

**SELECTION INDICES FOR LIMITING DETERIORATION IN
REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE ACCOMPANYING
SELECTION FOR MILK YIELD TRAITS IN
LACTATING COWS**

By

AMINA ALAA-ELDIN ZAKARIA MOHAMED HABIB

B.Sc. Agric. Sc. (Animal Production), Fac. of Agric., Ain Shams Univ. 2015

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of

The Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Sciences

(Animal Breeding)

Department of Animal Production

Faculty of Agriculture

Ain Shams University

2020

Approval Sheet

**SELECTION INDICES FOR LIMITING DETERIORATION IN
REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE ACCOMPANYING
SELECTION FOR MILK YIELD TRAITS IN
LACTATING COWS**

By

AMINA ALAA-ELDIN ZAKARIA MOHAMED HABIB

B.Sc. Agric. Sc. (Animal Production), Fac. of Agric., Ain Shams Univ., 2015

This thesis for M.Sc. degree has been approved by:

Dr. Samy Abou-Bakr Mahmoud

Prof. of Animal Breeding, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University.

Dr. Abdel-Haleem Anees Ashmawy

Professor Emeritus of Animal Breeding, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University.

Dr. Gouda Fathi Gouda

Associate Prof. of Animal Breeding, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University.

Dr. Manal Mohamed Ahmed Sayed

Prof. of Animal Breeding, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University.

Date of Examination: 28 / 3 / 2020

SELECTION INDICES FOR LIMITING DETERIORATION IN REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE ACCOMPANYING SELECTION FOR MILK YIELD TRAITS IN LACTATING COWS

By

AMINA ALAA-ELDIN ZAKARIA MOHAMED HABIB

B.Sc. Agric. Sc. (Animal Production), Fac. of Agric., Ain Shams Univ. 2015

Under the supervision of:

Dr. Manal Mohamed Ahmed Sayed

Prof. of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department, Faculty of
Agriculture, Ain Shams University (Principal Supervisor).

Dr. Ahmed Ragheb Ibrahim Shemeis

Prof. of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department, Faculty of
Agriculture, Ain Shams University.

Dr. Gouda Fathi Gouda

Associate Prof. of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department,
Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University.

ABSTRACT

Amina Alaa-Eldin Zakaria Mohamed Habib. Selection indices for limiting deterioration in reproductive performance accompanying selection for milk yield traits in lactating cows. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, 2020.

Genetic and phenotypic estimates of productive (305-day yields of milk, MY₃₀₅; fat, FY₃₀₅ and protein, PY₃₀₅) and reproductive performance traits (days open, DO; calving interval, CI and number of inseminations per conception, NSC) were estimated on 3398 records of 1054 Holstein cows, sired by 94 bulls and 691 dams using multi traits animal model with repeated measures. These estimates were used to construct eleven selection indices aiming to improve the three productive traits simultaneously. The possibilities of limiting the increase in calving interval were taken into consideration by imposing complete and partial restrictions to the most accurate unrestricted index (full index).

Heritability estimates for productive traits varied from 0.08 to 0.26 and from 0.04 to 0.19 for reproductive traits. The perfect genetic correlation among productive traits (0.995 to 0.998) indicating that the three traits are controlled by the same genes. The reproductive traits were less inter-correlated genetically (0.241 to 0.786) and phenotypically (0.025 to 0.378). The genetic correlations (r_G) between productive and reproductive traits were ranged from (0.587 to 0.947). So, cows which produce abundant yields of milk, fat or protein tended to be less reproductive efficiency in terms of longer days open ($r_G = 0.942$ to 0.947), longer calving intervals ($r_G = 0.587$ to 0.673) and more number of inseminations per conception ($r_G = 0.769$ to 0.829).

The highest accuracy of selection (0.57) resulted from selection based on the full index. The index based on milk yield alone gave the lowest accuracy (0.29). Protein yield and days open appear to be the most

valuable traits in the full index (2.37 and 8.39%, respectively, reduction in the accuracy of selection with their omission). Combining PY and DO into one index (the best reduced index) gave 0.55 accuracy of selection. Selection based on the full index and the best reduced index is expected to result in favorable expected genetic gains in yields of milk (367.1 and 358.2 kg, respectively), fat (27.9 and 27.2 kg, respectively) and protein (24.9 and 24.4 kg, respectively) and unfavorable increase in days open (+34.9 and +33.9 days, respectively), calving interval (+27.1 and +26.9 days, respectively) and number of inseminations per conception (+0.18 and +0.17 service, respectively).

It appears possible to avoid the unfavorable increase in calving interval due to selection based on the full index by using the restricted selection index. Restricting the full index to result in zero genetic change in calving interval is expected to result in a reduction of 0.33 in accuracy of selection and a reduction in the improvement expected in the productive traits (211.7 kg in milk yield, 17.4 kg in fat yield and 15.1 kg in protein yield).

It seems possible to reduce the spammy effects of complete restriction in terms of reduction in the accuracy of selection and the rate of improvement in the productive traits by restricted the full index partially to result in 75, 50 and 25% genetic change in calving interval. The partial restriction will allow breeders to sacrifice part of the expected genetic improvement in productive traits in order to mitigate the deterioration in the reproductive traits.

Keywords: Holstein cows, Productive and reproductive traits, Complete and partial selection indices

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First of all, great thanks and praises be to **ALLAH**, who guide me to accomplish this work and assist me in all my life.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors **Prof. Dr. Manal ELsayed** , Professor of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, **Prof. Dr. Ahmed Shemeis**, Professor of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University and **Dr. Gouda Fathi Gouda**, Associate Prof of Animal Breeding, Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for their tireless guidance, encouragement throughout this study, assistance in preparation of this manuscript, and for valuable facilities provided to manage this study. I am also indebted to them for their helping me in this work.

I am extremely grateful to **My family**, that they tried to facilitate all the difficulties which I faced in my special life to finish my study.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to everyone cooperate me during this work.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VI
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. RIVIEW OF LITERATURES.....	3
2.1. Means and variation coefficients.....	3
2.1.1. Means and variation coefficients of milk production traits...	3
2.1.2. Means and variation coefficient of reproduction traits	5
2.2. Genetic and phenotypic parameters.....	8
2.2.1. Heritability estimates (h^2)	8
2.2.1.1. Heritability estimates for productive traits	8
2.2.1.2. Heritability estimates for reproductive traits	11
2.2.2. Genetic and phenotypic correlations	15
2.2.2.1. Correlation coefficients among productive traits	15
2.2.2.2. Correlation coefficients among reproductive traits	16
2.2.2.3. Correlations between productive and reproductive traits ...	18
2.3. Selection indices	21
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	24
3.1. Source of data	24
3.2. Herd management	24
3.3. Studied traits	24
3.4. Statistical analysis	25
3.5. Definition of the aggregate genotype	26
3.6. Relative economic weights	26
3.7. Selection indices.....	26
3.8. Selection index alternatives	27
3.8.1. Construction of unrestricted selection indices.....	27
3.8.2. Imposing the complete restriction.....	29
3.8.3. Imposing the partial restrictions.....	29

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	31
4.1. Phenotypic and genetic parameters	31
4.1.1. Means and variation coefficients	31
4.1.1.1. Productive traits	31
4.1.1.2. Reproductive traits	32
4.1.1.3. Variability.....	33
4.1.2. Heritability estimates	36
4.1.2.1. Productive traits	36
4.1.2.2. Reproductive traits	37
4.1.3. Genetic and phenotypic associations	38
4.1.3.1. Associations among the productive traits	38
4.1.3.2. Associations among reproductive traits	39
4.1.3.3. Associations between productive and reproductive traits....	40
4.2. Selection indices	41
4.2.1. Relative economic weights.....	41
4.2.2. Estimates of parameters used for index constructions.....	42
4.2.3. Unrestricted selection indices (strategy I)	42
4.2.3.1. Weighing factors and value of sources of information in the indices constructed.....	43
4.2.3.2. Accuracy of indices constructed	44
4.2.3.3. Expected response for selection on the unrestricted indices	45
4.2.4. Imposing the complete restriction.....	49
4.2.5. Imposing the partial restriction.....	50
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	55
REFERENCES	60
ARABIC SUMMARY	

LIST OF TABLE CONTENTS

No. Table	Page
(1) Reviewed means form several literature sources for the production traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle...	4
(2) Reviewed means form several literature sources for the reproduction traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle	7
(3) Heritability estimates form several literature sources for the productive traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle	10
(4) Heritability estimates form several literature sources for the reproductive traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle	13
(5) Genetic (r_G) and phenotypic (r_P) correlation estimates from literature sources among productive traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle	16
(6) Genetic (r_G) and phenotypic (r_P) correlation estimates from several literature sources within reproductive traits in Holstein Friesian dairy cattle	17
(7) Genetic (r_G) and phenotypic (r_P) correlation estimates form several literature sources among productive and reproductive traits in Holstein-Friesian dairy cattle ...	20
(8) The productive and reproductive traits included in this study with its abbreviations and unit of measurements.....	25
(9) Means, residual genetic and phenotypic coefficients of variation and heritability estimates (h^2) with standard error ($\pm SE$) for productive and reproductive traits considered.....	32
(10) Genetic correlation with their standard errors (above diagonal) and phenotypic correlation (below diagonal) among productive trait.....	39

VII

(11)	Genetic correlation with their standard errors (above diagonal) and phenotypic correlation (below diagonal) among reproductive traits.....	39
(12)	Genetic and phenotypic correlations between productive and reproductive traits*	41
(13)	Genetic correlations (above diagonal), phenotypic correlations (below diagonal) and heritability (on diagonal)	42
(14)	Weighing factors (b-value), value of each trait as source of information (in parentheses), standard deviation of the index (σ_I), accuracy of selection (r_{TI}) and relative efficiency (RE) of the indices considered.....	44
(15)	Expected genetic changes in productive and reproductive traits (intensity of selection = 1.0)	46
(16)	Expected reduction in accuracy of selection, index standard deviation and rate of improvement in productive traits.	50
(17)	Expected reduction in accuracy of selection, index standard deviation and rate of improvement in productive traits as a result of imposing the partial restriction.....	51

LIST OF FIGURES

No.		Page
(1)	Genetic (CV_G) and phenotypic (CV_P) coefficients of variation and heritability (h^2) estimates (%) for milk (MY_{305}), fat (FY_{305}), protein (PY_{305}), days open (DO), calving intervals (CI) and number of inseminations per conception (NSC).....	33
(2)	Change in 305-yields of milk (MY_{305}), fat (FY_{305}) and protein (PY_{305}) over calving years.....	35
(3)	Expected genetic change as (percentage of the overall mean) in 305 yields of milk (MY_{305}), fat (FY_{305}) and protein (PY_{305}) from various unrestricted indices.....	47
(4)	Expected genetic change (as percentage of the overall mean) in days open (DO), calving interval (CI) and number of inseminations per conception (NSC) from various unrestricted indices.....	48
(5)	Accuracy of selection based on unrestricted index (100), partially restricted indices (75, 50 and 25) and completely restricted (0) index.....	52
(6)	Expected genetic change as (percentage of the overall mean) in 305 yields of milk (MY_{305}), fat (FY_{305}) and protein (PY_{305}) from full index and various restricted indices.....	53
(7)	Expected genetic change as (percentage of the overall mean) in days open (DO), calving interval (CI) and number of inseminations per conception (NSC) from full index and various restricted indices.....	54

INTRODUCTION

Holstein is the most popular dairy cattle breed over the world (**Dobson *et al.*, 2007**). It gained this popularity among the specialized dairy breeds from its superiority in the productive performance traits. Holstein cows produce the largest average amount of milk, butterfat and protein per cow. Although they criticized in the last decades for their irregular calving, shorter longevity, high rate of replacement, lower valuable of their male calves and culled cows as beef producing animals (**Dobson *et al.*, 2007**). This is due to placing more emphasis on the productive traits such as milk yield and milk composition in the breeding goal in most countries.

A decline in average reproductive performance has been observed. A decline in phenotypic trend has been reported to be around 0.45% per year in conception rate in the United States between 1975 and 1997 (**Brotherstone *et al.*, 1998; Beam and Buttler, 1999**) and 1% per year in the UK between 1975 and 1998 (**Rogers *et al.*, 1999**).

Most published genetic correlation estimates between milk yield and measures of fertility such as number of days open, number of inseminations per conception and calving interval are unfavorable. Fertility is an economically important trait. In the UK the cost of increasing calving interval by one day has been calculated at £4 per day (excluding culling costs) (**Stott *et al.*, 1999**) and in France 20FF per conception rate unit (**Boichard, 1990**).

Using data collected from a commercial Holstein herd, the objectives of the present study were to:

- i. Estimate the genetic and phenotypic parameters of some productive and reproductive traits,
- ii. Construct selection indices aiming to improve the productive performance traits,

INTRODUCTION

- iii. Calculate the expected deterioration in reproductive traits accompanied with selection for productive traits,
- iv. Imposing restriction to the most accurate index aiming to complete prevention of the deterioration in reproductive performance, and
- v. Present some alternatives as partial restricted selection indices aiming to limit the cost of complete restriction.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The aim of this part is to present a review of literature on productive and reproductive performance traits of Holstein Friesian dairy cattle involving their current levels (means), genetic and phenotypic parameters and possibility of limiting the deteriorations in the reproductive performance accompanying selection for yield traits.

2.1. Means and variation coefficients

2.1.1. Means and variation coefficients of milk production traits

Reviewed means of 305-day yields of milk (MY₃₀₅), Fat (FY₃₀₅) and protein (PY₃₀₅) for Holstein Friesian cattle raised in various countries are presented in table 1.

The range of MY₃₀₅ at various countries was 3504.02 to 10847.00 kg across lactations and 3072.00 to 8785.60 kg for the first lactation only. The highest values for multiple and first lactation were recorded under the Egyptian conditions (**Abou-Bakr *et al.*, 2006**) and **Radwan and Abo-Elfadl, 2016**), respectively. The lowest values were reported under the Ethiopian conditions by **Ayalew *et al.* (2017)** and **Goushu *et al.*, (2014)**, respectively. For multiple records, the coefficient of variation varied from 19.37 to 27.5 % in Egypt and from 20.39 to 34.89% in the other countries.

Means of FY₃₀₅ listed in table (1) was 260.40 under Egyptian conditions (**Gouda *et al.*, 2017**), 198.79 to 307.40 kg in Iranian Holstein Frisian cows (**Chegini *et al.*, 2018; Salimi *et al.*, 2017; Behzadi *et al.*, 2013; Toghiani, 2012**) and 187.30 to 310.59 kg in the other countries. The phenotypic coefficient of variation for FY₃₀₅ ranged from 20.80 to 35.2% (**Chegini *et al.*, 2018; Salimi *et al.*, 2017; Gouda *et al.*, 2017; Zink *et al.*, 2012**). The lowest value recorded under the Czech conditions by **Zink *et al.* (2012)** and the highest value recorded under the Egyptian conditions (**Gouda *et al.*, 2017**).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Table (1): Means and coefficients of variability (C.V%) from several literature sources for the production traits in Holstein Friesian

country	Lact. No.	Records No.	Mean	C.V%	Author
MY₃₀₅ (kg): -					
Egypt	1	1180	8761.2	26.80	Gouda <i>et al.</i> , 2017
	1	732	8237	22.00	Salem and Hammoud, 2016a
	4	1807	8315	27.50	Salem and Hammoud, 2016b
	6	1660	7430	23.96	Sanad and Afify, 2016
	3	1739	10369	27.20	Radwan and Abo-Elfadl, 2016
	6	4791	6384.95	19.37	Faid-Allah, 2015a
	1	693	8550	-	Samoul, 2015
	3	502	8805	22.99	Rushdi <i>et al.</i> , 2014
	1	696	8455.4	18.20	Hammoud, 2013
	5	4382	10847	20.00	Abou-Bakr <i>et al.</i> , 2006
Iran	1	27714	8785.6	24.60	Chegini <i>et al.</i> , 2018
Iran	3	183203	7596.7	20.39	Salimi <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Uruguay	3	535266	5310	25.30	Frioni <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Ethiopia	3	3733	3504.02	34.89	Ayalew <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Ireland	5	148041	6878	-	Carthy <i>et al.</i> , 2016
Ethiopia	1	743	3072	31.50	Goshu <i>et al.</i> , 2014
Japan	1	476284	8300	18.35	Yamazaki <i>et al.</i> , 2014
UK	4	133384	7354	26.50	Albarrán-Portillo and Pollott, 2013
Iran	3	50845	7125	22.76	Behzadi <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Pakistan	1	150	3553	19.80	Usman <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Iran	1	27766	6564.65	19.14	Toghiani, 2012
Turkey	1	2334	6222	27.80	Sahin <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Poland	1	42268	5606	25.53	Jagusiak, 2006
UK	5	62433	6778	25.88	Kadarmideen <i>et al.</i> , 2003
FY₃₀₅ (kg): -					
Egypt	1	1180	260.4	35.20	Gouda <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Iran	1	13972	307.4	27.30	Chegini <i>et al.</i> , 2018
Uruguay	3	160903	187.3	24.50	Frioni <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Iran	3	183203	246.73	23.15	Salimi <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Ireland	5	148041	271	-	Carthy <i>et al.</i> , 2016
Iran	3	50845	227	23.78	Behzadi <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Iran	1	26072	198.79	23.54	Toghiani, 2012
Czech	1	59430	310.59	20.80	Zink <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Poland	1	42268	231	27.27	Jagusiak, 2006
UK	5	62443	275.00	26.55	Kadarmideen <i>et al.</i> , 2003