EAAP 2009, Session 40, Presentation 2

Genetic parameters for meat percentage, average daily gain and feed conversion rate in ad *libitum* fed Finnish Landrace and Large White pigs

Anniina Peltonen & Marja-Liisa Sevón-Aimonen marja-liisa.sevon-aimonen@mtt.fi

MTT Agrifood Research Finland, Biotechnology and Food Research



Background...

- In year 2006 started Faba's new central test station for Finnish pig breeding scene
- At the same time the testing procedure changed
- For example, the feeding was changed from slightly restricted group feeding (RF) to individual *ad libitum* (AL) feeding



...background

- During transition period (co)variances from literature were used
- The objective of this study was to update genetic parameters due to changed situation and compare the new estimates to previous ones



Material and methods...

- Data was 2548 Finnish Landrace and 1684 Large White pigs.
- Pigs were fed individually using electronic feeding system and after 13 weeks test period pigs (except best boars) were slaughtered.
- Traits were meat percentage (M%), average daily gain (ADG, g/d) and feed conversion rate (FC, FU /kg live weight gain, 1 FU = 9.3 MJ NE)



...material and methods

- (Co)variances were estimated using a multitrait animal model and REML method with DMU program package
- Statistical model contains:
 - sex and rearing batch as fixed effects
 - start weight as a covariate
 - Litter, pen and additive animal effect as random effects
- Inbreeding was taken account



Data description

Table 1, Number of observations (No), means, standard deviations, coefficients of variation (CV) and minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values in Large White and Finnish Landrace

Trait	No.	Mean	SD	CV-%	Min	Max
Average	1684	911	109	11.9	595	1276
daily gain,	2548	945	116	12.2	606	1394
g/d						
Feed	1664	2.58	0.24	9.3	1.91	3.72
conversion	2505	2.58	0.24	9.3	1.74	4.14
rate, FU/kg						
Meat	1409	63.5	2.44	3.8	53.1	70.8
percentage,- %	2202	63.4	2.50	3.9	52.1	72.0



Results...

Table 2. Phenotypic variances (σ_p^2) , permanent environmetal effect of litter $(c^2 \pm S.E)$, permanent effect of pen $(b^2 \pm S.E)$ and heritabilities $(h^2 \pm S.E)$ in Large White

Trait	σ_{p}^{2}	$c^2 \pm S.E$	$b^2 \pm S.E$	$h^2 \pm S.E$
Average daily gain, g/d	11111	$\boldsymbol{0.08\pm0.04}$	0.10 ± 0.02	0.31 ± 0.09
Feed conversion rate, FU/kg	0.04	$\boldsymbol{0.10\pm0.04}$	$\boldsymbol{0.10 \pm 0.02}$	0.30 ± 0.09
Meat percentage,- %	4.54	$\boldsymbol{0.06\pm0.04}$	0.06 ± 0.02	0.34 ± 0.10



Table 2b. Phenotypic variances (σ_p^2) , permanent environmetal effect of litter $(c^2 \pm S.E)$, permanent effect of pen $(b^2 \pm S.E)$ and heritabilities $(h^2 \pm S.E)$ in Large White, brown ones are values in restricted feeding

Trait	σ_{p}^{2}	$c^2 \pm S.E$	$b^2 \pm S.E$	$h^2 \pm S.E$
Average	11111	$\boldsymbol{0.08 \pm 0.04}$	$\boldsymbol{0.10\pm0.02}$	$\boldsymbol{0.31\pm0.09}$
daily gain,	4225			0.35
g/d				
Feed	0.04	$\boldsymbol{0.10\pm0.04}$	$\boldsymbol{0.10 \pm 0.02}$	$\boldsymbol{0.30\pm0.09}$
conversion	0.032			0.40
rate, FU/kg				
Meat	4.54	$\boldsymbol{0.06 \pm 0.04}$	$\boldsymbol{0.06 \pm 0.02}$	$\boldsymbol{0.34 \pm 0.10}$
percentage,-	3.61			0.65
%				



Table 3. Phenotypic variances (σ_p^2) , permanent environmetal effect of litter ($c^2 \pm S.E$), permanent effect of pen ($b^2 \pm S.E$) and heritabilities ($h^2 \pm S.E$) in Finnish Landrace

Trait	σ_{p}^{2}	$c^2 \pm S.E$	$b^2 \pm S.E$	$h^2 \pm S.E$
Average daily gain, g/d	11367	0.13 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.02	0.19 ± 0.06
Feed conversion rate, FU/kg	0.04	0.12 ± 0.03	0.11 ± 0.02	0.18 ± 0.06
Meat percentage,- %	4.62	0.12 ± 0.03	0.01 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.08



Table 3b. Phenotypic variances ($\sigma^2 p$), permanent environmetal effect of litter ($c^2 \pm S.E$), permanent effect of pen ($b^2 \pm S.E$) and heritabilities($h^2 \pm S.E$) in Finnish Landrace, brown ones are values in restricted feeding

Trait	σ²p	$c^2 \pm S.E$	$b^2 \pm S.E$	$h^2 \pm S.E$
Average	11367	0.13 ± 0.03	$\boldsymbol{0.08\pm0.02}$	$\boldsymbol{0.19 \pm 0.06}$
daily gain, g/d	4225			0.35
Feed	0.04	$\boldsymbol{0.12 \pm 0.03}$	$\boldsymbol{0.11 \pm 0.02}$	$\boldsymbol{0.18 \pm 0.06}$
conversion rate, FU/kg	0.032			0.40
Meat	4.62	$\boldsymbol{0.12 \pm 0.03}$	$\boldsymbol{0.01 \pm 0.01}$	$\boldsymbol{0.31 \pm 0.08}$
percentage,- %	3.61			0.65



Table 4. Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular)correlations in Large White

Trait	Average daily gain	Feed conversion rate	Meat percentage
Average daily gain, g/d		-0.07 ± 0.22	-0.22 ± 0.22
Feed conversion rate, FU/kg	-0.40		-0.79 ± 0.14
Meat percentage,-%	-0.28	-0.29	



Table 4b. Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular) correlations in Large White, brown ones are correlations in restricted feeding

Trait	Average daily	Feed conversion	Meat percentage
	gain	rate	
Average daily		-0.07 ± 0.22	-0.22 ± 0.22
gain, g/d		-0.277	0.25
Feed conversion	-0.40		$\textbf{-0.79} \pm \textbf{0.14}$
rate, FU/kg	-0.09		-0.29
Meat	-0.28	-0.29	
percentage,-%	0.00	-0.02	



Table 5 Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular) correlations in Finnish Landrace

Trait	Average daily	Feed conversion	Meat percentage
Average daily	gem	0.02 ± 0.22	-0.40 ± 0.17
Feed conversion	-0.50		-0.34 ± 0.18
Meat percentage,-%	-0.30	-0.25	



...results

Table 5b. Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular) correlations in Finnish Landrace, brown ones are correlations in restricted feeding

Trait	Average daily	Feed conversion	Meat percentage
	gain	rate	
Average daily		0.02 ± 0.22	-0.40 ± 0.17
gain, g/d		-0.277	0.25
Feed conversion	-0.50		-0.34 ± 0.18
rate, FU/kg	-0.09		-0.29
Meat	-0.30	-0.25	
percentage,-%	0.00	-0.02	



Conclusions...

- Phenotypic variance was larger in *ad libitum* feeding than in restricted feeding
- Heritabilities were almost at same level or lower



...conclusions...

- Correlations between ADG and FC were zero in AL, whereas it was negative in RF
- In *ad libitum feeding*, moderate negative correlation
 (-0.22 in LW and -0.40 in LR) was between ADG and M
 %. In RF this correlation was moderately positive
- In AL, correlation between FC and M% varied from -0.34 to -0.79 (favourable). In RF the estimate was almost similar



... conclusions

 Change in feeding from restricted to ad libitum and perhaps also other changes in management practise between old and new test station affected more to the correlations between traits than to the heritabilities



Thank you for your attention!



Picture: Timo Serenius