

Overview of beef cattle national genomic evaluation in France.



R. Saintilan¹, T. Tribout², M. Barbat¹, M.N. Fouilloux³, E. Venot² and F. Phocas²

1: ALLICE, UMR1313 GABI, 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex

2: INRA, UMR1313 GABI, 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex

3: Idele, UMR1313 GABI, 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex



Plan of the presentation

- Genotyping activity in France in beef breeds
- Dataset in Charolais beef cattle
- Overview of methodology chosen
- Validation works
- Results in other breeds
- Conclusion and perspectives



Genotyping activity in France

- Genotyping activity per year per breed

	CHA	LIM	BLA
2012	1868	349	425
2013	1261	2113	2095
2014	1468	817	814
June 2015	1201	253	561

- 50k N in July 2015

July 2015	CHA	LIM	BLA
N	8200	5168	5707



Genotypes used in genomic selection

- Use both 50k and LD genotypes on Illumina Chip
- Imputation step using Fimpute software (Sargolzaei et al., 2014) with pedigree information included
- Allelic error rate in the 3 breeds

Breed	FIMPUTE
Limousine	1,5%
Charolaise	1,3%
Blonde Aquitaine	1,1%

Dataset in Charolais

Trait*	Heritability	N reference population (animals with phenotypes and genotypes)	Nb animals with CD(DEBV) >0.70
BW	0.41	5181	1049 (20%)
CS	0.10	5181	927 (18%)
WW	0.25	4766	864 (18%)
MD	0.30	4715	931 (20%)
SD	0.27	4712	912 (19%)
CS_mat	0.06	1147	388 (34%)
WW_mat	0.10	1029	365 (36%)

* Direct birth weight (BW), direct calving score (CS), direct weaning weight (WW), direct muscular development (MD), direct skeletal development (SD), maternal calving score (CS_mat), maternal weaning weight (WW).

Evaluation Methodology

- Genotyped animals = small proportion of all the population with pedigree and phenotypes available in a breed
- Need to use information of all animals included in the national polygenic evaluation and not genotyped
- Combination of EBV and DGV to produce more accurate



Evaluation Methodology

- 1) Phenotypes are deregressed estimated breeding value (EBV) corrected for parental information (DEBV) using the methodology of Garrick et al. (2009)

EBV → DEBV

CD → weight

- 2) Estimation of direct genomic value (DGV) with BayesC π methodology for a full genomic model and a π of 2% (GS3 software, Legarra et al. (2013)).

weight × DEBV → DGV



Evaluation Methodology

- 3) Combination of DGV and EBV as described by VanRaden et al. (2009) to obtain Genomic Estimated Breeding Value (GEBV) (take into account redundancy of informations)

$$f(\text{EBV}, \text{DGV}) \rightarrow \text{GEBV}$$

- 4) Additional information ($\Delta\Psi$) carried by genotypes is combined to the reliability of EBV to compute the reliability of GEBV



Validation: Retrospective Study in Charolais

- Restrospective analysis using EBV computed in 2010 for genomic evaluation and those from 2014 for validation calculation
- 5 direct traits: birth weight (BW), calving score (CS), weaning weight (WW), muscular development (MD) and skeletal development (SD)



Validation: DataSet in 2010 in Charolais

Trait*	Heritability	N reference population	Nb animals with CD(DEV) >0.70
BW	0.41	1878	799
CS	0.10	1877	725
GR	0.25	1499	669
MD	0.30	1443	724
SD	0.27	1442	708

* *Direct birth weight (BW), direct calving score (CS), direct weaning weight (WW), direct muscular development (MD), direct skeletal development (SD).*

Validation: Retrospective Study in Charolais

- Validation data set (VP): animals with mainly pedigree or only individual performance known in 2010 (young candidates) that had at least 45 calves recorded between 2011 and 2014 (DEBV₂₀₁₄ approximate the true BV).
- 145 animals in VP for BW and CS and 150 for WW, MD and SD

Accuracy=correlation(X;DEBV₂₀₁₄)/r

With X : EBV₂₀₁₀, DGV₂₀₁₀ or GEBV₂₀₁₀

r: square root of the weighted mean of CD_{DEBV₂₀₁₄}



Validation: Realized Accuracy in Charolais

Trait*	EBV2010-DEBV2014	DGV2010-DEBV2014	GEBV2010-DEBV2014
BW	0.53	0.57	0.65
CS	0.54	0.63	0.69
WW	0.58	0.54	0.62
MD	0.56	0.48	0.60
SD	0.50	0.47	0.54

*birth weight (BW), calving score (CS), weaning weight (WW), muscular development (MD) and skeletal development (SD)

- Accuracy DGV increases with the size of the reference population (higher for birth traits and lower for weaning traits)
- Better accuracy of GEBV2010 than EBV2010 to predict DEBV2014



Conclusion of the validation study in Charolais

- **GEBV is a better tool to rank young candidates than EBV for direct traits**
- **For maternal traits, limited improvement at the moment, between 3 to 7% of gain in reliability for a candidate**
- **Maternal reference populations around 1000 animals and only 400 animals with $CD > 0.70$**



Expectations in Charolais and Blonde d'Aquitaine

- Evaluation of February 2015
- Young Candidates without phenotypes born in 2013-2014
- Comparison of GEBV versus EBV reliabilities for young candidates for selection



Expected reliability of EBV and GEBV of young candidates in Charolais and Blonde d'Aquitaine

	Charolais		Blonde Aquitaine	
Nmin-Nmax	437-1039		158-261	
Traits*	REBV	RGEBV	REBV	RGEBV
BW	0.36	0.44	0.36	0.41
CS	0.34	0.40	0.34	0.38
WW	0.33	0.36	0.34	0.39
MD	0.37	0.44	0.37	0.47
SD	0.36	0.38	0.35	0.45
CS_mat	0.27	0.28	0.22	0.23
WW_mat	0.25	0.26	0.20	0.21

* Direct birth weight (BW), direct calving score (CS), direct weaning weight (WW), direct muscular development (MD), direct skeletal development (SD), maternal calving score (CS_mat), maternal weaning weight (WW).

Conclusions and Perspectives

- First evaluation in february 2015 in 3 breeds: Charolais, Limousine and Blonde d'Aquitaine
- At the moment gain of accuracy by GS are low
- Increase reference population with informative animals in order to increase the accuracy of GS in particular for maternal traits
- New traits under study (in particular carcass traits)
- Other breeds (Aubrac, Parthenaise) are on the way to get reference population about 1000 animals within 2-3 years



Acknowledgements



Overview of beef cattle national genomic evaluation in France.



R. Saintilan¹, T. Tribout², M. Barbat¹, M.N. Fouilloux³, E. Venot² and F. Phocas²

Thank you for your attention

