

# Improving single-step genomic prediction reliabilities for clinical mastitis in Nordic Red dairy cattle and Jersey by applying marker-specific weights

A. Chegini<sup>1</sup>, I. Strandén<sup>1</sup>, E. Karaman<sup>2</sup>, T. Iso-Touru<sup>1</sup>, J. Pösö<sup>3</sup>, G.P. Aamand<sup>4</sup>, M. H. Lidauer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke)

<sup>2</sup>Aarhus University, Denmark

<sup>3</sup>Faba co-op, Finland

<sup>4</sup>Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation, Denmark

# Introduction

- In standard single-step genomic prediction equal SNP marker weights are assumed
- The true state may deviate from this assumption
- Markers may be in the range of influential genes or in proximity with them
- It has been suggested to consider SNP marker-specific weights in genomic prediction

## Hypothesis

If SNP marker weighting is beneficial, it might be more pronounced in low heritable traits and traits having large QTLs

# Objectives

- Applying SNP marker-specific weights in single-step genomic prediction and comparing it to standard single-step genomic prediction
- Testing with real data
  - Model and data of the Nordic udder health evaluation

# Data

- Breed-specific evaluations that include observations for clinical mastitis, test-day somatic cell score, and conformation traits
- Data from Denmark, Finland and Sweden that were recorded since 1980
- Nordic Red dairy cattle (RDC)
  - 75 million records from 5.6 million cows
- Jersey (JER)
  - 17 million records from 0.9 million cows

# Trait definition

## Clinical mastitis (CM) traits:

CM11: -15 to 50 days in milk, first lactation.

CM12: 51 to 305 days in milk, first lactation.

CM2: -15 to 150 days in milk, second lactation.

CM3: -15 to 150 days in milk, third lactation.

## Correlated traits:

- 3 somatic cell score (SCS) traits: 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> lactation test-day observations (transformed to logarithmic scale).
- fore udder attachment (UA): 1<sup>st</sup> lactation.
- udder depth (UD): 1<sup>st</sup> lactation.

# Summary statistics of studied traits

Trait	RDC			JER		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
<b>CM11</b>	4,791,842	0.06	0.25	601,988	0.14	0.35
<b>CM12</b>	4,641,064	0.06	0.24	590,198	0.11	0.31
<b>CM2</b>	3,452,089	0.11	0.31	427,327	0.14	0.34
<b>CM3</b>	2,246,733	0.14	0.35	287,409	0.16	0.37
<b>SCS1</b>	29,944,467	4.05	1.19	7,317,581	4.44	1.09
<b>SCS2</b>	20,997,798	4.41	1.28	5,100,038	4.67	1.19
<b>SCS3</b>	12,978,293	4.63	1.30	3,301,183	4.84	1.23
<b>UA</b>	1,161,944	5.58	1.36	307,635	5.47	1.17
<b>UD</b>	1,160,324	5.62	1.66	307,634	5.39	1.12

# Genotype data

- Only genotypes from individual born after 2008 were used, leaving **64,777** and **125,789** genotyped JER and RDC, respectively
- 41,897 and 46,914 SNPs for JER and RDC, respectively



# Genomic prediction model

- Multiple-trait random regression model (9 traits)
- Same effects as in the official evaluation model (Negussie et al., 2010)
- Additive genetic effects are modelled by covariance functions
- An animal's breeding values are modelled by 12 random regression coefficients which correspond to the 12 largest eigenvalues of the originally estimated additive genetic (co)variance matrix
- Single-step SNPBLUP for models with marker-specific weights
- Residual polygenic proportion: 10%

# SNP marker weights

Own set of weights for each trait  $j$  (eigenvalue)

## Weighting scenarios

### 1. Nonlinear:

$$w_{jk} = 1.25 \frac{|\hat{u}_{jk}|}{\text{sd}(\hat{u}_j)^2}, \quad (\text{VanRaden, 2008; Cole et al., 2009})$$

### 2. $2pq\hat{u}^2$ :

$$w_{jk} = 2p_k q_k \hat{u}_{jk}^2, \quad (\text{Falconer \& Mackay, 1996})$$

### 3. **20SNP-window**:

Averaging the  $2pq\hat{u}^2$  weights of 20 adjacent SNP markers  
(Zhang et al., 2016)

# Model validation

- Validation method: Legarra & Reverter, 2018
- Reduced data: last four years of data were removed
- Validation group:
  - Bulls with  $ERC = 0.0$  in reduced data and  $ERC \geq 2.0$  in full data
  - Cows with  $ERC = 0.0$  in reduced data and  $ERC \geq 0.9$  in full data
- Validation traits: combined breeding values for CM and SCS
  - Weighting of traits:
    - CM combined (0.15, 0.15, 0.25, 0.45)
    - SCS combined (0.30, 0.25, 0.45)

# Validation results (Legarra & Reverter)

## Clinical mastitis

Breed	Sex	N	Weight	$b_0$	$b_1$	$R^2$	gain%
RDC	Male (Female)	86 (8440)	Standard ssGBLUP	0.002 (0.005)	0.75 (0.87)	0.50 (0.74)	-
			Nonlinear	0.001 (0.005)	0.73 (0.85)	0.51 (0.74)	2.0 (1.1)
			$2pq\hat{u}^2$	0.001 (0.003)	0.68 (0.79)	0.57 (0.78)	13.8 (5.3)
			20SNP-window	0.0004 (0.005)	0.70 (0.85)	0.49 (0.75)	-1.6 (1.8)
JER	Male (Female)	115 (8224)	Standard ssGBLUP	0.013 (0.010)	0.78 (0.89)	0.65 (0.72)	-
			Nonlinear	0.015 (0.012)	0.77 (0.88)	0.66 (0.73)	0.5 (1.9)
			$2pq\hat{u}^2$	0.010 (0.008)	0.70 (0.79)	0.66 (0.76)	0.9 (5.3)
			20SNP-window	0.012 (0.011)	0.74 (0.87)	0.64 (0.74)	-2.4 (3.1)

# Validation results (Legarra & Reverter)

## Somatic Cell Score

Breed	Sex	N	Weight	$b_0$	$b_1$	$R^2$	gain%
RDC	Male (Female)	125 (18112)	Standard ssGBLUP	<b>3.40</b> (6.11)	<b>0.86</b> (0.97)	<b>0.58</b> (0.77)	-
			Nonlinear	<b>7.40</b> (6.84)	<b>0.83</b> (0.94)	<b>0.60</b> (0.78)	<b>2.6</b> (0.6)
			$2pq\hat{u}^2$	<b>7.21</b> (5.82)	<b>0.77</b> (0.87)	<b>0.64</b> (0.79)	<b>11.1</b> (2.3)
			20SNP-window	<b>6.66</b> (6.63)	<b>0.82</b> (0.94)	<b>0.59</b> (0.78)	<b>2.5</b> (1.0)
JER	Male (Female)	119 (6537)	Standard ssGBLUP	<b>8.17</b> (8.43)	<b>0.81</b> (0.97)	<b>0.61</b> (0.79)	-
			Nonlinear	<b>7.80</b> (8.43)	<b>0.80</b> (0.96)	<b>0.63</b> (0.80)	<b>2.7</b> (0.9)
			$2pq\hat{u}^2$	<b>4.06</b> (5.71)	<b>0.70</b> (0.87)	<b>0.65</b> (0.81)	<b>5.4</b> (2.8)
			20SNP-window	<b>7.55</b> (7.66)	<b>0.80</b> (0.95)	<b>0.64</b> (0.80)	<b>4.0</b> (1.3)

# Conclusions

- SNP marker-specific weighting
  - improved bias and prediction reliability
  - but not dispersion
- Gain was higher in RDC than JER

# BovReg *PARTNERS*



*Thank you for your attention*

[www.bovregproject.eu](http://www.bovregproject.eu)



*This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 815668*

Disclaimer: the sole responsibility of this presentation lies with the authors. The Research Executive Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.