Rate of protein growth and energy for maintenance parameter changes in the Davis Growth Model

J.W. Oltjen^{1*}, R.D. Sainz¹, L.G. Barioni² and S.R. Medeiros³ ¹University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA; ²EMBRAPA Agricultural Informatics, Campinas, SP, Brazil; ³EMBRAPA Beef Cattle, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil; jwoltjen@ucdavis.edu

Abstract

The Davis Growth Model simulates protein and fat growth of the empty body of beef cattle. We have improved both model structure and parameter estimates to reflect trends in protein and fat accretion for today's more productive cattle. Initial DNA is now estimated by an equation which requires both body protein and previous rates of protein accretion and energy intake. Because the newer DNA estimates differ from the original ones, other parameters in the model were re-estimated using the same data with which the model was originally parameterized. Later data has been used to reparametrize the model for a number of different studies. Protein accretion and maintenance energy parameters have increased.

Keywords: beef cattle, growth, body composition, energy requirements

Introduction

The Davis Growth Model (Oltjen *et al.*, 1986) simulates protein and fat growth of the empty body of beef cattle. It is based on the net energy system but includes mechanistic representation of protein growth by simulating both DNA accretion and protein turnover. Experience with its use has revealed strengths and weaknesses, and improvements have been made both within the model structure and to parameter estimates. These changes reflect trends in protein and fat accretion due to selection pressure for more productive cattle.

Model structure

Originally initial DNA was an interpolation based on body fatness between DNA of a well-fed animal and an animal of similar protein content fed near maintenance. However, DNA estimates diverge from the model's simulated DNA at heavier weights. In subsequent implementation, initial DNA is estimated by the following equation which requires both body protein (PROT) and previous rates of protein accretion and energy intake (NUT2):

$$DNA = \left(\frac{K3 \times PROT^{0.73} + \frac{dPROT}{dt}}{NUT2 \times K2}\right)^{1/0.73}$$

Where K2 (protein synthesis rate constant), K3 (protein degradation rate constant) and NUT2 are defined as in the original model. This equation provides estimates of initial DNA that are within 1 g of simulated DNA across the entire growth path for both implanted and non-implanted steers. Because the newer DNA estimates differ from the original ones, other parameters in the model were re-estimated using the same data with which the model was originally parameterized (Oltjen *et al.*, 1986; original parameter values in parenthesis): K1=0.00493 (0.00429), K2=0.0444 (0.0461), K3=0.143 (0.143 fixed due to unidentifiability), Alpha=0.0841 (0.0858). Also, the increase in protein synthesis due to anabolic implant became 3.9% instead of the original 4.2%.

Model parameter changes over time

Data for original parameterization spanned 1960-1980. Later data was used to reparametrize the model (Table 1). Protein growth and maintenance parameters have increased, similar to increases in apparent maintenance requirements, efficiency of lactation (k_L) , and efficiency of growth (k_G) in dairy cattle (Moraes et al., 2013). An exception is for Nellore bulls with reduced K1, K3 and alpha in these slower growing *Bos indicus* cattle (Sainz et al., 2006). Also, our recent work (unpublished data) has shown decreased K3 with use of beta-agonists.

Description	K1	K2	K3	Alpha	Reference
Original estimates	0.00429	0.0461	0.143	0.0858	Oltjen et al., 1986
Revised estimates (above)	0.00493	0.0444	0.143	0.0841	Oltjen et al., 2014
Angus-Hereford Steers		0.053		0.0961	Garcia et al., 2008
Charolais Bulls		0.058		0.1372	
Salers Heifers		0.056		0.0901	
British Breed Steers		0.047		0.0983	McPhee et al., 2009
Nellore Bulls	0.00416		0.13	0.0768	Sainz et al., 2006
Angus Steers					Sainz and Oltjen, 2014
Low RFI (residual feed intake)			0.1375	0.062	
Medium RFI			0.1436	0.0737	
High RFI			0.1477	0.086	

Table 1. Estimates of growth and maintenance parameters in the Davis Growth Model.

References

- Garcia, F., R.D. Sainz, J. Agabriel, L.G. Barioni and J.W. Oltjen, 2008. Comparative analysis of two dynamic mechanistic models of beef cattle growth. Animal Feed Science and Technology 143: 220-241.
- McPhee, M.J., J.W. Oltjen, J.G. Fadel, D.G. Mayer and R.D. Sainz, 2009. Parameter estimation and sensitivity analysis of fat deposition models in beef steers using acslXtreme. Mathematics and Computers in Simulation 79: 2701-2712.
- Moraes, L.E., A.B. Strathe, E. Kebreab, D.P. Casper, J. Dijkstra, F. France and J.G. Fadel, 2013. A structural equation model to analyze energy utilization in lactating dairy cows. In: J.W. Oltjen, E. Kebreab and J. Lapierre (eds.). Energy and protein metabolism and nutrition in sustainable animal production. EAAP Scientific Series No. 134, Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, the Netherlands, pp. 327-328.
- Oltjen, J.W., A.C. Bywater, R.L. Baldwin and W.N. Garrett, 1986. Development of a dynamic model of beef cattle growth and composition. Journal of Animal Science 62: 86-97.
- Oltjen, J.W., R.D. Sainz, L.B. Barioni, D.P. Lanna and T.Z. Albertini, 2014. Evolution of parameter changes for beef cattle growth in the Davis Growth Model over 40 years. Animal Production Science 54(12): 52.
- Sainz, R.D., L.G. Barioni, P.V. Paulino, S.C. Valadares Filho and J.W. Oltjen, 2006. Growth patterns of Nellore vs British beef cattle breeds assessed using a dynamic, mechanistic model of cattle growth and composition. In: E. Kebreab, J. Dijkstra, A. Bannink, W.J.J. Gerrits and J. France (eds.). Nutrient digestion and utilization in farm animals: modelling approaches CAB International, Wallingford, UK, pp. 160-170.
- Sainz, R.D. and J.W. Oltjen, 2014. Dynamic mechanistic modelling of feed efficiency in *Bos inducus* beef cattle. In: K.J. Harper, D.M. McNeill and A.W. Bell (eds.). Modelling Nutrient Digestion and Utilization in Farm Animals, September 15-17, 2014, Cairns, Australia, p. 36.