

Genetic Parameters of Body weight and Some Carcass Traits In Two Quail Strains

N. Vali, M.A. Edriss and H.R. Rahmani
Department of Animal Sciences, College of Agriculture
Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.
E-mail: vali@ag.iut.ac.ir

Abstract: In order to estimate genetic parameters for body weights and carcass yield of 2 strains of quails; 32 pairs of Japanese quail (*coturnix Japanese*) and 26 pairs of range quail (*coturnix ypsilophorus*) randomly were selected from the base populations of parents. Produced progenies (650 birds) were used to estimate the genetic parameters of body weights and carcass characteristics traits. Body weights at 35, 42 and 49 days of ages were significantly different, while there was no significant difference for body weights at 63 days of age ($p>0.05$). Carcass weight, carcass percent, breast weight and thigh percent were significantly affected by strain source of variations ($p<0.1$). Estimated heritabilities for different traits were from 0.030 ± 0.090 for breast weight of *coturnix Japanese* to 0.787 ± 0.406 for thigh weight of *coturnix ypsilophorus*. Genetic correlation among body weights at 35, 42, 49, 63 days of age and among carcass traits (carcass weight, breast weight and thigh weight) were all positive and high, while genetic correlation for breast percent, and carcass percent were low. Genetic correlation of thigh percent with the other considered traits was negative except body weight at 42 days of age, which tended to be low.

Key words: *coturnix ypsilophorus*, *coturnix Japanese*, heritability, Genetic correlation, carcass traits, quail

Introduction

In order to establish a breeding program, it is essential to estimate genetic parameters for improving the traits. The scale of the genetic parameters could show the amount of improvement by selection. Some of the estimated genetic parameters for various traits of domestic Japanese quail were reported by several workers (Kawahara and Saito, 1976, Toelle et al., 1991 and Minvielle et al. 1999, 2000). Kawahara and Saito (1976) reported the genetic parameters of different organs and body weights in the Japanese quail. Toelle et al. (1991) estimated genetic and phenotypic relationships between body weight, carcass and some of the organ parameters. Minvielle et al. (2000) reported the carcass characteristics of a heavy Japanese quail line under introgression with the roux gene. Most of the investigations on quails are with *coturnix Japanese* while other strains were less considered. The objectives of this study were to estimate genetic parameters of body and some carcass traits in Range quail (*coturnix ypsilophorus*) and Japanese quail (*coturnix Japanese*).

Materials and Methods

32 pairs of Japanese quails (*coturnix Japanese*) and 26 pairs of Range quails (*coturnix ypsilophorus*) were randomly selected from the base populations (the base population were included 500 *coturnix Japanese* and 500 *coturnix ypsilophorus*). One male and one female quail in an individual one-tier cage ($50\times50\times70$ cm) performed the mating. All the birds were wing banded according to the cage number. The temperature in house was around 20°C and the light was given 15 hr per day (from 6:00 AM until 9:00 PM). Diet contained 20% crude protein and 2650 kcal/kg metabolizable energy. Food and water were available *ad libitum* (waterier plason type and feeder

from trough type). The eggs were collected for 50 days. Every afternoon the collected eggs were marked according to cage number. Collected eggs were stored in the room with temperature of 12°C and humidity of 70%. Every 10 days the collected eggs were antisepticated with formaldehyde, and then set in the setter for 14 days and 2 days in hatcher. The setter and hatcher were equipped with separate box which marked according to cage number in order to pedigree chicks. The wing banded Chickens were transferred to a house with 35°C temperature. The temperature was decreased 20°C on the weekly bases. After the 4th week, supplemental heating was disconnected. The chicks had access to continuous lighting for the first 48 hours. At 2 days of age, the daily light was reduced to 15 hours (6:00 AM until 9:00 PM) and was maintained for the rest of the experiment. A starter diet was contained 24% crude protein and 2750 kcal/kg metabolizable energy. Food and water were available *ad libitum*. Sums of 669 chickens from two strains were recorded for body weights at 42, 49 and 63 days of age with a digital balance with accuracy 0.1 gr. In addition, sums of 313 quails at 49 or 63 days of age were killed for carcass measurements. They were fasted for 10 to 15 hours before they were slaughtered, bled and plucked. Evisceration was performed by hand. Carcass weight and carcass parts (breast and thigh) were recorded for each chicken. Variance components of body weights and carcass traits were estimated using the general linear models procedures of SAS Institute (1998).

Model used was:

$$Y_{ijklm} = \mu + ST_i + HA_j + SA_k + SE_l + e_{ijklm}$$

Where: Y_{ijklm} was an individual observation for trait Y. μ was overall mean for trait Y_{ijklm} . ST_i was fixed effect of the i^{th} strain. HA_j was fixed effect of the j^{th} hatch. SA_k was fixed effect of the k^{th} slaughter age. SE_l was fixed effect of the l^{th} sex. e_{ijklm} was random error associated with the measurement of each individual.

In order to estimate variance components and genetic parameters, data were analysed using derivative-free maximum likelihood method applying DFREML 3.0β software (Meyer, 1998) by the simplex way.

$$Y = X\beta + Z\alpha + e$$

Where: y is the vector of observations, β is the vector of fixed effects (including strain, sex and hatch effects for overall data, and including sex and hatch effects for analyses performed for each strain solely), α is the vector of random direct additive genetic effects. X and Z are the incidence matrices for β and α respectively. The above model was run in both single trait and multi traits ways by DFUNI and DXMUX procedures of DFREML software (Meyer, 1998), respectively. All the correlation coefficients (including genetic, environment, and phenotypic) among the studied traits were estimated using multi traits analysis.

Results and Discussion

Description and statistical parameters of different traits for both strains are shown in Table 1. Least-squares means and standard errors by strain, sex, hatch for body weight is shown in Table 2. Body weights of two strains at 35, 42 and 49 days of age were significantly different ($p < 0.01$), but there were not any significant difference at 63 days of ages ($p > 0.05$). Sex was a significant source of variation for body weights at 35, 42, 49 and 63 days of ages ($p < 0.01$). Females showed a higher body weight than males, which was agreed with previous studies (Kawahara and Saito, 1976: Caron and Minvielle, 1990: Toelle *et al.*, 1991: Bumgartner, 1994: Minvielle *et al.*, 2000). Results

Table 1: Description of data for body and carcass weights and percent for strains, (cot) coturnix quail, (ran) Range quails

Trait	No. Obs.		Mean (gr)		SE		Min (gr)		Max (gr)		SD		CV	
	cot	ran	cot	ran	cot	ran	cot	ran	cot	ran	cot	ran	cot	ran
BW35	226	122	135.80	127.00	1.68	2.05	67.49	72.94	185.10	174.70	25.30	22.63	18.60	17.83
BW42	223	118	161.20	152.70	1.69	2.36	76.56	60.70	214.20	200.70	25.30	25.65	15.70	16.79
BW49	214	118	181.40	175.80	1.66	2.50	100.70	108.30	238.20	240.70	24.30	27.16	13.40	15.45
BW63	96	52	197.70	193.10	2.57	4.32	147.90	141.90	259.30	257.40	25.20	31.16	12.70	16.13
CW	200	113	125.90	120.90	0.96	1.39	75.83	79.28	171.00	152.20	13.50	14.78	10.70	12.23
CP	200	113	65.81	68.13	0.38	0.70	31.84	52.99	74.89	86.79	5.39	7.31	8.20	10.73
BRW	200	113	50.81	49.17	0.43	0.60	36.41	30.88	63.99	65.94	6.04	7.28	11.90	14.8
BP	200	113	40.41	40.64	0.23	0.26	31.76	32.02	73.98	54.81	3.30	2.79	8.18	6.86
TW	72	41	27.83	27.62	0.36	0.51	20.07	19.57	34.10	33.54	3.01	3.26	10.80	11.82
TP	72	41	22.61	23.47	0.13	0.21	19.68	20.73	25.41	27.07	1.12	1.31	4.97	5.56

BW: body weight days, CW: carcass weight, CP: carcass percent, BRW: breast weight, BP: breast percent, TW: thigh weight, TP: thigh percent, No. Obs: number of observations, SE: standard error of mean, Min: minimum, Max: maximum, SD: standard deviation, and CV: coefficient of variation.

obtained for body weight in coturnix Japanese are agreed or higher than the previous studies, which were unselected, but it was lower than selected group (Bacon *et al.* 1986. Marks, 1993; Syed Hussien *et al.* 1995, 1996, 1999). There were significant differences ($p < 0.01$) of body weights among hatches as well.

Least-squares means and standard errors by strain, sex, hatch and slaughter ages for carcass traits are shown in Table 3. Carcass weight, carcass percent, breast weight and thigh percent were significantly affected by strain source of variations ($p < 0.01$), while breast percent and thigh weight for two strains were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2: Least squares means and standard error for body weight (gr) in quails

Variation sources		BW35	BW42	BW49	BW63
Over all means		133.06± 1.32	158.78± 1.39	179.52± 1.40	196.05± 2.25
Strain	Coturnix	135.49± 1.40 ^a	160.81± 1.54 ^a	181.54± 1.62 ^a	198.46± 2.17 ^a
	Range	125.95± 1.91 ^b	150.73± 2.10 ^b	172.36± 2.16 ^b	192.81± 2.93 ^a
Sex	Female	133.32± 1.59 ^a	160.59± 1.75 ^a	187.13± 1.80 ^a	213.32± 2.45 ^a
	Male	128.12± 1.75 ^b	150.96± 1.93 ^b	167.78± 2.00 ^b	177.94± 2.66 ^b
Hatch	1	137.51± 2.74 ^b	155.86± 3.01 ^b	175.13± 3.10 ^{bc}	195.81± 3.20 ^b
	2	123.07± 3.22 ^c	144.99± 3.54 ^c	171.88± 3.74 ^{bc}	201.11± 3.52 ^a
	3	108.43± 2.41 ^d	142.20± 2.65 ^c	168.56± 2.73 ^c	189.98± 2.57 ^c
	4	147.47± 2.69 ^a	173.32± 2.95 ^a	191.44± 3.12 ^a	NA
	5	137.11± 1.89 ^b	162.48± 2.08 ^b	180.25± 2.14 ^b	NA

BW: body weight days.

^{a, b, c, d} Means within each subclass column with different superscript are significantly different ($P \leq 0.05$), NA: not available.

A significant difference ($P < 0.01$) for all carcass traits except thigh percent were between sexes. Carcass weight, breast weight, breast percent and thigh weight of females showed higher figures than males, which are consistent with other reports (Caron and Minvielle 1990, Toelle *et al.* 1991, Minvielle *et al.* 1999, 2000). Males showed higher percentage of carcass weight than females, which supported the earlier studies results (Minvielle *et al.* 2000, Caron and Minvielle 1990). There were no significant difference ($P > 0.05$) in the breast weight and breast percent between slaughter ages, but carcass weight and carcass percent were significantly different ($P < 0.01$). From the results obtained, it could be concluded that, slaughter at 63 days of age compared to 49 days slaughter increased carcass weights over this period but breast weight and breast percentage were not affected (Table 3).

Genetic parameters estimates for body weights and carcass traits for two strains are presented in Table 4. Heritability estimates seems to be different for two strains, and generally higher for Range quails. The lowest and highest heritability in Coturnix quails were for the breast percent and breast weight, respectively, and in Range quails were carcass percent and thigh weight, respectively (Table 4). A wide range of heritability estimates for body weights has been reported by different

Table 3: Least squares means and standard error for carcass traits in quails

Variation sources		carcass (gr)	carcass % ¹	Breast (gr)	Breast % ²	Thigh (gr)	Thigh % ²
Over all means		124.09± 0.80	66.63± 0.35	50.21± 0.37	40.49± 0.18	27.75± 0.29	22.92± 0.12
Strain	Coturnix	127.12± 1.01 ^a	65.92± 0.37 ^b	51.19± 0.45 ^a	40.34± 0.21 ^a	27.99± 0.36 ^a	22.66± 0.14 ^b
	range	121.36± 1.34 ^b	68.89± 0.50 ^a	48.78± 0.60 ^b	40.18± 0.28 ^a	27.30± 0.49 ^a	23.47± 0.19 ^a
Sex	Female	126.59± 1.12 ^a	64.23± 0.41 ^b	52.52± 0.50 ^a	41.55± 0.23 ^a	28.56± 0.40 ^a	23.19± 0.15 ^a
	Male	121.89± 1.24 ^b	70.58± 0.46 ^a	47.45± 0.55 ^b	38.98± 0.26 ^b	26.72± 0.46 ^b	22.94± 0.18 ^a
Hatch	1	126.07± 2.04 ^{ab}	66.88± 0.75 ^c	50.07± 0.91 ^a	39.70± 0.42 ^{bc}	NA	NA
	2	128.97± 2.31 ^a	70.43± 0.85 ^a	51.01± 1.03 ^a	39.46± 0.48 ^c	NA	NA
	3	122.10± 1.68 ^{bc}	67.84± 0.64 ^{bc}	49.56± 0.75 ^a	40.52± 0.35 ^{abc}	NA	NA
	4	124.04± 1.89 ^{abc}	65.62± 0.70 ^c	50.11± 0.84 ^a	40.72± 0.39 ^{ab}	NA	NA
	5	120.02± 1.31 ^c	66.25± 0.48 ^c	49.18± 0.58 ^a	40.91± 0.27 ^a	27.64± 0.30	23.06± 0.12
Slaughter age	49 days	121.70± 1.09 ^b	66.24± 0.40 ^b	49.64± 0.48 ^a	40.84± 0.22 ^a	27.67± 0.29	23.03± 0.11
	63 days	125.06± 1.15 ^a	68.23± 0.43 ^a	50.10± 0.51 ^a	40.20± 0.23 ^a	NA	NA

a, b, c, d Values within a column and classification (strain or sex or hatch) with no common superscript are significantly different ($P \leq 0.01$). NA: not available. ¹ Relative to body weight, ² Relative to carcass weight.

researchers (Kawahara and Saito 1976, Strong *et al.* 1978, Nestor *et al.* 1982, Caron and Minvielle 1990, Toelle *et al.* 1991 and Minvielle 1998).

These studies normally used body weights at different ages and often used different methods to estimate the heritability. Minvielle (1998) who reviewed reports from several studies stated that the heritability estimations for body weights at 4 and 8 weeks of ages ranges from 0.47 to 0.74. Toelle *et al.* 1991 reported heritability estimations from sire, dam and sire plus dam components unadjusted for body weight 0.49 ± 0.13 , 0.70 ± 0.14 , and 0.59 ± 0.8 respectively. It seems differences

in heritability estimates might be attributed to method of estimation, strain, environmental effects and sampling error due to small data set or sample size (Prado-Gonzalez 2003). The definition of the correct model is important, because the more complex the model, the larger the time needed for solution. This is even more important with large amount of data and in multi-trait analysis, because CPU time is a function of the number of variance and covariance components to be estimated (Prado-Gonzalez 2003).

Table 4: Heritability estimates single-trait method in quails

Traits	coturnix	range	Overall
BW35	0.295±0.133	0.413±0.244	0.325±0.107
BW42	0.245±0.127	0.457±0.231	0.289±0.110
BW49	0.114±0.107	0.409±0.222	0.195±0.094
BW63	0.121±0.158	0.472±0.243	0.452±0.209
CW	0.438±0.155	0.327±0.180	0.413±0.120
CP	0.084±0.085	0.060±0.119	0.082±0.071
BRW	0.482±0.160	0.404±0.194	0.483±0.125
BP	0.030±0.090	0.215±0.184	0.142±0.095
TW	0.278±0.239	0.787±0.406	0.505±0.241
TP	NA	NA	0.266±0.188

BW: body weight days, CW: carcass weight, CP: carcass percent, BRW: breast weight, BP: breast percent
TW: thigh weight, TP: thigh percent. NA: not available

The genetic, environmental and phenotypic correlations for all traits measured in the study are shown in Tables 5 and 6. Genetic correlation among body weight at 35, 42, 49 and 63 days of ages and also among carcass traits (carcass weight, carcass percent, breast weight and thigh weight) were all positive and ranged from 0.995±0.610 to 0.0001±0.660. Genetic correlation among body weight at 35 and 49 days of age with thigh percent, and genetic correlation among carcass trait with thigh percent were negative and ranged from -0.008±0.641 to -0.420±0.543 (Table 5). Correlation estimates among body weight at all ages with carcass, breast and thigh weight were high (Table 5).

Table 5: Heritability multi-traits method (h^2), genetic (r_g) and environmental (r_e) correlations and standard errors of various traits¹

Traits	BW35	BW42	BW49	BW63	CW	CP	BRW	BP	TW	TP
BW35	0.263± 0.098	0.964± 0.037	0.985± 0.081	0.799± 0.208	0.849± 0.140	0.209± 0.444	0.854± 0.100	0.218± 0.365	0.974± 0.082	-0.079± 0.466
BW42	0.868± 0.020	0.224± 0.093	0.975± 0.048	0.695± 0.227	0.870± 0.104	0.050± 0.570	0.694± 0.160	0.020± 0.039	0.995± 0.610	0.362± 0.421
BW49	0.817± 0.026	0.861± 0.023	0.121± 0.083	0.804± 0.223	0.894± 0.121	0.0001± 0.660	0.777± 0.164	-0.128± 0.592	0.994± 0.050	-0.366± 0.458
BW63	0.415± 0.120	0.548± 0.120	0.615± 0.083	0.374± 0.196	0.847± 0.106	0.004± 0.568	1.00± 0.083	0.009± 0.518	NA	NA
CW	0.661± 0.045	0.679± 0.051	0.704± 0.045	0.871± 0.044	0.273± 0.101	0.457± 0.808	0.941± 0.042	-0.403± 0.373	0.962± 0.044	-0.389± 0.378
CP	-0.044± 0.095	0.016± 0.084	-0.070± 0.081	-0.388± 0.117	0.266± 0.075	0.119± 0.084	-0.034± 0.502	-0.108± 0.475	0.906± 0.401	-0.420± 0.543
BRW	0.057± 0.066	0.698± 0.069	0.735± 0.061	0.661± 0.080	0.871± 0.029	0.147± 0.089	0.262± 0.100	0.013± 0.685	0.965± 0.066	-0.308± 0.389
BP	0.151± 0.090	0.110± 0.086	0.151± 0.078	0.138± 0.129	0.027± 0.085	-0.081± 0.078	-0.619± 0.060	0.152± 0.094	-0.159± 0.422	-0.008± 0.641
TW	0.763± 0.055	0.823± 0.041	0.896± 0.023	NA	0.874± 0.034	-0.031± 0.119	0.778± 0.061	0.213± 0.118	0.281± 0.141	-0.225± 0.535
TP	-0.347± 0.145	-0.249± 0.149	-0.247± 0.141	NA	-0.315± 0.144	-0.341± 0.125	-0.347± 0.151	-0.190± 0.144	0.004± 0.152	0.190± 0.164

BW: body weight days, CW: carcass weight, CP: carcass percent, BRW: breast weight, BP: breast Percent, TW: thigh weight, TP: thigh percent, NA: not available.

¹The h^2 on the diagonal, r_g above and r_e below the diagonal.

Earlier results suggest that selection to body weight would cause increase in carcass and breast weight. In addition, genetic correlation among the various traits measurements are important regarding the traits would be used in the calculation of the index for selection study (Toelle *et al.* 1991). In this study, genetic correlation of body weight at 63 days of age with breast weight was 1.00 ± 0.083 . Toelle *et al.* (1991) reported the correlation of deboned with total drum and deboned with total thigh were high (around 1.00 or greater). This indicates that selection for total drum and thigh weights would be also effective for increasing leg muscle mass.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran for financial support of this research.

Table 6: Phenotypic correlations among various traits

Traits	BW35	BW42	BW49	BW63	CW	CP	BRW	BP	TW	TP
BW35	1									
BW42	0.890	1								
BW49	0.838	0.882	1							
BW63	0.547	0.592	0.654	1						
CW	0.614	0.733	0.745	0.861	1					
CP	0.037	0.020	-0.062	-0.286	0.273	1				
BRW	0.656	0.683	0.713	0.790	0.876	0.524	1			
BP	0.084	0.093	-0.148	0.104	0.880	-0.082	0.524	1		
TW	0.827	0.871	0.915	NA	0.905	0.140	0.847	0.199	1	
TP	-0.277	-0.279	-0.273	NA	-0.333	-0.351	-0.329	-0.157	-0.049	1

BW: body weight days, CW: carcass weight, CP: carcass percent, BRW: breast weight, BP: breast percent, TW: thigh weight, TP: thigh percent, NE: not available.

References

- Bacon, W.L., K.E. Nestor and D.W. Long, 1986. Divergent selection for body weight and yolk precursor in *Coturnix coturnix jappnica*. 6. Correlated response in plasma calcium and eggshell traits. *Poult. Sci.*, 65:355-359.
- Baumgartner, J., 1994. Japanese quail production, breeding and genetics. *World's Poult. Sci. J.*, 50:227-235.
- Caron, N. and F. Minvielle, 1990. Mass selections for 45-day body weight in Japanese quail: Selection response carcass composition, cooking properties, and sensory characteristics. *Poult. Sci.* 69:1037-1045.
- Kawahara, T. and K. Saito, 1976. Genetic parameters of organ and body weight in the Japanese quail *Poult. Sci.* 55:1247-1252.
- Marks, H.L., 1993. Carcass composition, feed intake, and feed efficiency following long-term selection four week body weight in Japanese quail. *Poult. Sci.*, 72:1005-1011.
- Meyer, K. (1998) "DFREML Computer Program" Proc. 6th World Cong. on Gent. Appl to Livest. Prod. Brisbane, Australia.
- Minvielle, F.1998. Genetic and breeding of Japanese quail for production around the world. Proceedings 6th Asian Pacific poultry congress Nagoya, Japan.
- Minvielle, F., E. Hirigoyen, and M. Boulay, 1999. Associated effects of the Roux plumage color mutation on growth, carcass traits, egg production and reproduction of Japanese quail. *Poult. Sci.* 78:1479-1484.

- Minvielle, F., G. Gandemer, Y. Maeda, G. Leborgoyen and M. Boulay, 2000. Carcass characteristics of a heavy Japanese quail line under introgression with the roux gene. *British Poultry Sci.* 41:41-45.
- Nestor, K.E., W.L. Bacon and A.L. Lambio, 1982. Divergent selection for body weight and yolk precursor in *Coturnix coturnix Japonica*. 1. Selection response. *Poult. Sci.* 61:12-17.
- Prado-Gonzalez, E. A., L. Ramirez-Avila and J.C. Segura-Correa. 2003. Genetic parameters for body weight of Creole chickens from southeastern Mexico using an animal model livestock research for rural development 15 (1):1-7. <http://www.cipav.org.co/lrrd/lrrd15/1/prad151.htm>.
- SAS Institute, 1998. Statistical Analysis System. User Guide. SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC.
- Strong, C.F. Jr., K.E. Nestor and W.L. Bacon, 1978. Inheritance of egg production, egg weight, body weight and certain plasma constituents in *Coturnix*. *Poult. Sci.* 57:1-9.
- Syed Hussein, S.A., Y.S. Chee and M. Jamilah, 1995. Selection of quail for meat production. *Proceeding of the 17th Malaysian Society of Animal Production, Malaysia, Penang.* Pp 124-125.
- Syed Hussein, S.A. and A.Chik, 1996. Brooding of Japanese quails on deep litter system. *Proceedings of 8th Veterinary Association, Malaysia, Perak.* Pp 186-187.
- Syed Hussein, S.A., A.Chik, M. Jamilah and D. Hussein, 1999. Growth and reproduction performance across from strain crosses of Japanese quails. *Proceedings National Congress on Animal Health and Production.* Pp 233-235.
- Toelle, V.D., G.B. Havenstein, K.E. Nestor and W.R. Harvey, 1991. Genetic and phenotypic relationships in Japanese quail. 1. Body weight, carcass and organ measurements. *Poult. Sci.* 70:1679-1688.