

# The TG5 DNA marker test for marbling capacity in Australian feedlot cattle

W. Barendse, R. Bunch, M. Thomas, S. Armitage, S. Baud and N. Donaldson

CSIRO Molecular Animal Genetics Centre Level 3 Gehrmann Laboratories Research Road St. Lucia 4072 Australia Phone: 07 3214 2444; Email: Bill.Barendse@li.csiro.au

*Abstract.* We tested the TG5 polymorphism in the 5' leader sequence of the thyroglobulin regulatory DNA sequence on 1750 cattle drawn at random from a large feedlot over approximately 9 months in 28 separate days of sampling. The cattle were mainly Angus or Shorthorn grain-fed for 160-240 days. We have confirmed the earlier reported association between the '3' allele and higher marbling scores indicating that a DNA test based on the polymorphism should be robust for predicting marbling potential. This test detects one of the genes that contributes to the genetic potential for marbling.

# Introduction

Marbling potential in beef cattle is difficult to predict so the genetic selection for this trait is not simple.

Firstly, the degree of flecking of the fat is scored into categories by eye, so there is always a statistical disconnect between intra-muscular fat percent and marbling score primarily due to comparing a continuous measure to a categoric measure.

Secondly, marbling scores are obtained after slaughter in chiller rooms so there is a long period between the use of a bull and the recording of the performance of its offspring. This is coupled to the long time it takes for high marbling scores to develop, so tests on juvenile animals are unlikely to yield much differentiation between individuals.

Finally, sires do not express high levels of marbling. These are not insuperable obstacles, however they make the selection for marbling an expensive and time consuming activity. The hope is that DNA markers can be used that will aid in the selection for marbling by addressing the genetic material directly.

Several DNA markers, representing 3 cattle genomic regions (and hence at least 3 genes) were described as associated with marbling (Barendse 1997). Like most traits of an organism, marbling score is the result of an interaction between genes and the environment, so many genes are expected to show associations to marbling, with a range of impacts on the trait. There will be several genes with useful effects on marbling potential but no canonical "marbling gene" superior to all others.

We are interested in genes that contribute to the normal variation for marbling and that are not associated with large pleiotropic effects on other traits. One of these DNA markers is the TG5 polymorphism which occurs in the 5' leader sequence of the Thyroglobulin gene. It shows a genotypic association to realised marbling score in long fed cattle in which animals

that possess the '3' allele, ie., both '23' and '33' genotypes have higher marbling scores on average than those that have the '22' genotype (Barendse 1997). The '3' allele is defined as being delta T (-537bp; GATT) while the '2' allele is defined as being delta C (-537bp; GATC), the delta locations defined in terms of the beginning of the start of the first exon.

In this study we examine the genotypes at the TG5 polymorphism in cattle obtained from a single feedlot in which the animals were fed to standard commercial endpoints. The objectives of this were: 1) to confirm that the '3' allele is consistently associated with higher marbling score, 2) to determine whether the DNA marker could be used as a feedlot screening tool and 3) to determine whether these effects can still be seen in feeding regimes used in standard commercial practise.

## **Materials and Methods**

Cattle were sampled from the Australia Meat Holdings (AMH) Toowoomba feedlot using the following schema.

To determine whether the TG5 polymorphism would be applicable in real world conditions we tried to maximise the diversity of cattle within breeds. In feedlots it is generally not possible to obtain parentage of cattle while in the cattle industry at large there is a relatively small pool of sires that are used compared to the total number of cattle that are available. To prevent the study from being dominated by a few sires, resulting in the influence of some sires altering the effects that are to be measured, we chose to maximise the number of vendors while sampling. We obtained the breed of the cattle, the vendor, the date of entry, the time spent in the feedlot, the initial, final and hot dressed weights as well as the chiller



assessments for P8 fat, eye muscle area and AUSMEAT marbling score for each animal. Animals were mainly of the Angus and Shorthorn breed. Since slaughter groups are not tidy a small number of steers of other breeds were included.

DNA was extracted from the blood samples using the following method. A ten ml sample of blood (EDTA as anti-coagulant, Becton Dickonson vacutainers) was lysed in 40 mls of chilled buffered water (79 mg Sodium Bicarbonate, 7.6 g Ammonium Chloride per litre) for at least 15 minutes.

White cells were collected by centrifugation and the pellet was completely and vigorously resuspended in 4.5 mls of 1 x Phosphate Buffered Saline. Then 0.25 mls of 0.5 M di-Sodium Ethylene Diamine Tetra-acetic Acid (EDTA) (pH 8.0), 0.25 mls of 10% Sodium Dodecyl Sulphate (SDS) and 50ml of Proteinase K (Boehringer; 10 mg/ml in water) were added, the tubes rolled gently to mix and the samples incubated overnight at 37 degrees Celsius.

Following this, 2.4 mls of a 5 M Sodium Chloride/0.2% 2-Mercaptoethanol solution was added, the solution mixed on a roller for 5 minutes and then 5 mls of Analytical Grade Chloroform was added.

The samples were mixed gently for at least 60 minutes after which the organic phase was separated from the aqueous phase by centrifugation. The aqueous phase (top) was removed with a large-bore glass pipette and the DNA precipitated with an equal volume of chilled iso-propanol. The spooled DNA was fished out on a sealed glass pipette and transfered to 70% Ethanol to de-salt overnight. The spool of DNA was then transfered to 1 x TE (10 mM Tris, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0). This is a modified procedure of Barendse *et al.* (1993) and of Mullenbach *et al.* (1989). Genotypes at the TG5 polymorphism were sampled using Single Strand Conformational Polymorphism (SSCP) methods as described previously (Barendse *et al.* 1993; Barendse 1997).

In essence, the DNA fragment was amplified using the primers TG5U2 5'ggg gat gac tac gag tat gac tg3' and TG5D1 5'gtg aaa

atc ttg tgg agg ctg ta3' in a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) using Taq I polymerase in the manufacturers buffer (Biotech International) with an annealing temperature of 55 degrees Celsius.

The fragments were radioactively labelled in the reaction using 32P dCTP, separated on 8% acrylamide gels at 3 W overnight and detected using autoradiography. The polymorphism involving the '2' and '3' alleles can also be detected as a restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP). Instead of radiolabelling, the DNA is amplified as before without 32P dCTP, and after the reaction is completed, 5 u of MboI (New England Biolabs) was added and the sample incubated at 37 degrees Celsius for 1 hour. Isoschizomers of MboI do not work as efficiently and require purification of the DNA before restriction (data not shown). The fragments are separated on 4% agarose gels (3% wide range agarose and 1% standard agarose; Sigma and Promega) with 0.5 x Tris Borate EDTA pH >8.3 (TEB) gel and electrophoresis buffer with Ethidium Bromide incorporated in the gel and buffer. Fragments were detected under UV transillumination and recorded on Polaroid Instant Film.

The genotypic results were compared to the marbling scores using generalised linear models (GLM) based on the Poisson distribution implemented using S-PLUS (McCullagh and Nelder 1989; S-PLUS handbook; Venables and Ripley 2000). The Poisson distribution was used since marbling score is a categoric trait and as such, contingency tables are generated of numbers of individuals at each marbling score.

Factors in the feedlot were tested to determine whether they had an influence on the marbling score. Those that did were incorporated into the model and the genotypes were treated as fixed effects. The genotypes at TG5 were also compared to measures of feedlot and chiller performance using GLM appropriate to the distribution of the traits.

#### Results

DNA was obtained for 1750 cattle, 853 were Angus, 773 were Shorthorn, 106 were of 9 breeds and 18 were unknown (Table 1). There were 411 vendors represented with a median of 2 steers per vendor with quartiles of 1 and 5 steers per vendor. Sampling was halted when it became clear that the median number of steers per vendor was likely to increase. All available factors were tested for impacts on marbling. However, after the day of slaughter and the breed of origin were fitted, no other factor was statistically significant (Table 2). The number of days in the feedlot is shown plotted against the realised marbling score for each animal and it is clear that time in the feedlot has little influence on the marbling score (Figure 1). The genotype for TG5 is statistically significantly associated with marbling score (Table 3). The effect of genotype on marbling is shown as the interaction term



Figure 1. Marble score in cattle in relation to days on feed.



Table 1. Characteristics of the cattle same
---

Stee 1:	1750
Breede	Angue, Shouthorn, Mixed
Angu	853 staars
Shortho m	773 steers
Minsd	10 6 steers
Uninown	18 stears
Minsd	M may Gay
	Crossbud Angus or Shorthorn
	Charolais cross
	Lineusin and s
	Red Anges
	Shavar Croce
Angus Shortho m Mimd Unluo wa Mimd Wimd Days on which cattle wana sampled	Composite
	Simmental an se
	Santa Gertradis 2006
Vendou	+11
	Median: 2 steers per uendo r
	Bottom quartile: 1 s tear par vandor
	Iop quartile : 5 stears par uendor
Days on which cattle were campled	28
	Madian: 60 strans
	Mode: 49 steens (5 d.m.s.)
	Mean: (1.9 stears
	Minimum: 30 strens
	Maximum: 85 : then:
	9 days with more than one head

marbling:genotype and is added last in the analysis. The distribution of genotypes vs raw marbling scores shows that '33' genotype shows on average higher marbling scores than either the '23' or '33' genotype (Figure 2). There is a clear increase in gene frequency from one marbling extreme to another (Table 4). The TG5 genotypes show a small effect on feedlot liveweight gain where gain is measured as the difference between the final and initial weight normalised by the number of days spent in the feedlot (Table 5). The least squared means show that the '33' genotypes showed higher rates of gain than the '22' or '23' genotypes (Table 6). These TG5 genotypes were not found associated with any other of the measured traits.

# Discussion

The TG5 genotypes are consistently associated with marbling score. Not only are genotypes associated with marbling score as previously reported (Barendse 1997) but in this study we find the third example where the



![](_page_2_Figure_7.jpeg)

S. 4-888	Df	Deviance Resil	Df	Redie, Dev	Pr (Chi)
NULL		200200000	614	<b>425 0780</b>	
Dev	9	29 105 8	605	395 9724	0.0006220
Bred	2	73655	63	388,6068	0.0251533
Vendor	184	141.0148	+19	247 3920	0.9919853
Time	3 <b>1</b> 3	0 3126	<b>41</b> 8	247 2759	0.5739238
Weight	1	1 1130	+17	246 1629	0 291424 9
P8 fat	1	0.024	+14	246 1367	0.8715431
Gamrata	1	0.0600	415	246.0767	0.80 (4873)
Hdw	1.8	0.0394	+1+	246.0373	0.8424280
Drythmed	3 <b>1</b> 3	2.0730	413	243 9443	01499289
Deytine	9	8.7314	404	235 2129	0.4405270
Drywight	9	+ 2565	395	230 9564	0.8937347
Day P8fat	9	9.7231	386	221 2334	03733443
Drygin at	9	6 3926	377	214 #407	0.6386987
Dryhlw	9	3.8950	368	210 5457	09181882
Bredtine	1	0 3066	367	210 2390	0.5797444
Bued.weight	2	0.4836	365	209.7554	0.7851945
Bued P8 fat	2	3 #952	343	206 260 2	01741922
Bued:gain rate	2	0 1182	341	204 1420	0.9426323
Buedhdw	2	1 1940	359	204 9441	0.54.9922.5
Time weight	1	0.0450	358	204 9011	0.83 2094 7
Time P8 fat	31	0.9136	357	203 9875	0 33 91 579
Time:gain.rate	1	0 1420	354	203.8455	0.70 (323 8
Time hlw	3 <b>1</b> 6	0 1211	355	203.724.5	0.7278718
Weight P8 fat	1	0.9436	354	202.7808	03313485
Weight: zin 124	1	0.0477	353	202.7332	0.8271823
Weight hdw	1	0 #773	352	202 2359	0.4896680
P8 fat: gain a ta	1	0.0048	351	202 251 2	0.9449918
P8 fat Mw	8 <b>1</b> 3	2.4293	350	199.421.9	01049109
Gain rate hd w	3 <b>1</b> 3	0 1832	349	199.4386	0.6685960

**Table 2.** The effect of various feedlot measures on marbling score. Marbling score here is scored to 0.2 of a marbling score. (Response: marfine) (Terms added sequentially (first to last).

**Table 3.** The association between TG5 genotype and marbling score (Analysis of Deviance Table, Poisson model, Response: score). (Terms added sequentially (first to last).)

Df	Deviance	Df	Redis. Dev	Pr(Chi)
	Resid.	- 655		613855986385
	30,0000,000	539	3366,707	
2	86.758	537	3 <b>279<i>9</i>49</b>	0.0000000
27	240.975	510	3018974	0.0000000
2	1141.545	508	1877.430	0.0000000
ंस	1288.472	504	388.757	0.0000000
<u></u>	25 581	498	543 176	0.0002664
3 <b>4</b>	2.759	494	540.417	0.5988828
8	32 334	486	528.043	0.0000 805
54	50 3 69	+32	477.493	0.4152114
108	228.707	324	248.987	0.0000000
8	16.078	31.6	232,908	0.0412742
	Df 27 27 4 6 4 8 54 108 8	Df         Deviance Recil.           2         84.738           27         240.975           2         1141.545           4         12.88.472           4         2.759           8         32.354           54         50.349           108         22.8.707           5         14.073	Df         Deviance Resil.         Df           539         539         537           2         84.738         537           27         240.975         510           2         1141.545         508           4         12.88.672         504           6         25.581         498           4         2.759         494           8         32.354         486           54         50.349         432           108         228.707         324	Df         Deviance Resil.         Df         Redir. Dev Signature           539         3344.707           2         84.738         537         3279.949           27         240.975         510         3018.974           2         11.41.545         508         1877.430           4         12.88.472         504         588.737           4         25.581         498         543.174           4         2.739         494         540.417           8         32.334         486         528.063           54         50.349         432         477.493           108         228.707         324         248.987           8         14.078         31.6         232.908

**Table 4.** Gene frequency change in TG5 in extreme marbling score. M1 and M4+ are marbling score 1 and marbling score 4 and above respectively. f(3) is the frequency of the '3' allele. G(adj) is the value of G with the Williams correction.

Genotype	M	<b>M++</b>
A1	л	1+3
123	27	72
à)	0	12
រំចំ)	0 14	0.20

 Table 5. Generalised linear model of liveweight gain as a function of several feedlot characters, fixed factors and DNA markers. (Analysis of Deviance Table, Gaussian model; Response: (gain<2.5). (Terms added sequentially (first to last).)</th>

105 genotype s	Igninicantry (1 < If	De uance Recil	IH IH	Redis . Dev	F Value	$\Pr(\mathbf{F})$
NULL			1174	0.9991504		
Bmed	2	0.01244390	1174	0.9864865	7 5 90 225	0.0005326
Day	27	0.02184458	1147	0.9646419	0.969834	0.50.91034
Hiw	1	0.00011094	1146	0.9445310	0132988	0.71.54244
F8 fat	1	0.00142609	1145	0.9631049	1.709481	01913287
Ems	1	0.00023533	11++	0.9428695	0.282.093	0.5954411
Mari 1	15	0.01750987	1129	0.9453597	1399294	01394183
Marit 2	9	0.00710742	1120	0.9382523	0.946.645	0.4832997
Mari 3	24	0.00853282	1094	0.92971.94	0.393402	0.9974246
IG5*	3	0.02124945	1089	0.9084700	5.094 424	0.0001267

**Table 6.** Analysis of Variance of liveweight gain (LWG) with breed and genotype as factors. The breeds are Angus, Mixed and Shorthorn. The genotypes\* for TG5 are t12, t13, t22, t23, t24, and t33. Not all genotype means are estimable.

TCS	t12	t13	t22	t23	124	<b>B</b> 3	12
Mean LWG	1.4965	non-est	12711	1.2612	non-est	1.3140	
(bg) 	0.1256		0.0105	0.0142		0.0426	

\*TG5 genotype '33' had significantly higher LWG than '23' or '22' genotypes

'3' allele is associated with higher marbling scores. In studies of genetic factors associated with continuous traits there is a distinct possibility that associations may be different in different studies. This can be due to the DNA marker being insufficiently close to the causal mutation, so in one sample the higher trait values are associated with one allele while in a second sample the higher trait values are associated with the alternative allele.

Secondly, the association may be variably detected because the effect due to genotypic substitution is small relative to the overall phenotypic variance in the trait. When the sample sizes are modest there is a chance that this genetic variance will not be statistically significant. By using a relatively large sample to account for the large error variance in dealing with a categoric trait that has a subjective component in its assessment, we have tried to ensure that failure to detect the association will be minimised.

The consistency of the '3' allele associated with higher

marbling score in this as well as the two previous samples implies that the TG5 polymorphism is not only a robust test but that the polymorphism is either the causal mutation or is close to the causal mutation (e.g. Edwards 1980). However, in the previous study, which used cattle fed for unusually long periods (well in excess of 300 days), both the '23' and '33' genotypes were associated with higher marbling scores. Indeed, the '33' genotype is usually so rare that the tables are dominated by individuals with the '23' genotype. In this study, the plot of raw marbling score versus genotype does not show a difference in raw marbling score between the 22' and '23' genotypes. This could be due to the animals being fed for a much shorter period (Figure 1), although it should also be borne in mind that plots based on raw marbling scores lumped across breeds and slaughter days may either disguise or exaggerate differences.

The TG5 DNA marker test for marbling capacity in Australian feedlot cattle

![](_page_5_Picture_1.jpeg)

No association with hot dressed weight or final weight was found and it is not possible to determine whether this is an overall increase in fat since an equivalent of a hot dressed weight at entry to the feedlot is not available.

No association with P8 rump fat thickness was found indicating that selecting cattle on this DNA marker is not expected to change the subcutaneous fat thickness. The cattle sampling methods are appropriate to identifying the gene affecting marbling.

The consistent associations to TG5 implicate the Thyroglobulin gene which codes for thyroglobulin, the molecular store for the thyroid hormones T3 and T4 (tri-iodothyronine and thyroxine respectively). These hormones affect adipocyte growth and differentiation both in vivo and in vitro (Folley and Malpress 1948; Salter 1950; Beato 1989; Ailhaud *et al.* 1992; Darimont *et al.* 1993) and T3 and T4 levels have recently been associated with intra-muscular fat in Wagyu cattle (Mears *et al.* 2001). However, the mechanism by which mutations in the TG gene influence either marbling score directly or whether mutations affect the availability of T3 and T4 and thus marbling score is not known. None of the genes adjacent to TG are known to be implicated in adipocyte differentiation or growth, but negative evidence is not a strong form of confirmation.

Further research in the control and regulation of TG may provide information on the mechanism of action while studies of the adjacent genes could rule them out of contention as genes affecting marbling score.

## Acknowledgements

The Meat Research Corporation (now Meat and Livestock Australia) contributed to financial support of the project. We wish to acknowledge the AMH feedlot for allowing us access to its Toowoomba plant to collect samples and for allowing us access to cattle performance measurements.

R. Shepherd provided discussion on statistical methods. S. Baud and N. Donalson bled cattle and collated the phenotypes.M. Thomas, R. Bunch and S. Armitage genotyped animals for TG5.

W. Barendse extracted DNA, performed the analyses and designed the experiment.

# References

- Ailhaud, G., Grimaldi, P. and Negrel, R. (1992) Cellular and molecular aspects of adipose tissue development. Annual Reviews of Nutrition 12, 207–233.
- Anon. (1995) S-PLUS Guide to Statistical and Mathematical Analysis. MathSoft Inc., Seattle, Washington.
- Barendse, W. (1997) Assessing lipid metabolism. Patent Application WO9923248 PCT/AU98/00882) <a href="http://ep.espacenet.com/">http://ep.espacenet.com/</a>
- Barendse, W., Armitage, S.M., Ryan, A.M., Moore, S.S., Clayton, D., Georges, M., Womack, J.E., and Hetzel, J (1993) A genetic map of DNA loci on bovine chromosome 1. Genomics 18, 602–608.
- Beato, M. (1989) Gene regulation by steroid hormones. Cell 56, 335-344.
- Burroughs, W., Raun, A. and Cheng, E. (1958) Effects of methimazole on thyroid and live weights of cattle. Science 128, 147.
- Darimont, C., Gaillard, D., Ailhaud, G. and Negrel, R. (1993) Terminal differentiation of mouse preadipocyte cells: adipogenic and antimitogenic role of triiodothyronine. Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology 98, 67—73
- Edwards, J.H. (1980) Allelic association in man. pp 239 255 in Population Structure and Genetic Disorders, eds Eriksson, A.W., Forsius H.R., Nevanlinna, H.R., Workman, P.L. and Norio, R.K. Academic Press, London.
- Folley, S.J. and Malpress, F.H. (1948) Hormonal control of lactation. pp 745—805 in "The Hormones. Physiology, Chemistry and Applications" eds Pincus, G. and Thimann, K.V. Academic Press, New York.
- McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J.A. (1989) Generalized linear models, Second Edition, Chapman and Hall, London.
- Mears, G.J., Mir, P.S., Bailey, D.R.C. and Jones, S.D.M (2001) Effect of Wagyu genetics on marbling, backfat and circulating hormones in cattle. Canadian Journal of Animal Science. 81, 6573
- Mullenbach, R., Lagoda, P.J.L. and Welter, C. (1989) An efficient salt-chloroform extraction of DNA from blood and tissues. Trends in Genetics 5, 391.
- Raun, A.P., Cheng, E.W. and Burroughs, W. (1960) Effects of orally administered goiterogens upon thyroid activity and metabolic rate in ruminants. Journal of Animal Science 19, 678—686.
- Salter, W.T. (1950) pp 181—299 in "The Hormones, Physiology, Chemistry and Applications" eds Pincus, G. and Thimann, K.V. Academic Press Inc., New York.
- Venables, W.N. and Ripley, B.D. (2000) Modern Applied Statistics with S-PLUS. Third Edition. Springer Verlag New York Inc.
- Woolf, B. (1955) On estimating the relation between blood group and disease. Annals of Human Genetics 19, 251 253.

![](_page_5_Picture_27.jpeg)