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ABSTRACT  

A multiple-trait model analysis of weekly average daily gain (ADG) of kits on both full and restricted feeding regimen (ADG\text{FF} and ADG\text{RF}), and average daily feed intake on FF was performed (ADFI\text{FF}). Data from a total of 6,264 kits from 1,317 litters housed in 812 collective cages along 14 batches were used. Variance component of two different feed efficiency traits were estimated from those corresponding to growth and feed consumption on both feeding regimens. Results indicate that weighted estimates of heritability for ADG were 0.47 (0.03) and 0.40 (0.03) on FF and RF, respectively, but genetic variance was much smaller on RF. The interaction between the genotype and feeding regimen was 14% of the mean phenotypic variance for both traits. Heritability of ADFI\text{FF} was 0.28 (0.06). Breeding values of ADG\text{RF} conditional on ADG\text{FF} represents the effects of genes only involved in feed efficiency. The heritability of this trait is equal to that for ADFI\text{FF} conditional on ADG\text{FF} (a different measurement of feed efficiency) but its genetic variation is lower. The genetic correlation between both traits was nearly null which indicates that they are related to different components of feed efficiency.  
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INTRODUCTION  

Despite of its importance, direct selection for feed efficiency (FE) is not performed in most breeding programs because of the problems associated to individual recording of feed intake (FI), involved in the definition of FE. Thus, for example, residual feed intake (RFI) is defined as the difference between actual FI and predicted food requirements for production and maintenance. Recently, selection for increased average daily gain on restricted feeding (ADG\text{RF}) has been proposed as selection criteria to improve FE because variation in this trait is directly related with variation in FE due to constant FI. One of the advantages of using this trait is that individual records of FI are not needed. In rabbit, there are currently two experiments of selection to improve FE by selecting for increased ADG\text{RF} or reduced RFI on full-feeding, respectively (Drouilhet et al., 2013). In both experiments animals were kept in individual cages in order to individually record FI whereas, under commercial conditions, kits are raised in collective cages. In these conditions feeding behaviour is different due to social interactions among individuals sharing the same cage which in turns affects FI and ADG, and could lead to a GxE interaction effect on FE. On the other hand, the magnitude of the interaction between the genotype and the feeding regimen (FR), and therefore the effect of selection under restricted feeding on animals fed ad libitum or vice versa, is still unknown in rabbit.  

In this paper we propose a model for a joint analysis of individual ADG and cage average daily feed intake (ADFI), when data come from kits raised in collective cages on full (FF) or restricted feeding (RF). The objective is to estimate genetic parameters for these traits and the interaction between the genotype and FR, as well as for different measurements of FE which can be obtained from variance components of ADG and ADFI.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals and experimental design

A total of 6,264 kits from a rabbit sire line (Caldes line, Gómez et al., 2002) were used for the experiment. This line is currently selected for ADG with *ad libitum* feeding during the fattening period (from 32 to 60 d of age). After weaning, kits were randomly assigned to one of the two FR (FF or RF). A maximum of two kits from the same litter were allocated in the same cage to minimize the maternal and pre-weaning environmental effects on behaviour and growth performance. In order to get homogeneous groups regarding animal size, kits were assigned to two different groups within FR based on their weaning body weight: Big Size kits (BS; above the batch mean) and Small Size kits (SS; under or equal to batch mean). Animals were bred under the same environmental and management conditions except FR. In both cases kits were fed the same standard pellet diet from weaning (32 d) to slaughter age (67 d). For every week, the amount of food offered to animals on RF was equal to 75% of *ad libitum* FI, which was computed as the average FI of animals on FF during the week before in the same batch and size class combination, multiplied by a factor to account for the increase in FI from week to week due to animal growth (this factor was computed from data of a previous experiment). Actual feed restriction was on average 75.3% for BS kits and 74.1% for SS kits. Water was always available. Only data from cages containing the initial 8 kits at the end of the fattening were used for the analysis. Those data corresponded to 6,264 kits from 1,303 litters raised in 14 batches and housed in 783 cages. Individual body weight of all kits and total feed intake (TFI) of kits fed on FF in the same cage were weekly recorded always on the same day of the week.

Statistical Analysis

A multiple-trait analysis of weekly ADFI in cages on FF (ADFIFF) and individual ADG both under FF (ADGFF) and FR (ADGRF) was conducted. Thus, 12 traits were considered: 3 traits x 4 weeks. The analysis was performed using gibbs1f90 program. For each week, individual ADG was computed as the difference in body weight at the beginning and end of that week divided by 7; ADFIFF was defined as the average amount of feed daily consumed by a kit in a cage and computed as ADFI = TFI / (7 x 8). The model for all traits included the fixed factors of batch (14 levels), animal size (2 levels), litter size at birth (7 levels: <6, 6, 7, … , >10), parity order (4 levels: 1, 2, 3 and >3), the random environmental factors of litter and cage, the additive genetic effect and the residual. In the case of ADFIFF this model can be written as: yijpo = Bi + Sj + xijpo P + x’ijo LS + z’ijo L + x’ijo a + cijo + eijo where, yijpo is the ADFI of the cage i-th in the batch j-th and in the group of size j-th (j= BS, SS); xijpo, x’ijo, z’ijo, x’ijo, z’ijo, cijo, and eijo contain the proportion of the different levels among the 8 animals in the cage i-th; these vectors will have the same length as the number of levels of each factor; Bi is the effect of the batch i-th; Sj is the effect of the group of size j-th; a, cijo and eijo are the effects of the cageo-th; P is the vector (size 4) of parities effects; LS is the vector (size 7) of litter sizes effects; 1 is the vector (size 1,303) of the litter effects; a is the vector (size 7,701, number of animals in the pedigree) of breeding values and eijo is residual term. Variance components (VC) for ADFIFF and ADGRF, conditioned on ADGFF, were computed following the indications given by Strathe et al. (2014). These conditional variables can be then interpreted as average daily residual feed intake and the part of ADGRF independent of ADGFF (ADGRF|ADGFF), respectively. In addition weekly VC on both FR were summarized in single parameter by computing the weighted average across all weeks, being the weighting factor the proportion of data in each week.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The pattern of growth was different for animals on FF or RF (Figure 1). Post-weaning growth was decelerated after first week for animals on FF whereas it accelerated until week 3 and then remained constant for animals on RF. In order to avoid making assumptions on longitudinal trajectories, ADG and ADFI on different weeks and FR were considered to be different but correlated traits for the subsequence
analysis. Data from the 5th week were excluded from the analysis because in the last week a different diet was provided.

Figure 1: Weekly average daily feed intake (ADFI) and body weight gain (ADG) for animals feed on full or restricted feeding

Heritability for post weaning ADG computed from weighted averages of VC was high and similar for both FR (Table 1). The magnitude of this parameter is much higher than the corresponding to any week because of genetic co-variances among weeks were much higher than the phenotypic co-variances. For ADFI_FF, a much lower heritability was observed (Table 1), which was fairly equal to the raw average of weekly heritabilities, indicating a similar magnitude of both genetic and phenotypic weekly covariances. The posterior mean (posterior standard deviation) of weighted genetic correlation between ADG in both FR was 0.71 (0.07), clearly different from 1, indicating an important interaction effect (Mathur, 2002) between the genotype and FR; this interaction supposes 14% of mean of weighted averages of phenotypic variance in both FR.

Table 1: Posterior mean (posterior s.d.) of ratios of phenotypic variation at different weeks for feed intake (FI), average daily gain (ADG) and residual feed intake (RFI) for animals on full (FF) or restricted (RF) feeding regimen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADG</th>
<th>FI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(^a)</td>
<td>W1(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.91</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.48)</td>
<td>(3.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(^2)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c(^2)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>56.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.89)</td>
<td>(2.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(^2)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c(^2)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Parameter: \(\sigma^2\) = phenotypic variance, \(h^2\) = heritability; \(c^2\) = ratio of phenotypic variance due to cage effect; \(^b\)W1, W2, W3, W4 = week of the fattening period; \(^c\)Weighted averages; \(^d\)FF = full feeding; RF = restricted feeding

ADFI_FF conditioned on ADG_FF can be interpreted as a FE measurement similar to RFI, despite of maintenance needs has not been considered. The weighted heritability for this trait is high (Table 2), in agreement with previous estimates of heritability forced conversion ratio in the same population of rabbits (Piles et al., 2004). ADG_FF can also be interpreted as a FE trait. Despite of the high heritability for this trait, the possibilities of positive response to selection for this trait might be limited due to its low genetic variability in comparison with that for ADFI_FF|ADG_FF.
Conditioning ADG_{RF} on ADG_{FF} removes the covariance between ADG across FR. Therefore, predicted breeding value for ADG_{RF}|ADG_{FF} represent the effect of genes exclusively involved in ADG_{RF} and not involved in ADG_{FF}. Therefore, it could indicate better the effect of FE genes. The heritability of this conditional trait is equal to that for ADFI_{FF}|ADG_{FF} but its genetic variation is lower. The genetic correlation between ADFI_{FF}|ADG_{FF} and ADG_{RF}|ADG_{FF} was nearly null (PM = -0.16; PSD = 0.20) which suggests that they define different components of FE. It has to be noted that ADFI_{FF}|ADG_{FF} does not account for maintenance needs, but both ADG_{RF} and ADG_{RF}|ADG_{FF} would do it.

Table 2: Weekly estimates of ratios of phenotypic variance of average daily gain on restricted feeding (ADG_{RF}) and average daily feed intake on full feeding (ADFI_{FF}) conditional on average daily gain on full feeding (ADG_{FF}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>ADG_{RF}</th>
<th>ADG_{FF}</th>
<th>ADFI_{FF}</th>
<th>ADG_{FF}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p^2</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>77.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(1.88)</td>
<td>(2.65)</td>
<td>(3.45)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h^2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c^2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parameter: p^2 = phenotypic variance, h^2 = heritability; c^2 = ratio of phenotypic variance due to cage effect; W = week of the fattening period.

CONCLUSIONS

It is feasible to use collective data of feed intake in order to select for feed efficiency. Selection would be slightly more effective when animals are on full than on restricted feeding. However due to the existence of an interaction between the genotype and the feeding regimen, it is advisable to select animals on the same conditions as for production. Feed intake conditional on growth on full feeding can be interpreted as a measurement of RFI; this trait shows a moderate heritability and allows to capture genetic effects different from those involved in growth on restricted feeding.
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Introduction

Strategies for genetic improvement of feed efficiency in rabbit

- As a correlated response to selection for daily gain or body weight at given age.
  - Easy to perform irrespective of the type of housing (individual or collective cages)
  - In some cases, less response than expected

- Direct selection for some measurement of feed efficiency of kits on full feeding computed before the genetic evaluation (e.g., residual feed intake)
  - Potentially more effective (Baah et al., 2016, JAOCS)
  - It requires the measurement of individual feed intake (FI) and body weight gain (BWG). Difficult and costly to perform
  - Do not account for variation over time in variances and correlations for BWG and FI (Foord et al., 2016, JAOCS)
  - Kits need to be in individual cages. Low response in commercial conditions when there is an interaction between the genotype and the feeding regimen and/or type of housing due to social effects

- Direct selection for some measurement of feed efficiency which do not need records on feed intake, as growth rate on restricted feeding
  - Potentially effective (Baah et al., 2016, JAOCS)
  - Easy to perform
  - Possible genotype x feeding regimen interaction
  - Social-interaction effects might be important: G x Type of housing interaction

Objectives

- To define a model for direct selection for feed efficiency which
  - Allows the use of collective records of feed intake
  - Accounts for changes over time of genetic parameters of feed intake and growth rate

- To estimate the interaction between the genotype and the feeding regimen for growth and feed efficiency for kits in collective cages

Material & Methods

Feeding Regimens

- FF: Full
- RF: Restricted to 75% feed intake on FF

Same management & environmental conditions. 8 kits/cage. 4 families/cage

Multiple-trait model for weekly data as different correlated traits

ADF<sub>FF</sub>: average daily feed intake on full feeding
ADF<sub>RF</sub>: average daily gain on full feeding
ADF<sub>FR</sub>: average daily gain on restricted feeding

Y<sub>ij</sub> = β<sub>0</sub> + S<sub>i</sub> + X<sub>j</sub>P<sub>i</sub> + X<sub>j</sub>L<sub>i</sub>S<sub>i</sub> + Z<sub>j</sub>L<sub>i</sub>S<sub>i</sub> + Z<sub>j</sub>L<sub>i</sub>S<sub>i</sub> + C<sub>i</sub> + ε<sub>ij</sub>

3 definitions of feed efficiency

- ADF<sub>FF</sub> : ADF<sub>RF</sub>: feed intake conditioned on daily body gain on FF
- ADF<sub>RF</sub> : daily body gain on FF
- ADF<sub>RF</sub> : daily body gain on FF conditioned on daily body gain on FF

Bayesian analysis; gibbs1990.
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