

**METHODS AND MODELS FOR THE
ACCURATE ESTIMATION OF THE
EFFECTS OF SINGLE NUCLEOTIDE
POLYMORPHISMS (SNP) IN BEEF CATTLE**

By

Kirsty L. Moore

BSc (Animal Science) (Latrobe), BSc (Hons) (UNE)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND**

February 2008

Declaration

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree.

I certify that to the best of my knowledge any help in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

..... 

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Meat and Livestock Australia for their financial support during this thesis. I would also like to thank my supervisors, Dr David Johnston and Professor John Gibson. Thank you for your suggestions, guidance and assistance during the past three years. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Dr Bruce Tier, whose help over the last three years has been invaluable. I would like to acknowledge the Cooperative Research Centre for the Cattle and Beef Industry for including me in their post graduate program, and for providing the dataset that was analysed in Chapter 8.

I am grateful for the opportunity to complete my PhD with the Animal Genetics and Breeding Unit, and would like to thank Dr Hans Graser and all the staff and students at AGBU for their support and friendship. I would especially like to thank Dr Kath Donoghue, Anna Hansson, Dr Gilbert Jeyaruban, Rob Jones and Matt Wolcott for reading and commenting on sections of this thesis.

I have made many friends in Armidale, and I thank them for their friendships and the after work drinks. I would especially like to thank my 'Armidale family', who have made my stay in Armidale memorable. A huge thank you to my family for the support and encouragement I received during this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank Nathan for his company and support during this PhD.

Abstract

Genetic markers provide the Australian beef industry with the opportunity to increase rates of genetic gains. However, accurate estimates of the gene frequencies and the marker size of effects are first required. Stochastic simulation was used to examine the methods and models required to estimate SNP effects.

Results showed for a single SNP explaining 2% of the phenotypic variation, 1,500 animals were required to estimate the SNP effects when the favourable allele frequency (p) was 0.5. However, increasing the additive SNP effects decreased the number of animals required. SNP effect estimates were inflated when the power to detect genotype effects was low. In addition, when the allele frequency was rare ($p=0.1$), biased dominance effects were estimated. For SNPs that were in linkage disequilibrium with the causative SNP, the SNP effects were accurately estimated when linkage disequilibrium was greater than $D'=0.9$. This thesis found that when there was linkage disequilibrium between the two direct SNPs (explaining 8% of the phenotypic variation, collectively), and one SNP was ignored in the model, estimates of the SNP effects were biased upwards. Ignoring epistatic effects (1% of the phenotypic variance) also increased the estimates of the SNP effects. To estimate accurate SNP and epistatic effects 3,000 animals were required. If SNPs were excluded in the model, the SNP and epistatic variance was partitioned as polygenic and residual variances, respectively. The inclusion of SNPs was shown to increase the accuracy of the estimated breeding value (EBV); the more phenotypic variation explained by the SNPs the higher the increase in EBV accuracy (or estimated genetic merit when non-additive (i.e. epistasis) effects were included).

Different genotyping strategies resulted in different accuracies for estimating SNP effects. SNP effect estimates were inflated for the truncation selection strategies, but these over-estimates could be correctly adjusted for selection provided the genotype frequencies of the whole population were known. SNP effect estimates were more accurate for truncation selection (correctly adjusted for selection), compared with random genotyping strategies.

An industry dataset for meat tenderness was analysed using the same statistical models as the simulation. In this dataset, the estimated SNP effects were similar to estimates previously reported in literature. However, there is a need for further research on how pooling data across several breeds, potentially with different SNP allele frequencies may affect the ability to estimate SNP effects.

The statistical models were also shown to be important for the estimation of SNP effects. When only one or two SNPs were considered, it was found that fitting the SNPs as fixed effects was preferred to fitting the SNPs as random effects. Different methods of modelling genetic effects had no significant effect on estimates, when animals were both phenotyped and genotyped. However, when phenotyped animals were included that were not genotyped, estimates of the SNP effects and variance components were biased when a full animal model was fitted.

This thesis shows that the population size, allele frequency, statistical power to detect genotype effects, statistical models and the data structure all affect the ability to accurately estimate the size of SNP effects.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF FIGURES	X
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
CHAPTER 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 INTRODUCTION	4
2.2 LINKAGE DISEQUILIBRIUM	5
2.2.1 Measures of linkage disequilibrium.....	6
2.3 GENETIC MARKERS.....	8
2.3.1 Direct and linkage disequilibrium markers.....	8
2.3.2 Linkage equilibrium markers	10
2.3.3 Commercialised markers in the beef industry	10
2.4 POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF GENETIC MARKERS TO THE BEEF INDUSTRY.....	14
2.4.1 Factors that affect the potential benefits of marker assisted selection.....	14
2.4.2 The conflict between short and long term genetic response.....	16
2.5 METHODS FOR DETECTING GENETIC MARKERS	18
2.5.1 Candidate gene approach.....	19
2.5.2 QTL mapping	20
2.5.3 Multiple comparisons and type I error rates.....	20
2.6 ESTIMATING SIZE OF MARKER EFFECTS	21
2.6.1 Statistical power to detect genotype effects	21
2.6.2 Statistical models to estimate the size of marker effects	23
2.7 METHODOLOGIES INCORPORATING GENETIC MARKERS IN GENETIC EVALUATIONS..	26
2.7.1 Index selection methods.....	27

2.7.2 Linear mixed model methods	28
2.7.3 De-regression of EBVs	30
2.7.4 Genomic selection.....	30
2.7.5 Practical challenges.....	30
2.8 CONCLUSIONS.....	32
CHAPTER 3 GENERAL METHODOLOGY.....	34
3.1 DATA SIMULATION	34
3.1.1 Mate Selection.....	34
3.1.2 Simulating phenotypes.....	36
3.1.2.1 Polygenic effects (A_i).....	36
3.1.2.2 SNP effects (S_i)	37
3.1.2.3 Residual effects (E_i)	42
3.2 DATA ANALYSIS	43
3.2.1 Statistical models.....	43
3.2.1.1 SNP effects	43
3.2.1.2 Methods of modelling genetic effects and SNPs	44
3.2.2 Power of detecting genotype effects	45
3.2.2.1 Theoretical power of a non-central ANOVA F test.....	45
3.2.2.2 Theoretical power of a log likelihood ratio test	46
3.2.2.3 Achieved power of simulations.....	47
3.2.3 Linkage disequilibrium	47
3.2.4 Estimates of SNP effects.....	48
3.2.4.1 Additive effects (\hat{a}).....	48
3.2.4.2 Dominance effects (\hat{d})	49
3.2.4.3 Epistatic effects (\hat{e}).....	49
3.2.5 Variance component estimation	50
3.2.6 Accuracy of estimated breeding values (EBVs).....	50
3.2.7 Significance tests.....	52
CHAPTER 4 POPULATION SIZE:	53
4.1 INTRODUCTION	53
4.2 SIMULATED POPULATIONS	55
4.3 METHODS.....	56
4.3.1 Structure of the simulated populations	57
4.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	64
4.4.1 Power of detecting genotype effects	64
4.4.2 Estimates of SNP effects.....	68
4.4.2.1 Description of the replicates used to estimate SNP effects	68
4.4.2.2 Estimates of additive (\hat{a}) and dominance (\hat{d}) effects.....	69
4.4.3 Variance component estimation	79
4.4.3.1 Polygenic and residual variances for the direct SNP	79
4.4.3.2 SNP variance for the direct SNP	82
4.4.3.3 Polygenic and residual variances for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs ...	83
4.4.3.4 Additive SNP variance for linkage disequilibrium SNPs.....	83
4.4.4 Accuracy of estimated breeding values (EBVs).....	89

4.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION	93
CHAPTER 5 PERFORMANCE INFORMATION AND GENETIC EFFECT MODELS:	96
5.1 INTRODUCTION	96
5.2 SIMULATED POPULATIONS	97
5.3 METHODS.....	97
5.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	100
5.4.1 Power of detecting genotype effects	100
5.4.2 Estimates of SNP effects.....	100
5.4.3 Variance component estimation	101
5.4.4 Accuracy of estimated breeding values (EBVs).....	103
5.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION	106
CHAPTER 6 GENOTYPING STRATEGIES:	109
6.1 INTRODUCTION	109
6.2 SIMULATED POPULATIONS	110
6.3 METHODS.....	111
6.4 DESCRIPTION OF SIMULATED GENOTYPING STRATEGIES.....	113
6.5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	114
6.5.1 Power of detecting genotype effects	114
6.5.2 Estimates of SNP effects.....	116
6.6 GENERAL DISCUSSION	122
CHAPTER 7 MULTIPLE SNPS:	124
7.1 INTRODUCTION	124
7.2 SIMULATED POPULATIONS	125
7.3 METHODS.....	128
7.3.1 Structure of the simulated populations	129
7.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	132
7.4.1 Power of detecting genotype effects and epistatic interactions.....	133
7.4.1.1 Theoretical power.....	133
7.4.1.2 Achieved power.....	134
7.4.2 Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects.....	135
7.4.3 Estimation of epistatic effects	141
7.4.4 Variance component estimation	145
7.4.4.1 Simulated variances in the base generation.....	146
7.4.4.2 Polygenic and residual variances	147
7.4.4.3 Additive SNP variances.....	150
7.4.4.4 Epistatic variances.....	150
7.4.5 Accuracy of estimated genetic merit (EGMs)	152
7.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION	157
CHAPTER 8 INDUSTRY DATA ANALYSIS:	159
8.1 INTRODUCTION	159
8.2 THE DATA	160
8.3 DATA ANALYSIS.....	161

8.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	163
8.4.1 Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium.....	164
8.4.2 Linkage between SNPs A and C	165
8.4.3 Theoretical power.....	166
8.4.4 Significance of SNPs A and C.....	167
8.4.5 Genotype effects.....	168
8.4.6 Estimation of additive and dominance SNP effects.....	172
8.4.7 Estimation of epistatic effects	174
8.4.8 Variance component estimation	175
8.4.8.1 Polygenic and residual variances	175
8.4.8.2 Additive SNP variance.....	176
8.4.8.3 Epistatic variance	177
8.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION	178
CHAPTER 9 GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	180
BIBLIOGRAPHY	188
APPENDIX:	203

List of Figures

2.1 The average r^2 value for beef and dairy cattle given distances (Mb) between SNP pairs (Source: Goddard et al. (2006))	9
3.1 Random replacement strategy replacing a third of the parents each mating	35
4.1 Direct SNP frequencies (average of replicate means) of the favourable allele (p) and the genotypes (pp, pq and qq) for animals in the base (A) and last (B) generations (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	59
4.2 Linkage disequilibrium measures between the direct and linkage disequilibrium SNPs in the base generation: A is the actual linkage disequilibrium estimate, B the Lewontin's measure of linkage disequilibrium and C the maximum linkage disequilibrium possible given the allele frequencies	62
4.3 Linkage disequilibrium measures between the direct and linkage disequilibrium SNPs in the last generation: A is the actual linkage disequilibrium estimate, B the Lewontin's measure of linkage disequilibrium and C the maximum linkage disequilibrium possible given the allele frequencies	63
4.4 Estimate of the additive (A) and dominance (B) effects (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed effects for all replicates ¹ when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	75
4.5 Estimate of the additive (A) and dominance (B) effects (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed effects for significant replicates ¹ when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	76
4.6 Estimate of the additive effect (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as covariate effects for (A) all and (B) significant replicates ¹ when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	77
4.7 Polygenic variance estimates (kg^2/day^2) for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a fixed effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	84
4.8 Polygenic variance estimates (kg^2/day^2) for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	85
4.9 Residual variance estimates (kg^2/day^2) for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a fixed effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	86
4.10 Residual variance estimates (kg^2/day^2) for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	87

4.11 Additive SNP variance estimates (kg^2/day^2) for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 3,000 animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	88
4.12 Pearson correlation between true and estimated breeding value for all replicates ¹ with linkage disequilibrium SNPs as fixed, random or covariate effects.....	92
4.13 Pearson correlation between true and estimated breeding value for replicates ¹ detected to have a significant genotype effect with linkage disequilibrium SNPs as fixed, random or covariate effects.....	93
A.1 Linkage disequilibrium measures between the direct and linkage disequilibrium SNPs in the base generation: A is the actual linkage disequilibrium estimate, B the Lewontin's measure of linkage disequilibrium and C the maximum linkage disequilibrium possible given the allele frequencies	206
A.2 Linkage disequilibrium measures between the direct and linkage disequilibrium SNPs in the last generation: A is the actual linkage disequilibrium estimate, B the Lewontin's measure of linkage disequilibrium and C the maximum linkage disequilibrium possible given the allele frequencies	207
A.3 Estimate of the additive (A) and dominance (B) effects (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed effects for all replicates ¹ when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	211
A.4 Estimate of the additive (A) and dominance (B) effects (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed effects for significant replicates ¹ when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	212
A.5 Estimate of the additive effect (kg/day) for linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as covariate effects for (A) all and (B) significant replicates ¹ when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	213
A.6 Polygenic variance (kg^2/day^2) estimates for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a fixed effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	214
A.7 Polygenic variance (kg^2/day^2) estimates for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	215
A.8 Residual variance (kg^2/day^2) estimates for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a fixed effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	216
A.9 Residual variance (kg^2/day^2) estimates for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2} when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals)	217
A.10 Additive SNP variance (kg^2/day^2) estimates for the linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted individually as a random effect for all (A) and significant (B) replicates ^{1,2}	

when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation (error bars are 95% confidence intervals).....	218
A.11 Pearson correlation between true and estimated breeding values for all replicates ¹ with linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed, random or covariate effects.....	219
A.12 Pearson correlation between true and estimated breeding values for replicates ¹ detected to have a significant genotype effect with linkage disequilibrium SNPs fitted as fixed, random or covariate effects	220

List of Tables

2.1 Theoretical D' and r^2 measures of linkage disequilibrium for two scenarios with varying allele frequencies when D is equal or half of the predicted D_{\max} value given the allele frequencies.....	8
2.2 Summary of published SNPs for the beef tenderness and estimates for the size of the additive and dominance effects	12
3.1 Description of the statistical animal and fixed effects models fitted when SNPs were class (fixed and random) and covariate effects	44
3.2 The additive (a), dominance (d) and epistatic (I) effects that contribute to the 2-locus genotype effects.....	48
4.1 Description of population structure for the four population sizes.....	55
4.2 Description of population structure for the four population sizes after five generations of random selection	57
4.3 Proportion of replicates with one, two or three direct SNP genotype classes represented after five generations of random selection for the different population sizes.....	58
4.4 Proportion of replicates with one, two or three linkage disequilibrium SNP genotype classes represented after five generations of random selection when the population contained 3 000 animals per generation	58
4.5 Summary of the nine linkage disequilibrium SNP allele and genotype frequencies (average of replicate means) in the base and last generations when there were 3,000 animals per generation	60
4.6 Theoretical and achieved power to detect genotype effects for a single direct SNP fitted as fixed (class and covariate) or random effects	64
4.7 Theoretical and achieved power to detect genotype effects for nine linkage disequilibrium SNP fitted as fixed (class and covariate) or random effects for populations with 3,000 animals per generation.....	65
4.8 Proportion of replicates significant when the direct SNP was fitted as a fixed class effect, and were significant when the SNP was fitted as fixed covariate or random effects.....	67
4.9 Proportion of replicates significant when the linkage disequilibrium SNP was fitted as a fixed class effect, and were significant when the SNP was fitted as fixed covariate or random effects for populations with 3 000 animals per generation	67
4.10 Proportion of significant replicates, that were significant for the preceding SNP when linkage disequilibrium SNPs were fitted as fixed (class and covariate) or random effects for populations with 3 000 animals per generation.....	68

4.11	Number of replicates with the required number of direct SNP genotype classes for all replicates and replicates with significant genotype effects	69
4.12	Number of replicates with the required number of linkage disequilibrium SNP genotype classes present for all replicates and replicates with a significant genotype effects for populations with 3 000 animals per generation.....	69
4.13	Estimates of the additive and dominance (kg/day) direct SNP effects when the direct SNP was fitted as a fixed class effect for all and significant only replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²).....	70
4.14	Estimates of the additive and dominance (kg/day) direct SNP effects when the direct SNP was fitted as a random effect for all and significant only replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²)	71
4.15	Estimates of the additive effects (kg/day) for the direct SNP fitted as a covariate effect for all and significant only replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²).....	72
4.16	Estimates of the additive effects (kg/day) from the heterozygote method for the direct SNP fitted as a fixed effect for all and significant replicates (standard errors in brackets ¹)	78
4.17	Estimates of the polygenic variances (kg ² /day ²) for the direct SNP ignored or fitted as a fixed, covariate or random effect. Estimates are reported for all replicates and only significant replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²)	80
4.18	Estimates of the residual variances (kg ² /day ²) for the direct SNP when ignored or fitted as a fixed, covariate or random effect. Estimates are reported for all replicates and only significant replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²)	81
4.19	Estimates of the additive SNP variance (kg ² /day ²) when the direct SNP was a random effect. Estimates are reported for all replicates and only significant replicates ¹ (standard errors in brackets ²)	82
4.20	The mean of true and estimated breeding value (kg/day) when the direct SNP was ignored and fitted as a fixed, covariate or random effect. Estimates are for all and significant replicates ^{1,2}	89
4.21	The variance of true and estimated breeding values (kg ² /day ²) when the direct SNP was ignored, fixed, covariate or random effect. Estimates are for all replicates and replicates that were detected to have significant genotype effects ^{1,2}	90
4.22	The Pearson correlation between the true and estimated breeding values ¹ when SNP was ignored, fixed, covariate or random effect. Estimates are for all replicates and replicates that were detected to have significant genotype effects ²	91
5.1	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) from animal and fixed effects models for datasets with different levels of performance information recorded (standard errors ¹ in brackets).....	100
5.2	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) from different methods of modelling genetic effects when last generation animals had both phenotype and genotype information available ¹ (standard errors ² in brackets)	101
5.3	Estimated polygenic and residual variances (kg ² /day ²) for datasets with different levels of performance information when genetic effects were modelled with an animal model (standard errors ¹ in brackets).....	102
5.4	Estimated polygenic and residual variances (kg ² /day ²) for different methods of modelling the genetic effects ¹ (standard errors ² in brackets).....	103

5.5	The mean (kg/day) and variance (kg ² /day ²) of true (TBV) and estimated (EBV) breeding values of last generation animals, when SNP was ignored or fitted in animal models with varying levels of performance information available	104
5.6	The mean (kg/day) and variance (kg ² /day ²) of true (TBV) and estimated (EBV) breeding values of last generation animals, when SNP was ignored or fitted with genetic effects modelled with animal or sire models.....	105
5.7	The Pearson correlation between the true and estimated breeding values ¹ for last generation animals when SNP was ignored or fitted in animal models with varying levels of performance information available	105
5.8	The Pearson correlation between the true and estimated breeding values ¹ for last generation animals when SNP was ignored or fitted as a fixed effect in animal and sire models.....	106
6.1	Summary of genotyping strategies considered.....	111
6.2	Description of the population structure for the different genotyping strategies when the allele frequencies were 0.5 and 0.1	114
6.3	The theoretical and achieved power to detect genotype effects for different genotyping strategies when the direct SNP was fitted as a fixed class effect in animal and fixed effect models.....	115
6.4	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) for the random genotyping strategies when the allele frequency was 0.5.....	117
6.5	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) for the random genotyping strategies when the allele frequency was 0.1.....	118
6.6	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) for the selective genotyping strategies across the population for significant replicates ¹ when the allele frequency was 0.5.....	119
6.7	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) for the selective genotyping strategies across the population for significant replicates ¹ when the allele frequency was 0.1.....	120
6.8	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg/day) for selective genotyping strategies within paternal half-sib families for significant replicates ¹ when the allele frequency was 0.5	121
7.1	The expected 2-locus genotype frequencies for independent and linked scenarios..	126
7.2	Two-locus genotype effects (kg shear force) for scenarios with and without epistatic interactions.....	127
7.3	Description of the population structure for three simulated populations	128
7.4	Description of the abbreviations for the statistical models fitted.....	129
7.5	Description of population structure for the three data sizes after five generations of random selection	130
7.6	Number of replicates with all nine 2-locus genotype classes represented in the base and last generation when SNPs were linked for three population sizes and additive and epistatic scenarios	130
7.7	Estimates of linkage disequilibrium (D) and the proportion of the linkage disequilibrium (D') in the last generation	132
7.8	The achieved power to detect genotype and epistatic effects when SNPs A and B were fitted as fixed effects.....	134

7.9 The achieved power to detect genotype and epistatic effects when SNPs A and B were fitted as random effects.....	135
7.10 Estimates of the additive effects (kg shear force) when SNPs A and B were fitted as a fixed effect for significant replicates ¹	137
7.11 Estimates of the dominance effects (kg shear force) when SNPs A and B were fitted as a fixed effect for significant replicates ¹	138
7.12 Estimates of the additive effects (kg shear force) when SNPs A and B were fitted as a random effect for significant replicates ¹	139
7.13 Estimates of the dominance effects (kg shear force) when SNPs A and B were fitted as a random effect for significant replicates ¹	140
7.14 Estimates of epistatic components (kg shear force) when SNP was fitted as a fixed effect in an epistatic (EPIA×B) model ¹	142
7.15 Estimates of epistatic components (kg shear force) when SNP was fitted as a random effect as a 2-locus genotype (SINAB) ¹	143
7.16 Estimates of epistatic components (kg shear force) when SNP was fitted as a random effect in an epistatic (EPIA×B) model ¹	144
7.17 Simulated polygenic and residual variance components (kg ² shear force) in the base generation	146
7.18 Polygenic and residual variance estimates (kg ² shear force) when SNP was ignored	148
7.19 Polygenic and residual variance estimates (kg ² shear force) from significant replicates ¹ when SNPs were fitted as fixed effects for different scenarios and population sizes	149
7.20 Estimates of the additive SNP variance components (kg ² shear force) when SNPs were fitted as a random effect for significant replicates ¹ given different populations and scenarios	151
7.21 Epistatic variance estimates (kg ² shear force) from significant replicates ¹ when SNP was fitted a random effect for the epistatic scenarios	152
7.22 The mean of true (TGM) and estimated genetic merit (kg shear force) of all last generation animals, when SNP was ignored (IGN) or fitted in the model ¹ as fixed or random effects for replicates that were detected to have significant genotype effects ^{2,3}	154
7.23 The variance of true (TGM) and estimated genetic merits (kg shear force) of all last generation animals, when SNP was ignored (IGN) or fitted in the model ¹ as fixed or random effects for replicates that were detected to have significant genotype effects ^{2,3}	155
7.24 Pearson correlation between the true and estimated genetic merits of all last generation animals, when SNP was ignored (IGN) or fitted in the model ¹ as fixed or random effects for replicates that were detected to have significant genotype effects ^{2,3}	156
8.1 Raw measures of the average peak shear force tenderness measures, carcass weight and slaughter age for the individual breeds. (Standard deviations in brackets).....	161
8.2 The number of animals per genotype class, the frequency of the favourable allele and the chi-square test statistic for both SNPs to test for deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium	164

8.3	The frequency of 2-locus genotype classes and the chi-square statistic to test for significant linkage between SNPs.....	165
8.4	The minimum detectsize of the additive effect (kg shear force) given different powers to detect genotype effects when SNPs were treated as fixed or random effects in the model and assuming no dominance and a variance of 1.0	166
8.5	Significance of genotype and epistatic effects when SNPs were fitted in an animal model as fixed or random effects	167
8.6	Genotype ^{1,2} least squares means for the shear force (kg shear force) tenderness measure for Bos taurus and Bos indicus animals when SNPs were fitted as fixed or random effects	171
8.7	Estimates of the additive and dominance SNP effects (kg shear force) for Bos taurus and Bos indicus breeds when SNPs were fitted as fixed or random effects.....	172
8.8	Estimates of the epistatic effects ¹ (kg shear force) for Bos taurus and Bos indicus animals when SNPs were fixed and random	175
8.9	The polygenic and residual variance (kg ² shear force) estimates and heritability when SNP was excluded from the model for the Bos taurus and Bos indicus breeds.....	176
8.10	Estimates of the additive SNP variance ¹ (kg ² shear force) when SNPs were fitted as fixed or random effects for the Bos taurus and Bos indicus animals.....	177
A.1	Summary of the nine linkage disequilibrium SNP allele and genotype frequencies (average of replicate means) in the base generation when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation	204
A.2	Proportion of replicates with one, two or three linkage disequilibrium SNP genotype classes represented after five generations of random selection when the population size was 1,500 or fewer animals per generation.....	204
A.3	Summary of the nine linkage disequilibrium SNP allele and genotype frequencies (average of replicate means) in the last generation when there were 1,500 or fewer animals per generation	205
A.4	Theoretical and achieved power to detect genotype effects for nine linkage disequilibrium SNP fitted as fixed (class and covariate) or random effects for populations with 1,500 or fewer animals per generation.....	208
A.5	Proportion of replicates significant when the linkage disequilibrium SNP was fitted as a fixed class effect, and were significant when the SNP was fitted as fixed covariate or random effects for populations with 1,500 or fewer animals per generation	209
A.6	Proportion of significant replicates, that were significant for the preceding SNP when linkage disequilibrium SNPs were fitted as fixed (class and covariate) or random effects for populations with 1,500 or fewer animals per generation.....	209
A.7	Number of replicates with the required number of linkage disequilibrium SNP genotype classes present for all replicates and replicates with a significant genotype effects for populations with 1,500 or fewer animals per generation.....	210