



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

# Variance components using genomic information for 2 functional traits in Italian Simmental cattle: Calving interval and lactation persistency

This is the author's manuscript				
Original Citation:				
Availability:				
This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1744139 since 2020-07-16T12:44:19Z				
Published version:				
DOI:10.3168/jds.2019-17421				
Terms of use:				
Open Access				
Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works				
requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.				

(Article begins on next page)





# This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:

Alberto Cesarani, **Giustino Gaspa**, Yutaka Masuda, Lorenzo Degano, Daniele Vicario, Daniela A.L. Lourenco, Nicolò P.P. Macciotta

# Variance components using genomic information for two functional traits in Italian Simmental cattle: calving interval and lactation persistency

Journal of Dairy Science

Volume 103, Issue 6, June 2020, Pages 5227-5233

https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17421

The publisher's version is available at:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022030220302551?via%3Dihub

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text: http://hdl.handle.net/ID:431290

This full text was downloaded from iris-Aperto: https://iris.unito.it/

1	Variance components using genomic information for two functional traits in Italian Simmental
2	cattle: calving interval and lactation persistency. by Cesarani et al. Modern breeding programs
3	aim to improve functional traits, such as fertility and/or lactation persistency. Calving interval is an
4	easily accessible indicator of female fertility, but is lowly heritable and has moderate, unfavorable
5	correlations with yield traits. Lactation persistency is also lowly heritable. We investigated the genetic
6	background of calving interval and lactation persistency and estimated the genetic parameters that
7	are needed to include both traits and milk production for the Italian Simmental breeding program.
8	There is a potential to implement a single step-genomic prediction model by using both genomic and
9	pedigree information.
10	
11	VARIANCE COMPONENTS OF FUNCTIONAL TRAITS
12	
13	Variance components using genomic information for two functional traits in Italian
14	Simmental cattle: calving interval and lactation persistency
15	
16	Alberto Cesarani <sup>14</sup> *, Giustino Gaspa <sup>3</sup> , Yutaka Masuda <sup>4</sup> , Lorenzo Degano <sup>2</sup> , Daniele Vicario <sup>2</sup> ,
17	Daniela A.L. Lourenco <sup>4</sup> , Nicolò P.P. Macciotta <sup>1</sup>
18	
19	<sup>1</sup> Department of Agricultural Sciences, University of Sassari, Sassari, Italy
20	<sup>2</sup> Associazione Nazionale Allevatori Pezzata Rossa Italiana (ANAPRI), Udine
21	<sup>3</sup> Department of Agricultural, Forestry and Alimentary Sciences, University of Torino, Grugliasco
22	<sup>4</sup> Department of Animal and Dairy Science, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia
23	
24	* Corresponding author: acesarani@uniss.it
25	

#### 28

### ABSTRACT

29 Functional traits, such as fertility and lactation persistency, are becoming relevant breeding 30 goals for dairy cattle. Fertility is a key element for herd profitability and animal welfare: in particular, 31 calving interval (CI) is an indicator of female fertility that can be easily recorded. Lactation 32 persistency (LPE), i.e. the ability of a cow to maintain a high milk yield after the lactation peak, is 33 economically important and it is related to several other traits, such as feed efficiency, health, and 34 reproduction. The selection of these functional traits is constrained by their low heritability. In this study, variance components for CI and LPE in the Italian Simmental cattle breed were estimated 35 36 using genomic and pedigree information under the single-step genomic framework. A data set of 37 594,257 calving interval records (from 275,399 cows), 285,213 lactation persistency records (from 38 1563,389 cows) was considered. Phenotypes were limited up to the third parity. The pedigree 39 contained about 2 million animals, and 7,246 genotypes were available. LPE was estimated using principal component analysis on test day records, with higher PC2 values associated to lower LPE 40 41 and lower PC2 values to higher LPE, respectively. Heritability of CI and LPE were estimated using 42 single-trait repeatability models. A multiple trait analysis using CI and production traits (milk, fat, 43 and protein yields) was performed to estimate genetic correlations among these traits. Heritability for 44 CI in the single-trait model was low  $(0.06\pm0.002)$ . Unfavorable genetic correlations were found 45 between CI and production traits. A measure of LPE was derived using principal component analysis on test-day records. The heritability and repeatability of LPE were 0.11±0.004 and 0.20±0.02, 46 respectively. Genetic correlation between CI and LPE was weak but had a favorable direction. 47 48 Despite the low heritability estimates, results of the present work suggest the possibility of including 49 these traits in the Italian Simmental breeding program. The use of single-step approach can potentially 50 provide better results for young genotyped animals without own phenotypes.

51

52 Keywords: fertility, persistency, genomic selection

54

## **INTRODUCTION**

In the last century, the combined action of genetic, management, and feeding advancements 55 56 has led to a substantial improvement of dairy cow performances. Such results have been, however, accompanied by a general deterioration in fitness traits (Sun et al., 2019). The progressive reduction 57 58 of cow fertility is one of the most relevant examples of the unfavorable consequences of selection for 59 production traits (Ma et al., 2019). Relationships between fertility and genetic improvement for milk 60 production have been investigated (Castillo-Juarez et al., 2000; Lucy, 2001; Hayes et al., 2009; Walsh 61 et al., 2011). Reproduction traits have been, therefore, included in breeding programs (Philipsson and 62 Lindhé, 2003; López-Gatius, 2003; Miglior et al., 2005) even though a clear definition of phenotypes 63 is still an issue. For example, fertility traits can be defined in many ways: time lengths (i.e. days 64 open), or frequencies (i.e. number of inseminations needed to conceive). Generally, these traits are 65 difficult to record routinely and have low heritability. Among fertility traits, calving interval (CI) is one of the easiest to record (Dal Zotto et al., 2007); however, it can be biased for not being available 66 67 for cows that do not re-calve because of poor fertility. Other traits like conception or pregnancy rates 68 could be better fertility traits, but they need additional resources to be collected. A longer CI is usually 69 a consequence of more inseminations needed for the cow to conceive, with increased costs for the 70 herd, and therefore, is undesirable. Moreover, cows with longer CI will have fewer calvings in their 71 life. Selection for shorter CI would increase herd profitability: more calvings per cow, more offspring 72 that can be sold or used as replacement, decreased feed costs, and less reproductive problems 73 (Esslemont et al., 2001; Groenendaal et al., 2004; Atashi et al., 2013).

Reproductive performance is also strongly related to lactation persistency (LPE), i.e. the ability of the cow to maintain high levels of production after the lactation peak (Dekkers et al., 1998). LPE is a production trait connected to health, reproduction, and feed costs (Koloi et al., 2018). The relationship between CI and LPE in cattle has been investigated (Atashi et al., 2013; Němečková et al., 2015). Muir et al. (2004) reported a moderate, positive genetic correlation between CI and LPE 79 suggesting an unfavorable and antagonistic relationship between these two traits. This result was 80 confirmed by Atashi et al. (2013), who found that cows with shorter CI were less persistent in milk 81 production. Although there is a general consensus on the basic concept of LPE, generally defined as 82 the ratio between the milk measured in a certain period and the total milk yield, several measurements 83 have been proposed for this trait (Gengler, 1996; Sölkner and Fuchs, 1987; Cole and VanRaden, 84 2006; Strabel and Jamrozik, 2006; Togashi and Lin, 2006). Macciotta et al. (2006) have defined the 85 LPE in Italian Simmental using a principal component (PC) approach. The advantage of this approach 86 is that the measure of LPE is independent of milk production.

The Italian Simmental is a dual-purpose cattle breed farmed mostly in Northeastern Italy. Its breeding program aims to improve both dairy and beef traits, and an economic selection index has been developed for this purpose. Recently, the introduction of new functional traits such as CI and LPE has been suggested; however, variance components for these traits were not available for this breed in Italy. Thus, to investigate the genetic background of these two traits, the present study focused on the estimation of genetic parameters for CI and its relationship with production traits and LPE in Italian Simmental cattle using a genomic approach.

94

#### 95

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

96 Calving interval

97 CI phenotypes recorded from 275,399 cows in the period 1983 to 2017 were used. The number
98 of parities per cow ranged from 1 to 3, and the first record was mandatory in order to include a cow
99 in the analysis. A total of 594,257 CI records that were greater than 300 days and lower than 700 days
100 were retained for analysis.

101 Heritability and repeatability for CI were estimated using repeatability single-trait model:

102 y = hy + par + a + pe + e [1]

where y was the CI record; hy was the fixed effect of herd-year combination (103,467 levels); par
was the fixed effect of parity (three levels: 1-2, 2-3, 3-4); a was the random additive genetic effect

(465,633 animals in the relationship matrix); pe was the random effect of permanent environment
(465,633 levels); e was the random residual.

107 Genetic correlations between fertility and production traits were estimated using a multiple 108 trait animal model with the same structure of [1] considering CI, milk (MY), fat (FY) and protein 109 (PY) 305-d yield (kg). All available records for these 4 traits were included in the analysis (713,376 110 records from 274,759 cows). Average values of 5,687±1,676 kg, 221±81 kg, and 194±70 kg were 111 observed for MY, FY, and PY, respectively.

112

#### 113 *Lactation persistency*

114 Genetic parameters for LPE were investigated using a data set with 285,213 lactation records of 156,389 cows (parities ranging from 1 to 3) farmed in 5,344 herds. Each lactation (from 5 to 305 115 116 days in milk) was divided into seven intervals and one record per interval was kept. When more than 117 one test day per interval was available, the average value was used. Seven intervals were chosen because the majority of cows have this number of controls available in the routine evaluation system 118 of Italian Simmental. The availability of at least one record before the 45<sup>th</sup> day of lactation and after 119 120 the 245<sup>th</sup> day of lactation was mandatory to include a cow in the analysis. Since milk, fat and protein 121 daily yields showed a similar decreasing trend along lactation, we decided to consider only milk yield 122 to define LPE. Thus, data were arranged in a multivariate framework and a principal component 123 analysis using SAS PROC PRINCOMP procedure was performed to extract eigenvalues and 124 eigenvectors of the phenotypic correlation matrix of test-day records. The second extracted principal component (PC2) was used as an indicator of persistency (Macciotta et al., 2006). The PC2 scores 125 126 were analyzed with the following single-trait repeatability animal model:

127 
$$y = hy + par + a + pe + e$$
 [2]

where **y** was the value of PC2 scores (i.e. LPE); **hy** was the combination between herd and year (49,638 levels); **par** was the effect of parity (three levels: 1, 2 and 3); **a** was the random additive genetic effect (333,003 levels); pe was the random effect of permanent environment (333,003 levels);
e was the random residual.

Finally, a two-trait model was used to estimate genetic correlations between CI and LPE of the corresponding lactation: CI records between two consecutive parities (i.e. 1-2, 2-3 and 3-4) and the LPE estimated for the corresponding lactations (i.e. first, second, and third lactations) were used (total of 340,573 records).

136

### 137 Genetic parameter estimation

Variance components and heritability (h<sup>2</sup>) estimation for all the described models was 138 139 performed using a single-step genomic REML (ssGREML) approach with a combined relationship 140 matrix (H) built as described in Aguilar et al. (2010). Analyses were also done with pedigree 141 relationship matrix (A) with very similar results (not shown). Before the analyses, pedigree was traced 142 back for 5 generations. The full pedigree contained 1,981,728 animals of which 7,246 were genotyped 143 for 40,200 markers. Among all the genotyped animals, 3,358 were females with phenotypes and 2,045 were sires. The females with both phenotypes and genotypes came from 250 different herds and could 144 145 be dams of other phenotyped females. The other genotyped animals without phenotypes were half-146 sib or relatives of phenotyped females. Table 1 shows the distribution of genotyped animals by year 147 of birth. Variance components were estimated using the average information REML (AIREML) 148 algorithm implemented in the blupf90 family programs (Misztal et al., 2014).

- 149
- 150

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### 151 *Calving interval in a single-trait, repeatability model*

The phenotypic average of CI for Italian Simmental (397.50±68.32) is consistent with previous reports on other cattle breeds. Values between 387 and 398 were reported for UK Holstein (Wall et al., 2003) and Australian Holstein (Haile-Mariam et al., 2003), respectively. CI of 400 or more days were found in Spanish dairy cattle (González-Recio and Alenda, 2005) and in Mexican Holstein (Montaldo et al., 2010). Large values of CI were also reported for US Holstein (Tiezzi et al.,
2017).

Heritability (0.06±0.002) and repeatability (0.11±0.002) for CI in the present study, using a 158 159 single-trait model, were quite low. However, they were slightly higher than previous literature reports. Values of 0.02 were estimated in Mexican Holstein (Montaldo et al., 2010) and in Xinjiang 160 161 Brown (Fu et al., 2017). Estimates ranging from 0.03 to 0.05 were reported for Australian dairy 162 (Haile-Mariam et al., 2003; 2008), UK Holstein (Wall et al., 2003), Irish Holstein (Olori et al., 2002), 163 Spanish dairy (González-Recio and Alenda, 2005), and Italian Brown Swiss (Dal Zotto et al., 2007). 164 It should be pointed out that heritability for fertility traits is generally low, as reported in a recent 165 review (Ma et al., 2019).

166

#### 167 *Lactation persistency*

168 About 90% of the total phenotypic variance of test-day records was explained by the first two 169 principal components (PC). PC1 was related to the average level of milk yield whereas PC2 was 170 associated with the shape of the lactation curve. They explained about 78% and 12% of test-day 171 phenotypic variance, respectively. PC1 scores ranged from -7.60 to 14.54, with an average value of 172 0.14±2.37, and it showed a correlation of 0.97 with 305-d MY. PC2 scores ranged from -4.53 to 4.71. Animals were grouped according to their PC2 scores into four classes: Class1 =from -4.53 to -1.04; 173 174 Class2 = from -1.03 to -0.57, Class3 = from -0.56 to -0.15; and Class4 = from -0.14 to 4.71. Average 175 milk yield for all the seven test day records were calculated separately for each PC2 class. These 176 average lactation curves for different PC2 class are shown in Figure 1. It can be clearly seen that the 177 average lactation curve for PC2 class4 exhibited the steepest negative slope. LPE tends to increase 178 for higher PC2 classes reaching the maximum in Class1. These results confirm the meaning of PC2 179 score as an indicator of the shape of the lactation curve.

PC2 (i.e. LPE) and MY showed a phenotypic correlation of -0.03, which was expected
because PC2 was defined to be independent of milk production in the calculations. However, the

182 genetic correlation between PC2 and MY was unfavorable (0.35±0.03) because higher values of PC2, i.e., lower LPE, are associated to higher MY. In fact, animals belonging to the Class1 (those with the 183 184 highest LPE) showed a slightly lower 305-d MY compared to the animals of Class4 (those with the lowest LPE). LPE in this study was not defined by combining production levels at different lactation 185 stages, but using the PC2 values that just capture the shape of lactation curve without considering 186 187 production levels (PC are orthogonal). Thus, the genetic correlation observed between LPE and MY could probably be a spurious result mediated by other variables. In the literature, estimates of genetic 188 189 correlation between LPE and MY show different magnitudes and signs according to the LPE 190 definition (Haile Mariam et al., 2003; Muir et al., 2004). Cole and Null (2009) found that genetic 191 correlation between LPE and MY changed magnitudes and signs according to the considered breed. 192 Some studies reported unfavorable genetic correlation between LPE and MY (Cobuci and Costa, 2012; Khorshidie et al., 2012; Pereira et al., 2012), whereas other studies reported favorable genetic 193 194 correlation between these two traits (Muir et al., 2004; Yamazaki et al., 2013).

195 Heritability (0.11±0.004) and repeatability (0.20±0.003) of LPE in a single-trait model were 196 rather low. Macciotta et al. (2006) reported lower heritability and repeatability for LPE using a 197 smaller, older dataset that comprised only phenotypic and pedigree information from the same Italian 198 Simmental population. In fact, heritability estimates for LPE in the literature exhibit a considerable 199 variation, with values ranging from 0.01 (Otwinowska-Mindur and Ptak, 2015) to 0.50 (Koloi et al., 200 2018). Such relevant differences can be ascribed to statistical model, breed, and trait definition. There 201 is no consensus in literature for measuring LPE. Grayaa et al. (2019) defined LPE as the difference 202 between milk production at 280 days in milk and at the lactation peak, and estimated heritability using 203 different multi-trait models: the estimates ranged from 0.05 when milk fat percentage was considered 204 to 0.21 when milk yield was included among the response variables. Strabel and Jamrozik (2006) 205 reported heritability estimates for LPE that ranged from 0.07 to 018 using the eigenvectors of the 206 (co)variance matrix of RRM coefficients. Higher heritability (0.18±0.02) was reported for LPE for 207 first-lactation Canadian Holstein (Muir et al., 2004). Additionally, Cole and Null (2009), observed a large heterogeneity in the h<sup>2</sup> of LPE in several dairy cattle breeds: from 0.09 to 0.26 and 0.18 to 0.28
for Milking Shorthorn and Guernsey, respectively.

210

## 211 *Calving interval, production traits, and lactation persistency*

212 Heritability for CI obtained with the multiple trait model was slightly higher compared to the 213 single-trait analysis (Table 2). Heritabilities for the production traits were close to the current 214 estimates for the Italian Simmental breed. Unfavorable, moderate genetic correlations were found 215 between CI and production traits (Table 2), as generally reported in literature. The magnitude of the 216 estimates obtained in the present study is not far from previous reports of about 0.5-0.6 (Pryce et al., 217 2000; Dal Zotto et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2017). Deb et al. (2008) reported a genetic correlation of 0.4 218 between CI and MY in a native breed from Bangladesh. Antagonistic genetic correlation between MY and CI was also observed by Haile-Mariam et al. (2003) and by Strapáková et al. (2016). The 219 220 latest reported a genetic correlation of 0.51±0.11, with higher MY observed for cows with longer 221 calving interval. Other similar reproductive traits, such as days open and days from calving to the 222 first service, show undesirable genetic correlations with milk production traits (Abe et al., 2009). 223 Heritability estimates for CI and LPE using the univariate or bivariate models were similar. A weak, positive genetic correlation was observed between these two traits, whereas a near zero 224 phenotypic correlation was observed (Table 3). The positive genetic correlation reflected a favorable 225 226 association between CI and LPE because high values of CI are associated with high values of PC2, which means lower LPE. On the contrary, lower values of CI (desirable) are related to lower values 227 of PC2 and, therefore, to higher LPE (desirable). However, reports about the genetic association 228 229 between CI and LPE are not always consistent. An undesirable association between CI and LPE was 230 reported by Atashi et al. (2013), who found that cows with short CI had a lower LPE. Unfavorable

231 genetic correlation between CI and LPE was reported also by Muir et al. (2004). Němečková et al.

232 (2015) reported no significant association between these two traits and Andersen et al. (2011) found

233 no significant differences on peak yield and peak day (i.e. traits associated with LPE) in different

234 calving interval groups. Haile-Mariam et al. (2003) concluded that the genetic correlation between

235 LPE and CI was almost zero. Apart from sampling effect, it should be pointed out that the different

236 definition of LPE used in the various studies may strongly affect the results.

237 An antagonistic relationship between productive and reproductive performances in cattle has 238 been observed: animals need energy to produce milk and to conceive at the same time and, therefore, 239 the energy balance during lactation is of great interest. However, fertility and production traits are 240 associated in a complex causal pattern because this relationship strongly depends on the considered 241 period of the lactation. The attention can be mainly focused on the energy balance during the lactation: 242 milk yield affects the energy balance mostly in the first part of the lactation when cows are 243 inseminated; in this period, body reserve mobilization and negative energy balance frequently occur 244 and the cow has not enough energy to conceive (Andersen et al., 2011; Beran et al., 2012; Duchacek et al., 2014). Thus, a high level of milk production in early lactation (before or around the peak) could 245 246 reduce fertility with a subsequent delay of pregnancy. In the late part of the lactation, a switch in the 247 causal link between productive and reproductive performance occurs: in this period, energy 248 requirements for the fetal development are higher compared to the first part of lactation and, therefore, 249 pregnancy prioritizes the energy needs with an effect on milk production (that in the advanced stages 250 of lactation can be identified as LPE). More persistent cows with lower peak yield usually suffer less 251 strong energy imbalance during the lactation (Haile-Mariam et al., 2003). Results of the present study 252 highlighted a quite strong unfavorable genetic correlation between CI and MY, confirming the 253 negative relationship between reproductive and productive performance. Slightly favorable genetic 254 correlation between LPE and CI was also observed. However, such relationship between LPE and CI 255 could be influenced by MY. This is because selection for CI is unlikely to cause decline in MY, but the selection for MY ignoring CI would have more negative impact on fertility due to the high 256 257 unfavorable genetic correlation between these two traits. Nevertheless, LPE has some positive consequences for dairy cows because persistent cows could have less health and reproduction 258 problems, they are easier to manage, and there is a lower feeding cost (Sölkner and Fuchs, 1987; 259

260 Atashi et al., 2013). Thus, findings of the present work suggest the possibility to limit the fertility

261 deterioration caused by the selection for MY by including CI and LPE as breeding goals.

In spite of the low  $h^2$  for CI and LPE that has been confirmed also in the present study, it 262 should be pointed out that genomic selection offers interesting perspectives for improving these 263 functional traits, giving more phenotypes and genotypes are collected. García-Ruiz et al. (2016) 264 265 showed that the genetic gain per year achieved in US Holsteins has been markedly larger for low 266 heritability traits because of the considerable amount of data (e.g. somatic cell score, productive life, 267 and daughter pregnancy rate). For estimating variance components, the main benefit of using genomic 268 information in a single-step approach is the availability of more data that is reflected in the smaller 269 standard errors (Forni et al., 2011; Veerkamp et al., 2011). The use of combined pedigree and genomic 270 information using the single-step approach could have potential benefits for young candidates that 271 have genotypes but no phenotypic records. However, in our case using A instead of H gave very close 272 estimates (data not shown) because of the small number of genotyped animals. The similar results found using BLUP or ssGBLUP, even if with a small number of genotyped animals, showed the 273 274 robustness of the latter methodology and the possibility to have better results by increasing the amount of genomic information. 275

- 276
- 277

#### CONCLUSIONS

Although of small magnitude, the heritabilities for CI and LPE show that these traits can be improved by genomic selection. The use of multi-trait models allowed to better understand the genetic connection between CI and LPE, showing that both traits should be included as breeding objective in order to prevent a deterioration of fertility.

282

## 283 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 284 This work was supported by the Italian Government through the project "DUAL BREEDING
- Le razze bovine a duplice attitudine: un modello alternativo di Zootecnia eco-sostenibile" (grant
  no. J21J18000010005).

# REFERENCES

289	Abe, H., Masuda, Y., and M. Suzuki. 2009. Relationships between reproductive traits of heifers and
290	cows and yield traits for Holsteins in Japan. J. Dairy Sci. 92:4055-4062.
291	Aguilar, I., I. Misztal, D. L. Johnson, A. Legarra, S. Tsuruta, and T. J. Lawlor. 2010. Hot topic: A
292	unified approach to utilize phenotypic, full pedigree, and genomic information for genetic
293	evaluation of Holstein final score. J. Dairy Sci. 93:743-752.
294	Andersen, F., Østerås, O., Reksen, O., Toft, N., and Y. T. Gröhn. 2011. Associations between the
295	time of conception and the shape of the lactation curve in early lactation in Norwegian dairy
296	cattle. Acta Vet. Scand. 53:5.
297	Atashi, H., Zamiri, M. J., Akhlaghi, A., Dadpasand, M., Sayyadnejad, M. B., and A. R.
298	Abdolmohammadi. 2013. Association between the lactation curve shape and calving interval
299	in Holstein dairy cows of Iran. Iran. J. Vet. Res. 14:88-93.
300	Beran, J., Stadnik, L., and J. Duchacek. 2012.: Effect of body condition score at calving on
301	reproduction indicators of dairy cows. Reprod. Domest. Anim. 47:69-69.
302	Castillo-Juarez, H., Oltenacu, P. A., Blake, R. W., McCulloch, C. E., and E. G. Cienfuegos-Rivas.
303	2000. Effect of herd environment on the genetic and phenotypic relationships among milk yield,
304	conception rate, and somatic cell score in Holstein cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 83:807-814.
305	Cobuci, J. A. and C. N. Costa. 2012. Persistency of lactation using random regression models and
306	different fixed regression modeling approaches. Rev. Bras. Zootec. 41:1996-2004.
307	Cole, J. B., and D. J. Null. 2009. Genetic evaluation of lactation persistency for five breeds of dairy
308	cattle. J Dairy Sci. 92: 2248-2258.
309	Cole, J. B., and P. M. VanRaden. 2006. Genetic evaluation and best prediction of lactation
310	persistency. J. Dairy Sci. 89:2722-2728.
311	Dal Zotto, R., De Marchi, M., Dalvit, C., Cassandro, M., Gallo, L., Carnier, P., and G. Bittante. 2007.

somatic cell score, and linear type traits in Brown Swiss cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 90:5737-5743.

- Deb, G. K., Mufti, M. M., Mostari, M. P., and K. S. Huque. 2008. Genetic evaluation of Bangladesh
  livestock research institute cattle breed-1: heritability and genetic correlation. Bangladesh J.
  Anim. Sci. 37:25-33.
- 317 Dekkers, J. C. M., Ten Hag, J. H., and A. Weersink. 1998. Economic aspects of persistency of
  318 lactation in dairy cattle. Livest. Prod. Sci. 53:237-252.
- Duchacek, J., Beran, J., Ptacek, M., and L. Stadnik. 2014: Influence of breed, parity and body
  condition change on reproductive performance of dairy cows. Reprod. Domest. Anim. 49:6666.
- 322 Esslemont, R. J., Kossaibati, M. A., and J. Allcock, J. 2001. Economics of fertility in dairy cows.
  323 BSAP Occasional Publication, 26:19-29.
- Forni, S., Aguilar, I., and I. Misztal. 2011. Different genomic relationship matrices for single-step
  analysis using phenotypic, pedigree and genomic information. Genet Sel Evol. 43:1.
- 326 Fu, X., Lu, L., Huang, X., Wang, Y., Tian, K., Xu, X., Fang, J., Cheng, L., Guo, Z., and Y. Tian.
- 327 2017. Estimation of genetic parameters for 305 days milk yields and calving interval in Xinjiang
  328 Brown cattle. Agric Sci. 8:46-55.
- 329 García-Ruiz, A., Cole, J. B., VanRaden, P. M., Wiggans, G. R., Ruiz-López, F. J., and C. P., Van
- 330Tassell. 2016. Changes in genetic selection differentials and generation intervals in US Holstein
- dairy cattle as a result of genomic selection. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 113(28), E3995-E4004.
- 332 Gengler, N. 1996. Persistency of lactation yields: a review. Interbull Bulletin. 12:87-96.
- González-Recio, O., and R. Alenda. 2005. Genetic parameters for female fertility traits and a fertility
  index in Spanish dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 88:3282-3289.
- Grayaa, M., Vanderick, S., Rekik, B., Ben Gara, A., Hanzen, C., Grayaa, S., Reis Mota, R.,
  Hammami, H., and N. Gengler. 2019. Linking first lactation survival to milk yield and
  components and lactation persistency in Tunisian Holstein cows. Arch. Anim. Breed. 62:153160.

339	Groenendaal, H., Galligan, D. T., and H. A. Mulder. 2004. An economic spreadsheet model to
340	determine optimal breeding and replacement decisions for dairy cattle. J Dairy Sci. 87:2146-
341	2157.
342	Haile-Mariam, M., Bowman, P. J., and M. E. Goddard. 2003. Genetic and environmental relationship
343	among calving interval, survival, persistency of milk yield and somatic cell count in dairy cattle.
344	Livest. Prod. Sci. 80:189-200.
345	Haile-Mariam, M., Carrick, M. J., and M. E. Goddard. 2008. Genotype by environment interaction
346	for fertility, survival, and milk production traits in Australian dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 91:4840-
347	4853.
348	Hayes, B. J., Bowman, P. J., Chamberlain, A. J., and M. E. Goddard. 2009. Invited review: Genomic
349	selection in dairy cattle: Progress and challenges. J. Dairy Sci. 92:433-443.
350	Khorshidie, R., A. A. Shadparvar, N. Ghavi Hossein-Zadeh, and S. Joezy Shakalgurabi. 2012.
351	Genetic trends for 305-day milk yield and persistency in Iranian Holsteins. Livestock Science,
352	<u>144:211-217.</u>
353	Koloi, S., Pathak, K., Karunakaran, M., and A. Mandal. 2018. Lactation Persistency and its Genetic
354	Evaluation in Cattle-A Review. Research & Reviews: Journal of Dairy Science and
355	Technology. 7:1-8.
356	López-Gatius, F. 2003. Is fertility declining in dairy cattle?: a retrospective study in northeastern
357	Spain. Theriogenology. 60:89-99.
358	Lucy, M.C. 2001. Reproductive loss in high-producing dairy cattle: where will it end? J. Dairy Sci.
359	84:1277–1293.
360	Ma, L., Cole, J. B., Da, Y., and P. M. VanRaden. 2019. Symposium review: genetics, genome-wide
361	association study, and genetic improvement of dairy fertility traits. J. Dairy Sci. 102:3735-3743.
362	Macciotta, N. P. P., Vicario, D., and A. Cappio-Borlino. 2006. Use of multivariate analysis to extract
363	latent variables related to level of production and lactation persistency in dairy cattle. J. Dairy

364 Sci. 89:3188-3194.

- Miglior, F., Muir, B.L., and B. J. Van Doormaal. 2005. Selection indices in Holstein cattle of various
  countries. J. Dairy Sci. 88:1255–1263.
- Misztal, I., Tsuruta, S., Lourenco, D., Aguilar, I., Legarra, A., and Z. Vitezica. 2014. Manual for
   BLUPF90 family of programs. Accessed January 2019.
   http://nce.ads.uga.edu/wiki/lib/exe/fetch.php?media=blupf90\_all7.pdf
- 370 Montaldo, H. H., Castillo-Juárez, H., Valencia-Posadas, M., Cienfuegos-Rivas, E. G., and F. J. Ruiz-
- López. 2010. Genetic and environmental parameters for milk production, udder health, and
  fertility traits in Mexican Holstein cows. J. Dairy Sci. 93:2168-2175.
- Muir, B. L., Fatehi, J., and L. R. Schaeffer. 2004. Genetic relationships between persistency and
   reproductive performance in first-lactation Canadian Holsteins. J. Dairy Sci. 87:3029-3037.
- Němečková, D., Stádník, L., and J. Čítek. 2015. Associations between milk production level, calving
  interval length, lactation curve parameters and economic results in Holstein cows. Mljekarstvo:
  časopis za unaprjeđenje proizvodnje i prerade mlijeka, 65(4), 243-250.
- Olori, V. E., Meuwissen, T. H. E., and R. F. Veerkamp. 2002. Calving interval and survival breeding
  values as measure of cow fertility in a pasture-based production system with seasonal calving.
  J. Dairy Sci. 85:689-696.
- Otwinowska-Mindur, A., and E. Ptak. 2015. Genetic analysis of lactation persistency in the Polish
  Holstein-Friesian cows. Anim. Sci. Pap. Rep. 33:2.
- 383 Pereira, R. J., R. S. Verneque, P. S. Lopes, M. L. Santana Júnior, M. R. Lagrotta, R. A.Torres, A.
- 384 E. Vercesi Filho, and M. A. Machado. 2012. Milk yield persistency in Brazilian Gyr cattle based
  385 on a random regression model. Genet. Mol. Res. 11:1599-1609.
- Philipsson, J., and B. Lindhé. 2003. Experiences of including reproduction and health traits in
  Scandinavian dairy cattle breeding programmes. Livest. Prod. Sci. 83:99-112.
- 388 Pryce, J. E., Coffey, M. P., and S. Brotherstone. 2000. The genetic relationship between calving
- interval, body condition score and linear type and management traits in registered Holsteins. J.
- 390 Dairy Sci. 83:2664-2671.

- Sölkner, J., and W. Fuchs. 1987. A comparison of different measures of persistency with special
   respect to variation of test-day milk yields. Livest. Prod. Sci. 16:305-319.
- Strabel, T., and J. Jamrozik. 2006. Alternative measures of lactation persistency from random
  regression models with Legendre polynomials. In Proceedings of the 8th World Congress on
  Genetics Applied to Livestock Production, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil, 13-18
  August, 2006 (pp. 01-33). Instituto Prociência.
- Strapáková, E., Candrák, J., and P. Strapák. 2016. Genetic relationship of lactation persistency with
   milk yield, somatic cell score, reproductive traits, and longevity in Slovak Holstein cattle.
   Archives Animal Breeding, 59(3), 329-335.
- 400 Sun, H. Z., Plastow, G., and L. L. Guan. 2019. Invited review: Advances and challenges in application
- 401 of feedomics to improve dairy cow production and health. J. Dairy Sci. 102
  402 https://doi.org/10.3168/jds
- 403 Tiezzi, F., de Los Campos, G., Gaddis, K. P., and C. Maltecca. 2017. Genotype by environment
  404 (climate) interaction improves genomic prediction for production traits in US Holstein cattle.
  405 J. Dairy Sci. 100:2042-2056.
- 406 Togashi, K., and C. Y. Lin. 2006. Selection for milk production and persistency using eigenvectors
  407 of the random regression coefficient matrix. J. Dairy Sci. 89:4866-4873.
- Veerkamp, R. F., Mulder, H. A., Thompson, R., and M. P. L. Calus. 2011. Genomic and pedigreebased genetic parameters for scarcely recorded traits when some animals are genotyped. J Dairy
  Sci. 94:4189–4197.
- Wall, E., Brotherstone, S., Woolliams, J. A., Banos, G., and M. P. Coffey. 2003. Genetic evaluation
  of fertility using direct and correlated traits. J. Dairy Sci. 86:4093-4102.
- Walsh, S. W., Williams, E. J., and A. C. O. Evans. 2011. A review of the causes of poor fertility in
  high milk producing dairy cows. Anim. Reprod. Sci. 123:127-138.
- 415 Yamazaki, T., Hagiya, K., Takeda, H., Sasaki, O., Yamaguchi, S., Sogabe, M., Saito, Y., Nakagawa,
- 416 S., Togashi, K., Suzuki, K., and Y. Nagamine. 2013. Genetic correlations between milk

- 417 production traits and somatic cell scores on test day within and across first and second lactations
- 418 in Holstein cows. Livest Sci. 152:120-126.

Year of birth	Animals (n)
1963 - 1980	38
1981-1990	245
1991-2000	816
2001	118
2002	126
2003	148
2004	196
2005	179
2006	169
2007	196
2008	238
2009	269
2010	318
2011	336
2012	427
2013	859
2014	1048
2015	790
2016	389
2017	265
2018	76

**Table 1.** Distribution of genotyped animals by birth year.

**Table 2**. Heritability (diagonal), phenotypic (above diagonal) and genetic (below diagonal)

	Calving interval	Milk yield	Fat yield	Protein yield
Calving interval	0.09±0.02	0.17	0.15	0.16
Milk yield	$0.64 \pm 0.02$	$0.26 \pm 0.02$	0.88	0.96
Fat yield	$0.63 \pm 0.02$	$0.86 \pm 0.01$	$0.25 \pm 0.02$	0.89
Protein yield	$0.56 \pm 0.02$	$0.95 \pm 0.01$	$0.90 \pm 0.01$	$0.22 \pm 0.02$

424 correlation for calving interval and production traits using a 4-trait model.

**Table 3**. Heritability, repeatability, and correlations (phenotypic and genetic) for calving interval and

			Correlation	
	Heritability	Repeatability	Phenotypic	Genetic
Calving interval	$0.05 \pm 0.01$	0.11±0.01	-0.05	0.25±0 <mark>.03</mark>
Lactation persistency	$0.11 \pm 0.01$	$0.20\pm0.01$		

428 lactation persistency using the two-trait model.

# FIGURE CAPTION

Figure 1. Average shape for the lactation curve using quartiles of the second principal component
(PC2) that is associated with lactation persistency. Each curve is made using the average value of
milk production (kg/day) of all animals belonging to the first (Class1), second (Class2), third
(Class3), and fourth (Class4) quartile of PC2.

