

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.

Productive and reproductive efficiency  
of two Holstein Friesian lines of cows  
which differ genetically for live weight

Daniel Laborde

1998



Productive and reproductive efficiency of two  
Holstein Friesian lines of cows which differ  
genetically for live weight

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Applied Science in Animal Science

Massey University

Daniel Laborde

1998

## Abstract

Two lines of Holstein Friesian cows which differ genetically for live weight, the Light Line (LL) and the Heavy Line (HL), have been selected at the Dairy Cattle Research Unit (Massey University) since 1989. The aim of the current experiment was to compare the productive and reproductive performance of these two lines during early lactation. Measurements of milk production, liveweight (LW), and pasture intake were made in 1996, while reproductive data were analysed for 1992 to 1997.

In experiment 1a, the milk production of the two lines was compared during the first 12 weeks of the lactation by the weekly measurement of the milk yield and the milk composition of 30 LL cows (average LW= 412 kg) and 27 HL cows (average LW= 445 kg), with the two groups of cows fed and managed identically. Pasture dry matter intake (DMI), calculated as pasture disappearance, was 13 to 15 kg DM a day during these 12 weeks. Although the HL produced slightly more milksolids (MS) than the LL, the difference was not significant (LL= 139 vs HL= 141 kg MS). However, the HL cows > 2 year old produced 7 kg MS more than the LL cows > 2 year old ( $P<0.05$ ). The LW and body condition score (BCS) changes in cows after calving were similar for both lines, but in the heifers the LL lost 17 kg of LW during the first 5 weeks of lactation compared to the HL that maintained their LW ( $P<0.05$ ). Similarly, the BCS of the LL was lower than that of the HL at 40 days postcalving (LL= 4.17 vs HL= 4.43,  $P<0.05$ ) mainly due to the BCS lost by the LL heifers.

In experiment 1b, the DMI and the dry matter digestibility (both estimated using the alkanes technique) of 21 LL cows (406 kg) and 21 HL cows (482 kg), grazing at a pasture allowance of 40 to 45 kg DM/cow/day, was measured in a ten days trial. The grazing behaviour of the two lines was also recorded during 2 days. Although the LL cows ate slightly less DM (LL= 14.3 vs HL= 15.1 kg DM/cow) and had a slightly higher MS conversion efficiency than the HL cows (LL= 120 vs HL= 110 g MS/kg DM eaten), the differences were not significant. When DMI was regressed on  $LW^{0.75}$  and MS yield, the effect of  $LW^{0.75}$  only approached significance ( $P<0.1$ ), but the effect of MS was highly significant ( $P<0.001$ ). The two lines had similar DMD (LL= 77.8% vs HL= 78.0%), gross energy conversion efficiency (LL= 44.6% vs HL= 42.3%) and net energy conversion efficiency (LL= 64.8% vs HL= 64.6%). The bite size of the HL cows (estimated from the grazing time, biting rate and DMI) was heavier than that of the LL cows (LL= 0.46 vs HL= 0.60 g DM/bite,  $P<0.01$ ), but the LL cows compensated for their lighter bite size by increasing the number of bites per minutes (LL= 55 vs HL= 50 bites/minute,  $P<0.05$ ).

The reproductive performance of the two lines was compared for the period from 1992 to 1997, and the interval Calving-Ovulation was estimated from the concentration of progesterone in milk in 1996 and 1997. The HL cows had shorter calving-ovulation intervals than the LL cows (LL= 32 vs HL= 28 days,  $P<0.05$ ), but the difference in calving-first heat interval was not significant (LL= 43 vs HL= 50 days). Compared to the LL cows >2 year old, the HL cows > 2 year old tended to calve and to conceive later in the calving and mating periods, respectively, because the HL cows had a lower conception rate at first service than the LL cows (LL= 70% vs HL= 58%,  $P<0.05$ ).

The ovaries of 10 cows from each line (LL= 405 vs kg HL= 481 kg) were scanned daily during a complete cycle before the start of mating. Cows from the HL had preovulatory follicles with larger diameter (LL= 12.7 vs HL= 15.7 mm,  $P<0.05$ ) and corpus lutea with larger areas (LL= 690 vs HL= 859 mm<sup>2</sup>,  $P<0.05$ ) than the LL cows. No differences were detected in the diameter of the first and second dominant follicles. On average, the preovulatory follicles of the HL cows achieved their maximum diameter later in the cycle compared to the LL (LL= day 18<sup>th</sup> vs HL= day 20<sup>th</sup>).

The results from the current experiment show that although the HL produced slightly more MS than the LL in the longer period, the two lines of cows achieved similar levels of MS yield during early lactation independently of their LW and size. Similarly, although the LL cows had a slightly higher MS conversion efficiency than the HL cows, the differences in energy and MS conversion efficiency between the two lines were not significant. The reproductive data analysed from 1992 to 1997 suggest that the LL cows achieved a better reproductive performance than the HL cows because of their higher conception rate at first service. However, more information is required from other stages of the lactation before any definite conclusion is reached about the feed conversion efficiency of the two lines. Similarly, considering the variation in the reproductive performance of the HL between the years, reproductive data from subsequent seasons must be collected in order to verify, or disprove, the current conclusions.

## Acknowledgments.

I am most grateful to my supervisor, Dr C. W. Holmes, for his helpful advice throughout the studies. I really enjoyed his teaching style, common sense, and his approach to the scientific research. He was not only a very good supervisor, but a great person as well.

To my wife Bettina, my main supporter and my principal technician. Thanks for all your love and sorry for all the work.

To my parents, my brother, my sister and the rest of my family for all their support and understanding through faxes and phone calls.

To José Garcia and Nicolás Lopez, we shared discussions and opinions which I hope had made some positive contributions for all of us.

To the staff of the Dairy Cattle Research Unit: Martin Chesterfield, Sandra Dean and Jeff Purchas for their kindness and assistance while carrying out the experiment. I enjoyed working with them.

To : Dr Jeff Wichtel, Professor John Hodgson, Dr Keith Macmillan, Gavin Wilson, Keith Henderson, Dr Scott McDougall and Nigel Perkins who have given their time to discuss ideas, experiments and/or commented on drafts of materials.

To Phil Pearce, and the staff of the Nutrition Laboratory for their help with the analysis of all the samples.

My gratitude to the New Zealand Government for providing the scholarship which made it possible for me to study at Massey University.

On a more personal note I would like to thank : Professor Warren Parker, Nicola Shadbolt, Perry Matthews, Cory Matthew and Ian Brookes. I will remember their lectures. Grant and Barbara Boyden, Keith and Dorothy Dixon, Alistair MacDonald, the staff of the Dairy Farm N° 1, and to many other farmers whom allowed me to work and learn from their farm knowledge. To Tato, Marcela, Amy and Alana, to Vicki D, my mates from the glorious Brown Owl Soccer team and all the other latinoamerican students which made me feel closer to Uruguay.

All these people, in one way or the other, made my studies in New Zealand one of my most wonderful and unforgettable experiences.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Tables and Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	<b>1</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature review</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1) The concept of Efficiency of a system.</b>	<b>2</b>
Biological efficiency.	2
Economic Efficiency of the production systems.	2
<b>1.2) Brief description of the main characteristics of New Zealand milk production systems.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3) Energy conversion efficiency in a dairy cow.</b>	<b>6</b>
Cows Factors that affect Energy Conversion Efficiency.	7
Milk yield and Energy Conversion Efficiency.	8
Feed Conversion Efficiency.	9
Residual Feed Intake (RFI).	10
Relationship between milk yield and body size.	10
Relationship between size and milk production efficiency of dairy cows.	11
<b>1.4) Feed Intake of dairy cows.</b>	<b>14</b>
Main factors affecting feed intake of the grazing dairy cows.	15
The three components of herbage intake.	15
Intake per bite.	15
Grazing Time and Biting Rate.	16
Effect of the size of the ruminant on the intake per bite.	17
Ingestive Capacity as a regulator of feed intake.	18
Metabolic Control of the feed intake.	21
State of the animals as the long term factor regulating intake.	21
Genetic correlation between size of the cows and feed intake of different selection strategies.	21
Observed responses in DMI with the increase in size of the cows.	23
<b>1.5) Main features of the reproduction management in New Zealand dairy farms.</b>	<b>24</b>
Planned Start of Calving.	24
Calving Pattern.	24
Conception pattern.	25
Postpartum anoestrus.	26
Errors in heat detection.	27
Conception Rate.	28
Reproduction and size of the cows.	31
<b>1.6) Objectives of the study.</b>	<b>31</b>



## **CHAPTER TWO** **34**

---

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS** **34**

#### **2.1) Comparison of the milk trait yield, and changes in liveweight and body condition score of the LL and HL cows in early lactation (Experiment 1 a).** **34**

Animals and management. 34

Measurements and sample collection procedures. 34

#### **2.2) Comparison of the dry matter intake, milksolid and energy conversion efficiency of the LL and HL during early lactation (Experiment 1 b)** **36**

Animals and management. 36

Measurements and sample collection procedure for milk, liveweight and body condition scores variables. 36

Measurements of individual cow DMI and digestibility. 37

Indicators of Efficiency. 38

Measurement of grazing behaviour. 38

#### **2.3) Measurements and sample collection procedures for metabolites in blood of the LL and HL cows (Experiment 1 c).** **39**

#### **2.4) Comparison of the reproductive performance of the LL and the HL of cows. (Experiment 1 d).** **39**

Measurements and sample collection procedures for reproductive parameters. 40

Comparison of the follicular and luteal activity between LL and HL cows, during the 1996 season. 40

#### **2.5) Statistical analysis.** **41**

Analysis of the milk yield of the LL and the HL (Experiment 1 a). 41

Analysis used for the comparison of the DMI, and milksolid and energy conversion efficiency between LL and HL (Experiment 1 b). 41

Analysis of the concentration of blood metabolites and of the reproductive performance between LL and HL (Experiment 1 c and 1d). 42

## **CHAPTER THREE** **43**

---

### **RESULTS** **43**

#### **3.1) Milk production and milk composition of the LL and HL in the first 12 weeks of the lactation (Experiment 1 a).** **43**

Apparent DMI (kg DM/cow/day) of cows during the first 12 weeks of lactation. 43

Milk production and milk composition of the LL and HL cows during the first 12 weeks. 43

Changes in LW and BCS in the first 12 weeks of lactation. 45

#### **3.2) Milksolid and energy conversion efficiency for LL and HL cows (Experiment 1 b).** **50**

Pregrazing and postgrazing pasture masses in experiment 1b. 50

Chemical and botanical composition. 50

Liveweight and milk production of LL and HL cows in experiment 1 b. 51

DMI and digestibility measured by the alkanes technique, energy balance and efficiency of the LL and HL in experiment 1b. 51

Grazing behaviour of the HL and the LL cows in experiment 1b. 53

<b>3.3) Concentration of metabolites in blood of the HL and LL cows.</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>3.4) Comparison of the reproductive performance of the LL and HL cows.</b>	<b>55</b>
Reproductive performance of the HL and LL cows from 1992 to 1997.	55
Comparison of the reproductive performance between the two lines of cows in the 1996-1997 season.	58
Comparison of the follicular and luteal activity of the HL and LL cows.	59
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	<b>61</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Discussion of results.</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>4.1) Results of the experiment 1 a.</b>	<b>61</b>
Milk yield traits and milk composition of the HL and LL cows during the first 12 weeks.	61
LW and BCS changes of the HL and LL cows during the first 12 weeks of lactation.	62
The relationship between the production of milk traits and LW and BCS changes of the LL and HL cows during the first 12 weeks of lactation.	63
<b>4.2) Discussion of Experiment 1b.</b>	<b>63</b>
Pregrazing and postgrazing pasture mass during experiment 1b.	63
Liveweight and milk production of the HL and LL cows in early lactation in the experiment 1 b.	64
DMI (alkanes) and Grazing behaviour of the HL and LL cows in early lactation.	64
Digestibility of pasture DM by the HL and LL cows in early lactation in the experiment 1 b.	67
Efficiency of the LL and HL cows in early lactation.	67
<b>4.3) Discussion of the results about the reproductive performance of the two lines of cows.</b>	<b>69</b>
Calving Ovulation Interval (C-Ov) and Calving First Heat Interval (C-H).	69
Planned Start of Mating-First Service Interval, Planned Start of Mating-Conception Interval and Planned Start of calving- Calving Interval.	71
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	<b>73</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Conclusions.</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>APPENDIXES.</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>REFERENCES.</b>	<b>81</b>

## List of Tables and Figures

TABLE 1.1 <i>COMPARISON OF AN AVERAGE DAIRY FARM IN NEW ZEALAND AND PENNSYLVANIA (USA) IN 1989.</i>	3
TABLE 1.2 <i>SUMMARY OF THE PRODUCTIVE AND ECONOMIC RESPONSE TO THE USE OF DIFFERENT TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF SUPPLEMENTS IN THE 8 FARMLLET TRIAL CARRIED OUT AT THE DAIRY RESEARCH CORPORATION.</i>	4
TABLE 1.3. <i>DATA FROM 3 YEARS EXPERIMENT WITH HIGH BREEDING INDEX JERSEY COWS MANAGED IN SIMILAR CONDITIONS BUT AT DIFFERENT STOCKING RATE.</i>	4
TABLE 1.4 <i>PERCENTAGE OF COWS PER BREED, AND HERD TEST AVERAGE PER BREED OF THE TOTAL COWS HERD TESTED IN NEW ZEALAND IN 1994 .</i>	5
TABLE 1.5. <i>PHENOTYPIC AND GENETIC CORRELATION BETWEEN MEASURES OF FEED CONVERSION EFFICIENCY AND MILK YIELD.</i>	9
TABLE 1.6 <i>PHENOTYPIC AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LIVELWEIGHT (AS A MEASURE OF COW SIZE) AND MILK YIELD PRODUCTION IN HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN COWS.</i>	11
TABLE 1.7 <i>PHENOTYPIC AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LIVELWEIGHT (AS A MEASURE OF COW SIZE) AND MILKFAT AND PROTEIN PRODUCTION IN HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN COWS.</i>	12
TABLE 1.8 <i>SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED ABOUT PHENOTYPIC AND GENETIC CORRELATION BETWEEN SIZE AND FEED CONVERSION EFFICIENCY IN DAIRY COWS.</i>	12
TABLE 1.9 <i>VALUES FOR FEED INTAKE AND FOR FEED CONVERSION EFFICIENCIES FOR COWS OF DIFFERENT WEIGHTS BUT ADJUSTED TO A COMMON VALUE OF 78 MJ MILK ENERGY PRODUCED PER DAY.</i>	13
TABLE 1.10 <i>RANGE OF BITE WEIGHTS MEASURED BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS.</i>	16
TABLE 1.11 <i>THREE YEAR MEANS FOR THE EFFECT OF MATURE SIZE AND RATE OF MATURITY ON BITE SIZE (MG/BITE), GRAZING TIME (MIN/DAY) AND BITING RATE (BITE/MIN) IN 16 MONTH-OLD HEIFERS GRAZING BERMUDAGRASS.</i>	17
TABLE 1.12 <i>PHENOTYPIC AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LW AND INTAKE, AND LW AND RESIDUAL INTAKE OF THE DAIRY COWS .</i>	22
TABLE 1.13 <i>RESULTS REPORTED IN THE LITERATURE ABOUT THE INCREASE IN DMI (KG DM) OF DAIRY COWS BY EACH INCREASE IN 100 KG OF LW.</i>	23
TABLE 1.14 <i>EFFECT OF CALVING PATTERN (CONCENTRATE OR NORMAL) WITH THE SAME PSC DATE IN GROUPS OF MONOZYGOUS TWINS ON PRODUCTION DIFFERENCE.</i>	25
TABLE 1.15 <i>MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE SMFM, SMCO, P21, P42 AND NS (SERVICE PER CONCEPTION) IN FRIESIAN AND JERSEY COWS IN NEW ZEALAND.</i>	26

TABLE 1.16 AVERAGE POST PARTUM ANOESTRUS INTERVAL (PPA) AND CALVING-FIRST DETECTED HEAT INTERVAL (C-1ST H) REPORTED FOR 2 YEARS OLD AND MATURE DAIRY COWS IN NEW ZEALAND.	27
TABLE 1.17 AVERAGE CONCEPTION RATE (%) TO FIRST SERVICE AFTER VARIED INTERVALS POSTPARTUM AND AFTER THE OCCURRENCE OR ABSENCE OF PREMATING HEATS.	29
TABLE 1.18 THE INFLUENCE OF BODY CONDITION CHANGE POST- CALVING ON FIRST SERVICE CONCEPTION RATE.	29
TABLE 2.1 TIMING, NUMBER OF COWS USED , VARIABLES MEASURED AND FREQUENCY OF MEASUREMENTS DURING THE DIFFERENT SUB-TRIALS WITHIN THE EXPERIMENT ABOUT THE COMPARISON OF THE PRODUCTIVE AND REPRODUCTIVE EFFICIENCY OF LL AND HL COWS DURING EARLY LACTATION.	35
TABLE 2.2. NUMBER OF COWS PER YEAR(FROM 1992 TO 1997) USED TO COMPARE THE REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE LL AND HL LINES.	39
TABLE 3.1 APPARENT AVERAGE DMI (KG DM /COW/DAY) OF THE COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION.	43
TABLE 3.2 DATA FOR THE MATURE COWS AND HEIFERS COMBINED : ADJUSTED MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS FOR YIELD OF MILKSOLID ( MS, KG/COW), MILKFAT (MF, KG/COW), MILKPROTEIN (MP, KG/COW), AND MILK (MY, L/COW) OF THE LIGHT AND HEAVY COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION.	44
TABLE 3.3 DATA FOR MATURE COWS: ADJUSTED MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS FOR YIELD OF MILKSOLID ( MS, KG/COW), MILKFAT (MF, KG/COW), MILKPROTEIN (MP, KG/COW), AND MILK ( MY, L/COW) OF THE LIGHT AND HEAVY COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION.	44
TABLE 3.4 EQUATIONS OBTAINED FROM THE REGRESSION OF MS (KG/COW/DAY) ON LW, AGE AND CALVING PERIOD FOR THE COMBINED DATA (ROW 1), MATURE COWS DATA (ROW 2) AND HEIFERS (ROW 3).	45
FIGURE 3.1 DAILY MILKSOLID PRODUCTION OF THE HL AND THE LL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION (THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE NOT SIGNIFICANT IN ANY OF THE WEEKS).	45
FIGURE 3.2 DAILY MILK PROTEIN PRODUCTION OF THE LL AND THE HL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION ((THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE NOT SIGNIFICANT IN ANY OF THE WEEKS).	45
FIGURE 3.3 DAILY MILK FAT PRODUCTION OF THE LL AND THE HL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION ((THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE SIGNIFICANT IN WEEK 7 ( LL: 0.94 VS HL: 1.06 KG MF ) AND IN WEEK 11 (LL: 0.98 VS HL: 1.06 KG MF)).	46
FIGURE 3.4 DAILY MILK YIELD (LITRES/COW) OF THE LL AND THE HL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION ((THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE SIGNIFICANT ONLY IN WEEK 10 ( LL: 22.6 VS HL: 24.1 LITRES ).	46

FIGURE 3.5 CONCENTRATION OF PROTEIN IN MILK OF THE LL AND THE HL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION (THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE NOT SIGNIFICANT IN ANY OF THE WEEKS).	47
FIGURE 3.6 CONCENTRATION OF FAT IN MILK OF THE LL AND THE HL COWS DURING THE FIRST 12 WEEKS OF THE LACTATION (THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LINES WERE SIGNIFICANT ONLY IN WEEK 6 (LL: 4.3 HL: 4.0 %)).	47
FIGURE 3.7 CHANGES IN LIVEWEIGHT OF THE LL AND HL HEIFERS AND MATURE COWS DURING EARLY LACTATION.	48
FIGURE 3.8 CHANGES IN THE BODY CONDITION SCORE OF THE LL AND HL HEIFERS AND MATURE COWS DURING EARLY LACTATION (THE DIFFERENCES WERE SIGNIFICANT IN WEEK 5 (LL:4.17 HL:4.43)).	48
TABLE 3.5 AVERAGE PREGRAZING AND POSTGRAZING PASTURE MASS (KG DM/HA), DAILY PASTURE ALLOWANCE (KGDM/COW) AND ESTIMATED DAILY DMI (KG DM/COW) DURING THE FIRST AND SECOND 5 DAYS OF THE EXPERIMENT I B.	50
TABLE 3.6 CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF THE PASTURE SAMPLES TAKEN DURING THE FIRST AND SECOND 5 DAYS OF THE EXPERIMENT I B (% OR G; DM BASIS).	50
TABLE 3.7 MEAN LIVEWEIGHTS (KG) AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND MEAN ADJUSTED VALUES AND STANDARD ERRORS FOR DAILY MY (L/COW), DAILY MS PRODUCTION (KG MS / COW), DAILY MP PRODUCTION (KG/COW), DAILY MF PRODUCTION (KG/COW) AND MILK COMPOSITION OF THE LL AND HL COWS IN EXPERIMENT I B.	51
TABLE 3.8. ADJUSTED MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF THE DMI (KG DM/DAY), CORRECTED DMI (KG DM/100 KG LW), $DMI / KG LW^{0.75}$ , DM DIGESTIBILITY, MS CONVERSION EFFICIENCY (KG MS / KG DM EATEN), ENERGY BALANCE, GROSS ENERGY CONVERSION EFFICIENCY (GEEFF) AND NET ENERGY CONVERSION EFFICIENCY(NEEFF) OF LL AND HL COWS DURING EXPERIMENT I B.	52
FIGURE 3.9. REGRESSION OF THE ESTIMATED DRY MATTER EATEN BY EACH COW ( USING ALKANES) ON THE CALCULATED DMI REQUIRED BY EACH COW	52
TABLE 3.9 MEAN AND STANDARD ERRORS OF THE GRAZING TIME(MINUTES /DAY) AND BITING RATE (BITES/ MINUTE) OF LIGHT AND HEAVY COWS IN EXPERIMENT I B.	53
TABLE 3.10. MEAN GLUCOSE CONCENTRATION ( MMOL/LT) IN BLOOD OF LIGHT AND HEAVY COWS IN THE SECOND MONTH OF LACTATION.	54
TABLE 3.11 ADJUSTED MEAN OF ALBUMIN CONCENTRATION (G/L) IN BLOOD OF LL AND HL COWS IN THE SECOND MONTH OF LACTATION.	54
TABLE 3.12 ADJUSTED MEAN OF UREA CONCENTRATION (MMOL/L) IN BLOOD OF LL AND HL COWS IN THE SECOND MONTH OF LACTATION.	55
TABLE 3.13 CALVING-OVULATION INTERVAL (C-OV), CALVING-FIRST HEAT INTERVAL (C-H), PLANNED START OF MATING-FIRST SERVICE INTERVAL (PSM-I SERV), PLANNED START OF MATING-CONCEPTION INTERVAL (PSM-CON) AND PLANNED START OF CALVING-CALVING INTERVAL (PSC-C) OF THE LL AND THE HL OF COWS.	55
TABLE 3.14 PERCENTAGE OF FIRST CALVING COWS, MATURE COWS AND TOTAL ANIMALS (COMBINED DATA) FROM THE HEAVY LINE (HH) AND LIGHT LINE (LL) WHICH CONCEIVED DURING THE FIRST 21 DAYS OF MATING.	57

TABLE 3.15 CONCEPTION RATE AT FIRST SERVICE OF THE FIRST CALVING COWS, MATURE COWS AND TOTAL ANIMALS (COMBINED DATA) FROM THE HL AND LL.	57
TABLE 3.16 PERCENTAGE OF FIRST CALVING COWS, 3 YEAR OLD COWS AND TOTAL ANIMALS (COMBINED DATA) FROM THE HL AND LL THAT CALVED DURING THE FIRST 21 DAYS OF THE CALVING PERIOD.	57
TABLE 3.17 PERCENTAGE OF COWS (COMBINED DATA) FROM EACH LINE WHICH CALVED IN THE FIRST 21 DAYS OF CALVING PERIOD, CONCEIVED DURING THE FIRST 21 DAYS OF MATING PERIOD AND CONCEPTION RATE AT FIRST SERVICE IN 1994, 1995, 1996 AND 1997.	58
TABLE 3.18 CALVING-OVULATION INTERVAL (C-OV), CALVING-FIRST HEAT INTERVAL (C-H), PLANNED START OF MATING-FIRST SERVICE INTERVAL (PSM-ISERV) AND PLANNED START OF MATING-CONCEPTION INTERVAL (PSM-CON) OF THE LL AND THE HL OF COWS DURING 1996/97.	58
TABLE 3.19 AVERAGE LW, BCS, MS PRODUCTION AND DAYS POST-CALVING OF THE LL AND HL COWS USED IN THE SCANNING TRIAL.	59
TABLE 3.20 MEAN VALUES FOR THE ADJUSTED DIAMETERS OF DOMINANT FOLLICLES AND DAY OF THE CYCLE AT WHICH THEY ACHIEVED MAXIMUM DIAMETERS FOR HL AND LL COWS ( $\pm$ STANDARD ERRORS).	59
TABLE 3.21 MEAN VALUES FOR THE AREA OF THE CORPUS LUTEUM FOR HL AND LL COWS ON DIFFERENT DAYS OF THE OESTRUS CYCLE.	59
FIGURE 3.10 COMPARISON OF THE MEAN DIAMETER OF THE FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD DOMINANT FOLLICLE OF THE HL AND LL COWS SCANNED DURING A COMPLETE CYCLE.	59
FIGURE 3.11 COMPARRISON OF THE AREA OF THE CORPUS LUTEUM IN THE HL AND LL COWS SCANNED DURING A COMPLETE CYCLE	59
TABLE 4.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CALCULATED THEORETICAL DMI REQUIREMENTS OF THE AVERAGE LL AND HL COW AND THE MEAN DMI MEASURED USING THE ALKANE TECHNIQUE.	64
TABLE 4.2 RESULTS REPORTED ABOUT THE INCREASE IN DMI (KG DM) OF DAIRY COWS FOR EACH INCREASE OF 100 KG OF LW ).	64
TABLE 4.3 EQUATIONS FROM THE REGRESSION OF DMI ON $LW^{0.75}$ AND MILKSOLID PRODUCTION IN THE CURRENT EXPERIMENT (ROW 1), PUBLISHED BY WALLACE (1961) (ROW 2) AND PUBLISHED BY HOLMES AND WILSON (1987) (ROW 3).	66
TABLE 4.4 GROSS FEED CONVERSION EFFICIENCY (KG MS/KG DM) OF DAIRY COWS REPORTED IN THE LITERATURE BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS.	67
TABLE 4.5 NET ENERGY CONVERSION EFFICIENCY OF DAIRY COWS REPORTED IN THE LITERATURE BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS.	68
TABLE 4.6 AVERAGE POST PARTUM ANOESTRUS INTERVAL AND CALVING FIRST DETECTED HEAT INTERVAL REPORTED FOR 2 YEARS OLD AND MATURE DAIRY COWS IN NEW ZEALAND.	69

# Chapter One

## INTRODUCTION

The suspected relationship between size of the cows and efficiency of milk production has been the topic of many studies done in the last 50 years ( Brody, 1945; Mason,1957; Yerex *et al.*, 1988; Holmes *et al.*, 1993; Hansen *et al.*, 1998). Scientists have approached this subject in two different ways: indirectly, comparing the milk production efficiency between breeds which differ in size (Blake and Custodio, 1986; Gibson, 1986; Oldenbroek, 1988; Ahlborn and Bryant, 1992), or directly, assessing the conversion efficiency of dairy cows from the same breeds, but with different size (Stakelum and Connolly, 1987; Yerex *et al.*, 1988; Holmes *et al.*, 1993). They attempted to find out the direction in which the size of the dairy cows has to go in order to make the systems more efficient and profitable (Robertson, 1973). However, the conclusions have been controversial (Morris and Wilton, 1976). One constraint was that efficiency ,in economic or biological terms, is not easy to define or to measure (Spedding, 1988; Holmes, 1988; Ostergaard *et al.*, 1990). In addition, it is possible that the question about the “ideal” size of the cows does not have only one answer ( Robertson, 1973; Holmes, 1973), it could change according to the production system in which the cows are producing (Taylor, 1973; Oldenbroek , 1988).

Milk production in New Zealand is defined as a low input pastoral system (Holmes, 1990; Bryant, 1982). It is based on a high pasture utilisation which is achieved using the appropriate stocking rate under a seasonal system of milk production (Holmes and Macmillan, 1982; Holmes, 1990). A direct consequence of using high stocking rate and maximal pasture utilisation is that each cow of the herd has available a limited amount of the pasture produced in a year, meaning that dry matter intake of the cows is constrained by pasture allowances (Poppi *et al.*, 1987; Holmes, 1988). Under this scenario, because of the maintenance costs, size of the cows was identified as a component affecting the final efficiency of the dairy systems in New Zealand (Ahlborn and Dempfle, 1992; Holmes *et al.*, 1993). In fact, liveweight of the cows is now given a negative weight in the final selection index of the cows in the new overall objective of increased \$ of milk solids produced per tonne of DM eaten ( New Animal Evaluation System, LIC, 1996). The objective was to select dairy cows in a more appropriate direction for the New Zealand conditions of production, taking into account that heavier cows have to produce more to be as efficient as a light cow (Holmes *et al.*, 1993).

However, because of the existence of genetic correlation, other characteristics may be affected when selecting for or against size of the cows. For instance, some geneticists have expressed some concern about the possible negative effects that selecting against live weight may have on intake capacity and body condition score of the high genetic merit cows. It has also been reported that genetically heavy cows required more service to conceive than light cows (Hansen *et al.*, 1998). There are only a few genetic studies designed to evaluate the effect of genetic differences in the LW of cows from the same breed on the efficiency of the dairy systems. In Minnesota, an experiment with 2 lines of Holstein cows which differ genetically for live weight has been running for over 30 years (Hansen *et al.*, 1998), but the conditions of production are completely different to those in New Zealand. No experiment has been designed to compare in practice the efficiency of dairy cows within the same breed which differ genetically for live weight under grazing conditions. The Light (LL) and Heavy (HL) genetic lines of Holstein-Friesian cows developed at the Dairy Cattle Research Unit (DCRU, Massey University) is the first attempt to study this subject which has an especial significance for the New Zealand conditions of production. The present experiment was designed to compare the dry matter intake, milk production , feed conversion efficiency, grazing behaviour and reproductive performance during early lactation of the HL and LL lines of cows.