

GENETIC PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR MILK AND CONFORMATION TRAITS OF JERSEY CATTLE IN THE NEW DERIVED GUINEA SAVANNAH ZONE OF NIGERIA

Abstract

The objectives of this research were to estimate the genetic parameters of milk and conformation traits under environmental sensitivity of multi-genotype cattle. The data from the study came from two genotypes of cows (Jersey). Milk yield, five body traits (stature, ST; chest width, CW; body depth, BD; heart girth, HG; rump width, RW) and five udder traits (chest ligament, CL; rear udder height, RUH; rear udder width, RUW; udder clearance, UC; teat length, TL). Multi-trait animal models were used to estimate the (co)variance components based on average information restricted maximum likelihood method (AIREML) using R 3.0.3 software. Heritability estimates for milk production and conformation traits were low to high ($h^2=7$ to 44%, Holstein; 16 to 42%). Genetic and environmental correlation between 305 day fat corrected milk yield and conformation traits were less than unity across different genotypes. It was concluded that considerable exploitable genetic variation exists for milk production and conformation traits which suggest potential for improvement of economic traits.

KEYWORDS: 3/4HolsteinX1/4Bunaji, GENETIC, AIREML, MILK YIELD

1. INTRODUCTION

Breeding programs in cattle are primarily focused on milk yield. It is then obvious that accurate measurement and prediction of milk yield is also essential for the economy of the dairy industry. Genetic architecture refers to the composition or organization of the whole genome and its connection to the expression of complex phenotypes rather than single locus traits [7]. It is synonymous with the “genotype-phenotype map” for a trait. [11] provided a contemporary definition of genetic architecture as “the pattern of genetic effects that build and control a given phenotypic character and its variational properties”. Dissecting the genetic architecture and accurate statistical modeling has the propensity to increase genetic gain by increasing the estimate of heritability. Taking account of this variation by fitting herd as a fixed effect when

33 modeling milk yield will decrease the residual variance, therefore decreasing
34 phenotypic variance and increasing heritability estimate. This will lead to an increase
35 in accuracy of the predicted breeding value which directly increases genetic gain.

36 In a population, heritability, additive genetic variance and genetic correlation, are the
37 base knowledge of selection in quantitative genetics [10]. Although managerial
38 factors significantly affect the level of reproductive performance achieved within a
39 dairy herd [21]. The relationship between yield traits and body weight is complex
40 largely dependent on both the frame size of a cow and body condition score. Some
41 studies found unfavorable genetic relationship between weight at first calving and
42 milk, fat and protein yields. They indicated that genetically heavier cows after calving
43 produce less milk, fat and protein but conceive earlier than smaller cows [1]. [5]
44 found genetic correlation of the range near zero in the first lactation to moderate
45 negative in the second lactation between BW and milk production traits. Selection for
46 milk yield has a negligible progress on the BW of animal [5] However, there are still
47 potential exists to select animals with less BW loss at high levels of milk production,
48 which is expected to improve cow health and reproductive performance [5]

49 Increasing emphasis on the need for policy formulation for dairy cattle in Nigeria
50 under a National genetic evaluation program is highly desirable due to loss of our
51 valuable genetic resources [3] suggested that the genetic and environmental
52 relationship among breeds should be determined on different environmental scales,
53 so that the breed could be grouped into sets that are genetically similar in terms of
54 products delivery. Thus an objective quantification of the magnitude of the genetic
55 architecture among a set of dairy breeds can be obtained from quantitative,
56 qualitative, and computational measures under different production environment.
57 The role or potential of this approach in dairy value chain should not be underplayed.

58 Genetic evaluation programmes have been used in the dairy industry for many years
59 [22] in the developed countries. Estimation of the heritabilities of production traits is
60 required for the genetic evaluation of breeds. These parameters for individual herds
61 are compared with those of the national dairy herds. From this, the genetic and
62 environmental trends for production parameters can be determined for each herd
63 and compared with those of the national herd [18]. No such information is presently
64 available for the dairy cattle industry in Nigeria. There is currently a growing interest
65 in the keeping of dairy cows in Nigeria due to quest for protein sufficiency. A genetic

evaluation of the national dairy herd in Nigeria has not been done and with the small number of records available, it was considered necessary to include all available records of all dairy cattle over all lactations in the analysis. This will provide a basis for a breeding and selection programme for dairy cattle farmers with the aim of improving the milk yield and conformation traits of dairy cattle in Nigeria.

Therefore, the objective of this study was to estimate the genetic (heritability, repeatability and genetic correlations) and environmental relationships among milk production, conformational (body and udder) in genetic groups of in multi-breed dairy cattle.

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Location of the Study

This study was carried out in some selected states with large commercial dairy facilities.

Kwara State

Shonga dairy farm is situated in Edu Local Government (Kwara State, Nigeria). The farm is located in the tropical climate of Nigeria, with pronounced wet and dry seasons and steady high temperatures. Its geographical coordinates are 9° 1' north, 5° 9' East at an altitude 305m. The nearest meteorological station showed maximum rainfall in month of September which drops to zero in December. The rainy season with a duration of about 218 days, starts in April and ends in October [8].

2.1.1 Experimental animals

Jersey cattle belonging to different dairy herd which were used for the study. Females were imported as pregnant heifers. Artificial insemination technique was randomly performed for heifers in the temperate country before importation and for cows after parturition (in Nigeria) using random doses of frozen purebred bull semen (imported from the U.S.A.) with a restriction to avoid full-sib and sire-daughter inseminations. The breeding plan in the farms of the study permitted practicing pure and crossbreeding through artificial insemination. Lactations without breeding dates and those of aborted cows or those affected by mastitis or other udder disorders were considered as abnormal lactations and their records were excluded from the

original data before the statistical analyses. Also, records of cows sold for production purposes and data that was not normally distributed were excluded.

2.1.2 Milk yield

Milk yield was adjusted for lactation length at 305th days by multiplicative correction factors. Monthly test day milk yields of individual cows were used to calculate the accumulated 305-d MY using the test interval method following the computational expression below [15]

$$MY_{305} = (P_1 X D_1) + \sum_{i=2}^k \left[\left(\frac{P_i + P_{i-1}}{2} \right) \right] + (P_{k+1} X D_{k+1})$$

Where MY₃₀₅ is the milk yield of a cow adjusted to 305 d of lactation, P₁ is the milk yield of the test-day in the first month after calving, D₁ is the interval between five days after calving and the first day of the first month sampled, P_i is the test-day milk yield in month i (i = 2, ..., k), P_{k+1} is the test-day milk yield in the month when 305 days in lactation was achieved, and D_{k+1} is the interval between the 305th d of lactation and the last day of the month prior to achieving 305 d of lactation.

2.1.3 Body weight measurement

This was measured by firmly positioning of the animal on the Avery weigh bridge scale without agitation. The weight was expressed in kilogram (kg). Weight of the animals were recorded at monthly intervals.

Table A: Conformation traits definition of dairy cattle

No	Measurements	Units	Description	Instruments
1	Chest ligament	cm	Measured as the depth of cleft at the base of the rear udder	Flexible tape
2	Chest width	cm	Measured as the inside surface distance between the top of the front legs	Flexible tape
3	Body depth	cm	Measured as the distance between the top of spine and the bottom floor of the abdomen at last rib	Flexible tape
4	Stature	cm	Measured from the top of the spine in between hips to ground	Flexible tape
5	Rump width	cm	Measured between the inner walls of the two ischial tuberosities (i.e. pin bones)	Flexible tape
6	Heart girth	cm	Measured behind the front legs and shoulder blades	Flexible tape
7	Udder clearance	cm	Measured from the ground to the bottom of the udder	Measuring stick

8	Rear Udder height	cm	Measured as the distance from the bottom of the vulva to the top of the rear udder	Flexible tape
9	Rear Udder width	cm	Measured as the udder width at the point where the rear udder is attached to the body.	Flexible tape
10	Teat length	cm	Measured as the distance from base to tip of the front teat.	Flexible tape

[13].

2.1.4 Statistical model and analysis

All herd information regarding conformation, bodyweight or health-calving dates, cow entry/exit, were obtained from historical records, notebooks and cattle management software. This information was entered, analyzed and saved using the VAMMP Software, version 1.0. Data selection was based upon reliability: information whose validity could not be guaranteed was deleted from the final data set before analysis, as well as extreme values that were considered physiologically abnormal or erroneously coded. Covariance components were estimated by Derivative free Restricted Maximum Likelihood Method using the MTDFREML software [6], which estimates fixed and random effect solutions by solving the mixed models equations. Variance components for milk and conformation were estimated through univariate analysis using an animal model considering the effects of herd, number of calving and contemporary group as fixed, and the permanent environmental, animal additive genetic and residual effects as random. The contemporary group included herd, year of calving and calving season.

The model used [17] can be described as:

$$y = Xb + Wpe + Za + e$$

in which y = vector of observations; b = vector of fixed effects (herd, number of calving, and season). pe = vector of random permanent environmental effects; a = vector of random animal effects; e = vector of random residual effects; X , W , and Z = incidence matrices that establish relationships between the records and the effects. It is assumed that permanent environmental, animal, and residual effects are independently distributed with mean zero and constant variance:

$$V \begin{bmatrix} a \\ pe \\ e \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A\sigma_a^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I\sigma_{pe}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I\sigma_e^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

139 Considering that A = relationship matrix, $I\sigma_e^2 = R$, then $V(y) = ZAZ'\sigma_a^2 + W\sigma_{pe}^2W' +$
 140 R . Thus, the mixed model equations for the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) of
 141 estimable functions of b and for the best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) of p_e and
 142 a are:

$$143 \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \\ p_e \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X'X & X'Z & X'W \\ Z'X & Z'Z + A_{a1}^{-1} & Z'W \\ W'X & W'Z & W'W + I_{a2} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} X'y \\ Z'y \\ W'y \end{bmatrix}$$

144 in which A = relationship matrix; and $a1 = \sigma_e^2 / \sigma_a^2$ and $a2 = \sigma_e^2 / \sigma_{pe}^2$. Heritability was
 145 estimated as the ratio of the additive genetic variance to total phenotypic variance;
 146 and repeatability, as the ratio of the sum of the additive genetic variance plus
 147 permanent environmental variance to phenotypic variance, as described by Falconer
 148 and Mackay (2001):

$$149 h^2 = \frac{\sigma_a^2}{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_p^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

$$150 w^2 = \frac{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_p^2}{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_p^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

151 **To estimate genetic, environmental and residual correlations**, a bivariate model was
 152 used which included herd, number of calving and contemporary group (which
 153 included year of calving and calving season) as the fixed effects, and the permanent
 154 environmental and additive genetic direct effects as random. The matrix model used
 155 was:

$$156 \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} W_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p_{e1} \\ p_{e2} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

157 in which y_i = vector of N observations; b_i = vector of fixed effects (herd, number of
 158 calving, contemporary group); p_{ei} = vector of random permanent environmental
 159 effects; a_i = vector of random animal effects; e_i = vector of random residual effects;
 160 X , W , and Z = incidence matrices establishing relationships between the records and
 161 the fixed and random effects, respectively. It is assumed that random permanent
 162 environmental, animal and error effects are independently distributed with mean of
 163 zero and variance:

$$V \begin{bmatrix} a \\ pe \\ e \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_0 \otimes A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_0 \otimes I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & R_0 \otimes I \end{bmatrix}$$

in which $\otimes$ = direct or Kronecker product; I = identity matrix equal to number of observations; A = relationship matrix among all animals in the pedigree; G_0 = variance and covariance matrix of random animal effects; $\sigma_{a_{ii}}^2$ = animal additive genetic variance for trait i ; $\sigma_{a_{jj}}^2$ = animal additive genetic variance for trait j ; $\sigma_{a_{ij}} = \sigma_{a_{ji}}$ = animal additive genetic covariance between traits i and j ; Q_0 = variance and covariance matrix of random permanent environmental effects; $\sigma_{pe_{ii}}^2$ = permanent environmental variance for trait i ; $\sigma_{pe_{jj}}^2$ = permanent environmental variance for trait j ; $\sigma_{pe_{ij}} = \sigma_{pe_{ji}}$ = permanent environmental covariance between traits i and j ; R_0 = variance and covariance matrix of residual effects; $\sigma_{e_{ii}}^2$ = residual variance for trait i ; $\sigma_{e_{jj}}^2$ = residual variance for trait j ; and $\sigma_{e_{ij}} = \sigma_{e_{ji}}$ = residual covariance between traits i and j . The mixed model equations for the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) of estimable functions of b and for the best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) of a and ap are:

$$G_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{a_{ii}}^2 & \sigma_{a_{ij}} \\ \sigma_{a_{ji}} & \sigma_{a_{jj}}^2 \end{bmatrix}, Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{pe_{ii}}^2 & \sigma_{pe_{ij}} \\ \sigma_{pe_{ji}} & \sigma_{pe_{jj}}^2 \end{bmatrix}, R_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{e_{ii}}^2 & \sigma_{e_{ij}} \\ \sigma_{e_{ji}} & \sigma_{e_{jj}}^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{a} \\ \hat{pe} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X'R^{-1}X & X'R^{-1}Z & X'R^{-1}W \\ Z'R^{-1}X & Z'R^{-1}Z + k_1 & Z'R^{-1}W \\ W'R^{-1}X & W'R^{-1}Z & W'R^{-1}W + I * Q^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} X'R^{-1}y \\ Z'R^{-1}y \\ W'R^{-1}y \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{in which } k_1 = G_0 * A^{-1}, \bar{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{b}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \bar{a} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{a}_1 \\ \bar{a}_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{pe} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{pe}_1 \\ \hat{pe}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

The estimates of genetic (r_g) and environmental correlations (r_e) were obtained from the estimation of covariance components using the following equations:

$$r_g = \frac{\sigma_{a_{ij}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{a_{ii}}^2 \sigma_{a_{jj}}^2}} \quad r_e = \frac{\sigma_{e_{ij}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{e_{ii}}^2 \sigma_{e_{jj}}^2}}$$

in which $\sigma_{a_{ij}}$ = additive genetic covariance between traits i and j ; $\sigma_{a_{ii}}^2$ = additive genetic variance for trait i ; and $\sigma_{a_{jj}}^2$ = additive genetic variance for trait j were used for genetic correlation while for environmental correlations, $\sigma_{e_{ij}}$ = environmental covariance between traits i and j ; $\sigma_{e_{ii}}^2$ = environmental variance for trait i ; and $\sigma_{e_{jj}}^2$ = environmental variance for trait j .

189 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

190 The 305 d fat corrected milk yield had a moderate (0.35) heritability (Table 1). Regarding the linear
191 type traits, the h^2 was between 0.02 (BW) and 0.72 (CL). However, the most heritable body
192 measurement was CL (0.72) while rear udder width was the most heritable udder trait (0.52). BW
193 (0.02) had the least heritability for body conformation traits while the least heritable udder
194 conformation trait was RUH (0.38). Generally, the h^2 estimates for udder conformation traits were
195 higher than those for body type traits with the exception of BD and CL. The 305 d fat corrected milk
196 yield had high repeatability (0.57) estimates. The repeatability of the measurements of linear
197 conformation traits varied between 0.03 (BW) to 0.75 (CL) for body conformation traits and from
198 0.40 (TL) to 0.63 (RUH) for udder measurements. The most repeatable udder and body conformation
199 traits were CL (0.75) and RUH (0.63), respectively.

200 Body conformation traits had positive, significant ($P<0.05$) correlations which ranged from moderate
201 to high with 305 d fat corrected milk yield. Udder conformation traits were positive, significant
202 ($P<0.05$) and ranged from moderate to high with 305 d fat corrected milk yield but with the
203 exception of TL (-0.13) which was low with negative correlations. The strongest and positive genetic
204 correlations for body and udder conformation traits were between ST and BCS (0.99) and TL and
205 RUH (0.93), respectively. The strongest and negative genetic correlation for

body and udder conformation traits were between BD and BW (-0.68) and UC and CW (-0.93), respectively. The highest, significant ($P < 0.05$) and positive environmental correlations for body and udder conformation traits with 305 d fat corrected milk yield were BD (0.38) and RUW (0.94).

All the udder conformation traits had positive and significant correlations with 305 d fat corrected milk yield (Table 2). Environmental correlations between BW and BCS had positive and near zero correlations while CL and CW recorded negative and near zero correlations with 305 d fat corrected milk yield. The highest and positive environmental correlations among the body type traits was between CL and BD (0.90) while correlation between BCS and ST (-0.83) was negative and highest. Environmental correlations among udder conformation traits were positive and negatively weak with the exception of the correlation between TL and RUH (0.22) with RUW (-0.22) which were positive, negative, moderate and significant ($P < 0.05$).

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Moderate to high heritability for 305 day fat corrected milk yield in suggests the possibility of genetic improvement through direct selection while low heritability estimates among some conformation traits implies that genetic improvement through selection will be slow.

222

Heritability (h^2), repeatability (R), genetic and environmental correlations of 305dFCM and body conformation traits in Jersey cattle									
Traits	305Dfcm	BW	BCS	CL	CW	BD	ST	Rump	HG
305dFCM	0.35	0.86**	0.21*	0.42**	0.70**	0.67**	0.65**	0.69**	0.52**
BW (kg)	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.36*	-0.33*	-0.68**	0.71**	0.43**	-0.39*
BCS (cm)	0.05	-0.09	0.25	-0.34*	0.79**	0.23*	0.99**	-0.39*	0.53**
CL (cm)	-0.02	0.48**	0.64**	0.72	0.67**	0.64**	0.48**	0.37*	0.14
CW (cm)	-0.03	-0.05	-0.03	0.77**	0.23	0.10	-0.36*	-0.37*	-0.14
BD (cm)	0.38*	0.53**	0.56**	0.90**	0.81**	0.61	0.98**	0.87**	0.96**
ST(cm)	0.35*	0.27*	-0.83**	0.73**	-0.17	-0.37*	0.16	0.95**	0.77**
Rump(cm)	0.01	0.05	-0.77**	0.68**	-0.25*	-0.38*	0.08	0.04	0.02

HG(cm)	0.25*	0.26*	0.54**	-0.16	0.74**	0.65**	0.06	0.08	0.09
R	0.57	0.03	0.31	0.75	0.28	0.65	0.18	0.05	0.14

223

224 **Table-1**

Heritability (h^2), repeatability (R), genetic and environmental correlations of 305dFCM and udder conformation traits in Jersey cattle					
Traits	305dFCM	UC	RUH	RUW	TL
305dFCM	0.35				
UC (cm)	0.56**	0.44	-0.03	0.34*	0.42**
RUH(cm)	0.64**	-0.03	0.38	-0.28*	-0.81**
RUW(cm)	0.94**	-0.09	-0.14	0.52	0.93**
TL (cm)	0.34*	0.14	0.22*	-0.20*	0.34
R	0.57	0.45	0.41	0.63	0.40

225

226 Table-2

227

228 **6.0 REFERENCES**

- 229 1. Abdallah, J.M. and McDaniel, B.T. (2000). Genetic parameters and trends of
230 milk, fat, days open and body weight after calving in North Carolina
231 experimental herds. *Journal of Dairy Science*. 83, 1364–1370.
- 232 2. Alphonsus, C. (2008). Relationship of udder and body conformation traits with
233 milk yield and their inheritance in Bunaji and FriesianXBunaji cows. An MSc
234 thesis in the Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Ahmadu
235 Bello University, Zaria.pp 94.
- 236 3. Barker, D. J. (2004). The developmental origins of chronic adult disease. *Acta*
237 *Paediatricians*. 93, 26–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.
- 238 4. Berry, D.P., Harris, B.L., Winkelman, A.M. and Montgomerie, W. (2005).
239 Phenotypic Associations between Traits Other than Production and Longevity
240 in New Zealand Dairy Cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 88: 2962–2974.
- 241 5. Berry, D. P., Buckley, F. Dillon, P. Evans, R. D. Rath, M. and Veerkamp. R.
242 F. (2003). Genetic relationships among body condition score, body weight,
243 milk yield, and fertility in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 86: 2193–2204.
- 244 6. Boldman, K. G., Kriese, L. A., Van Vleck, L. D., Van Tassell, C. P. and
245 Kachman, S. D. (1995). A manual for use of MTDFREML. A Set of programs

- 248 to obtain estimates of variances and covariances [DRAFT]. USDA-ARS,
249 Lincoln, NE, USA.
- 250 7. Boone, C., Bussey, H. and Andrews, B. J. (2007). Exploring genetic
251 interactions and networks with yeast. *National Genetics*, 8: 437–49.
- 252 8. Climate-Data (2015). Climate-Data.org. Retrieved December 12, 2015, from
253 <http://en.climate-data.org/location/402824>.
- 254 9. Dal Zotto, R., De Marchi, M., Dalvit, C., Cassandro, M., Gallo, L., Carnier, P.
255 and Bittante, G. (2007). Heritabilities and genetic correlations of body
256 condition score and calving interval with yield, somatic cell score, and linear
257 type traits in Brown Swiss cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 90, 5737–5743.
- 258 10. Dechow, C.D., Rogers, G.W., Klei, L., Lawlor, T.J. (2003). Heritabilities and
259 correlations among body condition score, dairy form and selected linear type
260 traits. *Journal of Dairy Science*. 86 6 2236-2242
- 261
- 262 11. Dekkers, J. C. M., and Hospital. F. (2002). The use of molecular genetics in
263 improvement of agricultural populations. *National Revista Genetics*. 3:22–32.
- 264
- 265 12. Falconer, D. S. and Mackay, T. F. C. (2001). *Introduction to quantitative genetics* (4st
266 ed.). Zaragoza, ES: Acribia.
- 267
- 268
- 269 13. Hansen, T. F. (2006). The evolution of genetic architecture. *Neural Network.*
270 *Revolution Ecological Evolution System*, 37: 123–157.
- 271 14. Hayes, B. J., Bowman, P. J., Chamberlain, A. C., Verbyla, K. and Goddard,
272 M. E. (2009). Accuracy of genomic breeding values in multi-breed dairy cattle
273 populations. *Genetics Selection Evolution*, 41.
- 274
- 275 15. ICAR (2007). International Committee for Animal Recording Guidelines.
276 Approved by the general assembly held in Koupio, Finland in June 2006.
- 277 16. Interbull (2012). Description of National Genetic Evaluation Systems for dairy
278 cattle traits as applied in different Interbull member countries. Page 10.
- 279 17. Koonawootrittriron, S., Elzo, M.A. and Tumwasorn, S. (2002). Multibreed
280 genetic parameters and predicted genetic values for first lactation 305-d milk
281 yield, fat yield, and fat percentage in a *Bos taurus*×*Bos indicus* multibreed
282 dairy population in Thailand. *Thai journal of Agricultural Science*, 36:339–360.
- 283 18. Luan, J.A., Woolliams, S., Lien, M., Kent, M., Svendsen. and Meuwissen, T.H.
284 (2009). The accuracy of genomic selection in Norwegian Red cattle assessed
285 by cross-validation, *Genetics*, 183: pp. 1119–1126.
- 286
- 287 19. Mrode, R. (1996). Linear models for the prediction of animal breeding values.
288 1st ed. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

- 289 20. Mueller, W.M., Gregoire, F.M., Stanhope, K.L., Moobs, C.V., Mizuno, T.M.,
290 Warden, C.H., Havel, P.J. (1998). Evidence that glucose metabolism
291 regulates leptin secretion from cultured rat adipocytes. *Endocrinology*, 139:
292 551-558.
- 293 21. Pérez-Cabal, M.A., García, C., González-Recio, O. and Alenda, R. (2006).
294 Genetic and phenotypic relationships among locomotion type traits, profit,
295 production, longevity, and fertility in Spanish dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy*
296 *Science*, 89:1776–1783.
- 297 22. Tiezzi F., Maltecca C., Cecchinato A., Penasa M., Bittante G. (2012): Genetic
298 parameters for fertility of dairy heifers and cows at different parities and
299 relationship with production traits in first lactation. *Journal of Dairy Science*,
300 95, 7355–7362.
- 301
302 23. Tsuruta, S., Misztal, I. and Lawlor, T.J. (2005). Changing definition of
303 productive life in US Holsteins: Effect on genetic correlations. *Journal of Dairy*
304 *Science*, 88:1156–1165.
- 305 24. VanRaden, P.M., Tooker, M.E. Cole, J.B. Wiggans, G.R. and J.H. Megonigal
306 Jr. (2007). Genetic evaluations for mixed-breed populations. *Journal of Dairy*
307 *Science*, 90:2434–2441.
- 308 25. Wattiaux, M. (2002). Technical Dairy Guide: *Reproduction and Genetic*
309 *Selection*. The Babcock Institute for International Dairy Research and
310 Development, University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin.