Selection of functional EPHB2 genotype in ENU mutated grass carp response to GCRV by the method of BSA Sequence Analysis
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Abstract

**Background** N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea (ENU) mutagenesis is a useful method for genetic development of plants, as well as for inducing functional mutants in animal models including mice and zebrafish. GCRV (Grass carp Reovirus) is the hemorrhage disease of grass carp and causes noteworthy loss of fingerlings in the last few years. To overcome this problem, we have used ENU mutant grass carp might be a helpful to find out some resistant functional gene for future hereditary rearing projects in grass carp.

**Results** In the present study, ENU-mutated grass carp were used to identify genetic markers correlated with anti hemorrhagic disease caused by grass carp reovirus (GCRV). The BSA (Bulked segregant analysis) technology were performed on two homozygous gynogenetic ENU grass carp groups with susceptible or resistant in response of GCRV. Our results showed that 466,162 SNPs and 197644 InDel were found out in the mixed pool. A total of 170 genes were annotated in the associated region, including 49 genes with non-synonymous mutations at SNP sites and 25 genes with frame shift mutations at InDel sites. Among these 170 mutated genes, 5 randomly selected immune-related genes expression was higher in resistant group as compared to susceptible. Furthermore, we found one immune-related gene EPHB2 has confirmed two heterozygous SNP mutations which responded to GCRV disease. The SNPs within gene EPHB2 were found out in the intron region with position 5859 (5859G>A) and 5968 (5968G>A) were significantly (p = 0.002, 0.003) associated with the resistance against GCRV. These SNP sites were confirmed to correlate with the GCRV-resistant phenotype of ENU grass carp. The SNPs associated with GCRV resistance are useful in selecting GCRV-resistant genes for genetic breeding in grass carp.

**Conclusion** Our results proved the possibility of BSA-sequence analysis in detecting genes responsible for the exciting phenotypes and will help in carrying out the marker-assisted selection, especially for disease resistance in the response of GCRV.

Background

Genetic breeding of aquaculturally fish species primarily depends on the conclusion of natural mutants with high performance, and then better-quality strains can be formed by hybridization, genetic selection or marker-assisted breeding methods [1]. Thus far, more than 200 improved strains of aquaculturally fish species have been shaped in China, in which 139 classes were produced through genetic selection. Therefore, chemical mutagenesis is an effective way to make new mutants for upcoming genetic development in aquaculture species [2]. N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea (ENU) is a chemical mutagen that acts as an alkylating operator, exchanging its ethyl gather to nucleophilic nitrogen or oxygen locales on deoxyribonucleotides, directing to base inconsistency while DNA replication [3][4]. ENU mutagenesis has been demonstrated to be effective for inciting point mutation in the genome of the grass carp [5].

Grass carp reovirus (GCRV) belongs to the family Reoviridae and it has genus Aquareovirus. In 1972, Hemorrhagic disease of grass carp was first time revealed in a fish farm of Hubei Province [6]. GCRV was categorized as an aqua reovirus and in 1984, which contains 11 parts of double stranded RNA. The genus Aquareovirus is assigned A to G (AQRV-A to AQRV-G), and GCRV be appropriate to AQRV-C [7]. GCRV is the hemorrhage disease of grass carp and causes noteworthy loss of fingerlings in the last few years.

A genotyping-by-sequencing method, it permits the genome widespread association studies, bulked segregant analysis (BSA) and genomic selection, has previously been familiarized to breeding programs. In current times, because of reducing the prices of genome sequencing have loosened the opportunity for the whole genome sequencing and resequencing the higher pools of individuals. BSA was proposed to quickly distinguish markers connected to specific characteristics of intrigued such as disease resistance [8]. Their approach includes a segregating F2 population produced from a starting cross between two phenotypically different parents, which is at that point scored for a phenotype of intrigued. Bulked DNA or RNA tests are built from organism that appears differentiating phenotypes. BSA has been primarily utilized in crop species either for the recognizable proof of huge impact QTL, such as disease resistance genes or for mapping subjective mutation [9][10][8][11].

The objective of the current study was to select the functional genotype in ENU fish response to GCRV by the method of BSA sequence analysis. Thus, it will be helpful in carrying out the marker-assisted selection, especially for disease resistance in the response of GCRV.

Results

**SNPs and indels annotation results**

After filtration, the Clean Reads data was generated up to 73.47 Gbp, average Q30 reached 93.92%, and the average GC% was up to 38.11% (**Table 1**). The average genome coverage depth of each sample was 41.00X, and the genome coverage was about 99.11% (at least 1×) (**Table 1**), indicating the high quality of the sequencing data. The assembled genome size of grass carp is 900.50 Mb, GC content is 37.42%, the genome is Scaffold level[12]. Venn diagram showed that different number of SNP and inDel between sample S01(suspected) and R02...
(resistant) like in Fig.1, 200,270 SNPs were specified in the S01 and 173,531 SNPs were specifically found out in R02. The center overlapping portion of the Venn diagram represented the total number of identified SNPs 2,189,327 and InDel 759,064 results (Fig. 1).

We detected a total number of 466,162, 197,644, 8,492, and 3,668 polymorphic sites in different regions like SNP annotation results, InDel annotation results, SNP and InDel annotation results in candidate region respectively (Table 2). Based on the annotation, the SNPs were randomly distributed throughout the genome (Table 2). InDel frameshift mutation type was found out in 50 genes, 7 genes figured out in codon_insertion and 6 genes found out in codon_deletion (Table 2). Synonymous and non-synonymous codon had a higher number of genes that were found out in the SNP annotated region (7251, 9298) (Table 2).

**Association Analysis (SNP, InDel) and ED method correlation results**

Before the association analysis, first SNP was filtered, finally obtained 2,313,014 high-quality trusted SNP sites. Before using InDel for correlation analysis, same like SNP first InDel was filtered, and finally got 775,981 high-quality trusted InDel sites (Table 3). Through this, 1197 Scaffold/contig sequences with significantly enriched associated SNP sites were selected. Some results are shown in the table (Additional file 1). The same analysis method (ED method) as the SNP association analysis was used, and 85 Scaffold/contig sequences that were significantly enriched in association InDel sites were finally screened (Additional file 2). Take the intersection of the results obtained by these two association analysis methods (SNP & InDel along with ED), a total of 21 Scaffolds related to traits were obtained (Table 4).

**Gene annotation and functional results**

A total of 170 genes were annotated in the candidate region, among which 49 were non-synonymous mutant genes and 25 frameshift mutation genes were annotated in the mixed pool (Table 5, Additional file 3). Total 55 genes in the genome were annotated and classified into biological processes, cellular components, and molecular functions (Fig.2, Additional file 4, 5 & 6). 11 genes were found out with non-synonymous mutation and 2 genes were found out with frameshift mutation in GO enrichment analysis. The annotated KEGG databases showed that 29 SNP were found among top 20 pathways as shown in Fig.3. After multiple-testing corrections, we selected the pathways with Q values ≤ 0.05 as significantly enriched among the genes (Fig.4). Our data suggest that these genes may play an important in innate immune response to GCRV in ENU grass carp.

**Gene expression results associated with grass carp reovirus (GCRV) resistance**

The relative expression levels of the five genes significantly associated with grass carp reovirus (GCRV) resistance were detected through qPCR (Fig.5). We selected 5 genes with genetic variation to examine their mRNA expression levels in liver, kidney and gill tissue. All these five genes involved in the inflammatory response, cell proliferation, anti-apoptosis, tumor suppressor and immune response to viral infection pathways. Results showed that mRNA expression level of SAMD9L, BNIP3L and EPHB2 was highly significant expressed in resistant group than susceptible group in response of GCRV (<0.01), APPL2 expression level was higher in liver and kidney as compared to gill tissue in case of resistant group. Kidney-NLRP12 gene expression level was significantly highly expressed in resistant group as compared to infected group after GCRV infection (<0.01) (Fig. 5).

**Verification of SNPs associated with grass carp reovirus (GCRV) resistance**

After validation, we identified an SNP (CI01000190: 1067676 A > G) at the position of 1067676 and another SNP (CI01000190: 1067785 A > G) at the position of 1067785 in chromosome CI01000190, respectively (Table 6). Both SNPs were located in the intron region of EPHB2 as shown in Fig.6. SNPs in EPHB2 were found out in 2 position which has been mentioned with chromosomal position 5859 (5859G>A), 5968 (5968G>A) determine G to A mutation in S01/R02.

EPHB2 gene with confirmed SNPs has been showed in Table 7 in case of resistant (S01) and susceptible (R02) group in response of GCRV. In the first SNP, the allele frequencies of A and G in survived fish (resistant) were 24% and 76%, correspondingly. For dead fish (susceptible), the allele frequencies of A and G f were 66% and 34%, respectively. In the other SNP, the allele frequencies A and G in survived fish were 18% and 82%whereas in dead fish were 62% and 38%, respectively (Table 7). The chi-squared test showed that allele frequencies were significantly different between dead and survived individuals (p = 0.002 and p = 0.003 for respective SNPs) (Table 7), signifying that EPHB2 was significantly associated with GCRV disease resistance.

**Discussion**

Up to the present time, association analysis is still the key method for the mining of SNPs for disease resistance genes in marine animals. Previous work has been reported that SNP frequencies diverse among different populations in numerous species[13][14][15]. However, according to our knowledge, there is limited information on immune related SNP in relation to the response of GCRV in grass carp. Therefore,
the currently study focused on the selection of functional genes and its SNPs related to GCRV resistance of ENU grass carp, this could help to improve our understanding on GCRV resistance and might help to select disease-resistant strains of ENU grass carp culture.

Cultured grass carp are highly vulnerable to diseases which lead to yield reduction, antibiotics and drugs have been used to control the problem but the regular use of these alternatives showed side effects to animal and environment. Therefore, disease-resistant grass carp are highly desirable as they can greatly increase fish yields [5]. Due to low occurrence of natural mutation in grass carp, chemical mutagenesis can be useful for increasing genetic mutations [2]. In this study, homozygous gynogenetic ENU grass carp which has the advantages of strong disease resistance and rapid growth was used and its functional genotype was selected by using BSA sequence analysis after challenged to GCRV.

In this study, we used BSA technology to determine SNP mutation within the genic region associated with GCRV resistance in homozygous gynogenetic ENU grass carp. Our findings verified the viability of BSA approach and the extensive information of SNP gene for disease resistance traits as a fast and affordable method for marker development. Zhang et al (2019) also demonstrated that the genetic analysis with the application of BSA-seq has a propelling effect in disease resistance and will assist the selective breeding of turbot with Vibrio anguillarum resistance [16].

SNP and InDel are used for annotating mutations and predicting the effects of mutations[17]. SNP mutation is significant source for genetic diversity, molecular evolution and disease resistance. Some researchers primarily focus on non-synonymous coding SNPs, because those SNPs might influence the protein activity directly[18]. Wang et al (2015) reported the significant differences of SNPs and InDel in resistant and susceptible group in the C. idella genome; However, the SNPs and InDel associated with resistance/susceptibility to GCRV were not described by omics sequencing [12]. SNPs can provide innovative resources for genome sequence modification and facilitate the studies on selective breeding [19]. In current study, a total of 466,162 SNPs and 197,644 InDel were found in the resistant/susceptible group, but only 9,298 SNPs caused non-synonymous mutations.

In current study, we determined several resistance genes in S01/R02 group of ENU grass carp. Followed by the performance of GO classification, KEGG pathway analyses to well comprehend the molecular functions of candidate genes in resistance group. The correlation of differentially expressed sequences to the whole sequences of equivalent GO groups or KEGG pathways were observed as the key measures for enrichment factor [20][21]. Our results showed that KEGG pathways with SNP enrichment ratio were binding in resistant groups. GO analysis also showed that some cellular components tended to be less polymorphic. Whereas KEGG pathway analysis showed that some pathways tended to be more polymorphic. Since disease correlated SNP are inequitablydiffused by gene sequences, taking a higher contingency in functionally important positions. Similarly, SNP can affect the components and their interactions[22]. These clarifications should be investigated in future studies.

Gene mutation may bring phenotypic variation by influencing the gene expression, including the possibility of hybrid vigor as useful traits that are oppressed in animal and crop breeding[23]. There has long been a comprehension that gene expression differences play vital roles in species differentiation and experiments on natural selection for gene expression which can now be monitored in a more effortless way than that in the past[24][19]. In our analysis, we selected 5 genes with genetic variation to examine their mRNA expression levels in liver, kidney and gill tissue. Results showed that mRNA expression level of SAMD9L and EPHB2 in all tissues was higher in resistant group than susceptible group in response of GCRV, while BNP3L and APPL2 expression level was higher in liver and kidney compared to gill tissue of resistant group. Kidney-NLRP12 gene expression level was higher in resistant group as compared to susceptible group after GCRV infection. The results of expression analysis of five genes in resistant and susceptible group pinpoint that these gene may be partially responsible for GCRV resistance.

In recent years, studies have found out that SNPs in intron and intergenic also play a great role in the changes of traits. It was reported that, SNP in the third intron of the F-box and leucine rich repeat protein 17 (FBXL17) gene explains 58.4% of the phenotypic difference in sex reversal of Chinese tongue sole Cynoglossus semilaevis [25]. Li, et al (2016), also reported that Heterozygous SNP variation can contribute to increase latent yield in the hybrid [26]. In present study, we identified two heterozygous SNP (in chromosomal position 5859G>A and 5968G>A) in the intron region of EPHB2 gene after validation which significantly associated with GCRV response in resistance/ susceptible ENU grass carp. Allele G in resistance group was higher than in susceptible group, indicating that these alleles could increase disease resistance. The survival rate of susceptible ENU after GCRV infection might be reduced by higher frequency of allele A in SNP. Consequently, future breeding program of the ENU grass carp can emphasize on allele G in the two SNPs for GCRV disease resistance. Based on our knowledge, this study is the first to report SNPs located in a gene that is associated with GCRV disease resistance in ENU grass carp. Additionally, the SNPs obtained in this study provide the base for genetic selection of GCRV disease resistance in ENU grass carp.

EPHB2 (Ephrin type-B receptor 2) influence the immune system in numerous ways, primarily through immune cell transferring and immune cell activation. B and T lymphocyte as well as dendritic cell activation has been revealed to be controlled through EPHB2 [27][28]. The expression of EPHB2 can also be regulated by certain inflammatory cytokines and pathogen-related molecular forms [29][30]. Among the five resistant genes studied in this study, we only found SNPs in EPHB2 gene as explained above, and this gene was highly expressed in resistance group than in susceptible group. The modification and higher expression of this gene indicate that this it related to the resistance of GCRV. This gene
functioned as a tumor suppressor and also had a role in immune cell enhancement against GCRV disease in ENU grass carp. Our results prove that EPHB2 is involved in immune response that can repress virus replication and attenuates acute inflammatory responses to protect cells.

Conclusions

Our results proved the possibility of BSA-sequence analysis in detecting genes responsible for the exciting phenotypes and will help in carrying out the marker-assisted selection for GCRV disease resistance. EPHB2 expression was higher in kidney, liver and gills. Two SNPs found in the intron region of the EPHB2 gene were significantly associated with GCRV resistance. Additionally, EPHB2 is involved in immune response that may suppress virus replication and reduces acute inflammatory responses to protect cells. All these data suggest that EPHB2 may be an important gene for GCRV resistance. The SNPs associated with GCRV resistance could be applied to marker-assisted selection for GCRV resistance in mutant grass carp.

Materials And Methods

Experimental Design:

ENU mutant grass carp (meiotic gynogenetic offsprings induced by UV inactivated heterologous sperm from *Megalobrama amblycephala*) were obtained from the Bream Genetics and Breeding Center of Shanghai Ocean University, Shanghai, China. After on arrival in the laboratory, fish were maintained in the laboratory at 28 ± 0.5 °C for at least 7 days prior to experimental use and feed them well to make healthier. A total of 60 fishes were used. The average weight of the fish was 4.4-6.0g. The trials were conducted in aerated glass aquariums (120 x 40 x 30 cm) each containing 100 L of water. After the acclimatization period, all the fishes were intraperitoneally inoculated with 20 μl/g of GCRV-873 strain. After 14 days of the challenge, all survived fish were collected as a safe fish from which 30 fishes were chosen arbitrarily as a resistant group.

Fish sampling:

In this way, mutant grass carp were divided into two group. 30 fishes were selected as susceptible/ infected/morbid group (S01) and leftover 30 fishes which were selected as resistant group (R02) to GCRV. About fourteen days of the injection later, liver tissue collected as sample and transferred it for BSA analysis.

Sequencing analysis:

Genomic DNA was taken out utilizing conventional phenol-chloroform extraction strategy in combination with RNase treatment and put away at ~20°C until utilize. Two bulks were produced by pooling an equal quantity of DNA from a susceptible (S01) and a resistant group (R02). DNA from each bulk was utilized to build paired-end (PE) sequencing libraries, which were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq (Illumina Casava 1.8 version). Whole experimental procedure is prepared according to the standard convention was given by Illumina, including sample testing, library construction, library-quality testing, and computer sequencing and Sequence read length was 150 bp (Biomarker technology, Beijing, China).

After evacuating connector and low-quality reads, the clean reads were advance rechecked for quality utilizing FASTQC. High quality paired-end reads were mapped to the grass carp reference genome sequence (PRJEB5920) [12] using the BWA program with default constraints [31]. Position of Clean Reads on the reference genome was found out by comparing the data such as the sequencing depth and genome coverage of each test, and then mutation location was achieved. The assessment results of the sequencing output information of each sample, the comparison results of the samples, the average coverage depth of each sample, and the genome coverage proportion comparison to each depth among S01 and R02 group can be seen in the following Table 1.

SNP and InDel detection:

SnpEff is a software for annotating mutations (SNP, Small InDel) and predicting the effects of mutations[32]. The detection of SNP is mainly implemented using GATK software toolkit [33]. According to the positioning results of Clean Reads in the reference genome, Picard (http://sourceforge.net/projects/picard/) was used to perform preprocessing such as Mark duplicates. GATK was used for Local realignment and base recalibration to ensure detection.

InDel represents single base insertion and deletion. The insertion loss of the sample was detected using GATK. Small InDel variation is generally less than SNP variation, which also reflects the difference between the sample and the reference genome, and InDel in the coding region will cause frameshift mutations, resulting in changes in gene function.

Euclidean distance calculation:
The Euclidean Distance (ED) algorithm is a method that uses sequencing data to find markers that have significant differences between pools and also evaluated the SNP, InDel association analysis [8]. Theoretically, two mixed pools constructed by the BSA project have differences in the target trait-related sites, and other sites tend to be consistent, so the ED value of non-target sites should tend to 0. The calculation formula of the ED method is shown below. The larger the ED value, the greater the difference between the mark and the two mixing tanks.

\[
ED = \sqrt{(A_{mut} - A_{wt})^2 + (C_{mut} - C_{wt})^2 + (G_{mut} - G_{wt})^2 + (T_{mut} - T_{wt})^2}
\]

where each letter (A, C, G, T) corresponds to the frequency of its corresponding DNA nucleotide in the mutation and wild type pool or bulk respectively.

Functional annotation of genes containing SNPs:

The genes having SNPs correlated with resistance/susceptibility to GCRV were annotated using NCBI non-redundant database by BLAST software to perform in-depth annotation of multiple databases such as (NR [non-redundant protein database, NCBI], Swiss-Prot [http://www.uniprot.org/], GO [Gene Ontology, http://www.geneontology.org/], KEGG [http://www.genome.jp/kegg/], COG [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/COG/]) coding genes in the candidate interval. Quickly screening the candidate genes were through detailed annotations.

Gene expression and SNP verification analysis:

The qPCR was carried out on CFX96 Touch™Real-Time PCR System, using SYBR Premix Ex Taq kit (TaKaRa, Japan). All primers used in the study were designed by software Primer Premier 5.0 and are listed in Table 8. The comparative expression value of the designated gene vs. 18s rRNA (reference gene to normalize expression levels between sample) was calculated using the \(2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}\) method. Reactions of SYBR Green were performed in a 20 µL volume containing 10 µL of 2 × SYBR® Green Realtime PCR Master Mix (Toyobo, Osaka, Japan), 1 µL of each forward and reverse primer (10 µM), 7 µL of water, and 1 µL of diluted cDNA (100 ng/µL). All experiments were performed in two groups. We identified five functional genes as disease-causing mutations in response to GCRV in mutant grass carp.

For SNP verification, again we injected the virus (GCRV) in 100 ENU grass carp and divided the fishes into 50 resistant and 50 susceptible groups to find out their allelic frequency as we can see in the Table 8. Both SNPs were located in the intron region of EPHB2. Using these two SNPs, we investigated the genotype number in 50 dead (susceptible and 50 survived(resistant) fish after the GCRV challenge to detect whether there was a statistically association between genotype and resistance, using p-values of chi-square test. A subsequent p-value 0.05 or less was measured statistically significantly.

Statistical Analysis:

The statistical results (expressed as mean ± standard deviation) were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance, followed by Dunnett’s test for multiple comparisons using IBM SPSS Statistics 22 software. \(p < 0.01, p < 0.05\) was considered to be statistically significant. All experiments were repeated at least three times.
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Tables
Table 1 Summary of Illumina sequencing data

| Sample ID | Susceptible group (S01) | Resistant group (R02) | Average values |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Clean_reads | 125,577,407 | 117,707,723 | 73.47Gbp |
| Q30 (%) | 93.52 | 94.31 | 93.92% |
| GC (%) | 38.09 | 38.14 | 38.11% |
| Mapped ratio (%) | 80.51 | 80.53 | 80.52% |
| Average depth | 42 | 40 | 41.00X |
| Coverage_ratio_1× (%) | 99.17 | 99.05 | 99.11% |
| Coverage_ratio_5× (%) | 97.77 | 97.57 | 97.67 |
| Coverage_ratio_10× (%) | 96.26 | 95.97 | 96.12 |
Table. 2: Annotation results statistics of SNPs and indels containing candidate region

| Different region and types of Mutation | SNP annotation result statistics | InDel annotation result statistics | SNP annotation results statistics in candidate regions | InDel annotation results statistics in the candidate regions |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
|                                       | S01vsR02                        | S01vsR02                         | S01vsR02                                             | S01vsR02                                              |
| INTERGENIC                            | 220527                          | 89734                            | 4,223                                                | 1797                                                  |
| INTRON                                | 144560                          | 27                               | 2,538                                                | 1242                                                  |
| UPSTREAM                              | 37653                           | 66109                            | 618                                                  | 266                                                   |
| DOWNSTREAM                            | 37132                           | 16283                            | 653                                                  | 232                                                   |
| UTR_5_PRIME                           | 3202                            | 16315                            | 43                                                   | 25                                                    |
| UTR_3_PRIME                           | 4074                            | 1945                             | 60                                                   | 26                                                    |
| SPLICE_SITE_ACCEPTOR                  | 118                             | 2169                             | 1                                                    | 1                                                     |
| SPLICE_SITE_DONOR                     | 100                             | 94                               | 2                                                    | 2                                                     |
| SPLICE_SITE_REGION                    | 912                             | 66                               | 20                                                   | 5                                                     |
| FRAME_SHIFT                           | ---                             | ---                              | ---                                                  | 50                                                    |
| CODON_INSERTION                       | ---                             | ---                              | ---                                                  | 7                                                     |
| CODON_DELETION                        | ---                             | ---                              | ---                                                  | 6                                                     |
| CODON_CHANGE_PLUS_CODON_INSERTION     | ---                             | ---                              | ---                                                  | 3                                                     |
| CODON_CHANGE_PLUS_CODON_DELETION      | ---                             | ---                              | ---                                                  | 3                                                     |
| START_GAINED                          | 648                             | 401                              | 7                                                    | ---                                                   |
| START_LOST                            | 5                               | 15                               | ---                                                  | ---                                                   |
| SYNONYMOUS_START                      | 3                               | 3272                             | 1                                                    | ---                                                   |
| NON_SYNONYMOUS_START                  | 1                               | 276                              | ---                                                  | ---                                                   |
| SYNONYMOUS_CODING                     | 7251                            | 271                              | 139                                                  | ---                                                   |
| NON_SYNONYMOUS_CODING                 | 9298                            | 150                              | 180                                                  | ---                                                   |
| SYNONYMOUS_STOP                       | 71                              | 277                              | ---                                                  | ---                                                   |
| STOP_GAINED                           | 449                             | 178                              | 6                                                    | 2                                                     |
| STOP_LOST                             | 158                             | 62                               | 1                                                    | 1                                                     |
| Other                                 | 0                               | 0                                | 0                                                    | 0                                                     |
| Total                                 | 466162                          | 197644                           | 8492                                                 | 3668                                                  |

Table. 3 SNP and InDel filtering statistics

| Filtering statistics | Total SNP | Total InDel | Multiple allele loci | Read support for sites less than 4 | Loci with consistent pool | High quality number after filtration |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| SNP                  | 2,563,128 |             | 2,212                | 40,627                            | 207,275                  | 2,313,014                             |
| InDel                |           | 908,500     | 36,042               | 37,050                            | 59,427                   | 775,981                               |

Table. 4 Candidate Scaffold results
Table. 5 Statistics of gene function annotation results in SNP and InDel in candidate regions

| Annotated_databases | Gene Num | Non_Syn Gene Num | FRAME_SHIFT Gene Num |
|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|
| NR                  | 159      | 46               | 25                   |
| NT                  | 170      | 49               | 25                   |
| trEMBL              | 170      | 49               | 25                   |
| SwissProt           | 104      | 30               | 19                   |
| GO                  | 55       | 11               | 2                    |
| KEGG                | 69       | 13               | 7                    |
| COG                 | 35       | 11               | 6                    |
| Total               | 170      | 49               | 25                   |

Table. 6 Genes with validated SNP

| Chromosome          | Gene                | SNP position | Ref | S01 | R02 | ED-value |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| CI01000190_01061817_01090001.mRNA | EPHB2             | 1067676      | R   | R   | R   | 0.624991 |
|                     |                     |              |     |     |     | 0.648181 |

Scaffold | AllSNP | AssoSNP_ED | AssoInDel_ED
---|--------|------------|--------------
CI01000352 | 2484  | 306        | 85           
CI01112186 | 5     | 3          | 4            
CI01000136 | 2141  | 185        | 73           
CI01000184 | 1334  | 121        | 51           
CI01000190 | 2631  | 214        | 83           
CI01000087 | 2767  | 286        | 84           
CI01000240 | 274   | 50         | 18           
CI01061811 | 5     | 2          | 3            
CI01072320 | 5     | 7          | 3            
CI01163490 | 5     | 1          | 3            
CI01064712 | 6     | 2          | 3            
CI01085134 | 23    | 10         | 5            
CI01075334 | 3     | 4          | 2            
CI01141415 | 3     | 3          | 2            
CI01000257 | 280   | 30         | 16           
CI01079816 | 4     | 2          | 2            
CI01114229 | 4     | 2          | 2            
CI01017852 | 12    | 4          | 3            
CI01026461 | 5     | 3          | 2            
CI01114140 | 5     | 3          | 2            
CI01000262 | 112   | 33         | 8            
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Table. 7 Number and allele frequency at two SNPs of EPHB2 in susceptible and resistant ENU after GCRV infection

| SNP1(CI01000190, 1067676) (p = 0.002) | Allele frequency in resistant group (n = 50) | Allele frequency in susceptible group (n = 50) |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| A                                     | 24%                                         | 66%                                         |
| G                                     | 76%                                         | 34%                                         |
| SNP2(CI01000190, 1067785) (p = 0.003) |                                             |                                              |
| A                                     | 18%                                         | 62%                                         |
| G                                     | 82%                                         | 38%                                         |

SNP1 genotype (p = 0.004) Allele frequency in resistant group (n = 50) Allele frequency in susceptible (n = 50)

| AA | 16% | 34% |
| AG | 48% | 52% |
| GG | 36% | 14% |

SNP2 genotype (p = 0.003)

| AA | 12% | 30% |
| AG | 44% | 52% |
| GG | 44% | 18% |

Table. 8 Selected primer and sequence

| Gene | Primer name | Forward primer (5′-3′) | Reverse primer (5′-3′) | Temperature |
|------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| CI01000184_00984445_00984988.mRNA | APPL2 | CCGTGGATGACACCGCCTAC | CACACTCCACGGCCATGACA | 59.7 |
| CI01000087_01389941_01395452.mRNA | BNIP3L | TCTGAGTGTGTCCATCGAGT | GAGATCCAGCAGAACACTGG | 58.0 |
| CI01000190_01446777_01465687.mRNA | NLRP12 | TCTGAGTGTGTCCATCGAGT | GAGATCCAGCAGAACACTGG | 58.0 |
| CI01000190_01061817_01090001.mRNA | EPHB2 | CAGAGGCATTCATCTTCCCA | GAGAGGGCAGGGGAAAA | 58.1 |
| CI01000240_00049921_00050822.mRNA | SAMD9L | GCAGCAGAATGATGTGGTGAC | TGTGTTGGTAATGCTTTGAAT | 58.5 |

Figures
Venn diagram of SNP/InDel statistics between sample: Venn diagram describes the overlapped pathways between resistant and susceptible groups. (A) SNPs statistics results between S01 (susceptible)/R02 (resistant) group, (B) InDel statistics results between S01 (susceptible)/R02 (resistant) group
Figure 2

Clustering map of GO in candidate region: The abscissa is the content of each category of GO, the left of the ordinate is the percentage of the number of genes, and the right is the number of genes. This figure shows the gene classification of each secondary function of GO in the context of all genes in the associated region.
Figure 3

KEGG distribution map of genes: Top 20 KEGG pathways of genes containing SNPs associated with resistance to GCRV in ENU. The number of SNPs is shown behind the corresponding pathways.
KEGG enrichment of genes in candidate regions: The enrichment pathways with more enrichment factor and significance values were "Glycosaminoglycan biosynthesis-heparan sulfate / heparin (ko00534)", "RNA transport (ko03013)", "Protein processing in endoplasmic reticulum (ko04141)", "Focal adhesion (ko04510)", "Endocytosis (ko04144)", and "MAPK signaling pathway (ko04010)".

Figure 4

KEGG enrichment of genes in candidate regions: The enrichment pathways with more enrichment factor and significance values were "Glycosaminoglycan biosynthesis-heparan sulfate / heparin (ko00534)", "RNA transport (ko03013)", "Protein processing in endoplasmic reticulum (ko04141)", "Focal adhesion (ko04510)", "Endocytosis (ko04144)", and "MAPK signaling pathway (ko04010)".
genes expression analysis showed that mRNA expression level of SAMD9L, BNIP3L and EPHB2 was highly significant expressed in resistant group than infected group in response of GCRV (p <0.01), APPL2 expression level was higher in liver and kidney as compared to gill tissue in case of resistant group. Kidney-NLRP12 gene expression level was significantly highly expressed in resistant group as compared to infected group after GCRV infection (p <0.01). The statistical results (expressed as mean ± standard deviation) were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance, followed by Dunnett's test for multiple comparisons using IBM SPSS Statistics 22 software. p < 0.01, p < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.
Genomic structure and SNP confirmation sites of EPHB2 gene in ENU: 5'UTR start site was regarded as the +1-initiator codon (ATG) in EPHB2 shown with blue colour (CDS). In EPHB2, SNPs were found out in 2 position which has been mentioned with chromosomal position 5859, 5968 determine a GA mutation in S01 (susceptible)/R02 (resistant) group. Green colour shows intron region.

**Figure 6**
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