



**HAL**  
open science

## Heritability estimates for growth-related traits using microsatellite parentage assignment in juvenile common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.)

Marc Vandeputte, Martin Kocour, Stéphane Mauger, Mathilde Dupont-Nivet, Daphné de Guerry, Marek Rodina, David Gela, Dominique Vallod, Bernard Chevassus, Otomar Linhart

### ► To cite this version:

Marc Vandeputte, Martin Kocour, Stéphane Mauger, Mathilde Dupont-Nivet, Daphné de Guerry, et al.. Heritability estimates for growth-related traits using microsatellite parentage assignment in juvenile common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.). *Aquaculture*, 2004, 235 (1-4), pp.223-236. 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2003.12.019 . hal-04297861

**HAL Id: hal-04297861**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04297861>**

Submitted on 22 Nov 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Public Domain

1 Heritability estimates for growth-related traits using microsatellite parentage assignment in  
2 juvenile common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.)

3

4 **Marc Vandeputte<sup>1\*</sup>, Martin Kocour<sup>2</sup>, Stéphane Mauger<sup>1</sup>, Mathilde Dupont-Nivet<sup>1</sup>,**  
5 **Daphné De Guerry<sup>1</sup>, Marek Rodina<sup>2</sup>, David Gela<sup>2</sup>, Dominique Vallod<sup>3</sup>, Bernard**  
6 **Chevassus<sup>1</sup>, Otomar Linhart<sup>2</sup>**

7 <sup>1</sup>INRA Laboratoire de Génétique des Poissons, 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex, France

8 <sup>2</sup>Joint Laboratory of Genetics, Physiology and Reproduction of Fish, IAPG, Academy of  
9 Sciences of the Czech Republic, University of South Bohemia, RIFCH, 38925 Vodnany  
10 Czech Republic, e-mail: linhart@vurh.jcu.cz

11 <sup>3</sup>ISARA, 31 place Bellecour, 69288 Lyon Cedex 02, France

12

---

\* Corresponding author : tel. +331 34 65 23 54, fax +331 34 65 23 90, email

mvande@jouy.inra.fr

## Abstract

Common carp is one of the leading species in world aquaculture, but selective breeding for growth rate has not been actively pursued in this species after unsuccessful selection experiments. We estimated heritability for growth-related traits at 8 weeks of age in Hungarian Synthetic Mirror carp at Vodnany (Czech Republic). Parentage assignment with eight microsatellite markers was used in a full factorial cross of 10 dams x 24 sires. Out of 550 offspring, 95.3 % could be assigned to a single parental pair. Animal model heritability estimates were  $0.34 \pm 0.08$  for weight and length, and  $0.37 \pm 0.08$  for Fulton's condition factor ( $K$ ). Maternal effects and dominance were not significantly different from zero. The genetic correlation between weight and length was 0.98, and negative correlations were found between  $K$  and length (-0.36) and  $K$  and weight (-0.16). It is concluded that selective breeding for increased weight gain can be successful in carp, using indirect selection for length. However, the facts that heritability was estimated at 8 weeks of age and not at harvest weight, as well as a possible amplification of additive variance by competition are limitations to the applicability of the present results.

16

**Keywords** : common carp, *Cyprinus carpio*, heritability, dominance, maternal effects, growth, genetic correlations, parentage assignment, microsatellites.

19

## 1        1. Introduction

2        Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.) is undoubtedly one of the most cultured fish all over the  
3        world, especially in Asia and Central and Eastern Europe. Its annual world-wide production  
4        increased from 1 million tonnes in 1991 to 2.7 million tonnes in 2000, which is more than  
5        twice the production of all salmonids (FAO 2002). This species is mostly reared in ponds with  
6        extensive or intensive management, where at least part of the diet consists of in natural food.  
7        While procedures to ensure the best conditions for growth are well-known, much remains  
8        unknown about the genetic potential of this species.

9        Although carp was one of the first domesticated fishes (Balon, 1995) and we could assume  
10       that it has undergone empirical selective breeding for centuries, quite little is known and  
11       documented about this topic in the scientific literature (Vandeputte, 2003). Indeed, the genetic  
12       improvement of quantitative traits in carp has been achieved mostly through cross-breeding of  
13       strains (Bialowas, 1991; Bakos and Gorda, 1995; Gross and Wohlfarth, 1994; Linhart et al.,  
14       2002; Wohlfarth et al., 1987 and Wohlfarth, 1993), while selective breeding showed no effect  
15       on genetic improvement of growth (Moav and Wohlfarth, 1976). Hulata (1995) claims that  
16       most cultivated carp are not from selected lines.

17       To assess the utility of selective breeding for growth related traits in common carp, the  
18       heritability of those traits has to be known. According to existing data, the heritability is low  
19       or intermediate (0.3 or less), but the reliability of most existing heritability estimates in carp is  
20       quite low due to confounding with environmental effects or small numbers of breeders used in  
21       all experiments (Vandeputte, 2003 for a review).

22       Selective breeding of carp will have to rely on simple and relatively cheap methods, as many  
23       carp-rearing countries cannot afford expensive selective breeding programmes. It has been  
24       shown recently on brown trout (*Salmo trutta* L.) that selective breeding by an improved mass  
25       selection methodology could yield considerable weight gain (up to 25% per generation,

1 Vandeputte et al., 2002b). For assessing the possible extension of this method to common  
2 carp, a better knowledge of genetic parameters is needed. The recent development of  
3 microsatellite markers for common carp (Croijmans et al, 1997) provides the opportunity to  
4 identify the familial origin of any individual in a group of common carp, provided that DNA  
5 samples of the individual and its parents are available (e.g. Estoup et al., 1998; Fishback et al.,  
6 2002). Identification of genealogies may allow the precise estimation of the genetic  
7 parameters within strains, using factorial designs which allow the separation of additive,  
8 dominance and maternal components of variance (Becker, 1984; Vandeputte et al., 2001)  
9 without environmental bias (as all genotypes can be mixed just after fertilization). Although  
10 the methods used here to estimate genetic parameters are quite expensive, the information  
11 they provide can then be used in simple mass selection programs, which could be applied  
12 almost everywhere.

13 The aim of this study was to estimate the efficiency of microsatellite parentage assignment,  
14 the family representation for offspring in a factorial cross, and genetic parameter estimates for  
15 growth - related traits in juvenile common carp.

16

17

18

## 2. Materials and Methods

### *2.1. Establishment of broodstock and spawning*

The reproduction and culture of common carp was carried out at the Department of Fish Genetics and Breeding, RIFCH, University of South Bohemia at Vodnany in the Czech Republic. A Hungarian Synthetic Mirror strain (HSM) was imported to the Czech Republic during 1975-1985 (Linhart et al., 2002). F<sub>5</sub> individuals from this strain (15 females and 24 males) were chosen for reproduction during 1997. Five-year-old broodstock of HSM taken from breeding ponds in April were stored in two ponds of 0.2 ha separated by sex. Broodfish suitable for stripping were selected in May and kept separately at a hatchery in 4 m<sup>3</sup> tanks with water flow rate of 0.2 l s<sup>-1</sup>, temperature of 18-22 °C and 6-7 mg l<sup>-1</sup> O<sub>2</sub>. Twenty-four HSM sires were injected with a solution of dried carp pituitary at 1 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, 24 h before stripping at 21 °C. Milt was collected individually from each sire, kept in thin layer in cell culture vessels under aerobic conditions at 0°C for 24 h before fertilisation (Linhart et al., 2003). Twenty-eight dams were randomly divided into 2 groups of 10 and 18 fish and injected twice with dried carp pituitary (0.4 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 2.1 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, 24 h and 12 h before stripping, respectively) at 4 h interval. In each injection group, the dams were checked every 3 hours after the second injection for ovulation, stripped into separate dishes and the best spawns were selected based on visual inspection of egg quality and quantity. Ova were stored in aerobic conditions at 17-19 °C for 2-4 h prior to artificial insemination (Rothbard et al., 1996)

From each of the parents used in the cross, a fin sample was collected and stored in 90% ethanol at room temperature for further genotyping. For each female used, three batches of approximately 0.3 g (around 200 eggs) of unfertilised eggs were weighed to the nearest 0.0001 g. Once weighed, each batch was fixed in 4 % formaldehyde for later counting of eggs number and then calculation of mean egg weight.

## 2. 2. *A factorial design to produce experimental fish*

A full factorial cross (24 sires X 10 dams) was made as follows:

When 3 or 4 good quality spawns were simultaneously available, 50-200 g of eggs per dam (depending on the available amount of eggs for each dam) were pooled into one dish. From each dish, 24 batches of 15g of eggs were taken. Each fifteen-gram batch of eggs was placed into a dish of 50 ml; 500 µl sperm from one sire were added for individual fertilisation. Then the 24 dishes were placed on an orbital agitator with constant 200 rpm rotation speed with deflection 10 mm, and 4 ml of 22°C dechlorinated tap water were added (Linhart et al., 2003). After 1 minute, the twenty-four 15g batches from a given pool of 3-4 dams were grouped in one 360 g batch and egg stickiness was eliminated for 60 minutes in a solution of 33 g l<sup>-1</sup> half fat content milk powder. Each batch was then incubated in one Zuger jar for 4 days at 19-20°C. This operation was repeated three times, producing 3 pools of fertilised eggs in 3 separate jars. Pool 1 represented 3 dams (200 g of eggs from each), pool 2 represented 4 dams (130, 130, 75 and 50 g of eggs), and pool 3 represented 3 dams (130 g of eggs from each).

## 2.3. *Rearing of experimental fish*

At hatching, fry from each jar were kept separately in resorption trays at 19-20°C for 5 days until the beginning of exogenous feeding.

For on-growing to 8 weeks, 3 nursery ponds of 1600 m<sup>2</sup> were used, each being stocked with 16,000 larvae from one of the resorption trays. Pond 42 had the progeny from pool 1, pond 41 from pool 2 and pond 40 from pool 3. Fish grew up to 3 weeks of age on natural food and then were additionally fed on a commercial carp diet KP1, as is typical in the Czech Republic, using standard feeding ratios according to the estimated quantity of zooplankton.

At 8 weeks of age, the ponds were drained, all the fish were counted, and a random sample of 250 fish was taken from each pond, except in pond 40 where only 220 fish were

1 sampled. These fish were weighed to the nearest 0.01 g, and measured for length (from the tip  
2 of the nose to the end of the caudal peduncle) to the nearest mm. Fulton's coefficient of  
3 condition ( $K=W/L^3$ ) was calculated for each fish. A fin sample was collected from each fish  
4 and stored in 90 % ethanol for further genotyping.

5

#### 6 **2.4. Parentage assignment**

7 DNA extraction was performed as follows: a small piece of fin was incubated under  
8 continuous agitation at 55°C for 12 hours in 250 µl TNES-Urea extraction buffer (10 mM  
9 Tris-HCl pH8, 0.3M NaCl, 10mM EDTA, 1% SDS, 4M Urea) with 10 µl proteinase K. This  
10 mixture was then strongly agitated for 5 minutes after addition of 250 µl phenol, then  
11 centrifuged for 15 min (10,000 rpm, 15°C). The supernatant (200 µl) was collected and  
12 DNA was precipitated with 500 µl ethanol and 20µl 3M sodium acetate. After centrifugation  
13 (20 min, 10,000 rpm, 4 °C) ethanol was discarded and the DNA pellet was washed with 750  
14 µl of 70% ethanol, then centrifuged (12 min, 10,000 rpm, 4°C). Ethanol was discarded, the  
15 pellet was vacuum-dried, and then re-suspended in 200 µl water at room temperature  
16 overnight. DNA concentrations were estimated using a fluorometer at 260 nm OD, and then  
17 samples were diluted to a working concentration of 200 ng/µl. Samples were then stored at  
18 -20°C.

19 Due to bad preservation, probably caused by a low quality of one batch of ethanol used for the  
20 sample collection, 85 out of 250 samples were not recovered in ponds 41 and 42 (insufficient  
21 quality of DNA for microsatellite amplification). Altogether, 550 offspring gave good DNA  
22 quality (220 from pond 40, 165 from pond 41, 165 from pond 42). DNA from all parents (24  
23 sires, 10 dams) was also available.

24 Microsatellite DNA markers described by Crooijmans et al (1997) were used. Seven of them  
25 were selected for genotyping (*MFW16*, *MFW26*, *MFW7*, *MFW11*, *MFW18*, *MFW9*, *MFW3*),



1 and were labelled with TAMRA or 6-FAM fluorochromes. PCR conditions were as described  
2 in Crooijmans et al (1997) except for the use of 25 amplification cycles and a final elongation  
3 step of 5 minutes at 72°C. PCR products were electrophoresed through a 7M Urea, 8% 29:1  
4 acrylamide/bisacrylamide gel, and alleles were detected using a fluorescence scanner (FM-  
5 BIO II, Hitachi).

6 All individuals were genotyped for the seven microsatellites. For 48 individuals however, an  
7 eighth microsatellite (*MFW20*) was needed to achieve assignment to a single pair.

8 Parentage assignment was performed by exclusion using a program developed at INRA Fish  
9 Genetics Laboratory with Visual Basic for Microsoft Excel. Due to the structure of data  
10 (dams nested within ponds), some pond\*dam combinations could not occur, and individuals  
11 for which one single “impossible” dam was found were excluded from the analysis. On the  
12 other way, some individuals for which two couples with two different dams were possible  
13 could be assigned to a single couple, excluding the couple with the “impossible” dam.

#### 14 ***2.5. Statistical analyses***

15 Due to the nature of the cross, males were expected to be equally represented in the progeny  
16 from all three ponds. The number of observed progeny per male was therefore compared to a  
17 uniform distribution with a chi-square test. In each pond, three to four females were supposed  
18 to be represented. Theoretical proportions of offspring per female were generated using the  
19 weight of eggs from each female in the corresponding pool, as well as the mean weight of  
20 individual eggs from each female, to yield an estimation of the total eggs number from each  
21 female in each pool of eggs. Observed numbers of progeny per female were compared to  
22 these theoretical numbers using a chi-square test.

23 Due to the small value of expected frequencies (lower than 5 in most cases) for each full-sib  
24 family, homogeneity of the number of offspring per full-sib family could not be tested using a

1 chi-square test. It was tested using Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) estimates of the  
2 likelihood ratio chi-square (SAS® Proc Freq).

3 For discussing the effects of family sizes, the effective genetic size of the population ( $N_e$ ) was  
4 calculated. The basic formula used was :

$$5 \quad N_e = \frac{4(N-2)}{\left(K_s + \frac{V_s}{K_s}\right) + \left(K_d + \frac{V_d}{K_d}\right) - 2}$$

6 with  $N$  the offspring sample size,  $K_s$  and  $K_d$  the mean numbers of offspring per sire and per  
7 dam, and  $V_s$  and  $V_d$  the variances of  $K_s$  and  $K_d$ . Under the assumption of random family  
8 samples within equal family sizes (Poisson distribution) and large offspring sample ( $N > 50$ ),  
9  $N_e$  was calculated with the classical simplified formula:

$$10 \quad N_e = \frac{4N_s N_d}{N_s + N_d}$$

11 with  $N_s$  the number of sires, and  $N_d$  the number of dams.

12 For the progeny of each female, a survival index was calculated using the observed survival in  
13 each pond and the observed number of offspring from the given female in this pond :

$$14 \quad SI_{j(i)} = S_i FP_{j(i)} / IP_{j(i)}$$

15 Where  $S_{j(i)}$  is the survival index of dam  $j$  in pond  $i$ ,  $S_i$  is the survival in pond  $i$ ,  $FP_{j(i)}$  is the  
16 final proportion of offspring from female  $j$  in the sample of offspring from pond  $i$ , and  $IP_{j(i)}$  is  
17 the initial proportion of the eggs of female  $j$  in the pool of eggs used for pond  $i$ . This survival  
18 index was used in a covariance analysis (SAS Proc Glim, Type III SS) with the following  
19 model:

$$20 \quad Y_{ij} = \mu + P_i + a.c_{j(i)} + e_{ij} \quad (1)$$

21 where  $Y_{ij}$  is the survival index of dam  $j$  in pond  $i$ ,  $\mu$  is the population mean,  $P_i$  is the fixed  
22 effect of pond  $i$ ,  $c_{j(i)}$  is the covariate for dam  $j$  in pond  $i$  (covariates tested were mean  
23 individual weight of eggs from the dam, and time of ova storage from stripping to

1 fertilisation),  $a$  is the regression coefficient of survival on covariate and  $e_{ij}$  is the random  
2 residual.

3 For variance component estimation, the following model was used :

$$4 \quad Y_{ijkl} = \mu + P_i + s_j + d_{k(i)} + sd_{jk(i)} + e_{ijkl} \quad (2)$$

5 where  $Y_{ijkl}$  is the performance (weight, length, K) of the individual considered,  $\mu$  is the  
6 population mean,  $P_i$  is the fixed effect of pond  $i$ ,  $s_j$  is the random effect of sire  $j$ ,  $d_{k(i)}$  is the  
7 random effect of dam  $k$  within pond  $i$ ,  $sd_{jk(i)}$  is the random sire\*dam interaction and  $e_{ijkl}$  is the  
8 random residual. This model was adjusted with SAS® Proc Mixed (REML).

9 This model allowed the estimation of all the variance components:  $\sigma_s^2$  the sire component,  $\sigma_d^2$   
10 the dam component,  $\sigma_{sd}^2$  the sire\*dam interaction component, and  $\sigma_e^2$  the residual component.

11 Sire heritability was estimated as  $h_s^2 = 4\sigma_s^2 / (\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2)$ , dominance ratio as

12  $d^2 = 4\sigma_{sd}^2 / (\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2)$  and global (genetic + environmental) maternal effects ratio as

13  $m^2 = (\sigma_d^2 - \sigma_s^2) / (\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2)$ , and their standard errors approximated as done by Becker

14 (1984) :

$$15 \quad S.E.(h_s^2) \cong 4 \frac{\sqrt{\text{var}(\sigma_s^2)}}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2} \quad S.E.(d^2) \cong 4 \frac{\sqrt{\text{var}(\sigma_{sd}^2)}}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

$$16 \quad S.E.(m^2) \cong \frac{\sqrt{\text{var}(\sigma_d^2) + \text{var}(\sigma_s^2)}}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2 + \sigma_{sd}^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

17 Additionally, single and multiple trait animal models were optimised with VCE4

18 (Groeneveld, 1998) for estimating heritabilities and global maternal effects (single trait

19 models) as well as genetic correlations between traits (multiple trait model). The general form

20 of these models was as follows :

$$21 \quad y = Xb + Za + Wm + e \quad (3)$$

22 where  $y$  is the vector of observed performances,  $b$  is the vector of fixed effects (ponds),  $a$  is

23 the vector of additive genetic values,  $m$  is the vector of maternal effects and  $e$  is the vector of

1 errors.  $X$ ,  $Z$  and  $W$  are known incidence matrices. No standard errors were available for  
2 genetic correlations. Animal models were used as they give better precision for heritability,  
3 and provide direct estimations of genetic correlations. However, the software used does not  
4 allow the estimation of dominance effects, and the sire-dam model with interaction (model 2)  
5 was used therefore.  
6

### 1 **3. Results**

#### 2 ***3.1. Rearing parameters***

3 Egg sizes were quite variable among dams, with a mean egg weight of 1.24 mg, a minimum  
4 of 0.97 mg and a maximum of 1.61 mg. On average, the fertilisation rate was 85% in each of  
5 the three ponds, and the hatching rate was 75%. At 8 weeks post-resorption, the mean length  
6 of the juveniles was 54 mm (55, 53, 54 in ponds 40, 41, 42, respectively) and their mean  
7 weight was 5.51 g (5.80, 5.18, 5.56 in ponds 40, 41, 42, respectively). The mean coefficient of  
8 variation was 11% for length and 29% for weight. Mean survival was 61% (56%, 69%, 59%  
9 in ponds 40, 41, 42, respectively).

#### 10 ***3.2. Parentage assignment***

11 550 individuals were available for parentage assignment, of which 518 could be assigned  
12 directly to a single parental pair (Table 1). Two individuals, however, were considered as not  
13 assigned as the dam identified should have had no offspring in their pond of origin. Similarly,  
14 24 individuals were assigned to two parental pairs, and 8 of those were considered assigned to  
15 one pair as one of the two dams identified was not supposed to have any offspring in the  
16 given pond. Altogether, 95.3 % of the offspring could be assigned to a single parental pair,  
17 3.1 % to more than one pair and 1.6 % could not be assigned. For variance component  
18 estimation, the two offspring of dam 4 were removed from the analysis as they notably  
19 perturbed the estimation of maternal effects, so only 522 individuals were used.

#### 20 ***3.3. Differential family representations***

21 The representation of the offspring in the different families is given in Table 2. The observed  
22 numbers of offspring per sire were different from the expected numbers ( $\chi^2=45.9$ , 23 *d.f.*,  
23  $P<0.01$ ). However, two males (7 and 23) had an important contribution to the chi-square, and  
24 there was no more representation distortion when they were removed from the analysis  
25 ( $\chi^2=29.2$ , 21 *d.f.*,  $P> 0.1$ ). Representation of dams was tested within ponds. Within pond 40

1 (dams 1, 2, 3) there was a large distortion of dam representation ( $\chi^2=24.3$ , 2 *d.f.*,  $P<0.001$ ).  
2 The same was seen for dams 4 to 7 in pond 41 ( $\chi^2=127$ , 3 *d.f.*,  $P<0.001$ ). In this case, it has to  
3 be noted that dam 7 gave no offspring in the sample, and dam 4 gave only 2 offspring.  
4 Removing these two dams, the contributions from the two remaining ones were in the  
5 expected proportions ( $\chi^2=2.3$ , 1 *d.f.*,  $P>0.3$ ). In pond 42, the observed frequencies per dam  
6 also differed from their expectations, but to a lesser extent ( $\chi^2=8.7$ , 2 *d.f.*,  $P<0.05$ ). The  
7 MCMC estimate of the likelihood ratio chi-square for homogeneity was not significant  
8 ( $P>0.1$ ), showing an independent effect of sire and dam on the full-sib family survival.  
9 Covariance analysis on dam offspring survival showed no effect of the covariates on the  
10 survival index ( $P>0.5$  for egg weight,  $P>0.8$  for ova storage time).

### 11 **3.4. Genetic parameters**

12 The fixed effect of pond was not significant in model 2 ( $P>0.36$  for weight,  $P>0.50$  for length  
13 and  $P>0.43$  for  $K$ ).

14 Genetic parameters for weight, length and Fulton's coefficient ( $K$ ) are shown in Table 3.

15 Heritability estimates were significantly different from zero for all three traits studied, and all  
16 fall in the 0.3-0.4 range. Estimates derived from animal model were more precise (standard  
17 error divided by two) than those derived from sire-dam model with interaction. Maternal  
18 effects for all three traits did not significantly differ from zero. Dominance ratio estimations  
19 were positive (although not significantly different from zero) for weight and length and null  
20 for Fulton's coefficient. Multi-trait animal model heritabilities, genetic and phenotypic  
21 correlations are shown in Table 4. Heritability estimates were slightly lower than with single  
22 trait animal model for weight and length, and similar for  $K$ . The genetic correlation between  
23 length and weight was very high (0.976), and negative genetic correlations could be observed  
24 between  $K$  and length (-0.364) or weight (-0.159). Phenotypic correlations were quite  
25 comparable to genetic correlations, although showing a lower absolute value.

## 1 **4. Discussion**

### 2 ***4.1. Rearing parameters***

3 The quality of rearing was very satisfactory, with a good homogeneity between ponds for  
4 survival and growth rates. Hatching rates were as high as normal standards, despite the  
5 manipulations of the eggs (pooling, individual fertilisations). This shows that this type of  
6 factorial cross is practically applicable in a hatchery with good technical competence.

### 7 ***4.2. Parentage assignment***

8 The efficiency of parentage assignment (>95 % for a 10 X 24 factorial cross) was very high,  
9 with eight markers used. In other species, eight microsatellites have the theoretical capability  
10 of assigning 95% or more of the offspring to the right parents in a 140 X 140 factorial cross in  
11 turbot, and in a 34 X 34 factorial in rainbow trout (Estoup et al., 1998). The microsatellites in  
12 this theoretical study had a mean number of 14.1 alleles in turbot, and 8.4 and in rainbow  
13 trout. In our case, the mean number of alleles in the population is 7.75 for the eight  
14 microsatellites, so the expected performances are supposed to be a little below those in  
15 rainbow trout. Practically in rainbow trout, 14 multiplexed microsatellites allowed 91-95%  
16 assignment of the progeny to one parental pair in a 48 X 2 factorial cross (Fishback et al.,  
17 2002), or 10 microsatellites allowed 90% assignation in two 2 X 46 factorial crosses  
18 (Chevassus et al., 2002). In this case, our results are quite comparable, but with more families  
19 (240 compared to 96 or 92) and fewer markers used. Microsatellite parentage assignment in  
20 carp can then be rated as very satisfactory.

### 21 ***4.3. Differential survivals***

22 The “survivals” studied here are a combination of fertilisation rate, hatching rate and post-  
23 hatching survival, due to the mixing of families just after fertilisation. The pattern of  
24 differential survivals observed here is consistent with that seen in salmonid studies, with a  
25 small effect of sire and a large effect of dam. As in Herbinger et al. (1995), the effect of sires

1 on survival is only due to a very limited number of sires, and the effect of dams is very large.  
2 A large dam effect was also seen in Fishback et al. (2002) on rainbow trout, with 12 dams out  
3 of 48 (25%) giving no progeny. In our case, one dam (10%) gave no progeny, and one dam  
4 (10%) gave less than 1% of the offspring. There was a large effect of both sire and dam on  
5 differential survival in seabass (Garcia de Leon et al., 1998) and in Atlantic halibut (Jackson  
6 et al., 2003). Indeed, a dam effect on survival is usual in fish, and often is related to egg size  
7 (Bagenal, 1969; Beacham and Murray, 1985; Rana, 1985; Marteinsdottir and Able, 1992;  
8 Wallace and Aasjord, 1984). We see here that egg size had no effect on early survival, in  
9 accordance with recent results in salmonids (Jonsson and Svavarsson, 2000; Vandeputte et al.,  
10 2002a), and with the finding of Lahnsteiner et al. (2001) that egg size is not a good predictor  
11 of egg quality in carp. No effect of time of egg storage time from stripping to fertilisation was  
12 seen, in accordance with the results of Rothbard et al. (1996).

13 The relatively good equilibrium of family sizes implicates a significant but moderate  
14 reduction of the effective genetic size ( $N_e$ ) of the offspring sample. With the simple  
15 assumption that all 10 dams and all 24 sires participated equally in the production of  
16 juveniles, the expected  $N_e$  was 28.2, while the real  $N_e$ , taking into account the true variance in  
17 family size, was 22.3, a reduction of 21%. If we considered the expected variance in family  
18 size due to the initial known differences in egg numbers used from each dam, the theoretical  
19  $N_e$  would have been 26.8, the reduction in  $N_e$  then being 17%. Then, we can conclude that  
20 using the type of controlled factorial mating described here, hatchery managers can rely on  
21 effective numbers of breeders 20 percent smaller than the ones they can calculate *a priori*.  
22 This reduction is much smaller than what can occur in uncontrolled breeding schemes,  
23 especially natural or semi-natural reproduction, where  $N_e$  can be as low as 25 % of the  
24 number of breeders used (e.g, red sea bream, Perez-Enriquez et al., 1999).

25



#### 1 *4.4. Genetic parameters*

2 The heritability estimates obtained for growth rate were rather high (0.34-0.39). Nenashev  
3 (1966) and Nagy et al. (1980) found similar results ( $h^2=0.34-0.44$  and 0.48, respectively),  
4 however with experimental designs very likely to produce upward biased estimates. Other  
5 authors (Nenashev, 1969; Smisek, 1981; Tanck et al., 2001) found lower estimates, in the  
6 range 0-0.30. However, our estimate is the first one to be derived from more than 30 breeders  
7 without any evident source of bias, due to the factorial nature of the cross, and therefore this  
8 high value may be considered with confidence. With such values, one can expect significant  
9 selection gains (in the range of 20-25 % per generation following selection of the 2 % of  
10 heaviest fish). This is in contrast with the observations by Moav and Wohlfarth (1976), who  
11 saw no genetic gain during 5 generations of mass selection for growth rate in carp. However,  
12 it is quite likely that this last experiment was perturbed by the genetic composition of this  
13 particular population, and possibly also by high inbreeding, due to breeding beings done as  
14 mass spawnings, allowing a large under-representation of the breeders used. Still, the  
15 possibility that our HSM population may not respond to selection as well as theory predicts  
16 cannot be ruled out, especially if we consider that all families being reared communally in our  
17 experiment, some amplification of differences between families may occur due to  
18 competition. This amplification has been demonstrated for carp strains by Moav and  
19 Wohlfarth (1974) who showed that the variance between strains means was almost four times  
20 higher when carp strains were reared communally instead of separately. Nevertheless, as the  
21 normal management of strains is to be reared separately, the normal management of families  
22 in an outbred population is to be reared communally, so, hopefully, realized heritability  
23 should not be four times less than our estimated heritability. However, a definitive answer to  
24 this question will only be possible through the achievement of an experimental selective  
25 breeding programme on the HSM strain.

1 One limitation of our present work is the fact that genetic parameters are estimated only at 8  
2 weeks of age, and their validity for growth to harvest is questionable. Although we do not  
3 know formal estimations of genetic correlations between early growth and harvest size in  
4 carp, we can remark that the ranking of 3 strains is the same at 5 weeks and 2 summers in  
5 Vandeputte et al. 2002c, although the differences are not significant. The rankings also do not  
6 change between juvenile and adult crossbreeds in the 1982, 83 and 84 experiments reported in  
7 Wohlfarth 1993, and a positive correlation between the growth of strains at 1 summer and 3  
8 summers can be seen in Linhart et al 2002. Altogether, these results tend to show that a  
9 genetic correlation exists between early and late growth in common carp, and so our results  
10 should also at least partially apply for later growth.

11 Regarding the shape of the fish (Fulton's  $K$ ), the heritability was high (0.37-0.41), in  
12 accordance with the results of Ankorion et al. (1992) who found a realized heritability of 0.47  
13 upwards and 0.33 downwards for another measure of shape (Height/Length ratio). This  
14 confirms that shape may be easily selected for in common carp.

15 In our study, maternal effects were zero or close to zero. This result was quite unexpected, as  
16 it had been shown in the past that maternal effects were very strong on the early growth rate  
17 of carp (Hulata et al., 1976). In this last study, maternal effects were generated by maternal  
18 age (correlated to egg size) and differences in hatching time, and both showed marked effects  
19 on the growth performance of the fry. Here, as all families within the same pond were  
20 fertilized at the same time, only egg size was expected to have an effect, but none was seen,  
21 although some females have very different egg sizes (from 0.97 to 1.60 mg). However, the  
22 total number of degrees of freedom to estimate the maternal component of variance was low  
23 (5), due to the nesting of dams within ponds and to the (near) absence of offspring for two  
24 dams. Therefore, this result indicating no maternal effects should be taken cautiously, and  
25 needs confirmation. This information is very important because if maternal effects are known

1 to disappear quickly in salmonids when families are reared separately (Chevassus, 1976;  
2 McKay et al., 1986), this does not hold true when families are mixed from the egg stage  
3 (Chevassus et al., 2002), and this can interfere with the identification of the best individuals in  
4 mass selection procedures.

5 This study is the first one to propose an estimation of within-strain dominance variation in  
6 carp, and the values obtained are low (0.12 or less) and not significantly different from zero.

7 This is a little surprising, as exploitation of heterosis is widely used for crossbreeding of carps  
8 (see Hulata, 1995 for a review), and heterosis requires the existence of dominance variation.

9 However, the precision of the estimation is quite low, due to the disequilibrium in family  
10 sizes and the small size of full-sib families, which generates a lot of missing values (see Table  
11 2). The lack of within strain dominance variation may be a characteristic of the HSM stock,  
12 but would need confirmation, although it is much less important for practical within strain  
13 selective breeding than the level of maternal effects.

14 Our study also gives the first estimates of genetic correlations between growth-related traits in  
15 the common carp. The genetic correlation between length and weight is very close to unity  
16 (0.976) and the heritabilities of length and weight are similar, so selection on length (which is  
17 much easier to apply in the field) should give approximately the same results on weight as  
18 direct selection on weight. Interestingly, there is a negative correlation between length and  $K$   
19 (-0.36), so selection on length should produce heavier, but leaner fish, which might be an  
20 advantage for increasing fillet yield, although there is only a trend towards better fillet yields  
21 in leaner fish (Cibert et al., 1999, Vandeputte, unpublished data). Negative genetic  
22 correlations between length and  $K$  also exist in rainbow trout (Fishback et al., 2002), although  
23 to a lesser extent. More surprisingly, weight also has a negative, although smaller, correlation  
24 with  $K$  (-0.16), which is not seen in rainbow trout. In carp, it was traditionally speculated that  
25 a high height/length ( $H/L$ ) ratio (implying a high  $K$ ) would be positively correlated with

1 weight gain, and the traditional method for selecting broodstock in Europe was to keep the  
2 largest individuals with the highest *H/L* ratio (Hofmann, 1975 in Ankorion et al. 1992).  
3 Ankorion et al. (1992) found a negative association between weight and *H/L* ratio, but  
4 concluded it was probably not significant due to the small magnitude of the correlated  
5 responses. Our results are in the same direction as their finding, and then it seems quite  
6 probable that high-backed fish, which in many countries are preferred by the consumers, have  
7 a lower growth potential and should not be selected. It is valid especially if the objective is to  
8 market carp fillets, for which the high backed shape (triangular) has even a negative impact  
9 on consumer acceptance, at least in the Czech Republic.

10

### 11 **Acknowledgements**

12 The authors wish to thank the staff of the hatchery in Czech Republic for active  
13 participation in the production of the experimental fish, and Jérôme Garrigue for his valued  
14 help in the genotyping. This work was supported by the Czech Grant Foundation and Ministry  
15 of Education no. J06/98:126100001, Czech Republic and incentive funds from INRA  
16 Hydrobiology and Wildlife Department, as well funding from France-Czech Republic  
17 bilateral program BARRANDE n° 03218RF and 2002-045-2CZ

18

19

1 **References**

- 2 Ankorion, Y., Moav, R., Wohlfarth, G.W., 1992. Bidirectional mass selection for body  
3 shape in common carp. *Genet. Sel. Evol.* 24, 43-52.
- 4 Bagenal, T.B., 1969. Relationship between egg size and fry survival in brown trout *Salmo*  
5 *trutta* L. *J. Fish Biol.* 1, 349-353.
- 6 Bakos, J., Gorda, S., 1995. Genetic improvement of common carp strains using intraspecific  
7 hybridization. *Aquaculture* 129, 183-186.
- 8 Balon, E.K., 1995. Origin and domestication of the wild carp, *Cyprinus carpio*: from Roman  
9 gourmets to the swimming flowers. *Aquaculture* 129: 3-48.
- 10 Beacham, T.D., Murray, C.B., 1985. Effect of female size, egg size and water temperature on  
11 developmental biology of chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) from the Nitinat river,  
12 British Columbia. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 42, 1755-1765.
- 13 Becker, W.A., 1984. Manual of quantitative genetics. Academic Enterprises, Pullman,  
14 Washington, 188 pp.
- 15 Bialowas, H., 1991. Possibilities of application of the heterosis effect in commercial  
16 production of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.). *Acta Hydrobiol.* 33, 319-334.
- 17 Chevassus, B., 1976. Variabilité et héritabilité des performances de croissance chez la truite  
18 arc-en-ciel (*Salmo gairdneri* Richardson). *Ann. Génét. Sél. Anim.* 8, 273-283.
- 19 Chevassus, B., Dupont-Nivet, M., Mauger, S., Haffray, P., Vandeputte, M., 2002, Estimation  
20 of heritabilities in two groups of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) with families  
21 mixed together since eyed stage. In: Proceedings of the 7th World Congress on Genetics  
22 Applied to Livestock Production, Montpellier, France, 19-23 August 2002. INRA,  
23 Castanet Tolosan, France, CD-ROM communication 06-09.
- 24 Cibert, C., Fermon, Y., Vallod, D., Meunier, J.F., 1999. Morphological screening of carp  
25 *Cyprinus carpio*: relationship between morphology and fillet yield. *Aquat. Liv. Res.* 12,  
26 1-10.
- 27 Crooijmans, R.P.M.A., Bierbooms, V.A.F., Komen, J., Vand Der Poel, J.J., Groenen,  
28 M.A.M., 1997. Microsatellite markers in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.). *Anim.*  
29 *Genet.* 28, 129-134.
- 30 Estoup, A., Gharbi, K., SanCristobal, M., Chevalet, C., Haffray, P., Guyomard, R., 1998.  
31 Parentage assignment using microsatellites in turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) and  
32 rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) hatchery populations. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 55,  
33 715-725.
- 34 FAO, 2002. Yearbook of fisheries statistics summary tables.  
35 [ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/stat/summ\\_00/a-6\\_table.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/stat/summ_00/a-6_table.pdf)
- 36 Fishback, A.G., Danzmann, R.G., Ferguson, M.M., Gibson, J.P., 2002. Estimates of genetic  
37 parameters and genotype by environment interactions for growth traits of the rainbow  
38 trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) as inferred using molecular pedigrees. *Aquaculture* 206,  
39 137-150.
- 40 Garcia de Leon, F.J., Canonne, M., Quillet, E., Bonhomme, F., Chatain, B., 1998. The  
41 application of microsatellite markers to breeding programmes in the sea bass,  
42 *Dicentrarchus labrax*. *Aquaculture* 159, 303-316.
- 43 Groeneveld, E., 1998. VCE-4, User's guide and Reference manual. Insitute of Animal  
44 Husbandry and Animal Behavior, Mariensee, Germany, 61 pp.
- 45 Gross, R., Wohlfarth, G.W., 1994. Use of genetic markers in growth testing of common carp,  
46 *Cyprinus carpio*L., carried out over 2 or 3 year cycles. *Aquacult. Fish. Manage.* 25,  
47 585-599.
- 48 Herbinger, C.M., Doyle, R.W., Pitman, E.R., Paquet, D., Mesa, K.A., Morris, D.B., Wright,  
49 J.M., Cook, D., 1995. DNA fingerprint based analysis of paternal and maternal effects

- 1 on offspring growth and survival in communally reared rainbow trout. *Aquaculture* 137,  
2 245-256.
- 3 Hulata, G., 1995. A review of genetic improvement of the common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.)  
4 and other cyprinids by crossbreeding, hybridization and selection. *Aquaculture* 129,  
5 143-155.
- 6 Hulata, G., Moav, R., Wohlfarth, G., 1976. The effects of maternal age, relative hatching time  
7 and density of stocking on growth rate of fry in the European and Chinese race of the  
8 common carp. *J. Fish. Biol.* 9, 499-513.
- 9 Jackson, T.R., Martin-Robichaud, D.J., Reith, M.E., 2003. Application of DNA markers to  
10 the management of Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) broodstock.  
11 *Aquaculture*, in press.
- 12 Jonsson, B., Svavarsson, E., 2000. Connection between egg size and early mortality in arctic  
13 charr, *Salvelinus alpinus*. *Aquaculture* 187, 315-317.
- 14 Kohlmann, K., Gross, R., Murakaeva, A., Kersten, P., 2002. The genetics of common carp  
15 populations inferred from allozyme, microsatellite and mitochondrial DNA studies. In:  
16 Urban, T., et al., (Eds), *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> Genetic Days*, 12-13 Sept. 2002, Brno,  
17 Czech Republic, pp. 223-226.
- 18 Lahnsteiner, F., Urbanyi, B., Horvath, A., Weismann, T., 2001. Bio-markers for egg quality  
19 determination in cyprinid fish. *Aquaculture* 195, 331-352.
- 20 Linhart, O., Gela, D., Rodina, M., Slechtova, V., Slechta, V., 2002. Top-crossing with  
21 paternal inheritance testing of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.) progeny under two  
22 altitude conditions. *Aquaculture* 204, 481-491.
- 23 Linhart, O., Rodina, M., Gela, D., Kocour, M., Rodriguez, M., 2003. Improvement of  
24 common carp artificial reproduction using enzyme for elimination of eggs stickiness.  
25 *Aquat. Liv. Res.* 16, in press.
- 26 Marteinsdottir, G., Able, K.W., 1992. Influence of egg size on embryos and larvae of  
27 *Fundulus heteroclitus* (L.). *J. Fish Biol.* 41, 883-896.
- 28 McKay, L.R., Ihssen, P.E., Friars, G.W., 1986. Genetic parameters of growth in rainbow  
29 trout, *Salmo gairdneri*, prior to maturation. *Can. J. Genet. Cytol.* 28, 306-312.
- 30 Moav, R., Wohlfarth, G., 1974. Magnification through competition of genetic differences in  
31 yield capacity in carp. *Heredity* 33, 181-202.
- 32 Moav, R., Wohlfarth, G., 1976. Two way selection for growth rate in the common carp  
33 (*Cyprinus carpio* L.). *Genetics* 82, 83-101.
- 34 Nagy, A., Csanyi, V., Bakos, J., Horvath, L., 1980. Development of a short-term laboratory  
35 system for the evaluation of carp growth in ponds. *Bamidgah* 32, 6-15.
- 36 Nenashev, G.A., 1966. The determination of heritability of different characters in fishes.  
37 *Genetika* 11, 100-108.
- 38 Nenashev, G.A., 1969. Heritability of some selective characters in Ropsha carp. *Izvestija*  
39 *Gosud. Nauchno-issled. Inst. Ozern. Recn. Rybn. Hos (GosNIORH)* 65, 185-195.
- 40 Perez-Enriquez, R., Takagi, M., Taniguchi, N., 1999. Genetic variability and pedigree tracing  
41 of a hatchery-reared stock of red sea bream (*Pagrus major*) used for stock enhancement,  
42 based on microsatellite DNA markers. *Aquaculture* 173, 413-423.
- 43 Rana, K.J., 1985. Influence of egg size on the growth, onset of feeding, point-of-no-return,  
44 and survival of unfed *Oreochromis mossambicus* fry. *Aquaculture* 46, 119-131.
- 45 Rothbard, S., Rubinsthein, I., Gelman, E., 1996. Storage of common carp, (*Cyprinus carpio*  
46 L.) eggs for short durations. *Aquacult. Res.* 27, 175-181.
- 47 Smisek, J., 1981. The effect of gene pool on the performance and conformation of filial  
48 generations of carp fry from linecrossing. *Bull. VURH Vodnany* 17, 3-11.

- 1 Tanck, M.W.T., Vermeulen, K.-J., Bovenhuis, H., Komen, J., 2001. Heredity of stress-related  
2 cortisol response in androgenetic common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.). *Aquaculture* 199,  
3 283-294.
- 4 Vandeputte, M., 2003. Selective breeding of quantitative traits in the common carp (*Cyprinus*  
5 *carpio* L.): bases, results and prospects. *Aquatic. Liv. Res.* 16, in press.
- 6 Vandeputte, M., Dupont-Nivet, M., Chatain, B., Chevassus, B., 2001. Setting up a strain  
7 testing design for the seabass, *Dicentrarchus labrax*: a simulation study. *Aquaculture*  
8 202, 329-342.
- 9 Vandeputte, M., Quillet, E., Chevassus, B., 2002a. Growth and survival during yolk-sac  
10 resorption in brown trout (*Salmo trutta fario* L.): a quantitative genetic analysis.  
11 *Aquaculture* 204, 435-445.
- 12 Vandeputte, M., Quillet, E., Krieg, F., Hollebecq, M.G., Fauré, A., Labbé, L., Hiseux, J.P.,  
13 Chevassus, B., 2002b. The "PROSPER" methodology on brown trout (*Salmo trutta*  
14 *fario*): four generations of improved individual selection on growth rate. In:  
15 Proceedings of the 7th World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production,  
16 Montpellier, France, 19-23 August 2002. INRA, Castanet Tolosan, France, CD-ROM  
17 communication 06-04.
- 18 Vandeputte, M., Peignon, E., Vallod, D., Haffray, P., Komen, J., Chevassus, B., 2002c.  
19 Comparison of growth performances of three French strains of common carp (*Cyprinus*  
20 *carpio*) using hemi-isogenic scaly carp as internal control. *Aquaculture* 205, 19-36.
- 21 Wallace, J.C., Aasjord, D., 1984. An investigation of the consequences of egg size for the  
22 culture of Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.). *J. Fish Biol.* 24, 427-435.
- 23 Wohlfarth, G.W., 1993. Heterosis for growth rate in common carp. *Aquaculture* 113, 31-46.
- 24 Wohlfarth, G.W., Moav, R., Hulata, G., 1987. Breeding programs in Israeli aquaculture. In:  
25 Tiews, K., (Ed.), Proc. World Symp. On Selection, Hybridization, and Genetic  
26 Engineering in Aquaculture, Bordeaux 27-30 May 1986. Heenemann GmbH, Berlin  
27 Vol. 2, 393-405.  
28

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1:** Overall success of parentage assignment for 550 offspring of 10 dams and 24 sires  
 3 of common carp using 7 or 8 microsatellite markers.

4

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Proportion</b>
Assigned to a single parental pair	516	93.8 %
Assigned to one parental pair after inferences based on experimental design	8	1.5 %
<b>Total assigned to one single parental pair</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>95.3 %</b>
Assigned to 2 parental pairs	16	2.9 %
Assigned to 3 parental pairs	1	0.2 %
<b>Total assigned to more than one parental pair</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3.1 %</b>
Not assigned	7	1.2 %
Assigned to an impossible pair after inferences based on experimental design	2	0.4 %
<b>Total not assigned</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.6 %</b>
<b>Total number of offspring</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>100 %</b>

5

6



1 Table 2: Number of offspring identified for each of the families generated in the full factorial

2 cross

3

		Dam										Observed total per sire	Expected total per sire
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Sire	<b>1</b>	3	2	1	-	3	2	-	1	3	3	<b>18</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>2</b>	2	1	-	-	4	-	-	3	3	2	<b>15</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>3</b>	2	3	4	1	6	2	-	5	3	2	<b>28</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>4</b>	6	4	4	-	3	4	-	5	-	3	<b>29</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>5</b>	6	-	2	-	-	2	-	5	2	2	<b>19</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>6</b>	2	2	4	-	6	1	-	1	-	2	<b>18</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>7</b>	8	4	5	-	4	5	-	2	5	3	<b>36</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>8</b>	5	3	2	-	4	6	-	2	5	3	<b>30</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>9</b>	5	1	2	-	2	6	-	3	3	-	<b>22</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>10</b>	3	1	3	-	4	1	-	3	2	2	<b>19</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>11</b>	-	3	6	-	2	3	-	1	-	4	<b>19</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>12</b>	6	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	4	4	<b>20</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>13</b>	6	2	4	-	5	3	-	1	1	2	<b>24</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>14</b>	4	1	5	-	8	4	-	-	2	3	<b>27</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>15</b>	2	2	5	-	7	-	-	1	3	2	<b>22</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>16</b>	4	1	1	-	5	1	-	-	3	2	<b>17</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>17</b>	3	4	2	-	4	6	-	1	1	2	<b>23</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>18</b>	2	2	4	-	4	3	-	2	2	-	<b>19</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>19</b>	2	1	3	-	5	2	-	2	1	-	<b>16</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>20</b>	3	-	3	1	7	2	-	2	4	-	<b>22</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>21</b>	7	1	3	-	9	2	-	6	3	2	<b>33</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>22</b>	4	4	7	-	4	1	-	2	4	2	<b>28</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>23</b>	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	4	-	<b>9</b>	<b>21.8</b>
	<b>24</b>	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	3	1	<b>11</b>	<b>21.8</b>
<b>Observed total per dam</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>524</b>	
<b>Expected total per dam</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>63</b>		

4

5

1 Table 3: Genetic parameter (heritability, maternal effects, dominance) estimates for weight,  
 2 length and condition factor ( $K$ ) at 8 weeks post-resorption in common carp, using sire-dam  
 3 model with interaction (Model 2) or single-trait animal model (Model 3). NE: not estimated

4

<b>Trait</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b><math>h^2 \pm \text{S.E.}</math></b>	<b><math>m^2 \pm \text{S.E.}</math></b>	<b><math>d^2 \pm \text{S.E.}</math></b>
Weight	sire-dam	$0.38 \pm 0.149$	$0.03 \pm 0.061$	$0.084 \pm 0.154$
	animal	$0.34 \pm 0.078$	0	NE
Length	sire-dam	$0.39 \pm 0.176$	$0.05 \pm 0.059$	$0.12 \pm 0.156$
	animal	$0.34 \pm 0.076$	0	NE
$K$ (Fulton)	sire-dam	$0.41 \pm 0.172$	$0.03 \pm 0.067$	0
	animal	$0.37 \pm 0.082$	0	NE

5

6

1 Table 4: Multi-trait animal model heritabilities (diagonal), genetic correlations (bold) and  
 2 phenotypic correlations (italics) for growth-related traits in 8 week-old common carp.

3

	Length	Weight	<i>K</i> (Fulton)
Length	0.318	<b>0.976</b>	<b>-0.364</b>
Weight	<i>0.965</i>	0.318	<b>-0.159</b>
<i>K</i> (Fulton)	<i>-0.228</i>	<i>-0.027</i>	0.364

4