The suitability of test-day models for genetic evaluation of dairy cattle in South Africa

by

Bernice Euodia Mostert

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Philosophiae Doctor in the Faculty of Natural & Agricultural Science University of Pretoria

Pretoria

January 2007

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr F.H.J. Kanfer: Department of Statistics

University of Pretoria

Dr E. van Marle-Köster: Department of Animal and Wildlife Sciences

University of Pretoria

Dr H.E. Theron: Livestock Business Division

Agricultural Research Council

Irene

DECLARATION

I decla	are that the the	hesis, which	I h	ereby	subn	nit for	the d	legre	e Ph	ilosophae D	octo
at the	University	of Pretoria,	is	my	own	work	and	has	not	previously	been
submitted by me for a degree at this or any other tertiary institution.											

ABSTRACT

In this study the possibility to change to test-day models for genetic evaluation of production traits and somatic cell score of South African dairy breeds (i.e. Ayrshires, Guernseys, Holsteins and Jerseys) was investigated. Fixed Regression BLUP Animal Models were therefore developed, using test-day records of the first three lactations as repeated measures of the same trait. Milk, butterfat and protein yields were included in multitrait evaluations. A permanent environmental effect was fitted across lactations. Heritabilities estimated were comparable with other yield and somatic cell score estimates obtained from test-day models. Breeding values of qualifying sires were presented to INTERBULL for participation in the March 2005 test-runs. Genetic correlations between South Africa and other participating countries compared well with those amongst other countries, participating in these international evaluations. Trend validation tests were successful for all traits and breeds except for somatic cell score of the Guernsey breed, due to insufficient data for this trait. South Africa is now participating in routine INTERBULL evaluations in order to obtain MACE (multiple across country evaluation) breeding values, using this methodology. Further refinement of the model was tested, i.e. inclusion of a fixed calving year effect in the model and pre-adjusting records for heterogeneous variances due to days in milk and parity. This was investigated for the Jersey breed and recommended for implementation in the other South African breeds. South Africa's methodology is now more comparable to that of the leading dairy producing countries of the world.

SAMEVATTING

Die moontlikheid om toetsdag modelle te implementeer vir genetiese evaluering van produksie eienskappe en somatiese seltelling van Suid-Afrikaanse melkrasse (i.e. Ayrshires, Guernseys, Holsteins en Jerseys), is in hierdie studie ondersoek. Vaste Regressie BLOB Dieremodelle is gevolglik ontwikkel, waar toetsdag rekords van die eerste drie laktasies as herhaalde metings van dieselfde eienskap gebruik is. Melk, bottervet en proteïen toetsdagproduksies is in meereienskap analises ingesluit. 'n Permanente omgewingseffek is oor laktasies gepas. Oorefbaarhede is beraam wat vergelykbaar is met beramings verkry vanuit ander toetsdag modelle. Teelwaardes van kwalifiserende vaders is aan INTERBULL (Internasionale Bul Evaluarings Diens) verskaf vir deelname aan die Maart 2005 toetslopies. Genetiese korrelasies tussen Suid-Afrika en ander deelnemende lande het goed vergelyk met genetiese korrelasies wat tussen lande, wat aan hierdie internasionale ontledings deelneem, bestaan. Die internasionale toetse was suksesvol vir al die rasse en eienskappe, behalwe vir somatiese seltelling van die Guernsey ras as gevolg van onvoldoende data. Suid-Afrika neem tans deel aan roetine INTERBULL ontledings vir die verkryging van MACE ("Multiple Across Country Evaluation") teelwaardes, met toepassing van hierdie metodologie. Verdere verfyning van die model is getoets, naamlik die insluiting van 'n vaste kalwingsjaar effek, asook aanpassing van toetsdag rekords vir heterogene variansie as gevolg van dae in melk en laktasie effekte. Dit is getoets op die Jersey ras en aanbeveel om in die ander Suid-Afrikaanse rasontledings geïmplementeer te word. Suid-Afrika se metodologie is nou vergelykbaar met dié van die voorloper melk produserende lande van die wêreld.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- My promoters, Drs Esté van Marle-Köster, Frans Kanfer and especially Helena Theron for their encouragement, support and advice during this study.
- The ARC Livestock Business Division for granting me the opportunity to undertake and financially support this study.
- Dr Eildert Groeneveld of FAL, Germany, as well as Prof Dr Milena Kovac and Dr Spela Malovrh of the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, for their valuable inputs.
- Dr Bobbie van der Westhuizen for his keen interest and dedicated programming of pre- and post-BLUP procedures, without which this study could not be completed.
- Gaby Warren, my technician, who never complained if jobs had to be redone and for her support in preparing the articles and thesis.
- Frans Jordaan, of whom I often demanded immediate help in programming and who never failed me.
- The personnel of the ARC-LBD and Studbook, especially Dr Japie van der Westhuizen and Graham Hallowell for their guidance and support in understanding IRIS and the dairy industry.
- The SA Jersey Society, especially Poena van Niekerk, for constructive criticism and support with regards to, amongst others, presentation of the "new" breeding values to the industry.
- INTERBULL for their patience and support during participation in test-runs.
- My family and friends for their encouragement, support and love through the years.
- My husband, Pieter, who always believed in me.
- And above all my Heavenly Father, who gave me the ability and means to undertake and complete this study.

"WHAT YOU ARE, IS GOD'S GIFT TO YOU.
WHAT YOU BECOME, IS YOUR GIFT TO GOD."

Author: V. Mclellan

DEDICATION



VIR DIE LIEFDES IN MY LEWE:

MOSSIE, WYNAND EN NADIA

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Scientific Publications

- Mostert, B.E., Banga, C., Groeneveld, E. & Kanfer, F.H.J., 2004. Breeding value estimation for somatic cell score in South African dairy cattle. S. Afr. J. Anim. Sci. 34, 32-34.
- Mostert, B.E., Groeneveld, E. Kanfer, F.H.J., 2004. Test-day models for production traits in dairy cattle. S. Afr. J. Anim. Sci. 34, 35-37.
- Mostert, B.E., Theron, H.E., Kanfer, F.H.J. & Van Marle-Köster, E., 2006. Fixed regression test-day models for South African dairy cattle for participation in international evaluations. S. Afr. J. Anim. Sci. 36, 58-70.
- Mostert, B.E., Theron, H.E., Kanfer, F.H.J. & Van Marle-Köster, E., 2006. Comparison of breeding values and genetic trends for production traits estimated by a Lactation Model and a Fixed Regression Test-Day Model. S. Afr. J. Anim. Sci. 36, 71-78.
- Mostert, B.E., Theron, H.E., Kanfer, F.H.J. & Van Marle-Köster, E., 2006. Adjustment for heterogeneous variances and a calving year effect in test-day models for national genetic evaluation of dairy cattle in South Africa. S. Afr. J. Anim. Sci. 36, 165-174.

National Congresses

- Mostert, B.E., Banga, C.B., Theron, H.E., Groeneveld, E. & Kanfer, F.H.J., 2004. Breeding value estimation for somatic cell score in South African dairy cattle. Proc. 2nd Joint Congr. Grassland Soc. Of South Africa and SASAS. 28 June -1 July 2004, Worcestor.
- Mostert, B.E., Groeneveld, E. Kanfer, F.H.J., 2004. Test-day models for production traits in dairy cattle. Proc. 2nd Joint Congr. Grassland Soc. Of South Africa and SASAS. 28 June -1 July 2004, Worcestor.
- Mostert, B.E., Theron, H.E., Kanfer, F.H.J. & Van Marle-Köster, E., 2006. Adjusting days in milk and parity data for heterogeneous variances when fitting test-day models. 41st Nat. Congr. SASAS, 3-6 April 2006, Bloemfontein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Supervisory	Committee	Page 11
Declaration.		Page iii
Abstract		Page iv
Samevatting.		Page v
Acknowledge	ments	Page vi
Dedication		Page vii
List of Publica	ations	Page viii
Table of Cont	ents	Page ix
List of Tables		Page xiii
List of Figure	S	Page xv
CHAPTER 1	- LITERATURE STUDY	
1.1	INTRODUCTION.	Page 1
1.2	GLOBAL GENETIC EVALUATIONS FOR DAIRY CATTLE	Page 3
1.3	TEST-DAY MODELS.	Page 5
	1.3.1 Types of Test-day Models	Page 6
	1.3.1.1 Two-Step Test-day Models	Page 7
	1.3.1.2 One-Step Test-day Models	Page 7
	1.3.1.2.1 Fixed Regression Test-day Models (FRM)	Page 7
	1.3.1.2.2 Random Regression Test-day Model (RRM)	Page 7
	1.3.1.2.3 Reduced Rank Random Regression Test-day Model (RRRM)	Page 8
	1.3.1.2.4 Multiple Trait Test-day Model	Page 8
	1.3.1.2.5 Covariance Function Models	Page 9
	1.3.1.2.6 Character Process Models	Page 9

		1.3.1.2.7 Spline Models	Page 9
		1.3.2 Comparison of Models for Genetic Evaluation	Page 9
		1.3.2.1 Test-day Models <i>versus</i> Lactation Models	Page 9
		1.3.2.1.1 Genetic Parameters	Page 9
		1.3.2.1.2 Estimated Breeding Values	Page 10
		1.3.2.1.3 Genetic Trends	Page 11
		1.3.2.1.4 Computation	Page 11
		1.3.2.2 Comparison of different test-day models	Page 11
		1.3.2.2.1 Genetic parameters	Page 11
		1.3.2.2.2 Estimated Breeding Values	Page 11
		1.4 CLOSURE	Page 12
		1.5 AIM OF THE STUDY	Page 12
		1.6 REFERENCES	Page 13
СНА	PTER 2	2 - CRITICAL ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	
	2.1	INTRODUCTION	Page 18
	2.2	LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES	Page 18
	2.2	MODEL INFORMATION	Daga 10
	2.3	MODEL INFORMATION	Page 19
		2.3.1 Contemporary Group.	Page 19
		2.3.2 Age of the cow at calving	Page 19
		2.3.3 Calving Interval.	Page 20
		2.3.4 Regression Function.	Page 20
		2.3.5 Permanent Environment	Page 20
		2.3.6 Calving Year	Page 21

	2.5	PRESENTATION TO THE INDUSTRY	Page 21
	2.6	CRITICAL ASSESSMENT.	Page 21
	2.7	CONCLUSIONS	Page 22
	2.8	REFERENCES	Page 22
ESTIM	IATION	- THE USE OF FIXED REGRESSION TEST-DAY MODELS N OF VARIANCE COMPONENTS FOR SOMATIC CELL SCORE OF DLSTEIN AND JERSEY CATTLE.	
	3.1	ABSTRACT	Page 24
	3.2	INTRODUCTION.	Page 24
	3.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	Page 25
	3.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	.Page 26
	3.5	CONCLUSIONS	Page 31
	3.6	REFERENCES.	Page 32
	TER 4 H AFRI	- TEST-DAY MODELS FOR PRODUCTION TRAITS IN DAIRY CA'CA	TTLE IN
	4.1	ABSTRACT	Page 34
	4.2	INTRODUCTION.	Page 34
	4.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS.	Page 35
	4.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	Page 36
	4.5	CONCLUSIONS	.Page 38
	4.6	REFERENCES	Page 38
		- TEST-DAY MODELS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN DAIRY CATT ION IN INTERNATIONAL EVALUATIONS ABSTRACT	
	\mathcal{I} . 1		ago 70

5.2	INTRODUCTION	Page 40
5.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	Page 41
5.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	Page 43
5.5	CONCLUSIONS	Page 51
5.6	REFERENCES	Page 51
PRODUCTIO	6 - COMPARISON OF BREEDING VALUES ON TRAITS ESTIMATED BY A LACTATI ON TEST-DAY MODEL	
6.1	ABSTRACT	Page 54
6.2	INTRODUCTION	Page 54
6.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	Page 54
6.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	Page 55
6.5	CONCLUSIONS	Page 60
6.6	REFERENCES	Page 60
AND A CAL	– THE IMPACT OF THE ADJUSTMENT OF H VING YEAR EFFECT ON A TEST-DAY MOD ON OF DAIRY CATTLE IN SOUTH AFRICA	
7.1	ABSTRACT	Page 62
7.2	INTRODUCTION	Page 62
7.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	
7.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	Page 65
7.5	CONCLUSIONS	Page 70
7.6	REFERENCES	Page 70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Number of cows and 240-300 day phenotypic averages (kg/lactation) for breeds participating in performance testing in South Africa during the 2004 test year	Page 1
Table 1.2 Number of herds, cows, sires and lactations included in the August 2003 genetic evaluation for the different breeds in South Africa	Page 2
Table 1.3 Methodology applied for genetic evaluations of the Holstein breed by countries participating in INTERBULL, for production and somatic cell score traits (www-interbull.slu.se (March 2004)	Page 4
Table 3.1 Number of test-day observations by parity, age of calving and season of calving with their arithmetic means and standard deviations of the selected datasets for somatic cell score.	Page 27
Table 3.2 Best Linear Unbiased Estimates (BLUEs) from the Multiple Lactation Model for the effect of season on SCS in the different lactations for Holstein and Jersey cows.	Page 29
Table 3.3 Heritabilities, permanent environmental (PE) effects and correlations (± SE) of the ML- (heritabilities and PE on the diagonal, correlations above the diagonal) and RM-models for SCS of Holstein and Jersey cows.	Page 30
Table 3.4 Spearman correlation coefficients between breeding values from the RM-model and breeding value indices of the ML-model (MLeq for equal weights and MLweig for 0.25*lactation 1 + 0.65*lactation2 + 0.10*lactation 3) of sires with at least 50 daughters in 10 herds (proven sires), as well as for sires with less than 50 daughters in 10 herds (less reliable sires) for Holstein and Jersey cattle.	Page 31
Table 4.1 Arithmetic means and standard deviations of the selected datasets	Page 36
Table 4.2 Heritabilities (on the diagonal) and correlations (above the diagonal) for milk, butterfat and protein yield (kg/day) of Jersey and Holstein cattle	Page 37
Table 4.3 Specifications of models used and heritabilities reported by countries participating in INTERBULL evaluations using test-day methodology.	Page 37
Table 5.1 Data structure of the selected datasets for Ayrshire, Guernsey, Holstein and Jersey breeds. First line contains number of cows, sires, etc. and second line indicates average number of daughters per sire etc. in brackets	Page 42
Table 5.2 Statistics of the selected datasets for Ayrshire, Guernsey, Holstein and Jersey breeds.	Page 43
Table 5.3 Variance component ratios and correlations (± SE) for production traits and SCS	Page 44

Table 5.4 Number of common bulls for the production and (SCS) traits and genetic correlations between South Africa and other countries participating in MACE for the Ayrshire breed, as estimated by INTERBULL.	Page 47
Table 5.5 Number of common bulls and genetic correlations between South Africa and other countries participating in MACE for the Guernsey breed, as estimated by INTERBULL.	Page 47
Table 5.6 Number of common bulls for the production and (SCS) traits and genetic correlations between South Africa and other countries participating in MACE for the Holstein breed, as estimated by INTERBULL.	Page 48
Table 5.7 Number of common bulls for the production and (SCS) traits and genetic correlations between South Africa and other countries participating in MACE for the Jersey breed, as estimated by INTERBULL	Page 49
Table 6.1 Pearson Correlations between breeding values from three models for proven, unproven and measured cows of the Holstein and Guernsey breeds.	Page 57
Table 6.2 Pearson Correlations between breeding values of two models for proven sires, unproven sires and measured cows of the Ayrshire and Jersey breeds.	Page 58
Table 7.1 Data structure and statistics (average \pm SD) of the Jersey datasets used for (co)variance component estimation (selected dataset) and prediction of breeding values (unselected dataset)	Page 64
Table 7.2 Variance component ratios estimated using the selected dataset, adjusted for heterogeneous variances and unadjusted data, as used in the March 2005 genetic evaluation, for the Jersey breed.	Page 65
Table 7.3 Summary of statistics for individual differences (adjusted EBVs – unadjusted milk yield EBVs) of young sires, proven sires and first lactation cows, cows having up to second lactations and cows having up to third lactations.	Page 66

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 A set of test-day yields as basis of a 305-day milk yield.	Page 3
Figure 3.1 Estimated lactation curves of somatic cell score (SCS) from the Multiple Lactation Model for parity 1, 2 and 3, nested in season, for Holstein cows	Page 28
Figure 3.2 Estimated lactation curves of somatic cell score (SCS) from the Multiple Lactation Model for parity 1, 2 and 3, nested in season, for Jersey cows	Page 29
Figure 6.1 Genetic trends for milk yield of Ayrshire cattle.	Page 56
Figure 6.2 Genetic trends for milk yield of Guernsey cattle.	Page 56
Figure 6.3 Genetic trends for milk yield of Holstein cattle.	Page 56
Figure 6.4 Genetic trends for milk yield of Jersey cattle	Page 56
Figure 7.1 Residual variance per day in milk for lactations 1, 2 and 3 of the Jersey breed	Page 64
Figure 7.2 Differences in milk yield EBVs (adjusted - unadjusted), averaged per year of birth, for proven and young Jersey sires	Page 66
Figure 7.3 Differences in milk yield EBVs (adjusted - unadjusted), averaged per year of birth, for Jersey cows.	Page 66
Figure 7.4 Effect of adjustment for heterogeneous variances and inclusion of calving year in the model, on the milk yield genetic trend of proven and young sires.	Page 67
Figure 7.5 Effect of adjustment for heterogeneous variances and inclusion of calving year in the model, on the milk yield genetic trend of cows	Page 67