

Use of data from crossbred animals for a genomic evaluation of pure line layer

David Picard Druet, Amandine Varenne, Frédéric Herault, Thierry Burlot,
Sophie Allais, Pascale Le Roy

► **To cite this version:**

David Picard Druet, Amandine Varenne, Frédéric Herault, Thierry Burlot, Sophie Allais, et al.. Use of data from crossbred animals for a genomic evaluation of pure line layer. XIth European symposium on poultry genetics (ESPG), Oct 2019, Prague, Czech Republic. Guarant International spol. s r.o., 2019. hal-02352494

HAL Id: hal-02352494

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02352494>

Submitted on 6 Nov 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Acknowledgements

The authors extend their gratitude to the managers and personnel of the Hybrid Turkeys pedigree farm (Kitchener, Canada) for collecting and providing data used in this study. This study was part of the project entitled "Application of genomic selection in turkeys for health, welfare, efficiency and production traits" funded by the government of Canada through the Genome Canada Genomic Application Partnership Program and administered by Ontario Genomics (recipients: B.J. Wood (Industry) and C.F. Baes (Academic)).

List of References

- ABDALLA, E., SCHENKEL, F.S., VANDERHOUT, R., EMAMGHOLI BEGLI, H., WILLEMS, O., BAES, C.F., AND WOOD, B.J. (2019). Genomic prediction of feed efficiency, body weight, breast meat yield and walking ability in a turkey line (*Meleagris gallopavo*). *Genet Sel Evol* Submitted.
- ABDALLA, E.A., PEÑAGARICANO, F., BYREM, T.M., WEIGEL, K.A., AND ROSA, G.J.M. (2016) Genome-wide association mapping and pathway analysis of leukosis incidence in a US Holstein cattle population. *Anim Genet* **47**:395–407.
- AGUILAR, I., I. MISZTAL, D.L. JOHNSON, A. LEGARRA, S. TSURUTA, AND T.J. LAWLOR. (2010) Hot topic: A unified approach to utilize phenotypic, full pedigree, and genomic information for genetic evaluation of Holstein final score1. *J Dairy Sci* **93**:743–752.
- CHRISTENSEN, O.F., AND LUND, M.S. (2010) Genomic prediction when some animals are not genotyped. *Genet Sel Evol* **42**:1–8.
- CLARK, S.A., AND VAN DER WERF, J. (2013) Genomic best linear unbiased prediction (gBLUP) for the estimation of genomic breeding values. *Methods Mol Biol* **1019**:321–1030.
- DAETWYLER, H.D., VILLANUEVA, B., BIJMA, P., AND WOOLLIAMS, J.A. (2007) Inbreeding in genome-wide selection. *J Anim Breed Genet* **124**:369–376.
- FRAGOMENI, B.O., LOURENCO, D.A.L., TSURUTA, S., MASUDA, Y., AGUILAR, I., LEGARRA, A., LAWLOR, T.J., AND MISZTAL, I. (2015) Hot topic: Use of genomic recursions in single-step genomic best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP) with a large number of genotypes. *J Dairy Sci* **98**:4090–4094.
- GODDARD, M. (2009) Genomic selection: prediction of accuracy and maximisation of long term response. *Genetica* **136**:245–257.
- HABIER, D., TETENS, J., SEEFRIED, F.R., LICHTNER, P. AND THALLER, G. (2010) The impact of genetic relationship information on genomic breeding values in German Holstein cattle. *Genet Sel Evol* **42**:1–12.
- HAYES, B.J., BOWMAN, P.J., CHAMBERLAIN, A.C., VERBYLA, K., AND GODDARD, M.E. (2009) Accuracy of genomic breeding values in multi-breed dairy cattle populations. *Genet Sel Evol* **41**:1–9.
- LEGARRA, A., AGUILAR, I., AND MISZTAL, I. (2009) A relationship matrix including full pedigree and genomic information. *J Dairy Sci* **92**:4656–4663.
- MISZTAL, I., LEGARRA, A., AND AGUILAR, I. (2009) Computing procedures for genetic evaluation including phenotypic, full pedigree, and genomic information. *J Dairy Sci* **92**:4648–4655.
- VAN TASSELL, C.P., SMITH, T.P.L., MATUKUMALLI, L.K., TAYLOR, J.F., SCHNABEL, R.D., LAWLEY, C.T., HAUDENSCHILD, C.D., MOORE, S.S., WARREN, W.C., AND SONSTEGARD T.S. (2008) SNP discovery and allele frequency estimation by deep sequencing of reduced representation libraries. *Nat Methods* **5**:247–252.
- VANRADEN, P.M. (2008) Efficient Methods to Compute Genomic Predictions. *J Dairy Sci* **91**:4414–4423.
- VANRADEN, P.M., VAN TASSELL, C.P., WIGGANS, G.R., SONSTEGARD, T.S., SCHNABEL, R.D., TAYLOR, J.F., AND SCHENKEL, F.S. (2009) Invited Review: Reliability of genomic predictions for North American Holstein bulls. *J Dairy Sci* **92**:16–24.

Use of data from crossbred animals for a genomic evaluation of pure line layer

David Picard Druet¹, Amandine Varenne², Frédéric Héroult¹, Thierry Burlot², Sophie Allais¹, Pascale Le Roy¹

¹PEGASE, INRA, Agrocampus Ouest, 16 Le Clos, 35590 Saint-Gilles, France; ²NOVOGEN, 5 rue des Compagnons, 22960 Plédran, France

Corresponding author: pascale.le-roy@inra.fr

Keywords: laying hens, egg quality, genomic evaluation, accuracy, crossbred

Introduction

In poultry selection programs, pyramidal schemes are traditionally used to produce crossbred animals issued from several pure lines. Each pure line is selected independently of the others and its genetic evaluation is carried out using purebred performances. One major drawback is that the performances of purebred individuals (PB) may prove to be an imperfect predictor of the performances of crossbred individuals (CB). Indeed, because of the presence of non-additive genetic effects, e.g. dominance and epistasis, and genotype by environment interactions, the genetic correlation between PB and CB for a given trait can be significantly different from 1 (Wei and Steen, 1991).

To overcome this limitation, Wei (1992) proposed the joint use of both PB and CB information. Recent studies confirmed the interest of this strategy in optimizing genomic selection in crossbreeding schemes (Esfandyari *et al.*, 2015). However, in practice, this approach has its limitations since only purebred selection candidates are genotyped. To overcome this problem, Christensen *et al.* (2014) extended the Wei and van der Werf (1994) model in order to implement the single step method (ssGBLUP, Aguilar *et al.*, 2010) which allows for a joint evaluation of animals, whether genotyped or not.

Furthermore, a strategy commonly applied by layers breeding companies consists in checking the overall ability for combination of purebred males, by using the performances of different crossbred progeny. In this case, genotyping is available only for these purebred males, that represent only one of the various purebred lines used in the crossbreeding scheme. The performances are recorded on their crossbred daughters, which are half-sisters with unknown dam pedigree. In Picard Druet *et al.* (2019), the rele-

vance of genomic evaluation of egg quality traits using the ssGBLUP was analysed in a purebred line, i.e. using purebred performances. The present study focuses on the use of performances from crossbred individuals issued from the same purebred line.

Material and Methods

Animals and genotypes: PB individuals come from a pure line of Rhode Island layers selected by Novogen. Hens were hatched in 12 batches, born between 2008 and 2015, which corresponds to 4 generations (PB1 to PB4). Egg quality traits were measured once a week, from 60 weeks of age to 80 weeks of age (7 982 hens issued from 514 sires and 1 759 dams). Purebred birds were genotyped using the 600K Affymetrix® Axiom® HD genotyping array (Kranis *et al.*, 2013) for 580 961 SNP markers. After quality control was completed, 302 102 SNPs genotypes of 1 214 males and 1 148 females were kept for the study. In addition, the performances of CB individuals, which were crossbred offspring issued from PB1 to PB3 males (37 232 hens issued from 1 384 sires), were available. Each purebred male had 45 crossbred daughters in expectation, with unknown dams of different genetic type. Crossbred hens were hatched in collective cages of 12 half-sisters from the same sire. Egg quality traits were measured once they reached 70 weeks of age.

Traits: Three egg quality traits were studied: egg weight (EW), eggshell color (ESC), and eggshell strength (ESS). The first step consisted in measuring EW (in g). Then, eggshell color was measured with a Minolta chromameter and three measurements were recorded: redness of eggshell a^* , yellowness of eggshell b^* and lightness of eggshell L^* . Eggshell color was then calculated as: $ESC = 100 - (L^* - a^* - b^*)$. Finally, shell strength was measured using a compression machine, to evaluate the static stiffness of the shell. The egg was compressed between two flat plates moving at constant speed. ESS is the maximum force recorded before eggshell fracture (in N, multiplied by 100).

Genetic and genomic evaluations: Performances were centred and standardized prior to evaluations. Each trait was first evaluated using PB performances only, applying an uni-trait animal model. Then, 3 bi-variate animal models (EW(PB) and EW(CB), ESC(PB) and ESC(CB), ESS(PB) and ESS(CB)) were applied. For all the traits, the statistical model took into account environmental effects: batch, cage position in the poultry house, waiting time between sample and egg measurement covariable (in days), and age of the hen (in weeks) covariable. For PB performances, several measurements were available for each hen, and a random common environmental effect of the hen was taken into account in the model. The evaluations were performed using the BLUP methodology (to obtain Estimated Breeding Values (EBV)) and the single-step GBLUP methodology (to obtain Genomic Estimated Breeding Values (GEBV)), implemented in the BLUPF90 family of programs (Misztal *et al.*, 2002). Variance-covariance matrices were estimated using REMLF90. Standard errors of genetic parameters estimates were then obtained with AIREMLF90.

Reliability of prediction: To assess the relevance of the evaluations, the estimated breeding values, i.e. EBVs and GEBVs of selection candidates, were compared to their true breeding values (TBVs). For the purpose of this study, a male candidate population comprised of 93 PB3 males, with PB4 daughters and CB3 daughters, was used. However, their TBVs were unknown and the LR method (Legarra and Reverter, 2018) was therefore used. This method is based on a comparison between evaluations realized with complete and partial data sets, as the deviation between GEBVs resulting from consecutive evaluations is a function of GEBVs respective accuracy. Two different cases of partial data sets were studied, based on the amount of phenotypic information available when the evaluation was carried out: at the birth of candidates and at 80 weeks of age. In the first case, the phenotyped population was limited to the ancestors of the candidates. In the second case, the phenotyped population included the ancestors as well as the contemporary relatives of the candidates. This case corresponds to the classical scheme in layers selection. The available phenotypes made up the complete data set, which included the performances of candidates' daughters (PB and CB). The correlation between (G)EBVs resulting from complete and partial evaluations was an estimate of their relative accuracy. In order to compare evaluations, in a given case, the ratio between their relative accuracy was used. This statistics allows to quantify the expected increase in accuracy from one evaluation to the other.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 Genetic parameters

Trait	Heritability PB	Heritability CB	Genetic correlation
EW	0.43	0.76	0.82
ESC	0.37	0.48	0.78
ESS	0.21	0.28	0.73

Genetic parameters: Genetic parameters were very steady between REMLs carried out with BLUP and REMLs carried out with GBLUP, regardless of the trait studied. The same variance-covariance matrix, i.e. the one obtained with genomic evaluation using the complete data set, was then used to perform subsequent BLUP and GBLUP evaluations. Estimates of heritability in PB were in accordance with the literature (Table 1). As expected, they were higher in CB, which is probably due to the presence of non-additive effects, in particular as what regards EW. Moreover, for all traits, a strong link was observed between PB and CB traits, with genetic correlations estimated between 0.73 and 0.82 (Table 1). However, these values were significantly different from 1. This shows the potential interest of bi-variate models in obtaining accurate estimates of (G)EBVs, for both PB traits and CB traits.

(G)EBVs relative accuracy: For all traits and all evaluations, relative accuracy of (G)EBVs dramatically increased between the evaluation carried out at birth and the one carried out at 80 weeks of age (Table 2 by line). When using bi-trait models, the accuracy gain between genetic evaluation and genomic evaluation was always significant, although it varied depending on the trait and the period of evaluation (Figure 1). The deviation between PB traits and CB traits was moderate for what regards EW and ESC. It was greater for ESS, ranging from 13% (ESS in PB at birth) to 48% (ESS in CB at birth). As a consequence, genomic evaluation of ESS(CB) sounds very promising.

Table 2 Relative accuracy of (G)EBVs

Trait	Evaluation	At birth		At 80 weeks	
		EBV	GEBV	EBV	GEBV
EW(PB)	Unitrait PB	0.35	0.54	0.49	0.63
	Bitrait PB&CB	0.41	0.54	0.65	0.78
EW(CB)	Bitrait PB&CB	0.29	0.42	0.59	0.72
ESC(PB)	Unitrait PB	0.30	0.42	0.35	0.54
	Bitrait PB&CB	0.43	0.57	0.58	0.76
ESC(CB)	Bitrait PB&CB	0.37	0.51	0.56	0.76
ESS(PB)	Unitrait PB	0.49	0.52	0.57	0.71
	Bitrait PB&CB	0.46	0.53	0.70	0.82
ESS(CB)	Bitrait PB&CB	0.23	0.44	0.49	0.70

The role played by CB performances in the accuracy of (G)EBVs for PB traits is presented in Figure 2. The gain for EBVs and for GEBVs was quite similar, with slightly higher values for EBVs. CB performances proved useful in the case of ESC, with a gain ranging from 26% to 40%. Accuracy gain was lower in the case of EW (from 15% to 20%), and null in the case of GEBVs carried out at birth. In the case of ESS, the gain only shows at 80 weeks of age for both EBVs and GEBVs.

Conclusion

Whichever egg quality trait, the genetic correlation observed between PB performances and CB performances shows that these traits should be considered and evaluated as two different traits. In every case, genomic evaluation proved more accurate than genetic evaluation. Great heterogeneity in accuracy gain was observed from one trait to the other. This heterogeneity could be due to the differences in the genetic architecture of the traits (Romé *et al.*, 2015). Notably, the potential accuracy gain resulting from the inclusion of CB performances in the evaluation of PB traits, varied depending on the trait and on the period of evaluation.

References

Aguilar, I., Misztal, I., Johnson, D.L., Legarra, A., Tsuruta, S. and Lawlor, T.J. (2010) A unified approach to utilize phenotypic, full pedigree, and genomic information for genetic evaluations of Holstein final score. *J Dairy Science* **93**: 743-752.

Christensen, O.F., Legarra, A., Lund, M.S. and Su G. (2015) Genetic evaluation for three-way crossbreeding. *Genetics Selection Evolution* **47**: 98.

Esfandyari, H., Sorensen, A.C. and Bijma, P. (2015) Maximizing crossbred performance through purebred genomic selection. *Genetics Selection Evolution* **47**: 16.

Kranis, A., Gheyas, A.A., Boschiero, C., Turner, F., Yu, L., Smith S., et al. (2013) Development of a high density 600K SNP genotyping array for chicken. *BMC Genomics* **14**:59.

Legarra, A. and Reverter, A. (2018) Semi-parametric estimates of population accuracy and bias of predictions of breeding values and future phenotypes using the LR method. *Genetics Selection Evolution* **50**: 53.


Misztal, I., Tsuruta, S., Strabel, T., Auvray, B., Druet, T. and Lee, D. (2002) BLUPF90 and related programs. In: *Proceedings of the 7th World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production*, Montpellier, **28**: 743.

Picard Druet, D., Varenne, A., Herry, F., Héroult, F., Allais, S., Burlot, T. and Le Roy P. (2019) Ability of genomic evaluation for egg quality traits in layers. *BMC Genetics*, in revision.

Wei, M. (1992) Combined crossbred and purebred selection in animal breeding. *Ph. D. Thesis*, Wageningen University, Netherlands.

Wei, M. and Steen, H.A.M (1991) Comparison of reciprocal recurrent selection with pure-line selection systems in animal breeding. *Animal Breeding Abstracts* **59**: 281-298.

Wei, M. and van der Werf, J.H.J. (1994) Maximizing genetic response in crossbreds using both purebred and crossbred information. *Animal Production* **59**: 401-413.

Figure 1 Accuracy gain between EBVs and GEBVs resulting from bi-trait evaluations.**Figure 2** Accuracy gain between uni-trait PB evaluation and bi-trait PB&CB evaluation.