

## \*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( $i$ )<sub>YY</sub> 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( $i$ )<sub>USMARC</sub> 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 <sup>2</sup> ) | 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             | -11.6            |
| Shorthorn       | 5.1            | -30.7            | -12.3             | 4.6                | -0.24           | 0.31                           | -0.107             | -22.3            |
| 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             | -28.5            |
| 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              |
| Chianina        | 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                           | -0.102             | -23.6            |
| Salers          | 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 =  $\text{SI}^B$ ; 5.00 =  $\text{SI}^H$

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?

### Terminal

- \$B, \$F, \$G (Angus)
- TI (Simmental)
- CHB\$ (Hereford)
- MTI (Limousin)
- EPI and FPI (Gelbvieh)
- Charolais
- GridMaster (Red Angus)

### Maternal

- \$W, \$EN (Angus)
- API (Simmental)
- BMI\$, BII\$, CEZ\$ (Hereford)
- HerdBuilder (Red Angus)
- \$Cow (Gelbvieh)

**\*Example**

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

\*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](http://www.beefefficiency.org)
- \*[www.nbcec.org](http://www.nbcec.org)
- \*[www.eBEEF.org](http://www.eBEEF.org)

**\*Helpful Resources**