

# GENOMIC-POLYGENIC EVALUATION OF MULTIBREED ANGUS-BRAHMAN CATTLE FOR POSTWEANING ULTRASOUND AND WEIGHT TRAITS WITH ACTUAL AND IMPUTED ILLUMINA50K SNP GENOTYPES

M. A. Elzo\*, M. G. Thomas†, D. D. Johnson\*, C. A. Martinez\*, G. C. Lamb\*, D. O. Rae\*, J. G. Wasdin\*, and J. D. Driver\*

\*University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

†Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

## ABSTRACT

Additive genomic to total genetic variance fractions (VAGO/VGTOT) for postweaning ultrasound traits explained by 46,909 actual and imputed Illumina50k SNP genotypes were 0.17 for ribeye area (UREA), 0.32 for fat thickness (UFAT), 0.25 for percent intramuscular fat (UPIMF), and 0.19 for weight (UW) in a multibreed Angus-Brahman population. Heritabilities were 0.33 for UREA, 0.22 for UBF, 0.43 for UPIMF, and 0.54 for UW. The VAGO/VGTOT ratios were 1.8, 1.0, 4.4, and 2.1 times whereas heritabilities were 1.0, 1.2, 1.0, and 1.2 times those obtained for these traits with 2,899 Illumina3k SNP. Rank correlations between genomic-polygenic and polygenic EBV were the highest (0.93 to 0.96), followed by those between genomic-polygenic and genomic EBV (0.81 to 0.94), and by those between genomic and polygenic EBV (0.66 to 0.81). Regressions of EVB on Brahman fraction were low for all models and traits suggesting that animals of similar EBV existed in all breed groups.

## INTRODUCTION

Brahman and Brahman-Bos taurus crossbred cattle are widely used in Florida and other subtropical regions of the United States because of their superior adaptability to hot and humid climatic conditions. However, Brahman and high-percent crossbred Brahman cattle tend to have smaller ribeye areas, less marbling, and lower tenderness than Bos taurus cattle (Johnson et al., 1990; Elzo et al., 2012a). Hence the pressing need for accurate genetic predictions for carcass traits in Brahman and Brahman-Bos taurus crossbred populations. Ultrasound carcass traits are widely used because they are easy to measure and are closely associated with carcass traits (Houghton and Turlington, 1992). Genotypic data from could also be used to help increase accuracies of prediction for carcass traits. A combination of genotypes from low and high-density chips plus imputation (VanRaden et al., 2011, 2013) may be a cost-effective alternative to only using high-density chips. Consequently, the objectives of this research were: 1) to estimate fractions of additive genetic variances for postweaning ultrasound ribeye area (UREA), backfat thickness (UFAT), and percent intramuscular fat (UPIMF), and weight (UW) explained by 46,909 actual and imputed SNP genotypes, 2) to compare rankings of calf additive genetic predictions from genomic-polygenic (GP), genomic (G), and polygenic (P) models, and 3) to assess trends for GP, G, and P predicted additive genetic values as functions of Brahman fractions in a multibreed Angus-Brahman population.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

**Animals, management, and traits.** Calves (n = 812; 66 bulls, 413 heifers, and 333 steers) were from the multibreed Angus-Brahman (MAB) herd of the University of Florida (UF), Gainesville. Project research protocol was approved by the UF Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC #201003744). Calves were the offspring of 64 sires and 364 dams from 6 breed groups. Mating system was diallel (Elzo and Wakeman, 1998). Breed groups were as follows: Angus = (1.0 to 0.80) A (0.0 to 0.20) B, ¾ A ¼ B = (0.79 to 0.60) A (0.21 to 0.40) B, Brangus = (0.625) A (0.375) B, ½ A ½ B = (0.59 to 0.40) A (0.41 to 0.60) B, ¼ A ¾ B = (0.39 to 0.20) A (0.61 to 0.80) B, and Brahman: (0.19 to 0.0) A (0.81 to 1.00) B. Number of calves per breed group were 121 Angus, 163 ¾ A ¼ B, 143 Brangus, 192 ½ A ½ B, 87 ¼ A ¾ B, and 106 Brahman calves. Calves were kept at the UF Beef Unit until weaning. Calves were moved to the UF GrowSafe Feed Efficiency Facility (Marianna, Florida) after weaning to participate in a 70-d feed efficiency trial. Ultrasound measurements were taken at the conclusion of the feed efficiency trial by a trained technician using an Aloka 500 ultrasound system (Hitachi Aloka Medical, Ltd., Wallingford, Connecticut). Traits were ultrasound ribeye area (UREA, cm<sup>2</sup>), ultrasound backfat thickness (UBF, cm), ultrasound percent of intramuscular fat (UPIMF, %), and body weight at the time ultrasound measurements were taken (UW, kg). Phenotypic records for UREA, UBF, and UPIMF were obtained by analyzing the ultrasonic images with UICS Scanning Software by Walter and Associates, LLC (Ames, Iowa).

**Tissue sampling, genotyping, and imputation.** Blood samples were collected at weaning using 10 mL EDTA vacutainer tubes, and stored at -80 °C at New Mexico State University. Genotyping with the Illumina3K chip was done at GeneSeek (GeneSeek, Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA). Imputation from Illumina3k to Illumina50k was done with program Findhap2 (VanRaden, 2011) using a reference population of 828 registered Brangus heifers (Peters et al., 2012). A subset of output file "haplotypes" from Findhap2 containing SNP marker information for MAB animals was matched with a phenotype file containing data on UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW. Only calves with information on all traits were kept (n = 812). Lastly, SNP with minor allele frequencies lower than 0.04 were discarded (n = 3,367). This resulted in a genotype file of 812 animals with SNP data on 46,909 loci (2,648 actual Illumina3k SNP plus 44,261 imputed Illumina50k SNP).

**Genomic-Polygenic Variances, Variance Ratios, and Predictions.** Variance components for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW were estimated using single-trait genomic-polygenic models (Legarra et al., 2008; Elzo et al., 2012b). Fixed effects were contemporary group (year-pen), age of dam, sex of calf, age of calf, Brahman fraction of calf, and heterozygosity of calf. Random effects were additive SNP marker effect as a function of the number of "2" alleles in each locus (mean zero; variance = additive SNP variance), calf additive polygenic effect (mean zero; variance = A\*Vg; A = additive relationship matrix, Vg = additive polygenic variance), and residual (mean zero, common variance).

**Genomic-Polygenic Variances, Variance Ratios, and Predictions (Continued).** Variances and heritabilities were estimated using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedures with option VCE of program GS3 (Legarra et al., 2013; Number of iterations = 120,000; Burn-in = 20,000). Starting values for additive polygenic variances (VAPO) and residual variances (VRES) were REML estimates from single-trait polygenic models obtained with program AIREMLF90 (Tsuruta, 2013), and those for additive SNP variances (VSNP) were equal to VAPO divided by the sum of twice the product of the frequencies of the two alleles within a locus over the 46,909 loci (2PQSUM). Posterior means and standard deviations for VAGO (= VSNP × 2PQSUM), VAPO, total additive genetic variances (VGTOT = VAGO + VAPO), phenotypic variances (PVAR), and heritabilities for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW were computed using values from 1,000 MCMC post burn-in samples. Variances and variance ratios were also computed with polygenic models. Genomic-polygenic (GPEBV), genomic (GEBV), and polygenic predicted values (PEBV) for each trait were computed with option BLUP of program GS3 (convergence criterion = 10<sup>-6</sup>) using the computed posterior means for VAGO, VAPO, and VRES. Calf rankings across models were compared using Spearman's rank correlations. Linear regressions of GPEBV, GEBV, and PEBV on Brahman fraction were used to assess prediction trends as Brahman fraction increased.



## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Genomic and polygenic variance components and variance ratios.** Table 1 shows posterior means for VAGO, VAPO, VGTOT and PVAR from genomic-polygenic models, and additive polygenic (VGPO) and phenotypic variances (PVARPO) from polygenic models for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW. Correspondingly, Table 2 presents posterior means for variance ratios from genomic-polygenic and polygenic models these 4 traits. Estimates of VAGO/PVAR ratios here were lower than estimates for UREA (0.22), UBF (0.17), UPIMF (0.28), and 365-d weight (0.19) with 53,692 actual Illumina50k SNP markers in the reference Brangus population perhaps partly due to imputation errors and lower linkage disequilibrium in the MAB population. Estimates of VAGO and VAGO/PVAR ratios were comparable for UBF but larger for the other 3 traits (from 81% for UREA to 343% for UPIMF) than VAGO and VAGO/PVAR estimates with the Illumina3k chip (Table 3; Elzo et al., 2013). However, estimates of PVAR were similar suggesting that the 46,909 actual and imputed SNP from the Illumina50k chip explained a substantially larger fraction of VAGO than the 2,899 SNP from the Illumina3k. However, estimates of VGTOT were only larger for UBF (24%) and UW (16%) and PVAR estimates were alike for all 4 traits here and with the Illumina3k (Elzo et al., 2013). Thus, higher estimates of heritability existed only for UBF (22%) and UW (19%). Lastly, VGTOT from genomic-polygenic models were larger than VGPO from polygenic models for all traits (from 21% for UREA to 41% for UBF) indicating that the 46,909 actual-imputed SNP may have accounted for genetic variation beyond that explained by polygenic models.

**Ranking of animals evaluated with genomic-polygenic, genomic, and polygenic models.** The highest rank correlations were between EBV from the GP and P models (0.93 to 0.96; P < 0.0001), followed by those between EBV from the GP and G models (0.81 to 0.94; P < 0.0001), and by those between EBV from the G and P models (0.66 to 0.81; P < 0.0001; Table 4). Rank correlations between GP and P EBV with actual-imputed Illumina50k SNP were similar to rank correlations using Illumina3k SNP (Elzo et al., 2013). Contrarily, rank correlations between GP and G EBV and between G and P EBV here were, on the average, 25% higher (range: 9% to 47%) than corresponding values with Illumina3k SNP. This suggested that, despite imputation errors, the imputed Illumina50k SNP provided sizeable additional information on QTL affecting UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW, thus increasing the similarity between G, GP and P EBV. Ultimately, the high rank correlations between P and GP EBV indicated that a polygenic model would be enough to appropriately rank animals for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW in this multibreed Angus-Brahman population.

**Trends of genomic-polygenic, genomic, and polygenic EBV from Angus to Brahman.** Regressions of EVB on Brahman fraction were low for all traits and models. Significant regression values (P < 0.0364 to P < 0.0001) existed for UREA (G model), UBF (GP and G models), and UW (all models). Although EBV tended to decrease from Angus to Brahman, these low regression estimates indicated that there were animals of similar EBV for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW across all Angus-Brahman breed compositions.

Table 1. Posterior means for additive genomic, polygenic, total genetic and phenotypic variances

| Variance | UREA, cm <sup>4</sup> | UBF, cm <sup>2</sup> | UPIMF, % <sup>2</sup> | UW, kg <sup>2</sup> |
|----------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| VAGO     | 3.74                  | 0.002                | 0.08                  | 146.5               |
| VAPO     | 18.18                 | 0.005                | 0.24                  | 631.7               |
| VGTOT    | 21.92                 | 0.007                | 0.32                  | 778.2               |
| PVAR     | 55.79                 | 0.023                | 0.59                  | 1198.8              |
| VGPO     | 18.12                 | 0.005                | 0.25                  | 639.9               |
| PVARPO   | 55.04                 | 0.022                | 0.58                  | 1177.0              |

Table 2. Posterior means for additive genetic and genomic variance ratios

| Variance Ratios | UREA | UBF  | UPIMF | UW   |
|-----------------|------|------|-------|------|
| VAGO/VGTOT      | 0.17 | 0.32 | 0.25  | 0.19 |
| VAGO/PVAR       | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.14  | 0.12 |
| Heritability    | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.55  | 0.65 |
| HeritabilityPO  | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.43  | 0.54 |

Table 3. Ratios of posterior means of variances and variance ratios from actual-imputed Illumina50k and Illumina3k genomic-polygenic analyses

| Ratio 50k/3k | UREA | UBF  | UPIMF | UW   |
|--------------|------|------|-------|------|
| VAGO         | 1.81 | 1.03 | 4.42  | 2.08 |
| VAPO         | 0.90 | 1.37 | 0.82  | 1.03 |
| VGTOT        | 0.99 | 1.24 | 1.03  | 1.16 |
| PVAR         | 0.99 | 1.02 | 1.00  | 0.98 |
| VAGO/VGTOT   | 1.87 | 0.83 | 4.14  | 2.24 |
| VAGO/PVAR    | 1.83 | 1.02 | 4.43  | 2.65 |
| Heritability | 1.00 | 1.22 | 1.04  | 1.19 |

Table 4. Spearman rank correlations for animals evaluated using genomic-polygenic, genomic, and polygenic models

| Correlation       | UREA | UBF  | UPIMF | UW   |
|-------------------|------|------|-------|------|
| GP Model, G Model | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.94  | 0.81 |
| GP Model, P Model | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.95  | 0.96 |
| G Model, P Model  | 0.71 | 0.66 | 0.81  | 0.71 |

## CONCLUSION

Higher fractions of additive genomic variation for UREA, UBF, UPIMF, and UW were accounted for by 46,909 actual and imputed Illumina50k SNP than by 2,899 Illumina3k SNP in an Angus-Brahman multibreed population. Total genetic variation and heritabilities increased only for UBF and UW. Higher rank correlations between genomic and genomic-polygenic and between genomic and polygenic models with the actual-imputed Illumina50k indicated a closer agreement among EBV rankings from these models than with the Illumina3k. Low regression values of EBV on Brahman fraction indicated that similar EBV for ultrasound and weight traits existed in animals of all Angus-Brahman fractions.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Elzo, M. A., D. D. Johnson, J. G. Wasdin et al. 2012a. Meat Sci. 90:87-92.  
 Elzo, M. A., G. C. Lamb, D. D. Johnson et al. 2012b. J. Anim. Sci. 90: 2488-2497.  
 Elzo, M. A., C. A. Martinez, G. C. Lamb, et al. 2013. Livest. Sci. 153:39-49.  
 Elzo, M. A., and D. L. Wakeman. 1998. J. Anim. Sci. 76:1290-1302.  
 Houghton, P. L., and L. M. Turlington. 1992. J. Anim. Sci. 70:930-941.  
 Johnson, D. D., R. D. Huffman, S. E. Williams et al. 1990. J. Anim. Sci., 68:1980-1986.  
 Legarra, A., C. Robert-Granié, E. Manfredi et al. 2008. Genetics 180:611-618.  
 Legarra, A., A. Ricard, O. Filangi. 2013. [http://snp.toulouse.inra.fr/~alegarra/manualqs3\\_last.pdf](http://snp.toulouse.inra.fr/~alegarra/manualqs3_last.pdf).  
 Peters, S. O., K. Kizilkaya, D. J. Garrick et al. 2012. J. Anim. Sci. 90:3398-3409.  
 Tsuruta, S. 2013. [http://nce.ads.uga.edu/wiki/doku.php?id=application\\_programs](http://nce.ads.uga.edu/wiki/doku.php?id=application_programs).  
 VanRaden, P. M. 2011. Available at: <http://aipl.arsusda.gov/software/findhap>.  
 VanRaden, P. M., D. J. Null, M. Sargolzaei et al. 2013. J. Dairy Sci. 96:668-678.