



Crossing Phenotype Heritability and Candidate Gene Expression in Grafted Black-Lipped Pearl Oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*, an Animal Chimera

Carole Blay, Serge Planes, Chin-Long Ky

► To cite this version:

Carole Blay, Serge Planes, Chin-Long Ky. Crossing Phenotype Heritability and Candidate Gene Expression in Grafted Black-Lipped Pearl Oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*, an Animal Chimera. *Journal of Heredity*, 2018, 109 (5), pp.510-519. 10.1093/jhered/esy015 . hal-04106653

HAL Id: hal-04106653

<https://hal.science/hal-04106653>

Submitted on 15 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Crossing Phenotype Heritability and Candidate Gene Expression in Grafted Black-Lipped Pearl Oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*, an Animal Chimera

Carole Blay ^{1,2}, Serge Planes ², and Chin-Long Ky ¹

¹ Ifremer, UMR EIO 241, Labex Corail, Centre du Pacifique, BP49, 98719 Taravao, Tahiti, Polynésie Française

² PSL Research University: EPHE-UPVD-CNRS, USR 3278 CRIOBE, Labex Corail, Université de Perpignan, 52 Avenue Paul Alduy, 66860 Perpignan Cedex, France

Address correspondence to Chin-Long Ky at the address above, or e-mail: chinky@ifremer.fr.

Abstract

Grafting mantle tissue of a donor pearl oyster into the gonad of a recipient oyster results in the formation of a chimera, the pearl sac. The phenotypic variations of this chimera are hypothesized to be the result of interactions between the donor and recipient genomes. In this study, the heritability of phenotypic variation and its association with gene expression were investigated for the first time during *Pinctada margaritifera* pearl production. Genetic variance was evaluated at different levels, 1) before the graft operation (expression in graft tissue), 2) after grafting (pearl sac tissue expression in chimera), and 3) on the product of the graft (pearl phenotype traits) based on controlled biparental crosses and the F1 generation. Donor-related genetic parameter estimates clearly demonstrate heritability for nacre weight and thickness, darkness and color, and surface defects and grade, which signifies a genetic basis in the donor oyster. In graft relative gene expression, the value of heritability was superior to 0.20 in for almost all genes; whereas in pearl sac, heritability estimates were low ($h^2 < 0.10$; except for *CALC1* and *Aspein*). Pearl sac expression seems to be more influenced by residual variance than the graft, which can be explained by environmental effects that influence pearls sac gene expression and act as a recipient additive genetic component. The interactions between donor and recipient are very complex, and further research is required to understand the role of the recipient oysters on pearl phenotypic and gene expression variances.

Subject areas: Quantitative genetics and Mendelian inheritance, Molecular adaptation and selection

Keywords: gene expression, heritability, pearl oyster, phenotype, *Pinctada margaritifera*

Quantitative genetics is a powerful framework to explore the complex genetic architecture of phenotypic traits (Kruuk and Hadfield 2007). The fraction of the phenotypic variability that is of trans-phenotypic variation is genetically rather than environmentallymittable genetic origin is called heritability (Falconer and Mackay 1996; Falconer 1989). Broad-sense heritability (H^2) estimates the proportion of phenotypic variation due to all genetic effects, whereas narrow-sense heritability (h^2) estimates the proportion of phenotypic variation due to heritable genetic variation alone (Visscher et al. 2008). Recent reports of substantial heritability for gene expression and new estimation methods using marker data highlight the relevance of investigating heritability in the genomics era. At the transcriptome level, gene expression profiling has become a popular technique used to quantify regulatory changes in messenger (m)RNA expression. Indeed, gene expression acts as an intermediate phenotype between genotypes and complex traits (Nica and Dermitzakis 2008; Li et al. 2012; Goldinger et al. 2013). To investigate heritability, the expression profile of a gene in a segregating population can be treated as a quantitative trait, and its additive genetic variance estimated (Visscher et al. 2008; Powell et al. 2013; Wright et al. 2014; McCairns et al. 2016). Genetic variation underlying gene expression levels has been well established and reported in the literature, with the transcript levels for the majority of genes being heritable to some degree (Price et al. 2011; Grundberg et al. 2012; Powell et al. 2012), but inconsistency in heritability principles raises questions about the transmission process.

Heritability is of great relevance for breeding strategy as it measures the potential response to selection (Falconer 1989; Lynch and Walsh 1998; Mousseau 1998). In cultivated populations, the selection procedure chosen needs to be the best adapted to the breeding plan, allowing assessment of genetic parameters in few generations based on a small effective population. In the context of cultured pearl production by the *Pinctada* genus, the complexity of the graft leading to a chimera type complex makes it more complicated to understand the heritability of any phenotypes or candidate gene expression. In the plant kingdom, the heritability of graft-induced phenotypic changes suggests that regulatory processes underlying the scion–rootstock communication also involve a genetic component (Tsaballa et al. 2013). Some studies have demonstrated the exchange of genetic material between cells in grafted plants (Stegemann and Bock 2009). Recently, increasing effort has been made to determine how macromolecules are transferred between scions and rootstocks in grafted plants to reveal the mechanism that controls graft-induced changes in plant traits (Paultre et al. 2016). Grafting is characterized by tight connections between cells with different genomes, providing the possibility of interactions or cell communication between genetically divergent cells, resulting in a profound perturbation of the cellular environment (Cao et al. 2016). Chimeras provide one of the most interesting environments to investigate the transmission of genetic material and the resulting phenotypic variation. Thus, the phenotypic variations of the chimera are hypothesized to be the result of interactions between the different genomes.

In the case of pearl bivalve aquaculture based on a grafting operation, previous genetic studies have primarily focused on determining genetic parameters for shell growth, aiming to detect any significant genetic variation for shell growth in the pearl mussel *Hyriopsis cumingi* (Jin 2012) and in the pearl oysters *Pinctada fucata martensii* (He et al. 2008; Wang et al. 2010) and *P. maxima* (Kvingedal et al. 2010). For *Pinctada margaritifera*, genetic analyses based on heritability estimations are still lacking for both quantitative pearl traits and expression levels of some biomineralization genes. A study was made on *P. maxima*, with the estimation of the genetic parameters (heritability and genetic correlations) of commercially important pearl traits (Jerry et al. 2012). The production of cultured pearls is both unique and biologically complex in comparison with any other aquaculture industry. *P. margaritifera* produces valuable pearls as a result of the biomineralization process of a mantle graft originating from a donor oyster, inserted together with a nucleus, into the gonad of a recipient oyster (Southgate 2011). The grafting process therefore associates 2 distinct genotypes, each of which maintains its own genetic identity throughout the life of the grafted organism (the recipient) but which survive together as a genetic chimera due to a unique symbiotic relationship (Mudge et al. 2009). Exploring the heritability of candidate gene expression in the graft tissue (donor) and pearl sac (chimera) and the heritability of pearl phenotypic traits (product of the chimera) is vital to understand the phenotypic variations induced by the grafting process and the recipient environment.

This original study aimed to evaluate *P. margaritifera* genetic variance for both pearl traits and biomineralization gene expression levels, based on a multicross design that made it possible to consider parental and segregating progeny contributions at 3 material levels: 1) the mantle graft tissue gene expression, 2) the pearl sac tissue (chimera) gene expression, and 3) the final product at harvest, the pearl phenotypes. Most previous studies have estimated the genetic contribution to phenotypic traits and, more recently, examined relative gene expression, but they have rarely crossed the traits and the gene expression in the same analysis. In the present study, heritability will then be estimated from parents to progenies within different biparental crosses, making it possible to evaluate character transfer in a 2-generation framework. The representative panel of genes encoding proteins involved in the biomineralization process that we screened in the graft and pearl sac were 1) aragonite: *Pif-177*, *MSI60*, and *Perline*; 2) calcite (*Aspein*, *Shematin*, and *Prismalin*); and 3) for proteins implicated in both layers, *Nacrein* (Joubert et al. 2010; Marie et al. 2012; Xiang et al. 2013).

Materials and Methods

Experimental Design

Nine biparental *P. margaritifera* families (named A1, B2, D2, F5, G6, H6, H7, I6, and I7) were produced in the Ifremer hatchery system facilities in Vairao, Tahiti, French Polynesia, using female and male broodstock from Mangareva Island (Gambier Archipelago, French Polynesia). Spawning was induced by thermal shock (Ky et al. 2015a). Nine families were produced in 2 distinct periods (i.e., 2 separate controlled breedings, #1 and #2), 5 families (A1, B2, D2, and F5) using 4 females and 3 males (in March 2013), and 4 families (G6, H6, H7, I6, and I7) using 3 females and 2 males (in August 2013). Figure 1 illustrates the breeding design, showing that individuals 2, 6, and 7 (males) and H and I (females) were used in multiple combinations. Artificial breeding, larval rearing, and oyster culture procedures were conducted using the protocol developed by Ky et al. (2013).

Individuals of the 9 families that would be used as donor oysters were randomly selected and transferred by air to Mangareva Island (Gambier Archipelago), allowing the oysters to be cultured in natural environmental conditions. Two months prior to nucleus implantation, oysters from the 9 progenies were taken from the rearing station and stored ready for use in the grafting procedure.

Grafting Procedure

As the grafting operation itself may influence cultured pearl quality, all grafts were performed under standard production conditions by a single expert at the Regahiga Pearl Farm using a single nucleus size of 1.8 BU (5.45-mm diameter; Imai Seikaku Co Ltd, Japan). All recipient pearl oysters were obtained by natural spat collection from the wild in the Mangareva lagoon. They were selected based on visible health status (color of the visceral mass and gills), shell size appearance, and muscle resistance when prising the shells slightly open.

A total of 4 different experimental grafts were performed: 2 using the parents of the 2 breeding designs (1 per breeding) and 2 others using the progenies (1 per breeding). For breeding #1, all the 5 parents were used as donors, covering a total of 229 grafts, with for A ($n = 28$ grafts), B ($n = 36$), D ($n = 37$), F ($n = 29$), 1 ($n = 23$), 2 ($n = 36$), 5 ($n = 40$). For breeding #2, 200 grafts were produced with a standard 40 grafts per parent. Concerning the progenies, 20 donors per families were used, with donors providing 1260 grafts for breeding #1 and 2000 grafts for the breeding #2. At 45 days post grafting, recipient oysters were checked to estimate nucleus retention and oyster mortality rates as described in Ky et al. (2014). After this check, recipient oysters that had retained their nuclei were drilled and fixed to chaplets for long-term culture, and each chaplet was labeled according to the corresponding donor oyster for traceability.

Pearl Quality Variables

After 18 months of culture in Regahiga lagoon, the cultured pearls were harvested and placed separately in compartmented boxes that allowed traceability between the pearls and corresponding donor oyster family. Once harvested, cultured pearls were cleaned, and 5 variables were measured to characterize their quality (Figure 2):

- The size of the cultured pearls was assessed by measuring nacre thickness and weight.
- Cultured pearl shape was characterized in 2 ways: the presence/ absence of circle(s) and the shape category (“b” for baroque and semi baroque, “o” for oval and drop, “r” for round and semiround pearls).
- The color of the pearls was evaluated on the basis of the darkness of their color and their visually perceived color category, which is conferred by pigments (body color: gray, white, and yellow) and secondary colors (overtone: green, aubergine, and peacock).
- The cultured pearl grade was determined for each sample according to the official A–D Tahitian classification (Journal Officiel 2001 n° 30, 26 July 2001) from the most to least valuable quality: A, B, C, D, and Rejects (*rebuts*).
- The surface defects and luster (components of cultured pearl grade) were determined separately so that they could be analyzed independently.

Quality traits were evaluated as described in Ky et al. (2013). To ensure homogeneity in parameter assessment, all evaluations were made visually (without a jeweler’s loupe) by 2 operators working together and cross-checking.

Gene Expression Variables

The formation of the molluscan shell nacre is regulated to a large extent by a matrix of extracellular macromolecules that are secreted by the shell-forming tissue and the mantle (Ellis and Haws 1999). Recently, the number of genes identified as coding for molluscan shell matrix components has increased (Miyamoto et al. 2005; Suzuki et al. 2009; Joubert et al. 2010; Montagnani et al. 2011; Marie et al. 2012; Huang et al. 2013; Miyamoto et al. 2013; Shi et al. 2013; Suzuki and Nagasawa 2013). In order to identify variability in gene expression in the graft process, we sampled 3 to 5 grafts per donor during the graft operation and pearl sacs during harvest (preserved in RNeasy lysis buffer and stored at –80 °C for subsequent RNA extraction). In order to minimize the mixture of recipient tissues, the pearl sacs were excised from host oysters by removing the outer layers with a surgical blade until a thin (<0.5 mm) layer tissue surrounding the pearls remained and immediately transferred and preserved into 2.0-ml tubes with RNeasy lysis buffer. We then evaluated relative gene expression by screening aragonite-related genes (*Pif-177*, *MSI60*, and *Perline*), calciterelated genes (*Aspein*, *Shematrin5*, *Shematrin9*, and *Prismalin*), and one gene implicated in both layers (*Nacrein*) (Blay et al. 2017) (Table 1). Total cellular RNA was extracted from the initial graft tissues and harvested pearl sacs (final graft stage) using TRIzol reagent (Life Technologies) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. For each sample, 3 µg of total RNA were treated with DNase using a DNA-free Kit (Ambion). For each sample, 0.5 µg of total RNA were reverse transcribed using a Transcriptor First Strand cDNA Kit (Roche) and amplified by real-time PCR on a Roche Light Cycler® 480 using a set of forward and reverse primers (Blay et al. 2017). Two other genes were used as “housekeeping genes”: *REF1* (Joubert et al. 2014) and *GAPDH* (Lemer et al. 2015). The amplification reaction details are provided in Blay et al. 2017. All measurements were performed on duplicate samples, and all analyses were based on the Ct values of the PCR products. Relative gene expression was calculated using 2 reference genes *GAPDH* and *REF1*, by the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method (Livak and Schmittgen 2001), as follows: Relative expression (target gene, sample x) = $2^{-(\Delta Ct \text{ sample, sample x} - \Delta Ct \text{ calibrator, sample x})} = 2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$. Here, the ΔCt calibrator is the mean of the ΔCt values obtained for the tested gene. The delta threshold cycle (ΔCt) is calculated by the difference in Ct for the target and reference genes. The relative stability of the *GAPDH* and *REF1* combination was confirmed using NormFinder (stability value for best combination; Andersen et al. 2004).

Statistics

The normality of data distribution and homogeneity of variances were tested for pearl size and graft and pearl sac relative gene expression data using the Shapiro–Wilk test and Bartlett’s test. When necessary, transformations were used to adjust data to this distribution (logarithm or square root).

We first evaluated the “family effect” on culture pearl trait and gene expression among the progenies of the controlled breeding ([Table 2](#)). An Anova was performed to test for “family effect” on cultured pearl weight, thickness, and gene expression in the graft among the progenies. To test for “family effect” on pearl sac gene expression, Anova was performed on progenies of breeding #1 only (pearl sacs from breeding #2 were not harvested). If the overall test was significant, a Dunn procedure, including Bonferroni correction for multiple tests, was performed among all pairs of families. Qualitative classes based on cultured pearl surface defects, luster, grade, darkness, and circles were re-encoded to give quantitative scores that would enable the mean value of progenies to be obtained for each criterion, thus allowing them to be ranked. For each criterion, Kruskal–Wallis tests were then applied to compare the progenies. For the cultured pearl color and shape categories, differences and family effects were evaluated using χ^2 tests ([Ky et al. 2013](#)).

Quantitative genetic parameters and variance components were estimated using an animal model ([Kruuk 2004](#)) based on the donor oyster family relationships. The analyses were implemented in R© software using the Markov chain Monte Carlo for generalized linear mixed models (MCMCglmm) package ([Hadfield 2010](#)). We considered the phenotype y_i of the individual i as a variation around the average population phenotype μ as a function of the pedigree of the individual and other factors. The model was as follows:

$$y_i = \mu + a_i + e_i$$

In this equation, μ stands for the average population phenotype, a_i is called the breeding value and accounts for the influence of the additive effect on the phenotype, and e_i is a residual accounting for the variation not captured by the phenotype. Host genetic variation was considered as a common environmental effect. “Animal” was included as a random effect. The heritability (h^2) was estimated as the ratio of the additive genetic variance to total phenotypic variance.

$$h^2 = \sigma_a / \sigma_p = \sigma_a / (\sigma_a + \sigma_f + \sigma_r)$$

Where σ_a is an estimate of the additive variance, σ_f is an estimate of random variance, and σ_r is an estimate of the residual variance. When summed, these 3 components add up to the total phenotypic variance σ_p .

In all cases, the differences were considered statistically significant when P values were lower than 0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using R© software (version 3.2.1).

Results

Cultured pearl quality traits were recorded and analyzed on a total of 2241 samples, resulting from grafts made using tissue from the parental and progeny generations. Variations in pearl quality traits and both graft and pearl sac relative gene expressions are given in [Supplementary Tables S1–S4](#), supporting information. Results are presented in 3 sections below corresponding to 1) family and cohort effects on pearl quality and gene expression, 2) heritability of cultured pearls traits, and 3) heritability of gene expression levels.

Family Effect on Pearl Quality Traits and Gene Expression

The average nacre thickness among the 2241 harvested pearls was 0.11 cm, with minimum and maximum values of 0.01 and 0.37 cm, respectively. The average nacre weight was 0.62 ± 0.29 g, with minimum and maximum values of 0.05 and 3.35 g, respectively. The nacre weight and thickness for each family and parent are given in [Supplementary Table](#)

S1, supporting information. Very highly significant “family effects” were demonstrated for the nacre thickness and weight ($P < 0.0001$) (Table 2). The cultured pearl quality traits are described in Supplementary Table S2, supporting information. Overall, analyses comparing differences in pearl quality indicators among the 9 families showed a significant “family effect” for all traits except luster (Table 2).

Analyses comparing differences in relative gene expression of the graft from the 9 families showed a highly significant “family effect,” with the main differences between the 9 families (Table 2). This effect was the least significant for relative expression of the *Pif-177* gene ($P = 0.01$). Relative gene expressions in the graft among the 8 genes are given in Supplementary Table S3, supporting information. All differences between the 9 families for each gene are shown in Supplementary Figure S1, supporting information.

The comparison of the relative expression of the 8 genes in the pearl sac showed a significant “family effect” for 4 genes *Aspein* ($P = 0.01$), *MSI60* ($P = 0.01$), *Shematrin9* ($P = 0.01$), and *Nacrein* ($P = 0.04$) (Table 2). Pearl sac relative gene expressions are given in Supplementary Table S4, supporting information. All differences between the families for each gene in pearl sac are shown in Supplementary Figure S2, supporting information.

The high variability across samples for the gene expression data could be explained by the correlation between the gene expressions with the pearl’s surface quality (Blay et al. 2017). Moreover, in *P. margaritifera*, we have a lot of variability in pearl culture quality at the time of harvest, with surface defects, surface deposits, and grade classification, which could justify the range of standard deviation observed.

Heritability of Cultured Pearl Traits

Heritability estimates for donor-derived pearl quality traits are given in Table 3. A moderate-to-low heritability was found for darkness ($h^2 = 0.37$; 95% CI [0.30, 0.44]), nacre weight ($h^2 = 0.34$; 95% CI [0.27, 0.41]), nacre thickness ($h^2 = 0.29$; 95% CI [0.22, 0.36]), surface defects ($h^2 = 0.21$; 95% CI [0.15, 0.28]), grade ($h^2 = 0.19$; 95% CI [0.11, 0.25]), color ($h^2 = 0.16$; 95% CI [0.11, 0.23]), and luster ($h^2 = 0.12$; 95% CI [0.06, 0.18]). For these heritable expression traits, the genetic variance component explained between 12% and 37% of the total variance. However, pearl shape and presence/absence of circle(s) showed low heritability values ($h^2 = 0.02$; 95% CI [0.00, 0.06] and $h^2 = 0.05$; 95% CI [0.01, 0.10], respectively) attributable to the donor.

Heritability of Relative Gene Expression Levels

Heritability estimates for donor-derived relative gene expression in the graft are given in Table 3. With the exception of *Pif-177* transcript levels, which showed only a low heritability, *MSI60* ($h^2 = 0.42$; 95% CI [0.24, 0.63]), *Perline* ($h^2 = 0.47$; 95% CI [0.22, 0.72]), *Nacrein* ($h^2 = 0.37$; 95% CI [0.22, 0.54]), *Aspein* ($h^2 = 0.33$; 95% CI [0.14, 0.51]), *Prismalin* ($h^2 = 0.44$; 95% CI [0.27, 0.6]), *Shematrin5* ($h^2 = 0.35$; 95% CI [0.21, 0.52]), and *Shematrin9* ($h^2 = 0.25$; 95% CI [0.11, 0.41]) showed moderate-to-high heritability.

Regarding relative gene expression in the pearl sac, heritabilities are given in Table 3. Except *Aspein*, which showed a high heritability ($h^2 = 0.41$; 95% CI [5E-5, 0.77]), and *Nacrein*, which showed a moderate heritability ($h^2 = 0.25$; 95% CI [5E-5, 0.67]), expression levels of all other genes had low heritabilities ($h^2 < 0.10$).

Discussion

The present approach in a complex animal graft model evaluates the genetic parameters of relative gene expression of the graft tissue (at grafting time), the pearl sac tissue (at harvest), together with the pearl quality trait phenotypes (i.e., the product of the grafting procedure). We report for the first time in *P. margaritifera* the variation together in the phenotype and in the transcription response (i.e., gene expression).

Gene Expression Heritability

It is well known that traits under genetic control are likely to demonstrate higher heritability values than those whose variability is highly influenced by the environment (Fisher 1930; Falconer and Mackay 1996; Lynch and Walsh 1998). The data of the present study indicate that the parental effects on gene expression level are much stronger in the mantle graft, than in the pearl sac. From our study, the value of heritability was moderate-to-high ($h^2 > 0.20$) in graft relative gene expression for almost all genes (only *Pif-177* showed a low heritability; $h^2 = 0.11$), whereas heritability values were low for expression in the pearl sac ($h^2 < 0.10$); except for *Nacrein* ($h^2 = 0.25$) and *Aspein* ($h^2 = 0.41$). The pearl sac therefore seems to be more influenced by residual variance than the mantle graft provided by the donor oyster. The residual variance can mainly be explained by environmental effects that influence pearl sac gene expression and act as a recipient additive genetic component. Unfortunately, we were unable to estimate recipient oyster-derived genetic parameters for relative gene expression because recipient oysters were obtained from natural spat collection in which we could not control the natural variance. Previous studies observed a significant correlation between recipient shell size and harvested pearl size in *P. fucata martensii* (Wada and Komaru 1996) and in *P. margaritifera* (Blay et al. 2017; Ky et al. 2017). So, pearl size is likely to have a recipient additive genetic component. The low heritability levels of gene expression in pearl sac corroborate a recipient additive genetic component and suggest that the deposition of nacre on the pearl may be dependent on the capacity of the recipient oyster to gather energy and allocate it to cellular growth and nacre deposition processes (Wada and Jerry 2008; Le Pabic et al. 2016). Moreover, this low heritability could be induced by grafting, particularly by the recipient cellular environment. A recent histological examination and chronological description of pearl sac development in *P. margaritifera* (Kishore and Southgate 2016) showed that complete attachment of the mantle graft tissue to the host tissues had taken place by 14 days after grafting. The newly developed pearl sac could barely be distinguished as foreign tissue present in host oysters at this stage. In fact, the pearl sac had attained the visible characteristics of the host tissue and could not be differentiated as foreign tissue by 18 days after grafting. In the plant kingdom, grafting is characterized by a tight connection between cells, providing the possibility of interactions or cell communication between different cell lineages and resulting in a profound perturbation of the cellular environment (Cao et al. 2016). Grafting involves contact between heterologous cells at the stock and scion junction. It has been previously shown that cells of the scion and stock individuals become linked to each other and that genetic material (macromolecules including DNAs, RNAs, and protein) can be transported between them (Jackson 2001; Li et al. 2013; Cao et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2017). Recently, several studies have reported that endogenous small RNAs can be transmitted in chimeras during grafting and induce epigenetic modifications such as DNA methylation and RNA silencing, without changing the DNA sequence (Haque et al. 2007; Molnar et al. 2010; Wu et al. 2010; Li et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2017). Interactions between scions and rootstocks are complex, but they mutually affect the graft zone, and research has increasingly attempted to uncover the processes involved in these interactions (Wang et al. 2017). In the present animal model, detailed mechanisms enabling intercellular molecular transport need further research in order to confirm or refute their likeness with plant kingdom chimera and propose mechanisms that could help us to understand how this environment could moderate heritability in pearl sac gene expression.

Moreover, the present heritability values based on pedigree assignment explained only a minority of the expected heritable fraction. Although the majority of transcripts appear to have genetic variation for expression in the graft, less than 50% of the total phenotypic variation is typically explained by additive effect. Other nonadditive genetic effects contribute significantly to transcriptional variation. This variance is known as “missing heritability,” and its underlying factors and mechanisms are not precisely established (Trerotola et al. 2015). Gene expression heterogeneity can be influenced by cell-cycle position, stochastic expression, or epigenetic effects (Parts et al. 2014). In recent decades, some studies clarify that nongenetic sources of heritable phenotypes play a role in phenotypic variations (Jablonka and Lamb 2008; Danchin et al. 2011; Laland et al. 2014). In particular, epigenetic modifications (defined as heritable changes in chromatin structure and DNA methylation) impact gene expression (Migicovsky and Kovalchuk 2011) without affecting the underlying genomic sequences (Gibney et al. 2010; Trerotola et al. 2015). Epistatic components need to be integrated by estimating the contribution of nongenetic factors (Koch 2014). In the present study, further work needs to be done

on epistatic variance. Furthermore, genetic regulation does not only happen at the transcription level; further investigation on the expression of matrix protein in the pearl sac at the protein level should be made.

Relationship Between Pearl Phenotype and Gene Expression

Gene expression levels constitute an intermediate step toward final phenotype expression ([Hubner et al. 2005](#); [Emilsson et al. 2008](#); [Chakravarti et al. 2013](#); [Parts et al. 2014](#)). Some studies have combined genetic data and genome-wide gene expression analysis to try to understand the genetic basis of gene expression ([Brem et al. 2002](#); [Cheung et al. 2003](#); [Schadt et al. 2003](#)). In such studies, mRNA levels are considered as a phenotypic value, which is subjected to variation (as every phenotype) due to experimental, environmental, and/or genetic sources. These variations and associated heritability could thus be estimated. It was first demonstrated that, within populations, statistically significant estimates of heritability were found for gene expression in a much larger proportion of genes than would be expected by chance ([Cheung et al. 2003](#); [Schadt et al. 2003](#)). Such evidence of heritability for gene expression is important because statistical power to detect gene variants that affect gene expression depends on heritability ([Visscher et al. 2008](#)). In the present study, it was not possible to combine genetic data and genome-wide gene expression analysis, but it was possible to combine data on gene expression in the pearl sac with phenotype traits to show the relationship between the final pearl phenotype and gene expression level.

Nacrein and *Aspein* were the only transcripts in the pearl sac for which the heritability estimates are rather high or moderate. Shell matrix proteins play a key role in the shell biomineralization process. Some genes encoding the proteins of the calcified matrix have been identified and are known to be specifically involved in the formation of the nacreous layer and/or prismatic layer, playing a role in crystal nucleation, orientation, polymorph, and morphology during deposition of the 2 shell layers ([Joubert et al. 2010](#); [Montagnani et al. 2011](#); [Marie et al. 2012](#)). *Aspein* is thought to play a key role in calcite precipitation ([Takeuchi et al. 2008](#); [Isowa et al. 2012](#)). In contrast, *Nacrein*, which is found in both the nacreous and prismatic layers of the shell, exhibits carbonic anhydrase activity and probably functions as a supplier of bicarbonate ions and a regulator of calcium carbonate crystal formation ([Liu et al. 2012](#); [Miyamoto et al. 2013](#); [Suzuki and Nagasawa 2013](#)). In previous studies, we found a significant correlation between relative gene expression of *Aspein* in the pearl sac with the component of quality traits (surface defects, luster, and grade) and with color. Furthermore, a significant correlation was found between *Nacrein* relative gene expression with color of the pearl (and no significant correlation in graft tissue; [Blay et al. 2017](#)). These 2 candidates seem to be involved in pearl quality and color phenotypes. However, further work is still required to refine our understanding of the exact role of *Aspein* and *Nacrein* in the pearl phenotype because our studies revealed high levels of additive expression in pearl sac, thus providing evidence for a genetic basis for this variation, which could be used in breeding programs.

Final Phenotype

Heritability allows a comparison of the relative importance of genetics and environment in the variation of traits within and across populations and is a proxy parameter for predicting the response to selection ([Visscher et al. 2008](#)). Whatever the mechanism implied in pearl formation, the most important is the final pearl phenotype and its heritability. Our results clearly demonstrate heritability for nacre weight and thickness, darkness and color, surface defects and grade, signifying an important donor oyster effects with a genetic basis, whereas shape and presence/absence of circle(s) with low heritability were not strongly heritable or attributable to the donor. In fact, pearl shape is known to be mostly influenced by environmental factors ([Ky et al. 2015b](#)). This study confirms the significant genetic role that the implanted mantle graft plays in the biomineralization process of cultured pearls ([Arnaud-Haond 2007](#); [McGinty et al. 2010](#); [Blay et al. 2017](#)). When heritability is high, the corresponding trait could be improved by selecting donor oysters with high genetic merit. Sufficient additive genetic variance in a selected trait is a prerequisite for selective breeding, and good breeding efficiency is possible when levels are high ([Gjedrem and Baranski 2010](#)). From an applied point of view, this has major implications for any genetic selection strategies and for the black pearl industry in French Polynesia. Variation in additive and nonadditive genetic factors and environmental variance are population specific, meaning that heritability

depends on the population. Therefore, the heritability in one population cannot be used to predict the heritability in another population for the same trait, although in practice heritabilities of similar traits are often similar across populations in the same or different species (Visscher et al. 2008). Therefore, selection programs aimed at improving traits such as pearl size, color, darkness, surface defects, and grade should be achievable through targeted donor oyster selection, whereas further work is required to understand the role of the recipient oysters on pearl phenotypic variance and gene expression variance.

Conclusion

The current study showed, for the first time, an additive genetic component attributable to donor oysters for gene expression in graft tissue and, to a lesser extent, in the pearl sac and for harvested pearl phenotype (excluding pearl shape and circle). The interactions between donor and recipient are very complex, and research has increasingly attempted to uncover the processes involved in these interactions and the resulting graft-induced phenotypic changes, for example, by studying molecular mechanisms and endogenous factors. Moreover, establishing a direct link between pearl phenotype and candidate gene expression remains an important next step if we are to understand its role in *P. margaritifera* selection potential in a breeding program. This study provided a good understanding of heritability estimates for pearl phenotypes and gene expression in this chimera model.

Funding

“Direction des Ressources Marines et Minières,” through the TripaGEN project (2016–2019). C.B. was joint funded by an Ifremer PhD grant, the “Direction des Ressources Marines et Minières,” and CRIOBE EPHE.

Acknowledgments

The authors would especially like to thank 1) the technical support for production and rearing of the families, managed by M. Sham-Koua, and 2) the SCA Regahiga Pearl farm (Mangareva island, Gambier Archipelago, French Polynesia), managed by D. Devaux and S. Nakasai, for their generous help with the grafting experiment and associated technical support throughout the culture period. The authors are indebted to S. Parrad, for her helpful assistance with the molecular work in the laboratory (RT-PCR).

Data Availability

In accordance with the *Journal of Heredity* data archiving policy, we have deposited the primary data underlying these analyses as follows:

- Cultured pearl quality traits for each individual: Dryad ([10.5061/ dryad.4gr1303](https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.4gr1303))
- Gene expression levels for each individual: Dryad ([10.5061/ dryad.4gr1303](https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.4gr1303))




Figure 1. *Pinctada margaritifera* crossbreeding design for the production of the 9 half-sib families used as graft donors. Females and males were named with letters and numbers, respectively

a) circle



b) baroque



c) drop



d) round



e) surface defects



f) non lustre



g) rebut



Figure 2. *P. margaritifera* cultured pearls from different colors, showing the main quality traits variables. Shapes and A grade pearls were illustrated in (a), (b), (c), and (d), with respective circle, baroque, drop, and round samples. Pictures (e), (f), and (g) represented respectively pearls with numerous surface defects, pearls without luster, and rebut pearls.

Table 1 Set of forward and reverse primers used for the biomineralization gene expression analysis in *Pinctada margaritifera*

Gene name	Function	NCBI accession numbers	Forward primer (5'–3')	Reverse primer (5'–3')
<i>Pif-177</i>	Aragonite formation	HE610401	AGATTGAGGGCATAGCATGG	TGAGGCCGACTTTCTTGG
<i>MSI60</i>	Aragonite formation	No accession number but described by Marie et al. 2012	TCAAGAGCAATGGTGCTAGG	GCAGAGCCCTTCAATAGACC
<i>Perline</i>	Aragonite formation	DQ665305	TACCGGCTGTGTGCTACTG	CACAGGGTGTAATATCTGGAACC
<i>Aspein</i>	Calcite formation	No accession number but described by Marie et al. 2012	TGGAGGTGGAGGTATCGTTC	ACACCTGATACCCTGCTTGG
<i>Prismalin</i>	Calcite formation	HE610393	CCGATACTTCCCTATCTACAATCG	CCTCCATAACCGAAAATTGG
<i>Shematrins</i>	Calcite formation	HE610376	GTCCGAAACCAAATCGTCTG	CTGTGGTGATGGTGACTTCG
<i>Nacrein</i>	Aragonite and calcite formation	HQ896199	CTCCATGCACAGACATGACC	GCCAGTAATACGGACCTTGG
<i>Shematrins9</i>	Calcite formation	No accession number but described by Marie et al. 2012	TGGTGCGTAAGTACAGGTG	GGAAACTAAGGCACGTCCAC

Table 2 Significance of the fixed family effect on pearl quality traits and gene expression in *P. margaritifera* progenies

Pearl traits (<i>n</i> = 1918)	Nacre weight	Nacre thickness	Circle	Shape	Surface defect(s)	Luster	Grade	Darkness	Color
	***	***	**	*	***	ns	***	*	**
Graft (<i>n</i> = 164)	<i>Pif-177</i>	<i>MSI60</i>	<i>Perline</i>	<i>Nacrein</i>	<i>Aspein</i>	<i>Shematin9</i>	<i>Prismalin</i>	<i>Shematin5</i>	
	**	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	
Pearl sac (<i>n</i> = 73)	<i>Pif-177</i>	<i>MSI60</i>	<i>Perline</i>	<i>Nacrein</i>	<i>Aspein</i>	<i>Shematin9</i>	<i>Prismalin</i>	<i>Shematin5</i>	
	ns	*	ns	*	*	*	ns	ns	

1918 harvested pearls were examined for 9 pearl quality traits, and 8 genes coding for proteins potentially involved in the construction of the nacreous layer (*Pif-177*, *MSI60*, and *Perline*), the prismatic layer (*Aspein*, *Shematin9*, *Prismalin*, and *Shematin5*), and both the prismatic and the nacreous layers (*Nacrein*) were studied in 164 graft tissue pieces and 73 pearl sacs

****P* < 0.0001; ***P* < 0.01; **P* < 0.05; ns = not significant.

Table 3 Heritability (and CI 95%) for 1) pearl quality traits in *P. margaritifera* (N=2241) ; 2) mantle graft tissue relative gene expression levels (N=176) ; and 3) pearl sac tissue relative gene expression level (N=80)

1) Pearl quality traits	Nacre weight	Nacre thickness	Circle	Shape	Surface defect(s)	Luster	Grade	Color	Darkness
h^2	0.34	0.29	0.03	0.06	0.21	0.12	0.19	0.16	0.37
CI 95%	(0.27, 0.41)	(0.22, 0.36)	(0.01, 0.10)	(1E-3, 0.06)	(0.15, 0.28)	(0.06, 0.18)	(0.11, 0.25)	(0.11, 0.23)	(0.30, 0.44)
2) Graft tissue relative gene expression	<i>Pif-177</i>	<i>MSI60</i>	<i>Perline</i>	<i>Nacrein</i>	<i>Aspein</i>	<i>Shematin9</i>	<i>Prismalin</i>	<i>Shematin5</i>	
h^2	0.11	0.42	0.47	0.37	0.33	0.25	0.44	0.35	
CI 95%	(4E-4, 0.29)	(0.24, 0.63)	(0.22, 0.72)	(0.22, 0.54)	(0.14, 0.51)	(0.11, 0.41)	(0.27, 0.60)	(0.21, 0.52)	
3) Pearl sac relative gene expression	<i>Pif-177</i>	<i>MSI60</i>	<i>Perline</i>	<i>Nacrein</i>	<i>Aspein</i>	<i>Shematin9</i>	<i>Prismalin</i>	<i>Shematin5</i>	
h^2	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.25	0.41	0.06	0.03	0.05	
CI 95%	(2E-4, 0.11)	(2E-4, 0.27)	(3E-4, 0.23)	(5E-5, 0.67)	(5E-5, 0.77)	(4E-5, 0.21)	(4E-5, 0.15)	(4E-5, 0.23)	

Eight genes were studied coding for proteins potentially involved in the construction of the nacreous layer (*Pif-177*, *MSI60*, and *Perline*), prismatic layer (*Aspein*, *Shematin9*, *Prismalin*, and *Shematin5*), or both (*Nacrein*).

References

- Andersen CL, Jensen JL, Ørntoft TF. 2004. Normalization of real-time quantitative reverse transcription-PCR data: a model-based variance estimation approach to identify genes suited for normalization, applied to bladder and colon cancer data sets. *Cancer Res.* 64:5245–5250.
- Arnaud-Haond S, Goyard E, Vonau V, Herbaut C, Prou J, Saulnier D. 2007. Pearl formation: persistence of the graft during the entire process of biomineralization. *Mar Biotechnol (NY)*. 9:113–116.
- Blay C, Planes S, Ky CL. 2017. Donor and recipient contribution to phenotypic traits and the expression of biomineralisation genes in the pearl oyster model *Pinctada margaritifera*. *Sci Rep.* 7:2696.
- Brem RB, Yvert G, Clinton R, Kruglyak L. 2002. Genetic dissection of transcriptional regulation in budding yeast. *Science.* 296:752–755.
- Cao L, Yu N, Li J, Qi Z, Wang D, Chen L. 2016. Heritability and reversibility of DNA methylation induced by in vitro grafting between *Brassica juncea* and *B. oleracea*. *Sci rep.* 6: 27233.
- Chakravarti A, Clark AG, Mootha VK. 2013. Distilling pathophysiology from complex disease genetics. *Cell.* 155:21–26.
- Cheung VG, Conlin LK, Weber TM, Arcaro M, Jen KY, Morley M, Spielman RS. 2003. Natural variation in human gene expression assessed in lymphoblastoid cells. *Nat Genet.* 33:422–425.
- Danchin É, Charmantier A, Champagne FA, Mesoudi A, Pujol B, Blanchet S. 2011. Beyond DNA: integrating inclusive inheritance into an extended theory of evolution. *Nat Rev Genet.* 12:475–486.
- Ellis S, Haws M. 1999. Producing pearls using the black-lip pearl oyster (*Pinctada margaritifera*). *Aquafarmer Information Sheet.* 141:8.
- Emilsson V, Thorleifsson G, Zhang B, Leonardson AS, Zink F, Zhu J, Carlson S, Helgason A, Walters GB, Gunnarsdottir S, *et al.* 2008. Genetics of gene expression and its effect on disease. *Nature.* 452:423–428.
- Fisher RA. 1930. *The genetical theory of natural selection: a complete variorum edition*. Oxford University Press.
- Falconer DS. 1989. *Introduction to quantitative genetics*. 3rd ed. Harlow, UK: Longman Scientific & Technical.
- Falconer DS, Mackay TF. 1996. *Introduction to quantitative genetics*. 4th ed. Harlow, Essex, UK: Benjamin Cummings.
- Gibney ER, Nolan CM. 2010. Epigenetics and gene expression. *Heredity (Edinb)*. 105:4–13.
- Gjedrem T, Baranski M. 2010. *Selective breeding in aquaculture: an introduction*. Vol. 10. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Goldinger A, Henders AK, McRae AF, Martin NG, Gibson G, Montgomery GW, Visscher PM, Powell JE. 2013. Genetic and nongenetic variation revealed for the principal components of human gene expression. *Genetics.* 195:1117–1128.
- Grundberg E, Small KS, Hedman ÅK, Nica AC, Buil A, Keildson S, Bell JT, Yang TP, Meduri E, Barrett A, *et al.*; Multiple Tissue Human Expression Resource (MuTHER) Consortium. 2012. Mapping cis- and trans-regulatory effects across multiple tissues in twins. *Nat Genet.* 44:1084–1089.
- Hadfield JD. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *J Stat Softw.* 33:1–22.
- Haque AK, Yamaoka N, Nishiguchi M. 2007. Cytosine methylation is associated with RNA silencing in silenced plants but not with systemic and transitive RNA silencing through grafting. *Gene.* 396:321–331.
- He M, Guan Y, Yuan T, Zhang H. 2008. Realized heritability and response to selection for shell height in the pearl oyster *Pinctada fucata* (Gould). *Aquacult Res.* 39:801–805.
- Huang XD, Zhao M, Liu WG, Guan YY, Shi Y, Wang Q, Wu SZ, He MX. 2013. Gigabase-scale transcriptome analysis on four species of pearl oysters. *Mar Biotechnol (NY)*. 15:253–264.
- Hubner N, Wallace CA, Zimdahl H, Petretto E, Schulz H, Maciver F, Mueller M, Hummel O, Monti J, Zidek V, *et al.* 2005. Integrated transcriptional profiling and linkage analysis for identification of genes underlying disease. *Nat Genet.* 37:243–253.

- Isowa Y, Sarashina I, Setiamarga DH, Endo K. 2012. A comparative study of the shell matrix protein aspein in pteriod bivalves. *J Mol Evol.* 75:11–18.
- Jablonka E, Lamb MJ. 2008. Soft inheritance: challenging the modern synthesis. *Genet Mol Biol.* 31:389–395.
- Jackson D. 2001. The long and the short of it: signaling development through plasmodesmata. *The Plant Cell.* 13:2569–2572.
- Jerry DR, Kvingedal R, Lind CE, Evans BS, Taylor JJ, Safari AE. 2012. Donor oyster derived heritability estimates and the effect of genotype \times environment interaction on the production of pearl quality traits in the silver-lip pearl oyster, *Pinctada maxima*. *Aquaculture.* 338:66–71.
- Jin W, Bai Z, Fu L, Zhang G, Li J. 2012. Genetic analysis of early growth traits of the triangle shell mussel, *Hyriopsis cumingii*, as an insight for potential genetic improvement to pearl quality and yield. *Aquacult Int.* 20:927–933.
- Joubert C, Linard C, Le Moullac G, Soyeux C, Saulnier D, Teaniniuraitemoana V, Ky CL, Gueguen Y. 2014. Temperature and food influence shell growth and mantle gene expression of shell matrix proteins in the pearl oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*. *PLoS One.* 9:e103944.
- Joubert C, Piquemal D, Marie B, Manchon L, Pierrat F, Zanella-Cl  on I, Cochennec-Laureau N, Gueguen Y, Montagnani C. 2010. Transcriptome and proteome analysis of *Pinctada margaritifera* calcifying mantle and shell: focus on biomineralization. *BMC Genomics.* 11:613.
- Kishore P, Southgate PC. 2016. A detailed description of pearl-sac development in the black-lip pearl oyster, *Pinctada margaritifera* (Linnaeus 1758). *Aquacult Res.* 47:2215–2226.
- Koch L. 2014. Disease genetics: insights into missing heritability. *Nat Rev Genet.* 15:218.
- Kruuk LE. 2004. Estimating genetic parameters in natural populations using the “animal model”. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 359:873–890.
- Kruuk LE, Hadfield JD. 2007. How to separate genetic and environmental causes of similarity between relatives. *J Evol Biol.* 20:1890–1903.
- Kvingedal R, Evans BS, Lind CE, Taylor JJ, Dupont-Nivet M, Jerry DR. 2010. Population and family growth response to different rearing location, heritability estimates and genotype \times environment interaction in the silver-lip pearl oyster (*Pinctada maxima*). *Aquaculture.* 304:1–6.
- Ky CL, Blay C, Sham-Koua M, Vanaa V, Lo C, Cabral P. 2013. Family effect on cultured pearl quality in black-lipped pearl oyster *Pinctada margaritifera* and insights for genetic improvement. *Aquat Living Resour.* 26:133–145.
- Ky CL, Cabral P, Lo C. 2017. Phenotypic indicators for cultured pearl size improvement in the black-lipped pearl oyster (*Pinctada margaritifera*): towards selection for the recipient growth performance. *Aquacult Res.* 48:4132–4142.
- Ky CL, Lau C, Koua MS, Lo C (2015a). Growth performance comparison of *Pinctada margaritifera* juveniles produced by thermal shock or gonad scarification spawning procedures. *J Shellfish Res.* 34:811–817.
- Ky CL, Molinari N, Moe E, Pommier S. 2014. Impact of season and grafter skill on nucleus retention and pearl oyster mortality rate in *Pinctada margaritifera* aquaculture. *Aquac Int.* 22:1689–1701.
- Ky CL, Nakasai S, Molinari N, Devaux D (2015b). Influence of grafter skill and season on cultured pearl shape, circles and rejects in *Pinctada margaritifera* aquaculture in Mangareva lagoon. *Aquaculture.* 435:361–370.
- Laland K, Uller T, Feldman M, Sterelny K, M  ller GB, Moczek A, Jablonka E, Odling-Smee J, Wray GA, Hoekstra HE, *et al.* 2014. Does evolutionary theory need a rethink? *Nature.* 514:161–164.
- Lemer S, Saulnier D, Gueguen Y, Planes S. 2015. Identification of genes associated with shell color in the black-lipped pearl oyster, *Pinctada margaritifera*. *BMC Genomics.* 16:568.
- Le Pabic L, Parrad S, Koua MS, Nakasai S, Saulnier D, Devaux D, Ky CL. 2016. Culture site dependence on pearl size realization in *Pinctada margaritifera* in relation to recipient oyster growth and mantle graft biomineralization gene expression using the same donor phenotype. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci.* 182:294–303.

- Li Y, Huang J, Amos CI. 2012. Genetic association analysis of complex diseases incorporating intermediate phenotype information. *PLoS One*. 7:e46612.
- Li J, Wang Y, Zhang L, Liu B, Cao L, Qi Z, Chen L. 2013. Heritable variation and small RNAs in the progeny of chimeras of *Brassica juncea* and *Brassica oleracea*. *J Exp Bot*. 64:4851–4862.
- Liu X, Li J, Xiang L, Sun J, Zheng G, Zhang G, Wang H, Xie L, Zhang R. 2012. The role of matrix proteins in the control of nacreous layer deposition during pearl formation. *Proc R Soc Lond [Biol]*. 279:1000–1007.
- Lynch M, Walsh B. 1998. *Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits*. Sunderland (MA): Sinauer Associates.
- Marie B, Joubert C, Tayalé A, Zanella-Cléon I, Belliard C, Piquemal D, Cochennec-Laureau N, Marin F, Gueguen Y, Montagnani C. 2012. Different secretory repertoires control the biomineralization processes of prism and nacre deposition of the pearl oyster shell. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 109:20986–20991.
- McCairns RJ, Smith S, Sasaki M, Bernatchez L, Beheregaray LB. 2016. The adaptive potential of subtropical rainbowfish in the face of climate change: heritability and heritable plasticity for the expression of candidate genes. *Evol Appl*. 9:531–545.
- McGinty EL, Evans BS, Taylor JU, Jerry DR. 2010. Xenografts and pearl production in two pearl oyster species, *P. maxima* and *P. margaritifera*: effect on pearl quality and a key to understanding genetic contribution. *Aquaculture*. 302:175–181.
- Migicovsky Z, Kovalchuk I. 2011. Epigenetic memory in mammals. *Front Genet*. 2:28.
- Miyamoto H, Endo H, Hashimoto N, Limura K, Isowa Y, Kinoshita S, Kotaki T, Masaoka T, Miki T, Nakayama S, et al. 2013. The diversity of shell matrix proteins: genome-wide investigation of the pearl oyster, *Pinctada fucata*. *Zoolog Sci*. 30:801–816.
- Miyamoto H, Miyoshi F, Kohno J. 2005. The carbonic anhydrase domain protein nacrein is expressed in the epithelial cells of the mantle and acts as a negative regulator in calcification in the mollusc *Pinctada fucata*. *Zoolog Sci*. 22:311–315.
- Molnar A, Melnyk CW, Bassett A, Hardcastle TJ, Dunn R, Baulcombe DC. 2010. Small silencing RNAs in plants are mobile and direct epigenetic modification in recipient cells. *Science*. 328:872–875.
- Montagnani C, Marie B, Marin F, Belliard C, Riquet F, Tayalé A, Zanella-Cléon I, Fleury E, Gueguen Y, Piquemal D, et al. 2011. Pmarg-pearlin is a matrix protein involved in nacre framework formation in the pearl oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*. *Chembiochem*. 12:2033–2043.
- Mousseau TA, Ritland K, Heath DD. 1998. A novel method for estimating heritability using molecular markers. *Heredity*. 80:218–224.
- Mudge K, Janick J, Scofield S, Goldschmidt EE. 2009. Main content area A history of grafting. *Horticultural reviews*. 35:437–493.
- Nica AC, Dermitzakis ET. 2008. Using gene expression to investigate the genetic basis of complex disorders. *Hum Mol Genet*. 17:R129–R134.
- Parts L, Liu YC, Tekkedil MM, Steinmetz LM, Caudy AA, Fraser AG, Boone C, Andrews BJ, Rosebrock AP. 2014. Heritability and genetic basis of protein level variation in an outbred population. *Genome Res*. 24:1363–1370.
- Powell JE, Henders AK, McRae AF, Kim J, Hemani G, Martin NG, Dermitzakis ET, Gibson G, Montgomery GW, Visscher PM. 2013. Congruence of additive and non-additive effects on gene expression estimated from pedigree and SNP data. *PLoS Genet*. 9:e1003502.
- Powell JE, Henders AK, McRae AF, Wright MJ, Martin NG, Dermitzakis ET, Montgomery GW, Visscher PM. 2012. Genetic control of gene expression in whole blood and lymphoblastoid cell lines is largely independent. *Genome Res*. 22:456–466.
- Price AL, Helgason A, Thorleifsson G, McCarroll SA, Kong A, Stefansson K. 2011. Single-tissue and cross-tissue heritability of gene expression via identity-by-descent in related or unrelated individuals. *PLoS Genet*. 7:e1001317.

- Roff DA. 1997. *Evolutionary quantitative genetics*. New York: Chapman & Hall.
- Schadt EE, Monks SA, Drake TA, Lusis AJ, Che N, Colinayo V, Ruff TG, Milligan SB, Lamb JR, Cavet G, *et al.* 2003. Genetics of gene expression surveyed in maize, mouse and man. *Nature*. 422:297–302.
- Shi Y, Yu C, Gu Z, Zhan X, Wang Y, Wang A. 2013. Characterization of the pearl oyster (*Pinctada martensii*) mantle transcriptome unravels biomineralization genes. *Mar Biotechnol (NY)*. 15:175–187.
- Southgate PC. 2011. The pearl oyster culture. In: Southgate P, Lucas J (Eds.) *The pearl Oyster*. Elsevier Science Publishers BV, Amsterdam. p. 257.
- Stegemann S, Bock R. 2009. Exchange of genetic material between cells in plant tissue grafts. *Science*. 324:649–651.
- Suzuki M, Nagasawa H. 2013. Mollusk shell structures and their formation mechanism. *Can J Zool*. 91:349–366.
- Suzuki M, Saruwatari K, Kogure T, Yamamoto Y, Nishimura T, Kato T, Nagasawa H. 2009. An acidic matrix protein, Pif, is a key macromolecule for nacre formation. *Science*. 325:1388–1390.
- Takeuchi T, Sarashina I, Iijima M, Endo K. 2008. In vitro regulation of CaCO₃ crystal polymorphism by the highly acidic molluscan shell protein Aspein. *FEBS Lett*. 582:591–596.
- Trerotola M, Relli V, Simeone P, Alberti S. 2015. Epigenetic inheritance and the missing heritability. *Hum Genomics*. 9:17.
- Tsaballa A, Athanasiadis C, Pasentsis K, Ganopoulos I, Nianiou-Obeidat I, Tsaftaris A. 2013. Molecular studies of inheritable grafting induced changes in pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) fruit shape. *Scientia Horticulturae*. 149:2–8.
- Visscher PM, Hill WG, Wray NR. 2008. Heritability in the genomics era—concepts and misconceptions. *Nat Rev Genet*. 9:255–266.
- Wada KT. 1986. Genetic selection for shell traits in the Japanese pearl oyster, *Pinctada fucata martensii*. *Aquaculture*. 57:171–176.
- Wada KT, Jerry DR. 2008. Population genetics and stock improvement. In: Southgate PC, Lucas JS, editors. *The pearl oyster*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 437–471.
- Wada KT, Komaru A. 1996. Color and weight of pearls produced by grafting the mantle tissue from a selected population for white shell color of the Japanese pearl oyster *Pinctada fucata martensii* (Dunker). *Aquaculture*. 142:25–32.
- Wang H, Du X, Lü W, Liu Z. 2010. Estimating the heritability for growth-related traits in the pearl oyster, *Pinctada fucata martensii* (Dunker). *Aquacult. Res*. 42:57–64.
- Wang J, Jiang L, Wu R. 2017. Plant grafting: how genetic exchange promotes vascular reconnection. *New Phytol*. 214:56–65.
- Wright FA, Sullivan PF, Brooks AI, Zou F, Sun W, Xia K, Madar V, Jansen R, Chung W, Zhou YH, *et al.* 2014. Heritability and genomics of gene expression in peripheral blood. *Nat Genet*. 46:430–437.
- Wu L, Zhou H, Zhang Q, Zhang J, Ni F, Liu C, Qi Y. 2010. DNA methylation mediated by a microRNA pathway. *Mol Cell*. 38:465–475.
- Xiang L, Su J, Zheng G, Liang J, Zhang G, Wang H, Xie L, Zhang R. 2013. Patterns of expression in the matrix proteins responsible for nucleation and growth of aragonite crystals in flat pearls of *Pinctada fucata*. *PLoS One*. 8:e66564.