Genetic evaluation of beef carcass data using different endpoint adjustments



Janice M. Rumph, Montana State University Beef Improvement Federation Meeting June 7, 2007 Fort Collins, Colorado







EPD Calculation

 EPD were calculated using data collected from animals born 1992 – 2001 (5,983 – 6,795 records)

 $y = X\beta + Z_aa + e$

- Fixed Effects
 - Categorical: Contemporary Group
 - Covariate: Endpoint (Fat, Marbling, Carcass Weight, or Age)

Results • No matter the endpoint, ranking of sires did not differ • Backfat • Carcass Weight • Marbling • Ribeye Area

1
Marbling
r = 0.99
Are Adjusted Rank

	Percent	Retail (Cuts	
$\mathbf{r} = 0$	96			-
		<u>.</u>		
	Carrielles			
		•••		
Configuration -	Age A	djusted Rank		

	Percent Retail Cuts
Fat Thickness Adjusted Rank	r = 0.60 Age Adjusted Rank

	% Retail Cuts – Heritabilities & EPD							
h²	Sire EPD Range	σ² _p						
0.23 (0.05)	-0.59 to +0.55	1.57% ²						
0.21 (0.05)	-0.53 to +0.52	1.43% ²						
0.20 (0.04)	-0.54 to +0.59	1.50% ²						
0.32 (0.05)	-0.39 to +0.47	0.75% ²						
	h ² 0.23 (0.05) 0.21 (0.05) 0.20 (0.04) 0.32 (0.05)	h ² Sire EPD Range 0.23 (0.05) -0.59 to +0.55 0.21 (0.05) -0.53 to +0.52 0.20 (0.04) -0.54 to +0.59 0.32 (0.05) -0.39 to +0.47						

Validation

- Looked at the phenotypes of 822 progeny born 2002 present
- Fixed Effects
 - Categorical: Contemporary Group
 Covariate: Linear covariate of endpoint

Res	sults	
_Endpoint Age	Coefficient 1.02 (0.43)	
CWT	1.16 (0.52)	
Marb	0.96 (0.48)	
Fat	0.56 (0.52)	

Conclusions

- Coefficients support that there is negligible difference between PRC adjusted to most endpoints
 - Marbling
 - Carcass Weight
 - Age
- The fat endpoint is a worse model than the other endpoints

Next Steps...

- Shrink the standard errors
 - Add more carcass data
 - Lessen the proportion of records in the calculation of EPD, increase the proportion in the validation
- Analyze additional breeds
 British

 - Zebu

