

Optimized Genetic Testing for Polledness in Multiple Breeds of Cattle

Imtiaz A. S. Randhawa,^{*1} Brian M. Burns,[†] Michael R. McGowan,^{*} Laercio R. Porto-Neto,[‡]

Ben J. Hayes,[§] Ryan Ferretti,^{**} Karen M. Schutt,^{††} and Russell E. Lyons^{*††}

^{*}School of Veterinary Science, University of Queensland, Gatton, QLD 4343, Australia, [†]Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, Rockhampton, QLD 4702, Australia, [‡]CSIRO Agriculture and Food, St Lucia, QLD 4067, Australia, [§]Centre for Animal Science, Queensland Alliance for Agriculture and Food Innovation, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia, ^{**}Bioinformatics and Biostatistics, Neogen GeneSeek, Lincoln, NE, 68504 and ^{††}Neogen Australasia, University of Queensland, Gatton, QLD 4343, Australia

ORCID IDs: 0000-0001-7224-191X (I.A. S.R.); 0000-0003-0783-4748 (M.R.M.); 0000-0002-3536-8265 (L.R.P.-N.); 0000-0002-5606-3970 (B.J.H.)

ABSTRACT Many breeds of modern cattle are naturally horned, and for sound husbandry management reasons the calves frequently undergo procedures to physically remove the horns by disbudding or dehorning. These procedures are however a welfare concern. Selective breeding for polledness – absence of horns – has been effective in some cattle breeds but not in others (*Bos indicus* genotypes) due in part to the complex genetics of horn phenotype. To address this problem different approaches to genetic testing which provide accurate early-in-life prediction of horn phenotype have been evaluated, initially using microsatellites (MSAT) and more recently single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP). A direct gene test is not effective given the genetic heterogeneity and large-sized sequence variants associated with polledness in different breeds. The current study investigated 39,943 animals of multiple breeds to assess the accuracy of available poll testing assays. While the standard SNP-based test was an improvement on the earlier MSAT haplotyping method, 1999 (9.69%) out of 20,636 animals tested with this SNP-based assay did not predict a genotype, most commonly associated with the Indicus-influenced breeds. The current study has developed an optimized poll gene test that resolved the vast majority of these 1999 unresolved animals, while the predicted genotypes of those previously resolved remained unchanged. Hence the optimized poll test successfully predicted a genotype in 99.96% of samples assessed. We demonstrated that a robust set of 5 SNPs can effectively determine P_C and P_F alleles and eliminate the ambiguous and undetermined results of poll gene testing previously identified as an issue in cattle.

KEYWORDS

Poll gene
bovine
dehorning
genetic testing
animal welfare
Genomic
Prediction
GenPred
Shared Data
Resources

Cattle, like other bovidae species, were historically naturally horned with bony appendages fused onto the frontal cranium for defense from predators and to exert dominance for food and mating (Kiltie 1985;

Lundrigan 1996; Davis *et al.* 2011). Since domestication of cattle (*Bos taurus* and *Bos indicus*), the shape and size of horns have become the prominent feature of their unique phenotypic diversity between the breeds (Ajmone-Marsan *et al.* 2010). Generally, the head phenotype in cattle is termed as *Horned* when keratin coated permanent pointy protrusions anchored to the skull, *Scurred* when rudimentary horns are loosely attached to the skin rather than the skull, or *Polled* when there is a complete absence of horns and scurs. Absence and presence of horns or scurs is determined during prenatal development. However, the postnatal development of horns vs. scurs is very difficult to differentiate at an early age because both present initially as free-floating horn-buds and subsequently, only the former fuses to the cranium (Dove 1935; Wiener *et al.* 2015).

Desirability of horns has changed over the centuries with developments in the intensity and practices of raising beef and dairy cattle

Copyright © 2020 Randhawa *et al.*

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.119.400866>

Manuscript received August 10, 2019; accepted for publication November 24, 2019; published Early Online November 25, 2019.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Supplemental material available at figshare: <https://doi.org/10.25387/g3.10423904>.

¹Corresponding author: School of Veterinary Science, The University of Queensland, Office 133, SVS Building 8114, Gatton Campus, Gatton, QLD 4343, Australia. E-mail: i.randhawa@uq.edu.au

(Zeder 2008; Ajmone-Marsan *et al.* 2010). In the modern commercial cattle industry, horned animals are less desirable because they pose potential hazards for other cattle and animals used for mustering (horses, dogs), feeding, handling and transport facilities, and farm workers. Furthermore, there is evidence that horned cattle are associated with higher costs of on-farm and post-farm production and greater risk of reduced meat and skin quality (Bunter *et al.* 2013; Knierim *et al.* 2015; Schafberg and Swalve 2015). Therefore, polled cattle have generally become much more desirable. Archaeological evidence suggests that polled cattle have existed in various civilizations for at least a few centuries (Kysely 2010; Lauwerier 2015; Schafberg and Swalve 2015). A range of different surgical, chemical and cautery methods are used to either remove unattached horn buds (disbudding) or horns attached to the cranium (dehorning). All procedures are costly and cause varying degrees of pain and reduced animal welfare, morbidity, mortality and reduced productivity, with dehorning often resulting in exposure of the frontal sinus (Stafford and Mellor 2005; Neely *et al.* 2014; Knierim *et al.* 2015; Herskin and Nielsen 2018).

Selective breeding for polled animals requires accurate early-in-life prediction of horn phenotype (Spurlock *et al.* 2014; Scheper *et al.* 2016). Horn phenotype is a qualitative trait controlled by genetics – 000483-9913 (OMIA 2019) – which have been mapped to bovine autosome 1 (BTA1) (Georges *et al.* 1993; Harlizius *et al.* 1997; Mariasegaram *et al.* 2012; Randhawa *et al.* 2016). The underlying genes and causal mutations for horns, scurs and polledness remain to be fully elucidated. Phenotypic penetrance suggests that the poll gene is dominantly inherited, *i.e.*, PP (polled), pp (horned), with heterozygous animals usually polled but also commonly scurred (Pp). The genetic basis of scurs remains unclear although evidence suggests the condition is genetically complex and affected by polled status as well as sex of individuals (Capitan *et al.* 2009; Mariasegaram *et al.* 2010; Capitan *et al.* 2011; Tetens *et al.* 2015). In addition, an as yet unidentified African horn gene has been speculated as a possible explanation for the epistasis-like complexity in the horn inheritance in several breeds (White and Ibsen 1936; Long and Gregory 1978; Prayaga 2007). However, no empirical evidence has been presented to confirm its existence to date (Grobler *et al.* 2018).

Genetic heterogeneity has been found across breeds linking the poll characteristics with different sequence variants of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), namely, *Celtic* (P_C), *Friesian* (P_F), *Mongolian* (P_M) and *Guarani* (P_G) mutations (Medugorac *et al.* 2012; Rothhammer *et al.* 2014; Wiedemar *et al.* 2014; Medugorac *et al.* 2017; Grobler *et al.* 2018; Utsunomiya *et al.* 2019). Each mutation is a complex insertion-deletion of variable size, such that P_C is g.[22429326_2429335del;2429109_2429320dupins], P_F is g.2629113_2709240dup (80,128 bp), P_M is g.[2695261_2695267delinsTCTGAA;2695889_2696047dupins] and P_G is g.2614828_2724315dup (~110 kb) within the poll locus (2.2 to 2.8 Mb) on BTA1 (bovine genome assembly ARS-UCD1.2 (GCA_002263795.2): https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/assembly/GCF_002263795.1/). These genetic mutations (P_C , P_F , P_M and P_G) are not directly involved in gene coding, although putative causal effects have been reported by introgression of the P_C allele by gene-editing of bovine embryos that resulted in the birth of healthy and phenotypical unremarkable polled cattle (Carlson *et al.* 2016). The mutations may be involved in gene regulation and translation processes through unconventional mechanisms as speculated by the presence of antisense sequences caused by similar insertions disturbing normal function of horn growth associated genes (Allais-Bonnet *et al.* 2013; Wiedemar and Drögemüller 2015). However, their association with polledness provides opportunities for genetically selecting animals to produce naturally polled cattle (Prayaga 2007; Spurlock *et al.* 2014;

Windig *et al.* 2015). Notably, P_C and P_F are the most frequent mutations observed in the majority of breeds in production systems globally, and hence are the focus of this study.

The poll locus contains several microsatellite (MSAT) markers, unique to several breeds, that have been successfully employed to predict the poll phenotypes (Mariasegaram *et al.* 2012). However, within-population instability and cross-population diversity of these obsolescent genetic markers make them vulnerable to diminishing accuracy over time and in non-ascertained populations. As genome sequencing technologies have become more accessible and cost effective, SNP-based testing has replaced MSAT testing. SNP-based indirect tests have been developed to predict both P_C and P_F alleles and are present on many commercial genotyping assays designed for genomic evaluation to reduce testing costs. However, the accuracy of commercially available SNP-based poll gene tests are constrained because their initial development only involved a limited number of taurine cattle breeds (Grobler *et al.* 2018). To address the problem that the current commonly used SNP haplotype translations are not well suited to several beef breeds, including Brahman and Brahman-infused cattle common to northern Australia and other tropical countries, an optimized poll gene test was developed using the recently identified SNPs associated with Celtic and Friesian mutations, and a resource herd with accurate phenotypic and genotypic recording across generations. This paper describes the development and evaluation of this optimized poll gene test for cattle.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animal ethics

Ethics approval for the pre-tested animals was not required, as these results were generated under commercial services using microsatellites and SNP based poll testing. However, tail-hair samples, head phenotypes and genotyping for confirmation of the optimized poll gene test were approved (Animal ethics approval numbers SVS/301/18, SVS/465/18 and SVS/ANRFA/397/19).

Sampling, genomic and phenotypic records

A total of 39,943 cattle samples were used in this study to compare the previously performed diagnostic predictions with the proposed optimization and assess their phenotypic concordance (Table 1, Table S1). The poll predictions previously tested with MSAT ($n = 20,534$) were obtained from Neogen Australasia. Genomic data and CPT-based predictions consisted of 20,636 samples. Phenotypic information about registered animals in Australia were obtained from the BREEDPLAN database (<http://breedplan.une.edu.au/index.php>). Tail-hair samples of Brahman ($n = 60$) were used from previously available stocks for DNA sequencing. In addition, tail-hair samples of validation populations including Droughtmaster ($n = 156$), Brangus (17), Brahman (22), Santa Gertrudis (29) and cross-bred (33) cattle were collected for phenotypic and genetic concordance evaluation (Table 1).

Microsatellites, SNP markers and current poll testing assays

A total of 14 microsatellite (MSAT) markers located between positions 2,341,080 to 3,014,463 on BTA1 have strong associations with polledness across different populations (Table S2). The poll-haplotype diagnostic test data set in the current study used 10 markers for predictions (Mariasegaram *et al.* 2012; Piper *et al.* 2014). There are over twelve thousand SNPs surrounding the poll locus in cattle, of which only 10 have shown strong association with the candidate mutations (Celtic and Friesian) causing polledness (Table 2) (Medugorac *et al.* 2012;

■ **Table 1** Number of animals tested by Microsatellites and SNPs based assays

Breed	Tested animals	Tested by MSAT	Tested by SNP	Validation population
Angus	1630	28	1602	
Brahman	7160	4532	2819	22
Brangus	806	745	72	17
Charolais	3148	2666	900	
Droughtmaster	2718	2223	558	156
Hereford	6424	3485	3341	
Limousin	2193	2124	207	
Santa Gertrudis	4456	4306	136	29
Shorthorn	316	224	67	
Wagyu	9182	201	9050	
Other breeds ^a	1910	—	1884	33
Total	39,943	20,534	20,636	257

^aList of other breeds are provided in Table S1.

Rothammer *et al.* 2014; Wiedemar *et al.* 2014). Out of the 10 SNPs associated with polledness in various cattle breeds and with strong LD to the known Celtic and Friesian variants (Table 2), the current poll testing (CPT) assay represents 8 SNPs. Within this haplotype, the SNP rs800947704 has been identified as having low call rates in several breeds (Table S3), and therefore was investigated by DNA sequencing.

DNA extraction, PCR, DNA sequencing and SNP genotyping

DNA extraction from all samples used for targeted DNA sequencing and SNP genotyping was performed by using the standardized protocol at the genetic testing laboratory of Neogen Australasia. DNA fragments of 1,098 bp (2,377,810-2,378,907) harboring a targeted genotype rs800947704 (g.2378745G > C) were amplified by using primers (Forward: 5'-TCCCCTGCTGTGATAAACACC-3' and Reverse: 5'-ACCACAAACCAAGGCCAAAC-3'). PCR reactions containing 15-20 ng DNA, 10 μM forward and reverse primers, 0.12 μl taq in a total volume of 25 μl, and employed standard PCR cycling conditions on an Applied Biosystems thermocycler. An internal primer (5'-TCCAATGAACACCCAGGACT-3') was used to generate 665 bp (2,378,243-2,378,907) sequencing reads. Unused dNTPs and primers were removed using ExoSAP-IT (USB Corporation distributed by GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences, Rydalmere, Australia). Sequencing was performed using an ABI Prism Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Ready Reaction Kit Version 3.1 (PE Applied Biosystems, Foster City, USA) following the instructions supplied with the kit. Sequencing separation was performed on an ABI 3730xl automated sequencer.

Forward and reverse sequences were aligned and edited using ChromasPro (Technelysium Pty Ltd, Tewantin, Australia).

Prediction of celtic and friesian alleles: Prediction of polledness-associated P_C and P_F mutations were generated using the SNP markers (Table 2) available on commercial bovine BeadChip assays (Illumina) including Neogen's proprietary GGP-LDv4, GGP Taurus 50K or GGP Indicus 35K assays (Neogen Corporation, Lincoln, NE). The Celtic (P_C) is predicted by translating a single SNP marker rs383143898 based on its horn or poll allele (Table 2). The Friesian mutation is predicted based upon haplotype associated with markers in LD with P_F (Table 2). Note that the combination of P_F-markers used varied with different versions of the Poll Test being assessed in this study. Final results represent reconciled outcomes from both predictions to generate allele-pairs (genotypes) such as HH, HP_C, HP_F, P_CP_C, P_CP_F or P_FP_F. However, if the P_C-SNP or more than two P_F-SNPs fail during genotyping, or two or more SNPs differ in predicted genotype (H vs. P_F) then the result is considered ambiguous and termed as a "No Result". The optimized poll testing assay remained identical for P_C, while genotyping failure or contrasting prediction were restricted to only one differing or missing P_F SNP.

Data availability

Genomic sequences generated in this study have been deposited in NCBI's GenBank (accession numbers: MN473394 to MN473448). Genotypic and phenotypic data have been provided in supplementary files Data 1 and Data 2 available at figshare: <https://doi.org/10.25387/g3.10423904>.

■ **Table 2** List of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) on autosome 1 known for strong linkage disequilibrium (LD) with Celtic (P_C) and Friesian (P_F) mutations and their call rate in cattle breeds

SNPs	ARS-UCD1.2 positions	Mutations	Poll alleles	LD with	Call rate ^a
rs801127025	2,372,456	P _{51D}	T	P _F	99.47
rs799187101	2,377,687	G > A	A	P _F	99.98
rs800947704	2,378,745	C > T	T	P _F	96.32
rs798116945	2,407,338	G > C	C	P _F	99.99
rs383143898	2,429,319	P _{202D}	T	P _C	99.92
rs799403053	2,486,811	T > C	C	P _F	99.80
rs210350155	2,491,161	C > A	A	P _F	99.23
rs797088784	2,578,598	G > A	A	P _F	99.44
rs800767839	2,629,115	T > A	A	P _F	99.94
rs799920960	2,748,715	C > G	G	P _F	100

^aIndicates mean call rate. Breed-wise call rates are given in Table S3.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distinctive characteristics of MSAT and SNP in different populations have historically made interpretation of the poll gene test quite complex, resulting in compromised performance of both test types in some breeds. Out of 20,534 samples tested with the MSAT-based assays, 11.7% have failed to predict a poll genotype - reported as "Not Determined" (Figure S1). Breed specific failure varied from Angus (3.57%) to Wagyu (30.35%), while most breeds have the failure rates over 10% (Brahman, Brangus, Charolais, Droughtmaster, Santa Gertrudis, Shorthorn). The high frequency of Not Determined was a major barrier to widespread uptake of the MSAT-based poll test in Australia.

SNP-based poll testing in cattle has significantly reduced the frequency of Not Determined (No Result) in taurine breeds. However Zebu (*Bos indicus*) and their cross-bred cattle are still constrained by a high frequency of No Results (Figure S1). Out of 20,636 samples genotyped with the current SNP-based poll test (CPT), most of the breeds of European origin (Angus, Charolais, Hereford, Limousin, Holstein-Friesian etc.) except Shorthorn were successfully predicted for head-status (Table S1). Nonetheless, overall 9.69% of CPT-tested samples had failed to identify an unambiguous genotype and hence were predicted as "No Result" with the majority of these No Results being Brahman (17.45%) and Brahman-infused populations such as Brangus, Droughtmaster, Santa Gertrudis and Cross-bred cattle (Table S1, Figure S1).

We investigated the utility of the 10 SNPs that make up the CPT assays in the predictions of P_C and P_F prevalence in different breeds. Two SNPs, rs798116945 and rs800767839, were homozygous across most of the European and Zebu breeds and their cross-bred populations. Hence, these two SNPs were declared non-informative for the Poll gene testing assays (Table 2, Table S3). Our investigation also identified two SNPs, rs799187101 and rs800947704, as the major cause of "No Result" in the Zebu cattle when running the CPT assay. Neither SNP is in complete LD in the haplotypes predicting the presence of P_C or P_F . Furthermore, in a subset of 18,675 genotyped animals, SNP rs800947704 consistently showed lower call rate (Table S3) in several breeds including Brahman (14.3%). Therefore, 60 Brahman samples were selected to sequence the 665 bp genomic region surrounding rs800947704 in 55 samples (Table S4, GenBank accession numbers: MN473394 to MN473448). Sequence alignment of 55 Brahman samples found nine known SNPs (rs383371521, rs377981008, rs135217384, rs136702754, rs134535435, rs381418143, rs800947704, rs110759734 and rs444879378).

Targeted sequencing analyses of Brahman cattle suggested that there was an inherent issue with the probe design of rs800947704 SNP in the various Illumina BeadChips (Table S4). Genotype call failure at the target SNP (C > T, rs800947704) in the genotyping assays was being caused by probe hybridization issues, due to a neighboring SNP rs381418143 (g.2378742A > G) located 3 bp upstream to rs800947704 in Brahman cattle. The current probes are designed based upon the Taurine reference genome to recognize allele A only of rs381418143. Therefore all samples carrying the allele A at rs381418143 ($n = 22$) were correctly genotyped at the target SNP rs800947704 for all alleles (CC, TT or CT = Y). However, DNA samples ($n = 16$) with G at rs381418143 resulted in incorrect genotype or failure to generate a genotype depending upon whether animals tested were heterozygous GA or homozygous AA for rs800947704. Although some of the genotyping assays were optimized to fix the aforementioned errors, it was observed that the poll-associated allele T of rs800947704 was not consistently genotyped in samples when other marker SNPs were indicating the presence of P_F associated alleles. Similarly, another SNP rs799187101 was found discordant causing unsuccessful predictions for P_F . Therefore, both SNPs (rs799187101 and rs800947704) were deemed unreliable and

■ **Table 3 Comparison of current (CPT) and optimized (OPT) poll testing on 20,636 Australian cattle samples. List of breed-wise No results is given in Table S1**

Animal genotypes	CPT results	OPT results	Gain by OPT
HH	11,113	12,785	1,672
HP _C	3,420	3,696	276
HP _F	135	147	12
P _C P _C	3,641	3,651	10
P _C P _F	300	311	11
P _F P _F	28	37	9
No Result	1,999	9	-1,990

excluded. Finally, SNP rs799920960 was found to be redundant and was also excluded.

At this point, the remaining 5 SNPs (rs801127025, rs383143898, rs799403053, rs210350155 and rs797088784) were retained to assess accurate predictions of P_C and P_F alleles, with rs383143898 (P_{2021D}) as the sole predictor for P_C , while the other 4 SNPs are associated with P_F . For the sake of this prediction we accepted the successful genotyping of at least 3 out of the 4 SNPs as minimum to predict P_F . Collectively, these 5 SNP markers are named as optimized poll testing (OPT) assay, which predicts 6 possible genotypes (HH, HP_C, HP_F, P_CP_C, P_CP_F or P_FP_F). We evaluated previously successful predictions ($n = 18,637$), confirming the predictions remain unchanged (100%) using OPT relative to the original prediction with CPT (Table 3). Of the samples previously unable to be predicted based upon the CPT translations (No Result, $n = 1,999$), 1,990 (99.6%) were effectively classified into one of the 6 genotypic predictions (Table 3, Table S1). Thus, out of the total genotyped samples ($n = 20,636$) the success rate for OPT predictions was 99.96% as compared to 90.31% for the CPT assays. Subsequent investigation of the remaining unpredicted (No Result) 9 samples found that 8 of them were due to genotyping failure for rs383143898 (P_C) and one failed for multiple markers associated with P_F (Table S1). Both genotyping error rates were within the expected < 0.01% range (Wu *et al.* 2019) and can be resolved by resampling. It is possible that higher prediction failure rates by MSAT and CPT in some breeds (e.g., Brahman and Wagyu) might suggest that they carry another mutation (e.g., Mongolian) given the spatial and temporal closeness with Turano cattle. However, 100% of polled animals of these breeds in this study carried P_C or P_F as elucidated by the OPT. Hence, we conclude that with successfully genotyped OPT markers, 100% of the samples can be effectively predicted in multiple breeds of cattle including European, Zebu and their composite animals (Table S1, Figure S2).

Accuracy of true phenotype matching with predicted genotypes is challenging because of a lack of phenotypic records as well as inaccuracies (Connors *et al.* 2018). Phenotypic records on a subset of 6,930 animals were obtained from the BREEDPLAN database to test concordance between phenotypes and genotypes (Table 4). OPT-based genotypes have shown high concordance with known head-status for HH and PP animals. However the potential for *scur* phenotypes in heterozygous animals (HP_C and HP_F) significantly compromises informativeness of these genotypes. The biology underpinning *scur* development remains poorly understood and potentially multifactorial, with indications in literature pointing to the probability that gender (female) and sex hormones (steer) sway heterozygotes to be *poll* (Pailhoux *et al.* 2001). It is very unlikely that HH animals can be either *scurred* (3.1%) or *polled* (2.1%), and these percentages likely reflect errors due to imprecise phenotyping at a very early age, improper dehorning resulting in partial regrowth of horns mimicking scurs and data recording errors. Accuracy of phenotype recording remains a significant challenge as

■ **Table 4** Phenotypic concordance (%) between OPT genotypes and BREEDPLAN and validation samples

OPT genotypes	Concordance with BREEDPLAN				Concordance in validation population			
	N	Horn	Scur	Poll	N	Horn	Scur	Poll
HH	2,800	94.8%	3.10%	2.10%	66	100%	—	—
HP _C	2,121	13.5%	15.7%	70.8%	137	—	59.9%	40.1%
HP _F	120	2.50%	5.80%	91.7%	3	—	—	100%
P _C P _C	1,595	0.75%	0.25%	99.0%	49	—	—	100%
P _C P _F	267	0.37%	0.37%	99.2%	2	—	—	100%
P _F P _F	27	—	—	100%	0	—	—	—

evident in the BREEDPLAN data set. In the validation data, phenotype-genotype concordance was found as expected with HH (100% horned) and P_CP_C / P_CP_F / P_FP_F (100% polled) except HP_C (59.9% scurred and 40.1% polled) and HP_F (100% polled). If in the future true discordance between genotypes and phenotypes is confirmed, e.g., P_CP_C being horned or HH being polled, these animals should be considered be a valuable resource for further study. We have noted that heterozygous animals carrying P_F (i.e., HP_F) were significantly (Fisher's exact test, $P = 0.05$) more likely to be polled compared to HP_C. This observation may warrant further study in the future as the numbers of HP_F genotypes is too small ($n = 123$) in both data sets (Table 4). On the other hand, a larger number of P_CP_F animals ($n = 269$) were found to be 99.3% polled (Table 4). Note that P_C and P_F mutations are approximately 200 kb apart and expected to be *in trans*-arrangements given their independent evolutions. This study have found no occurrence of *cis*-gametes carrying P_C and P_F on the same haplotype in P_CP_F, P_FP_F and P_CP_C animals ($n = 7,640$, Table 3). However, there is non-negligible recombination probability (~0.2%) and a P_CP_F *cis*-haplotype coexisting with H allele on second haplotype may cause growth of scurs as unexpected phenotype. To date it remains unclear whether the existence of a scur gene could be involved in the diversity of scurred animals as well as polled phenotypes in heterozygotes HP_C and HP_F (Tetens *et al.* 2015). We continue to investigate further genetic factors in target populations by using high-density SNP arrays, whole genome sequencing and accurate phenotyping.

Economic sustainability and animal welfare have driven recent progress in modern livestock production systems especially in efforts to minimize or eliminate undesirable traits such as the presence of horns in cattle. Genetic dehorning is being progressively adopted as the non-invasive approach to breed hornless cattle through genetic selection (Carlson *et al.* 2016; Mueller *et al.* 2019). Genotype-phenotype relationships of horn growth are however complex (Medugorac *et al.* 2012) limiting the informativeness of current assays for early detection for horn status, and the presence or absence of polled alleles (polledness), in some breeds. In this study we identified limitations of the current poll gene testing assays, especially in tropical cattle common in Northern Australia and throughout Asia. Our investigations have demonstrated that a robust set of 5 SNPs can effectively eliminate the ambiguous and undetermined results that limited the effectiveness of previous poll predictions. The next important step is to get a better understanding of the Scur locus, which remains a confounding influence especially for heterozygous (HP_C, HP_F) animals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by the Meat and Livestock Australia (project L.GEN.1713). We thank Alan Morris, John Bertram, Sean Corley and Deanne Waine for their help during sample collection, DNA extraction, sequencing, genotyping and genomic data acquisition. We also acknowledge the phenotypes provided

by the Australian cattle breed societies available through BREEDPLAN (<http://breedplan.une.edu.au/>).

LITERATURE CITED

- Ajmone-Marsan, P., J. F. Garcia, and J. A. Lenstra, 2010 On the origin of cattle: How aurochs became cattle and colonized the world. *Evol. Anthropol.* 19: 148–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20267>
- Allais-Bonnet, A., C. Grohs, I. Medugorac, S. Krebs, A. Djari *et al.*, 2013 Novel insights into the bovine polled phenotype and horn ontogenesis in *Bovidae*. *PLoS One* 8: e63512. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0063512>
- Bunter, K. L., D. J. Johnston, M. L. Wolcott, and G. Fordyce, 2013 Factors associated with calf mortality in tropically adapted beef breeds managed in extensive Australian production systems. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 54: 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN12421>
- Capitan, A., C. Grohs, M. Gautier, and A. Eggen, 2009 The scurs inheritance: new insights from the French Charolais breed. *BMC Genet.* 10: 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2156-10-33>
- Capitan, A., C. Grohs, B. Weiss, M.-N. Rossignol, P. Reversé *et al.*, 2011 A Newly Described Bovine Type 2 Scurs Syndrome Segregates with a Frame-Shift Mutation in TWIST1. *PLoS One* 6: e22242. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0022242>
- Carlson, D. F., C. A. Lancto, B. Zang, E.-S. Kim, M. Walton *et al.*, 2016 Production of hornless dairy cattle from genome-edited cell lines. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 34: 479–481. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3560>
- Connors, N. K., B. Tier, and D. J. Johnston, 2018 Current status of Australia's diagnostic poll haplotype test, pp. 344 in *World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production*.
- Davis, E. B., K. A. Brakora, and A. H. Lee, 2011 Evolution of ruminant headgear: a review. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 278: 2857–2865. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0938>
- Dove, W. F., 1935 The physiology of horn growth: A study of the morphogenesis, the interaction of tissues, and the evolutionary processes of a mendelian recessive character by means of transplantation of tissues. *J. Exp. Zool.* 69: 347–405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.1400690302>
- Georges, M., R. Drinkwater, T. King, A. Mishra, S. S. Moore *et al.*, 1993 Microsatellite mapping of a gene affecting horn development in *Bos taurus*. *Nat. Genet.* 4: 206–210. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng0693-206>
- Grobler, R., C. Visser, A. Capitan, and E. van Marle-Köster, 2018 Validation of the POLLED Celtic variant in South African Bonsmara and Drakensberger beef cattle breeds. *Livest. Sci.* 217: 136–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2018.10.003>
- Harlizius, B., I. Tammen, K. Eichler, A. Eggen, and D. Hetzel, 1997 New markers on bovine Chromosome 1 are closely linked to the polled gene in Simmental and Pinzgauer cattle. *Mamm. Genome* 8: 255–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003359900404>
- Herskin, M. S., and B. H. Nielsen, 2018 Welfare Effects of the Use of a Combination of Local Anesthesia and NSAID for Disbudding Analgesia in Dairy Calves-Reviewed Across Different Welfare Concerns. *Front. Vet. Sci.* 5: 117. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2018.00117>
- Kiltie, R. A., 1985 Evolution and function of horns and hornlike organs in female ungulates. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* 24: 299–320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1985.tb00377.x>

- Knierim, U., N. Irrgang, and B. A. Roth, 2015 To be or not to be horned—Consequences in cattle. *Livest. Sci.* 179: 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.014>
- Kysely, R., 2010 Breed character or pathology? Cattle with loose horns from the Eneolithic site of Hostivice–Litovice (Czech Republic). *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 37: 1241–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.12.024>
- Lauwerier, R. C. G. M., 2015 Polled cattle in the Roman Netherlands. *Livest. Sci.* 179: 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.018>
- Long, C. R., and K. E. Gregory, 1978 Inheritance of the horned, scurred, and polled condition in cattle. *J. Hered.* 69: 395–400. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a108980>
- Lundrigan, B., 1996 Morphology of Horns and Fighting Behavior in the Family Bovidae. *J. Mammal.* 77: 462–475. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1382822>
- Mariasegaram, M., B. E. Harrison, J. A. Bolton, B. Tier, J. M. Henshall *et al.*, 2012 Fine-mapping the *POLL* locus in Brahman cattle yields the diagnostic marker *CSAFG29*. *Anim. Genet.* 43: 683–688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2052.2012.02336.x>
- Mariasegaram, M., A. Reverter, W. Barris, S. A. Lehnert, B. Dalrymple *et al.*, 2010 Transcription profiling provides insights into gene pathways involved in horn and scurs development in cattle. *BMC Genomics* 11: 370. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-11-370>
- Medugorac, I., A. Graf, C. Grohs, S. Rothhammer, Y. Zagdsuren *et al.*, 2017 Whole-genome analysis of introgressive hybridization and characterization of the bovine legacy of Mongolian yaks. *Nat. Genet.* 49: 470–475. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3775>
- Medugorac, I., D. Seichter, A. Graf, I. Russ, H. Blum *et al.*, 2012 Bovine polledness – an autosomal dominant trait with allelic heterogeneity. *PLoS One* 7: e39477. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0039477>
- Mueller, M. L., J. B. Cole, T. S. Sonstegard, and A. L. Van Eenennaam, 2019 Comparison of gene editing vs. conventional breeding to introgress the *POLLED* allele into the US dairy cattle population. *J. Dairy Sci.* 102: 4215–4226. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15892>
- Neely, C. D., D. U. Thomson, C. A. Kerr, and C. D. Reinhardt, 2014 Effects of three dehorning techniques on behavior and wound healing in feedlot cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 92: 2225–2229. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-7424>
- OMIA, 2019 *Online Mendelian Inheritance in Animals*, Sydney School of Veterinary Science.
- Pailhoux, E., B. Vigier, S. Chaffaux, N. Servel, S. Taourit *et al.*, 2001 A 11.7-kb deletion triggers intersexuality and polledness in goats. *Nat. Genet.* 29: 453–458. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng769>
- Piper, E. K., B. Tier, and J. M. Henshall, 2014 A haplotype diagnostic for polled in Australian beef cattle. *Proceedings, 10th World Congress of Genetics Applied to Livestock Production* 10:1–3.
- Prayaga, K., 2007 Genetic options to replace dehorning in beef cattle—a review. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* 58: 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AR06044>
- Randhawa, I. A. S., M. S. Khatkar, P. C. Thomson, and H. W. Raadsma, 2016 A Meta-Assembly of Selection Signatures in Cattle. *PLoS One* 11: e0153013. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0153013>
- Rothhammer, S., A. Capitan, E. Mullaart, D. Seichter, I. Russ *et al.*, 2014 The 80-kb DNA duplication on BTA1 is the only remaining candidate mutation for the polled phenotype of Friesian origin. *Genet. Sel. Evol.* 46: 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1297-9686-46-44>
- Schafberg, R., and H. H. Swalve, 2015 The history of breeding for polled cattle. *Livest. Sci.* 179: 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.017>
- Scheper, C., M. Wensch-Dorendorf, T. Yin, H. Dressel, H. Swalve *et al.*, 2016 Evaluation of breeding strategies for polledness in dairy cattle using a newly developed simulation framework for quantitative and Mendelian traits. *Genet. Sel. Evol.* 48: 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12711-016-0228-7>
- Spurlock, D. M., M. L. Stock, and J. F. Coetzee, 2014 The impact of 3 strategies for incorporating polled genetics into a dairy cattle breeding program on the overall herd genetic merit. *J. Dairy Sci.* 97: 5265–5274. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7746>
- Stafford, K. J., and D. J. Mellor, 2005 Dehorning and disbudding distress and its alleviation in calves. *Vet. J.* 169: 337–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2004.02.005>
- Tetens, J., N. Wiedemar, A. Menoud, G. Thaller, and C. Drögemüller, 2015 Association mapping of the scurs locus in polled Simmental cattle – evidence for genetic heterogeneity. *Anim. Genet.* 46: 224–225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/age.12237>
- Utsunomiya, Y. T., R. B. P. Torrecilha, M. Milanese, S. C. Paulan, A. T. H. Utsunomiya *et al.*, 2019 Hornless Nellore cattle (*Bos indicus*) carrying a novel 110 kbp duplication variant of the polled locus. *Anim. Genet.* 50: 187–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/age.12764>
- White, W. T., and H. L. Ibsen, 1936 Horn inheritance in Galloway-Holstein cattle crosses. *J. Genet.* 32: 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02982500>
- Wiedemar, N., and C. Drögemüller, 2015 A 1.8-kb insertion in the 3'-UTR of *RXFP2* is associated with polledness in sheep. *Anim. Genet.* 46: 457–461. <https://doi.org/10.1111/age.12309>
- Wiedemar, N., J. Tetens, V. Jagannathan, A. Menoud, S. Neuenschwander *et al.*, 2014 Independent Polled Mutations Leading to Complex Gene Expression Differences in Cattle. *PLoS One* 9: e93435. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093435>
- Wiener, D. J., N. Wiedemar, M. M. Welle, and C. Drögemüller, 2015 Novel Features of the Prenatal Horn Bud Development in Cattle (*Bos taurus*). *PLoS One* 10: e0127691. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127691>
- Windig, J. J., R. A. Hoving-Bolink, and R. F. Veerkamp, 2015 Breeding for polledness in Holstein cattle. *Livest. Sci.* 179: 96–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.021>
- Wu, X. L., J. Xu, H. Li, R. Ferretti, J. He *et al.*, 2019 Evaluation of genotyping concordance for commercial bovine SNP arrays using quality-assurance samples. *Anim. Genet.* 50: 367–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/age.12800>
- Zeder, M. A., 2008 Domestication and early agriculture in the Mediterranean Basin: Origins, diffusion, and impact. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105: 11597–11604. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0801317105>

Communicating editor: D. J. de Koning