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Abstract

Linear scoring is widely applied in domestic animal species, mainly in cattle and horses. There are only few cases of linear scoring in sheep, probably because the small body size and the narrow range of the classes make difficult to correctly evaluate the measures. In this paper the results of a linear scoring test carried out on Merinizzata Italiana sheep breed in order to verify the feasibility of this method in sheep, are reported. Twenty untrained people, with three different levels of scoring experience in meat sheep morphology, evaluated 52 pluriparous ewes for body length, chest circumference, chest width, rump height, rump width, and withers height; to check for misclassification, their scores were compared with a reference score, previously obtained measuring the same animals by the suitable tools (measuring tape and a Lydtin stick). The percentage of correct scoring ranged from 44.4% for body length to 61.8% for withers height, and was not affected by the experience of the judge. In all characters, the distance of the class from the trait mean had a significant effect in increasing the intensity of misclassifications; the judge’s experience showed a positive effect in reducing the intensity of misclassifications; the judge’s experience had a significant effect in increasing the intensity of misclassifications. The data obtained from linear evaluation protocols can be useful for estimating traits heritability, as showed by Serrano et al., 2002.

The concept of linear scoring of type traits was conceived in 1976, firstly implemented and tested in 1979 (Thompson et al., 1981). In few years it spread in many dairy cattle associations (Foster et al., 1988). In Italy, the linear scoring was firstly applied in dairy cattle such as “Italian Friesian” (Tartara, 1984) and “Bruna” (Santus et al., 1985). Years later, also the beef cattle associations set up linear scoring protocols: National Association of Piemontese cattle Breeders in Piedmontese (ANABORAPI, 2009) and National Association of Italian Beef-Cattle Breeders (ANABIC) in Chianina, Marchigiana and Romagnola (Panella et al., 1992). Besides cattle, the linear scoring is utilized also for water buffalo (2004) as described in a preliminary study by Amante et al. (2001) and for several horse breeds, such as: CAITPR (The Italian Heavy Draught Horse) and Haflinger (1992), Bardigiano (1996) and Maremmano (2000) (Samore, 2008).

Linear scoring in sheep is mainly used in dairy breeds, but is rather rare in meat breeds. The main reason of the scarce use of this evaluation method in sheep is the hard right assignment of the measures to their correct linear class; in fact, the short biological interval and, consequently, the little range of each class, makes the correct scoring difficult.

One of the most common uses of the linear scoring method is the evaluation of the mammary morphology, which is one factor that determines aptitude for mechanical milking of sheep (Labussière, 1988, De La Fuente et al., 1996, Marie-Elancelin et al., 2005). In Italy, udder evaluation has been implemented in the Sarda breed (Casu et al., 2006). In meat sheep, there is a multibreed evaluation protocol in Belgium (Janssens and Vandepitte, 2004); in Italy, there is an evaluation protocol in the

Introduction

The morphological scoring is a common evaluation method in domestic animals; people employed in this kind of activity must be able to translate in numbers or words their judgement on some features of the animal body by comparing a subject to the ideal type described in the breed standard (Thompson et al., 1981). A problem with this procedure is the “subjectivity” (González Velasco et al., 1999); as a matter of fact, it is sometimes difficult that different judges, although well trained, give the same assessment to the same animal. Besides an update in the standard, or in selection goals, can probably wipe out a data set of morphological scores whilst linear scores will stand.

Because of this, the morphological scoring has been progressively substituted by the linear scoring system, which is based on the objective measures of the body traits. The data obtained from linear evaluation protocols can be useful for estimating traits heritability, as showed by Serrano et al., 2002.

Materials and methods

In a previous research (Sarti and Panella, 1999), 800 pluriparous Merinizzata Italiana ewes were measured in order to estimate the main statistical parameters of several traits; moreover, on this sample, a multivariate analysis was carried out and it was ascertained that
the most informative characters to evaluate the body conformation were: body length (BL), chest circumference (CC), chest width (CW), rump height (RH), rump width (RW) and withers height (WH). All these traits were positively correlated each other and normally distributed (Sarti and Panella, 1999).

For all the traits five classes were defined as reported in Table 1 (class dimension = 1 standard deviation) and the score frequencies showed.

To evaluate the judges’ work on a new sample of 52 randomly chosen pluriparous ewes, the measures of the above cited traits were taken, using suitable tools such as measuring tape and Lydthin stick (Negretti et al., 2008); in this way the correct class was assigned to each animal to be used as reference score.

This sample was then linear scored by 20 judges, i.e. 1040 observations were obtained for each trait. The judges were assigned to three levels according to their previous experience: the 3 judges assigned to level 1 had a good knowledge of meat sheep morphology and experience in morphological scoring of sheep and of linear scoring in other species (cattle); 8 judges were assigned to level 2, because they had a good knowledge of meat sheep morphology, but no experience in scoring; the last 9 judges, who had just a basic knowledge of meat sheep morphology, were assigned to level 3 of experience.

At the scoring time, all the ewes had the wool as recommended by the ASSONAPA. rules (ASSONAPA, 2009).

The fairness of the scoring was evaluated by the difference between the class assigned by the judge and the reference one. To verify if the probability of correct assignment was influenced by the judge experience, the percentage of right classifications was arcsin transformed percentages of correct scoring showed that there was no significant effect of the judge experience on the probability of correct scoring (data not shown).

The highest error was 3 classes, but it has to mean value was tested by Mantel-Haenszel $\chi^2$. Statistical analysis was made by means of R package (R Development Core Team, 2007).

Results and discussion

The scored ewes measured under the average for bone traits such as RH and WH, with 70.05% and 72.15% of the animals in the two lowest classes respectively; on the contrary, 57.66% of the ewes were in the two highest classes for CC and also the means for RW was greater than 24.7 cm (Table 1), that was the mean of the 800 ewes sample (Sarti and Panella, 1999). These facts suggest that the muscularity of the 52 ewes used in the scoring test was better than the breed average.

The judges did not have the same difficulties in scoring different traits (Table 2); the percentage of overall correct scoring was 52.9%, ranging from a minimum of 44.4% for BL to a maximum of 61.8% for WH. Moreover, the analysis of the arcsin square root transformed percentages of correct scoring showed that there was no significant effect of the judge experience on the probability of correct scoring (data not shown).

The highest error was 3 classes, but it has to

| Trait                  | Classes     | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |
|------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Body length            | <63.7       | 63.7-67.1| 67.2-70.8| 70.9-74.4| >74.5   |
|                        | 4.51        | 46.41   | 35.58   | 11.81   | 1.69    |
| Chest circumference    | <87.4       | 87.4-94.8| 94.9-102.3| 102.4-109.8| >109.8  |
|                        | 1.41        | 5.91    | 35.02   | 39.94   | 17.72   |
| Chest width            | <19.6       | 19.6-22.4| 22.5-25.3| 25.4-28.2| >28.2   |
|                        | 1.55        | 24.19   | 47.12   | 23.49   | 3.65    |
| Rump height            | <62.5       | 62.5-66.8| 66.9-71.3| 71.4-75.7| >75.7   |
|                        | 20.82       | 49.23   | 24.32   | 5.49    | 0.14    |
| Rump width             | <19.9       | 19.9-23.0| 23.1-26.3| 26.4-29.5| >29.5   |
|                        | 1.48        | 16.88   | 48.73   | 27.99   | 4.92    |
| Withers height         | <61.3       | 61.3-65.8| 65.9-70.5| 70.6-75.1| >75.1   |
|                        | 25.74       | 46.41   | 23.35   | 4.36    | 0.14    |

Table 1. Limits of the classes for each morphological trait (in cm) and the class frequencies in the scored sample (in %).

| Trait                  | Correct score probability | F       | Judge distance from the mean | Main effects | Interaction |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Body length            | 44.4                      | 2.68    | 0.48                        | 7.12 $10^{3+}$| 33.32*      |
| Chest circumference    | 49.6                      | 0.05    | 0.35                        | 2.07 $10^{3+}$| 13.12*      |
| Chest width            | 51.2                      | 0.16    | 2.02                        | 2.26 $10^{3+}$| 17.84*      |
| Rump height            | 60.1                      | 0.08    | 2.52                        | 1.82 $10^{3+}$| 8.53*       |
| Rump width             | 49.9                      | 0.92    | 0.17                        | 1.43 $10^{3+}$| 10.25*      |
| Withers height         | 61.8                      | 0.35    | 0.01                        | 6.72 $10^{3+}$| 9.31*       |
| Overall                | 52.9                      | 0.13    |                             |              |             |

*P<0.001.

| Trait                  | Mantel-Haenszel $\chi^2$ for linear correlation between intensity of misclassification and judge experience or distance of the ewe’s reference class from the mean of the trait. |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Body length            | 5.38                                                                                                                                  | 138.69**                                                                                           |
| Chest circumference    | 1.93                                                                                                                                  | 21.77**                                                                                           |
| Chest width            | 0.01                                                                                                                                  | 28.28**                                                                                           |
| Rump height            | 0.51                                                                                                                                  | 2.57                                                                                               |
| Rump width             | 1.64                                                                                                                                  | 23.91**                                                                                           |
| Withers height         | 0.24                                                                                                                                  | 2.68                                                                                               |

*P<0.05, **P<0.001.
be pointed out that these heavy mistakes were extremely rare: the highest frequency (1.41%) was registered in RW. Furthermore, the lightest errors seemed to be overestimations, whilst 2 and 3 class errors were mostly underestimation. The two-way analysis of variance performed did not show any significant effect of the judge experience class on the intensity of misclassification (Table 2); on the contrary, the distance of the reference class of the ewe’s trait from the mean class was always significant (P<0.001), and the same level of significance was reached by the interaction.

The Mantel-Haenszel $\chi^2$ test showed that for BL, which could be speculated as the hardest trait to score, because of its lowest percentage of assignment to the correct class, there is also a linear correlation between intensity of misclassification and judge experience: in fact, BL was the only trait with a significant value of $\chi^2$ (P<0.05; Table 3). For four traits, the difficulty of correct scoring increased with the distance of the trait value from the mean (P<0.001) (Table 3). This seems to confirm that BL is the most difficult trait to score, whilst for WH and RW, the two traits with the greatest percentages of correct scoring, the amount of the error in scoring does not depend on the real body size of the ewe.

## Conclusions

The results of this first test of linear scoring in the Merinizzata Italiana breed can be considered positive: in fact, although the people enrolled as judges were not trained at all in sheep linear scoring, the percentages of evaluation with an error of no more than one class ranged from 92.3% for CW to 86.2% for RW.

The main concern before performing the test was the narrow range of the traits measured in sheep. The results showed that the small dimensions of the sheep do not interfere with linear scoring: in fact, although RH and WH were lower than expected in this breed, these two traits seemed to be the easiest to score. Since the effect of the judge experience on the probability of correct scoring was not significant for all traits, it could be difficult to raise the percentage of correct scoring by mean of a training period; just for BL, that seemed the hardest trait to score, the level of experience has a positive effect in reducing the intensity of the errors: in this case, the effect of the interaction judge experience $\times$ distance from the mean reached the highest significance, and this fact shows that the experience in morphology is important to score the extreme classes.

After the result of such a test, the judges can be focused on the errors of their scoring and they become fully operative with a short period of practicing. These results encourage to further verify this method in the Merinizzata Italiana sheep breed, by testing the effect of a training period on scoring results, and also to extend the trials in other meat breeds.
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