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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CV-%</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2505</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage,-%</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Phenotypic variances (\( \sigma^2_p \)), permanent environmental 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>( \sigma^2_p )</th>
<th>( c^2 \pm S.E )</th>
<th>( b^2 \pm S.E )</th>
<th>( h^2 \pm S.E )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage, %</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...results...

Table 2b. Phenotypic variances ($\sigma^2_p$), permanent environmental 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>$\sigma^2_p$</th>
<th>$c^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$b^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$h^2 \pm S.E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage, %</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Phenotypic variances ($\sigma^2_p$), permanent environmental 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>$\sigma^2_p$</th>
<th>$c^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$b^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$h^2 \pm S.E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>11367</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage, %</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...results...

Table 3b. Phenotypic variances ($\sigma^2 p$), permanent environmental 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>$\sigma^2 p$</th>
<th>$c^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$b^2 \pm S.E$</th>
<th>$h^2 \pm S.E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>11367</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>4225</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage, %</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular) correlations in Large White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Average daily gain</th>
<th>Feed conversion rate</th>
<th>Meat percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.07 ± 0.22</td>
<td>-0.22 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.79 ± 0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage,-%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...results...

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Average daily gain</th>
<th>Feed conversion rate</th>
<th>Meat percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.07 ± 0.22</td>
<td>-0.22 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage,-%</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.79 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Genetic (upper triangular) and phenotypic (lower triangular) correlations in **Finnish Landrace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Average daily gain, g/d</th>
<th>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</th>
<th>Meat percentage, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.22</td>
<td>-0.40 ± 0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage, %</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...results

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Average daily gain</th>
<th>Feed conversion rate</th>
<th>Meat percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain, g/d</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.22</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>-0.40 ± 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion rate, FU/kg</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat percentage,-%</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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!
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