

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**BREEDING OBJECTIVES AND
GENETIC EVALUATION
TO IMPROVE PIG FARM PROFITABILITY**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Animal Science
at Massey University,
Palmerston North, New Zealand

Mariusz Tadeusz Skorupski

1995

Massey University Library

Thesis Copyright Form

148
5628

Title of thesis: "BREEDING OBJECTIVES AND GENETIC EVALUATION TO IMPROVE PIG FARM PROFITABILITY"

- (1) (a) I give permission for my thesis to be made available to readers in Massey University Library under conditions determined by the Librarian.
- (b) I do not wish my thesis to be made available to readers without my written consent for months.
- (2) (a) I agree that my thesis, or a copy, may be sent to another institution under conditions determined by the Librarian.
- (b) I do not wish my thesis, or a copy, to be sent to another institution without my written consent for 24 months.
- (3) (a) I agree that my thesis may be copied for Library use.
- (b) I do not wish my thesis to be copied for Library use for months.

Signed



/ Mariusz T. Skorupski /

Date: 17 March 1995

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author. Readers must sign their name in the space below to show that they recognise this. They are asked to add their permanent address.

NAME and ADDRESS

DATE

Errata Note

- It was recently found (D. Johnson private communication) that the AIREML programme was incorrectly calculating the standard errors (s.e.) of variance and covariance components. The standard errors in Table 4.5 (page 107) and in Table 4.7 (page 110) are underestimated by a square root of 2. For example, the s.e. of 0.015 should be $0.015 * \sqrt{2} = 0.021$.
- The Duroc annual genetic trend in ADG (page 140, line 8) should read 4.33 g/day, as in the preceding Table 5.6.

ABSTRACT

The optimal design of a pig improvement programme requires the choice of an appropriate breeding objective and relevant economic values for objective traits, the choice of selection criteria and consequent genetic and phenotypic parameters, determination of selection indices and predicted genetic gains, and choice of an appropriate population structure.

A computer model simulating life cycle production of a breeding sow and growth performance of her offspring was developed to estimate economic values (EV's) of reproduction and growth performance traits. A biological growth model simulating the digestion and metabolism of dietary energy and nitrogen in growing pigs, based on the linear/plateau relationship between daily protein deposition and digestible energy intake, was part of the life cycle model. The upper limit to body protein deposition rate (Pd_{max}), mean daily *ad libitum* digestible energy intake (DEi) and minimum lipid to protein deposition ratio (R_{min}) were assumed the major genetic determinants of pig growth. EV's were calculated per gilt life cycle by simulating effects of genetic changes in several biological components, in a farrow-to-finish production system, assuming *ad libitum* feeding. For unimproved genotypes ($Pd_{max} < 140$ g/day, DEi > 30 MJ/day, $R_{min} \geq 1$), the EV of 1 g/day improvement in Pd_{max} ranged from \$12 to \$22, DEi EV's ranged from \$-20 to \$-123 per 1 MJ/day increase, and EV's below \$-500 were found per one unit increase in R_{min} . EV's for number born alive/litter (NBA) were below \$12 per extra pig. For improved genotypes, EV's for Pd_{max} had values below \$14 per unit increase and became zero at high Pd_{max} levels exceeding 180 g/day, when full expression of Pd_{max} was restricted by insufficient digestible energy intakes. The DEi EV's for improved genotypes with insufficient amounts of metabolisable energy became positive. Improved genotypes had high EV's for NBA, exceeding \$70 per 1 extra pig. Relatively low negative EV's were found for one unit increase in other reproduction traits: gilt age at first oestrus, interval weaning-oestrus, and pre-weaning mortality percentage. Results demonstrated EV's of traits depended on the average genetic merit in the pig herd and its interaction with the management circumstances (level of feeding, nature of the diet, life cycle length) of the production system.

Multivariate animal models and Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML) methods were used to estimate (co)variance components, heritabilities, genetic correlations and common environmental effects of reproduction and growth performance traits for on-farm tested Large White, Landrace and Duroc pigs. Best Linear Unbiased Prediction (BLUP) methods were applied for breeding value estimation allowing determination of genetic, environmental and phenotypic trends in the studied populations. The annual realised genetic gains ranged from 2.1 to 4.3 g/day for average daily gain (ADG) and -0.2 to -0.3 mm for ultrasonically-measured backfat thickness (BF). The realised genetic trends in ADG and BF compared favourably with the rate of improvement found in similar overseas studies but were substantially lower than the respective predicted gains of 4.13 g/day/year and -0.88 mm/year, except for the Duroc ADG where predicted and actual gains were similar. The NBA genetic trends were negligible for Large White and Landrace, but favourable ($+0.07$ pigs/litter/year) for the Duroc breed. Mixed model techniques (BLUP and REML) offered efficient and accurate prediction of breeding values and estimation of parameters, utilising all available information from relatives, traits and environments.

Different selection strategies were investigated and predicted genetic gains were estimated, based on indices derived for a range of improved and unimproved pig genotypes. The effect of different sets of selection criteria on the efficiency of selection, use of restricted selection indices, and sensitivity to changes in the economic values and in the structure of future costs and returns were studied, and the effects of these changes on the predicted selection response were analysed. The increase in profit resulting from further selection was lower in pig populations representing improved genotypes, as a result of lower predicted genetic gains in growth and carcass traits. This reduced rate of increase in profit was partially offset by the increase in predicted genetic gains in reproductive performance. For improved genotypes, the predicted increase in profit per gilt life cycle after one generation of selection ranged from \$26 to \$98 for one standard deviation of index selection with a selection intensity of 1. For unimproved genotypes, higher genetic gains in growth and carcass traits resulted in profits exceeding \$120 per generation of selection. Greater economic emphasis on litter size resulted in lower predicted genetic gains in growth and carcass traits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I sincerely thank my supervisors, Professor Dorian Garrick and Professor Hugh Blair, for their commitment, guidance and invaluable assistance throughout this study.

Without the contribution and encouragement of the late Associate Professor William Smith this project would not have been possible.

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Paul Moughan for providing advice and helpful criticism on many aspects of this study.

I am also grateful to Mr Mac Hanley and Mr Nigel Stables for their useful comments and suggestions. Gratitude is extended to Mr David Dobson and to my colleagues at the New Zealand Pork Industry Board for their assistance and encouragement. Thanks are also due to Dr Carlos Sosa for advice on statistical analyses.

I wish to acknowledge the help and co-operation of Mr Paul Lysaght and his staff at the National Pig Breeding Company N.Z. Ltd.

The financial assistance of the New Zealand Pork Industry Board is gratefully acknowledged.

The support and encouragement of my colleagues at the Monogastric Research Centre and staff members of the Department of Animal Science and the Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences is greatly appreciated.

Finally, very special thanks are due to Joanna Olczak for her loving support, encouragement and assistance throughout this study.

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	xiv
List of Figures	xviii
Introduction	1
✓ Chapter 1. Review of Methods for Deriving Relative Economic Values to Enable Construction of Selection Indices	8
✓ Chapter 2. Economic Values of Traits for Pig Improvement.	
I. A Simulation Model	22
✓ Chapter 3. Economic Values of Traits for Pig Improvement.	
II. Estimates for New Zealand Conditions	63
✓ Chapter 4. Estimation of Genetic Parameters for Production and Reproduction Traits Using Restricted Maximum Likelihood	90
Chapter 5. Prediction of Breeding Values and Estimation of Genetic and Phenotypic Trends with an Animal Model	123
✓ Chapter 6. Genetic Connectedness Between Management Units	170
Chapter 7. Economic Indices Using Breeding Values Predicted by BLUP	182
General Discussion	242
Zusammenfassung	253
Résumé	256

Chapter 1. Review of Methods for Deriving Relative Economic Values to Enable Construction of Selection Indices	8
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 Comparison of Economic, Biological and Bioeconomic Approaches to Defining Economic Values of Traits ✓	9
✓1.3 Differences in Methods of Derivation of Relative Economic Values Depending on the Perspective Taken	13
✓1.4 Derivation of Economic Values Using Different Combinations of Income and Expense	15
1.5 Conclusion	18
1.6 References	19

Chapter 2. Economic Values of Traits for Pig Improvement.	
I. A Simulation Model	22
2.1 Abstract	23
2.2 Introduction	24
2.3 Materials and Methods	25
2.3.1 Strategy and Model Design	25
2.3.2 Gilt and Sow Costs and Returns	28
2.3.3 Offspring Costs and Returns	32
2.3.4 Simulation of Pig Growth	36
2.3.5 Diets Used in the Growth Model Simulations	38
2.3.6 Growth Model Description	39
2.4 Discussion	42
2.5 References	48
2.6 Appendix A. Essential equations in the life cycle simulation model	53
2.6.1 Gilt and sow costs and returns	53
2.6.2 Offspring costs and returns	54
2.6.3 Calculation of Annualised Present Value	54
2.7 Appendix B. Growth model equations	55
2.7.1 Calculation of the chemical composition of the whole-body of the pig at the start of the third stage of growth	55
2.7.2 Simulation of energy flow and partitioning of nitrogen for each day of growth to predict daily protein and lipid deposition	55
2.7.3 Simulation of growth for each day until a specified slaughter liveweight is reached	56
2.7.4 Calculation of average daily gain (ADG), backfat thickness (BF), carcass weight (CW), feed conversion ratio (FCR) and average price per carcass (AVCP), over the growth period	57
2.8 Appendix C. List of symbols used in the model	57

Chapter 3. Economic Values of Traits for Pig Improvement.	
II. Estimates for New Zealand Conditions	63
3.1 Abstract	64
3.2 Introduction	66
✓ 3.3 Methods and Results	68
3.3.1 Strategy	68
3.3.2 Economic values for genetic growth control variables: Pd_{max} , DEi and R_{min}	69
✓ 3.3.3 Effect of Pd_{max} , DEi and R_{min} on profitability	72
3.3.4 Effect of Pd_{max} , DEi and R_{min} on ADG, BF and DFI	76
3.3.5 Economic values for growth performance output variables: ADG, BF and DFI	80
✓ 3.3.6 Economic values for reproduction performance traits: NBA, PWM, IWO and GAO	81
3.4 Discussion	83
3.5 References	87

Chapter 4. Estimation of Genetic Parameters for Production and Reproduction Traits Using Restricted Maximum Likelihood	90
4.1 Abstract	91
4.2 Introduction	92
4.3 Materials and Methods	95
4.3.1 Data	95
4.3.2 Mixed Model Definition	98
4.3.3 Univariate Sire Model Analysis	99
4.3.4 Multivariate Animal Model Analysis	102
4.3.5 Univariate Animal Model Analysis for NBA	103
4.3.6 Approximation of Standard Errors	104
4.4 Results	106
4.5 Discussion	111
4.5.1 Conclusions	114
4.6 References	115

Chapter 5. Prediction of Breeding Values and Estimation of Genetic and Phenotypic Trends with an Animal Model	123
5.1 Abstract	124
5.2 Introduction	126
5.3 Materials and Methods	128
5.3.1 Data	128
5.3.2 Statistical Models	131
5.3.3 Computing Strategy	133
5.3.4 Predicted Rates of Response to Selection	135
5.4 Results	139
5.4.1 Trends	139
5.4.2 Generation Intervals	151
5.4.3 Selection Applied	155
5.5 Discussion	158
5.6 Conclusions	162
5.7 References	165

Chapter 6. Genetic Connectedness Between Management Units	170
6.1 Abstract	171
6.2 Introduction	172
6.3 Methods and Results	174
6.3.1 Measures of Connectedness between two Herds	174
6.3.2 Simulation	176
6.4 Discussion	179
6.5 References	180

Chapter 7. Economic Indices Using Breeding Values	
Predicted by BLUP	182
7.1 Abstract	183
7.2 Introduction	184
7.3 Methods	187
7.3.1 Selection Indices for a Range of Pig Genotypes	187
7.3.2 Review of Index Theory	191
7.3.3 Economic Indices Using EBV's Predicted by BLUP	194
7.3.4 Reduced Selection Indices	196
7.3.5 Restricted Selection Indices	198
7.3.6 Derivation of Implied Economic Weights	199
7.3.7 Restricted Index Weights for BLUP EBV's	200
7.3.8 Sensitivity of Selection Indices to Changes in Economic Values	200
7.3.9 Sensitivity of Selection Indices to Changes in Feed Prices, Pigmeat Returns and Non-Feed Costs	202
7.4 Results	203
7.4.1 Economic Indices for a Range of Pig Genotypes	203
7.4.2 The Relative Efficiencies of Reduced Selection Indices	208
7.4.3 The Relative Efficiencies of Restricted Selection Indices	209
7.4.4 Effects of Changes in Economic Values on the Predicted Genetic Gains and on the Efficiency of Index Selection	212
7.4.5 Effects of Changes in Feed Prices, Pigmeat Returns and Non-Feed Costs on the Efficiency of Index Selection	218
7.4.6 Concluding Remarks	223
7.5 Discussion	225
7.5.1 Assumptions	225
7.5.2 Effect of Changes in Economic Weights on Selection Response	225
7.5.3 Genetic Evaluation using BLUP Index	228
7.5.4 Importance of Voluntary Feed Intake	230
7.5.5 Summary and Conclusions	231

7.6 References	234
General Discussion	242
Main Conclusions	247
References	250
Zusammenfassung	253
Résumé	256

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	Values of reproductive input variables (base level) compared with the New Zealand field data	29
Table 2.2	Reproductive parameters by sow parity, based on 10 years' information from the New Zealand pig industry	31
Table 2.3	Simulated performance of a breeding sow (base level) compared with the New Zealand field data	32
Table 2.4	Simulated average performance of growing pigs (base level), assuming $Pd_{\max} = 140$ g/day, $DE_i = 30.6$ MJ/day and $R_{\min} = 1.0$	33
Table 3.1	Economic values (\$ / gilt life cycle) for growth performance and reproduction traits, calculated for a range of unimproved (1 to 2) and improved (3 to 9) pig genotypes	70
Table 4.1	Numbers of tested pigs, sires, dams, test days and litters for average daily gain (ADG) and backfat thickness (BF) by breed	96
Table 4.2	Numbers of purebred farrowing records, sires, dams with records, animals in the model, farrowing seasons and parities for number of pigs born alive per litter (NBA) by breed	97
Table 4.3	Means (\bar{x}) and phenotypic standard deviations ($\hat{\sigma}_p$) for average daily gain (ADG), backfat thickness (BF) and number born alive per litter (NBA) by breed	97
Table 4.4	Estimates of variances and covariances for average daily gain (ADG) and backfat thickness (BF) by breed	106
Table 4.5	Estimates of variance ratios and correlations of average daily gain (ADG) and backfat thickness (BF) computed from estimates of (co)variance components for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breeds	107

Table 4.6	Published estimates of variance ratios and correlations of average daily gain (ADG), age adjusted for weight (AGE), and backfat thickness (BF)	109
Table 4.7	Estimates of variances, variance ratios and repeatability (t) estimates for number of pigs born alive per litter (NBA) by breed	110
Table 5.1	Number of records and data structure for average daily gain (ADG) and backfat thickness (BF) by breed	129
Table 5.2	Number of purebred farrowing records and data structure for number of pigs born alive per litter (NBA) by breed	129
Table 5.3	Means (\bar{x}), phenotypic standard deviations ($\hat{\sigma}_p$) and coefficients of variation (CV%) for average daily gain (ADG), backfat thickness (BF) and number born alive per litter (NBA) by breed	130
Table 5.4	Expected distribution of farrowings by parity, sow age at farrowing and mean litter size at birth	137
Table 5.5	Assumed heritabilities (h^2), means (\bar{x}), and phenotypic (σ_p) and genetic (σ_g) standard deviations for ADG and BF	138
Table 5.6	Annual genetic, environmental and phenotypic trends for ADG, BF and NBA traits for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breeds, and predicted genetic gains from selection on the MLC index	139
Table 5.7	Generation intervals (L) by breed - realised averages across years	151
Table 5.8	Realised selection differentials for ADG and BF traits by breed and sex	155
Table 5.9	Predicted and realised selection differentials for the MLC index by breed and sex	157

Table 6.1	Measures of connectedness between two herds for Large White and Landrace breeds (base level)	176
Table 6.2	Effect of adding different number of reference sires on the change in genetic connectedness between two nucleus herds	177
Table 7.1	Assumed heritabilities (h^2), common environmental (litter) effects (c^2), phenotypic standard deviations (σ_p), and genetic (r_g) and phenotypic (r_p) correlations, for production traits	189
Table 7.2	Mean levels of performance in selected population and economic values for traits in the breeding objective calculated for a range of unimproved (1 to 2) and improved (3 to 9) genotypes	190
Table 7.3	Predicted genetic gains calculated for one standard deviation of selection and selection index parameters for unimproved (1 to 2) and improved (3 to 9) genotypes. Selection criteria are: ADG, BF, DFI and NBA	205
Table 7.4 A	Effect of using different selection criteria on the index parameters and predicted genetic gains. <i>Selection index parameters and predicted genetic gains per generation, assuming selection intensity, $\bar{i} = 1$</i>	210
Table 7.4 B	Effect of using different selection criteria on the index parameters and predicted genetic gains. <i>Index efficiencies and predicted genetic gains per year, assuming selection intensity, $\bar{i} = 1.6$, and generation interval, $L = 1.25$ years</i>	211

- Table 7.5 A Effect of changes in the economic values on the index parameters and predicted genetic gains. The economic value for Pd_{\max} is doubled, with no change in economic values of other objective traits. *Selection index parameters and predicted genetic gains per generation, assuming selection intensity, $\bar{i} = 1$* 214
- Table 7.5 B Effect of changes in the economic values on the index parameters and predicted genetic gains. The economic value for Pd_{\max} is doubled, with no change in economic values of other objective traits. *Index efficiencies and predicted genetic gains per year, assuming selection intensity, $\bar{i} = 1.6$, and generation interval, $L = 1.25$ years* 215
- Table 7.6 Effect of changes in the economic values on the index parameters and predicted genetic gains. The economic value for NBA is doubled, with no change in economic values of other objective traits 216

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Generalised model flow diagram	26
Figure 2.2	Effect of carcass weight and backfat thickness on carcass price (from polynomial regression)	35
Figure 3.1	Effect of Pd_{max} and DEi on APV (\$ profit / gilt life cycle) for genotypes with $R_{min} = 1.0$. Expected differences in profit between sexes of the same breed of pigs in relation to Pd_{max} and DEi are marked with ♂ (males) and ♀ (females)	72
Figure 3.2	Effect of Pd_{max} and R_{min} on APV (\$ profit / gilt life cycle) for genotypes with intermediate levels of DEi (30 – 30.5 MJ/day)	74
Figure 3.3	Effect of R_{min} and DEi on APV (\$ profit / gilt life cycle) for genotypes with $Pd_{max} = 160$ g/day	75
Figure 3.4	Effect of Pd_{max} and DEi on average daily gain (ADG) for genotypes with $R_{min} = 1.0$	77
Figure 3.5	Effect of Pd_{max} and DEi on backfat thickness (BF) for genotypes with $R_{min} = 1.0$	78
Figure 3.6	Effect of Pd_{max} and DEi on daily feed intake (DFI) for genotypes with $R_{min} = 1.0$	79
Figure 5.1	Genetic trends for average daily gain (ADG) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	141
Figure 5.2	Genetic trends for backfat (BF) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	142
Figure 5.3	Genetic trends for number born alive (NBA) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	143
Figure 5.4	Environmental trends for average daily gain (ADG) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	145

Figure 5.5	Environmental trends for backfat (BF) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	146
Figure 5.6	Environmental trends for number born alive (NBA) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	147
Figure 5.7	Phenotypic trends for average daily gain (ADG) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	148
Figure 5.8	Phenotypic trends for backfat (BF) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	149
Figure 5.9	Phenotypic trends for number born alive (NBA) for Large White, Landrace and Duroc breed	150
Figure 5.10	Generation intervals for Large White, Landrace and Duroc boars	152
Figure 5.11	Generation intervals for Large White, Landrace and Duroc sows	153
Figure 5.12	Generation intervals for Large White, Landrace and Duroc (boars and sows combined)	154
Figure 6.1	Change in genetic connectedness between two herds	178
Figure 7.1	Predicted genetic gains in production traits	206
Figure 7.2	Predicted genetic gains in NBA	207
Figure 7.3	Effect of changes in economic values on the index efficiency	217
Figure 7.4	Effect of changes in feed prices on the index efficiency	220
Figure 7.5	Effect of changes in pigmeat returns on the index efficiency	221
Figure 7.6	Effect of changes in non-feed costs on the index efficiency	222