ value})_{\text{SNP}}}\]

\[\text{ratio} = \frac{5.19}{3.89}\]

\[\text{ratio} = 1.33\]

Fig. 2 Manhattan plot of genome-wide association analysis for body weight by a QFAM in PLINK and b FASTA based on genomic kinship matrix in GenABEL. The red solid line indicates the genome-wide significant threshold: $- \log_{10}(P \text{ value}) = 5.19$. The black solid line indicates the threshold for the significance of “suggestive association”: $- \log_{10}(P \text{ value}) = 3.89$. (Color figure online)
phenotypic variation explained by the QTL. The phenotypic variation explained by the most significant SNP on linkage group 5 is 6.72%. Additionally, four suggestive QTL on linkage group 1, 2, 23 and 24 could explain 3.14, 2.68, 3.01 and 3.62%, respectively. Collectively, these significant and suggestively significant QTL can account for 19.17% phenotypic variation.

Genes within the significant QTL region for growth

Since the reference genome sequence is available, we determined the genes within the region containing significant SNPs (Fig. 3). Twenty-one genes including duplications of two genes are present in the genomic region harboring the significant SNPs on linkage group 5 associated with body weight (Fig. 3, Table S3). Of the non-redundant 19 genes, six were found to have known functions in growth or associated with growth-related traits in humans and pigs, including ryanodine receptor 2 (ryr2), alpha actinin 2 (actn2), glutathione peroxidase 6 (gpx6), disintegrin and metalloproteinase domain 12 (adam12), dedicator of cytokinesis 1 (dock1) and family with sequence similarity 196 member A (fam196a).

Discussion

In this work, we used GWAS and identified one significant QTL and four additional suggestive QTL for catfish growth. Because the reference genome sequence was available, it was possible for us to determine the genes included in the QTL regions. This is the first GWA study in catfish that identified growth-related QTLs and some novel candidate genes which have never been found to affect growth in fish species. These findings may provide genetic basis for better understanding the molecular mechanisms in regulation of growth in teleosts.

We were surprised to have identified only one significant QTL associated with body weight and this finding was further confirmed by another two different methods (QFAM and FASTA), which indicated the significance of this QTL in catfish growth. Because the interspecific hybrid backcross progenies were used for the GWAS analysis, the identified genetic signal could be due to differences in channel catfish and blue catfish genomes (i.e., different alleles in each species). Since multiple strains of channel catfish have been applied to study QTL associated with hypoxia using the same 250 K SNP array (Wang et al. 2016a), those significant markers were examined in the channel catfish populations. The searching results suggested that the significant SNPs were polymorphic in all the channel catfish strains.

Fig. 3 Regional genome scan for the QTL significantly associated with body weight on linkage group 5. The blue shade indicates the associated genomic region. The horizontal red line indicates the threshold for genome-wide significance (= log_{10}(P value)=5.19). The horizontal black line indicates the threshold for the significance of “suggestive association” (= log_{10}(P value)=3.89). The boxes of candidate genes are marked in red. (Color figure online)
suggesting that the growth QTL is not functioning at the species level, but variable within channel catfish and blue catfish.

The most significant SNP on linkage group 5 was estimated to account for 6.72% of phenotypic variation. The small percentage may suggest that growth is under the control of a number of genes. The use of multiple families could have increased the environmental variations that affected the growth trait. To provide a better estimation of the ratio of its accounted phenotypic variation, use of larger populations is required. The sample size of the present study was limited by financial restrictions because of the costs of the SNP arrays. Similarly, those percentages of phenotypic variation estimated for the suggestive QTL likely were also underestimated.

The use of well-structured families for QTL analysis likely increased the chances of detecting QTL because phenotypic variations were under control. The use of a large number of families should have also increased the odds of narrowing the QTL to smaller genomic regions. However, the use of family-based individuals, instead of random and unrelated fish, prohibited fine mapping of the QTL because of long haplotype blocks in the backcross progeny (Geng et al. 2016). Although the high-density SNP array was effective for the GWAS analysis, the resolution was mainly limited by the number of individuals used in this study, and by the lack of recombination within the QTL region.

Once the QTL is mapped to a small physical region in the genome, genes in such associated regions can be readily determined with the catfish reference genome sequence (Liu et al. 2016). Nineteen non-redundant genes were present within the genomic region containing significant SNPs on linkage group 5 (Fig. 3). Due to the lack of high resolution of the mapping powers, we do not know which of these genes, and even some other genes at a nearby genomic location outside of this region, are likely to be the causal gene. However, a close examination of the gene identities and their known functions provided some insights into the potential candidate genes. For instance, eight genes in the associated region and extended regions on linkage group 5 were known to have functions in growth or associated with growth-related traits in other organisms. **Hhex** is a critical regulator of development and in zebrafish it is required for hemangioblast differentiation, liver specification and especially the formation of body axis (Ho et al. 1999; Liao et al. 2000; Bischof and Driever 2004; Shin et al. 2007; Soufi and Jayaraman 2008), during which it may affect early growth-related traits. **Ryr2** regulates calcium release from sarcoplasmic reticulum in cardiomyocytes, playing an integral role in cardiac myocyte contraction (Taur and Frishman 2005). Moreover, a mouse model with **ryr2** knocked in showed accelerated development of cardiac hypertrophy (van Oort et al. 2010). Similarly, its paralog **ryr1** also has an effect on muscle hypertrophy with being associated with **Ifg2** (Stinckens et al. 2007), and it is positively associated with increased percentage of lean meat in pigs (Pommier et al. 1998; Stinckens et al. 2009). Interestingly, the hypertrophy of fish muscle fibers contributes greatly to the massive increase of girth between hatching and maturity (Johnston 1999). There is another gene, **actn2**, in the genomic region, which was known to cause muscle hypertrophy. Mutations in **actn2** were reported to be related to hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and dilated cardiomyopathy with hypertrophic myocardium in human (Mohapatra et al. 2003; Chiu et al. 2010). In addition, **actn2** is a major structural component of sarcomeric Z-lines where it functions to organize actin filaments in a constitutive manner (Beggs et al. 1992). In vitro studies in cell culture demonstrated that deletion mutants of **actn2** led to disruption of myofibrils, indicating its role in skeletal muscle assembly and maintenance (Schultheiss et al. 1992). In addition, **actn2** could interact with different classes of cytoskeletal and regulatory proteins to maintain the structure and functions of skeletal muscle (Faulkner et al. 2001; Clark et al. 2002; Sjöblom et al. 2008). **Adam12** is another gene affecting muscle development and functions. Overexpression of **adam12** in the mice with muscular dystrophy could alleviate the skeletal muscle pathology, contributing to muscle regeneration (Kronqvist et al. 2002). Interestingly, Galliano et al. (Galliano et al. 2000) found that binding of **adam12** to **actn2** is required for myoblast fusion which is a key process for formation and repair of muscle. Moreover, **adam12** was also found to be expressed in human and mouse bone cells including osteoblasts and osteoclasts (Inoue et al. 1998; Abe et al. 1999; Boissy et al. 2003; Verrier et al. 2004), suggesting its regulatory role in bone development. One pronounced example is that **adam12** transgenic mice exhibited an increase in the longitudinal bone length including femur, tibia and vertebrae through regulating chondrocyte proliferation and maturation (Kveiborg et al. 2006). Furthermore, **adam12**-knockout zebrafish exhibited reduced body size during juvenile stage without defects in morphology, indicating the possible role of **adam12** in affecting cartilage/bone development (Tokumasu et al. 2016). In addition to **adam12**, **dock1** is another gene modulating myoblast fusion, which was well characterized in its homologue myoblast city (**mbc** gene in Drosophila (Erickson et al. 1997). Both **dock1**-knockdown zebrafish embryo and **dock1-null** mouse embryo exhibited reduction in skeletal muscle, which is attributed to defective myoblast fusion (Moore et al. 2007; Laurin et al. 2008). Its paralog, **dock5**, is also a critical regulator during myoblast fusion process (Moore et al. 2007; Laurin et al. 2008). PBX homeobox 4 (**pbx4**) was identified close to the most significant SNP in the suggestively associated region on linkage group 24. The homeodomain proteins **pbx** are important in modulating skeletal myogenesis, inhibitions of which in zebrafish embryos affected the
development of fast muscle (Maves et al. 2007; Yao et al. 2013). Although it is unknown which of these genes is the causal gene, the involvement of these genes within the QTL in muscle growth and bone development provided additional support of the QTL as truly affecting growth.

There appears to be evolutionary conservation of the genes involved in growth. Several genes within the QTL region were known to be associated with growth in other organisms. Gpx6 was found to be positively associated with obesity in Spanish children (Rupérez et al. 2014), and its paralogs (gpx1, gpx4 and gpx5) were also observed in close relationship with obesity in animal and human studies (Asayama et al. 2001; Ozgen et al. 2012; Rupérez et al. 2014). Alaska native population was also analyzed for obesity traits, suggesting that dock1 and ptpre were potential candidate genes (Vaughan et al. 2015). Interestingly, their paralogs (dock5, ptpra, ptprd and ptprf) have been long known as obesity susceptibility genes (Ahmad et al. 1997; Moustafa et al. 2012). Another association study was carried out for pig birth weight, showing that ptpre and fam196a were close to the significantly associated SNP (Wang et al. 2016b). Syntenic conservation among catfish, human and pig (Fig. 4) with adam12, dock1, fam196a and ptpre all in the conserved syntenic block indicated that the functions of these genes may be evolutionarily conserved.

In addition to the evolutionary conservation of the genes discussed above involved in growth among catfish and mammals, several genes associated with growth in catfish identified in this study were also reported to be associated with QTL for growth in several teleost species. GWAS or QTL mapping analysis for growth was reported in Atlantic salmon (Gutierrez et al. 2015; Tsai et al. 2015), orange-spotted grouper (Yu et al. 2016), tilapia (Liu et al. 2014a) and catfish (Hutson et al. 2014). For the study in catfish (Hutson et al. 2014), an old linkage map was utilized and candidate gene analysis was not conducted due to absence of genome sequence, so it did not provide much useful information for comparison with our study. In those cases except catfish, there were only a handful of shared genes such as growth hormone (GH), growth hormone receptor (GHR), insulin-like growth factor (IGF) and myostatin (MSTN), all of which have been well known to be correlated with growth in fish (De-Santis and Jerry 2007). However, several homologs of the genes identified within the QTL for growth in catfish in this study were also identified in some linkage mapping studies for growth, such as pax7 from rainbow trout (Wringe et al. 2010), foxk2 from common carp (Lv et al. 2016), rgs7, trim16 and trim41 from Tilapia (Liu et al. 2014a). Once again, these results suggested evolutionary conservation of genes and their functions across species.

In summary, we identified a single significant QTL on linkage group 5 for growth traits, and four suggestive QTL on linkage groups 1, 2, 23, and 24. The causal gene for growth is unknown at the present, but the nine genes known to have functions in growth or associated with growth traits within the mapped QTL region are potential candidates. Future studies are required to fine map the QTL, toward the identification of the causal gene. Nonetheless, there appeared to be evolutionary conservation of the genes controlling growth among fish and various mammals. In addition to fine mapping, comparative quantitative genomics may lend some additional powers for the identification of the causal gene for growth traits.
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