



Lazy computation of Residual Polygenic effects

A Legarra^{1,2}, S Savoia¹, G Jansen¹, M Bermann², D Lourenco²

Council on Dairy Cattle Breeding, Bowie, MD¹ University of Georgia, Athens, GA²

Interbull meeting, June 2025

Gerald



- ▶ This is maybe the last “appearance” of Gerald Jansen in an Interbull meeting
- ▶ He is enjoying retirement now...
- ▶ He worked at U Guelph, Anafi, and then as consultant for Anafi, Interbull and CDCB (probably other places too)
- ▶ LOTS of what we do in this room use Gerald’s programs or ideas
- ▶ I found great pleasure working with him, and I learnt a lot

Residual polygenic effects

- ▶ Single step methods use a blended relationship matrix

$$G^* = (1 - \alpha) \frac{ZZ'}{k} + \alpha A_{22}$$

- ▶ α (typically 5%-20%) represents “relationships in pedigree but not in markers”
- ▶ “blending” protects from overdispersion / bias
- ▶ As a result, the final GEBV is composed of
 - a fraction due to “purely genomics” (often called DGV)
 - a fraction due to “pedigree”(RPG, Residual Polygenic Effect)

RPGs in Indirect Predictions

- ▶ “Nominators” send “young animals” (no records or progeny with records) DNA readings and pedigree to National Centers like CDCB
- ▶ National Centers often send back (initially) a so-called “Indirect Prediction”
 - $IP = DGV \text{ (sum of SNP effects)} + RPG$
 - $RPG[\text{new_animal}] = 0.5 * (RPG[\text{sire}[\text{new_animal}]] + RPG[\text{dam}[\text{new_animal}]])$
 - In other words, $RPG[\text{new_animal}] = PA(RPGs)$
 - back in the pedigree, the RPGs eventually come from ssGBLUP equations
- ▶ The algebra of DGV and RPG can be found in
 - AL (that’s me) et al. notes “Bases of Genomic Prediction”
 - Vandenplas et al. Genetics Selection Evolution(2023) 55:37 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12711-023-00808-z>
(very complete and detailed)

Algorithms to get RPGs from ssGBLUP

- ▶ get RPGs = (GEBVs-DGVs) for genotyped animals in the MME

$$\hat{d}_g = \hat{u}_g - Z\hat{g}$$

- ▶ what is the RPG for a non genotyped animal [or a metafounder]?
- ▶ solve for non-genotyped animals (+metafounders) using selection index

$$\hat{d}_n = A_{n,g}A_{g,g}^{-1}\hat{d}_g$$

- ▶ or similar alternative equations. In all cases this involves big pedigrees, Colleau's algorithm, etc. Doable but tedious and may require more programming.
- ▶ Both Vandenplas et al. and Liu et al. (2024) also propose approximate expressions with good results

New idea

- ▶ see RPG \hat{d}_g of genotyped animals as “data”
- ▶ use a BLUP solver with MME as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A^{n,n}\lambda & A^{n,g}\lambda \\ A^{g,n}\lambda & A^{g,g}\lambda + I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{d}_n \\ \hat{d}_g^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{d}_g \end{pmatrix}$$

- ▶ same animals as in your ssGBLUP equations
- ▶ for $h^2 \approx 1$, $\hat{d}_g^* \approx \hat{d}_g$ and we get \hat{d}_n too!
- ▶ \hat{d}_n can be verified to be $\hat{d}_n = A_{n,g}A_{g,g}^{-1}\hat{d}_g$

Advantages

- ▶
$$\begin{pmatrix} A^{n,n} \lambda & A^{n,g} \lambda \\ A^{g,n} \lambda & A^{g,g} \lambda + I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{d}_n \\ \hat{d}_g^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{d}_g \end{pmatrix}$$
- ▶ we don't restrict the equation to genotyped + ancestors
- ▶ we get RPG for **all** animals in the ssGBLUP equations
- ▶ easy to implement from existing ssGBLUP pedigree, GEVVs, genotypes, SNP solutions

does it run?

- ▶ Example MY, FY, PY
- ▶ ~50M animals in pedigree, ~2.5M animals genotyped
- ▶ we have 2.5M RPG “records” ($\hat{d}_g = \hat{u}_g - Z\hat{g}$) and 48M animals with “no records”
- ▶ 150M equations
- ▶ PCG iteration in blup90iod3, 8 threads

does it run?

- ▶ The PCG iteration seems very robust
 - ▶ pseudo-true solution: PCG convergence $<10^{-14}$
 - ▶ Time per round: 20 seconds
 - ▶ reaching 10E-10 in 900 iterations takes 5h
- | PCG convergence | corr with pseudo-true | iteration |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| 10E-06 | 0.916 | 113 |
| 10E-07 | 0.958 | 244 |
| 10E-08 | 0.978 | 381 |
| 10E-09 | 0.995 | 655 |
| 10E-10 | 0.9995 | 898 |
| 10E-11 | 0.999988 | 1177 |
| 10E-12 | 0.999999 | 1385 |
| 10E-13 | 1 | 1549 |
| 10E-14 | 1 | 1808 |
- ▶ Across all our trait groups, rounds to reach 10E-12 went from 100 to 1500
 - ▶ Number of rounds depends on the size of the pedigree and proportion of genotyped animals in it.

Alternative new idea

- ▶ Maybe could add a general mean ?

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1'1 & 0 & 1' \\ 0 & A^{n,n}\lambda & A^{n,g}\lambda \\ 1 & A^{g,n}\lambda & A^{g,g}\lambda + I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu} \\ \hat{d}_n \\ \hat{d}_g^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1'\hat{d}_g \\ 0 \\ \hat{d}_g \end{pmatrix}$$

- ▶ If we add back $\hat{\mu}$ we obtain the same solutions
- ▶ The PCG convergence is faster yet the “real” convergence is slower

Alternative new idea: does it run?

- ▶ Compare with previous pseudo-true solution
- ▶ In fact, we need a stricter criterion to reach the pseudo-true solution
- ▶ Total time is about the same as the first idea
- ▶ Improved PCG convergence might be misleading for some models

PCG convergence	corr with pseudo-true	iteration
10E-10	0.872	31
10E-11	0.895	46
10E-12	0.9137	79
10E-13	0.950	213
10E-14	0.9947	568
10E-15	0.99918	712
10E-16	0.9996	804

Thoughts & Conclusion

- ▶ My personal experience is that approximate expressions may eventually end up biting you
- ▶ ...and that having and maintaining ONE Swiss Army knife is better than having many dedicated programs
- ▶ We think that using BLUP for RPG effects is a good option to get all RPGs, without much extra cost in time or programming
- ▶ relaxed convergence criterion of 10^{-10} is probably enough

Acknowledgments

- ▶ Participating **dairy producers** for supplying data
- ▶ **DHI** organizations and **DRPCs** for processing and relaying the information to the Council on Dairy Cattle Breeding (CDCB)
- ▶ **Purebred breed associations** for providing pedigree data
- ▶ Mention of trade names or commercial products is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply recommendation or endorsement by CDCB
- ▶ CDCB is an equal opportunity provider and employer



Holstein in Oderitz, Navarre (my picture)



COUNCIL ON DAIRY CATTLE BREEDING

Thoughts & Conclusion

- ▶ My personal experience is that approximate expressions may eventually end up biting you
- ▶ ...and that having and maintaining ONE Swiss Army knife is better than having many dedicated programs
- ▶ We think that using BLUP for RPG effects is a good option to get all RPGs, without much extra cost in time or programming
- ▶ relaxed convergence criterion of 10^{-10} is probably enough