Agronomy **2014**, *4*, 1-x manuscripts; doi:10.3390/agronomy40x0000x

OPEN ACCESS

agronomy

ISSN 2073-4395

www.mdpi.com/journal/agronomy

Article

Genetic Dissection of QTL Associated with Grain Yield in Diverse Environments

Junli Zhang [1], Jianli Chen [2,*], Chenggen Chu [3], Weidong Zhao [2], Justin Wheeler [2], Edward J. Souza [4] and Robert S. Zemetra [5]

[1] Dept. of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA; E-Mail: psjzhang@ucdavis.edu

[2] Dept. of PSES, University of Idaho, 1691 S 2700 W, Aberdeen, ID 83210, USA; E-Mails: zhao@uidaho.edu (W.Z); jwheeler@uidaho.edu (J.W.);

[3] Monsanto Company, Filer, ID 83328, USA; E-Mail: chenggen.chu@monsanto.com

[4] Bayer Crop Science LP, 206 Biochemistry Hall, UNL East Campus, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA; E-Mail: edward.souza@bayer.com

[5] Dept. of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State University, 109 Crop Science Building, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA; E-Mail: robert.zemetra@oregonstate.edu

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; E-Mail: jchen@uidaho.edu; Tel.: +1-208-397-4162 (ext. 229); Fax: +1-208-397-4165.

External editor:

Received: / Accepted: / Published:

Abstract: Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) breeding programs strive to increase grain yield; however, the progress is hampered due to its quantitative inheritance nature, low heritability, and confounding environmental effects. In the present study, a winter wheat population of 159 recombinant inbred lines (RILs) was evaluated in six trials under rainfed, terminal drought, and fully-irrigated conditions over four years. QTL mapping was conducted for grain yield main effect (GY) and the genotype x environment interaction (GEI) effect. A total of 17 QTL were associated with GY and 13 QTL associated with GEI, and nine QTL were mapped in the flanking chromosomal regions for both GY and GEI. One major QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*, explaining up to 22% of grain yield, was identified in all six trials. Besides the additive effect of QTL associated with GY, interactions among QTL (QTL x QTL interaction), QTL x environment, and QTL x QTL x environment were also

observed. When combining the interaction effects, QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* along with other QTL explained up to 52% of the variation in grain yield over the six trials. This study suggests that QTL mapping of complex traits such as grain yield should include interaction effects of QTL and environments in marker-assisted selection.

Keywords: *Triticum aestivum*; QTL x QTL interaction; grain yield; genotype x environment interaction

1. Introduction

Wheat is one of the most important crops, and breeding for improved grain yield has been a major objective in wheat breeding programs throughout the world. Progress on genetic improvement of grain yield using phenotypic evaluation has been hampered because it is under quantitative genetic control, has a low heritability, and is confounded by environmental effects [1–5]. QTL analysis has been proved to be an effective approach for identifying chromosomal regions conferring quantitative traits and estimating the relative effects of each region [6]; however, the genetic and physiological complexity of grain yield makes it difficult to identify major QTL that are consistently associated with improved grain yield under a variety of environmental conditions and in different mapping populations. Previous studies have focused on the main effect of QTL associated with grain yield, but the identified QTL have not been successfully used in marker-assisted selection (MAS) for improving grain yield [7].

Exploring genotype x environment interaction (GEI) is another important aspect for studying adaptability of genotypes with high yielding potential. Plants could change their phenotypic expression to adapt to different environments (also called phenotypic plasticity), and the GEI was caused by response differences of genotypes to environmental change [8]. Several studies have been conducted to measure and understand the nature of GEI [9–13]; however, most of them mainly focused on effects of environmental covariates rather than the genetic attributes of GEI. More recently, Gauch *et al.* [11] proposed a new strategy, analyzing the GEI using additive main effects and multiplicative interaction (AMMI) model. In this method, the GEI matrix was compressed into several interaction principal components (IPCs), which were then used as genetic traits in QTL analysis to represent the differences of genotypes in responding to the environmental changes. Therefore, QTL that are responsible for GEI could be detected. Besides the IPCs from the AMMI model, environmental sensitivity score (standardized differences in trait values measured in different environments) has also been used in QTL mapping to understand the GEI [8].

In addition to GEI, the interaction effects of QTL x QTL, QTL x environment and QTL x QTL x environment play important roles in gene network regulation and plant adaptability [14]. Studies of the QTL x QTL interaction (QQI, or QTL epistasis) and QTL x environment interaction (QEI) have been conducted in several crops, including rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) [15,16], corn (*Zea mays ssp. mays* L.) [17,18], cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) [19], and the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* [8,20]. These

studies showed that QQI and QEI effects were common for some complex traits and needed to be examined to better understand the genetic control of these traits.

In wheat, QQI has been conducted for coleoptile length [21], plant height [22,23], *Fusarium* head blight resistance [24–26], end-use quality [27,28], grain protein content [29], pre-harvest sprouting [30,31], water-soluble carbohydrates [32], and yield and yield components [33,34]. Particularly, Kumar *et al.* [33] and Wu *et al.* [34] demonstrated that analyzing QQI and QQEI would be helpful for improving GY through MAS because the estimation of the main-effect QTL might be biased if QQI and QEI were not examined.

The present study used spatially adjusted phenotypic data and advanced statistical method (AMMI) to identify QTL associated with the grain yield main effect and GEI effect, and studied the QQI, QEI, and QQEI of grain yield.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Plant Materials

A population of 159 $F_{8:10}$ recombinant inbred lines (RILs) were used in this study. The population was derived from the cross between Rio Blanco (PI 531244) and IDO444 (PI 578278) [35]. Rio Blanco is a hard white winter wheat cultivar with high yielding and good quality released by Agripro Biosciences, Inc. Mission, KS [36]. It carries dwarf gene alleles *Rht-B1b* and *Rht-D1a* and has been widely used as a parent in hard white winter wheat breeding programs [37–39]. IDO444 is a tall hard red winter wheat germplasm that carries dwarf gene alleles *Rht-B1a* and *Rht-D1a* developed by University of Idaho, Aberdeen, ID. IDO444 was released as germplasm based on its disease resistance and improved grain yield under rainfed production conditions in the Pacific Northwest [40].

2.2. Trial Conditions and Trait Evaluations

The mapping population was planted in six location-year environments (six trials) in southeastern Idaho, including Aberdeen (42.96° N, 112.83° W, elevation 1342 m) in harvesting years 2006 (06AB) and 2010 (10AB), Arbon Valley (42.89° N, 112.61° W, elevation 1525 m) in harvesting year 2007 (07AR), Rockland (42.57° N, 112.88° W, elevation 1417 m) in harvesting years 2007 (07RK) and 2011 (11RK), and Blackfoot (43.19° N, 112.35° W, elevation 1371 m) in harvesting year 2010 (10BF). Fertilizer was applied based on a soil test before sowing (data not shown). Herbicides and fungicides were applied to control weeds and diseases when necessary (data not shown). The trial 06AB was an irrigated trial. The trials 10AB and 10BF were terminal drought (TD) environments where water stress was applied when all plots completed anthesis. The trials 07RK, 07AR, and 11RK were three non-irrigated trials (rainfed) and only received rainfall during the growing season. Total rainfall (estimated) in growing seasons (Sep 1st to Jul 31st) in trials 06AB, 07AR, 07RK, 10AB, 10BF, and 11RK were 334, 296, 255, 183, 273, and 430 mm, respectively. Total rainfall (estimated) from March 1st to July 31st in 06AB, 07AR, 07RK, 10AB, 10BF and 11RK were 150, 132, 118, 101, 167, and 225 mm, respectively (data from National Climate Data Center: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/coop/coop.html). Overhead irrigation system was used in 06AB and

10AB trials, whereas wheel irrigation system was used in 10BF. The estimated irrigation water was 376, 208, and 508 mm for 06AB, 10AB, and 10BF, respectively.

In each trial, parents and RILs were planted in a randomized complete block design with two replicates. Seeding rate was 2.0 million kernels per hectare for trials in 07RK, 07AR, and 11RK; while 2.5 million kernels per hectare in 06AB, 10AB, and 10BF. Plots in trials 07AR, 07RK and 11RK were 3-meter long and 1.5-meter wide with four rows; plots in trial 06AB were 1.5-meter long and 1.5-meter wide with 7 rows; and plots in trials 10AB and 10BF were 3-meter long and 1.5-meter wide with 7 rows.

In all six trials, plots were harvested using a Wintersteiger Classic small plot combine (Wintersteiger Inc., Salt lake City, UT) equipped with a Harvest Master weighing system (Juniper Systems, Inc., Logan, UT). Grain yield (GY, ton/hectare) was determined from the grain weight of each plot at 12% moisture. Heading date (HD, day) was recorded as days from Jan. 1st to the date when 50% of the spikes were fully visible above the flag leaf collar in a plot. Plant height (HT, cm) was determined after maturity as the height of the stem to the tip of the spike excluding awns.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

Broad sense heritability (h_B^2) and the adjusted means (Best Linear Unbiased Estimates, BLUEs) were calculated from a spatial model in the computer program ASReml-R [41,42]. For trials 06AB, 07AR and 07RK, only replicates were used to adjust the spatial variation due to the incomplete data in the row and column directions; while for trials 10AB, 10BF and 11RK, replicate, row and column were used to adjust the spatial variation. Best spatial model were selected based on the log-likelihood value. RILs were first fitted as random effect to estimate h_B^2 according to the equation:

$$h_B^2 = \sigma_g^2/(\sigma_g^2 + \sigma_e^2/r) \quad (1)$$

where σ_g^2 is the genetic variance, σ_e^2 is the error variance and r represents the number of replications. RILs were then used as fixed effect to obtain the BLUEs for use in Pearson's correlation and QTL analyses.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was estimated to test the effect of genotype x environment interaction (GEI) for each trait. In order to account for the heterogeneous variance of the environments, the inverse of the variance of individual environments were used as weights in the ANOVA model. The AMMI method [10] was conducted to obtain the first two interaction principal components of the GEI effect (IPC1 and IPC2) across six environments. The standard deviation of BLUEs of GY (GYsd) was calculated across six environments to represent the environmental sensitivity of genotypes.

2.4. QTL Analysis

The whole genome linkage map developed based on this RIL population was previously obtained, and the map included 739 markers with the average density of 6.7 cM per marker [35]. To take advantage of the newly developed 9K single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers from the IIlumina Infinium 9K iSelect platform [43], the 159 RILs and the two parents were all genotyped with the 9K SNP markers in the USDA-ARS genotyping lab at Fargo, North Dakota. A total of 999 SNPs

showed polymorphisms between the two parents. Markers with high segregation distortion (χ^2 test at $\alpha = 0.01$) were removed for both the SNPs and the markers used in previous maps. The maps were constructed using software MSTmap (http://alumni.cs.ucr.edu/~yonghui/mstmap.html) [44] and Mapmaker/EXP 3.0b [45]. The SNP names in the map were "IWA" (Illumina wheat Design A) plus the index number of the SNP, such as "IWA7179". The full SNP names and indexes can be accessed from Cavanagh *et al.* [43]. The marker groups and the marker order in each group were determined in MSTmap, and the marker orders were checked in Mapmaker 3.0b using the "ripple" function. Map distances were calculated using Kosambi function in Mapmaker and given in centi-Morgan (cM).

BLUEs of RILs of each trait in individual environments and the GEI related traits (the IPCs and GYsd) were used separately in QTL analysis in Windows QTL Cartographer 2.5 [46]. Composite interval mapping (CIM) method was applied to identity the potential QTL associated with the traits investigated. Model 6 was used with 5 control markers, 10 cM window, and forward and backward regression method (probability for into and out 0.05). A QTL with LOD score >= 2.5 ($\alpha = 0.05$) was declared as a significant QTL in order to detect potential QTL across different environments. Genomic regions of the corresponding QTL were determined with the 1-LOD support interval method [47].

For QTL closely located and associated with the same trait, stepwise multiple regression using the peak marker of each QTL was conducted, and the QTL that were not significant in the model were excluded. If QTL identified for the same trait but coming from different environments had overlapped confidence interval, they are supposed to be the same QTL and given the same name. QTL x environment interaction (QEI), QTL x QTL interaction (QQI, QTL epistasis) and QTL x QTL x environment interaction (QQEI) were tested by ANOVA method using the peak markers of the QTL associated with GY, IPCs and GYsd in R [42]. Accumulative effect of GY QTL without and with the QQI were tested by stepwise multiple regression in R [42], and the coefficient of determination (R^2) from the stepwise multiple regression model was the total amount of phenotypic variation explained by all the QTL left in the model.

3. Results

3.1. Phenotypic analysis of GY, HD, and HT

The broad sense heritability and the BLUEs of GY, HD, and HT of the two parents and RILs in six trials are summarized in Table 1. GY of IDO444 was significantly greater than that of Rio Blanco in four of the six trials, which comprised of three RF and one TD trials. Grain yield of Rio Blanco was significantly greater than that of IDO444 in one irrigated trial 06AB and one terminal drought trial 10BF. The broad sense heritability of GY was greater than 0.50 in all trials except for in 07RK. Distributions of GY in the RIL population exhibited continuous variation in all trials (Figure 1), and the significant transgressive segregation was also observed in both lower and higher yield (Table 1 and Figure 1).

Table 1. The broad sense heritability (h_B^2) and mean BLUE values of grain yield (GY, ton/hectare), heading date (HD, day), and plant height (HT, cm) of the two parents and the 159 recombination inbred lines in six trials.

Trait	Env[a]	Parent[b]			RILs				h_B^2
		ID	RB	Diff	Mean	Std.Dev.	Min.	Max.	
GY	06AB	8.88	9.18	-0.30	8.46	0.80	6.24	10.28	0.63
	07AR	2.39	2.08	0.32	2.30	0.29	1.36	2.93	0.53
	07RK	2.10	1.30	0.80	1.51	0.33	0.67	2.17	0.33
	10AB	6.48	6.08	0.40	6.45	0.69	4.46	8.01	0.55
	10BF	5.02	5.45	-0.43	4.96	0.51	3.74	6.27	0.52
	11RK	1.91	0.59	1.32	1.39	0.31	0.65	2.29	0.57
HD	06AB	160	152	8	157	2.46	152	164	0.70
	07AR	167	161	6	164	1.71	159	170	0.78
	07RK	159	160	NS	160	1.02	158	163	0.40
	10AB	169	163	6	168	2.66	163	174	0.78
	10BF	174	164	10	171	1.98	166	176	0.77
	11RK	181	175	6	176	2.56	171	183	0.59
HT	06AB	103.1	74.4	28.7	84.6	8.15	68.6	105	0.81
	07AR	80.5	57.4	23.1	69.2	7.20	52.1	86.4	0.79
	07RK	59.9	51.8	8.1	53.6	4.65	43.2	67.3	0.08
	10AB	104.0	81.2	22.8	98.8	6.53	83.8	121.6	0.47
	10BF	109.2	86.4	22.8	97.1	8.53	76.2	121.9	0.83
	11RK	64.4	43.8	20.6	54.7	5.77	42.2	67.6	0.62

Env environment, h_B^2 broad sense heritability

[a] 06AB was an irrigated trial, 10AB and 10BF were terminal-drought trials, and 07RK, 07AR, and 11RK were rainfed trials

[b] *ID* IDO444, *RB* Rio Blanco, *Diff* difference between IDO444 and Rio Blanco (IDO444 – Rio Blanco): *NS* means not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, numbers mean significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Figure 1. Histograms of grain yield in six environments.



Field conditions greatly affected GY and HT as expected, but had almost no effects on HD (Table 1). Mean GY of the RILs in irrigated trial 06AB was much higher than that in RF and TD trials, almost twice as much of GY in TD trials (10AB and 10BF), and four times as much of GY in RF trials (07RK, 07AR, and 11RK).

Compared to HD and HT, GY had relatively low broad sense heritability in the six trials (Table 1). All three traits had the lowest heritability in 07RK. Traits GY and HD showed lower heritability in rainfed condition than the other conditions. Under terminal drought condition, HD and HT still had very high heritability, but GY showed lower heritability. Of all six trials, GY10AB had the lowest heritability among grain yield, and heritability of HT in environment 07RK was the lowest among all the traits (only 0.08), indicating a strong environment effect in 07RK.

Correlation between grain yield, HD, and HT were analyzed for individual environments and summarized in Table 2. Correlation coefficients (*r*) were low in general and there was no significant correlation between grain yield with HD and HT in irrigated trial 06AB. The *r* between grain yield and HT was higher than that between grain yield and HD in two rainfed and one terminal drought trial. HD showed consistently negative correlation with grain yield in 4 out of 6 trials; whereas HT showed positive correlation with grain yield under the three rainfed conditions and negative correlation with grain yield in the terminal drought trial 10AB.

Table 2. Phenotypic correlations between grain yield (GY), heading date (HD), and plant height (HT) in the 159 RILs over six environments.

Trait	GY					
	06AB	07AR	07RK	10AB	10BF	11RK
HD	NS	-0.18*	-0.21**	-0.28**	-0.19*	NS
HT	NS	0.37**	0.34**	-0.38**	NS	0.30**

NS not significant, * significant at α = 0.05, ** significant at α = 0.01

Figure 2. Distribution of QTL for grain yield (GY), heading date (HD), plant height (HT) and three traits related to genotype x environment interactions (IPC1, IPC2 and GYsd).


1A-1
0.0 IWA6644
13.4 XLMW1
13.8 wPt-6564
15.1 X374068
23.1 Xgwm33a
26.4 wPt-7567
44.4 wPt-5776
44.7 X408257
47.0 wPt-3904
50.7 IWA7050
53.7 IWA7151
59.4 X343892
65.5 wPt-4886 X304915
68.5 D25AD26A
69.1 Xbarc28 Xbarc83
71.1 wPt-9592
71.7 wPt-6074
72.3 X378271
74.3 IWA6553
76.8 Xcfa2129
81.2 IWA5534
85.4 IWA7868
89.9 IWA7577
92.6 IWA7439
93.9 IWA6984
95.9 IWA7804
98.6 IWA6622
100.9 IWA8440
102.5 IWA7385
106.3 IWA7413
107.3 IWA8615
109.3 IWA7065
111.3 IWA5631
113.6 IWA7328 IWA7945
IWA6942 IWA8238
IWA8294 IWA7713
114.2 IWA7505 IWA7716
IWA8230 IWA7922
IWA5636
115.8 IWA7898
121.3 IWA7824
GY10AB
GYsd
IPC2


1B-1
0.0 IWA5445
3.4 IWA5446
8.2 X378029
8.9 wPt-1403
11.0 X304623
28.4 IWA7179
30.7 IWA5382
35.6 IWA5383
39.4 X347295
43.4 wPt-3227
50.2 X408385
54.4 X345327
55.1 wPt-3451
55.8 Xbarc181
59.1 Xgwm11
66.6 wPt-5678
67.3 X372640
69.2 wPt-1684
71.7 X346137
72.1 X345641
72.5 X349423
77.3 X304189 wPt-1139
77.6 Xbarc152 X346932
78.6 wPt-0328
79.4 X312735
79.6 X344955
79.8 wPt-2762 X372967
80.2 wPt-3465
80.9 X305937
81.6 X311780
82.3 X372717 X378083
82.4 wPt-8949
X379940 wPt-0524
82.6 X304454 wPt-1317
wPt-4237
82.7 X348521
82.8 X372360
X372405 X372514
82.9 wPt-7708 X372587
83.2 XLMW2
84.3 X378734 X305721
85.8 Xgwm264
86.8 Xgwm374c
87.8 Xgwm33b
91.2 IWA6787
93.9 IWA5976
100.4 IWA7703
103.1 IWA7117
108.4 IWA6290
110.7 IWA8081 IWA7119
114.7 IWA5665
GY06AB
GY07AR
GY07RK
GY10AB
GY10BF
GY11RK
GY11RK
HD07AR
HT07RK
HT11RK


2B-1
0.0 wPt-6158
1.5 wPt-3565
1.9 wPt-0477
5.8 X348496 X378343
8.1 wPt-4453
10.6 wPt-7995
25.1 IWA5554 IWA8124
27.8 IWA5555
29.8 IWA7106
37.5 wPt-8326 X348039
37.8 wPt-8004 wPt-8398
38.5 Xwmc154
45.7 wPt-9668 X377479
50.2 IWA6048
52.2 IWA7916
61.2 IWA6893
68.1 Xgwm429
75.0 wPt-8492
77.4 Xgwm148
83.0 Xgwm374a
83.6 Xgwm374b
84.7 X349299
85.1 X379114
87.6 Xbarc091
90.6 IWA5436
92.6 IWA6209
96.3 IWA7520 IWA8244
97.6 IWA6547
102.5 IWA6554
104.9 IWA6918
115.8 IWA6093
121.5 IWA5411
123.1 IWA6399
129.5 IWA5460
136.3 wPt-4223
137.3 X408176
138.6 wPt-9736 wPt-0473
138.9 wPt-1068
139.2 wPt-5242
143.7 wPt-8460 wPt-2160
144.0 X381486 wPt-9350
145.6 wPt-0950
148.2 wPt-2430
148.6 wPt-8569
149.0 wPt-3109
149.3 X344573
151.6 Xgwm120
156.5 Xwmc175
GY07AR
HD06AB
HD10AB
HD10BF
HT06AB
2B-2
0.0 IWA6317
3.6 IWA5414 IWA5415
7.3 IWA6453
12.9 IWA5958
16.8 IWA7371
23.5 IWA7955
27.2 IWA8555
30.2 IWA5810
37.5 IWA7540
46.7 IWA5830 IWA6308
50.5 IWA6509
GY06AB
GYsd
IPC1


2D
0.0 Xbarc297
10.7 Xgdm35
11.2 X380120
11.7 X345625
13.4 X304730
20.5 Xgwm614
24.4 Xbarc124
47.6 Xgwm129
53.8 wPt-0298
54.3 wPt-5426
57.3 IWA8562
64.3 Xgwm102
72.7 Xgwm608
74.7 wPt-3728
87.6 Xcfd188
105.5 Xbarc054
107.0 Xgwm325
113.4 Xbarc273
114.5 Xcfd076
121.3 Xbarc096
HD06AB
HT10AB
GY07AR
3B-1
0.0 Xgwm389
0.3 wPt-8093
0.6 X345897
10.6 wPt-3921
11.6 Xgwm533
30.3 Xbarc131
31.0 wPt-7212 Xgwm493
35.5 IWA7647
37.2 IWA7231
GY06AB
GYsd
IPC1


3B-2
0.0 IWA7177
5.7 IWA7915
8.7 IWA7914
12.1 IWA7095
16.2 Xbarc177
16.5 wPt-5870
17.9 wPt-1197
24.6 IWA7383
44.8 IWA7342
46.8 IWA5618
49.5 Xbarc101 X303943
62.4 X346722 X348055
63.0 wPt-5105
63.6 X344962
63.9 Xbarc68 wPt-4209
65.5 wPt-9432
65.8 X381874
66.4 Xbarc73
70.5 IWA6761
72.1 IWA5925
74.8 IWA5977
77.8 IWA7860 IWA5556
78.4 IWA7748 IWA6200
IWA5960
82.1 IWA6192
85.5 IWA6919
88.2 IWA6920
95.0 IWA7595
97.7 IWA7905
99.7 IWA6677
102.6 wPt-6047
104.1 X378680
107.3 wPt-7502
108.7 IWA8531
112.1 IWA7078
114.1 IWA6510
117.5 IWA6104
120.9 IWA5711
123.2 IWA6223
127.7 IWA6297
131.1 IWA7035
131.4 IWA7353
131.7 IWA8196
132.0 IWA5902
134.3 IWA5805
138.1 IWA6375 IWA8104
IWA5646
141.9 IWA7561
145.0 IWA5941
157.5 Xbarc229
158.3 X304635
159.7 X305581
GY10BF
IPC2
4B
0.0 IWA5358
5.2 IWA8197
19.9 Xgwm6
32.0 IWA6808
35.1 IWA8163
35.4 IWA7688
37.7 IWA7284
45.4 Xgwm165
48.6 Xgwm192
49.7 Xgwm495
50.7 Xgwm513
53.0 X348609
55.7 wPt-6149
58.9 wPt-1708
62.5 XRhtB1
69.9 barc125b
90.4 IWA7218
100.0 IWA7268
108.1 IWA5739
115.9 X348043
121.5 wPt-8756
GY10AB
HT06AB
HT07AR
HT10BF
HT11RK
GYsd
IPC2


5A-1
0.0 IWA7302
19.4 IWA8154
25.2 IWA7926
26.2 IWA7596
30.7 IWA7961
33.7 IWA5735
37.4 IWA5539
40.9 IWA5689
47.2 Xbarc180
49.4 X348252
62.9 Xgwm156
74.1 IWA6126
75.9 X347190
79.2 X344315
82.4 Xbarc197
GY07RK
GY10AB
5B-2
0.0 barc1032
6.6 wPt-1302
22.8 IWA6947
25.1 IWA6946
28.1 X304783
35.0 wPt-1457
39.1 IWA7272
43.6 IWA8005 IWA5439
45.9 IWA6344 IWA6526
49.6 IWA7123
51.6 IWA5621
54.6 IWA5620
57.3 IWA7507
62.6 IWA6992
67.9 IWA6689
72.0 IWA7127
75.4 IWA7227
80.3 Xgwm213
84.7 X305486
85.8 wPt-9552
88.8 Xgwm371
90.1 IWA7562
92.1 wPt-7114
92.7 X378696
93.0 X348314
94.0 X343562
100.7 wPt-4936
102.1 wPt-4628
102.4 wPt-7101
103.0 wPt-1250 X303931
103.5 X380591
107.5 X304205
113.2 IWA6721
119.3 IWA5488
120.3 IWA7776
123.3 IWA5669
125.6 IWA5671
126.6 IWA5487
131.8 IWA8187
146.2 IWA8470
151.2 IWA7735
152.8 IWA8508
158.3 Xgwm582
173.0 Xgwm499
182.6 IWA5391
HD06AB
HD10AB
GY07RK
GY10BF



3.2. Enrichment of the previous genetic maps

By adding 413 SNPs to the previous map derived from this population, the average interval between two markers was reduced from 6.7 to 3.4 cM, which excluded markers with high segregation distortion (χ^2 test at $\alpha = 0.01$). The map used in the QTL analysis included 413 SNPs, 342 DArTs, 106 SSRs, and 1 sequence-tagged-site (STS) marker from the semi-dwarf gene *Rht-B1*, representing all the 21 chromosomes except 1D and 5D.

3.3. QTL associated with the grain yield

A total of 17 QTL located on 14 chromosomal regions (1A-1, 1B-1, 2B-1, 2B-2, 2D, 3B-1, 3B-2, 4B, 5A-1, 5B-2, 6B-2, 7A-4, 7A-5, and 7B-1) were associated with grain yield derived from the six individual trials (Figure 2 and Table 3). The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* on chromosomal region1B-1 was associated with grain yield and significant across all six trials and explained 6 – 22% of the yield variation. IDO444 contributed the high yielding allele for this QTL. The remaining 16 QTL each explained 6 – 16% of the variation of grain yield but mostly were significant in only one trial. Besides *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* that was detected in all trials, two QTL (*Q.Gy.ui-2B.2* and *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*) were identified in trial 06AB, two (*Q.Gy.ui-5A.1* and *Q.Gy.ui-5B.1*) in 07RK, three (*Q.Gy.ui-2B.1, Q.Gy.ui-2D* and

Q.Gy.ui-7B) in 07AR, four (*Q.Gy.ui-1A, Q.Gy.ui-4B, Q.Gy.ui-6B* and *Q.Gy.ui-7A.2*) in 10AB, four (*Q.Gy.ui-3B.2, Q.Gy.ui-5B.2, Q.Gy.ui-6B* and *Q.Gy.ui-7A.1*) in 10BF, and one (*Q.Gy.ui-1B.1*) in 11RK. QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.1 and Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* on chromosome segment 1B-1 were 8.5 cM apart, and each explained 22% of grain yield in 11RK trial. Additional four QTL, *Q.Gy.ui-1A*, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*, *Q.Gy.ui-4B*, and *Q.Gy.ui-7B*, explained 11, 12, 16, and 11% of grain yield variation in 10AB, 06AB, 10AB and 07AR, respectively.

Table 3. QTL of grain yield identified in Rio Blanco/IDO444 population in six environments.

QTL	Env.	Chr.	Position	Peak Marker	LOD	Add[a]	R^2 (%)
Q.Gy.ui-1A	10AB	1A-1	71.71	X115497	6.1	0.23	11
Q.Gy.ui-1B.1	11RK	1B-1	77.31	X304189	9.5	0.14	22
Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	11RK	1B-1	85.81	Xgwm264	9.6	0.15	22
	07RK	1B-1	91.21	IWA6787	3.7	0.10	8
	06AB	1B-1	92.21	IWA6787	4.8	0.25	9
	10AB	1B-1	92.21	IWA6787	3.2	0.17	6
	10BF	1B-1	93.21	IWA5976	3.4	0.14	7
	07AR	1B-1	93.91	IWA5976	4.3	0.09	9
Q.Gy.ui-2B.1	07AR	2B-1	45.71	X116276	3.9	0.08	8
Q.Gy.ui-2B.2	06AB	2B-2	8.31	IWA6453	4.0	-0.23	8
Q.Gy.ui-2D	07AR	2D	74.71	X119684	2.9	0.07	6
Q.Gy.ui-3B.1	06AB	3B-1	10.61	X116345	6.1	0.28	12
Q.Gy.ui-3B.2	10BF	3B-2	156.01	Xbarc229	3.4	-0.15	8
Q.Gy.ui-4B	10AB	4B	62.51	XRhtB1	8.3	-0.27	16
Q.Gy.ui-5A.1	07RK	5A-1	19.41	IWA8154	3.5	0.13	8
Q.Gy.ui-5A.2	10AB	5A-1	65.91	Xgwm156	2.8	0.16	6
Q.Gy.ui-5B.1	07RK	5B-2	25.11	IWA6946	2.8	-0.08	6
Q.Gy.ui-5B.2	10BF	5B-2	54.61	IWA5620	4.2	-0.15	8
Q.Gy.ui-6B	10AB	6B-2	57.01	IWA7625	2.9	0.15	5
	10BF	6B-2	60.31	Xbarc136	2.6	0.12	5
Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	10BF	7A-4	37.41	IWA7430	3.6	-0.14	7
Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	10AB	7A-5	0.01	X408088	4.3	-0.20	8
Q.Gy.ui-7B	07AR	7B-1	0.01	IWA8177	5.3	-0.10	11

Env environment, *Chr* chromosome, *LOD* logarithm of the odds ratio, *Add* additive effect, R^2 the phenotypic variation explained by a QTL

[a] *Positive values* alleles from IDO444 increased the value of the trait, *negative values* alleles from Rio Blanco increased the value of the trait

3.4. QTL related to genotype x *environment interaction*

QTL associated with GEI (or phenotypic plasticity) is summarized in Table 4. By using data of IPC1, IPC2, and GYsd, 13 QTL were identified (two for IPC1, six for IPC2, and five for GYsd) to be

associated with GEI. Nine of the 13 QTL were located in the flanking regions of the QTL associated with GY. QTL on chromosome segments 1A-1, 2B-2, 3B-1 and 4B were associated with two of the three GEI traits. QTL on 3B-1 explained 15 and 12% of variation of IPC1 and GYsd, respectively. QTL on 4B flanking *Rht-B1* explained 17 and 8% of variation of IPC2 and GYsd, respectively. QTL on 1A-1 and 2B-2 had smaller effect than that of on 3B-1 and 4B.

Table 4. QTL identified for genotype x environment interaction of grain yield.

Trait[a]	QTL	Chr	Position	Peak Marker	LOD	Add	R^2 (%)
IPC1	Q.Gypc1.ui-2B	2B-2	8.31	IWA6453	3.6	-0.19	8
	Q.Gypc1.ui-3B	3B-1	10.61	X116345	6.2	0.26	15
IPC2	Q.Gypc2.ui-1A	1A-1	71.71	X115497	5.2	-0.19	9
	Q.Gypc2.ui-3B	3B-2	157.51	Xbarc229	2.9	0.14	5
	Q.Gypc2.ui-4B	4B	62.51	XRhtB1	9.2	0.26	17
	Q.Gypc2.ui-6B	6B-2	39.11	IWA7929	3.0	-0.14	5
	Q.Gypc2.ui-7A.1	7A-5	0.01	X408088	3.0	0.15	5
	Q.Gypc2.ui-7A.2	7A-5	20.51	IWA7074	3.2	0.16	6
GYsd	Q.Gysd.ui-1A	1A-1	68.51	D25AD26A	2.9	0.07	6
	Q.Gysd.ui-2B	2B-2	3.61	IWA5414	3.5	-0.07	7
	Q.Gysd.ui-3B	3B-1	7.61	X116345	4.8	0.10	12
	Q.Gysd.ui-4B	4B	64.51	XRhtB1	3.5	-0.08	8
	Q.Gysd.ui-7A	7A-4	48.11	IWA8122	2.9	-0.07	6

Chr chromosome, *LOD* logarithm of the odds ratio, *Add* additive effect, R^2 the phenotypic variation explained by a QTL

[a] *GYsd* standard deviation of grain yield from 6 environments, *IPC1* the first interaction principal component of genotype x environment effect, *IPC2* the second interaction principal component of genotype x environment effect

3.5. QTL x *QTL interaction*

QTL x QTL interaction (QQI) analysis was performed on five QTL (*Q.Gy.ui-1A*, *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*, *Q.Gy.ui-4B* and *Q.Gy.ui-7B*) that showed relatively larger effects on grain yield (Table 5). Among the five QTL, *Q.Gy.ui-1A* had significant interaction with all the other four QTL except *Q.Gy.ui-7B*, and *Q.Gy.ui-4B* had significant interaction with both *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* and *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*. The total phenotypic variation explained by the QQI ranged from 5 to 31% (Table 5). Some QQI were significant in several environments. For example, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* and *Q.Gysd.ui-1A* had significant interaction effect in 07AR, 10AB and 10BF. Some QQI were significant in the environments where both QTL were identified, such as *Q.Gy.ui-4B* x *Q.Gy.ui-7A.2*; some QQI were significant in the environments where only one of the two QTL was identified, such as *Q.Gy.ui-4B* x *Q.Gy.ui-7A.2*, and some QQI were significant in the environments where neither QTL was identified, such as *Q.Gy.ui-4B* x *Q.Gy.ui-1A*.

Table 5. QTL x QTL interactions detected in the six trials among *Q.Gy.ui-1A*, *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*, *Q.Gy.ui-4B* and *Q.Gy.ui-7B*, and with other QTL associated with grain yield.

Q1	Q2	Environment	Interaction effect[a]	R^2 (%)
Q.Gy.ui-1A	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	10AB	0.46	17
	Q.Gy.ui-3B.1	10AB, 10BF	0.5	12
	Q.Gysd.ui-3B.1	10BF, 11RK	0.45	8
	Q.Gy.ui-3B.2	11RK	-0.21	5
	Q.Gy.ui-4B	07RK	-0.32	9
Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	Q.Gy.ui-2B.1	07RK	-0.34	17
	Q.Gy.ui-4B	07RK	-0.2	11
	Q.Gy.ui-5A.1	07AR	0.19	8
	Q.Gy.ui-6B	10BF	0.32	14
	Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	06AB	-0.52	12
Q.Gy.ui-3B.1	Q.Gysd.ui-1A	07AR, 10AB, 10BF	0.18	6
	Q.Gy.ui-2D	07AR	-0.19	10
	Q.Gy.ui-4B	10BF	-0.38	9
Q.Gy.ui-4B	Q.Gysd.ui-1A	07RK, 11RK	-0.29	8
	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	10AB	-0.42	22
	Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	10AB	-0.74	31
Q.Gy.ui-7B	Q.Gy.ui-2B.2	10AB	0.49	5
	Q.Gy.ui-2D	06AB	-0.59	6

[a] Interaction effects were estimated as A + D – B – C, where A and D represent the means of genotypes same as the two parents, and B and C represent means of recombination genotypes

Figure 3. Interaction between two QTL for grain yield in 10AB.



3.6. QTL x *environment interaction*

Of the 30 QTL associated with GY main effect and GEI effect (Table 3 and 4), 18 QTL (12 peak markers) showed significant QEI effect (Table 6). Eight of the 12 peak markers were identified for the GEI effects (GYsd, IPC1 or IPC2). The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*, which was identified in all six trials, also showed significant QEI effect.

Table 6. QTL showing significant QTL x environment interaction effect for grain yield.

Marker	Chr.	Position	QTL	Trait	R^2 (%)
D25AD26A	1A-1	68.51	Q.Gysd.ui-1A	GYsd	6
X115497	1A-1	71.71	Q.Gy.ui-1A	GY10AB	11
X304189	1B-1	77.31	Q.Gy.ui-1B.1	GY11RK	22
Xgwm264	1B-1	85.81	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	GY11RK	22
IWA5976	1B-1	93.91	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	GY07AR, GY10BF	7-24
IWA5414	2B-2	3.61	Q.Gysd.ui-2B	GYsd	4 -7
IWA6453	2B-2	8.31	Q.Gy.ui-2B.2, Q.Gypc1.ui-2B	GY06AB, IPC1	8
X116345	3B-1	7.61	Q.Gysd.ui-3B, Q.Gy.ui-3B.1, Q.Gypc1.ui-3B	GYsd, GY06AB, IPC1	6-12
Xbarc229	3B-2	156.01	Q.Gy.ui-3B.2,	GY10BF, IPC2	4-8

			Q.Gypc2.ui-3B		
XRhtB1	4B	64.51	Q.Gysd.ui-4B, Q.Gy.ui-4B, Q.Gypc2.ui-4B	GYsd, GY10AB, IPC2	5-17
IWA8122	7A-4	48.11	Q.Gysd.ui-7A	GYsd	6
X408088	7A-5	0.01	Q.Gy.ui-7A.2, Q.Gypc2.ui-7A.1	GY10AB, IPC2	4-8

Marker peak markers of each QTL, *Trait* traits for which the QTL were identified

3.7. QTL x *QTL* x *environment interaction of grain yield*

A total of nine pairs of QTL showed significant QQEI (Table 7). These QTL pairs mostly showed QQI in trials 06AB and 10AB. The two peak markers of QTL *Q.Gy.ui-7A.2* also showed significant QQI and QQEI effect. The two QTL *Q.Gy.ui-7B* and *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* did not show significant QQI in any trials but showed significant QQEI effect.

Table 7. QTL pairs that showed significant QTL x QTL x environment interactions.

Marker-1	Marker-2	Identified in[a]	QTL-1	QTL-2
IWA6787	X408088	AB06	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2	Q.Gy.ui-7A.2
IWA6453	IWA8154	AB06	Q.Gy.ui-2B.2	Q.Gy.ui-5A.1
IWA6453	IWA8122	AB06	Q.Gy.ui-2B.2	Q.Gysd.ui-7A
IWA5620	IWA5887	AB06	Q.Gy.ui-5B.2	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1
IWA5887	IWA6453	AB06	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	Q.Gy.ui-2B.2
IWA7430	IWA7625	AB10	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	Q.Gy.ui-6B
IWA5887	IWA7430	AB10	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	Q.Gy.ui-7A.1
X408088	XRhtB1	AB10	Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	Q.Gy.ui-4B
IWA8177	X116345	NA	Q.Gy.ui-7B	Q.Gy.ui-3B.1

Marker-1 and Marker-2 were the peak markers of QTL-1 and QTL-2, respectively

[a] Environments where the interaction between the two QTL (QQI) were identified.

3.8. The Pyramiding Effect of QTL for Grain Yield in the Six Environments

An accumulative effect of all QTL in each environment was estimated by a step-wise multiple regression (Table 8). The additive effect of all QTL explained 31, 24, 18, 49, 36, and 21% in 06AB, 07AR, 07RK, 10AB, 10BF and 11RK, respectively. When the QQI effect was considered, the explained phenotypic variation was 39, 24, 21, 52, 41, and 24%, respectively (Table 9). QQI effect was not significant in the pyramiding for GY07AR.

Table 8. Total phenotypic variation (R^2) explained by all the QTL for grain yield in each trial.

Trait	QTL	R^2 (%)
GY06AB	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-2B.2, Q.Gy.ui-3B.1	31
GY07AR	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-2B.1, Q.Gy.ui-2D, Q.Gy.ui-	24

	7B	
GY07RK	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-5A.1, Q.Gy.ui-5B.1	18
GY10AB	Q.Gy.ui-1A, Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-4B, Q.Gy.ui-5A.2, Q.Gy.ui-6B, Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	49
GY10BF	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-3B.2, Q.Gy.ui-5B.2, Q.Gy.ui-6B, Q.Gy.ui-7A.1	36
GY11RK	Q.Gy.ui-1B.1	21

Table 9. Total phenotypic variation (R^2) of grain yield explained by QTL main effect and interaction effect.

Trait	QTL[a]	R^2 (%)
GY06AB	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-3B.1, Q.Gy.ui-1B.1/Q.Gy.ui-7A.2, Q.Gy.ui-2B.2/Q.Gy.ui-5A.1	39
GY07AR	Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-2B.1, Q.Gy.ui-2D, Q.Gy.ui-7B	24
GY07RK	Q.Gy.ui-5B.1, Q.Gy.ui-1B.2/Q.Gy.ui-2B.1	21
GY10AB	Q.Gy.ui-1A, Q.Gy.ui-1B.2, Q.Gy.ui-5A.2, Q.Gy.ui-6B, Q.Gy.ui-4B/Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	52
GY10BF	Q.Gy.ui-5B.2, Q.Gy.ui-7A.1, Q.Gy.ui-1B.2/Q.Gy.ui-6B, Q.Gy.ui-3B.2/Q.Gy.ui-7A.2	41
GY11RK	Q.Gy.ui-2D, Q.Gy.ui-1B.1/Q.Gy.ui-3B.2	24

[a] QTL-1/QTL-2 means the interaction effect of QTL-1 and QTL-2 including their additive effects

4. Discussion

Improvement of grain yield is an essential target in all wheat breeding programs. Genetic dissection of QTL associated with gain yield would help us gain a better understanding of the genetic mechanisms controlling grain yield and provide insight into developing improved breeding schemes using molecular marker assisted selection. Numerous studies have targeted identification of more additive QTL associated with grain yield; however, few studies have analyzed the non-additive QTL effect [14] contributing to grain yield variation. The present study not only focused on identifying major additive QTL but also elucidated several non-additive interaction effects contributing to grain yield, with an attempt to develop a breeding scheme or a genetic architecture to improve grain yield using MAS.

4.1. Major QTL Associated to Grain Yield

Out of 17 QTL associated with the main effect of grain yield, five QTL (*Q.Gy.ui-1A*, Q.*Gy.ui-1B.2*, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*, *Q.Gy.ui-4B*, and *Q.Gy.ui-7B)* explained over 10% of phenotypic variation (Table 3). Especially, the QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* was identified in all six trials and explained 22% of the phenotypic variation of gain yield in 11RK, one rain-fed trial. The interaction of this QTL with *Q.Gy.ui-1A,*

Q.Gy.ui-2B.1, Q.Gy.ui-4B, Q.Gy.ui-5A.1, Q.Gy.ui-6B and Q.Gy.ui-7A.2 explained 8 to 17% of grain yield variation over five of the six trials (Table 5). This QTL was located in the flanking region of the QTL associated with HT in 07RK and 11RK, two rain-fed trials, and with HD in 07AR, another rain-fed trial (Figure 2). QTL for grain yield on chromosome 1B have been reported in several studies [3,48–52], but the positions of the reported QTL were different from that of *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* identified in the present study, so *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* most likely to be a novel QTL for grain yield. After checking the USDA wheat SNP database (http://129.130.90.211/snp/), marker *IWA6787* (*wsnp_Ku_c2620_4980121*) is related to an *ACT_ACR-like* protein in Sorghum and *IWA5976* (*wsnp_JD_c2805_3748370*) is related to an *ABC* transporter related protein in Rice. Considering its consistent effect in diverse environments and the interaction effect with other QTL, *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2* may be one candidate gene controlling grain yield in wheat, and future studies thus need to be conducted to better understand this QTL.

The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-1A* explained 11% of grain yield only in the terminal drought trial 10AB, but it had significant interaction effect with three other major QTL (*Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*, *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1*, and *Q.Gy.ui-4B*) in one terminal drought trial 10BF and two rainfed trials 07RK and 11RK (Table 5). In addition, this QTL was co-located with two GEI QTL (GYsd and IPC2), so it might be related to plant response to environmental change. This QTL was close to marker *Xbarc83*, where QTL associated with spike number per plant, spikelet number per spike, and thousand-grain weight were identified [53].

The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* explained 12% of grain yield only in the irrigated trial 06AB; however, its interaction with *Q.Gy.ui-1A*, *Q.Gy.ui-2D*, *Q.Gy.ui-4B* and *Q.Gysd.ui-1A* explained 6-12% of grain yield in trials other than 06AB (Table 5). *Q.Gy.ui-1A* and *Q.Gysd.ui-1A* were co-located, and their interactions with *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* showed in both terminal drought trials (10AB and 10BF). The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* was located in the flanking region of a major QTL associated with yield in durum wheat (*Triticum durum* Desf.) [3]. This QTL was also co-located with two QTL associated with GEI (*Q.Gysd.ui-3B* and *Q.Gyipc1.ui-3B*), it might be related to the adaptation to different environments.

The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-4B* explained 16% of the phenotypic variation of grain yield only in the terminal drought trial 10AB; however, its interaction with *Q.Gy.ui-7A.2* and *Q.Gy.ui-3B.1* explained 31 and 10% of the phenotypic variation of grain yield in the two terminal drought trials 10AB and 10BF, respectively. This QTL was located in the position where the semi-dwarf gene *Rht-B1* located, and the allele from Rio Blanco (*Rht-B1b*) increased GY, suggesting that selecting shorter plants is favorable for higher grain yield in terminal drought environments. One QTL for GEI, *Q.Gysd.ui-4B*, was also located at the position of *Rht-B1*, so it is possible that both *Q.Gy.ui-4B* and *Q.Gysd.ui-4B* were the pleiotropic effect of *Rht-B1*.

Currently, QTL associated with grain yield have been mapped on all 21 chromosomes of bread wheat [1–5,33,48–50,52,54–61], but common QTL are still rare. Some of the QTL identified in the present study confirm the previously reported ones. The QTL *Q.Gy.ui-2B.1* identified in GY07AR was co-located with a HD QTL (possibly related to *Ppd-B1* gene) and might be the same QTL reported by McCartney *et al*. [4]; and the QTL *Q.Gy.ui-4B* that was detected at the locus *Rht-B1* was also detected by Cuthbert *et al*. [1].

4.2. QTL x *Environment Interactions*

In the present study, 12 peak markers (19 QTL) responsible for GY or GEI showed significant QEI (Table 6). Shen *et al.* [19] defined three types of QEI: 1) QTL identified in all environments showed QEI, such as the *Q.Gy.ui-1B.2*; 2) QTL identified only in parts of the environments showed QEI, such as the *Q.Gy.ui-2B.2* from 06AB; and 3) QTL not identified in any individual environments showed QEI, such as *Q.Gysd.ui-7A*. Here, the second type QEI was the most common, and it also supports why QTL for the same trait usually are identified only in specific environments. In practice, if MAS was performed on QTL that have QEI effect, the selected plant thus could be more likely to adapt to different environments. However, due to QEI effect either changes in magnitude or changes in the direction of additive effects, it might be more practical to use QEI that only showed changes in magnitude of effect and will not have opposite effect in different environments.

4.3. QTL x *QTL Interactions*

The present study identified several QQI in individual environments, but no common QQI were found in all the environments (less than 4 environments), indicating that interactions between QTL were also affected by environments.

Different types of QQI were identified in the present study. Based on the marker combination effect, both synergistic (parental genotype combination favored) and antagonistic epistasis (recombination favored) were identified (Table 5). In addition to this, one special type of interaction was also observed, that is, when marker A was a specific allele (from IDO444 or Rio Blanco), the two alleles of marker B had no difference but had higher grain yield than when marker A was the other allele. For example, both *X408088* (*Q.Gy.ui-7A.2*) and *XRhtB1* (*Q.Gy.ui-4B*) (Figure 3) were significantly associated with GY10AB, but *XRhtB1* had an epistatic effect over *X408088*. When *XRhtB1* was the allele from Rio Blanco, the two alleles of *X408088* had no difference but still had higher yield than when *XRhtB1* was the allele from IDO444; in this case, selection the allele from Rio Blanco of marker *XRhtB1* is enough although both markers were significant for GY10AB. This could save time and effort in MAS. Not only could the use of that QQI increase the selection efficiency, but also could increase the selection response (Table 8 and 9). Therefore, for some complex traits like grain yield, the interaction between QTL could be as important as the QTL main effect [16].

4.4. QTL for Genotype x *Environment Interactions*

Via *et al.* [62] developed two models, allelic sensitivity model and gene regulation model, to explain genotype x environment interaction (GEI). The allelic sensitivity model proposes that GEI was caused by the differential expression of loci in different environments, and the gene regulation model proposes that some specific genes might sense environmental changes and regulate (enhance or suppress) the expression of related genes. However, these two models are not mutually exclusive and might work together to explain the process [8]. In the present study, we used the first two principal components (IPC1, IPC2) of GEI matrix and the standard deviation (GYsd) of GY across six trials as indicators of the response differences of genotypes to environmental changes. A total of 13 QTL were identified for these three traits (IPC1, IPC2 and GYsd), and nine of them were co-located with QTL for

the GY main effect in individual environments (Table 3 and 4, Figure 2), so these nine GEI QTL, which were related to the different responses of genotypes to the environmental changes, might just be a subset of QTL associated with GY. However, it is also possible that some QTL associated with GY were just QTL controlling the response to environmental changes, not for GY *per se*. The first possibility would be consistent with the expectation of the allelic sensitivity model [8]. The four QTL that were not co-located with QTL responsible for GY might only play a role in regulation. Overall, the results here suggest that both the allelic sensitivity model and the gene regulation model could be involved in the GEI, but allelic sensitivity model might have a greater influence on grain yield. As far as we know, no previous studies on QTL mapping of environmental sensitivity have been conducted, except that Gauch *et al.* [11] introduced the AMMI method in QTL mapping using the pre-harvest spouting study in wheat as an example. Another study on *Arabidopsis* was conducted by Ungerer *et al*. [8], and they also found that most of the environmental sensitivity QTL were co-located with the main effect QTL.

4.5. Pleiotropic QTL

In the present study, the co-location between grain yield and traits associated with GEI (IPC1, IPC2 and GYsd) has already been discussed. Of interest here is the pleiotropic effect of QTL associated with HD and HT. The population used in present study had segregation for the semi-dwarf gene *Rht-B1* (4B), and the photoperiod sensitivity gene *Ppd-B1* (2B) might also be segregating in the population based on the QTL mapping results for heading date. These two genes play major roles in the ability of wheat plants to adapt in different environments, so some QTL associated with HD or HT might have pleiotropic effect with GY or GEI traits. The QTL mapping results confirmed this hypothesis. The pleiotropic effect between QTL of HD and GY happened on chromosome 2B-1 (*Q.Gy.ui-2B*) at the position of the *Ppd-B1* gene. Compared with the potential *Ppd-B1* gene on chromosome 2B, the *Rht-B1* gene on chromosome 4B had a greater effect on grain yield, but mainly for grain yield in terminal drought condition (10AB and 10BF). The *Rht-B1* region not only had pleiotropic effect on GY from 10AB and 10BF, but also on GEI traits GYsd and IPC2, so this locus might play an important role on regulating plant response to environmental changes.

5. Conclusions

The present study was an attempt to dissect the genetic basis of wheat grain yield and genotype x environment interactions using QTL mapping method. One major QTL on chromosome 1B was identified in all of the six trials, and explained up to 22% of grain yield variation. Most of the QTL for GEI were co-located with QTL for grain yield main effect. Interaction effects (QQI, QEI, QQEI) were common in the present study, suggesting that future QTL mapping and marker-assisted selection of complex traits like grain yield should include QQI and QEI.

Acknowledgments

This project was supported by the USDA-ARS WheatCAP and Idaho Wheat Commission. We would like to thank Dr. Joseph Kuhl and Ms. Katherine O'Brien for reviewing this manuscript.

Author Contributions

JZ implemented the field trials, and did data analysis, genetic map construction, and primary writing of the manuscript. JC is the project leader and corresponding author who oversaw all activities related to the project implementation and manuscript development. CC is a collaborator who contributed to genetic map construction and manuscript development. WZ and JW provided technical assistance in field trials and genotyping of the mapping population. ES originally developed the mapping population and contributed to manuscript development. RZ is a collaborator who contributed to field trials and manuscript development.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References and Notes

1. Cuthbert, J. L.; Somers, D. J.; Brûlé-Babel, A. L.; Brown, P. D.; Crow, G. H. Molecular mapping of quantitative trait loci for yield and yield components in spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2008**, *117*, 595–608.
2. Huang, X. Q.; Cloutier, S.; Lycar, L.; Radovanovic, N.; Humphreys, D. G.; Noll, J. S.; Somers, D. J.; Brown, P. D. Molecular detection of QTLs for agronomic and quality traits in a doubled haploid population derived from two Canadian wheats (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2006**, *113*, 753–766.
3. Maccaferri, M.; Sanguineti, M. C.; Corneti, S.; Ortega, J. L. A.; Salem, M. B.; Bort, J.; DeAmbrogio, E.; del Moral, L. F. G.; Demontis, A.; El-Ahmed, A.; Maalouf, F.; Machlab, H.; Martos, V.; Moragues, M.; Motawaj, J.; Nachit, M.; Nserallah, N.; Ouabbou, H.; Royo, C.; Slama, A.; Tuberosa, R. Quantitative trait loci for grain yield and adaptation of durum wheat (*Triticum durum* Desf.) across a wide range of water availability. *Genetics* **2008**, *178*, 489–511.
4. McCartney, C. A.; Somers, D. J.; Humphreys, D. G.; Lukow, O.; Ames, N.; Noll, J.; Cloutier, S.; McCallum, B. D. Mapping quantitative trait loci controlling agronomic traits in the spring wheat cross RL4452x'AC Domain'. *Genome Natl. Res. Counc. Can.* **2005**, *48*, 870–883.
5. McIntyre, C. L.; Mathews, K. L.; Rattey, A.; Chapman, S. C.; Drenth, J.; Ghaderi, M.; Reynolds, M.; Shorter, R. Molecular detection of genomic regions associated with grain yield and yield-related components in an elite bread wheat cross evaluated under irrigated and rainfed conditions. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2010**, *120*, 527–541.
6. Mackay, T. F. C.; Stone, E. A.; Ayroles, J. F. The genetics of quantitative traits: challenges and prospects. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **2009**, *10*, 565–577.
7. Collard, B. C. Y.; Mackill, D. J. Marker-assisted selection: an approach for precision plant breeding in the twenty-first century. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2008**, *363*, 557–572.

8. Ungerer, M. C.; Halldorsdottir, S. S.; Purugganan, M. D.; Mackay, T. F. C. Genotype-environment interactions at quantitative trait loci affecting inflorescence development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetics* **2003**, *165*, 353–365.
9. Campbell, B. T.; Baenziger, P. S.; Eskridge, K. M.; Budak, H.; Streck, N. A.; Weiss, A.; Gill, K. S.; Erayman, M. Using environmental covariates to explain genotype x environment and QTL x environment interactions for agronomic traits on chromosome 3A of wheat. *Crop Sci.* **2004**, *44*, 620–627.
10. Gauch, H. G. Statistical analysis of yield trials by AMMI and GGE. *Crop Sci.* **2006**, *46*, 1488–1500.
11. Gauch, H. G.; Rodrigues, P. C.; Munkvold, J. D.; Heffner, E. L.; Sorrells, M. Two new strategies for detecting and understanding QTL × environment interactions. *Crop Sci.* **2011**, *51*, 96–113.
12. Yan, W.; Kang, M. S. *GGE Biplot Analysis: A Graphical Tool for Breeders, Geneticists, and Agronomists*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
13. Yin, X.; Struik, P. C.; Eeuwijk, F. A. van; Stam, P.; Tang, J. QTL analysis and QTL-based prediction of flowering phenology in recombinant inbred lines of barley. *J. Exp. Bot.* **2005**, *56*, 967–976.
14. Erickson, D. Quantitative trait loci: Mapping the future of QTL's. *Heredity* **2005**, *95*, 417–418.
15. Cao, G.; Zhu, J.; He, C.; Gao, Y.; Yan, J.; Wu, P. Impact of epistasis and QTL x environment interaction on the developmental behavior of plant height in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2001**, *103*, 153–160.
16. Wang, Z.; Cheng, J.; Chen, Z.; Huang, J.; Bao, Y.; Wang, J.; Zhang, H. Identification of QTLs with main, epistatic and QTL × environment interaction effects for salt tolerance in rice seedlings under different salinity conditions. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2012**, *125*, 807–815.
17. Ma, X. Q.; Tang, J. H.; Teng, W. T.; Yan, J. B.; Meng, Y. J.; Li, J. S. Epistatic interaction is an important genetic basis of grain yield and its components in maize. *Mol. Breed.* **2007**, *20*, 41–51.
18. Yan, J.; Tang, H.; Huang, Y.; Zheng, Y.; Li, J. Quantitative trait loci mapping and epistatic analysis for grain yield and yield components using molecular markers with an elite maize hybrid. *Euphytica* **2006**, *149*, 121–131.
19. Shen, X.; Zhang, T.; Guo, W.; Zhu, X.; Zhang, X. Mapping fiber and yield QTLs with main, epistatic, and QTL × environment interaction effects in recombinant inbred lines of upland cotton. *Crop Sci.* **2006**, *46*, 61–66.
20. Juenger, T. E.; Sen, S.; Stowe, K. A.; Simms, E. L. Epistasis and genotype-environment interaction for quantitative trait loci affecting flowering time in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetica* **2005**, *123*, 87–105.
21. Rebetzke, G. J.; Ellis, M. H.; Bonnett, D. G.; Richards, R. A. Molecular mapping of genes for coleoptile growth in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2007**, *114*, 1173–1183.
22. Wu, X.; Wang, Z.; Chang, X.; Jing, R. Genetic dissection of the developmental behaviours of plant height in wheat under diverse water regimes. *J. Exp. Bot.* **2010**, *61*, 2923–2937.
23. Zhang, K.; Tian, J.; Zhao, L.; Wang, S. Mapping QTLs with epistatic effects and QTL × environment interactions for plant height using a doubled haploid population in cultivated wheat. *J. Genet. Genomics* **2008**, *35*, 119–127.

24. Ma, H.-X.; Bai, G.-H.; Zhang, X.; Lu, W.-Z. Main effects, epistasis, and environmental interactions of quantitative trait loci for Fusarium head blight resistance in a recombinant inbred population. *Phytopathology* **2006**, *96*, 534–541.
25. Yang, Z.; Gilbert, J.; Fedak, G.; Somers, D. J. Genetic characterization of QTL associated with resistance to Fusarium head blight in a doubled-haploid spring wheat population. *Genome* **2005**, *48*, 187–196.
26. Zhou, W.; Kolb, F. L.; Bai, G.; Shaner, G.; Domier, L. L. Genetic analysis of scab resistance QTL in wheat with microsatellite and AFLP markers. *Genome Natl. Res. Counc. Can.* **2002**, *45*, 719–727.
27. Ma, W.; Appels, R.; Bekes, F.; Larroque, O.; Morell, M. K.; Gale, K. R. Genetic characterisation of dough rheological properties in a wheat doubled haploid population: additive genetic effects and epistatic interactions. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2005**, *111*, 410–422.
28. Mann, G.; Diffey, S.; Cullis, B.; Azanza, F.; Martin, D.; Kelly, A.; McIntyre, L.; Schmidt, A.; Ma, W.; Nath, Z.; Kutty, I.; Leyne, P. E.; Rampling, L.; Quail, K. J.; Morell, M. K. Genetic control of wheat quality: interactions between chromosomal regions determining protein content and composition, dough rheology, and sponge and dough baking properties. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2009**, *118*, 1519–1537.
29. Kulwal, P.; Kumar, N.; Kumar, A.; Gupta, R. K.; Balyan, H. S.; Gupta, P. K. Gene networks in hexaploid wheat: interacting quantitative trait loci for grain protein content. *Funct. Integr. Genomics* **2005**, *5*, 254–259.
30. Kulwal, P. L.; Singh, R.; Balyan, H. S.; Gupta, P. K. Genetic basis of pre-harvest sprouting tolerance using single-locus and two-locus QTL analyses in bread wheat. *Funct. Integr. Genomics* **2004**, *4*, 94–101.
31. Mohan, A.; Kulwal, P.; Singh, R.; Kumar, V.; Mir, R. R.; Kumar, J.; Prasad, M.; Balyan, H. S.; Gupta, P. K. Genome-wide QTL analysis for pre-harvest sprouting tolerance in bread wheat. *Euphytica* **2009**, *168*, 319–329.
32. Yang, D.-L.; Jing, R.-L.; Chang, X.-P.; Li, W. Identification of quantitative trait loci and environmental interactions for accumulation and remobilization of water-soluble carbohydrates in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) stems. *Genetics* **2007**, *176*, 571–584.
33. Kumar, N.; Kulwal, P. L.; Balyan, H. S.; Gupta, P. K. QTL mapping for yield and yield contributing traits in two mapping populations of bread wheat. *Mol. Breed.* **2007**, *19*, 163–177.
34. Wu, X.; Chang, X.; Jing, R. Genetic insight into yield-associated traits of wheat grown in multiple rain-fed environments. *PloS One* **2012**, *7*, e31249.
35. Chen, J.; Chu, C.; Souza, E. J.; Guttieri, M. J.; Chen, X.; Xu, S.; Hole, D.; Zemetra, R. Genome-wide identification of QTL conferring high-temperature adult-plant (HTAP) resistance to stripe rust (*Puccinia striiformis* f. sp. *tritici*) in wheat. *Mol. Breed.* **2012**, *29*, 791–800.
36. Wu, J.; Carver, B. F. Sprout damage and preharvest sprout resistance in hard white winter wheat. *Crop Sci.* **1999**, *39*, 441–447.
37. Carver, B. F.; Krenzer, E. G.; Hunger, R. M.; Martin, T. J.; Klatt, A. R.; Porter, D. R.; Verchot, J.; Rayas-Duarte, P.; Guenzi, A. C.; Martin, B. C.; Bai, G. Registration of "Intrada" wheat. *Crop Sci.* **2003**, *43*, 1135–1136.

38. Haley, S. D.; Quick, J. S.; Martin, T. J.; Johnson, J. J.; Peairs, F. B.; Stromberger, J. A.; Clayshulte, S. R.; Clifford, B. L.; Rudolph, J. B. Registration of "Avalanche" wheat. *Crop Sci.* **2003**, *43*, 432–432.
39. Martin, T. J.; Sears, R. G.; Seifers, D. L.; Harvey, T. L.; Witt, M. D.; Schlegel, A. J.; McCluskey, P. J.; Hatchett, J. H. Registration of "Trego" wheat. *Crop Sci.* **2001**, *41*, 929–a–930.
40. Windes, J. M.; Souza, E.; Sunderman, D. W.; Goates, B. Registration of four dwarf bunt resistant wheat germplasm: Idaho 352, Idaho 364, Idaho 443, and Idaho 444. *Crop Sci* **1995**, *35*, 1239–1240.
41. Butler, D. G.; Cullis, B. R.; Gilmour, A. R.; Gogel, B. J. *ASReml-R reference manual release (3 edn). Queensland Department of Primary Industries*; Technical report, 2009.
42. R Core Team *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*; R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2012.
43. Cavanagh, C. R.; Chao, S.; Wang, S.; Huang, B. E.; Stephen, S.; Kiani, S.; Forrest, K.; Saintenac, C.; Brown-Guedira, G. L.; Akhunova, A.; See, D.; Bai, G.; Pumphrey, M.; Tomar, L.; Wong, D.; Kong, S.; Reynolds, M.; Silva, M. L. da; Bockelman, H.; Talbert, L.; Anderson, J. A.; Dreisigacker, S.; Baenziger, S.; Carter, A.; Korzun, V.; Morrell, P. L.; Dubcovsky, J.; Morell, M. K.; Sorrells, M. E.; Hayden, M. J.; Akhunov, E. Genome-wide comparative diversity uncovers multiple targets of selection for improvement in hexaploid wheat landraces and cultivars. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2013**, *110*, 8057–8062.
44. Wu, Y.; Bhat, P. R.; Close, T. J.; Lonardi, S. Efficient and accurate construction of genetic linkage maps from the minimum spanning tree of a graph. *PLoS Genet* **2008**, *4*, e1000212.
45. Lander, E. S.; Green, P.; Abrahamson, J.; Barlow, A.; Daly, M. J.; Lincoln, S. E.; Newburg, L. MAPMAKER: An interactive computer package for constructing primary genetic linkage maps of experimental and natural populations. *Genomics* **1987**, *1*, 174–181.
46. Wang, S.; Basten, C. J.; Zeng, Z.-B. Windows QTL Cartographer 2.5. *Dep. Stat. N. C. State Univ. Raleigh NC* **2012**.
47. Lander, E. S.; Botstein, D. Mapping mendelian factors underlying quantitative traits using RFLP linkage maps. *Genetics* **1989**, *121*, 185–199.
48. Huang, X. Q.; Cöster, H.; Ganal, M. W.; Röder, M. S. Advanced backcross QTL analysis for the identification of quantitative trait loci alleles from wild relatives of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2003**, *106*, 1379–1389.
49. Kuchel, H.; Williams, K. J.; Langridge, P.; Eagles, H. A.; Jefferies, S. P. Genetic dissection of grain yield in bread wheat. I. QTL analysis. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2007**, *115*, 1029–1041.
50. Mathews, K. L.; Malosetti, M.; Chapman, S.; McIntyre, L.; Reynolds, M.; Shorter, R.; Eeuwijk, F. van Multi-environment QTL mixed models for drought stress adaptation in wheat. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2008**, *117*, 1077–1091.
51. Pinto, R. S.; Reynolds, M. P.; Mathews, K. L.; McIntyre, C. L.; Olivares-Villegas, J.-J.; Chapman, S. C. Heat and drought adaptive QTL in a wheat population designed to minimize confounding agronomic effects. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2010**, *121*, 1001–1021.
52. Quarrie, S. A.; Steed, A.; Calestani, C.; Semikhodskii, A.; Lebreton, C.; Chinoy, C.; Steele, N.; Pljevljakusić, D.; Waterman, E.; Weyen, J.; Schondelmaier, J.; Habash, D. Z.; Farmer, P.; Saker, L.; Clarkson, D. T.; Abugalieva, A.; Yessimbekova, M.; Turuspekov, Y.; Abugalieva, S.;

Tuberosa, R.; Sanguineti, M.-C.; Hollington, P. A.; Aragués, R.; Royo, A.; Dodig, D. A high-density genetic map of hexaploid wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) from the cross Chinese Spring × SQ1 and its use to compare QTLs for grain yield across a range of environments. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2005**, *110*, 865–880.

53. Wang, J.; Liu, W.; Wang, H.; Li, L.; Wu, J.; Yang, X.; Li, X.; Gao, A. QTL mapping of yield-related traits in the wheat germplasm 3228. *Euphytica* **2011**, *177*, 277–292.
54. Bennett, D.; Reynolds, M.; Mullan, D.; Izanloo, A.; Kuchel, H.; Langridge, P.; Schnurbusch, T. Detection of two major grain yield QTL in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under heat, drought and high yield potential environments. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2012**, *125*, 1473–1485.
55. Bennett, D.; Izanloo, A.; Reynolds, M.; Kuchel, H.; Langridge, P.; Schnurbusch, T. Genetic dissection of grain yield and physical grain quality in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under water-limited environments. *TAG Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2012**, *125*, 255–271.
56. Huang, X. Q.; Kempf, H.; Ganal, M. W.; Röder, M. S. Advanced backcross QTL analysis in progenies derived from a cross between a German elite winter wheat variety and a synthetic wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *TAG Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2004**, *109*, 933–943.
57. Kato, K.; Miura, H.; Sawada, S. Mapping QTLs controlling grain yield and its components on chromosome 5A of wheat. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2000**, *101*, 1114–1121.
58. Kirigwi, F. M.; Ginkel, M. V.; Brown-Guedira, G.; Gill, B. S.; Paulsen, G. M.; Fritz, A. K. Markers associated with a QTL for grain yield in wheat under drought. *Mol. Breed.* **2007**, *20*, 401–413.
59. Li, S.; Jia, J.; Wei, X.; Zhang, X.; Li, L.; Chen, H.; Fan, Y.; Sun, H.; Zhao, X.; Lei, T.; Xu, Y.; Jiang, F.; Wang, H.; Li, L. A intervarietal genetic map and QTL analysis for yield traits in wheat. *Mol. Breed.* **2007**, *20*, 167–178.
60. Marza, F.; Bai, G.-H.; Carver, B. F.; Zhou, W.-C. Quantitative trait loci for yield and related traits in the wheat population Ning7840 × Clark. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2006**, *112*, 688–698.
61. Narasimhamoorthy, B.; Gill, B. S.; Fritz, A. K.; Nelson, J. C.; Brown-Guedira, G. L. Advanced backcross QTL analysis of a hard winter wheat x synthetic wheat population. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* **2006**, *112*, 787–796.
62. Via, S.; Gomulkiewicz, R.; De Jong, G.; Scheiner, S. M.; Schlichting, C. D.; Van Tienderen, P. H. Adaptive phenotypic plasticity: consensus and controversy. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **1995**, *10*, 212–217.