



Consequences of selection for residual feed intake in beef cattle

David Lines

A thesis submitted for the partial fulfilment of the requirements of Doctorate of
Philosophy

The University of Adelaide

Faculty of Sciences

School of Animal and Veterinary Sciences

December, 2016

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	I
List of Figures.....	VII
List of Tables.....	XII
Declaration.....	XVII
Acknowledgements.....	XVIII
Abstract.....	2
1.....	7
CHAPTER 1: Literature Review.....	8
1.1 Introduction.....	8
1.2 Measures of feed efficiency.....	8
1.2.1 Gross efficiency and feed conversion ratio.....	8
1.2.2 Maintenance.....	10
1.2.3 Partial efficiency of growth.....	11
1.2.4 Conclusion: Measures of feed efficiency.....	11
1.3 Residual Feed Intake.....	12
1.4 RFI and heat production.....	14
1.5 RFI and protein turnover.....	15
1.5.1 Protein turnover.....	15
1.5.2 Protease systems.....	16
1.5.3 Contribution of protein turnover to the efficiency of feed use.....	20
1.6 Conclusion.....	27
2.....	28

CHAPTER 2: Protein metabolism of Angus heifers divergently selected for residual feed intake.....	29
2.1 Introduction.....	29
2.2 Materials and Methods.....	30
2.2.1 Experimental protocols	30
2.2.2 Protein metabolism and leucine kinetics	31
2.2.3 Determination of α -ketoisocaproic acid and leucine enrichment.....	33
2.2.4 Determination of 3-methyl-histidine	34
2.2.5 Determination of carbon dioxide enrichment.....	35
2.2.6 Calculation of parameters of leucine kinetics	36
2.2.7 Statistical analysis	38
2.3 Results.....	38
2.4 Discussion.....	43
2.5 Conclusions.....	46
3	48
CHAPTER 3: Energy, nutrient balance and body composition of Angus heifers divergently selected for residual feed intake	49
3.1 Introduction.....	49
3.2 Materials and Methods.....	50
3.2.1 Animals	50
3.2.2 Body Composition.....	50
3.2.3 Heat production (HP)	50
3.2.4 Nitrogen and energy balance.....	51
3.2.5 Determination of total titanium dioxide	52
3.2.6 Statistical analysis	53

3.3	Results.....	53
3.3.1	Body composition	53
3.3.2	Feed intake and digestibility	55
3.3.3	Heat production	59
3.4	Discussion.....	60
3.5	Conclusions.....	72
4	74
CHAPTER 4: Regulation of appetite and indicators of energy balance in Angus heifers		
divergently selected for residual feed intake		
4.1	Introduction.....	75
4.2	Materials and Methods.....	77
4.2.1	Animals	77
4.2.2	Statistical analysis	77
4.3	Results.....	78
4.3.1	Glucose.....	79
4.3.2	NEFA	80
4.3.3	Ghrelin.....	82
4.3.4	Insulin.....	86
4.3.5	Leptin	88
4.4	Discussion.....	89
4.4.1	Energy Status.....	89
4.4.2	Appetite Regulation.....	92
4.5	Conclusions.....	95
5	96

CHAPTER 5: Carcass composition and meat quality traits of long fed feedlot finished Angus steers divergently selected for residual feed intake.....	97
5.1 Introduction.....	97
5.2 Materials and Methods.....	98
5.2.1 Cattle Breeding.....	98
5.2.2 Cattle management and measurements	99
5.2.3 Statistical analysis	104
5.3 Results.....	107
5.4 Discussion.....	116
5.5 Conclusions.....	122
6	123
CHAPTER 6: Responses to selection for RFI.....	124
6.1 Introduction.....	124
6.2 Materials and Methods.....	124
6.2.1 Animals: Steers divergent in RFI for 1 generation	125
6.2.2 Animals: Steers divergent in RFI for 2.5 generations.....	128
6.2.3 Animals: Heifers divergent in RFI for 3.5 generations.....	128
6.2.4 Modelling RFI in the “Davis Growth” model	130
6.2.5 Statistical analysis	131
6.3 Results.....	132
6.3.1 Single trait RFI selection for 1 generation: steers	132
6.3.2 Single trait RFI selection for 2.5 generations: steers	136
6.3.3 Single trait RFI selection for 3.5 generations: heifers.....	138
6.3.4 Comparison of selection lines	141
6.3.5 Modelling residual feed intake.....	142

6.4	Discussion.....	143
6.5	Conclusions.....	152
7	153
CHAPTER 7: Phenotypic relationships between body composition, ME-intake and energetics of cows and calves from diverse fat genotypes and implications for residual feed intake.....		
		154
7.1	Introduction.....	154
7.2	Materials and Methods.....	155
7.2.1	Animals	155
7.2.2	Treatment allocation.....	156
7.2.3	Animal Measurements.....	157
7.2.4	Feeding	159
7.2.5	Modelling body composition	163
7.2.6	Modelling energy requirements	164
7.2.7	Change traits.....	168
7.2.8	Statistical analysis	168
7.3	Results.....	170
7.3.1	Maternal efficiency - weaning to mating	170
7.3.2	Maternal efficiency - mating to weaning	182
7.4	Discussion.....	195
7.5	Conclusion	202
8	204
CHAPTER 8: General Discussion.....		
		205

8.1	Introduction.....	205
8.2	Biological mechanisms associated with variation in RFI.....	206
8.2.1	Appetite	206
8.2.2	Biological mechanisms associated with variation in RFI	213
8.3	Biological mechanisms not associated with variation in RFI.....	215
8.3.1	Protein metabolism.....	215
8.3.2	Heat production	216
8.3.3	Maintenance requirements	217
8.4	Value of low maintenance requirements in production systems	218
8.5	Practical alternatives to RFI.....	223
8.5.1	Growing animals	223
8.5.2	Breeding animals.....	224
8.6	Conclusions.....	227
9	230
Appendix 3.1	231
Appendix 5.1	233
Appendix 8.1	235
Appendix 8.2	238
Publications	240
References	241

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Contributions of biological mechanisms to variation in residual feed intake as determined from experiments on divergently selected cattle (Richardson and Herd, 2004).	14
Figure 2.1: Enrichments (atom percent excess) of plasma leucine (●), α -ketoisocaproic acid (●) and carbon dioxide (●) of the first four animals infused for 12 hours with 10 μ mol/kg BW0.75/hr L-leucine-1-13C.	32
Figure 2.2: Least squares means for the RFI by feeding level interaction on protein synthesis adjusted for weight (covariate).....	40
Figure 2.3: Least squares means for the RFI by feeding level interaction on protein degradation adjusted for weight (covariate).	41
Figure 2.4: Least squares means for the RFI by feeding level interaction on protein balance adjusted for weight (covariate).	42
Figure 3.1: Least squares means for the RFI by feeding level interaction adjusted for weight (covariate). ^{ab} Superscripts differ significantly at P<0.05.....	56
Figure 3.2: Least squares means for the RFI by feeding level interaction adjusted for weight (covariate). GEI = Gross Energy Intake; MEI = Metabolisable Energy Intake; HP = Heat Production; 105M= 105% ME _m ; 180M = 180%ME _m	60

Figure 4.1: Plasma glucose concentration of high and low RFI heifers during feeding.	79
Figure 4.2: Plasma glucose concentration in heifers fed at 105% and 180% ME _m during feeding.	80
Figure 4.3: Plasma NEFA concentration of high and low RFI heifers during feeding. .	81
Figure 4.4: Plasma NEFA concentration in heifers fed at 105% and 180% ME _m during feeding. † = P<0.10.	82
Figure 4.5: Plasma ghrelin concentration of high and low RFI heifers during feeding.* = P<0.05.....	83
Figure 4.6: Plasma ghrelin concentration in heifers fed at 105% and 180% ME _m during feeding. * = P<0.05.....	84
Figure 4.7: Average plasma ghrelin concentrations over time of high and low RFI heifers fed at 105% and 180% ME _m . * = P<0.05	85
Figure 4.8: Plasma ghrelin concentration of high and low RFI heifers fed at 105% and 180% ME _m during feeding. † = P<0.10.....	85
Figure 4.9: Plasma insulin concentration of high and low RFI heifers during feeding. ** = P<0.01.....	86

Figure 4.10: Plasma insulin concentration in heifers fed at 105% and 180% MEm during feeding. * = P<0.05; † = P<0.10.	87
Figure 4.11: Plasma leptin concentration of high and low RFI heifers during feeding..	88
Figure 4.12: Plasma leptin concentration in heifers fed at 105% and 180% MEm during feeding.	89
Figure 5.1: Cubic smoothing splines for consecutive three-day means for adjusted daily feed intake (adjDFI-3 day bloc) the high low RFI-EBV (low mid-parent RFI-EBV), medium RFI-EBV and high RFI-EBV (high mid-parent RFI-EBV) pens of Angus steers (± 2 se). Y-axis = kg feed intake, x-axis = days on feed	105
Figure 7.1: Weight of B drop cows at Struan Research Station, representative of seasonal changes in body weight and the critical dates of weaning and start of mating during three calving periods of all cow cohorts.....	158
Figure 7.2: Rib fat depths of B drop cows at Struan Research Station, representative of seasonal changes in body composition and the critical dates of weaning and start of mating during three calving periods of all cow cohorts.....	159
Figure 7.3: Predicted ME requirements and actual ME-Intake of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from weaning to start of mating.	175

Figure 7.4: Metabolisable energy requirements for cow maintenance, growth, growth of the gravid uterus and lactation of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from weaning to start of mating. 180

Figure 7.5: Estimated heat production (HP), heat production of gain (HPG) and heat production of maintenance (HPM) of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from weaning to start of mating. 181

Figure 7.6: Predicted ME requirements and apparent ME-intake of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from start of mating to weaning. 188

Figure 7.7: Metabolisable energy requirements for cow maintenance, growth, growth of the gravid uterus and lactation of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from start of mating to weaning. 191

Figure 7.8: Heat production (HP), heat production of gain (HPG) and heat production of maintenance (HPM) of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from start of mating to weaning. 193

Figure 8.1: Contribution of biological mechanisms to variation in RFI as determined from the experiments on divergently selected steers and heifers herein (Chapters 2, 3 and 6; Appendix 8.2). 214

Figure 8.2: Hypothesis of the variance in feed intake of high and low RFI animals associated with energy restriction in a southern Australian production system. 218

Figure 9.1: Relationship between CO₂ entry rate and heat production in beef cattle from literature sources and in sheep from Corbett et al. (1971)..... 231

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Correlation coefficients for measures of protein degradation	22
Table 1.2: Metabolic heat production	24
Table 2.1: Diet ingredients and composition	31
Table 2.2: Main effects means and SEM over the treatment periods in leucine kinetics for high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.	39
Table 2.3: Main effects means and SEM over the treatment periods in protein metabolism for high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.	40
Table 2.4: Main effects means and SEM over the treatment periods in the energetics of protein turnover for high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.	43
Table 3.1: Raw means for age and body composition at the start of each measurement period for high and low residual feed intake heifers.	54
Table 3.2: Main effects means and SEM for absolute changes over the treatment periods in weight and body composition for high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.....	55

Table 3.3: Main effect means and SEM for feed intake, digestibility, nitrogen and energy partitioning of high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.....	58
Table 3.4: Main effects means and SEM for CO ₂ entry rate and heat production of high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% or 180% maintenance feeding levels.....	59
Table 4.1: Best linear unbiased estimates of plasma metabolite concentrations for low and high RFI heifers and feeding levels of 105% ME _m and 180% ME _m	78
Table 5.1: Mid-parent RFI-EBV, age, weight, average daily gain (ADG), feed intake and feed efficiency in the feedlot for Angus steers in high, medium and low RFI-EBV groups based on mid-parent RFI-EBV. Values are means (\pm se; LS-means for weights and daily gains) and regression coefficients (\pm se) for the trait with mid-parent RFI-EBV and percentage changes of traits.	110
Table 5.2: Subcutaneous rib fat depth and eye-muscle area taken by ultrasound scan prior to induction and carcass traits for Angus steers in high, medium and low feed intake groups based on mid-parent RFI-EBV. Values are LS-means (\pm se) and regression coefficients (\pm se) for the trait with mid-parent RFI-EBV and percentage changes of traits.	113
Table 5.3: Ultimate pH, calpastatin activity and meat quality characteristics of the M. longissimus dorsi from Angus steers in high, medium and low feed intake groups based on mid-parent RFI-EBV. Values are LS-means (\pm se) and regression coefficients (\pm se) for the trait with mid-parent RFI-EBV	115

Table 6.1: Main effects means and SEM for energetics of <i>ad libitum</i> feed intake and body composition of Angus steers genetically differing in RFI fed for approximately 140 days. Assigned to low and high RFI groups based on sire RFI-EBVs.	134
Table 6.2: Main effect means and SEM for energetics of <i>ad libitum</i> feed intake and body composition of Angus steers following 1 generation of selection for RFI and fed for approximately 140 days. Assigned to high and low RFI based on own RFI measurements.....	135
Table 6.3: Main effect means and SEM for energetics of <i>ad libitum</i> feed intake and body composition of Angus steers following 2.5 generations of selection for RFI and fed in a commercial feedlot for 251 days. Assigned to RFI group based on mid-parent RFI-EBVs.	137
Table 6.4: Main effect means and SEM for energetics of feed intake and body composition of high and low RFI heifers fed at either 105% of 180% maintenance feeding levels, the result of 3.5 generations of selection for RFI. Assigned to RFI group based on mid-parent RFI-EBVs.....	140
Table 6.5: Heat production, HPG and HPM of high and low RFI animals genetically divergent in RFI after 1, 2.5 and 3.5 generations of selection.	141
Table 6.6: Davis growth model predictions of energy intake, feed efficiency, body composition and energy retention responses to a $\pm 10\%$ change in feed intake over a typical 70 day test period.	143

Table 7.1: Data for fat lines heifers joined at Struan Research Centre by year and genetic group based on their mid parent EBVs.	156
Table 7.2: Experimental dates for B and C drop heifers for calving, mating and weaning in supplementary feeding and grazing periods.	157
Table 7.3: Weight and body composition of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from weaning to start of mating.	172
Table 7.4: Weight and body composition of cows fed at high and low nutrition as well as high and low fat genotype cows from weaning to start of mating.	173
Table 7.5: Apparent feed intake, energy retention, metabolisable energy requirements and efficiency of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from weaning to start of mating.	176
Table 7.6: Apparent feed intake, energy retention, metabolisable energy requirements and ECR of cows fed at high and low nutrition as well high and low fat genotype cows from weaning to start of mating.	177
Table 7.7: Weight and body composition of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from start of mating to weaning.	185
Table 7.8: Weight and body composition of cows fed at high and low nutrition as well as high and low fat genotype cows from start of mating to weaning.	186

Table 7.9: Apparent feed intake, energy retention, metabolisable energy requirements and efficiency of high and low fat genotype animals at two levels of nutrition from start of mating to weaning.	189
Table 7.10: Apparent feed intake, energy retention, metabolisable energy requirements and ECR of cows fed at high and low nutrition as well high and low fat genotype cows from start of mating to weaning.....	190
Table 8.1: ME-intake and activity related heat production of high and low RFI steers divergent in RFI for one and 2.5 generations.	212
Table 8.2: Disposition of dietary energy of circa 1900 vs. circa 1996 steers. Adapted from Johnson <i>et al.</i> (2003).....	220
Table 9.1: Means, standard deviations and ranges in values for traits for the feedlot steers 2.5 generations divergent for RFI and for their sires and dams.....	233

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

David Lines

December, 2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Kerry Hutton for her assistance with the sampling, and laboratory analyses in chapters 2 and 3, as well as the University of New England and the NSW DPI Beef Industry Centre for allowing me to use their facilities for 2 years. I have some very fond memories of Armidale and thank them for this opportunity. NSW DPI supplied me with the animals in most of this thesis and I am eternally grateful to Robert Herd and Paul Arthur for this. I would also like to thank Robert Herd and Shelly Piper with help preparing chapter 5 as well as Geert Geesink for the calpastatin analysis and Andrew Egarr for fat analysis in this chapter. A big thanks go to the Maternal Productivity team who helped with chapter 7, firstly Katrina Copping and Wayne Pitchford for help with the methods, Michelle Hebart for providing data and Michelle Hebart and Wayne Pitchford for helping with statistical analysis of this chapter. My research and scholarship was fully supported by The Co-operative Research Centre for Beef Genetic Technologies, without whom my research would not have been possible.

My long suffering supervisors, Hutton Oddy, Wayne Pitchford and Cynthia Bottema, I owe you each a great deal of gratitude. In your different ways you made up the ideal supervisory team and I am eternally grateful for not only your supervisory guidance but also your friendship.

To friends, family and colleges who have provided support and believed in me, it is finally complete.

Abstract

Abstract

In all livestock systems, feed accounts for the greatest cost of production. Therefore, improvements in the production efficiency by reduced feed inputs would be a significant economic benefit to Australian ruminant production systems, particularly for beef cattle. Residual feed intake (RFI) is the difference between an animal's actual feed intake and that which would be expected based on production. Selection for residual feed intake enables a reduction in inputs (feed) with no or minimal change in outputs (mature weight and growth rate). However, the biological processes underpinning variation in residual feed intake are unclear.

Many authors have hypothesised that part of the variation in RFI may be due to differences in energetic efficiency through changes in heat production, these being in part due to differences in protein metabolism. Following three generations of divergent selection for RFI, eight High and eight Low-RFI heifers were fed at both 105 and 180% of predicted maintenance feed requirements. Between-RFI line and feeding-level differences were assessed for energy intake, protein metabolism, heat production, body composition, energy and nitrogen balance and digestibility. The RFI lines did not differ in protein metabolism or heat production. The High-RFI heifers deposited 51 and 56% more subcutaneous fat at the P8 rump and 12/13th rib sites, respectively, with no difference in eye muscle area gain or average daily weight gain. The greater fat deposition of High-RFI heifers was due to a larger ad libitum feed consumption compared with the Low-RFI heifers. Energy and nitrogen balance did not differ between the RFI lines. The energy transactions indicated no difference in the efficiency

of energy use on 105% maintenance, although when fed 180% of maintenance the differences in feed intake suggest variation in appetite as the mechanism contributing to RFI. All of the extra energy consumed by High-RFI heifers above maintenance and deposition of protein was associated with additional energy retained as fat.

Despite the variation in residual feed intake being accounted for by variation fat deposition high and low RFI animals still differ significantly in actual feed intake. A potential explanation of this difference could be variation in the energy status and appetite between high and low RFI animals. Eight High and eight Low-RFI heifers were fed at either 105 or 180% of predicted maintenance feed requirements. Plasma were analysed for glucose, insulin, non-esterified fatty acids (NEFA) and ghrelin from blood samples taken before during and after feeding. There was no difference between the circulating ghrelin of low and high RFI heifers, however, low RFI heifers have a reduced feed intake compared to high RFI heifers. It could be hypothesised that the low RFI heifers had a reduced sensitivity to circulating ghrelin whilst the high RFI heifers appear to have weaker negative feedback mechanisms from fatness to reduce feed intake. Additionally, low RFI heifers may be more stressed and certainly appear to be mobilising adipose tissue to produce NEFA as an energy source.

The performance of low RFI-EBV Angus steers in a large commercial feedlot by reduced feed consumed with no adverse effects on final turnoff weight. Low RFI-EBV steers consumed on average 270kg less feed than medium RFI-EBV and high RFI-EBV steers, resulting in a saving of \$53 (at \$200/tonne) of feed per animal. Low RFI-EBV steers finished with less subcutaneous fat measured at the 7/8th rib, which may impact on market specifications. Dressing percentage and seam fat were higher in the low RFI-

EBV steers. Together, this would be expected to result in a greater yield of retail beef with no reduction in visual meat quality or marbling grade. Breeding to reduce RFI, may change distribution of carcass fat but the consequences may not be as severe as previously thought as not all fat depots appear to be equally affected. Meat tenderness may be slightly reduced, but with longer ageing periods, this is unlikely to be a problem.

Cows genetically differing in fatness appear to behave similarly to animals differing in RFI. Low fat genotype cows consume considerably less feed and energy than expected based on their weight, weight gain, growth of the calf and the growth of the gravid uterus. Thus, low fat genotype cows had a lower RFI during both periods of measurement than the high fat genotype cows. Low fat genotype cows had higher mature weights (as these genotypes appear to have a later maturity pattern) with no differences in the weight gains of cows and calves or the weaning weights of calves from these cows, similar to low RFI cows. High fat genotype cows had a greater appetite and ate more, as do high RFI cows. Both of these types of cows are possibly fatter as they have greater appetites and eat more (Chapter 8). Whilst not conclusive, high fat genotype cows and high RFI cows tend to both have higher calving rates, weaning rates and weaning weights per cow exposed. These differences between high and low fat genotypes cows are exactly as expected from cows divergent in RFI. The conclusion is that given the high phenotypic and genotypic correlations between fatness and RFI, selection for feed efficiency may be most easily and cheaply achieved by selecting for fatness.

Direct selection for feed efficiency in beef cattle (FCR) in the past has indicated some potential drawbacks. One issue is that FCR is highly correlated with average daily gain; therefore selection for high growth alone is much more cost-effective than measuring individual feed intake. Another problem is that this measure of feed efficiency would tend to select for animals with greater muscle mass and less fat deposition. Additionally, selection for increased FCR results in increased mature size and increasing the size and energy requirements of cows would not be a goal of most commercial operations.

Due to these issues with selecting for feed conversion ratio (FCR), it was anticipated that RFI may be an alternative to genetic selection for FCR(Koch *et al.*, 1963). It was thought that RFI could be used for genetic selection with much more confidence in beef production systems as it was supposed to be independent of average daily gain, body weight and mature size. However, all the evidence from the experiments conducted herein show that the only biological mechanisms that appear to be affected through selection for RFI is appetite and activity at constant weight and daily gain. The 2 main implications are not trivial: 1) animals that have a greater appetite and consume more energy at constant weight and daily gain, deposit more energy as fat, and 2) animals that deposit more energy as fat do this due to a greater appetite.

Evidence from this thesis concludes that reducing maintenance requirements through selection for RFI may not be possible and may be detrimental to animal fitness. However, if RFI is to be used as a tool for improving feed utilisation, then adjustment for body composition would need to be considered. Given that improving feed utilisation is only reasonable in the growing animal, then feed conversion would be much easier to implement given the high generic and phenotypic correlations between

FCR and growth rate. Currently, producers do not have good measures for the variation in feed utilisation for maintenance to target in selection programs. In the absence of such measures, producers should be encouraged to focus on measurable output traits in their selection programs.