

11-2015

Economically Relevent Traits and Selection Indcies

Matt Spangler

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, mspangler2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/rangebeefcowsymp>



Part of the [Meat Science Commons](#)

Spangler, Matt, "Economically Relevent Traits and Selection Indcies" (2015). *Range Beef Cow Symposium*. 363.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/rangebeefcowsymp/363>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Range Beef Cow Symposium by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

*** ECONOMICALLY
RELEVANT TRAITS
AND SELECTION
INDICES**

Matt Spangler
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

* $P=G+E$
* Phenotype = Mean + BV + Environment

* There is more than one trait that impacts the profitability of your herd!

*** Fundamentals**

* What are my breeding/marketing goals?

* What traits directly impact the profitability of my enterprise?

* Are there environmental constraints?

*** How To Begin?**

* Traits that are directly associated with a revenue stream or a cost

* Examples

- * BWT vs CE
- * REA vs YG
- * YWT vs CWT
- * MWT vs DMI
- * RFI vs FI

*** Economically Relevant Traits**

* Many ERTs are not currently evaluated nor collected routinely in the seedstock sector

* However, they drive value downstream

- * Reproduction phenotypes (longevity)
- * Disease (pulls, treatments, mortality)
- * "Routine" carcass data
- * Plant value—primal yield, dark cutters, blood splash, etc.

*** Value Discovery of Added Information**

* Traits that are genetically correlated to an ERT

* Why use indicator traits?

- * Measured earlier in life
- * Cheaper/easier to measure
- * Measured on both sexes
- * Coheritability > heritability of ERT

*** Indicator Traits**

*** Across Breed EPD**

Breed table factor (A_i) to add to the EPD for bull of breed i

$$M_i = \text{USMARC}(i)/b + [\text{EPD}(i)_{YY} - \text{EPD}(i)_{\text{USMARC}}]$$

$$A_i = (M_i - M_{\text{Angus}}) - (\text{EPD}(i)_{YY} - \text{EPD}(\text{Angus})_{YY})$$

USMARC(i) is solution for effects of sire breed i from analysis of USMARC data

EPD(i)_{YY} is the average within-breed 2012 EPD for breed i for animals born in the base year YY (which is two years before the update)

EPD(i)_{USMARC} is the weighted average of 2012 EPD of bulls of breed i having descendants with records at USMARC

b is the pooled coefficient of regression of progeny performance at USMARC on EPD sire

i denotes sire breed i

TABLE 1: ADJUSTMENT FACTORS TO ADD TO EPDs OF EIGHTEEN DIFFERENT BREEDS TO ESTIMATE ACROSS BREED EPDs

Breed	Birth Wt. (lb)	Weaning Wt. (lb)	Yearling Wt. (lb)	Maternal Milk (lb)	Marbling Score*	Ribeye Area (in ²)	Fat Thickness (in)	Carcass Wt. (lb)
Angus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.000	0.0
Hereford	2.7	-4.4	-26.6	-17.8	-0.32	-0.10	-0.053	-6.2
Red Angus	3.4	-25.7	-30.9	2.4	-0.32	0.03	-0.023	-6.2
Shorthorn	5.1	-30.7	-12.3	4.6	-0.24	0.31	-0.107	-11.6
South Devon	3.6	-8.0	-25.9	2.4	-0.09	0.21	-0.129	-22.3
Beefmaster	5.7	36.1	32.3	11.9				
Brahman	10.9	47.5	9.2	23.6	-0.83	-0.11	-0.146	-26.5
Brangus	3.9	13.9	5.1	4.6				-12.5
Santa Gertrudis	6.9	41.4	42.2	14.2	-0.62	-0.06	-0.097	-5.4
Braunvieh	2.5	-22.1	-49.3	-0.4				-44.9
Charolais	8.6	39.6	40.8	7.3	-0.39	0.98	-0.207	5.4
Chiangus	3.5	-28.9	-38.8	0.2	-0.40	0.34	-0.114	-20.9
Gelbvieh	2.7	-21.5	-30.4	1.6	-0.33	0.65	-0.117	-22.6
Limousin	3.0	-17.0	-42.0	-8.8	-0.60	0.98		-13.4
Maine-Anjou	5.0	-24.5	-35.0	-3.6	-0.60	0.78	-0.192	-23.6
Sakers	2.2	-4.1	-26.3	4.9	-0.14	0.85	-0.203	-29.7
Simmental	3.6	-4.8	-9.5	3.6	-0.38	0.43	-0.137	3.8
Tarentaise	3.1	28.3	9.6	23.4				

*Marbling score units: 4.00 = S1⁰; 5.00 = S1m⁰

Adapted from Kuehn et al., 2015.

Simm. Bull act EPD	1.0	60.0	100.0	25.0
Simm. Adj.	+3.6	-4.8	-9.5	+3.6
	4.6	55.2	90.5	28.6
Heref. Bull act EPD	2.3	55.0	90.0	25.0
Heref Adj.	+2.7	-4.4	-26.6	-17.8
	5.0	50.6	63.4	7.2

*** Example**

*** Problem...**

- *Scaling of threshold traits
- *Correctly accommodating the differences in models used by various beef breed associations
- *For CE All breeds use a multi-trait model fitting BWT but some use a linear-linear and some use a threshold-linear
- *Some breeds combine categories
 - *Mean incidence of difficulty (e.g. 50%, 80%, etc.)

- *Calf survival
 - *Male fertility
 - *Disease susceptibility
 - *Calving ease direct
 - *Growth rate
 - *Feed efficiency
 - *Carcass quality/composition
- * Terminal Sires—Traits of Importance**

- *Female fertility
 - *Maternal calving ease
 - *Maintenance requirements*
 - *Longevity
 - *Maternal weaning weight (Milk)*
 - *Disease susceptibility
 - *Adaptation
 - *Temperament
- * Maternal Traits of Importance**

- *Tandem Selection
- *Independent Culling Levels
- *Selection Indices

***Methods of Multiple Trait Selection**

INDEPENDENT CULLING LEVELS

CED = 2.1 WW = 43 MM = 18 SC = 0.9 IMF = 0.04

	CED	WW	MM	SC	IMF	\$BMI
1	2.5	55	20	1.0	0.10	20.16
2	5.0	50	25	1.2	-0.10	19.55
3	4.0	45	20	1.0	0.25	20.35
4	1.6	62	19	1.0	0.20	21.64

Moser, 2005

$$*I = a_1 \times EPD_1 + a_2 \times EPD_2 + a_n \times EPD_n$$

- *Where a = index weight and n = number of traits

***Economic Index**

- *[Dam Weight*Lean Value of Dam + **No. Progeny***Progeny Weight*Lean Value of Progeny] - [Dam Feed*Value of Feed for Dam + **No. Progeny***Progeny Feed*Value of Feed for Progeny].
- *By simply increasing number of progeny per dam through either selection, **heterosis from crossing**, or better management, we will increase efficiency of production.

***Improving Efficiency**

*Simulation Framework

- *Stochastic Model
 - *Allows for random variation in multiple traits
 - *Variation based on fluctuation in historical data
- *Simulated base herd
 - *Multiple iterations

$$b = P^{-1}Gv$$

↑
Economic values from simulation

*Terminal or Maternal?

<p>Terminal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$B, \$F, \$G (Angus) • TI (Simmental) • CHB\$ (Hereford) • MTI (Limousin) • EPI and FPI (Gelbvieh) • Charolais • GridMaster (Red Angus) 	<p>Maternal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$W, \$EN (Angus) • API (Simmental) • BMI\$, BII\$, CEZ\$ (Hereford) • HerdBuilder (Red Angus) • \$Cow (Gelbvieh)
---	--

- *Profitability per exposure
- *HerdBuilder
- *Bull A 134
- *Bull B 110

***Example**

- *30 cows/yr. over 4 yrs. = 120 exposures
- *120 exposures X (134-110) =
- *\$2,880 profit difference
- *If you follow the assumptions of the index!

- *Improvement in current indices can be made by increasing the number of ERT that have EPD
 - *Input traits
 - *Fertility
- *Enterprise level profitability should move closer to industry level profitability
 - *Example: What is the direct economic benefit for a producer to improve tenderness?

- *Establish production goals
- *Use economic indices that fit your desired breeding objectives
- *Do not make sire selection more cumbersome than it needs to be

***Summary**

- Know your costs
 - Select on PROFIT not just revenue
- Multiple trait selection is critical and could become more cumbersome
 - Economic indexes help alleviate this
 - Use index values that meet your breeding objective

***Summary**

- *<http://beef.unl.edu>
- *www.beefefficiency.org
- *www.nbcec.org
- *www.eBEEF.org

***Helpful Resources**