The impact of quantitative genetics on productive, reproductive and adaptive traits in beef cattle

LV Cundiff

US Meat Animal Research Center, Agricultural Research Service, US Department of Agriculture, Clay Center, Nebraska USA

Introduction

Efficiency of beef production has been impacted greatly by implementation of genetic evaluation procedures that have increased accuracy and effectiveness of selection and by use of crossbreeding or composite populations to exploit heterosis and match genetic potential with the climaticenvironment,feed resources, and consumer preferences for lean tender beef products. The impact of improved genetic evaluation procedures and the impact of experimentation with beef cattle on choice of breeds and breeding systems used to improve productive, product quality, reproductive, and adaptive traits in beef cattle will be the focus of this review.

Genetic Improvement Within Breeds

Expected progeny differences (EPDs) have provided the beef industry with an effective tool to impact genetic improvement in beef cattle. Genetic trends in EPDs for birth weight, direct and maternal components of weaning weight and yearling weight are shown in figures 1-6 for six breeds that play a prominent role in beef production in North America. In the 1960's genetic evaluation were based on estimated breeding values (EBVs) computed within herds. Widespread use and acceptance of artificial insemination in the 1970's provided for multi-herd comparisons which paved the way for use of best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) methodology (Henderson, 1975) and reduced animal model estimation procedures (Pollak and Quass, 1983) to compute EPDs. Accuracy of estimates were greater for EPDs than EBVs and rate of genetic change for growth traits was increased by the mid to late 1970's in most breeds (e.g., Hereford genetic trends, figure 2) as a result of increased use of AI and improved genetic evaluation procedures. More recently effectiveness of genetic evaluations have been improved by use of multi-trait genetic evaluations (BIF, 2002). Multi-breed genetic evaluations (Pollak and Quaas, 2005) have also been an important development in genetic evaluations, especially for producers of F1 seedstock or composite breeds.

The EPD technology has had a much greater impact on growth traits than other traits, primarily

because growth traits have been recorded for more animals over a longer period of time. Genetic trend slopes for weaning and yearling weights have been steeper in British breeds (Angus and Hereford) than in Continental-European breeds (Charolais, Limousin, Gelbvieh and Simmental), an indication that the latter have exerted more selection pressure on calving ease or against birth weight. Genetic trends for calving ease EPDs have been significant for Simmental and Gelbvieh because they were introduced by these breeds much earlier than by other breeds. Hereford, Red Angus, and Limousin have published calving ease EPDs in recent years. Most breeds have relied solely on use of birth weight EPDs as the basis for genetic improvement in calving ease.

By the mid-1990's EPDs for scrotal circumference were included in genetic evaluations by the Hereford and Limousin breeds and they have been included in more recent genetic evaluations by Angus, South Devon, Charolais, Gelbvieh, Salers, and Beefmaster. Some breeds have introduced EPDs for stayability (Red Angus, Salers and Gelbvieh), docility (Limousin, Salers), mature weight (Angus, Simmental, and Salers), and mature height (Angus, Limousin) in recent years.

The EPDs for carcass traits were introduced in the late 1990's. Records on carcass traits were sparse, so EPDs were not available for many bulls. However, with development and increased use of ultrasound estimates for ribeye area, fat thickness and intramuscular fat (marbling) estimates of EPDs for fat thickness, ribeye area and marbling have been provided for at least three years by 11 breeds (Angus, Red Angus, Hereford, Shorthorn, Limousin, Simmental, Charolais, Gelbvieh, Maine Anjou, Salers, and Brangus). In a recent analysis (Van Vleck and Cundiff, unpublished), we estimated coefficients of regression for carcass traits in steers (n = 2,602) produced in our Germplasm Evaluation Program at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center (MARC) on EPDs for their sires (402 sires) from 2005 genetic evaluations of these 11 breeds. Regression coefficients of 1.07 + 17 for marbling, 2.8 + .35 for fat thickness, and 0.88 + 0.19for ribeye area suggest that EPDs can predict with reasonable precision variation in carcass traits



Figure 1. Angus Genetic Trends, EPDs



Figure 2. Hereford Genetic Trends, EPDs



Figure 3. Genetic Trend in Limousin



Figure 4. Genetic Trend in Charolais









of steers fed and managed to relatively heavy slaughter weights (mean = 590 kg) and degrees of fatness (means of 1.08 cm for fat thickness) typical of commercial production systems in the U.S. It is not surprising that the regression coefficient for fat thickness (2.8) was greater than unity since the EPDs were based primarily on ultrasound estimates taken in seedstock herds on yearling bulls or yearling heifers developed for use as replacements. We are encouraged by these results indicating that significant progress can be made by use of EPDs for carcass traits based primarily upon live animal ultrasound estimation of marbling, fat thickness, and ribeye area.

Heterosis

Experiments conducted in the 1970's demonstrated effects of heterosis increase production per cow about 20-25% in crosses of Bos taurus breeds (e.g., Cundiff et al., 1974). More than half of this advantage was dependent on use of crossbred cows. We have repeated comparison of Hereford X Angus reciprocal crosses to straightbred Hereford and Angus cows in Cycles II, IV, and VII of the Germplasm Evaluation Program at MARC and results have continued to be very similar to these earlier results. Results from experiments Bos indicus X Bos taurus breed crosses have found even higher levels of heterosis, increasing production per cow at least 50% (Cartwright et al., 1964; Koger et al., 1975; Crocket et al., 1978, Peacock et al., 1979). Effects of heterosis increase production per cow about 20 to 25 percent in Bos taurus crosses (e.g., Angus X Hereford) and at least 50 percent in Bos indicus X Bos taurus breed crosses (e.g., Brahman X Shorthorn). Significant levels of heterosis are maintained by rotational systems of crossbreeding (Gregory and Cundiff, 1980) or by use of composite populations founded from crosses of two or more Bos taurus breeds (Koch, et al., 1985; Gregory et al, 1991; 1999). Results from experiments involving Bos taurus breed crosses have indicated that heterosis is retained proportional to heterozygosity with either rotational crossing systems or in composite populations, as expected from dominance model predictions of heterosis.

Experimental evidence concerning heterosis retention in inter se mated Bos indicus X Bos taurus breed crosses has been mixed and not as conclusive. Results from rotational crossing experiments conducted in Texas (Cartwright et al., 1964); Louisiana (Turner and McDonald, 1969; McDonald and Turner, 1972; Boston et al., 1969), and Florida (Koger et al., 1975; Peacock and Koger, 1979) are consistent with expectations that heterosis was proportional to heterozygosity and expectations from dominance model predictions. However, results reported by Arthur et al. (1999) indicate that weaning weight declined significantly in advanced generation Brahman-Hereford rotational crosses due to significant negative epistatic effects. Sanders et al. (2005b) reported results from an experiment comparing Brahman X Hereford and Brahman X Angus F1 and F2 progeny to their respective parental purebreds. Results for calf crop born, calf crop weaned, calf survival, weaning weight, and 4-year-old cow weight were mixed and not conclusive. Results indicated that more heterosis was lost in Brahman X Angus F2 cows than would be predicted from a dominance model, but that less heterosis was lost in a Brahman X Hereford F2 cows than would be predicted from a dominance model.

Breed Differences in Germplasm Evaluation Program at MARC

The Germplasm Evaluation Program at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center (MARC) has been conducted to characterize breeds of cattle for a comprehensive series of bio-economic traits. Table 1 shows the mating plan for the first eight Cycles of the GPE Program. Each Cycle has been an experiment conducted over a time span of about 10 years. Topcross performance of 37 sire breeds has been evaluated in F1 calves out of Hereford, Angus, or Composite MARC III (Composite MARC III is 1/4 each Angus, Hereford, Pinzgauer, and Red Poll) dams. Hereford and Angus sires have been used in each Cycle of the program to provide ties for analysis of data pooled over Cycles. Some of the Hereford and Angus sires used in Cycle I were repeated in Cycles II, III and IV (60'-70's sires). Later, many of the Hereford and Angus sires used for the first time in Cycle IV were repeated in Cycle V (80's sires). Similarly, many of the Brahman sires used in Cycle III (70's sires) were repeated in Cycle V and compared to a new sample of Brahman sires born in the 1980's (80's sires). As a general rule in each Cycle, about 200 progeny per sire breed were produced from artificial insemination (AI) to 20-25 sires per breed. Sires were sampled representing young herd sire prospects (non progeny tested sires) for each breed. Starting with Cycle VII, about half of the sires sampled were chosen from lists of the 50 most widely used bulls in each breed according to registrations.

Prominent Bos taurus breeds. In Cycle VII of the GPE Program (Cundiff et al., 2004), the seven most prominent beef breeds in the U.S. were evaluated, according to registrations in breed associations (National Pedigreed Livestock Council, 2005-2006). Among registrations reported, 83% were for these seven breeds: Angus, Hereford, Limousin, Simmental, Charolais, and Gelbvieh were first characterized in Cycle I and II of the GPE Program (Table 2). Red Angus was evaluated for the first time in Cycle VII. In general, management practices have been similar to those used in commercial production in the U.S. Cundiff et al.,

| Cycle I | Cycle II | Cycle III | Cycle IV | Cycle V | Cycle VI | Cycle VII | Cycle VIII |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| (1970-72) | (1973-74) | (1975-76) | (1986-90) | (1992-94) | (1997-98) | (1999-2000) | (2001 - 2002) |
| | | | <u>F1 crosses (Here</u> | ford or Angus d | ams) ^a | | |
| Hereford | Hereford | Hereford | Hereford | Hereford | Hereford | Hereford | Hereford |
| Angus | Angus D ad Dati | Angus | Angus | Angus Tt: | Angus | Angus | Angus |
| Jersey S. Devon | Red Poll Braunvieh | Branman Sahiwal | Longnorn Salers | Boran | wagyu Norwegian Red | kea Angus Limousin | brangus Beefmaster |
| Limousin | Gelbvieh | Pinzgauer | Galloway | Belgian Blue | Swedish Red&White | Charolais | Bonsmara |
| Simmental | Maine Anjou | Tarentaise | Nellore | Brahman | Friesian | Simmental | Romosinuano |
| Charolais | Chianina | | Shorthorn | Piedmontese | | Gelbvieh | |
| | | | Piedmontese | | | | |
| | | | Charolais | | | | |
| | | | Gelbvieh | | | | |
| | | | Pinzgauer | | | | |
| | 3-way crosses | <u>s out of F₁ dams</u> | | | | | |
| Hereford | Hereford | | | | | | |
| Angus | Angus | | | | | | |
| Brahman | Brangus | | | | | | |
| Devon | Santa Gertrudis | | | | | | |
| Holstein | | | | | | | |
| , , , , | | ; | : | | - - - - | | |

Table 1. Sire breeds used in Germplasm Evaluation Program at MARC

^aComposite MARC III cows (1/4 each Angus, Hereford, Red Poll and Pinzgauer) also were included in Cycles V, VI, and VII. MARC III cows completely replaced Hereford cows in Cycle VIII.

(2004) provided further details concerning management of steers and heifers and procedures used in analyses of data.

Sire breed means for preweaning traits are shown in Table 2. Sire breed means for final weight, percentage and weight of retail product, marbling score, percentage of carcasses grading USDA choice, and Warner-Bratzler shear Table 2. Breed group means for preweaning traits of calves

| Sire | No. | Calvings | Calving | Birth | 200-d |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|-------|
| breed | calves | unassist. | diff. | wt. | wt. |
| of calf | born | % | sc | kg | kg |
| | | | | | |
| Hereford | 190 | 95.6 | 1.24 | 41.0 | 237.7 |
| Angus | 189 | 99.6 | 1.01 | 38.1 | 241.9 |
| Red Angus | 206 | 99.1 | 1.06 | 38.3 | 238.7 |
| | | | | | |
| Simmental | 201 | 97.7 | 1.10 | 41.8 | 251.0 |
| Gelbvieh | 209 | 97.8 | 1.10 | 40.2 | 242.2 |
| | | | | | |
| Limousin | 200 | 97.6 | 1.13 | 40.6 | 235.3 |
| Charolais | 199 | 92.8 | 1.40 | 42.5 | 245.0 |
| | | | | | |
| LSD < .05 | | 3.6 | .21 | 1.5 | 6.4 |
| | | | | | |

estimates of tenderness for longissimus steaks are shown in Table 3. Sire breed means for estimates for postweaning efficiency of live weight gain (gain, g/Mcal feed intake) of steers for time (0 to 187 days), weight (340 to 590 kg), fat thickness (0 days to 1.1 cm fat thickness), marbling (0 days to Small00 marbling), percentage fat trim (0 days to 24.8% fat trim), and retail product weight (0 days to 225 kg retail product) intervals of evaluation are shown in Table 4. Sire breed means for 400-day weight, 550-day weight, 18-month height, frame score, age at puberty, and pregnancy rate (%) of females are shown in Table 5. Sire breed means for percentage calf crop born and weaned per cow exposed, calving difficulty score, percentage unassisted births, birth weight, and 200-day weaning weight of progeny produced by the F1 females with MARC III sired calves produced at 2 years of age are presented in Table 6. Sire breed means for percentage calf crop born and weaned per cow exposed, calving difficulty score, percentage unassisted births, birth weight, and 200-day weaning weight of progeny produced by the F1 females at 3 – 6 years of age are shown in Table 7. Sire breed means for height, condition score (1 for very thin to 9 for very fat), weight, and weight adjusted for conditions score of the F1 females at 5 years of age are shown in Table 8. The mean least significant difference (LSD < .05) shown for each trait can be used to assess specific sire breed contrasts (sire within sire breed mean square was used as the error term).

Angus and Red Angus sired calves require less assistance at calving than those by other British or Continental-European sire breeds (Table 2). Even so, calving ease has improved significantly for calves sired by Continental-European breeds, especially Simmental and Gelbvieh, relative to those by British breeds since the Continental-European breeds were first introduced into the U.S. Sire breed of calf differences for birth weight between Continental-European and British breeds are less than half as great in recent years as they were 30 years earlier. Sire breed of dam differences for calving ease and birth weight for 2-year-old first calf heifers progeny (Table 7) were not significant, reflecting significant improvement in calving ease for Continental breeds relative to British breeds over a 30 year period. Simmental has made the most improvement in calving ease for 2-year-old first calf heifers. In Cycle I, Simmental sired 2-yearold females required 6% more assistance than Hereford-Angus reciprocal crosses. In Cycle VII, Simmental sired 2-year-olds required 11% less assistance than Hereford and Angus sired crosses. These results, suggest that Continental-European breeds have emphasized selection for components of calving ease relatively more than British breeds during this time span.

Steer progeny of British and Continental-European sire breeds did not differ in postweaning average daily gain or final slaughter weight at 445 days of age (Table 3). In evaluations conducted 30 years earlier, Continental-European sire breeds had significantly faster average daily gains and were 1-3 standard deviations heavier at yearling ages than British breeds (Cundiff et al., 1986). Similarly, heifers by British and Continental-European sire breeds did not differ in 400-day and 550-day weights (Table 5). These results, are consistent with slopes for genetic trends for yearling weight reported by breed association for these breeds (figures 1-6) indicating that selection emphasis for growth rate to weaning and yearling ages has been emphasized more in British breeds than in Continental-European breeds during the past 30 years.

Although, steers progeny of British and Continental-European sire breeds did not differ significantly in live weight at 445 days, Continental-European sire breeds still produced progeny with significantly heavier retail product (15 kg) due to higher retail product yields (3.9%) than British sire breeds (Table 3). Steers by British sire breeds had significantly greater marbling and a higher percentage of carcasses grading USDA

| Sire breed | N | Final wt kg | Re pro % | etail duct kg | Marb- ling sc | USDA Choice % | WB shear kg |
|---------------|----|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 97 | 599.6 | 60.7 | 217.8 | 526 | 65.4 | 4.12 |
| Angus | 98 | 619.3 | 59.2 | 221.3 | 584 | 87.6 | 4.02 |
| Red Angus | 93 | 604.7 | 59.1 | 215.1 | 590 | 89.9 | 4.15 |
| Simmental | 92 | 617.9 | 63.0 | 237.0 | 527 | 65.7 | 4.30 |
| Gelbvieh | 90 | 595.0 | 63.8 | 231.1 | 506 | 57.7 | 4.51 |
| Limousin | 84 | 583.0 | 637 | 228 5 | 504 | 56.9 | 4 31 |
| Charolais | 95 | 611.2 | 63.5 | 237.3 | 517 | 61.9 | 4.34 |
| LSD < .05 | | 18.4 | 1.3 | 7.3 | 28 | 10.7 | .31 |

 Table 3. Sire breed means for final weight and carcass traits of F1 steers (445 days)

Choice than those by Continental-European sire breeds. Results indicate that differences between Continental-European and British breeds for carcass composition, marbling, and tenderness remain nearly as great today as they were 30 years ago (Cundiff et al., 1986), a result that is not surprising because EPDs have only recently been introduced for carcass traits and results have shown that correlated response for carcass composition or marbling to selection for growth is low (e.g., Koch et al., 2004).

As a result of these relative changes in growth rate, British and Continental-European breeds no longer differ significantly in efficiency of postweaning live weight gain (gain, kg/Mcal metabolizable energy consumed) to age or weight end-points (Table 4). In Cycles I and II, steers by Continental-European sire breeds were significantly more efficient than those by British sire breeds, especially to weight end-points (Cundiff et al., 1986). However, to fatness end-points (1.1 cm fat thickness, 25% carcass fat trim, or small00 marbling), progeny by British sire breeds were still significantly more efficient than those by Continental-European sire (e.g., Simmental and Gelbvieh), still produce females that reach puberty at younger ages than those that have not been selected for milk production (Limousin, Charolais, Hereford, Angus or Red Angus) much as they did 30 years earlier (Cundiff et al., 1986).

Differences among sire breeds for F1 daughters percentage calf crop born or weaned at 2 years of age (Table 6) or at 3 – 6 years of age

(Table 7) were not significant in recent or earlier evaluations (Cundiff et al., 1986). Weaning weights of progeny of F1 daughters are still greater for Simmental and Gelbvieh, that have had a history of selection for milk production, than for those by Charolais, Limousin, Angus, Red Angus, Hereford that were never used for dual purpose dairy and beef production (Tables 6 and 7). However, magnitude of contrasts for direct and maternal components of weaning weight between Continental-European and British breeds are less than half as great in the current evaluations as those 30 years earlier (Cundiff et al., 1986).

Recent estimates indicate that Continental-European and British breeds do not differ significantly in estimates of cow weight or height at 5 years of age, with one exception Gelbvieh are significantly lighter than females by other sire breeds. Results indicate that the reduced cow weight for Gelbvieh is associated with strong negative genetic trends for birth weight in the Gelbvieh breed, contrasted to slightly positive or null genetic trends for birth weight in other breeds.

breeds just as they were 30 years earlier. Also, to a weight of retail product end point (0 days 225 kg), progen by Continenta European si breeds were sti significantly more efficient tha those by Britis sire breeds.

Breeds that have had a long history of selection for milk production

| Table 4. | Feed efficiency (live weight gain, g/Mcal) for alternative |
|----------|--|
| | intervals and endpoints |

| | | Weight | | Marb- | | Retail |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | change | Fat | ling | Fat | prod. |
| Sire | Time | 340 to | thick. | score | trim | wt. |
| breed | 187d | 590 kg | 1.1 cm | Small 00 | 24.8% | 225 kg |
| | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 59.2 | 57.8 | 60.5 | 58.5 | 60.4 | 57.0 |
| Angus | 56.6 | 56.1 | 59.5 | 61.0 | 59.8 | 55.1 |
| Red Angus | 55.7 | 54.5 | 57.8 | 60.3 | 58.5 | 52.6 |
| | | | | | | |
| Simmental | 57.4 | 57.6 | 55.6 | 56.7 | 55.9 | 60.3 |
| Gelbvieh | 55.4 | 54.5 | 53.8 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 56.5 |
| | | | | | | |
| Limousin | 58.1 | 55.8 | 56.4 | 55.5 | 56.6 | 59.0 |
| Charolais | 54.5 | 54.5 | 52.2 | 53.1 | 52.5 | 57.4 |
| LSD < .05 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 4.2 |
| | Sire breed Hereford Angus Red Angus Simmental Gelbvieh Limousin Charolais LSD < .05 | SireTimebreed $187d$ Hereford 59.2 Angus 56.6 Red Angus 55.7 Simmental 57.4 Gelbvieh 55.4 Limousin 58.1 Charolais 54.5 LSD < .05 | Weight changeSireTime 340 to 590 kgHereford $187d$ 590 kgHereford 59.2 57.8 56.6 Angus 56.6 56.1 Red AngusRed Angus 55.7 54.5 Simmental 57.4 57.6 Gelbvieh 55.4 54.5 Limousin 58.1 54.5 55.8 54.5 LSD < .05 | Weight changeSireTime340 toFatbreed187d590 kg1.1 cmHereford59.257.860.5Angus56.656.159.5Red Angus55.754.557.8Simmental57.457.655.6Gelbvieh55.454.553.8Limousin58.155.856.4Charolais54.554.552.2LSD < .05 | Weight changeMarb- lingSireTime340 tothick.scorebreed187d590 kg1.1 cmSmall 00Hereford59.257.860.558.5Angus56.656.159.561.0Red Angus55.754.557.860.3Simmental57.457.655.656.7Gelbvieh55.454.553.853.6Limousin58.155.856.455.5Charolais54.554.552.253.1LSD < .05 | Weight changeMarb- lingSireTime 340 tothick.scorebreed $187d$ 590 kg 1.1 cmSmall 00 24.8% Hereford 59.2 57.8 60.5 58.5 60.4 Angus 56.6 56.1 59.5 61.0 59.8 Red Angus 55.7 54.5 57.8 60.3 58.5 Simmental 57.4 57.6 55.6 56.7 55.9 Gelbvieh 55.4 54.5 53.8 53.6 53.6 Limousin 58.1 55.8 56.4 55.5 56.6 Charolais 54.5 54.5 52.2 53.1 52.5 LSD < .05 |

Australian Beef - the Leader Conference

These results are consistent with preliminary results from a selection experiment at MARC, in which response selection for lighter to birth weight and heavier yearling weight, reduced birth weight and mature cow weight significantly while yearling weight was increased (G. L. Bennett, personal communication). The lack of differences among breeds for cow weight and height, contrast sharply with comparisons made 30 years earlier when

| Table 5. Sire Breed Least Squares Means for Growth and Pu | uberty Traits of |
|---|------------------|
| Heifers in Cycle VII of the GPE Program (1999-2000 Ca | alf Crops) |

| Sire | | 400-d | 550-day | 18-mo | Frame | Age | Preg. |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------|-------|-------|---------|-------|
| breed of | | wt. | wt. | ht. | score | at | rate |
| female | No. | kg | kg | cm | sc | puberty | % |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 81 | 381.5 | 430.9 | 128.4 | 5.5 | 342 | 94 |
| Angus | 85 | 394.2 | 424.5 | 127.2 | 5.3 | 340 | 88 |
| Red Angus | 106 | 393.7 | 432.5 | 126.9 | 5.2 | 339 | 91 |
| Simmental | 103 | 385 3 | 435.8 | 130.2 | 59 | 335 | 90 |
| Gelbvieh | 111 | 366.1 | 418.4 | 128.8 | 5.6 | 322 | 83 |
| Limousin | 109 | 373.6 | 423.3 | 129.9 | 5.8 | 363 | 87 |
| Charolais | 103 | 375.4 | 430.7 | 129.5 | 5.8 | 348 | 91 |
| LSD <u><</u> .05 | | 14.0 | 14.7 | 1.6 | .3 | 15 | 13 |
| | | | | | | | |

cows by Continental-European sire breeds were on average 2.3 cm taller and about 15 kg heavier than those by British sire breeds (Arango et al., 2004a,b).

Adaptation to Temperate and Subtropical Environments

In choosing breeds for a specific production system it is very important to consider climatic adaptation of breeds. Frisch and Vercoe (1978) and Utech et al., (1978) have documented the advantages of using Bos indicus X Bos taurus crosses (e.g., Brahmans X Shorthorn or Brahman X Hereford) to cope with ticks, gastrointestinal helminthes, high ambient temperature, solar radiation, and nutritional stress in a tropical environment. Use of some tropically adapted germplasm is also important in subtropical climates (e.g., Cartwright et al., 1964; Koger et al., 1975; Thrift and Thrift, 2005). In a cooperative effort between the Subtropical Agricultural Research Station, (ARS, USDA and the University of Florida), Brooksville, Florida and MARC, weaning weight per cow exposed was significantly greater for the Bos indicus X Bos taurus F1 crosses (Brahman X Hereford, Brahman X Angus, Sahiwal X Hereford, Sahiwal X Angus) than for the Bos taurus X Bos taurus F1 crosses

(Hereford X Angus, Angus X Hereford, Pinzgauer X Hereford, Pinzgauer X Angus) at both locations, but the advantage was especially large in Florida (Olson et al., 1991). Results at MARC have also indicated that cow efficiency (pounds of calf gain per unit of feed consumed by the cow and calf), estimated during lactation in summer months, was exceptional for Bos indicus X Bos taurus relative to Hereford X Angus crosses (Green et al., 1991), which were in turn relatively efficient compared to other Bos taurus X Bos taurus crosses (Jenkins et al, 1991). Reproduction rate, weaning weight per cow exposed and cow efficiency is outstanding in Bos indicus X Bos taurus F1 crosses, especially in subtropical climatic environments, but their advantages are tempered by older age at puberty and reduced meat tenderness as the proportion of Bos indicus increases (Crouse et al., 1989). Concerns about meat quality and reproduction rate at young ages have prompted introduction and evaluation of other tropically adapted germplasm in cooperative research efforts involving the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center (MARC) and research stations in subtropical regions of the U.S. (i.e., Texas, Oklahoma, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana). Recently a bulletin including 24 reports summarizing results from this cooperative research effort has been published (Southern

 Table 6. Sire Breed Means for Reproduction and Maternal Traits of

 F1 Females Producing Their First Calves at

 2 Years of Age (2001 and 2002)

| | | | B - (| | , | | |
|-----------|-----|------|--------------|---------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Sire | | Calf | crop | Calving | Unassist. | Birth | 200-d wt |
| breed | | born | wnd. | diff. | births | wt | per calf |
| of female | No. | % | % | score | % | kg | kg |
| Harafard | 80 | 02 | 70 | 1.0 | 74 | 27.0 | 107 / |
| Herefold | 80 | 92 | 70 | 1.9 | 74 | 57.0 | 10/.4 |
| Angus | 84 | 83 | 76 | 2.0 | 72 | 36.2 | 192.2 |
| Red Angus | 104 | 86 | 76 | 2.2 | 68 | 35.5 | 188.1 |
| Simmental | 98 | 86 | 69 | 1.5 | 86 | 36.1 | 200.3 |
| Gelbvieh | 109 | 79 | 68 | 2.2 | 64 | 37.9 | 202.9 |
| Limousin | 109 | 85 | 73 | 2.0 | 68 | 36.4 | 194.7 |
| Charolais | 97 | 87 | 73 | 2.1 | 69 | 37.0 | 195.2 |
| LSD < .05 | | 14 | 15 | .6 | 19 | 2.0 | 9.5 |

Cooperative Series Bulletin 405).

Tropically adapted breeds in the GPE Program. In Cycle V of the Germplasm Evaluation Program at MARC (Table 12), tropically adapted Tuli, Boran and Brahman sire breeds were evaluated relative to Hereford and Angus crosses (Cundiff et al., 2000). Semen from nine Tuli bulls and eight Boran bulls was imported from Australia for use in the experiment. Results for preweaning traits;

| Sire | | Calf | crop | Calving | Unassist. | Birth | 200-d wt |
|-----------|------|------|------|---------|-----------|-------|----------|
| breed | No. | born | wnd. | diff. | births | wt | calf |
| of female | rec. | % | % | score | % | kg | kg |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 244 | 94 | 91 | 1.16 | 96.9 | 43.0 | 233.1 |
| Angus | 241 | 95 | 89 | 1.03 | 98.4 | 41.2 | 239.0 |
| Red Angus | 288 | 89 | 85 | 1.19 | 96.4 | 40.7 | 234.8 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Simmental | 294 | 90 | 87 | 1.02 | 98.9 | 41.8 | 249.4 |
| Gelbvieh | 305 | 90 | 86 | 1.11 | 97.8 | 42.3 | 248.8 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Limousin | 303 | 95 | 91 | 1.06 | 98.7 | 42.3 | 240.1 |
| Charolais | 293 | 90 | 86 | 1.30 | 94.5 | 42.7 | 243.9 |
| | | | | | | | |
| LSD < .05 | | 7 | 8 | .21 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 8.7 |

 Table 7. Sire Breed Means for Reproduction and Maternal Traits of

 F1 Females Producing Calves at 3-6 Years of Age (2002-2005)

slaughter weight, carcass and meat traits; growth and puberty traits of heifers; and reproduction and maternal performance for F1 produced in Cycle V of the GPE Program are summarized in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively. Performance of Nellore crosses, also shown in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 were estimated by adding the deviation of Nellore crosses from Hereford and Angus crosses produced in Cycle IV (Wheeler et al., 1996; Wheeler et al., 1997; Cundiff et al., 1998; Thallman et al., 1999) to the mean of Hereford and Angus crosses produced in Cycle V (The least significant differences between Nellore crosses and other breeds can be approximated by multiplying 1.5 times the least significant difference shown in Tables 9 through 12 for Cycle V contrasts).

Results indicate that Tuli sired steers had carcass (marbling) and meat (tenderness) characteristics more similar to progeny sired by British Bos taurus breeds (i.e., Hereford and Angus) than to progeny sired by Bos indicus breeds (i.e., Brahman or Boran). However, Tuli crosses had relatively low weaning weights (Table 9) and final slaughter weights compared to other breeds. Performance of Nellore crosses was comparable to that of current Brahman crosses for preweaning and postweaning growth rate, weight and percentage of retail product.

Tuli and Boran crosses were significantly younger at puberty and had higher percentages of calf crop weaned as 2-year-olds than Brahman crosses (Table 11). However, at three through seven years of age, percentages of calf crop weaned did not differ among Nellore, Brahman, Boran and Tuli sired females (Table 12). At all ages, maternal weaning weight (200 day weight per calf) was greater for Nellore and Brahman than Boran sired F1 cross females which were in turn greater than Tuli sired F1 cross females. Tuli germplasm may be useful to replace a portion of Bos indicus breeding and maintain tropical adaptation without detrimental effects on meat tenderness, provided they are crossed with other breeds that optimize size and growth rate.

Resultsfromcooperative research efforts at research stations located in subtropical regions of the U.S. including Brooksville, Florida (Chase et al., 2005); McGregor, Texas (Sanders et al., 2005a); Uvalde, Texas (Holloway et al. 2005); and El Reno, Oklahoma (Phillips et al., 2005) for Tuli, Boran, and Brahman crosses have been similar to our results at MARC for growth traits, carcass

and meat traits, and reproduction and maternal performance of F1 cross cows. Holloway et al. (2005) reported further that mature cow weights were significantly lighter for Tuli than Brahman crosses, and had greater efficiency of production as estimated by weight of calf weaned per unit of cow weight exposed to breeding.

In Cycle VIII of the GPE Program Brangus, Beefmaster, Bonsmara, and Romosinuano are being evaluated relative to Hereford and Angus crosses (Wheeler et al., 2006). Brangus and Beefmaster were included in Cycle VIII because they are prominent breeds used extensively in subtropical regions of the U.S., ranking 7th and 8th in registrations among beef breeds and 1st and 2nd among tropically adapted breeds in the U.S. (National Pedigreed Livestock Council, 2005-2006). Brangus is an American composite breed with 62.5% Angus and 37.5% Brahman inheritance. Beefmaster is an American composite with about 50% Brahman, 25% Hereford, and 25% Shorthorn Bonsmara is a composite breed inheritance. developed in South Africa with 50% Africaner (an African Sanga breed), 25% Hereford, and 25% Shorthorn inheritance. Semen was used from 19 Bonsmara bulls. The Romosinuano breed was developed primarily in Colombia and introduced into the U.S. from Venezuela at the Subtropical Agricultural Research Station (STARS), ARS, USDA and the University of Florida, Brooksville, FL. The Romosinuano is a Criollo (domestic) breed of Central America that traces back to Bos taurus cattle introduced from Europe about 400 to 500 years ago. Semen from 20 Romosinuano bulls was used. Estimates of sire breed means averaged over Angus and MARC III dams are shown in Table 13 for preweaning traits; Table 14 for slaughter weight, carcass and meat traits; Table 15 for female growth and puberty traits; and Table 16 for reproduction and maternal performance of cows.

| Breed | Number cows | Five-yr-old height, cm | Five-yr-old cond. sc. | Five- Wei | year-old ght ^a , kg |
|-----------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Hereford | 56 | 135.4 | 7.00 | 679 | (677) |
| Angus | 62 | 134.4 | 7.22 | 681 | (673) |
| Red Angus | 68 | 134.4 | 7.40 | 685 | (672) |
| Simmental | 70 | 137.4 | 6.98 | 669 | (671) |
| Gelbvieh | 68 | 135.0 | 6.77 | 627 | (634) |
| Limousin | 80 | 137.4 | 6.95 | 663 | (665) |
| Charoalis | 69 | 137.3 | 7.09 | 669 | (667) |
| LSD < .05 | | 0.8 | .28 | 29 | (26) |

 Table 8. Sire breed least squares means for height, condition score, and weight of F1 cows (adjusted for condition score) at 5 years of age

*P < 0.05. **P < 0.01.

^a Estimates for Hereford, Angus, and Red Angus were adjusted to the level of heterosis expected in three-way F_1 crosses (estimate of 18.9 kg was added to five-year-old weight and 16.6 kg was added to five-year-old weight adjusted for condition score).

Birth weight did not differ significantly among progeny of Bonsmara, Brangus and Hereford sires, which were significantly heavier than progeny of Angus sires. Birth weights of Romosinuano sired progeny were significantly lighter than those of any other breed except Angus. Weaning weight at 205 days was significantly heavier for progeny of Beefmaster sires than for any other sire breed, followed by Brangus and Angus, which did not differ significantly. Brangus sired progeny were significantly heavier at weaning than Hereford sired progeny. Angus, Hereford and Bonsmara sire breeds did not differ significantly in weaning weight. Romosinuano sired progeny were significantly lighter at

weaning than those of any other sire breed.

Beefmaster sired steers significantly had heavier final weights than all other breeds except Angus. Angus, Brangus, and Hereford sired steers were significantly heavier than Bonsmara steers at 426 sired davs, which were in turn significantly heavier than Romosinuano sired steers. Romosinuano and Bonsmara sired steer carcasses had significantly higher percentages of retail product than Brangus, Hereford, Beefmaster

| Table 9. Breed group means for preweaning traits of calves produced in |
|--|
| Cycle V of the GPE Program (1992-1994 Calf Crops) |

except Bonsmara.

for weight of retail product.

Romosinuano sires had significantly lower retail

product weights than those of all other sire breeds

Marbling score and percentage grading USDA

Choice or higher were significantly greater for

Angus than for any other sire breed. Carcasses

from Hereford sired steers ranked second and

had significantly greater marbling scores and

a greater percentage grading USDA Choice or

higher than those from Romosinuano, Bonsmara

and Beefmaster sired steers. Brangus ranked

| Sire | No. | Calvings | Calving | Birth | 200-d |
|---|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| breed of | calves | unassist. | diff. | wt. | wn. wt., |
| calf | born | % | score | kg | kg |
| Hereford | 334 | 97.0 | 1.17 | 42.7 | 241 |
| Angus | 313 | 98.3 | 1.06 | 41.0 | 240 |
| Brahman original ^a recent ^b | 155 281 | 93.2 88.7 | 1.39 1.58 | 45.1 47.4 | 243 246 |
| Boran | 456 | 95.7 | 1.23 | 43.3 | 229 |
| Tuli | 451 | 97.4 | 1.19 | 38.9 | 225 |
| Nellore ^c | 196 | 96.8 | | 44.4 | 247 |
| LSD < .05 | | 4.1 | 0.21 | 1.5 | 7 |

^aProgeny of sires born in 1964-1975.

^bProgeny of sires born in 1984-1989.

^cEstimated by adding deviation for Nellore crosses from 1980's Hereford-Angus crosses produced in Cycle IV (Cundiff et al., 1998) to mean of Hereford-Angus crosses in Cycle V.

and Angus sired steer carcasses. Angus sired steer carcasses had significantly lower percentages or retail product than those by any other sire breed. Estimates of weight of totally trimmed boneless retail product at 426 days of age were very similar for Beefmaster and Brangus sired carcasses and steer were significantly greater than estimates for Angus, Hereford, Bonsmara, and Romosinuano. Hereford, Angus, and Bonsmara did not differ significantly

Steer progeny of

| | | F: 1 | | | | LICDA | 14.1 |
|-----------|-----|-------|--------|---------|----------|--------|-------|
| | | Final | | | | USDA | 14-d |
| Sire | | wt. | Retail | product | Marbling | Choice | Shear |
| breed | No. | kg | % | kg | score | % | kg |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 106 | 576 | 61.9 | 204 | 520 | 70.3 | 4.8 |
| Angus | 101 | 580 | 62.2 | 206 | 556 | 84.6 | 4.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Brahman | | | | | | | |
| Original | 43 | 533 | 64.1 | 199 | 485 | 29.4 | 6.1 |
| Recent | 76 | 544 | 63.8 | 204 | 466 | 30.4 | 5.9 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Boran | 151 | 506 | 62.6 | 181 | 504 | 47.2 | 5.1 |
| Tuli | 162 | 503 | 63.4 | 184 | 525 | 63.8 | 4.6 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Nellore | 97 | 555 | 65.0 | 211 | 500 | 51.4 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| LSD < .05 | | 22 | 1.7 | 8 | 30 | 22.2 | .6 |

Table 10. Sire breed means for final weight and carcass traits of F1 steers

produced in Cycle V of the GPE Program (447 d)

^aProgeny of sires born in 1964-1975.

^bProgeny of sires born in 1984-1989.

"Estimated by adding deviation for Nellore crosses from 1980's Hereford-Angus crosses produced in Cycle IV (Cundiff et al., 1998) to mean of Hereford-Angus crosses in Cvcle V

third in marbling and percentage grading USDA Choice or higher, but did not differ significantly from Hereford or from Romosinuano, Bonsmara, or Beefmaster.

Half of the Brangus, Beefmaster, Bonsmara, and Romsinuano females being produced at MARC were transferred at about 8 months of age from MARC to Louisiana State University to evaluate Genotype-environment interactions. Data summarizing growth and puberty characteristics of females (Tables 15 and 16), are only for the heifers that remained at MARC. The Brangus, Beefmaster, Brangus, and Romosinuanosired progeny represent only about 50% of the females being evaluated in the cooperative experiment. Results for growth

of heifers are generally consistent with that of steers indicating that Beefmaster and Angus sired females had the greater growth rates to 400 days than all other sire breeds except Brangus. By 400 days, Brangus and Herefords did not differ significantly in body weight, but both were heavier than Bonsmara Romosinuano or sired females. By 18 months of age, after the summer grazing season, Beefmaster were significantly heavier than all other breeds except Brangus. Brangus sired heifers

Table 11. Sire breed means for growth and puberty traits of F₁ females produced in Cycle V of the GPE Program

| Sire | | 365-d | 18 m | onth | Puberty | Preg. |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|
| breed | | wt. | wt. | ht. | age, | rate |
| of female | No. | kg | kg | cm | days | % |
| | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 152 | 353 | 413 | 128.3 | 355 | 92.7 |
| Angus | 130 | 347 | 404 | 127.3 | 351 | 91.6 |
| D1 | 212 | 229 | 200 | 122.0 | 426 | 04.2 |
| Branman | 212 | 328 | 398 | 132.0 | 426 | 84.2 |
| Diff. (curr.) | ^a -orig. ^b) | 3 | 10** | 2.9** | -6 | 15.0* |
| Boran | 206 | 303 | 362 | 125.8 | 396 | 96.8 |
| Tuli | 244 | 302 | 357 | 125.5 | 371 | 90.2 |
| Nellore | 82 | 342 | 401 | 356 | 406 | 96.6 |
| | 02 | 542 | -01 | 550 | 100 | 70.0 |
| LSD < .05 | | 6 | 6 | 1.6 | 13 | 11.0 |

^aProgeny of sires born in 1964-1975.

^bProgeny of sires born in 1984-1989.

^cEstimated by adding deviation for Nellore crosses from 1980's Hereford-Angus crosses.

were significantly heavier at 18 months of age than Romosinuano sired females, but did not differ significantly from Hereford, Bonsmara or Angus sired females, which had similar 18-month weights. Brangus and Beefmaster sired heifers had significantly greater hip heights and frame scores at 18 months of age than Hereford, Bonsmara, Angus, or Romosinuano sired heifers. Hereford sired heifers ranked third in hip height and frame score and were significantly taller than Romsinuano sired heifers. Bonsmara, Angus and Romosinuano sired heifers did not differ in hip height or frame score at 18 months

of age. Females by Angus sires reached puberty at a significantly younger age than those by any other sire breed. Females by Romosinuano sires reached puberty at significantly older ages than females by any other sire breed except Bonsmara.

Implications

The beef industry is challenged to 1) reduce costs of production to remain competitive with meat products from other species, especially poultry and swine, 2) match genetic potential with the climate and feed resources available in diverse environments, 3) reduce fat and increase leanness of products to gain greater acceptance of consumers,

| | | | | | ¢ | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Sire breed | I | Calf crop | 2-years of age 200- | day wt. | د | to / years of 200 | age -day wt. |
| of | | weaned | per calf | per cow | Calf crop | per calf | per cow |
| female | No. | % | kg | exposed, kg | wnd., % | kg | exposed, kg |
| Hereford | 146 | 73.8 | 190.1 | 136.1 | 88.7 | 214.8 | 191.1 |
| Angus | 132 | 74.4 | 198.2 | 142.0 | 86.3 | 223.5 | 193.3 |
| Brahman | | | | | | | |
| Original | 69 | 54.3 | 206.8 | 108.0 | 85.9 | 231.9 | 199.6 |
| Current | 135 | 69.69 | 215.9 | 144.7 | 82.7 | 236.2 | 195.2 |
| Boran | 197 | 83.3 | 201.4 | 161.9 | 86.2 | 221.5 | 183.1 |
| Tuli | 235 | 74.6 | 187.3 | 134.3 | 84.1 | 213.7 | 191.1 |
| Nellore | 82 | 75.1 | 210.0 | 147.0 | 91.6 | 233.1 | 209.1 |
| LSD < .05 | | 13.9 | 8.2 | 28.1 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 16.1 |
| ^a Progeny of | sires born in | 1964-1975. | | | | | |

Table 12. Breed group means for reproduction and maternal trait of F₁ females in Cycle V of the GPE Program

^bProgeny of sires born in 1984-1989. ^cEstimated by adding deviation for Nellore crosses from 1980's Hereford-Angus crosses produced in Cycle IV (Cundiff et al., 1998) to mean of Hereford-Angus crosses in Cycle V.

 Table 13. Breed group means for preweaning traits of calves produced in Cycle VIII of the GPE Program (2001 and 2002 calf crops)

| Sire | No. | Calvings | Calv. | Birth | 200-d |
|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|----------|
| breed of | calves | unassist. | diff. | wt. | wn. wt., |
| calf | born | % | score | kg | kg |
| | | | | | - / - / |
| Hereford | 212 | 94.4 | 1.33 | 41.3 | 242.4 |
| Angus | 208 | 97.2 | 1.19 | 39.5 | 245.6 |
| Brangus | 214 | 96.9 | 1.19 | 41.0 | 248.9 |
| Beefmaster | 222 | 95.6 | 1.23 | 43.3 | 254.0 |
| Bonsmara | 207 | 97.7 | 1.10 | 41.0 | 242.0 |
| Romosinuano | 207 | 99.2 | 1.05 | 38.4 | 230.1 |
| LSD < 05 | | 3.4 | .20 | 1.4 | 4.9 |

and 4) improve palatability, tenderness, and consistency of beef products. Use of heterosis and breed differences through crossbreeding or use of composite populations, and selection of breeding stock to exploit genetic variation within breeds can all be used to help meet these challenges.

Effects of heterosis increase production per cow about 20 to 25 percent in Bos taurus breed crosses (e.g., Angus X Hereford) and at least 50 percent in Bos indicus X Bos taurus breed crosses (e.g., Brahman X Shorthorn). Significant levels of heterosis are maintained by rotational systems of crossbreeding and in composite populations. Rotational systems of crossbreeding provide for more effective use of heterosis than composite populations for any specific number of breeds. However, uniformity of cattle and greater consistency of end product can be provided for with greater precision by use of F1 seedstock or composite populations than by use of rotational crossing of pure breeds.

Results from the Germplasm Evaluation Program at MARC have provided a basis for classifying breeds into biological types (Table 17). In the table increasing X's indicate relatively greater growth rate and mature size, lean to fat ratios, marbling, beef tenderness, age at puberty of females, milk production, and tropical adaptation. Biological type classifications for growth rate and mature size are not the same today as they were 30 years ago. In the 1970's, Continental-European breeds had significantly faster growth rates and heavier body weight at weaning, yearling and mature ages. Recent results indicate that British breeds are comparable to Continental-European breeds for these traits. The advantage of Continental-European breeds over British breeds in retail product yield is about the same today as in the 1970's. However, British breeds, especially Angus, Red Angus, and Shorthorn's still excel in marbling relative to Continental-European breeds. No one breed excels in all traits of importance to beef production. Thus, crossing of two or more breeds can be used to optimize performance levels. In temperate environments, genetic potential for

retail product and marbling are more nearly optimized in cattle with 50:50 ratios than in cattle with higher or lower ratios of Continental to British inheritance.

To limit costs of production and improve efficiency of production a strong influence of tropically adapted germplasm is needed in tropical and subtropical regions of the world. In hot and humid subtropical regions such as the U.S. Gulf Coast,

cattle with 50:50 ratios of Bos indicus to Bos taurus inheritance may be optimal. A little further north (e.g., Southeastern Oklahoma, central Arkansas, Tennessee and parts of North Carolina), 25:75 ratios of Bos indicus: Bos taurus inheritance may be optimal in cow herds. In temperate climates (e.g., Nebraska), crosses with 50% or more Bos indicus inheritance suffer increased mortality when calves are born in colder seasons and reduced average daily gains in feedlots during winter months. Use of F1 Brahman cross cows, Nellore, or Boran F1 cross cows or rotational crossing of composite breeds such as Beefmaster, Brangus, Bonsmara, or Santa Gertrudis are especially appropriate in subtropical environments. In harsher tropical climates, it is possible that even more than 50% tropically adapted germplasm is required to provide for optimal performance. If replacement requirements for suitably adapted females are met and terminal crossing is feasible, then a Bos taurus breed can be used to optimize carcass and meat characteristics and increase market value of terminal cross slaughter progeny.

In developing composite populations with an overall level of 50% to 75% tropical adaptation, it may be appropriate to substitute a portion (e.g., 25%) of non Bos indicus germplasm for Bos indicus germplasm from such breeds as the Tuli, Romosinuano, or Senepole to maintain tropical adaptation and improve meat tenderness, provided they are crossed with other breeds that optimize size and growth rate. However, additional research is needed to determine optimum contributions of Bos indicus, British Bos taurus, Continental Bos taurus, tropically adapted Sanga breeds, and tropically adapted Criollo breeds from Central and South America for beef production in harsh tropical environments.

Experimental populations will be even more critical to the development of technology in the future than they have been in the past. It is very expensive and difficult to measure components of complex traits such as feed efficiency, meat tenderness and other quality attributes, disease

| | | (426 | days, 2001 an | nd 2002 calf cro | sd (sd | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|------------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | Final | | | | USDA | W-B |
| Sire | | wt. | Retail | product | Marb. | Choice | Shear |
| breed | N | kg | % | kg | score | % | kg |
| Hereford | 102 | 564.9 | 61.8 | 211.5 | 515 | 52 | 3.67 |
| Angus | 103 | 582.0 | 60.09 | 212.8 | 548 | 71 | 3.44 |
| Brangus | 107 | 569.9 | 62.1 | 218.0 | 497 | 42 | 3.89 |
| Beefinaster | 103 | 587.9 | 61.2 | 218.8 | 483 | 35 | 4.08 |
| Bonsmara | 104 | 537.7 | 63.4 | 210.3 | 487 | 37 | 3.69 |
| Romosinuano | 102 | 521.4 | 64.4 | 205.2 | 488 | 37 | 3.78 |
| LSD < .05 | | 13.4 | 1.1 | 6.0 | 24 | 13 | 0.22 |

Table 14. Sire breed means for final weight and carcass traits of F1 steers produced in Cycle VIII

Table 15. Sire breed means for growth and puberty traits of F_1 females produced in Cycle VIII

| | | | (2001 and 20(| 12 calf crops) | | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|----------------|-------|---------|-------|
| Sire | | 400-d | 18 n | nonth | Frame | Puberty | Preg. |
| breed of | | wt. | wt | ht | score | age, | rate |
| female | N | kg | kg | cm | sc | days | % |
| Hereford | 102 | 387.5 | 403.1 | 127.7 | 5.41 | 329 | 85 |
| Angus | 107 | 399.7 | 399.1 | 126.3 | 5.12 | 310 | 83 |
| Brangus | 47 | 394.8 | 410.1 | 129.3 | 5.74 | 341 | 92 |
| Beefmaster | 53 | 401.4 | 418.6 | 129.1 | 5.69 | 350 | 96 |
| Bonsmara | 51 | 377.2 | 403.4 | 126.7 | 5.20 | 352 | 84 |
| Romosinuano | 50 | 347.6 | 372.4 | 126.1 | 5.09 | 362 | 89 |
| LSD < .05 | | 11.8 | 11.5 | 1.2 | .24 | 14 | 11 |

| | | | 2-years of age | • | 3 | to 4 years of | fage |
|-------------|-----|-----------|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Sire breed | | Calf crop | 200- | -day wt. | | 200 | -day wt. |
| of | | weaned | per calf | per cow | Calf crop | per calf | per cow |
| female | No. | % | kg | exposed, kg | wnd., % | kg | exposed, kg |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hereford | 101 | 76.5 | 205.2 | 156.8 | 91.7 | 238.2 | 218.3 |
| Angus | 104 | 69.0 | 215.0 | 147.5 | 91.9 | 248.4 | 228.5 |
| Brangus | 45 | 85.0 | 217.7 | 184.5 | 88.0 | 250.9 | 221.8 |
| Beefmaster | 51 | 86.1 | 220.5 | 188.9 | 94.3 | 244.5 | 231.5 |
| Bonsmara | 48 | 69.0 | 206.4 | 143.8 | 89.6 | 237.7 | 216.7 |
| Romosinuano | 50 | 79.2 | 188.4 | 148.6 | 97.0 | 217.6 | 212.7 |
| LSD < .05 | | 15.8 | 10.1 | 32.9 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 21.1 |

| Table 16. | Breed group means for reproduction and maternal traits of F1 females in |
|-----------|---|
| | Cycle VIII of the GPE Program at MARC |

resistance, and age at puberty in industry herds. However, complex traits such as these can be measured in experimental populations. If the experimental populations are representative of those used in the industry, algorithms can be derived to compute EPDs based on DNA and phenotypic data obtained in experimental herds and only DNA data obtained in industry herds. Once sufficient markers are identified to account for significant genetic variation in seedstock populations, significant progress can be made from selection for traits that can only be measured in intensively managed experimental populations.

Literature Cited

- Arango, J. A., L. V Cundiff, and L. D. Van Vleck. 2002a. J. Anim. Sci. 80:3123.
- Arango, J. A., L. V Cundiff, and L. D. Van Vleck. 2002ba. J. Anim. Sci. 80:3133.
- Arthur, P. F., H. Hearnshaw, P. D. Stephenson. 1999. Livestock Prod. Sci. 57:231.
- BIF. 2002. Guidelines for uniform beef improvement programs. Beef Improvement Federation. www.beefimprovement.com.
- Boston, A. C., M. Taylor, E. A. Icaza and T.O. McRae. 1969. Livestock Producers Day Report. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. LA 16:73.
- Cartwright, T. C., G. F. Ellis, Jr., W. E. Kruse, and E. K. Crouch. 1964. Texas Agr.Exp. Sts. Tech. Monogr. 1.
- Chase, C. C. Jr., D. G. Riley, T. A. Olson, and S. W. Coleman. 2005. Evaluation of Brahman and tropically adapted Bos taurus breeds in the humid subtropics. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.6-15. http://www.lsuagcenter.com/en/crops_livestock/livestock/beef_cattle/breeding_genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm
- Crocket, J. R., M. Koger, and D. E. Franke. 1978. J. Anim. Sci. 46:1170.

- Crouse, J. D., L. V. Cundiff, R. M. Koch, M. Koohmaraie, and S. C. Siedeman. 1989. J. Anim. Sci. 22:702.
- Cundiff, L. V., K. E. Gregory, R. M. Koch. 1974. J. Anim. Sci. 38:711.
- Cundiff, L. V., K. E. Gregory, R. M. Koch, and G. E. Dickerson. 1986. Proc. 3rd World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production. IX:271.
- Cundiff, L. V., K. E. Gregory, R. M. Koch. 1998. J. Anim. Sci. 76:2528.
- Cundiff, L. V., T. L. Wheeler, K. E. Gregory, S. D. Shackelford, M. Koohmaraie, H. C. Freetly, G. D. Snowder, and D. D. Lunstra. 2000. Germplasm Evaluation Program Progress Report No. 19. pp. 1-12. http://www.ars.usda.gov/Main/ docs.htm?docid=6238
- Cundiff, L. V., T. L. Wheeler, K. E. Gregory, S. D. Shackelford, M. Koohmaraie, R. M. Thallman, G. D. Snowder, and L. D. Van Vleck. 2004. Germplasm Evaluation Program Progress Report No. 22. pp. 1-15. http://www.ars.usda. gov/Main/docs.htm?docid=6238
- Jenkins, T. G., L. V. Cundiff, and C. L. Ferrell. 1991. J.Anim. Sci. 69:2762.
- Franke, D. E., O. F. Habet, L. C. Tawak, A. R. Williams, and S. M. De Rouen. 2001. J. Anim. Sci. 79:1713.
- Frisch, J. E. and J. E. Vercoe. 1978. World Anim. Rev. 25:8.
- Green, R. D., L. V. Cundiff, G. M. Smith, and R. M. Koch. 1991. J. Anim. Sci. 69:3156.
- Gregory, K. E., and L. V. Cundiff. 1980. J. Anim. Sci. 51:1224.
- Gregory, K. E., L. V. Cundiff, and R. M. Koch. 1991. Breed effects and heterosis in advanced generations of composite populations for preweaning traits of beef cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 69:947.
- Gregory, K. E., L. V. Cundiff, and R. M. Koch. 1999. Composite breeds to use heterosis and

| | Growth | | Marbling | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|---------|------------|------------|
| | rate and | | (Intra- | | Age | | |
| | mature | Lean to fat | muscular | Tender- | at | Milk | Tropical |
| Breed group | size | ratio | fat) | ness | puberty | production | adaptation |
| Jersey | Х | Х | XXXX | XXX | Х | XXXXX | XX |
| Longhorn | Х | XXX | XX | XX | XXX | XX | XX |
| Wagyu | Х | XXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XX |
| Angus | XXXX | XX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Red Angus | XXXX | XX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Hereford | XXXX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XX | Х |
| Red Poll | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | XX | XXXX | Х |
| Devon | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XX | Х |
| Shorthorn | XXXX | XX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Galloway | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XX | Х |
| South Devon | XXX | XXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Tarentaise | XXX | XXX | XX | XX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Pinzgauer | XXXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XX | XXX | Х |
| Braunvieh | XXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXXX | XX |
| Gelbvieh | XXXX | XXXX | Х | XX | XX | XXXX | Х |
| Holstein | XXXXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXXXXX | Х |
| Simmental | XXXXX | XXXX | XX | XX | XXX | XXXX | Х |
| Maine Anjou | XXXXX | XXXX | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | Х |
| Salers | XXXX | XXXX | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | Х |
| Norwegian Red | XXXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXXX | Х |
| Swed. Red & White | XXXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXXX | Х |
| Friesian | XXXX | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXXX | Х |
| Piedmontese | XX | XXXXXX | Х | XXX | XX | XX | XX |
| Belgian Blue | XXX | XXXXXX | Х | XXX | XX | XX | Х |
| Limousin | XXXX | XXXXX | Х | XX | XXXX | х | Х |
| Charolais | XXXXX | XXXXX | XX | XX | XXXX | XX | Х |
| Chianina | XXXXX | XXXXX | XX | XX | XXXX | Х | XX |
| Tuli | XX | XXX | XXX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Romosinuano | X | XXX | XXX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Romosinuano | Λ | ΛΛΛ | AΛ | ΛΛ | ЛЛЛ | ААА | АЛА |
| Brangus | XXXX | XXX | XXX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Beefmaster | XXXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Bonsmara | XXX | XXX | XX | XX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Brahman | XXXX | XXXX | XX | Х | XXXXX | XXXX | XXXX |
| Nellore | XXXX | XXXX | XX | Х | XXXXX | XXX | XXXX |
| Sahiwal | XX | XXXX | XX | Х | XXXX | XXXX | XXXX |
| Boran | XXX | XXX | XX | Х | XXXX | XXX | XXXX |

| TABLE 17. | BREEDS | GROUPED | INTO BIOI | OGICAL | TYPES FOR | R SEVEN CRITERIA |
|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------------|
|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------------|

^aIncreasing numbers of X's indicate relatively higher value.

breed differences to improve efficiency of beef production. USDA, ARS, Technical Bulletin Number 1875. pp. 1-75.

Henderson, C. R. 1975. Biometrics 31:423.

- Holloway, J. W., B. G. Warrington, D. W. Forrest, and R. D. Randel. 2005. Lifetime performance and efficiency of F1 tropically adapted beef cattle breeds X Angus in Semiarid rangeland. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.118-125. http://www.lsuagcenter.com/en/crops_ livestock/livestock/beef_cattle/breeding_ genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm
- Koch, R. M., G. E. Dickerson, L. V. Cundiff, and K. E. Gregory. 1985. J.Anim. Sci. 60:1117.
- Koch, R. M., L. V. Cundiff, K. E. Gregory, and L. D. Van Vleck. 2004. J.Anim. Sci. 82:668.
- Koger, M., F. M. Peacock, W. G. Kirk, and J. R. Crocket. 1975. J.Anim. Sci. 40:826.
- McDonald, R. P., and J. W. Turner. 1972. J. Anim. Sci. 35:1146.
- National Pedigreed Livestock Council. 2005-2006. Annual Report, Directory & Career Opportunities. 177 Palermo Place, The Villages, FL 32159. USA. pp. 1-21.
- Olson, T. A., K. Uuclides Filho, L. V. Cundiff, M. Koger, W. T. Butts, Jr., and K. E. Gregory. 1991. J. Anim. Sci. 69:104.
- Peacock, F. M. and M. Koger. 1979. J. Anim. Sci.49: Suppl. 1.168.
- Phillips, W. A., R. P. Wettemann, S. W. Coleman, and J. W. Holloway. 2005. Evaluation of Boran, Tuli Gelbvieh, and Brahman F1 crosses in Oklahoma. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp. 6-15. http://www.lsuagcenter.com/en/crops_ livestock/livestock/beef_cattle/breeding_ genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm
- Pollak, E. J. and R. L. Quaas. 1983. Prediction of Genetic Values for Beef Cattle. Workshop Proceedings. Beef Improvement Federation. Dec. 12-15, 1983. pp.58-69
- Pollak, E. J., and R. L. Quaas. 2005. Multibreed genetic evaluations for beef cattle. Proc. Beef Improvement Federation 37th Annual Research Symposium and Annual Meeting. Billings, MT pp. 101-104. www.beefimprovement.com

Sanders, J. W., S. F. Cunningham, A. Ducoing, A.

D. Herring, and D. K. Lunt. 2005a. Evaluation of the F1 crosses of Tulie, Boran, and Brahman with Herford and Angus for birth growth carcass, cow productivity, and longevity characteristics. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.126-130. http://www.lsuagcenter.com/ en/crops_livestock/livestock/beef_cattle/ breeding_genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm

- Sanders, J. W., K. Key, D. Riley, and D. Lunt. 2005b. Evaluation of heterosis retention for cow productivity traits in Bos indicus/Bos taurus crosses. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.212-220. http://www.lsuagcenter.com/ en/crops_livestock/livestock/beef_cattle/ breeding_genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm
- Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin. 405. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.1-227. http:// www.lsuagcenter.com/en/crops_livestock/ livestock/beef_cattle/breeding_genetics/ trpoical+breeds.htm
- Thallman, R. M., L. V. Cundiff, K. E. Gregory, and R. M. Koch. 1999. J. Anim. Sci. 77:2651.
- Thrift, F. A. and T. A. Thrift. 2005. Rationale for evaluating alternative sources of subtropically adapted beef cattle germplasm. A Compilation of Research Results Involving Tropically Adapted Beef Cattle Breeds. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 405. pp.6-15. http://www.lsuagcenter. com/en/crops_livestock/livestock/beef_ cattle/breeding_genetics/trpoical+breeds.htm
- Turner, J. W., and R. P. McDonald. 1969. J. Anim. Sci. 29:389.
- Utech, K. B. W., R. H. Wharton, and J. D. Kerr. 1978. Aust J. Agr. Res. 29:885.
- Wheeler, T. L., L. V. Cundiff, R. M. Koch, and J. D. Crouse. 1996. J. Anim.Sci. 74:1023.
- Wheeler, T. L., L. V. Cundiff, R. M. Koch, M. E. Dikeman, and J. D. Crouse. 1997. J. Anim.Sci. 75:2389.
- Wheeler, T. L., L. V. Cundiff, L. D. Van Vleck, G. S. Snowder, M. D. Thallman, S. D. Shackelford, M. Koohmaraie. 2006. Germplasm Evaluation Program Progress Report No. 23. pp. 1-17. http://www.ars.usda.gov/Main/docs. htm?docid=6238