

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Acta agriculturae Scandinavica. Section A, Animal science on 28 Feb 2012, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09064702.2012.660983>

1 SHORT COMMUNICATION

2 Genotype by environment interaction for lamb weaning
3 weight in the Norwegian White Sheep breed

4 Yazel Valdez-Nava^{1,2}, Geir Steinheim^{*,1}, Jørgen Ødegård³, Leiv S. Eikje⁴,
5 Birgit Fuerst-Waltl², Gunnar Klemetsdal¹

6

7 ¹Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences,
8 P.O. Box 5003, N-1432 Ås, Norway, ²Department of Sustainable Agricultural Systems,
9 Division of Livestock Sciences, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Vienna,
10 Gregor-Mendel-Strasse 33, A-1180 Vienna, Austria, ³Nofima, P.O. Box 5010, N-1432 Ås,
11 Norway, ⁴The Norwegian Association of Sheep and Goat Breeders, P.O. Box 104, N-1431 Ås,
12 Norway

13

14 *Correspondence to Geir Steinheim: e-mail: geir.steinheim@umb.no;

15 telephone: (+47) 64 96 51 60; fax: (+47) 64 96 51 01

16

17

1 **Abstract:** Genotype by environment (GxE) interaction effects influence phenotypic
2 expressions of a trait and may be of importance for sheep breeding. Interaction effects are
3 more likely to be present when there are large environmental differences. Norwegian sheep
4 usually graze mountain or forest pastures during summer. In this study, we estimate GxE
5 interactions in Norwegian White Sheep as genetic correlation between area-specific traits
6 (autumn lamb weight) in three ram circles located in two different counties; two in Buskerud
7 in the south and one in Troms to the north of the country. Using data from the National Sheep
8 Recording System, a bivariate animal model was fitted and genetic correlations for each trait
9 were obtained. None of the correlations were significantly different from unity indicating the
10 absence of GxE interaction effect for weaning weight. To gain further insight, studies should
11 include a breeding-goal level aggregation of all traits thought to contribute to profitability.

12

13 [Y. Valdez-Nava^{1, 2}, G. Steinheim¹, J. Ødegård³, L. S. Eikje⁴, B. Fuerst-Waltl²,
14 G. Klemetsdal¹; ¹Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of
15 Life Sciences, P.O. Box 5003, N-1432 Ås, Norway, ²Department of Sustainable Agricultural
16 Systems, Division of Livestock Sciences, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences
17 Vienna, Gregor-Mendel-Strasse 33, A-1180 Vienna, Austria, ³Nofima, P.O. Box 5010, N-
18 1432 Ås, Norway, ⁴The Norwegian Association of Sheep and Goat Breeders, P.O. Box 104,
19 N-1431 Ås, Norway]

20

21 **Title:** Genotype by environment interaction for lamb weaning weight in the Norwegian White
22 Sheep breed

23 **Journal:** Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A - Animal Science

24 **Keywords:** animal model, genetic correlation, GxE, rangeland pasture

25

1 **Introduction**

2 Norway has diverse rangeland pastures, ranging from southern lowland forests to the
3 transition zone between alpine vegetation and arctic tundra in the north (Austrheim &
4 Eriksson, 2001). This large environmental variation, together with a national breeding scheme
5 with intensified use of artificial insemination (AI) (Eikje et al., 2011), stress the need to
6 investigate whether genotype by environment (GxE) interaction effects important for
7 breeding, exist within the most prevalent Norwegian sheep breed, the Norwegian White
8 Sheep (NWS).

9 Steinheim et al. (2004, 2008) found significant breed by environment interactions
10 effects on lamb autumn weights when comparing NWS and the Spælsau breed, with lower
11 environmental sensitivity (deJong & Bijma, 2002) for Spælsau than for NWS, and suggested
12 that this was due to breed differences in digestive anatomy (Steinheim et al., 2003) and diet
13 choice (Steinheim et al., 2005). We now present the first attempt to estimate GxE interactions
14 within-breed in Norwegian sheep, using the NWS. This recently founded, composite breed
15 (Eikje et al., 2008), is mainly made up of the Norwegian breeds Dala, Rygja, and Steigar
16 (these hail from old Norwegian breeds and UK breeds, with some imports of Finnish
17 Landrace and Texel) (descriptions, see: Oklahoma State University, 2011:
18 www.ansi.okstate.edu/breeds/sheep).

19 We estimated genotype by environment (GxE) interaction effects on lamb weaning
20 weight in the NWS using a bivariate animal model, with the GxE effect modelled as the
21 genetic correlation between environment-specific weaning weight traits.

1 **Material and methods**

2 *Sheep data and study areas*

3 The Norwegian sheep breeding scheme is based on ram circles (Gjedrem, 1969) made up of
4 several flocks (in 2011 a total of 122 circles; 92 of these keep NWS) that exchange promising
5 rams for progeny testing. Rams producing high quality offspring are selected as elite rams,
6 and some of these are chosen for national use through AI. Data are collected through the
7 Norwegian Sheep Recording System in which today approximately 4,500 sheep flocks (of a
8 total of 14,000) participate.

9 Ram circles included in this study were 1) Lier, Modum and Eiker (hereafter termed:
10 LME), grazing their sheep on forest pasture in Buskerud county, 2) Uvdal, also in Buskerud,
11 using mountain pastures, and 3) Alperingen using coastal mountain pasture in Troms County
12 (Fig. 1). Animals from flocks belonging to these circles were selected from the Recording
13 System. A requirement for inclusion in the study was that the summer range pastures should
14 be relatively free from large predators, and within a circle only sheep from farms using the
15 same rangeland area for all sheep (verified through communication with the circles) were
16 included.

17 Data included observations from 1990 through 2010, on 37,530 lambs in LME (11
18 flocks), 17,040 in Uvdal (10 flocks) and 21,540 in Alperingen (5 flocks); in total 76,110
19 lambs. Selection criteria for including lambs in the dataset were similar to those used in the
20 national BLUP evaluations (Eikje et al., 2008), e.g. weaning weight 15-85 kg, age at weighing
21 90-180 days, with birth in spring and weighing in autumn. Due to few older ewes in our
22 dataset we included only dams aged 1 - 8 years. A 12-generation pedigree was constructed for
23 all lambs.

24

1

2 *Statistical analysis*

3 Data management and descriptive statistics, including number of sires used across >1 of the
4 circles (for indication of genetic ties between the environments) was done in SAS 9.2 (SAS
5 Institute Inc., 2008). Using ASReml-W v3.0 (Gilmour et al., 2009) we fitted a bivariate
6 general mixed linear animal model, with the GxE effect modelled as the genetic correlation
7 between weaning weight in environments *I* and *II* and tested through comparing log
8 likelihoods of a (reduced) model with the correlation set to unity and a (full) model with the
9 correlation estimated from the data. In the following, environment *I* and *II* represent two of
10 the in total four environment classes (LME, Uvdal, LME and Uvdal pooled, and Alperingen).
11 The model was

$$12 \begin{bmatrix} y_I \\ y_{II} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_I & 0 \\ 0 & X_{II} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_I \\ b_{II} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} Z_{wI} & Z_{pI} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_{wI} & Z_{pI} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{wI} \\ u_{pI} \\ u_{wII} \\ u_{pII} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} e_I \\ e_{II} \end{bmatrix},$$

13 where \mathbf{y} is the vector of all weaning weight observations in environment *I* or *II*; \mathbf{b} is a vector
14 of environment-specific fixed effects included to correct for environmental and demographic
15 effects and \mathbf{X} an incidence matrix relating \mathbf{b} to the environment-specific observations. Fixed
16 effects included ram circle, birth rank (combinations of litter size at birth 1-5, litter size in
17 autumn 1-4, and sex of lamb), age of dam (1-8 years), and flock by year. Age at weighing
18 (80-180 days) was included as a regression variable. The incidence matrix \mathbf{Z} relates
19 observations in environment *I* or *II* to their random effects in \mathbf{u} , a vector representing random
20 effects for direct (\mathbf{w}) additive effect and maternal permanent environmental (\mathbf{p}) effects for
21 environment *I* or *II*. Variance-covariance structure for \mathbf{w} was

$$\begin{bmatrix} A\delta_{BV_I}^2 & A\delta_{BV_I,II} \\ A\delta_{BV_I,BV_{II}} & A\delta_{BV_{II}}^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

1
2 where **A** is the additive relationship matrix between animals; correspondingly sized maternal
3 (environmental) and residual variance matrices were diagonal but heterogeneous.

4

5 **Results**

6 Mean weaning weights and descriptive statistics per ram circle are given in Table 1. The
7 heaviest lambs were found in Uvdal and the lightest in Alperingen.

8 Log-likelihood tests of explanatory gains of including estimated-from-data
9 correlations between weaning weights in the pair-wise environment classes (Table 2) did not
10 find any of the correlations to be significantly different from unity (all $p > 0.05$). Heritabilities
11 and genetic and residual variance components are given in Table 3.

12 From use of AI sires and exchange of live animals within Buskerud, LME and Uvdal
13 shared 83 sires, LME and Alperingen 49 sires, and Uvdal and Alperingen 43 sires. Of these
14 rams, 30 had sired lambs in all three ram circles.

15

16 **Discussion**

17 None of the obtained correlations were significantly different from unity. The smallest
18 estimate was 0.85 for weights in the southern forest area (LME) versus weights in the
19 northern mountain grazing area (Alperingen): this environmental pair, with a north-south
20 distance of approximately 2000 km, is likely the one with the largest between-environment
21 contrast in pasture conditions. The correlation is, however, not even approaching significance
22 and is not an appropriate basis for a discussion on possible interactions.

1 The pattern of genetic correlations from the bivariate model may seem
2 counterintuitive: r_g is at unity between environments LME and Uvdal, and between Uvdal and
3 Alperingen, but estimated to 0.85 between LME and Alperingen. Estimating the correlations
4 simultaneously through a trivariate model would likely have given more tidy results; we do
5 however believe the bivariate approach to be the most valid in our case: when investigating
6 GxE interaction effects between a southern forest environment and a northern mountainous
7 environment, information from a third, separate area (southern mountain) should not make the
8 level of the estimate more correct.

9 The estimates of heritability for weaning weight ranged from 0.14 to 0.19 with a
10 tendency towards being highest in Uvdal and lowest in Alperingen. The size of these
11 estimates correspond well with previous studies: Larsgard and Olesen (1998) estimated a
12 heritability of 0.12 ± 0.11 in Norwegian White sheep. From the genetic and residual variance
13 components it is clear that the phenotypic variance and (substantially) the residual (micro-
14 environmental) variance were higher in Alperingen than in Uvdal, with LME at an
15 intermediate level. This may be due to sheep achieving a more homogenous pasture
16 environment in Uvdal, or, possibly, to different weighing practices. In theory the different
17 variation could be due to differences in environmental plasticity (de Jong & Bijma, 2002); this
18 should be addressed in further studies

19 When performing GxE studies across environments, strong genetic ties
20 (connectedness) are needed; otherwise there is risk of bias in genetic comparisons (Kennedy
21 & Trus, 1993; Kuehn et al., 2008). We found a considerable overlap in use of sires between
22 the circles, as reflected in the reasonable standard errors of the estimates of the genetic
23 correlations.

1 To determine the environmental factors that are relevant in a GxE context is not
2 straightforward. From our selected material and locations, it seems likely that interactions
3 could be related to genetic differences in foraging behaviour; e.g. on mountain pastures sheep
4 usually take advantage of the altitudinal gradient by following the snow melt and thus getting
5 prolonged access to fresh, newly emerged plant growth. Another possible reason for GxE
6 interactions could be different occurrence of heat stress: even in Northern Norway sheep will
7 often reduce their foraging time on hot summer days [even in the northernmost part of
8 Norway temperatures may rise as high as 30°C, see *e.g.* Meteorologisk institutt (2011)] and
9 resistance to heat stress is likely to have a genetic basis. Overall, when comparing such
10 diverse environment classes as rangeland pasture types it is likely that GxE interaction effects,
11 if present, are due to combinations of several environmental factors.

12 Unlike the reaction norm approach (Kolmodin, 2003), which is based on defined
13 environmental gradients, genetic correlations are estimated without the need to define what
14 specific environmental traits (e.g. altitude, precipitation, etc.) are relevant. Because of the
15 high number of potentially important environmental traits shaping the Norwegian sheep
16 grazing areas, defining relevant environmental gradients may turn out to be a complex task.

17 Further GxE research within sheep breed in Norway should appreciate all production
18 traits that are important for industry profitability in a wide range of environments. Even with
19 small GxE effects for individual traits, the effect through aggregated genotypes could still be
20 considerable.

21

22 **Conclusion**

23 This is the first attempt to estimate genotype by environment interaction (GxE) within-breed
24 for sheep in Norway. The results do not indicate the presence of a GxE interaction effect for

1 the lamb weaning weight. Further attempts to gain industry-relevant insight into GxE
2 interaction effects within sheep breed, should carry out studies on a breeding goal level, i.e.
3 for an aggregated economic genotype.

4

5 **References**

- 6 Austrheim, G. & Eriksson, O. (2001). Plant species diversity and grazing in the Scandinavian
7 mountains: patterns and processes at different spatial scales. *Ecography* 24, 683-695.
- 8 de Jong, G. & Bijma, P. (2002). Selection and phenotypic plasticity in evolutionary biology
9 and animal breeding. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 78, 195-214.
- 10 Eikje, L.S., Ådnøy, T. & Klemetsdal, G. (2008). The Norwegian sheep breeding scheme:
11 description, genetic and phenotypic change. *Animal* 2, 167-176.
- 12 Eikje, L.S., Schaeffer, L.R., Ådnøy, T. & Klemetsdal, G. (2011). Sheep breeding schemes
13 utilising artificial insemination; large-scale simulation with a complex breeding goal.
14 *Animal* 5, 367-377.
- 15 Gilmour, A.R., Gogel, B.J., Cullis, B.R. & Thompson, R. 2009. *ASReml User Guide Release*
16 *3.0*. VSN International Ltd, Hemel Hempstead, UK.
- 17 Gjedrem, T. (1969). Some attempts to increase the efficiency of sheep selection. *Acta Agric.*
18 *Scand.* 19, 116–126.
- 19 Kennedy, B.W. & Trus, D. (1993). Considerations on genetic connectedness between
20 management units under an animal-model. *J. Anim. Sci.*, 71, 2341-2352.
- 21 Kolmodin, R. 2003. Reaction norms for the study of genotype by environment interaction in
22 animal breeding. Doctoral dissertation. Dept. of Animal Breeding and Genetics, SLU.
23 *Acta Universitatis agriculturae Sueciae. Agraria* vol. 437, Swedish University of
24 Agriculture Sciences (SLU), Uppsala.

- 1 Kuehn, L. A., Notter, D.R., Nieuwhof, G.J. & Lewis, R.M. (2008). Changes in connectedness
2 over time in alternative sheep sire referencing schemes. *J. Anim. Sci.* 86, 536-544.
- 3 Larsgard, A.G. & Olesen, I. 1998. Genetic parameters for direct and maternal effects on
4 weights and ultrasonic muscle and fat depth of lambs. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 55, 273-278.
- 5 Meteorologisk institutt (Norwegian Meteorological Institute), 2011. The climate of Norway,
6 internet document, URL: http://met.no/English/Climate_in_Norway/. Accessed 23-
7 Dec2011.
- 8 Oklahoma State University 2011. Breeds of livestock: Sheep (*Ovis aries*). Internet document:
9 www.ansi.okstate.edu/breeds/sheep/. Accessed 23-Dec 2011.
- 10 SAS Institute Inc. 2008. What's New in SAS® 9.2. Cary, NC, SAS Institute Inc.
- 11 Steinheim, G., Nordheim, L.A., Weladji, R.B., Gordon, I.J., Ådnøy, T. & Holand, Ø. (2005).
12 Differences in choice of diet between sheep breeds grazing mountain pastures in
13 Norway. *Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. A, Anim. Sci.* 55, 16–20.
- 14 Steinheim, G., Nordheim, L.A., Weladji, R.B., Holand, Ø. & Ådnøy, T. (2003). Digestive
15 tract anatomy of Norwegian sheep: difference between breeds. *Acta Agric. Scand. Sect.*
16 *A, Anim. Sci.* 53, 155–158.
- 17 Steinheim, G., Ådnøy, T., Meuwissen, T. & Klemetsdal, G. (2004). Indications of breed by
18 environment interaction for lamb weights in Norwegian sheep breeds. *Acta Agric.*
19 *Scand. Sect. A, Anim Sci.* 54, 193-196.
- 20 Steinheim, G., Ødegård J., Ådnøy T. & Klemetsdal G. (2008). Genotype by environment
21 interaction for lamb weaning weight in two Norwegian sheep breeds. *Acta Agric.*
22 *Scand. Sect. A, Anim Sci.* 86, 33-39.

23

TABLE HEADINGS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Table 1. Number of records (N), mean, standard deviation (SD) and range of autumn lamb weight in the four environments studied (LME = ram circle “Lier, Modum og Eiker”)

Table 2. Genetic correlations (r_g) \pm SE, between lamb weaning weights in Lier, Modum og Eiker (LME), Uvdal, and Alperingen ram circles; no r_g differed significantly from 1.0: the χ^2 statistics (df= 1) in italics for the log-likelihood test must be ≥ 3.84 to reach a 0.05 level of significance.

Table 3. Genetic (δ^2_{BV}), maternal permanent environmental (δ^2_{PE}), and residual environmental (δ^2_E) variation, with estimated heritabilities (h^2) for each environment (LME= Lier, Modum and Eiker), for each bivariate analysis.

FIGURE CAPTION

1

2

3

4 **Figure 1.** Location of study areas are indicated on the map; these are the summer grazing
5 areas of the ram exchange circles Lier, Modum og Eiker (LME), Uvdal (U) and Alperingen
6 (A).