ESTIMATION OF ESTIMATED BREEDING VALUES FOR PRODUCTION AND FERTILITY PERFORMANCE TRAITS IN MURRAH BUFFALOES

SMRITI SHARMA, S.S. DHAKA and C.S. PATIL* Department of Animal Genetics and Breeding, Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Hisar-125004, Haryana

Received: 13.02.2023; Accepted: 08.06.2023

ABSTRACT

The data of 614 Murrah buffaloes and 169 sires related to production and fertility performance traits were gathered from history-cumpedigree sheets of buffalo farm, Department of Livestock Production Management, Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Hisar. Univariate animal model was used for estimating estimated breeding values of production performance traits viz. 305 days milk yield (305 DMY), peak yield (PY), lactation length (LL), dry period (DP), lactation milk yield (LMY), wet average (WA), milk yield per day of calving interval (MCI) and milk yield per day of age at second calving (MSC) were ranged from -332.72 to 173.87 days, -0.48 to 0.47 kg/day, -41.23 to 29.41 days, -16.88 to 62.77 days, -380.66 to 360.62 kgs, -0.20 to 0.19 kg/day, -0.21 to 0.25 kg/day and -0.27 to 0.36 kg/day, respectively and for fertility traits viz. age at first calving (AFC), service period (SP), conception rate (CR), calving interval (CI), number of services per conception (NSC) and pregnancy rate (PR) were ranged from -32.85 to 44.33 days, -15.61 to 28.42 days, -7.41 to 6.48%, -20.64 to 35.79 days, -0.24 to 0.41 and -0.08 to 0.11%, respectively. Spearman rank correlation and Pearson correlation was negatively correlated between the production and fertility performance traits can be improved simultaneously.

Keywords: Breeding value, Fertility traits, Murrah buffaloes, Pearson correlation, Production traits, Spearman correlation

How to cite: Sharma, S., Dhaka, S.S. and Patil, C.S. (2023). Estimation of estimated breeding values for production and fertility performance traits in Murrah buffaloes. *The Haryana Veterinarian* **62(2)**: 113-117.

Murrah is renowned world-famous buffalo breeds of India. Its home tract is Rohtak, Hisar, Jind, Sonepat and Bhiwani districts of Haryana. Due to their high milk yield, Murrah buffaloes have a significant impact on the dairy sector. The objectives of selection in India were mainly based on production traits due to which the fertility traits remained neglected for the long time (Valsalan et al., 2014). By raising culling rates, extending calving intervals, lowering milk output, producing fewer calves per cow per year, and eventually, lowering profit, a decline in reproductive performance raises production costs. Now-a-days, breeding programmes for dairy animals focus on the reproductive and functional characteristics of dairy cows because neglecting fertility lowered a farm's economic return (Komlosi et al., 2010). Economic efficiency of sires are judged from the production and fertility performance of the daughters of those sires. Estimated breeding values (EBVs) of traits determine the genetic merits of animals of each trait. True genetic potential or genetic transmitting ability of animals are reflected by the estimated breeding values (Berry et al., 2011). Ranking of elite sires based on their progeny performances helps in selecting superior quality bulls to produce next generation of high production and fertility performances. However, it has been shown in many studies (Shalaby, 2005; Mostafa et al., 2006) that the production and fertility performance traits had antagonistic relationship with one another. Consequently, the primary

*Corresponding author: dr.cspatil03@gmail.com

goal of this study was to rank the superior and inferior sires according to their EBVs for the production and fertility performance traits. Additionally, the Pearson and Spearman's rank correlations between the EBVs of these traits were drawn in order to ascertain their relationship.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Source of data

The data collected from history-cum-pedigree sheets of buffalo farm, Department of Livestock Production Management, Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Hisar of 614 Murrah buffaloes and 169 sires related to production and fertility performance traits. Hisar climate is subtropical in nature and is found in a semi-arid area. Hisar is located in a latitude of 29° 10' N, a longitude of 75° 40' E, and an elevation of 215.2 metres. For the purpose of estimating estimated breeding values and elite sires in terms of production and fertility performance attributes, data was gathered during a 24-year period from 1996 to 2019.

Standardization of data

Animals with lactation periods less than 150 days, questionable outliers, and atypical records such as abortion, mastitis, and chronic sickness were excluded from the current study. For research on production qualities, it was necessary for a herd to have at least one lactation completed. This requirement applied to animals whose dates of birth, date of first calving, date of disposal, and subsequent calving were known.

Traits under study

The production performance traits included under this study were 305 days milk yield (305 DMY), peak yield (PY), lactation length (LL), dry period (DP), lactation milk yield (LMY), wet average (WA), milk yield per day of calving interval (MCI) and milk yield per day of age at second calving (MSC), all traits were studied up to third lactation and fertility performance traits were age at first calving (AFC), service period (SP), conception rate (CR), calving interval (CI), number of services per conception (NSC) and pregnancy rate (PR) up to 3 calving.

Statistical analysis

The procedure of animal genetic evaluation, has been developed in a standardized way, from using simple least squares methods to maximum likelihood method of separating variation into its component sources. Currently, analysis of variance component for continuous traits are mainly on the basis of mixed model, and for inference maximum likelihood or related methods are utilised. For estimation of breeding values, animal models including mixed-models have become the choice. These techniques offer the best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) of breeding values and calculate the genetic and environmental influences while accounting for the relationship among animals. (Kennedy *et al.*, 1988; Meyer, 1989).

Univariate animal model

Animal model which includes only a single trait for study, is the simplest model used in animal breeding. Breeding value is fitted for each animal. When animals have only one trait, with only fixed and additive genetic effects, and no other random effects (maternal or dominance), such model is known as single trait animal model. These models, analyze one trait at a time. Univariate/Single trait animal model is as follows:

Model: $y = X\beta \pm Za \pm e$

Where, $y = n \times 1$ vector of observations for each trait; X = Incidence matrix that relates data to the unknown vector of fixed effects β ; Z = Incidence matrix that relates unknown vector of direct (a) breeding values, to y; e = Unknown vector that contains random residuals due to environmental effects peculiar to individual records.

The model uses standard assumptions and definitions. Additive direct effects were assumed to be normally distributed with means 0 and variance A σ_{a}^{2} , where, σ_{a}^{2} is the direct additive genetic and A is the numerator relationship matrix.

Spearman's rank correlation and Pearson correlation

between the estimated breeding values of the production and fertility performance traits was estimated using IBM SPSS version 23 software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean of production and fertility performance traits under univariate animal model using WOMBAT software have been depicted in Table 1 and 2. The means for production performance traits *viz.* 305 DMY, PY, LL, DP, LMY, WA, MCI and MSC were 2148.05 kg, 10.74 kg/day, 319.19 days, 117.88 days, 2288.8 kg, 7.12 kg/day, 4.84 kg/day and 1.33 kg/day, respectively. Likewise, the mean values of fertility traits *viz.* AFC, SP, CR, CI, NSC and PR were 1361.21 days, 186.73 days, 59.75 %, 493.36 days, 2.23 and 0.22%, respectively.

The estimated breeding values of production performance traits viz. 305 DMY, PY, LL, DP, LMY, WA, MCI and MSC were ranged from -332.72 to 173.87 kg, -0.48 to 0.47 days, -41.23 to 29.41 days, -16.88 to 62.77 days, -380.66 to 360.62 kg, -0.20 to 0.19 kg/day, -0.21 to 0.25 kg/day and -0.27 to 0.36 kg/day, respectively and for fertility traits viz. AFC, SP, CR, CI, NSC and PR were ranged from -32.85 to 44.33 days, -15.61 to 28.42 days, -7.41 to 6.48 %, -20.64 to 35.79 days, -0.24 to 0.41 and -0.08 to 0.11 %, respectively. High EBV value of milk yield was reported by Ahmad (2007) in Nili-Ravi buffaloes which was between -922 to +2954 kg and in Mehsana buffaloes by Saha et al. (2014) which were ranged between -422.59 to 456.61 kg. Lower estimates of range of EBVs were obtained by Shalaby et al. (2013) in Friesian cattle were 685 kg for TMY, 18 days for DP, 8.15 day for LL, 48.20 day for SP and 1.05 month for CI, respectively. The results reported by Oudah and Zainab (2010) for TMY and LL were 559 kg and 9.85 day, respectively.

Inheritance of production and fertility performance traits was antagonistic to each other as sires which performed better for production traits viz. 222 and 275 were least accountable for fertility traits (Table 3, 4, 5 and 6). Sire no. 275 exhibited high estimated breeding value of production traits valued as 163.51 kg for 305 DMY, 0.47 kg/day for PY, 26.31 days for LL, -8.48 days for DP, 360.62 kg for LMY, 0.19 kg/day for WA, 0.18 kg/day for MCI and 0.36 kg/day for MSC, respectively but low in fertility traits valued as 13.02 days for SP, 16.99 days for CI and -0.04% for PR, respectively. In similar manner, sire number code 193, 212, 222 and 275 performed and exhibited top ten ranks in their production performance but did not meet up the ends and lied in bottom ten ranks for fertility performance traits. Similarly, sire no. 273 had low estimated breeding value for production performance traits valued as -333.72 kg for 305 DMY, -0.48 kg/day for

| Table 1. | Sum model values for production traits |
|----------|--|
|----------|--|

| Particulars | 305 DMY | PY | LL | DP | LMY | WA | MCI | MSC |
|--|---------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|------|
| No. of animal IDs in data file | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 |
| No of sires | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 |
| No of sires with records & progeny in data | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 |
| No of dams with progeny in data | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| Mean | 2148.05 | 10.74 | 319.19 | 117.88 | 2288.8 | 7.12 | 4.84 | 1.33 |
| Standard Deviation | 619.22 | 2.09 | 67.07 | 12.44 | 730.88 | 1.78 | 1.51 | 0.59 |
| Minimum | 584.3 | 4.5 | 100 | 101 | 584.3 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Maximum | 4406 | 17.3 | 528 | 256 | 4667 | 13.2 | 9.52 | 4.83 |

Table 2. Sum model values for fertility traits

| Particulars | AFC | SP | CR | CI | NSC | PR |
|--|---------|--------|-------|--------|------|------|
| No. of animal IDs in data file | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 | 614 |
| No of sires | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 | 169 |
| No of sires with records & progeny in data | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 | 166 |
| No of dams with progeny in data | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| Mean | 1361.21 | 186.73 | 59.75 | 493.36 | 2.23 | 0.22 |
| Standard Deviation | 221.56 | 104.76 | 30.17 | 106.33 | 1.26 | 0.19 |
| Minimum | 960 | 22 | 16.67 | 307 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Maximum | 2535 | 519 | 100 | 825 | 6 | 0.95 |

Table 3. Top ten sires with estimated breeding value of production traits

| | | - | | | | _ | | - | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|-----------|------|------|------|-------|------|--------|------|--------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Rank | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV |
| | No. | (305 DMY) | No. | (PY) | No. | (LL) | No. | (DP) | No. | (LMY) | No. | (WA) | No. | (MCI) | No. | (MSC) |
| 1 | 206 | 173.87 | 275 | 0.47 | 222 | 29.41 | 121 | -16.88 | 275 | 360.62 | 275 | 0.19 | 200 | 0.25 | 275 | 0.36 |
| 2 | 275 | 163.51 | 212 | 0.24 | 206 | 28.37 | 165 | -15.12 | 206 | 262.03 | 256 | 0.14 | 257 | 0.24 | 241 | 0.13 |
| 3 | 222 | 154.00 | 181 | 0.24 | 275 | 26.31 | 245 | -13.12 | 222 | 197.1 | 181 | 0.12 | 275 | 0.18 | 136 | 0.11 |
| 4 | 212 | 141.06 | 186 | 0.21 | 279 | 25.25 | 246 | -12.12 | 193 | 196.56 | 259 | 0.11 | 214 | 0.15 | 137 | 0.11 |
| 5 | 195 | 139.21 | 187 | 0.21 | 209 | 21.22 | 152 | -12.10 | 171 | 180.18 | 207 | 0.11 | 138 | 0.12 | 244 | 0.11 |
| 6 | 193 | 136.88 | 222 | 0.21 | 202 | 19.21 | 200 | -11.56 | 212 | 160.45 | 138 | 0.11 | 165 | 0.11 | 192 | 0.10 |
| 7 | 171 | 128.99 | 257 | 0.20 | 136 | 19.18 | 188 | -10.88 | 157 | 158.57 | 232 | 0.1 | 206 | 0.11 | 206 | 0.10 |
| 8 | 201 | 116.53 | 256 | 0.20 | 137 | 15.16 | 273 | -9.11 | 279 | 152.01 | 233 | 0.1 | 195 | 0.09 | 196 | 0.10 |
| 9 | 207 | 110.98 | 163 | 0.18 | 277 | 15.11 | 275 | -8.48 | 201 | 137.92 | 195 | 0.1 | 182 | 0.09 | 222 | 0.08 |
| 10 | 257 | 109.17 | 162 | 0.16 | 207 | 13.11 | 198 | -7.82 | 136 | 132.4 | 242 | 0.09 | 162 | 0.08 | 209 | 0.08 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4. Bottom ten sires with estimated breeding value for production traits

| | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|-----------|------|-------|------|--------|------|-------|------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Rank | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV |
| | No. | (305 DMY) | No. | (PY) | No. | (LL) | No. | (DP) | No. | (LMY) | No. | (WA) | No. | (MCI) | No. | (MSC) |
| 1 | 273 | -332.72 | 273 | -0.48 | 115 | -41.23 | 140 | 62.77 | 273 | -380.66 | 273 | -0.20 | 140 | -0.21 | 273 | -0.27 |
| 2 | 150 | -185.62 | 135 | -0.34 | 114 | -40.56 | 173 | 59.72 | 150 | -262.55 | 135 | -0.19 | 104 | -0.19 | 255 | -0.11 |
| 3 | 122 | -171 | 239 | -0.3 | 177 | -39.62 | 102 | 59.22 | 135 | -216.51 | 106 | -0.14 | 273 | -0.18 | 254 | -0.11 |
| 4 | 135 | -170.42 | 220 | -0.21 | 273 | -38.55 | 233 | 58.38 | 170 | -206.26 | 140 | -0.13 | 224 | -0.18 | 140 | -0.1 |
| 5 | 170 | -153.83 | 192 | -0.19 | 135 | -36.89 | 232 | 58.38 | 104 | -178.42 | 150 | -0.11 | 122 | -0.15 | 189 | -0.1 |
| 6 | 239 | -149.52 | 189 | -0.18 | 188 | -35.69 | 241 | 56.61 | 239 | -172.47 | 129 | -0.1 | 150 | -0.14 | 104 | -0.09 |
| 7 | 211 | -144.71 | 250 | -0.18 | 128 | -32.45 | 145 | 56.44 | 122 | -171.86 | 239 | -0.1 | 173 | -0.14 | 170 | -0.09 |
| 8 | 104 | -138.27 | 121 | -0.17 | 246 | -31.25 | 115 | 56.22 | 267 | -159.23 | 189 | -0.09 | 267 | -0.12 | 267 | -0.09 |
| 9 | 267 | -111.09 | 150 | -0.16 | 245 | -28.14 | 114 | 56.22 | 188 | -143.03 | 202 | -0.09 | 189 | -0.11 | 106 | -0.09 |
| 10 | 177 | -109.05 | 122 | -0.15 | 150 | -24.15 | 224 | 55.88 | 231 | -134.57 | 112 | -0.09 | 102 | -0.10 | 211 | -0.08 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

PY, -38.55 days for LL, -380.66 kg for LMY, -0.20 kg/day for WA, -0.18 kg/day for MCI and -0.27 kg/day for MSC whereas high estimated breeding values for fertility traits valued as -15.01 days for SP, 6.48% for CR, -18.25 days for CI and -0.24 for NSC. For instance, sire number code 220, 245, 246 and 273 were top ranked for their fertility abilities but lied in bottom position in terms of production performance traits.

Spearman's rank correlation between EBVs of production and fertility performance traits has been shown in Table (7). 305 DMY, PY, LL, LMY had purely negative Spearman's rank correlation with all fertility traits viz. AFC, SP, CR, CI, NSC and PR. However, negative Spearman's rank correlation between 305 DMY/CI (-0.19)

Table 5. Top ten sires with estimated breeding value of fertility traits

| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | 1 | L | | | 0 | | e e | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-------------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------|--------|------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Rank | | | | | | | | | | EBV (NSC) | Sire No. | EBV (PR) |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 1 | 209 | -32.85 | 245 | -15.61 | 273 | 6.48 | 165 | -20.64 | 273 | -0.24 | 245 | 0.11 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2 | 232 | -29.17 | 246 | -15.58 | 165 | 5.92 | 245 | -19.75 | 165 | -0.20 | 246 | 0.1 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 3 | 233 | -29.17 | 273 | -15.01 | 110 | 4.86 | 246 | -19.64 | 245 | -0.17 | 188 | 0.09 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 4 | 121 | -26.88 | 188 | -14.94 | 245 | 4.76 | 273 | -18.25 | 246 | -0.14 | 162 | 0.07 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 5 | 165 | -23.22 | 165 | -14.06 | 246 | 4.74 | 188 | -18.13 | 138 | -0.11 | 194 | 0.06 |
| 8 213 -22.34 162 -8.94 194 3.34 152 -12.79 188 -0 9 220 -20.55 200 -8.52 175 2.83 160 -11.93 110 -0 10 251 -19.22 198 -8.41 162 2.74 162 -11.43 162 -0 Table 6. Bottom ten sires with estimated breeding value for fertility traits Rank Sire EBV Sire Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire Sire EBV Sire Sire EBV Sire Sire Sire Sire Sire | 6 | 107 | -22.94 | 152 | -10.32 | 198 | 3.79 | 200 | -13.71 | 198 | -0.11 | 165 | 0.06 |
| 9 220 -20.55 200 -8.52 175 2.83 160 -11.93 110 -0 10 251 -19.22 198 -8.41 162 2.74 162 -11.43 162 -0 Table 6. Bottom ten sires with estimated breeding value for fertility traits Rank Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EBV No. (AFC) No. (SP) No. (CR) No. (CI) No. (No. 1 259 44.33 222 28.42 222 -7.41 222 35.79 222 0.4 | 7 | 112 | -22.53 | 150 | -9.01 | 199 | 3.79 | 135 | -13.3 | 199 | -0.11 | 267 | 0.05 |
| IO 251 -19.22 198 -8.41 162 2.74 162 -11.43 162 -0 Table 6. Bottom ten sires with estimated breeding value for fertility traits Rank Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EBV Sire EH No. (AFC) No. (SP) No. (CR) No. (CI) No. (No. 1 259 44.33 222 28.42 222 -7.41 222 35.79 222 0.4 | 8 | 213 | -22.34 | 162 | -8.94 | 194 | 3.34 | 152 | -12.79 | 188 | -0.11 | 200 | 0.05 |
| Table 6. Bottom ten sires with estimated breeding value for fertility traitsRankSireEBVSireEBVSireEBVNo.(AFC)No.(SP)No.(CR)No.(CI)No.(No.125944.3322228.42222-7.4122235.792220.4 | 9 | 220 | -20.55 | 200 | -8.52 | 175 | 2.83 | 160 | -11.93 | 110 | -0.1 | 119 | 0.05 |
| Rank Sire EBV Sire Sire Sire Sire Sire <th< th=""><th>10</th><th>251</th><th>-19.22</th><th>198</th><th>-8.41</th><th>162</th><th>2.74</th><th>162</th><th>-11.43</th><th>162</th><th>-0.09</th><th>149</th><th>0.05</th></th<> | 10 | 251 | -19.22 | 198 | -8.41 | 162 | 2.74 | 162 | -11.43 | 162 | -0.09 | 149 | 0.05 |
| No. (AFC) No. (SP) No. (CR) No. (CI) No. (No. 1 259 44.33 222 28.42 222 -7.41 222 35.79 222 0.4 | Table | 6. Bot | tom ten sir | es with e | estimated b | reedingv | alue for fe | ertility tra | nits | | | | |
| 1 259 44.33 222 28.42 222 -7.41 222 35.79 222 0.4 | Rank | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV | Sire | EBV |
| | | No. | (AFC) | No. | (SP) | No. | (CR) | No. | (CI) | No. | (NSC) | No. | (PR) |
| 2 104 34.04 211 16.44 133 -6.87 173 20.83 122 0.2 | 1 | 259 | 44.33 | 222 | 28.42 | 222 | -7.41 | 222 | 35.79 | 222 | 0.41 | 211 | -0.08 |
| | 2 | 104 | 34.04 | 211 | 16.44 | 133 | -6.87 | 173 | 20.83 | 122 | 0.25 | 133 | -0.04 |
| 3 177 31.53 173 15.99 140 -5.05 211 20.01 133 0.2 | 3 | 177 | 31.53 | 173 | 15.99 | 140 | -5.05 | 211 | 20.01 | 133 | 0.22 | 222 | -0.04 |

6 7 193 28.29 275 13.02 141 -3.17 275 16.99 187 -0.03 113 0.11 8 27.56 227 145 202 145 11.53 -3.01 15.03 187 0.11 186 -0.03 9 170 26.68 262 10.74 226 -3.01 141 14.49 186 0.11 212 -0.03 10 115 26.6 261 10.74 173 -2.82 122 12.63 227 0.1 122 -0.03

140

102

133

19.15

19.12

17.65

141

173

140

0.21

0.15

0.13

275

279

173

-0.04

-0.04

-0.04

-4.21

-3.8

-3.25

Table 7. Spearman's rank correlations and Karl Pearson correlations of estimated breeding values of production and fertility performance traits

| Traits | Correlation | AFC | SP | CR | CI | NSC | PR |
|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|
| 305 DMY | Spearman | -0.12 | -0.16 | -0.18 | -0.19* | -0.15 | -0.29** |
| | Pearson | 0.09 | 0.24** | -0.22* | 0.26** | 0.21* | -0.20* |
| PY | Spearman | -0.15 | -0.13 | -0.14 | -0.16 | -0.12 | -0.25* |
| | Pearson | 0.12 | 0.23* | -0.22* | 0.25** | 0.20* | -0.24* |
| LL | Spearman | -0.05 | -0.38** | -0.32** | -0.39** | 28** | -0.35** |
| | Pearson | -0.03 | 0.43** | -0.36** | 0.44** | 0.36** | -0.37** |
| DP | Spearman | -0.24** | 0.68** | 0.46** | 0.68** | 0.47** | 0.43** |
| | Pearson | -0.1 | 0.66** | -0.51** | 0.67** | 0.48** | -0.46** |
| LMY | Spearman | -0.11 | -0.25** | -0.27** | -0.29** | -0.23* | -0.39** |
| | Pearson | 0.09 | 0.35** | -0.31** | 0.37** | 0.29** | -0.34** |
| WA | Spearman | -0.26** | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.09 | -0.01 | -0.06 |
| | Pearson | 0.19* | -0.02 | -0.04 | 0.01 | 0.08 | -0.05 |
| MCI | Spearman | -0.30** | 0.39** | 0.18* | 0.38** | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| | Pearson | 0.15 | -0.36** | 0.22* | -0.36** | -0.21* | 0.20* |
| MSC | Spearman | 0.22** | -0.09 | -0.12 | -0.11 | -0.08 | -0.19* |
| | Pearson | -0.19* | 0.22* | -0.18* | 0.22* | 0.19* | -0.19* |

Where *P<0.05, **P<0.01

4

5

279

182

212

29.99

29.73

29.01

102

140

133

15.47

14.53

14.01

211

113

122

and PY/PR (-0.25) was significant (p<0.05) and highly significant (p<0.01) between 305 DMY/PR (-0.29). LL had highly significant (p<0.01) and negative Spearman's rank correlation with all fertility performance traits ranging from -0.28 to -0.39 except with AFC (-0.05) which was negative and non-significant. Furthermore, DP was the only production performance trait which had positive and highly significant (p<0.01) Spearman's rank correlation with all fertility traits varying from 0.43 to 0.68

except AFC (-0.24) with which it was negative and highly significant (p<0.01). Like LL, LMY also had negative and highly significant (p<0.01) Spearman's rank correlation with all fertility traits except AFC (-0.11) and with NSC, it was negative and significant at p<0.05. Moreover, WA had shown highly significant (p<0.01) and negative Spearman's rank correlation with AFC only. MCI was found to have highly significant (p < 0.01) relationship with SP(0.39) and CI (0.35) but negative and highly significant

(p<0.01) relationship with AFC (-0.30). MSC had positive and highly significant (p<0.01) relationship with AFC (0.22). conclusively, most of the production performance traits had antagonistic relationship with fertility performance traits.

Thereby, selection for production performance traits would compromise the improvement rate in fertility performance traits. Pearson correlation between EBVs of production and fertility performance trait is depicted in Table 7. 305 DMY, PY, LL, DP and LMY had positive low (0.20) to moderate (0.67). Pearson correlation with SP, CI and NSC and negative relationship with CR and PR ranging from -0.20 to -0.51. WA and MSC had significant positive (0.19) and negative (-0.19) relationship with AFC. MCI had significant (p<0.05) and positive Pearson correlation with CR (0.22) and PR (0.20) and negative and highly significant (p<0.01) relationship with SP (-0.36) and CI (-0.36). CR and PR had negative relationship with all production performance trait ranging from -0.02 to 0.66 except MCI whereas SP, CI and NSC had positive relationship with all production performance traits ranging from 0.20 to 0.67 except with MCI. AFC was nonsignificant correlation with all production performance traits except with WA (0.19) and MCI (-0.19). Here, improvement in production performance traits seem to effect mainly CR and PR negatively whereas it goes in hand with other fertility trait viz. SP, CI and NSC and nearly unaffected with AFC. The above results were in frame with the results of Kadarmideen et al. (2003), Shalaby (2005) and Oudahand Khalefa (2010) in Holstein Friesian cattle. Divya et al. (2014) reported high and positive Spearman's rank correlations between the rankings on the basis of estimated breeding values (EBVs) of FL 305 DMY from single trait (FL 305 DMY only) animal model with 2 traits (FL 305 DMY-AFC, FL 305 DMY-FCI and FL 305 DMY-FSP) and 3 traits (FL 305 DMY-AFC-FCI) animal models were 0.86, 0.92, 0.94 and 0.82, respectively in Karan Fries cattle. Saha et al. (2014) obtained high rank correlation (76.81%) between models applied to milk production in Mehsana buffaloes. Ghiasi et al. (2021) reported high and positive (>0.94) Spearman rank correlation coefficients between breeding value of composite milk and fertility traits (CMF) with SP, CI, and TMY but moderate (0.64) with NSC.

CONCLUSION

From the above study, it can be concluded that the sire's elite in production performance traits outskirts in fertility performance traits indicated that improvement in these traits was related antagonistically. Although, Spearman rank correlation and Pearson correlation was negatively correlated between the production and fertility performance traits but it was not unity which indicated that it is possible to have sire which can be best for both kinds of traits and thus, production and fertility performance traits can be improved simultaneously.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M. (2007). Estimated breeding values and genetic trend for milk yield in Nili Ravi buffaloes. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* 6(2): 393-396.
- Berry D.P., Bermingham M.L., Good M. and More S.J. (2011). Genetics of animal health and disease in cattle. *Irish Vet. J.* **64**: 5.
- Divya, P., Singh, A., Gandhi, R.S. and Singh, R.K. (2014). Estimation of breeding values of first lactation 305-day milk yield from single and multi-trait animal models in Karan Fries cattle. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* 84(10): 1085-1089.
- Ghiasi, H., D. Piwczyňski, D., B. Sitkowska, B. and O. González-Recio, O. (2021). New composite traits for joint improvement of milk and fertility trait in Holstein dairy cow. *Anim. Biosci.* 34(8): 1303-1308.
- Valsalan, J., Chakravarty, A.K., Patil, C.S., Dash, S.K., Mahajan, A.C., Kumar, V. and Vohra, V. (2014). Enhancing milk and fertility performances using selection index developed for Indian Murrah buffaloes. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.* 46(6): 967-974.
- Kadarmideen, H.N., Thompson, R., Coffey, M.P. and Kossaibati, M.A. (2003). Genetic parameters and evaluations from single and multipletrait analysis of dairy cow fertility and milk production. *J. Livest. Prod. Sci.* 81: 183.
- Kennedy, B.W., Schaeffer, L.R. and Sorensen, D.A. (1988). Genetic Properties of Animal Models. J. Dairy Sci. 71: 17-26.
- Komlosi, I., Wolfova, M., Wolf, J., Farkas, B., Szendrei, Z. and Beri, B. (2010). Economic weights of production and functional traits for Holstein Friesian cattle in Hungary. J. Anim. Breed. Genet. 127: 143-153.
- Meyer, K. (1989). Restricted maximum likelihood to estimate variance components for animal models with several random effects using a derivative-free algorithm. *Genet. Sel. Evol.* 21: 317-340.
- Mostafa, M.A. (2006). Genetic evaluation of milk production and reproduction traits in Holstein Friesian raised in Hungary using single and multi-trait animal model analyses. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ. 31(10): 6217-6231.
- Oudah, E.Z.M. and Zainab, A. Khalefa, Z.A. (2010). Genetic evaluation for Friesian cattle in Egypt using single-trait animal models. J. Anim. Poultry Prod. 1(9): 371-381.
- Oudah, E.Z.M. and Khalefa, Z.A. (2010). Genetic evaluation for Friesian cattle in Egypt using single-trait animal model. J. Anim. Poultry Prod. 1(9): 371-381.
- Saha S., Sudhakar A., Prajapati M.N., Nayee N. and Trivedi K.R. (2014). Efficiency of Random Regression model over conventional univariate animal model for estimation of breeding values for first lactation 305-day milk yields in Mehsana buffaloes. Proceedings at 10th World Congress of Genetics Applied to Livestock Production.
- Shalaby, N.A. (2005). Genetic evaluation for milk production, reproduction traits and persistency of lactation using single and two-trait animal model analyses for Friesian cows in commercial herds in Egypt. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ. 30(7): 3637-3653.
- Shalaby, N.A., El-Barbary, A.S.A., Oudah, E.Z.M. and Helmy, M. (2013). Genetic analysis of some productive and reproductive traits of first lactation of Friesian cattle raised in Egypt. J. Anim. Poultry Prod. 4(2): 97-106.