Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

HERITABILITY OF BODY WEIGHT AND LINEAR BODY MEASUREMENTS OF ISA BROWN x LOCAL CHICKEN GENOTYPES

Ugwumba C. Isaac^{1*}, Reginald J. Nosike², Jonas Ezea², Helen C. Ezejesi¹, Benedethe N. Ezenyilimba¹ and Sylvester N. Ibe²

¹Department of Animal Science and Technology, Faculty of Agriculture, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, P.M.B. 5025, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

²Department of Animal Breeding and Physiology, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, PMB 7267, Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria.

https://doi.org/10.35410/IJAEB.2023.5819

ABSTRACT

Heritability of growth traits was studied at 2, 10 and 20 weeks using 531 day-old unsexed crossbred chickens belonging to six genotypes. Heritability estimates were obtained from variance components of sire (σ_s^2) , dam (σ_d^2) and sire plus dam (σ_{s+d}^2) by analysis of variance in a nested design. The heritability of body weight was high (0.43-0.66) in frizzle feathered x Isa Brown (FxIB), Isa Brown x frizzle feathered (IBxF), Isa Brown x normal feathered (IBxN) and normal feathered x Isa Brown (NxIB) at 10 and 20 weeks, but low to moderate (0.02-0.38) in Isa Brown x naked neck (IBxNa) and naked neck x Isa Brown (NaxIB) at all ages from different variance components. The heritability of shank length was high at weeks 2 (0.45) in NaxIB, 10 (0.53-0.90) in IBxF, IBxN and NaxIB and 20 (0.40 - 0.53) in IBxNa and IBxN from σ_s^2 . The heritability of drumstick length (0.40 - 0.46), body girth (0.54 - 0.62), body width (0.50 - 0.81) and keel length (0.72 - 1.50) was also high from different variance components and ages. Body length was highly heritable only in IBxN (0.50) from σ_s^2 at 20 weeks. Wing length was lowly to moderately heritable (0.01 - 0.36) at all ages of the genotypes. There was large additive genetic variance for most of the traits in different genotypes and ages. Rapid genetic improvement of growth can be made in these chickens by individual selection, especially using shank length of IBxN from sire lines between 10 and 20 weeks of age.

Keywords: Chicken, Genotype, Body measurements, Heritability, Variance components.

1. INTRODUCTION

The productivity of local chickens is quite low compared to their improved exotic counterparts (Ajayi, 2010). This is due mainly to their low genetic profile and lack of improved production environment (Leenstra and Cahaner, 1992; Adetayo and Babafunso, 2001). This problem has resulted in insufficient animal production and concomitant low animal protein consumption in developing countries like Nigeria. The level of animal protein consumption in Nigeria is put at 5 g/caput/day, which is far below the Food and Agriculture Organization recommended level of 35 g/caput/day (Ojo, 2003). On the other hand, there is not only huge foreign exchange implication (Ibe, 1990) but also health and environmental problems associated with importation of exotic stock as well as genotype-environment interaction which causes loss of fitness (Ebangi and Ibe, 1994). The productivity of the local chickens must therefore be improved to address the problem of low animal protein consumption in the country. Previous

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

studies have shown that estimation of genetic parameters is a prerequisite to genetic improvement in chicken (Oleforuh-Okoleh, 2011; Niknafs *et al.*, 2012). Heritability is a genetic parameter which enables prediction of breeding value and selection decision to be made (Zhang *et al.*, 2005; El-Labban *et al.*, 2011). Estimates of heritability may be high, moderate or low with corresponding values of 0 to 19%, 20 to 39% and 40% and above, respectively (Falconer, 1989).

Heritability estimate for a trait is dependent upon the population and environment from where it was estimated (Ranjan and Guatam, 2018). This accounts for a wide range of differences in heritability estimates for a trait in literature. Le Bihan-Duval *et al.* (1998), Argenta *et al.* (2002) and Sanda *et al.* (2014) reported low to high estimates of heritability for body weight and linear body measurements at different ages in commercial strains of broiler chickens. Momoh and Nwosu (2008) reported moderate to high heritability estimates for body weight at different ages of local chicken. Ebangi and Ibe (1994) reported moderate to high heritability estimates for body weight, shank length, keel length and breast width of local chickens at 6 weeks of age and concluded that appreciable genetic variance existed in the local chicken population. Ibe (1993), on the other hand, noted that growth traits are useful in quantifying size and shape which have direct relationship with the economic value of animals.

Extensive research has not been carried out on the heritability of growth traits from the three variance components of crossbred local chickens except perhaps the work done by Nwosu and Asuquo (1984) and Roff, (2006). Therefore, the present study will not only assist in bridging the research gap but give opportunity to compare the level of bias in the three variance estimates as to know the best source from which heritability can be estimated for fast genetic improvement in chicken (Roff, 2008; Ibe, 2019; Bal *et al.* 2019). The objective of this study was to estimate the heritability of body weight and some linear body measurements of main and reciprocal crossbred Isa Brown and local chickens.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2. 1 Experimental animals and management

The parent stocks used in the study consisted of Isa Brown strain of layers and three strains of local chickens namely frizzle feathered, naked neck and normal feathered. The Isa Brown chickens consisted of 9 cocks and 27 hens. Each strain of local chicken consisted of 3 cocks. The hens were made up of 8 frizzle, 7 naked neck and 9 normal feathered chickens. These were randomly allotted in nested design and mated in main and reciprocal order using Isa Brown cocks and local chicken cocks, respectively. A total of 531 F₁ day-old chicks were produced in 12 hatches at weekly interval. The chicks were made up of 123 Isa Brown x frizzle feathered (IBxF), 49 Isa Brown x naked neck (IBxNa), 116 Isa Brown x normal feathered (IBxN), 137 frizzle feathered x Isa Brown (FxIB), 42 naked neck x Isa Brown (NaxIB) and 64 normal feathered x Isa Brown (NxIB) genotypes.

The chickens were brooded for four weeks. Water and feed were given to them *ad libitum*. They were fed with starter mash containing 2800 kcal ME/kg and 20% CP at 0 - 6 weeks and grower mash containing 2550 kcal ME/kg and 15% CP at 6-20 weeks. The birds were administered antibiotics and coccidiostats against diseases. The experiment lasted for twenty weeks.

2.2 Data collection and traits measurement

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

Data were collected from individual chicken of mixed sexes at 2, 10 and 20 weeks on the body weight and linear body measurements, namely shank length, drumstick length, body width, body girth, body length, keel length, and wing length. The descriptions of these traits are reported by Isaac (2020).

2.3 Experimental design and statistical analytical procedures

Unbalanced nested design was employed in the experiment. The design has a mixed model involving fixed (hatch) and random (sire and dam) effects. There were 12 hatches, 18 sires and 54 dams. The model was specified in (1).

$\mathbf{Y}_{ijkl} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{H}_i + \mathbf{S}_j + \mathbf{D}_{kj} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ijkl}, \qquad \dots \dots (1)$

where Y_{ijkl} is observation made on the lth progeny of kth dam mated to jth sire in ith hatch, μ is overall mean, H_i is fixed effect of hatch (i = 1,..., 12), S_j is random effect of sire (k = 1,..., 18), D_{kj} is random effect of dam mated to sire (l = 1,..., 51) and ϵ_{ijkl} is random error, assumed to be independently and identically, normally distributed with zero mean and constant variance [iind (0, σ^2)].

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for unbalanced data was employed as a method of estimation of variance components (Table 1). By unbalanced data it meant that number of dams per sire, number of progeny per dam and number of progeny per sire were not equal in each case. All analysis was carried out using SAS (1999) computer programme.

Table 1: Analysis of variance for estimation of variance components.

Source variance	Df	SS	MS	E(MS)
Sires	s-1	SSs	MS _s	$\sigma_e^2 + k_2 \sigma_d^2 + k_3 \sigma_s^2$
Dams/Sire	d-s	SS_d	MS_d	$\sigma_e^2 + k_1 \sigma_d^2$
Progeny/dam/sire	nd	SS_e	MS_e	σ_e^2
Total	n1	SS_t		

df= Degree of freedom; SS= Sum of squares; MS = Mean square; E(MS) = Expected mean square; SS_t = total sum of squares; s = number of sires; d = number of dams; n.. = total number of progeny; σ_e^2 , σ_d^2 , σ_s^2 = error, dam and sire variances components, respectively.

The correction factor and sums of squares in Table 1 were calculated with expressions (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6), respectively according to Becker (1984) and Ibe (2019).

$$CF = \frac{y^{2} \dots}{n} \qquad \dots \qquad (2)$$

$$SS_{t} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} y^{2}_{ijk} - \dots \qquad (3)$$

$$SS_{s} = \sum_{i} \frac{y_{i..}^{2}}{n_{i.}} - CF \qquad \dots \qquad (4)$$

$$SS_{d} = \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \frac{y_{ij.}^{2}}{n_{ij}} - \sum_{i} \frac{y_{i..}^{2}}{n_{i.}} \qquad \dots \qquad (5)$$

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

$$SS_e = SS_t - SS_d \qquad \dots \qquad (6)$$

where y...is the grand total of all observations, y_{ijk} is a single progeny record, y_i is the total for sire i, y_{ij} is the total for dam j mated to sire i, s is the total number of sires, d is the total number of dams, n_{i} is the number of progeny produced by sire i, and n_{ij} is the number of progeny produced by dam j mated to sire i. From Table 1, the coefficients of σ_d^2 in the dams/sire and sire lines are not equal i.e $k_1 \neq k_2$ because of the unbalanced data used. Therefore, the three coefficients were determined by using expressions (7) - (9), respectively.

$$k_{1} = (n.. - \sum_{i} \frac{\sum n_{ij}^{2}}{n_{i.}})/d.f. (dams) ... (7)$$

$$k_{2} = (\sum_{i} \frac{\sum n_{ij}^{2}}{n_{i.}} - \frac{\sum \sum n_{ij}^{2}}{n_{..}})/d.f. (sires) ... (8)$$

$$k_{3} = (n.. - \frac{\sum n_{i.}^{2}}{n_{i.}})/d.f. (sires) ... (9)$$

where n.. is the total number of progeny per genotype, $n_{i.}$ is the number of progeny per sire and n_{ij} is the number of progeny per dam. The ANOVA yielded variance components of sire (σ_s^2) , dam (σ_d^2) and error (σ_e^2) which were estimated by equating the mean squares to their expectations and solving. Solutions were obtained as expressed in (10), (11) and (12), respectively (Becker, 1984).

$\sigma_e^2 = MS_e$	•••	(10)
$\sigma_d^2 = (MS_d - MS_e)/k_1$	•••	(11)
$\sigma_s^2 = MS_s - (MS_e + k_2\sigma_d^2)/k_3$	•••	(12)

The three variance components were summed to obtain the total phenotypic variance (σ_p^2) for any trait as shown in expression (13).

$$\sigma_{\rm p}^2 = \sigma_{\rm s}^2 + \sigma_{\rm d}^2 + \sigma_{\rm e}^2 \qquad \dots \qquad (13)$$

Heritability was computed from paternal half-sib (h_s^2) , maternal half-sib (h_d^2) and full-sib (h_{s+d}^2) correlations as the ratio of sire, dam and combined sire and dam variance components to total phenotypic variance, respectively according to Becker (1984). The corresponding formulae used to compute the three heritabilities were as follows:

 $\begin{array}{rcl} h_{s}^{2} &=& 4\sigma_{s}^{2}/\sigma_{p}^{2} \\ h_{d}^{2} &=& 4\sigma_{d}^{2}/\sigma_{p}^{2} \\ h_{s+d}^{2} &=& 2(\sigma_{s}^{2}+\sigma_{d}^{2})/\sigma_{p}^{2}. \end{array}$

Standard errors of the heritability estimates were computed according to Becker (1984).

3. RESULTS

In Table 2, heritability of body weight from sire and sire plus dam variance components (0.08 and 0.02, respectively) were low at 2 weeks and those from the three variance components ranged from low to high (0.07-0.50) at 20 weeks in IBxF. The heritability estimates were high for shank length at 10 and 20 weeks and for body width at 20 weeks from sire, sire plus dam and dam variance components, respectively in IBxF. At other ages, heritability of shank length, body width and other linear body measurements ranged from low to moderate (0.02 to 0.36) from all

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

variance components. Table 3 presents the heritability estimates of body weight and linear body measurements from sire, dam and sire plus dam variance components of IBxNa genotype at different ages. The estimates for body weight were moderate (0.19-0.31) at 2 weeks; low to moderate at 10 (0.07-0.38) and 20 (0.11-0.33) weeks from sire, dam and sire plus dam variance components, respectively. The estimates for the linear body measurements ranged from low to moderate (0.02 -0.38) from all variance components at all ages except for drumstick length from sire plus dam variance component at 2 weeks, shank length from sire variance component and keel length from dam variance component each at 20 weeks which had high estimates (0.40 -(0.46). In Table 4, heritability of body weight was low (0.04) from sire variance component at 2 weeks, moderate to high (0.21-0.48) from sire and sire plus dam variance components at 10 weeks and high (0.44-0.54) from the three variance components at 20 weeks. The heritability estimates were high for shank length at all ages, drumstick length at 2 weeks, body girth and keel length at 10 and 20 weeks, respectively from different variance components in IBxN genotype. The heritability estimates for the other traits ranged from low to moderate (0.01-0.39) from different variance components at all ages. In Table 5, heritability estimates for body weight of FxIB ranged from low to moderate (0.11-0.22) from the three variance components at 2 weeks, moderate to high (0.21-0.46) from sire variance component at 10 weeks and low to moderate (0.17-0.36) from sire plus dam variance components at 20 weeks. High heritability estimate (0.52) existed only for body width from sire variance components at 20 weeks in FxIB. The heritability estimates for the other linear measurements ranged from low to moderate (0.01 -0.36) in this genotype. Heritabilities of many traits were inestimable from dam and sire plus dam variance components in this genotype.

Table 6 showed that heritability of body weight in NaxIB genotype was very low at 2 (0.00-0.11) and 10 weeks (0.02-0.03) and moderate at 20 weeks (0.17 -0.20) from the three variance components. High heritability estimates were obtained for shank length at 2 and 10 weeks, drumstick length and body width each at 10 weeks from sire variance component. Estimates for shank length, drumstick length, body width and other linear traits from different variance components at other ages ranged from low to moderate (0.01-0.37). Heritabilities of many traits from dam variance components were inestimable. The heritability of body weight and linear body measurements from sire, dam and sire plus dam variance components of NxIB genotype at different ages are presented in Table 7. The estimates for body weight were low (0.04-0.13) both at 2 and 10 weeks and ranged from moderate to high (0.27-0.66) at 20 weeks from the three variance components. The heritability estimates for the linear measurements ranged from low to moderate (0.01-0.28) at all ages from the three variance component at 20 weeks. The heritability was inestimable for most of the linear measurements at 2 weeks from sire and sire plus dam variance components except for body width which was high (0.81) from sire variance component at 20 weeks. The heritability was inestimable for most of the linear measurements at 2 weeks from sire and sire plus dam variance components.

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

Age (weeks)	Trait	h_s^2	$\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{d}}^2$	\mathbf{h}_{s+d}^2
2	Body weight (g)	0.08 ± 0.00		0.02 ± 00
	Shank length (cm)	0.12 ± 0.02		0.04 ± 0.00
	Drumstick Length (cm)	0.08 ± 0.00		0.02 ± 0.00
	Body girth (cm)		0.03 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.02
	Body width (cm)	0.17 ± 0.05		0.08 ± 0.00
	Keel length (cm)	0.13 ± 0.03	0.18 ± 0.06	0.00
	Body length (cm)	0.20 ± 0.06	0.06 ± 0.00	0.13 ± 0.02
	Wing length (cm)		0.04 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.00
10	Shank length (cm)	0.90 ± 0.69	0.07 ± 0.00	0.08 ± 0.00
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.03 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00
	Body girth (cm)		0.02 ± 0.00	
	Body width (cm)		0.50 ± 0.30	
	Wing length (cm)	0.11 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.03	0.07 ± 0.00
20	Body weight (g)	0.07 ± 0.00	0.50 ± 0.30	0.28 ± 0.10
	Shank length	0.40 ± 0.20	0.41 ± 0.22	0.22 ± 0.08
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.08 ± 0.00	0.33±0.16	0.20 ± 0.07
	Body width (cm)	0.00	0.36 ± 0.19	0.18 ± 0.05
	Keel length (cm)	0.03 ± 0.00	0.11 ± 0.01	0.07 ± 0.00
	Body length (cm)	0.09 ± 0.00	0.10 ± 0.01	0.09 ± 0.00
	Wing length (cm)	0.03 ± 0.00	0.27 ± 0.11	0.19 ± 0.07

 Table 2: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire,

 dam and sire plus dam variance components in IBxF genotype at different ages

Table 3: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire,
dam and sire plus dam variance components of IBxNa genotype at different ages

Age (weeks)	Trait	\mathbf{h}_{s}^{2}	h _d ²	\mathbf{h}_{s+d}^2
2	Body weight (g)	0.31±0.13	0.19 ± 0.06	0.25 ± 0.09
	Drumstick length	0.14 ± 0.03		0.40 ± 0.23
	Body width (cm)	0.20 ± 0.07		0.10 ± 0.00
	Keel length (cm)	0.05 ± 0.00		
	Body Length (cm)	0.13±0.03		0.06 ± 0.00
	Wing length (cm)	0.02 ± 0.00		
10	Body weight (g)	0.38 ± 0.17	0.07 ± 0.00	0.23 ± 0.08
	Shank length (cm)	0.08 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.00	0.08 ± 0.00
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.02 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00
	Body girth (cm)		0.05 ± 0.00	0.00
	Wing length (cm)	0.12±0.03	0.03±0.00	0.07 ± 0.00
20	Body weight (g)	0.11 ± 0.02	0.33 ± 0.14	0.22 ± 0.08
	Shank length (cm)	0.40 ± 0.11	0.12 ± 0.02	0.08 ± 0.00
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.11 ± 0.01	0.12 ± 0.03	0.11 ± 0.03

www.ijaeb.org

Page 95

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

				-
Body girth (cm)		0.11±0.02	0.02 ± 0.00	
Body width (cm)	0.05 ± 0.00	0.13 ± 0.04	0.09 ± 0.00	
Keel length (cm)	0.25 ± 0.09	0.46 ± 0.28	0.33 ± 0.14	
Body length (cm)		0.17 ± 0.05	0.06 ± 0.00	
Wing length (cm)	0.08 ± 000	0.36 ± 0.20	0.21 ± 0.08	

 Table 4: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire,

 dam and sire plus dam variance components of IBxN genotype at different ages

Age (weeks)	Trait	h _s ²	h _d ²	h_{s+d}^2
2	Body weight (g)	0.04 ± 0.00		
	Shank length (cm)	$2.00{\pm}1.41$	0.06 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.72
	Drumstick length	0.40 ± 0.23	0.19 ± 0.06	0.16 ± 0.04
10	Body weight (g)	0.48 ± 0.27		0.21±0.07
	Shank length (cm)	0.71 ± 0.52		0.33±0.14
	Drumstick length	0.32 ± 0.14	0.14 ± 0.04	0.13±0.03
	Body girth (cm)	0.62 ± 0.44	0.05 ± 0.00	0.34 ± 0.17
	Body width (cm)	0.35 ± 0.19	0.01 ± 0.00	0.18 ± 0.05
	Keel length (cm)	0.51 ± 0.30	0.01 ± 0.00	0.26 ± 0.09
	Wing length (cm)	0.18 ± 0.06	0.01 ± 0.00	0.09 ± 0.00
20	Body weight (g)	0.45 ± 0.24	0.54 ± 0.31	0.44 ± 0.23
	Shank length (cm)	0.53 ± 0.30	0.08 ± 0.00	0.29 ± 0.11
	Drumstick length(cm)	0.36 ± 0.19	0.14±0.3	0.24 ± 0.09
	Body girth (cm)	0.54 ± 0.39	0.31±0.12	0.39±0.21
	Body width (cm)	0.38 ± 0.20	0.10 ± 0.01	0.23 ± 0.08
	Keel length (cm)		1.50 ± 1.03	0.72 ± 0.49
	Body length (cm)	0.50 ± 0.31	0.04 ± 0.00	0.26 ± 0.09
	Wing length (cm)	0.23 ± 0.08	0.26±0`09	0.15 ± 0.04

Table 5: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire,
dam and sire plus dam variance components of FxIB genotype at different ages

Age (weel	ks) Trait	h _s ²	$\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{d}}^2$	h_{s+d}^2
2	Body weight (g)	0.11±0.02	0.22 ± 0.07	0.16 ± 0.04
	Shank length (cm)	0.27±0.12	0.10 ± 0.01	0.19 ± 0.06
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.05 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00
	Body girth (cm)	0.04 ± 0.00		
	Body width (cm)	0.08 ± 0.00		0.04 ± 0.00
	Keel length (cm)	0.06 ± 0.00		0.01 ± 0.00
	Body length (cm)	0.02 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00
	Wing length (cm)	0.29 ± 0.10		0.14 ± 0.03
10	Body weight (g)	0.46 ± 0.25		0.21 ± 0.07
	Shank length (cm)	0.24 ± 0.09		0.08 ± 0.00

www.ijaeb.org

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

	Drumstick length (cm)	0.07 ± 0.00			
	Body girth (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00			
	Body width (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.00	
	Keel length (cm)	0.19 ± 0.07	0.03 ± 0.00	0.11 ± 0.01	
	Body length (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	
	Wing length (cm)	$0.22 \pm 0.0.7$		0.01 ± 0.00	
20	Body weight (g)	0.36±0.17		0.17 ± 0.05	
	Shank length (cm)	0.35±0.14	0.01 ± 0.00	0.18 ± 0.06	
	Drumstick Length (cm)	0.30±0.12		0.12 ± 0.03	
	Body girth (cm)	0.19 ± 0.06	0.02 ± 0.00	0.10 ± 0.01	
	Body width (cm)	0.52 ± 0.34	0.01 ± 0.00	0.27 ± 0.11	
	Keel length (cm)	0.18 ± 0.05		0.06 ± 0.00	
	Body length (cm)	0.32±0.13	0.02 ± 0.00	0.17 ± 0.06	
	Wing length (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00			
					-

Table 6: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire, dam and sire plus dam variance components of NaxIB genotype at different ages

Age (weeks)	Trait	h_s^2	h_d^2	$\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{s}+\mathbf{d}}^2$
2	Body weight (g)	0.11±0.02		
	Shank length (cm)	0.45 ± 0.27	0.01 ± 0.00	0.23±0.09
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.06 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00
	Body girth (cm)	0.28 ± 0.11		0.12 ± 0.01
	Body width (cm)	0.34±0.16		0.16±0.04
	Keel length (cm)	0.29 ± 0.11		0.13±0.03
	Body length (cm)	0.19 ± 0.07		0.08 ± 0.00
	Wing length (cm)	0.33±0.12		0.14±0.03
10	Body weight (g)	0.02 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00
	Shank length (cm)	0.53±0.41		0.24±0.10
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.46 ± 0.25		0.22±0.10
	Body girth (cm)	0.23 ± 0.08	0.02 ± 0.00	0.13±0.025
	Body width (cm)	0.96 ± 0.73	0.05 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.00
	Keel length (cm)	0.29 ± 0.10		0.12 ± 0.01
	Wing length (cm)	0.22 ± 0.05		0.08 ± 0.00
20	Body weight (g)	0.20 ± 0.06	0.17 ± 0.05	0.18 ± 0.06
	Shank length (cm)	0.14 ± 0.04	0.37±0.17	0.24 ± 0.08
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.15 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.08	0.13±0.03
	Body girth (cm)	0.11±0.01	0.13±0.03	0.12 ± 0.01
	Body width (cm)	0.10 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.01	
	Keel length (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.28 ± 0.11	0.14±0.03
	Body length (cm)	0.01 ± 0.00		
	Wing length (cm)	0.03 ± 0.00		

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

Table 7: Heritability estimates for body weight and linear body measurements from sire,
dam and sire plus dam variance components of NxIB genotype at different ages

Age (weeks)	Trait	h_s^2	h _d ²	$\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{s}+\mathbf{d}}^2$
2	Body weight (g)		0.13±0.03	0.04 ± 0.00
	Shank length (cm)		0.01 ± 0.00	
	Drumstick length (cm)		0.03 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00
	Body length (cm)		0.01 ± 0.00	
10	Body weight (g)		0.05 ± 0.00	
	Shank length (cm)			
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.05 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00
	Body length (cm)	0.03 ± 00	0.04 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 00
20	Body weight (g)	0.66 ± 0.46	0.27 ± 0.10	0.43±0.21
	Shank length (cm)	0.07 ± 0.00		0.01 ± 0.00
	Drumstick length (cm)	0.13 ± 0.03	0.02 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.00
	Body width (cm)	0.80 ± 0.61		
	Keel length (cm)	0.04 ± 0.00		0.28±0.10
	Body length (cm)		$0.10{\pm}0.01$	

4. DISCUSSION

The low to moderate range of heritability estimates obtained for body weight in the different genotypes at various ages (Tables 2-7) were similar to the heritability estimates of body weight reported by Kabir et al. (2006) in Rhode Island Red and White chickens. This implied that additive genetic variance for body weight of these crossbred chickens were comparable to that of pure exotic ones, suggesting that the chickens could be used for breeding purposes in the absence of the exotic ones. The low to high heritability estimates for body weight obtained at 20 weeks from the three variance components in IBxF (Table 2), moderate to high estimates at 10 weeks in IBxN and 20 weeks in FxIB, NaxIB and NxIB (Tables 4-7), high estimates in IBxN at 20 weeks (Table 4), high estimates of shank length, drumstick length, body width, body girth and keel length at 2, 10 and 20 weeks and the low to moderate heritability estimates for the other linear body measurements in IBxNa, FxIB, NaxIB and NxIB especially at 2 weeks are in agreement with the previous studies (Oni et al., 1991; Argenta o et al., 2002; Momoh and Nwosu, 2008; Adeleke et al., 2011; Osei-Amponsah et al., 2013; Sanda et al., 2014). These different estimates suggested that heritability was dependent on many factors such as genotype and age of estimation in addition to source of variation. This accounts for why heritability estimate of a trait varies greatly in literature (Wray and Visscher, 2008).

The low to moderate heritability estimates obtained for body weight and linear body measurements mostly at 2 weeks indicated existence of low additive genetic relative to non-additive and environmental variances for these traits. This suggested that environmental and non-additive deviations including maternal, dominance and epistasis effects had more influence on body weight of these genotypes at their early stage of growth (Prado-Gonzalez *et al.*, 2003). This implied that less genetic improvement could be achieved if these chickens were selected as early as two weeks of age since environmental and maternal effects had been reported to have more influence on the phenotype at early life of chickens (Barbato and Vasilalos-Younken, 1991; Jasouri *et al.*, 2017). The moderately high heritability estimates obtained for body weight and the

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

high estimates for shank length, drumstick length, body width, body girth and keel length at 10 and 20 weeks suggested that greater proportion of additive genetic variance relative to non-additive genes and environmental deviations existed with increase in age (Kramer *et al.*, 1998), and that individual selection should be employed for improvement of such traits (Rath *et al.*, 2015; Mebratie *et al.*, 2019). This suggested that as the chickens advanced in age, maternal and environmental effects gradually disappeared, giving way to true genetic effect which resulted in moderate to high heritability estimates at 10 and 20 weeks compared to 2 weeks of age (Prado-Gonzalez *et al.*, 2003; Ndungù et al., 2020). Hence, greater response to selection will be achieved at 10 weeks and above based on the heritability of the traits.

The increasing trend of heritability estimates with age observed for the traits among the genotypes was similar to the previous investigations (Kumararaj *et al.*, 1991; Chambers, 1990; Chaudhary *et al.*, 1996; Adeleke *et al.*, 2011). Prado-Gonzalez *et al.* (2003), however, reported decreasing heritability values with increasing ages in chicken and explained that this might be due to environmental and genetic differences.

The numerically larger estimates of heritability obtained from dam variance components compared to that of the sire at 20 weeks in IBxF and IBxNa chickens support the opinion that heritability estimates from sire variance component is less biased and usually smaller in value than that of dam and sire plus dam variances components using the same data (Kearsey and Pooni, 1996; Astles et al., 2006; Ibe, 2019;). Ibe (2019) explained that the smaller and less biased heritability estimate from sire variance component is due to the fact that sire variance includes proportions of additive genes and various interactions of additive genes only, whereas dam and combined sire and dam variance components in addition may contain additive x dominance interaction and even maternal effects. Kabir *et al.* (2006) reported that maternal effect from preoviposition such as egg size contributes to the high heritability estimates obtained for some traits at different ages indicated negative variances which is one of the drawbacks of analysis of variance procedure for estimating heritability (Ibe, 2019).

5. CONCLUSION

Shank length was the most highly heritable trait, followed by body width, body weight, keel length, body girth, drumstick length and body length. Wing length was lowly to moderately heritable. IBxN genotype recorded more traits with high heritability estimates, followed by NaxIB, IBxF, NxIB and FxIB. No trait with high heritability was recorded in IBxNa. Traits with high heritability estimates occurred more from sire variance component at 20 weeks, followed by 10 weeks. The magnitude of high estimates obtained at 10 weeks was larger than those at 20 weeks. It was concluded that growth should best be improved by individual selection of IBxN sire lines using shank length as the most heritable trait between 10 and 20 weeks of age in these crossbred chickens.

REFERENCES

Adeleke MA, Peter SO, Ozoje MO, Ikeobi CON, Bamgbose MA, Adebambo OA. Genetic parameter estimates for body weight and linear body measurements in pure and crossbred progenies of Nigerian indigenous chickens. 2011. Live. Res. Rural Dev., 23 (1). Retrieved November 7, 2020 from http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd23/1/adel23019.htm

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

- Adetayo AS, Babafunso SE. Comparison of the performance of Nigerian indigenous chickens from three agro-ecological zones. 2001 Live. Res. Rural Dev. 13(15). http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd 13/2/added 132.htm
- Argenta^o C, Michelan Filho T, Marques JB, Souza EM, Eler JP, Ferraz, JBS. Genetic and phenotypic parameters of growth and carcass traits of a male line of broilers raised in tropical conditions. 2002 In: Proceedings of 7th Congress of Genetics App. Live. Prod., Montpellier, France, pp: 33
- Ajayi F. Nigerian indigenous chicken: A valuable genetic resources for meat and egg production. 2010. Asian J. Poult. Sc., 4(4). <u>https://doi.org/10.3923/ajps.2010.164.172</u>
- Astles PA, Moore AJ, Preziosi RF. Comparison of methods of estimate cross-environment genetic correlations. 2006. J. Evo. Bio., 19 (1): 114-122.
- Bal GR, Vishesh KS, Usha R, Mahendra, CK. Estimation of Genetic parameters and expected response to selection for oviposition and clutch traits. 2019. Arch. Anim. Poult. Sc., 1(3): 555-564.
- Barbato G, Vasilalos-Younken R. Sex-linked and maternal effects on growth in chickens. 1991. Poult. Sc. 70(4): 709-718. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0700709</u>
- Becker WA. Manual of quantitative genetics. 4th ed. 1984. Academic Enterprises, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A., 188.
- Chambers JR. Genetics of growth and meat production in chickens. In: Poultry Breeding and Genetics. Crawford R.D. (Ed). 1990. Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp: 559-643.
- Chaudhary ML, Bajwa NNP, Brah GS, Sandhu JS. Variance component analysis of cross and pure-bred egg type chickens. 1996. Int'l J. Poult. Sc., 3:18-22.
- Ebangi AL, Ibe SN. Heritabilities of and genetic correlations between some growth traits in Nigerian local chickens. 1994. Nig. J. Anim. Prod., 21: 19-24.
- El-Labban AM, Iraqi MM, Hanafi MS, Heba AH. Estimation of genetic and non-genetic parameters for egg production traits in local strains of chickens. 2011. Live. Res. Rural Dev., 23(1):1-9.
- Ibe SN. Utilizing local poultry genetic resources in Nigeria. 1990. In: *Proceeding of 4th World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production*. Edinburgh XVI, pp.1-5.
- Ibe SN. Growth performance of normal, frizzle and naked-neck chickens in a tropical environment. 1993. Nig. J. Anim. Prod. 20: 25-31.
- Ibe SN. An Introduction to Genetics and Animal Breeding, Ist ed. 1998. Longman Nigeria Plc, Ikeja, 150 pp.
- Ibe SN. Statistical methods in genetics and animal breeding. 2019. University of Nigeria Press Ltd. Enugu State, Nigeria, 153 pp.
- Isaac UC. Phenotypic, genetic and environmental correlations between body weight and linear body traits of chicken genotypes. 2020. *Agrobiological Records.* 4: 32-43. https://doi.org/10.47278/journal.abr/2020.026
- Jasouri M, Zamani P, Alijani S. Dominance genetic and maternal effects for genetic evaluation of egg production traits in dual purpose chickens. 2017. Brit. Poult. Sc. 58(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/00071668.2017.1336748

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

- Kabir M, Oni OO, Akpa GN, Adeyinka IA. Heritability Estimates and the Interrelationships of Body Weight and Shank Length in Rhode Island Red and White Chickens. 2006. Pak. J. Bio. Sc., 9: 2892-2896.
- Kearsey MJ, Pooni HS. The genetic analysis of traits. 1996. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Kramer MG, Vaughn TT, Pletscher LS, King-Ellison K, Adams E, Erickson C, Cheverud JM. Genetic variation in body weight gain and composition in the intercross of Large (LG/J) and Small (SM/J) inbred strains of mice. 1998. Gene. Mol. Bio., 21(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1415-47571998000200007
- Krishner ST, Chaudhary RP. Heritability of age and body weight of selection based on initial egg production. 1987.p Wuzza Szkola Rolneiza W. Lublinie Wydzial Zoonechniczny, p.57. (In Polish).
- Kumararaj RO, Kothandarahman P, Waganathan V. Comparison of heritability between pure bred and crossbred layers. 1991. Indian J. Poult. Sc., 26: 1-5.
- Le Bihan-Duval E, Mignon-Grasteau S, Millet N, Beaumont C. Genetic analysis of a selection experiment on increased body weight and breast muscle weight as well as on limited abdominal fat weight. 1998. Brit. Poult. Sc., 39: 346-353
- Leenstra F, Cahaner A. Effects of low, normal and high temperatures on slaughter yield of broilers from lines selected for high weight gain, favourable feed conversion, and high or low fat content. 1992. Poult. Sc., 71: 1994-2006.
- Mebratie W, Madsen P, Hawken R, Rome H, Marois D, Henshall J, Bovenhois H, Jensen J. Genetic parameters for body weight and different definitions of residual feed intake in broiler chickens. 2019. Gene. Sel. Evo., 51(53). <u>http://doi.org/10.1186/s12711-019-0494-</u>2
- Momoh OM, Nwosu CC. Genetic evaluation of growth traits in crosses between ecotypes of Nigerian local chicken. 2008. Lives. Res. Rural Dev., 20(1). http://www.lrrd.org/irrd20/10/momo20158.htm
- Niknafs S, Nejati-Javaremi A, Mehrabani-Yeganeh H, Fetemi SA. Estimation of genetic parameters for body weight and egg production traits in Mazandaran native chicken. 2012. Trop. Anim. Health Prod. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-012-0084-6</u>
- Ndungù W, Okeno TO, Muasya. Pooled parameter estimates for traits of economic importance in indigenous chicken in the tropics. 2020. Live. Sci., 239, 104102. https/doi.org/10.1016/j.livsc.2020.104102.
- Nwosu CC. Is the local chicken essential or non-essential? 1987. Invited paper, poultry farmers workshop. Agricultural Extension and Research Liason Service, ABU, Zaria, Nigeria, pp: 8-10
- Nwosu CC, Asuquo BO. Heritability of body weight in local chicken and skeletal dimensions in a randombred strain of meat-type fowl. 1984. Poult. Sc., 45:118-125.
- Ojo SO. Productivity and technical efficiency of poultry egg production in Nigeria. 2003. Int'l J. Poult. Sc., 2(6): 459-464.
- Oleforuh-Okoleh VU. Estimation of genetic parameters and selection for egg production traits in a Nigerian local chicken ecotype. 2011. J. Agric. Bio. Sc., 6(12):54-57.
- Oni OO, Abubakar BY, Ogundipe SO. Genetic and phenotypic associations of juvenile body weights and egg production traits in 2 strains of Rhode Island chickens. 1991. Nig. J. *Anim. Prod.*, 18:66-69.

Vol. 08, No. 02; 2023

ISSN: 2456-8643

- Osei-Amponsah R, Kayang BB, Naazie A. Phenotypic and genetic parameters for production traits of local chickens in Ghana. 2013. Animal Genetic Resources. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <u>https://doi.org/10.1017/S2078633613000271</u>
- Prado-Gonzalez EA, Ramirez-Avila L, Segura-Correa JC. Genetic parameters for body weight of Creole chickens from Southeastern Mexico using an Animal model. 2003. Lives. Res. Rural Dev., 15(6):1-6. <u>http://www.lrrd.org/lrrds15/1/prad151.htm</u>
- Rath PK, Mishra PK, Mallick BK, Behura NC. Evaluation of different egg quality traits and interpretation of their mode of inheritance in White Leghorns. 2015. Vet. World, 8 (4): 449-452.
- Ranjan S, Guatam A. Heritability estimates. Encyclopedia of Animal Cognition and Behaviour. Vonk J., Shackelford T.K. (eds.). 2018. Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature, India. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007.978-3-319-47829-6_6-1</u>
- Roff DA. Evolutionary Quantitative Genetics. 2006. Chapman and Hall: New York.
- Roff DA. Comparing sire and dam jackknife and likelihood approaches. 2008. Heredity. 100:32-38.
- Sanda AJ, Olowofeso O, Adeleke MA, Oso AO, Durosaro SO, Sanda MO. Heritability and repeatability estimates of some measurable traits in meat type chickens reared for ten weeks in Abeokuta, Nigeria. 2014. *Int'l J. Bio., Vet., Agric. and Food Eng.*, 8(7): 170-173.
- SAS. Statistical Analysis Software. The SAS System for Windows version 8. 1999. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA.
- Wray NR. Visscher, PM. Estimating trait heritability. 2008. Nature Education, 1(1): 29.
- Zhang IC, Ning Z-H, Xu G-Y, Hou Z-C., Yang, N. Heritabilities and genetic and phenotypic correlations of egg quality traits in brown-egg dwarf layers. 2005. Poult. Sc., 84:1209-1213.