Molecular tools for coral reef restoration: beyond biomarker discovery

John Everett Parkinson^{1,2}, Andrew C. Baker³, Iliana B. Baums⁴, Sarah W. Davies⁵, Andréa G. Grottoli⁶, Sheila A. Kitchen⁴, Todd C. LaJeunesse⁴, Mikhail V. Matz⁷, Margaret W. Miller¹, Andrew A. Shantz⁴, Carly D. Kenkel^{8*}

¹SECORE International, Miami, FL, USA

²Department of Integrative Biology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

³Department of Marine Biology and Ecology, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA

⁴Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

⁵Department of Biology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

⁶School of Earth Sciences, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

⁷Department of Integrative Biology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

⁸Department of Biological Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

*Corresponding author: ckenkel@usc.edu, 213-821-1705

Key Words: climate change, coral, genetic management, molecular biomarker, population enhancement

Abstract

As coral reefs continue to decline due to climate change and other stressors, scientists have proposed adopting genomic tools, such as biomarkers, to aid in the conservation and restoration of these threatened ecosystems. Biomarkers are easily measured indicators of higher-order biological processes that can be used to predict or diagnose health, resilience, and other key performance metrics. The ultimate goal of developing biomarkers is to determine the conservation value and utility of a given coral colony, including the host animal, its algal symbionts, and their microbial partners. However, we remain far from achieving this goal because most efforts have not yet moved beyond the initial discovery phase. Here, we review recent progress in the development of coral molecular biomarkers from a practical standpoint and consider the many challenges that remain as roadblocks to large-scale implementation. We caution practitioners that, while biomarkers are a promising technology, they are unlikely to be available for field application in the near future barring a rapid shift in research focus from discovery to subsequent validation and field trials. To facilitate such a shift, we propose a stepwise framework to guide additional study in this area, with the aim of accelerating practical molecular biomarker development to enhance coral restoration practice.

1. Introduction

The management of reef-building coral populations has progressed beyond basic conservation to active restoration. This practice is especially evident in Florida and the Caribbean, where multiple in-water nurseries specializing in the asexual propagation of multiple species, particularly the endangered staghorn coral, *Acropora cervicornis*, have been established (Young et al. 2012). In the last decade, significant progress has been made in coral husbandry: practitioners are now capable of generating tens of thousands of colonies via microfragmentation in a matter of months (D. Vaughan, personal communication), and managing the in-water grow-out of similar numbers using submerged buoyant structures (Fig. 1, Nedimyer et al. 2011; Lirman et al. 2014; Forsman et al. 2015). The rate-limiting step impeding broader restoration goals is the outplanting of nursery-reared stock back onto natural reefs. Growth and survival of coral outplants is highly variable, both among genotypes and reef sites (Bowden-Kerby 2008; Bowden-Kerby and Carne 2012; Lirman et al. 2014; Johnson 2015; Drury et al. 2017; Lohr and Patterson 2017; O'Donnell et al. 2018), and practitioners currently have no way of reliably matching source corals with their optimum outplant destinations.

Box 1 Defining Biomarkers

In 2001 the NIH-funded Biomarkers Definitions Working Group defined biological markers as objectively measurable indicators of a biological processes (Biomarkers Definitions Working Group 2001). Markers can be diagnostic, meaning they provide some information with respect to an ongoing condition, or predictive, meaning they provide some information that can be used to make a decision about a potential future outcome. Although the original intent was to standardize studies in the rapidly developing field of personalized medicine, this definition is universal and we adopt it here for the purposes of coral restoration ecology. In this sense, there are biomarkers that are already routinely used in coral science and reef management. Diagnostic markers include PAM fluorometry as a proxy for photosynthetic function (Warner et al. 2010) and the CoralWatch Coral Health Chart as a bleaching indicator (Siebeck et al. 2006). Predictive markers include NOAA's degree heating weeks as an indicator of the likelihood of observing mass coral bleaching (Liu et al. 2003). The value of such biomarkers is that, when accurately quantified, they are easily assayable substitutes exhibiting strong correlations with meaningful biological phenotypes.

There is also a growing desire to identify and outplant the most resilient corals, such as those less susceptible to disease outbreaks or more tolerant of temperature stress (e.g. van Oppen et al. 2015). One impediment to achieving this goal is the challenge of determining what readily quantifiable phenotypes are most indicative of resilience, and we refer readers to our companion review for more detailed consideration (Baums et al. 2018). These restoration priorities have also spurred renewed interest in the development of simplistic assays, such as biomarkers (Box 1), which could provide managers with additional information to aid in outplant design. Recent advances in biotechnology, genomics, and computational power have only increased our ability to identify putative biomarkers (Sgrò et al. 2011; Evans and Hofmann 2012; Traylor-Knowles and Palumbi

Figure 1 Submerged buoyant structures for the grow out of *Acropora cervicornis* fragments. Photo credit: Erich Bartels.

2014). Analogous to expectations in the field of personalized medicine (Willis and Lord 2015), it is hoped that these advances can facilitate rapid identification of resilient corals, diagnose stress events, and provide predictive information to optimize outplanting strategies aimed at preserving genetic diversity and enhancing ecosystem structure and function. While these aims are potentially achievable with sufficient time and resources, our goal here is to synthesize the current state of the science for restoration practitioners, temper some of the high expectations associated with coral biomarker discoveries, and provide a framework to guide future research in this area.

Although the potential utility of molecular biomarkers in diagnosing and predicting health outcomes has long been recognized in the coral restoration science community (Downs et al. 2005b; Evans and Hofmann 2012; Traylor-Knowles and Palumbi 2014), research in this area has yet to produce any management-ready tools. As is evidenced by numerous studies reporting on putative biomarkers (Downs et al. 2000, 2005a; Kenkel et al. 2011, 2014; Lundgren et al. 2013; Bay and Palumbi 2014, 2017; Jin et al. 2016; Mayfield et al. 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Wright et al. 2017; Parkinson et al. 2018), the problem lies not in the discovery phase, but in the subsequent phases of validation, field trials, and implementation (Traylor-Knowles and Palumbi 2014). There are many steps between identifying a potential biomarker and refining it for standard use, and the inherent difficulties involved in downstream biomarker development and validation are often overlooked. Here, we propose a stepwise research framework for bridging this gap (Fig. 1), which is modeled on a similar flow-chart proposed for generating clinical biomarkers (Willis and Lord 2015).

Importantly, we diverge from previous recommendations in that we do not consider the understanding of the underlying biological mechanism to be essential in the design of a functional coral biomarker. Instead we follow the approach adopted by the medical field in prioritizing biomarkers according to their ability to robustly predict or diagnose a response regardless of mechanism (Willis and Lord 2015). Furthermore, establishing mechanism can take several years of experiments, whereas the time frame for effective coral restoration at present, especially in Florida and the Caribbean, is narrow. Below, we

Figure 2 Flow chart depicting steps involved in biomarker development (adapted from Willis and Lord 2015).

outline each of the proposed steps in detail, explaining the rationale and reviewing relevant literature. Although our discussion is limited to molecular biomarkers, we believe that satisfying the criteria described in this framework will be necessary for developing any type of biomarker, including ecophysiological, environmental, or otherwise.

2. Molecular Biomarker Discovery

Funding for coral restoration fundamentally constrains the type of research undertaken as well as the eventual implementation of any newly developed methodology by practitioners. Consequently, it is at this initial stage of biomarker development that researchers should consider the ultimate cost to end-users, both at the level of base cost (for materials and reagents necessary to run the prospective assay) as well as the cost in person-hours (for sample processing and subsequent analyses necessary to generate usable information). It may be that cutting-edge molecular approaches that are highly promising in terms of the amount of information that can be generated may not be practical solutions, in the near-term, for restoration programs which operate without access to a molecular lab, a stable internet connection, or a computationally-trained staff.

Nevertheless, whole genome screening approaches still have value, and recent efforts to develop a 60K SNP-chip array and a centralized analysis and repository pipeline for Caribbean acroporids show that the generation of big data can be achieved for comparatively low cost and user effort (estimated \$50 per sample; S. Kitchen, I. Baums, personal communication). However, at this earliest stage a cost/benefit analysis should be conducted to weigh the potential utility of an assay against barriers to its implementation. The type of assay desired, whether diagnostic or predictive, will also inform initial experimental design and downstream development considerations. As studies focused on human health applications have shown, biomarkers are generally highly specific to particular conditions and not necessarily transferable, even within the same family of diseases, such as the Oncotype test for estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer (Cronin et al. 2007). If true for corals, this may necessitate different markers for each combination of species, trait, and condition, which will further increase costs.

Coral molecular biomarker discovery is not currently a bottleneck: many putative markers have already been proposed (Downs et al. 2000, 2005a; Kenkel et al. 2011, 2014; Lundgren et al. 2013; Bay and Palumbi 2014, 2017; Jin et al. 2016; Mayfield et al. 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Wright et al. 2017; Parkinson et al. 2018). Furthermore, given the substantial progress being made in the field of coral ecological genomics, additional candidates could be identified through a larger meta-analysis of currently published studies which quantify both ‘-omics’ markers and phenotypes of interest. Such an analysis would be facilitated by establishing a broader genotype/phenotype database, similar to those currently available for model organisms (Gramates et al. 2016) and planned for *Acropora cervicornis* and other Caribbean corals (Baums et al. 2018). Because discovery is relatively easy and inexpensive, it should be viewed as an initial step in any biomarker project with application goals, not an end goal.

(a) Cost/Benefit Analysis

We consider the large-scale restoration of *Acropora cervicornis* in the Florida Keys as a case study in estimating costs from the perspective of practitioners and funding agencies. Since 2007, various organizations have transplanted on the order of 100,000 fragments of *A. cervicornis* along the Florida Reef Tract (Schopmeyer et al. 2017, <https://www.coralrestoration.org/restoration>), which represents roughly 10,000 fragments per year. At present, major acroporid nurseries in Florida are charging ~\$20 per nursery fragment (D. Vaughan, personal communication), although some published estimates run as low as ~\$1 per fragment (Edwards 2010). The total price of this effort (assuming no economies of scale) can therefore be estimated at \$10,000-\$200,000 in annual coral propagation costs alone (but see models of Vardi et al. 2012 and Mercado-Molina et al. 2015, which predict that success can be achieved with far fewer acroporid outplants). In most cases, the genotypes outplanted at a given site are not native to that site, and are haphazardly selected from the nursery stock, which are in turn sourced from a variety of sites in the general area. While average mortality among non-native *A. cervicornis* outplants is ~15% during a typical year (Schopmeyer et al. 2017), it can rise to ~89% in a bleaching year (Drury et al. 2017). Applying this average mortality, and assuming that only 15% of corals would have expired in the absence of heat stress, a single annual bleaching event could represent a loss of \$7,400-\$148,000. Consequently, rather than outplanting randomly, a hypothetical biomarker to predict thermal tolerance could be used to identify resilient genotypes and prioritize their restoration. If such prioritization reduced bleaching mortality by even 25% (a reasonable value considering the effect sizes of some commercially important quantitative trait loci (QTLs) in plants; e.g. Anderson et al. 2007), this would represent a cost saving of \$2,225-\$44,500 per year, or \$22,250-\$445,000 per decade.

This calculation emphasizes that the cost saving first depends on the price to rear a colony, which likely varies from nursery to nursery, and secondly on marker effectiveness. The cost to outplant a coral fragment varies considerably, with estimates as low as ~\$1 USD per unit (Edwards 2010), to practical examples ranging from ~\$5 per unit (Villanueva et al. 2012; Chamberland et al. 2015) up to an extreme ~\$150 per unit (Nakamura et al. 2011), depending on the species and scenario. Cost per unit depends both on the input costs (which are determined primarily by nursery, location, and sociocultural factors, but also by species and productivity) and on survivorship (which is determined primarily by environment and location, species, and unpredictable disturbance events). If coral propagation costs are in the upper range of the estimate, developing a useful biomarker could be worthwhile, especially considering that the marker could be applied to multiple restoration projects throughout the Caribbean. At the lower end, however, if coral propagation costs can be minimized, a trial-and-error approach to outplant site selection may indeed be the most cost-effective method, even if it does result in high subsequent coral mortality.

(b) Types of Molecular Biomarkers: Benefits and Barriers

As a consequence of the ‘-omics’ revolution, many types of molecular markers can now be evaluated as potential biomarkers in a high-throughput, cost-effective manner. However, before investing in downstream development, the ultimate applicability from the practitioner’s perspective should be considered when deciding which methods to explore. In addition, the type and quality of information provided by each marker should be considered. For example, if a predictive assay is desired, a marker that is a fixed property of an individual may be more desirable than one that is variable (Bourlat et al. 2013). Below, we summarize different types of biomarkers in the context of these benefits and barriers.

(i) Genetic/genomic biomarkers of host corals are based on associations between DNA variation (fixed differences in the genetic code among individuals, populations, or species) and phenotypes (traits) of interest. These markers range from single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) to copy number variants, such as microsatellites. High-throughput methods used to identify such biomarkers include whole genome/transcriptome sequencing and resequencing, genotyping by sequencing, restriction-site associated DNA (RAD) sequencing, and amplicon sequencing (reviewed by Matz 2017). One benefit of investing in the downstream development of genomic markers is that many studies aimed at uncovering the genomic basis of adaptive trait variation in corals have already identified putative markers for further development (e.g. Lundgren et al. 2013; Bay and Palumbi 2014, 2017; Dixon et al. 2015; Jin et al. 2016; Kirk et al. 2017; Kitchen et al. 2018). Additionally, DNA sequences are more fixed than any other type of molecular biomarker, and are therefore the most amenable to predictive assays. Barriers to consider include whether assay design can be sufficiently streamlined for general use by restoration practitioners and the transferability of markers when initial discovery studies are focused on non-restoration species. For example, the probes on the 60K SNP-chip designed for Caribbean acroporids works well within the genus (e.g. 30-54K transferable probes for Indo-Pacific acroporids) but poorly for other genera (e.g. 344 transferable probes for *Orbicella faveolata* and 456 for *Stylophora pistillata*; S. Kitchen, I. Baums, personal communication).

(ii) Genetic/genomic biomarkers of holobiont community composition are a special case in that the presence/absence or abundance of particular microbial organisms (as determined through DNA quantification) may be associated with metrics of coral host performance and thus may reflect phenotypes of interest to restoration practitioners. Corals associate with unicellular algal symbionts (Symbiodiniaceae) as well as with other members of the microbial community, such as bacteria (for recent reviews, see Hernandez-Agreda et al. 2018; LaJeunesse et al. 2018). The presence/absence or relative abundance of particular Symbiodiniaceae (Bay et al. 2016; Parkinson et al. 2018) and bacteria (Ziegler et al. 2017; Leite et al. 2018) have been proposed as potential biomarkers (reviewed by Roitman et al. 2018). Specific genomic regions that differentiate taxa, such as 16S or ITS, can be targeted using amplicon sequencing and/or quantitation, such as real-time PCR (e.g. Mieog et al.

2007). Alternatively, metagenomics can be used to recover whole genomes and their relative abundances. Biomarkers of holobiont community composition share similar benefits and barriers as host genomic markers, but may not remain fixed during a coral's lifetime. They tend to vary widely among healthy colonies in different environments, and they often respond to stress in stochastic ways (Zaneveld et al. 2017); consequently they may be less useful for developing predictive assays.

(iii) Epigenetic/genomic biomarkers are based on associations between phenotypes and different chemical modifications of the genome (rather than changes in DNA sequences themselves). In corals, DNA methylation has received the most attention to date (Dixon et al. 2014; Dimond and Roberts 2016; Liew et al. 2018), but it is important to note that other epigenetic changes may also be important, such as histone acetylation, which plays a role in memory consolidation in crabs (Federman et al. 2009). High throughput methods for exploring such markers include whole genome methylation profiling, bisulfite sequencing, and MethylRAD (Wang et al. 2015; Kurdyukov and Bullock 2016). Putative epigenetic biomarkers have been identified in coral hosts (Liew et al. 2018), but may also be present in algal symbionts or other microbial community members. The benefits and barriers of epigenetic biomarkers are similar to genomic markers, but—as for biomarkers of holobiont community composition—an additional barrier is that these biomarkers may change over time and are not necessarily fixed across generations (Heard and Martienssen 2014). Such markers will likely be identified as by-products of an increase in basic research focused on understanding the role of epigenetic modification for phenotypic trait variation in general (Eirin-Lopez and Putnam 2018).

(iv) Gene expression biomarkers quantify messenger RNA (mRNA) and are based on associations between phenotypes of interest and changes in gene transcription (the process of translating genes to proteins). Methods used to quantify gene expression patterns include metatranscriptomics, mRNA sequencing, and quantitative reverse transcription PCR (qRT-PCR). Expression biomarkers have progressed furthest in terms of overall development (see Molecular Biomarker Validation and Field Trials, below), and have been investigated in the context of both diagnostic and predictive capacities for a variety of phenotypes in the coral host, and to a lesser extent in the algal symbiont (reviewed by Louis et al. 2017). To our knowledge, expression markers in other members of the microbial community have not been explored, but that does not exclude their possible utility. Barriers specific to gene expression biomarkers includes the inherent variability of transcription over time, and even within colonies (Mayfield et al. 2012; Parkinson et al. 2018); additional work is needed to understand how to control for these variables. Some preliminary proof-of-concept work has already been done to address barriers related to transferability and simplicity of assay design (Kenkel et al. 2011; Wright et al. 2017) and further progress in these areas will be facilitated by basic research, especially with high-throughput methods (e.g. Bay and Palumbi 2015, 2017).

(v) Protein-based biomarkers relate levels of specific proteins (the products of gene translation that interact to perform biochemical functions in a cell) to phenotypes of interest. Older techniques relied on immunohistochemistry to quantify proteins, but more high-throughput technologies, such as proteomics, have recently been applied to cnidarians (Oakley et al. 2016, 2017). Protein-based markers have also progressed quite far in terms of overall marker development (Downs et al. 2000, 2005a). However, antibodies needed for such immunohistochemistry-based approaches are difficult to standardize across production batches (Baker 2015) and proteomic methods have yet to catch up to their genomic and transcriptomic counterparts in terms of throughput and repeatability, both for sample preparation and analysis. We anticipate that improvement in these techniques will result in the discovery of additional proteomic biomarkers in the future. Similar to gene expression markers, protein levels will likely also vary considerably and marker consistency will be a major consideration during validation studies (Mayfield et al. 2012).

(vi) Metabolomic-based biomarkers focus on associations between levels of metabolites (low molecular weight intermediates and products of enzymatic reactions) and traits of interest. Similar to proteomics, metabolomics techniques have lagged behind the other ‘-omics’ approaches in terms of methods development, but are predicted to rise to prominence in clinical biomarker development as methods improve (Monteiro et al. 2013). As for all marker types discussed, discovery will be facilitated by basic research utilizing these techniques (e.g. Gordon and Leggat 2010; Parkinson and Baums 2014; Klueter et al. 2015; Quinn et al. 2016; Sogin et al. 2016), but subsequent development will be hampered by methodological and analytical complexities. Similar to all other variable molecular markers, consistency must also be carefully vetted prior to any broadscale implementation.

(c) Common Experimental Design Considerations

In many ways, the goals of coral restoration practitioners mirror those of plant breeders, where much more research has focused on developing biomarkers to guide management and increase production. Parallel aims include characterizing organismal performance efficiently, choosing which individuals to propagate, and correctly anticipating responses to environmental changes. As technologies have improved, DNA-informed plant breeding has adopted several major experimental approaches to develop biomarkers and/or improve performance directly. The types of biomarkers pursued are generally genomic, because breeding programs are inherently predictive. Chronologically, the earliest approaches to identify such predictive markers focused on quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping, followed by genome-wide association studies (GWAS), then genome-wide selection (GS), and most recently gene editing. The life cycle of each approach tends to comprise periods of initial excitement, followed by a realization of the mismatch between hype and true deliverables, then an acceptance of the reality of what each approach can actually provide (Bernardo 2016). In recent years, coral biologists have begun to use many of these approaches to address basic research questions. Given the great interest in

identifying predictive markers for coral restoration applications (van Oppen et al. 2015) we briefly consider the promises and limitations of each experimental approach in this context.

QTL mapping is an established system for identifying single genes that have a large and consistent effect across many individuals in a population, but one that traditionally requires a known pedigree and several generations to facilitate informative crossing designs. However, many mapping and QTL analysis strategies for plants have been developed more recently to account for their differing propensities to be inbred, their varying generation times, and other factors (Collard et al. 2005, Peace 2017, Verma et al. 2017, Weebadde et al. 2018, Zurn et al. 2018). Most corals have long generation times (e.g. four years to reach sexual maturity in fragmented Caribbean acroporids; Chamberland et al. 2016). Similarly long generation times are observed in crops such as apples and pears, so the QTL mapping strategies used in these systems may be portable to corals (Peace 2017). Another option to accelerate the utility of a QTL approach is to use alternative cnidarian systems with much shorter generation times and less demanding rearing requirements, such as the upside-down jelly *Cassiopea xamachana* (Ohdera et al. 2018). However, these alternate systems often have limited utility for certain phenotypes of interest for reef restoration (such as those related to calcification).

GWAS designs involve large-scale sequencing of many individuals to identify DNA variation that correlates with phenotypes of interest. They are well suited to coral systems because they typically rely on sampling from large, contemporaneous populations lacking pedigrees. However, this dilutes the signal from rare alleles, which may be those of most value (Bernardo 2016). In addition, GWAS typically recover many genes of small effect, whereas for restoration purposes, few genes of large effect may be more useful, as assays will be more streamlined and cost-effective. Furthermore, large-effect genes are the most likely to predict performance and have high heritability in a breeding program (Bernardo 2016). It may be possible to improve GWAS-based detection of rare variants by making use of natural selective experiments (e.g. after a major disease outbreak, the survivors might all be enriched in disease-resistant alleles). Nevertheless, the optimal GWAS design depends on several factors, including sample size, allele frequency, effect size, and genotyping platform (Visscher et al. 2017). Such considerations are beyond the scope of this review, but several guides are available (e.g. Spencer et al. 2009; Cantor et al. 2010), as well as examples from the coral literature (e.g. Lundgren et al. 2013; Jin et al. 2016).

Genome-wide selection (GS) is a new approach in plant breeding that involves developing thousands of SNP markers combined with extensive phenotyping over multiple generations to predict performance in novel environments, particularly for traits governed by many genes of small effect (Bernardo 2016). While GS has been used somewhat successfully in a few agricultural cases (Cabrera-Bosquet et al. 2012), it remains impractical for most plant programs. The genotypic and phenotypic data requirements are massive, and analysis depends on specialized, complicated software (Crossa et al. 2017). Rapid, large scale geno-, pheno-, and enviro-typing are simply not feasible in coral systems at this time. Other cutting-edge technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing have been

demonstrated in corals (Cleves et al. 2018), but remain technically challenging, which make their inclusion in coral restoration programs unlikely in the near future.

3. Molecular Biomarker Validation and Field Trials

To progress beyond the discovery phase, putative coral biomarkers must be tested in several ways. Initial results must be validated by additional lab studies. The consistency and specificity of the marker should be tested in many individuals and across different time periods and environments. The detection range and limits need to be quantified so that practitioners can be made aware of the level of uncertainty inherent to a particular assay. If these small-scale validations yield positive results, trials must then progress beyond controlled laboratory experiments to field-collected samples to see if specificity, consistency, range, and limits remain similar in nature. To our knowledge, only a few sets of coral molecular biomarkers have ever been validated and tested in the field. Here we review key studies to date.

The first efforts began nearly two decades ago with the development of a suite of protein bioassays to detect host and/or symbiont protein and metabolic condition, oxidative stress response, and xenobiotic response in laboratory-stressed orbicellid colonies (Downs et al. 2000, 2005a). Application of these markers to monitor the health of five colonies at several reef sites in the Florida Keys seasonally for a year revealed one location exhibiting unique signatures of molecular stress at one time point (Downs et al. 2005a). Importantly, the detection of molecular stress preceded a subsequent loss of coral cover at the site, indicating that biomarkers could be used to detect stress and predict coral health outcomes, albeit at low resolution. Field validation was also achieved for additional proteins and early gene expression biomarkers using cDNA microarrays (Morgan and Snell 2002; Edge et al. 2005; Morgan et al. 2005).

More recently, a broader multivariate approach to validation was trialed in a survey of a few pocilloporid colonies from each of ~50 sites in Fiji and Tonga (Mayfield et al. 2017a, 2017b). RNA/DNA ratios and the expression levels of several host and symbiont genes were used to determine the biomarker profile of an “average” coral at these locations, and statistical outliers were identified as “aberrant” (Mayfield et al. 2017a, 2017b). In total, 23 of the 136 colonies (17%) were considered aberrant, but the lack of additional phenotypic trait data precluded linking the differences in assay values to health outcomes. A more extensive series of laboratory experiments was employed in the development of two ‘double-gene assays’ to discriminate between acute and long-term stress in the Caribbean coral *Porites astreoides* (Kenkel et al. 2011, 2014), which were subsequently validated in four ways. First, field-collected colonies were compared between a high temperature/light inshore site and a low temperature/light offshore site. Consistent with these environmental differences, the acute stress marker indicated that the inshore colonies (n = 9) were somewhat ‘stressed’, whereas offshore colonies (n = 7) were not. Second, corals were sampled *in situ* during a natural bleaching event. The acute stress marker value was low and indistinguishable in both bleached (n = 10) and healthy colonies (n = 10), suggesting

that the inciting stress had passed, but the long-term stress assay indicated a history of prior stress in only the bleached colonies. Third, an additional laboratory experiment revealed that the acute stress assay also reflected stress levels in the Pacific congener *Porites lobata*. Because of their relatively extensive field validation and utility across species, these double-gene stress assays currently show the most promise for broad application as coral molecular biomarkers, although they have only been validated in the field during the summer season.

A recent field study used a repeated measures design to quantify gene expression responses of 30 colonies of *Acropora cervicornis* exposed to the identical thermal stresses at four different time points during a year (Parkinson et al. 2018). While 40% of genes exhibited consistent responses, the remainder varied considerably and none were related to seasonal changes in coral performance (growth, mortality, or bleaching). In one striking example, there was a >1,000-fold difference in the expression of a gene among two independently-growing fragments derived from the same donor colony. These results indicate that, while diagnostic markers may be easier to identify than predictive markers, validation nevertheless requires large sample sizes and multiple time points to account for sometimes large transcriptional variation among and within coral colonies.

Two additional studies have incorporated some level of downstream marker validation, both focusing on predictive assays. The first study is the only validation to date of a genomic biomarker (Jin et al. 2016). A GWAS-type design was used to first identify SNPs associated with environmental differences among *Acropora millepora* populations spanning 12° latitude along the Great Barrier Reef. The top two candidate loci were then further validated by comparing corals exhibiting different phenotypic responses to natural stress events. Of 150 colonies sampled across five sites in the Palm Islands group during a natural summer bleaching event, healthy corals exhibited a 12% higher frequency of a particular SNP (allele T) at one locus (C70S236). In a subsequent survey of 165 corals following a severe runoff event which increased turbidity and decreased salinity, healthy corals showed a 28% higher SNP frequency of the G allele at the second locus (C29226S281). Finally, genotypes at the two loci explained a large proportion of the variance in the host coral's coenzyme Q levels and in the algal endosymbiont's maximum quantum yield of photosystem II in response to controlled heat stress, consistent with prior observations. This study illustrates the potential utility of a GWAS design, but additional work is needed to determine the relationship between variance in ecophysiological traits and long-term resilience to disturbance.

In the second study, the gene expression responses of eight *Acropora millepora* colonies to a putative microbial pathogen were investigated (Wright et al. 2017). Two genes were identified whose expression in unexposed fragments predicted survival following bacterial challenge. To validate this two-gene assay and determine its predictive power, an additional 19 colonies were then collected from the field and exposed to a microbial challenge to quantify susceptibility (based on survival). Survival was then related to gene expression in the control treatment samples. The assay successfully categorized the disease risk of a given genotype 73% of the time. As yet, this is the only coral biomarker

that can be used on asymptomatic colonies to predict a future health outcome with sufficient resolution to be useful to restoration practitioners.

4. Molecular Biomarker Implementation

So far, no coral molecular biomarkers have been broadly implemented in any conservation programs. Assuming successful discovery, validation, and field trials, there are additional challenges that may limit molecular biomarker adoption when compared to other types of markers. To assay any molecular marker, individual colonies must be physically sampled at least once. This is a major bottleneck compared to remote sensing via buoy or satellite, which does not require divers, fueled boats, permits, shipping considerations, or special analytical equipment. Other marker systems, such as the CoralWatch Coral Health Chart, have seen large-scale adoption despite the need for individuals to travel into the field; however, tissue collection requires more training and resources than non-invasive visual inspection or photography, which students and citizen scientists can learn rapidly (Siebeck et al. 2006; Parkinson et al. 2016). Such survey methods are relatively inexpensive, whereas molecular techniques always incur additional laboratory and computational costs to generate useful data. Molecular biomarkers are also less translatable; it is unlikely that one assay will work across all species of interest, whereas a metric such as color—although requiring species-specific calibration—can be assessed universally. Finally, there is a time component to consider: while well-equipped restoration practitioners could potentially sample a coral and assess a molecular biomarker in just a few days, others in more remote locations may have to wait weeks or months for sample shipment and analysis to be completed.

Nevertheless, molecular biomarkers have been successfully incorporated into restoration and breeding programs for other marine organisms, suggesting they could also be used effectively at large scales to influence health and conservation outcomes for coral reefs. For example, a genomic panel of 188 SNPs was used by wildlife managers to identify introgression from hatchery broodstock into wild salmonid populations in the Pacific Northwest (Steele et al. 2013), and multiple nonacademic laboratories now use genomic data to manage these populations (Garner et al. 2016). On land, larger panels have been incorporated into dairy cattle breeding programs, leading to genetic gains for commercially-important traits, improved selection accuracy and breeding value predictions, shorter generation intervals, and reduced costs (for reviews, see Pryce and Daetwyler 2012; Wiggans et al. 2017). Similar results have been reported for plant breeding programs designed for commercial crops such as maize, soybean, rice, and wheat (reviewed by Mammadov et al. 2012). Consequently, although corals present unique challenges, progress in these other fields should guide genomic efforts to restore reefs, and we encourage coral restoration researchers to continue to incorporate these developments into their work.

5. Conclusion

In this review, we take a critical look at the current state of molecular biomarkers for reef restoration and emphasize that broad application is still a distant goal. However, our intent is not to dismiss biomarker research outright. As our cost/benefit calculations suggest, biomarkers could represent a substantial savings, and may be particularly useful in situations where one or a few species have the potential to restore the ecological services a complex reef provides, as is the case with Caribbean acroporids. By highlighting current barriers, we hope to catalyze further research to advance coral molecular biomarker development beyond the discovery phase. Because so few studies have attempted the subsequent steps of validation and field trials, no molecular biomarkers are yet ready for implementation, despite broad interest and urgent need. Increased communication between scientists and practitioners will be necessary to determine whether biomarkers are desired, and if so, which putative markers should be prioritized for subsequent development. Fortunately, as plant and animal breeding programs have shown, implementation can be effective provided researchers, practitioners, and funders are aligned. Given the vast ecological and economic importance of reefs, and the rapid degradation they face in light of climate change, the ideal window for additional biomarker research is now.

Acknowledgements

The Coral Restoration Consortium (CRC) formed in the fall of 2016 and established eight initial working groups to provide best management practices for coral restoration with collaborative participation of practitioners, reef managers, and scientists. The synthesis provided here is a product of the coral genetics and science working group. The CRC, the Pennsylvania State University's Institute for Sustainability, Institute for Energy and the Environment and the Center for Marine Science and Technology are acknowledged for travel and logistics support. Special thanks to Michelle L. Loewe for her support of the working group.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, J.E.P. and C.D.K.; Writing—Original Draft, J.E.P. and C.D.K.; Writing—Review and Editing, J.E.P., A.C.B., I.B.B., S.W.D., A.G.G., S.A.K., T.C.L., M.V.M., M.W.M., S.R.P., A.A.S., and C.D.K.; Project Administration, J.E.P, I.B.B., and C.D.K.; Funding Acquisition, I.B.B.

References

- Anderson JA, Chao S, Liu S (2007) Molecular breeding using a major QTL for *Fusarium* head blight resistance in wheat. *Crop Sci* 47:S112–S119
- Baker M (2015) Reproducibility crisis: blame it on the antibodies. *Nature* 521:274–276
- Baums IB, Baker AC, Davies SW, Grottoli AG, Kenkel CD, Kitchen SA, Kuffner IB, LaJeunesse TC, Matz MV, Miller MW, Palumbi SR, Parkinson JE, Shantz AA (2018) How to maximize future adaptive potential of restored coral populations. (in review)
- Bay LK, Doyle J, Logan M, Berkelmans R (2016) Recovery from bleaching is mediated by threshold densities of background thermo-tolerant symbiont types in a reef-building coral. *R Soc Open Sci* 3:160322
- Bay RA, Palumbi SR (2014) Multilocus adaptation associated with heat resistance in reef-building corals. *Curr Biol* 24:2952–2956
- Bay RA, Palumbi SR (2015) Rapid acclimation ability mediated by transcriptome changes in reef-building corals. *Genome Biol Evol* 7:1602–1612
- Bay RA, Palumbi SR (2017) Transcriptome predictors of coral survival and growth in a highly variable environment. *Ecol Evol* 7:4794–4803
- Bernardo R (2016) Bandwagons I, too, have known. *Theor Appl Genet* 129:2323–2332
- Biomarkers Definitions Working Group. (2001) Biomarkers and surrogate endpoints: preferred definitions and conceptual framework. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 69:89–95
- Bourlat SJ, Borja A, Gilbert J, Taylor MI, Davies N, Weisberg SB, Griffith JF, Lettieri T, Field D, Benzie J, Glöckner FO, Rodríguez-Ezpeleta N, Faith DP, Bean TP, Obst M (2013) Genomics in marine monitoring: New opportunities for assessing marine health status. *Mar Pollut Bull* 74:19–31
- Bowden-Kerby A (2008) Restoration of threatened *Acropora cervicornis* corals: intraspecific variation as a factor in mortality, growth, and self-attachment. *Proc 11th Int Coral Reef Symp* 2:1200–1204
- Bowden-Kerby A, Carne L (2012) Thermal tolerance as a factor in Caribbean *Acropora* restoration. *Proc 12th Int Coral Reef Symp*
- Cabrera-Bosquet L, Crossa J, von Zitzewitz J, Serret MD, Araus JL (2012) High-throughput phenotyping and genomic selection: the frontiers of crop breeding converge. *J Integr Plant Biol* 54:312–320
- Cantor RM, Lange K, Sinsheimer JS (2010) Prioritizing GWAS results: a review of statistical methods and recommendations for their application. *Am J Hum Genet* 86:6–22
- Chamberland VF, Petersen D, Latijnhouwers KRW, Snowden S, Mueller B, Vermeij MJA (2016) Four-year-old Caribbean *Acropora* colonies reared from field-collected gametes are sexually mature. *Bull Mar Sci* 92:263–264

- Chamberland VF, Vermeij MJA, Brittsan M, Carl M, Schick M, Snowden S, Schrier A, Petersen D (2015) Restoration of critically endangered elkhorn coral (*Acropora palmata*) populations using larvae reared from wild-caught gametes. *Global Ecol Conserv* 4:526–537
- Cleves PA, Strader ME, Bay LK, Pringle JR, Matz MV (2018) CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genome editing in a reef-building coral. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 115:5235–5240
- Collard BCY, Jahufer MZZ, Brouwer JB, Pang ECK (2005) An introduction to markers, quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping and marker-assisted selection for crop improvement: the basic concepts. *Euphytica* 142:169–196
- Cronin M, Sangli C, Liu M-L, Pho M, Dutta D, Nguyen A, Jeong J, Wu J, Langone KC, Watson D (2007) Analytical validation of the Oncotype DX genomic diagnostic test for recurrence prognosis and therapeutic response prediction in node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. *Clin Chem* 53:1084–1091
- Crossa J, Pérez-Rodríguez P, Cuevas J, Montesinos-López O, Jarquín D, de Los Campos G, Burgueño J, González-Camacho JM, Pérez-Elizalde S, Beyene Y, Dreisigacker S, Singh R, Zhang X, Gowda M, Roorkiwal M, Rutkoski J, Varshney RK (2017) Genomic selection in plant breeding: methods, models, and perspectives. *Trends Plant Sci* 22:961–975
- Dimond JL, Roberts SB (2016) Germline DNA methylation in reef corals: patterns and potential roles in response to environmental change. *Mol Ecol* 25:1895–1904
- Dixon GB, Bay LK, Matz MV (2014) Bimodal signatures of germline methylation are linked with gene expression plasticity in the coral *Acropora millepora*. *BMC Genomics* 15:1109
- Dixon GB, Davies SW, Aglyamova GA, Meyer E, Bay LK, Matz MV (2015) Genomic determinants of coral heat tolerance across latitudes. *Science* 348:1460–1462
- Downs CA, Fauth JE, Robinson CE, Curry R, Lanzendorf B, Halas JC, Halas J, Woodley CM (2005a) Cellular diagnostics and coral health: declining coral health in the Florida Keys. *Mar Pollut Bull* 51:558–569
- Downs CA, Mueller E, Phillips S, Fauth JE, Woodley CM (2000) A molecular biomarker system for assessing the health of coral (*Montastraea faveolata*) during heat stress. *Mar Biotechnol* 2:533–544
- Downs CA, Woodley CM, Richmond RH, Lanning LL, Owen R (2005b) Shifting the paradigm of coral-reef “health” assessment. *Mar Pollut Bull* 51:486–494
- Drury C, Manzello D, Lirman D (2017) Genotype and local environment dynamically influence growth, disturbance response and survivorship in the threatened coral, *Acropora cervicornis*. *PLoS One* 12:e0174000
- Edge SE, Morgan MB, Gleason DF, Snell TW (2005) Development of a coral cDNA array to examine gene expression profiles in *Montastraea faveolata* exposed to environmental stress. *Mar Pollut Bull* 51:507–523
- Edwards AJ (2010) Reef Rehabilitation Manual. Coral Reef Targeted Research and Capacity Building for Management Program, St. Lucia, Australia
- Eirin-Lopez JM, Putnam HM (2018) Marine environmental epigenetics. *Ann Rev Mar Sci*

- Evans TG, Hofmann GE (2012) Defining the limits of physiological plasticity: how gene expression can assess and predict the consequences of ocean change. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 367:1733–1745
- Federman N, Fustiřana MS, Romano A (2009) Histone acetylation is recruited in consolidation as a molecular feature of stronger memories. *Learn Mem* 16:600–606
- Forsman ZH, Page CA, Toonen RJ, Vaughan D (2015) Growing coral larger and faster: micro-colony-fusion as a strategy for accelerating coral cover. *PeerJ* 3:e1313
- Garner BA, Hand BK, Amish SJ, Bernatchez L, Foster JT, Miller KM, Morin PA, Narum SR, O'Brien SJ, Roffler G, Templin WD, Sunnucks P, Strait J, Warheit KI, Seamons TR, Wenburg J, Olsen J, Luikart G (2016) Genomics in conservation: case studies and bridging the gap between data and application. *Trends Ecol Evol* 31:81–83
- Gordon BR, Leggat W (2010) *Symbiodinium*—invertebrate symbioses and the role of metabolomics. *Mar Drugs* 8:2546–2568
- Gramates LS, Marygold SJ, Santos G dos, Urbano J-M, Antonazzo G, Matthews BB, Rey AJ, Tabone CJ, Crosby MA, Emmert DB, Others (2016) FlyBase at 25: looking to the future. *Nucleic Acids Res* gkw1016
- Heard E, Martienssen RA (2014) Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance: myths and mechanisms. *Cell* 157:95–109
- Hernandez-Agreda A, Leggat W, Bongaerts P, Herrera C, Ainsworth TD (2018) Rethinking the coral microbiome: simplicity exists within a diverse microbial biosphere. *MBio* 9:e00812-18
- Jin YK, Lundgren P, Lutz A, Raina J-B, Howells EJ, Paley AS, Willis BL, van Oppen MJH (2016) Genetic markers for antioxidant capacity in a reef-building coral. *Sci Adv* 2:e1500842
- Johnson M (2015) Staghorn coral, *Acropora cervicornis*, restoration in South Florida: growth and survivorship of outplanted nursery corals. Nova Southeastern University
- Kenkel CD, Aglyamova G, Alamaru A, Bhagooli R, Capper R, Cunning R, deVillers A, Haslun JA, Hédouin L, Keshavmurthy S, Kuehl KA, Mahmoud H, McGinty ES, Montoya-Maya PH, Palmer CV, Pantile R, Sánchez JA, Schils T, Silverstein RN, Squiers LB, Tang P-C, Goulet TL, Matz MV (2011) Development of gene expression markers of acute heat-light stress in reef-building corals of the genus *Porites*. *PLoS One* 6:e26914
- Kenkel CD, Sheridan C, Leal MC, Bhagooli R, Castillo KD, Kurata N, McGinty E, Goulet TL, Matz MV (2014) Diagnostic gene expression biomarkers of coral thermal stress. *Mol Ecol Resour* 14:667–678
- Kirk NL, Howells EJ, Abrego D, Burt JA, Meyer E (2017) Genomic and transcriptomic signals of thermal tolerance in heat-tolerant corals (*Platygyra daedalea*) of the Arabian/Persian Gulf. *bioRxiv* 185579
- Kitchen SA, Rata A, Bedoya-Reina OC, Burhans R, Fogarty ND, Miller W, Baums IB (2018) Genomic variants among threatened *Acropora* corals. *bioRxiv* 349910
- Klueter A, Crandall JB, Archer FI, Teece MA, Coffroth MA (2015) Taxonomic and environmental variation of metabolite profiles in marine dinoflagellates of the genus *Symbiodinium*.

- Kurdyukov S, Bullock M (2016) DNA methylation analysis: choosing the right method. *Biology* 5:3
- LaJeunesse TC, Parkinson JE, Gabrielson PW, Jeong HJ, Reimer JD, Voolstra CR, Santos SC (2018) Systematic revision of Symbiodiniaceae highlights the antiquity and diversity of coral endosymbionts. *Curr Biol* 28:2570-2580
- Leite DCA, Salles JF, Calderon EN, Castro CB, Bianchini A, Marques JA, van Elsas JD, Peixoto RS (2018) Coral bacterial-core abundance and network complexity as proxies for anthropogenic pollution. *Front Microbiol* 9:833
- Liew YJ, Zoccola D, Li Y, Tambutté E, Venn AA, Michell CT, Cui G, Deutekom ES, Kaandorp JA, Voolstra CR, Forêt S, Allemand D, Tambutté S, Aranda M (2018) Epigenome-associated phenotypic acclimatization to ocean acidification in a reef-building coral. *Sci Adv* 4:eaar8028
- Lirman D, Schopmeyer S, Galvan V, Drury C, Baker AC, Baums IB (2014) Growth dynamics of the threatened Caribbean staghorn coral *Acropora cervicornis*: influence of host genotype, symbiont identity, colony size, and environmental setting. *PLoS One* 9:e107253
- Liu G, Strong AE, Skirving W (2003) Remote sensing of sea surface temperatures during 2002 Barrier Reef coral bleaching. *Eos Trans AGU* 84:137–141
- Lohr KE, Patterson JT (2017) Intraspecific variation in phenotype among nursery-reared staghorn coral *Acropora cervicornis* (Lamarck, 1816). *J Exp Mar Bio Ecol* 486:87–92
- Louis YD, Bhagooli R, Kenkel CD, Baker AC, Dyll SD (2017) Gene expression biomarkers of heat stress in scleractinian corals: promises and limitations. *Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol Pharmacol* 191:63–77
- Lundgren P, Vera JC, Peplow L, Manel S, van Oppen MJH (2013) Genotype—environment correlations in corals from the Great Barrier Reef. *BMC Genet* 14:9
- Mammadov J, Aggarwal R, Buyyarapu R, Kumpatla S (2012) SNP markers and their impact on plant breeding. *Int J Plant Genomics* 2012:728398
- Matz MV (2017) Fantastic beasts and how to sequence them: ecological genomics for obscure model organisms. *Trends Genet* 34:121-132
- Mayfield AB, Chen C-S, Dempsey AC (2017a) Identifying corals displaying aberrant behavior in Fiji's Lau Archipelago. *PLoS One* 12:e0177267
- Mayfield AB, Chen C-S, Dempsey AC (2017b) Biomarker profiling in reef corals of Tonga's Ha'apai and Vava'u archipelagos. *PLoS One* 12:e0185857
- Mayfield AB, Hsiao Y, Fan T, Chen C (2012) Temporal variation in nucleic acid and protein ratios in four anthozoan-dinoflagellate endosymbioses of the Indo-Pacific: implications for molecular diagnostics. *Platax* 9:1–24
- Mayfield AB, Wang Y-B, Chen C-S, Chen S-H, Lin C-Y (2016) Dual-compartmental transcriptomic + proteomic analysis of a marine endosymbiosis exposed to environmental

change. *Mol Ecol* 25:5944–5958

- Mercado-Molina AE, Ruiz-Díaz CP, Pérez ME, Rodríguez-Barreras R, Sabat AM (2015) Demography of the threatened coral *Acropora cervicornis*: implications for its management and conservation. *Coral Reefs* 34:1113–1124
- Mieog JC, van Oppen MJH, Cantin NE, Stam WT (2007) Real-time PCR reveals a high incidence of *Symbiodinium* clade D at low levels in four scleractinian corals across the Great Barrier Reef: implications for symbiont shuffling. *Coral Reefs* 26:449–457
- Monteiro MS, Carvalho M, Bastos ML, Guedes de Pinho P (2013) Metabolomics analysis for biomarker discovery: advances and challenges. *Curr Med Chem* 20:257–271
- Morgan MB, Edge SE, Snell TW (2005) Profiling differential gene expression of corals along a transect of waters adjacent to the Bermuda municipal dump. *Mar Pollut Bull* 51:524–533
- Morgan MB, Snell TW (2002) Characterizing stress gene expression in reef-building corals exposed to the mosquitoside dibrom. *Mar Pollut Bull* 44:1206–1218
- Nakamura R, Ando W, Yamamoto H, Kitano M, Sato A, Nakamura M, Kayanne H, Omori M (2011) Corals mass-cultured from eggs and transplanted as juveniles to their native, remote coral reef. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 436:161–168
- Nedimyer K, Gaines K, Roach S, Others (2011) Coral tree nursery: an innovative approach to growing corals in an ocean-based field nursery. *AACL Bioflux* 4:442–446
- Oakley CA, Ameisemeier MF, Peng L, Weis VM, Grossman AR, Davy SK (2016) Symbiosis induces widespread changes in the proteome of the model cnidarian *Aiptasia*. *Cell Microbiol* 18:1009–1023
- Oakley CA, Durand E, Wilkinson SP, Peng L, Weis VM, Grossman AR, Davy SK (2017) Thermal shock induces host proteostasis disruption and endoplasmic reticulum stress in the model symbiotic cnidarian *Aiptasia*. *J Proteome Res* 16:2121–2134
- O'Donnell KE, Lohr KE, Bartels E, Baums IB, Patterson JT (2018) *Acropora cervicornis* genet performance and symbiont identity throughout the restoration process. *Coral Reefs*
- Ohdera AH, Abrams MJ, Ames CL, Baker DM, Suescún-Bolívar LP, Collins AG, Freeman CJ, Gamero-Mora E, Goulet TL, Hofmann DK, Jaimes-Becerra A, Long PF, Marques AC, Miller LA, Mydlarz LD, Morandini AC, Newkirk CR, Putri SP, Samson JE, Stampar SN, Steinworth B, Templeman M, Thomé PE, Vlok M, Woodley CM, Wong JCY, Martindale MQ, Fitt WK, Medina M (2018) Upside-down but headed in the right direction: review of the highly versatile *Cassiopea xamachana* system. *Front Ecol Evol* 6:157
- van Oppen MJH, Oliver JK, Putnam HM, Gates RD (2015) Building coral reef resilience through assisted evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112:2307–2313
- Parkinson JE, Bartels E, Devlin-Durante MK, Lustic C, Nedimyer K, Schopmeyer S, Lirman D, LaJeunesse TC, Baums IB (2018) Extensive transcriptional variation poses a challenge to thermal stress biomarker development for endangered corals. *Mol Ecol* 27:1103–1119
- Parkinson JE, Baums IB (2014) The extended phenotypes of marine symbioses: ecological and evolutionary consequences of intraspecific genetic diversity in coral–algal associations.

- Parkinson JE, Yang S-Y, Kawamura I, Byron G, Todd PA, Reimer JD (2016) A citizen science approach to monitoring bleaching in the zoantharian *Palythoa tuberculosa*. *PeerJ* 4:e1815
- Peace CP (2017) DNA-informed breeding of rosaceous crops: promises, progress and prospects. *Hortic Res* 4:17006
- Pryce JE, Daetwyler HD (2012) Designing dairy cattle breeding schemes under genomic selection: a review of international research. *Anim Produc Sci* 52:107–114
- Quinn RA, Vermeij MJA, Hartmann AC, Galtier d'Auriac I, Benler S, Haas A, Quistad SD, Lim YW, Little M, Sandin S, Smith JE, Dorrestein PC, Rohwer F (2016) Metabolomics of reef benthic interactions reveals a bioactive lipid involved in coral defence. *Proc Biol Sci* 283:1829
- Roitman S, Joseph Pollock F, Medina M (2018) Coral microbiomes as bioindicators of reef health. *Population Genomics*. Springer, Cham, pp 1–19
- Schopmeyer SA, Lirman D, Bartels E, Gilliam DS, Goergen EA, Griffin SP, Johnson ME, Lustic C, Maxwell K, Walter CS (2017) Regional restoration benchmarks for *Acropora cervicornis*. *Coral Reefs* 36:1047–1057
- Sgrò CM, Lowe AJ, Hoffmann AA (2011) Building evolutionary resilience for conserving biodiversity under climate change. *Evol Appl* 4:326–337
- Siebeck UE, Marshall NJ, Klüter A, Hoegh-Guldberg O (2006) Monitoring coral bleaching using a colour reference card. *Coral Reefs* 25:453–460
- Sogin EM, Putnam HM, Anderson PE, Gates RD (2016) Metabolomic signatures of increases in temperature and ocean acidification from the reef-building coral, *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Metabolomics* 12:71
- Spencer CCA, Su Z, Donnelly P, Marchini J (2009) Designing genome-wide association studies: sample size, power, imputation, and the choice of genotyping chip. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000477
- Steele CA, Anderson EC, Ackerman MW, Hess MA, Campbell NR, Narum SR, Campbell MR (2013) A validation of parentage-based tagging using hatchery steelhead in the Snake River basin. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 70:1046–1054
- Traylor-Knowles N, Palumbi SR (2014) Translational environmental biology: cell biology informing conservation. *Trends Cell Biol* 24:265–267
- Vardi T, Williams DE, Sandin SA (2012) Population dynamics of threatened elkhorn coral in the northern Florida Keys, USA. *Endanger Species Res* 19:157–169
- Villanueva RD, Baria MVB, dela Cruz DW (2012) Growth and survivorship of juvenile corals outplanted to degraded reef areas in Bolinao-Anda Reef Complex, Philippines. *Mar Biol Res* 8:877–884
- Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, Yang J (2017) 10 years of GWAS discovery: biology, function, and translation. *Am J Hum Genet* 101:5–22

- Wang S, Lv J, Zhang L, Dou J, Sun Y, Li X, Fu X, Dou H, Mao J, Hu X, Bao Z (2015) MethylRAD: a simple and scalable method for genome-wide DNA methylation profiling using methylation-dependent restriction enzymes. *Open Biol* 5:150130
- Warner ME, Lesser MP, Ralph PJ (2010) Chlorophyll fluorescence in reef building corals. In: Suggett D.J., Prášil O., Borowitzka M.A. (eds) *Chlorophyll a fluorescence in aquatic sciences: methods and applications*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 209–222
- Wiggans GR, Cole JB, Hubbard SM, Sonstegard TS (2017) Genomic selection in dairy cattle: the USDA experience. *Annu Rev Anim Biosci* 5:309–327
- Willis JCD, Lord GM (2015) Immune biomarkers: the promises and pitfalls of personalized medicine. *Nat Rev Immunol* 15:323–329
- Wright RM, Kenkel CD, Dunn CE, Shilling EN, Bay LK, Matz MV (2017) Intraspecific differences in molecular stress responses and coral pathobiome contribute to mortality under bacterial challenge in *Acropora millepora*. *Sci Rep* 7:2609
- Young CN, Schopmeyer SA, Lirman D (2012) A review of reef restoration and coral propagation using the threatened genus *Acropora* in the Caribbean and western Atlantic. *Bull Mar Sci* 88:1075–1098
- Zaneveld JR, McMinds R, Vega Thurber R (2017) Stress and stability: applying the Anna Karenina principle to animal microbiomes. *Nat Microbiol* 2:17121
- Ziegler M, Seneca FO, Yum LK, Palumbi SR, Voolstra CR (2017) Bacterial community dynamics are linked to patterns of coral heat tolerance. *Nat Commun* 8:14213
- Spencer CCA, Su Z, Donnelly P, Marchini J (2009) Designing genome-wide association studies: sample size, power, imputation, and the choice of genotyping chip. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000477
- Steele CA, Anderson EC, Ackerman MW, Hess MA, Campbell NR, Narum SR, Campbell MR (2013) A validation of parentage-based tagging using hatchery steelhead in the Snake River basin. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 70:1046–1054
- Traylor-Knowles N, Palumbi SR (2014) Translational environmental biology: cell biology informing conservation. *Trends Cell Biol* 24:265–267
- Vardi T, Williams DE, Sandin SA (2012) Population dynamics of threatened elkhorn coral in the northern Florida Keys, USA. *Endanger Species Res* 19:157–169
- Verma S, Zurn JD, Salinas N, Mathey M, Denoyes B, Hancock J, Finn C, Bassil N, Whitaker VM (2017) Clarifying sub-genomic positions of QTLs for flowering habit and fruit quality in U.S. strawberry (*Fragaria ×ananassa*) breeding populations using pedigree-based QTL analysis. *Hort Res* 4:17062
- Villanueva RD, Baria MVB, dela Cruz DW (2012) Growth and survivorship of juvenile corals outplanted to degraded reef areas in Bolinao-Anda Reef Complex, Philippines. *Mar Biol Res* 8:877–884
- Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, Yang J (2017) 10

years of GWAS discovery: biology, function, and translation. *Am J Hum Genet* 101:5–22

Wang S, Lv J, Zhang L, Dou J, Sun Y, Li X, Fu X, Dou H, Mao J, Hu X, Bao Z (2015) MethylRAD: a simple and scalable method for genome-wide DNA methylation profiling using methylation-dependent restriction enzymes. *Open Biol* 5:150130

Warner ME, Lesser MP, Ralph PJ (2010) Chlorophyll fluorescence in reef building corals. In: Suggett D.J., Prášil O., Borowitzka M.A. (eds) *Chlorophyll a fluorescence in aquatic sciences: methods and applications*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 209–222

Weebadde CK, Wang D, Finn CE, Lewers KS, Luby JJ, Bushakra J, Sjulín TM, Hancock JF. (2008) Using a linkage mapping approach to identify QTL for day-neutrality in the octoploid strawberry. *Plant Breeding* 127:94–101

Wiggans GR, Cole JB, Hubbard SM, Sonstegard TS (2017) Genomic selection in dairy cattle: the USDA experience. *Annu Rev Anim Biosci* 5:309–327

Willis JCD, Lord GM (2015) Immune biomarkers: the promises and pitfalls of personalized medicine. *Nat Rev Immunol* 15:323–329

Wright RM, Kenkel CD, Dunn CE, Shilling EN, Bay LK, Matz MV (2017) Intraspecific differences in molecular stress responses and coral pathobiome contribute to mortality under bacterial challenge in *Acropora millepora*. *Sci Rep* 7:2609

Young CN, Schopmeyer SA, Lirman D (2012) A review of reef restoration and coral propagation using the threatened genus *Acropora* in the Caribbean and western Atlantic. *Bull Mar Sci* 88:1075–1098

Zaneveld JR, McMinds R, Vega Thurber R (2017) Stress and stability: applying the Anna Karenina principle to animal microbiomes. *Nat Microbiol* 2:17121

Ziegler M, Seneca FO, Yum LK, Palumbi SR, Voolstra CR (2017) Bacterial community dynamics are linked to patterns of coral heat tolerance. *Nat Commun* 8:14213

Zurn JD, Rouse MN, Chao S, Aoun M, Macharia G, Hiebert CW, Pretorius ZA, Bonman JM, Acevedo M (2018) Dissection of the multigenic wheat stem rust resistance present in the Montenegrin spring wheat accession PI 362698. *BMC Genomics* 9:67

Glossary

GBS: Genotyping By Sequencing; a method for identifying SNPs that is similar to RAD sequencing

Genome: the entire complement of an organism's DNA

GWAS: Genome-Wide Association Study; a correlational study that seeks to link genomic differences, such as SNPs, with traits of interest. For example, SNPs that differ between healthy and diseased individuals.

Metabolome: the entire complement of an organism's metabolites, which are the low molecular weight substrates and byproducts of biochemical processes.

Proteome: the entire complement of an organism's proteins, or gene products.

QTL: Quantitative Trait Locus; a region of the genome (which may or may not be an actual gene) that is correlated with a quantitative trait of interest. For example, SNPs that are associated with growth rate.

RAD: Restriction-site Associated DNA; a molecular technique used to identify SNPs in a genome, identical to older methods such as RFLP (restriction fragment length polymorphisms) except that the DNA is sequenced rather than being visualized using agarose gel electrophoresis.

SNPs: Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms; single base-pair differences in a DNA sequence between individuals, populations, or species.

Transcriptome: the entire complement of an organism's messenger RNA, which represents all genes that are expressed.