# Reference population designs affects reliability of selection for (un)genotyped animals

#### Marcin Pszczola<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Tomasz Strabel<sup>3</sup>, Johan van Arendonk<sup>2</sup>, and Mario Calus<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wageningen UR Livestock Research, Animal Breeding and Genomics Centre, The Netherlands <sup>2</sup>Wageningen University, Animal Breeding and Genomics Centre, The Netherlands <sup>3</sup>Poznan University of Life Sciences, Department of Genetics and Animal Breeding, Poland







### In this talk:

Design of reference population & relationship to reference population affects reliability of breeding values

Average squared relationship to reference population – good reliability proxy

Genotyping selection candidates is more important

# Acknowledgments

### **Organizers - EAAP SCHOLARSHIP**

Faculty of Animal Breeding and Biology (PULS, Poland)

Koepon Stichting (Leusden, the Netherlands)



The GreenHouseMilk is financially supported by the European Commission under the Seventh Research Framework Programme, Grant Agreement KBBE-238562. This publication represents the views of the authors, not the European Commission, and the Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information.

### National Science Centre (Krakow, Poland); DEC-2011/01/N/NZ9/00614





**Genomic selection - accuracy** 

# Number of animals in the

# reference population

## **Genomic selection**

## Traits difficult and/or expensive to measure

### Methane emission

### Feed intake



### Data

### Simulation:



Genome: 3x1M; 1SNP/0.001cM



Historic cattle population



- Reference populations:
  - Highly, moderately, lowly and randomly related



- **Small (n=2,000)**
- Cows only

	2
- A Toke	4L

Selection candidates (n=1,000)





## **Reference populations' structure**

Relationship within reference population		Number of	
		3	$\mathcal{P}$
High	(HR)	5	2000
Moderate	(MR)	20	2000
Low	(LR)	40	2000
Random	(RND)	50	2000

Pedigree-based average relationship within the reference populations



Pedigree-based average relationship within the reference populations





# Different groups genotyped





























### **Scenarios**





### **Scenarios**









**G** matrix:

• VanRaden (2008)



# $\mathbf{G} = \frac{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'}{2\sum p_i(1-p_i)}$

• Current allele frequencies (p<sub>i</sub>)

H matrix:



### Legarra et al. (2009)

### H matrix:

- A & G compatibility:
  - A & G on the same base pop.



- Wright's F-statistics (Powell et al.)
- G regressed to A
  - Bins of relationships (0-0.10, >0.10-0.25, >0.25, and >0.50)
  - Parent-offspring & diagonals not regressed

$$r^{2} = c_{ref\_sel} \left[ C_{ref} + I \left( \frac{\sigma_{e}^{2}}{\sigma_{a}^{2}} \right) \right]^{-1} c'_{ref\_sel}$$

 $r^{2} = c_{ref\_sel} \left[ C_{ref} + I \left( \frac{\sigma_{e}^{2}}{\sigma_{a}^{2}} \right) \right]^{-1} c'_{ref\_sel}$ 





### Average reliabilities of selection candidates

(n=1000) across differently designed reference populations for different (un)genotyped groups











# **Conclusions – Accuracy is increased by:**



# **Conclusions – Accuracy is increased by:**



# Thank you for your attention!



Increasing GS accuracy differently than by increasing the reference population size is (still) needed!





Marcin.Pszczola@wur.nl

