269 | 80

Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour. 35(3): 269–278 (2022) DOI 10.5958/0976-1926.2022.00081.X

A1/A2 Milk Research in Indian Cattle

Monika Sodhi^{*}, M Mukesh, RS Kataria, SK Niranjan and BP Mishra

ICAR-National Bureau of Animal Genetic Resources, Karnal-132001, Haryana, India

Bovine beta casein A1 and A2 are the most common variants in cattle breeds. Because of the bioactive peptide beta casomorphin-7 (BCM7) produced by raw or processed A1-milk, which has high affinity for opioid receptors and can exert regulatory activities, A1 variant is considered a risk factor for many human diseases, but not by A2-milk, during digestion. The frequency of A1/A2 allele of beta casein is breed dependent and can be very easily checked with simple PCR-RFLP technique. The aim of this article was to review the different studies and assess the status of A1/A2 in Indian native cattle breeds as well as crossbred/taurine populations and breeding bulls being used at different AI centres in India. Analysis of frequency pattern clearly indicated that all Indian native cattle breeds have high frequency of A2 allele and homozygous A2A2 genotype and hence are very good resource for A2 milk. Crossbred, taurine cattle populations and breeding bulls being used at different AI centres have a higher frequency of A2 allele and A1A2 genotype. The percentage of animals with homozygous A2A2 genotype is low. This suggests the need for screening of crossbred/exotic bulls being used in A1 and modify the existing breeding policy so as to drift the herds towards A2.

Introduction

Milk from a variety of livestock species and cow in particular has been included in the diet for infants, children and adults worldwide since it is the most common source of animal proteins and microelements known to be essential for human nutrition. Worldwide, the different sources of milk are cow, buffalo, goat, sheep and camel contributing 85%, 11%, 2%, 1.4% and 0.2% respectively to the total world milk production. With a herd capacity of 264 million cows contribute highest to the total milk production that is 600 million tons every year. Cow milk contains various components like lipids, proteins, amino acids, vitamins, minerals, immunoglobulins, hormones, growth factors, cytokines, nucleotides, peptides, polyamines, enzymes and other bioactive peptides with physiological functionality. It also provides a high quality source of energy, proteins and selected micronutrients such as calcium, magnesium, zinc and phosphorus to most human population. Cow milk generally contains about 3.5 % protein, of which approximately 80 % are caseins and 20 % are whey proteins. More than 95% of the cow milk proteins are constituted by caseins ($\alpha S1$ -, $\alpha S2$ -, β -, k-CN) and whey $(\alpha$ -LA and β -LG) genes. Milk and milk products are considered as functional foods as digestion of different components of cow milk specially proteins lead to the formation of biologically active molecules that can have a direct and significant effect on health (Marshall 2004) including digestive functions, metabolic responses to absorbed nutrients, growth and development of organs or different diseases.

Beta Casein Variants

Among the caseins, beta casein, the second most abundant protein with an excellent nutritional balance of amino acids is a rich source of such bioactive peptides. It holds special significance as the bioactive peptides may exert regulatory activities in the human beyond nutrition and also act as promoters of different physiological functions (Kostyra et al., 2004; Silva and Malcata, 2005). The bovine beta casein (β -CN) gene spanning over a region of 8.5 kb, has nine exons and different mutations have led to formation of 15 genetic variants (A1, A2, A3, B, C, D, E, F, G, H1, H2, I, J, K and L). These variants hold importance as digestion of β -case in with different variants not only result in generation of different group of active peptides (Nguyena et al., 2015), but also has an influence on milk protein composition and milkproduction traits according to its genetic polymorphism (Visker et al., 2011).

Among these variants, A1 and A2 are the most common genetic variants, with A2 being the ancestral allele/variant of the gene. These variants differ at amino acid position 67 corresponding to single nucleotide difference cytosine to adenine. β -casein allele A2 has cytosine at position 8101, codon C<u>C</u>T corresponding

^{*}Author for Correspondence: Email-Monika.Sodhi@icar.gov.in



to amino acid proline at position 67. In variant A1, conversion of cytosine to adenine leading to codon change from C<u>C</u>T to C<u>A</u>T replaces proline with histidine at position 67. Based on this A1/A2 variation, milk is generally referred as A1 or A2 milk. On the basis of common variation of Pro67His change, the variants, A1, B, C, F or G having a common amino acid histidine (His) at position 67 (-Tyr60– Pro61–Phe62–Pro63–Gly64–Pro65–Ile66–<u>His67</u>–), but variations at other positions of amino acid s are called A1 type. Similarly, variants A2, A3, D, H1, H2 and I alleles having a common amino acid proline (Pro) at position 67 (-Tyr60–Pro61–Phe62–Pro63–Gly64–Pro65–Ile66–Pro67), but variations at other positions at other positions are categorized as A2 type.

Bioactive Peptides from Beta Casein A1/A2 Variants

A1 and A2 variants of bovine β -casein, generally called A1/A2 milk differ at amino acid position 67 with histidine in A1variant/A1milk and proline in A2 variant/milk. This polymorphism leads to key conformational changes in the secondary structure of expressed β -casein protein. Because of the structural differences, the bioactive peptides generated upon digestion of A1/A2 beta casein are different. Gastrointestinal proteolytic digestion (leucine aminopeptidase, elastase and carboxypeptidase

Y) of A1 β -casein (raw/processed milk) releases a 7 amino acid bioactive peptide 'opioid' called beta-casomorphin 7 (BCM-7) (Fig 1) in small intestine, while proline in A2 β -casein at 67 position prevents the split at this particular site and generates nine amino acid peptide BCM-9 (Kostyra *et al.*, 2004; De Noni 2008). Release of BCM-7 from A2 β -casein is minimal under normal gut conditions. In hydrolysed milk with A1 beta-casein variant, BCM-7 level is 4-fold higher than in A2 milk. Further, BCM-7 is released not only from milk but also from almost all milk product including yoghurt and cheese, infant formulas

Beta-casomorphin suggest the peptide from beta casein with opiate properties similar to morphine, that includes affinity to opioid receptors, especially the MOP (μ -opioid receptor). The beta-casomorphine-7 has been identified as the "atypical" opioid peptide and exerts its influence on nervous, digestive, and immune functions via the MOR. In addition to BCM7/9, digestion of beta casein results in the release of other encrypted casomorphins including the non-opioid peptides (BCM5, BCM11, Immunopeptides). The BCM-9 is also an opioid agonist but with lesser affinity for μ -opioid receptor. The BCM-5, which is the more potent than BCM-7 and BCM-9,



Different genotypes for A1/A2 allele of β -casein

Fig. 1. Different variants of Beta-casein, their digestion and genotyping protocol

Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour. 35(3): 269–278 (2022)



is primarily released from further proteolytic digestion of BCM-7 and BCM-9 by brush border peptidases. Various epidemiological, biochemical data or animal trials suggest the association of A1 milk (cow milk with A1 β -casein) as a risk factor for digestive discomforts, type I diabetes, coronary heart disease, arteriosclerosis, sudden infant death syndrome etc. (Kuellenberg *et al.*, 2022; Sodhi *et al.*, 2022; Yadav *et al.*, 2020; Brooke-Taylor *et al.*, 2017; Laugesen and Elliott, 2003; Tailford *et al.*, 2003)

Status of β-casein Variants across Taurine Breeds

Although a clear link between A1 β -casein and a disease state has not yet been confirmed, the importance of monitoring the status of A1/A2 alleles in dairy animals

as a precautionary measure has been realized. The distinguishing amino-acid sequence that characterizes A1 beta–casein is essentially unique to some European cattle breeds. Asian and African cattle; goats, sheep, yak and camel; all produce A2 milk. Human beta-casein is also of the A2 type as defined by the relevant amino-acid sequence (proline) fixation of A2 allele in buffalo breeds have also been reported in different studies (Mishra *et al.*, 2009; Ramesha *et al.*, 2016). Animals belonging to Genus Bos, which includes *Bos Indicus* (Indian humped Zebu), *Bos taurus* (Exotic) and Yak were initially of A2A2 type only but later due to point mutation A2 allele was replaced with A1 some 5000-10,000 years ago and some animals got A1A2 or A1A1 genotype (Ng-Kwai



Fig. 2. Status of A1/A2 variant in Bos taurus breeds

Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour. 35(3): 269–278 (2022)



and Grosclaude, 2002). With the advent of selective breeding for high production, better fertility and protein quality, unconsciously, genetically superior bulls carrying A1 allele were used in breeding programs. Hence, A1 variant became prominent in European cattle some thousands of years ago while making selection for high milk production. The frequency of A1 beta-casein with A1 variant varies breed by breed. A1 β -casein is a major variant of β -case in the milk of the common dairy cows of north European origin: Friesian, Ayrshire, British Shorthorn, and Holstein. Also, the frequency of A1 has increased over the last century as the Holstein Friesian (*HF*) has become predominant in many countries for its high milk production character. Artificial insemination of large number of cows with semen of HF bulls multiplied A1 gene frequency over time. Several reports indicate that A1/A2 frequency is breed as well as area specific. Frequency of A1 allele of beta casein is high in Holstein Friesen (HF) breed in North America but low in German HF. Overall, across countries frequency of A1allele in HF ranges between (40-65%). Compared to HF, frequency of A2 allele is higher in Jersey. Breeds like Guernsey, Kerry, Channel Island cows; Southern French breeds; Charolais and Limousin also have higher frequency of A2 allele compared to HF.

Indian Native Cattle Breeds: A Resource for A2 Allele

Cattle genetic resources are the backbone of the farmer's economy since centuries producing milk as well as draught power. With 190.90 million cattle that is around 12.5% of world cattle population and producing 165.4 million tons of milk, India ranks first in the total milk produced annually (Livestock animalhusbandry-statistics, 2018). India is home to some of the best zebu (Bos indicus) breeds represented by 50 well-defined breeds. Besides these, many lesserknown cattle populations are also spread out in the length and breadth of the country each having its own special features contributing towards milk pool. The status of A1/A2 alleles of β -casein gene was delineated systematically first time at ICAR-NBAGR, Karnal in 2009, under the DBT funded project and later in National fund project. In a comprehensive analysis, nearly 4000 animals representing 27 breeds of Indian cattle and 231 animals from eight buffalo breeds have been genotyped to understand the distribution of A1/A2 variants. Blood samples were collected from the random, true to the breed animals by visiting the specific breeding tract of the breed. DNA was isolated and PCR-RFLP genotyping protocol was followed to ascertain the allelic status. The process included amplification of 251bp region of β -casein exon 7 harbouring the mutant site using specific primer pair restriction digestion of the PCR products with *Taq-I* restriction enzyme followed by visualization on 3% Ethidium bromide stained agarose gel. Three restriction fragments corresponding to different genotypes: A1A2 (251 & 213bp); A2A2 (251bp) and A1A1 (213bp) were observed for the analysed samples (Fig. 1).

The data on 15 Indian native cattle breeds (Mishra et al., 2009) from different agroclimatic regions and of different utility (milch, dual and draft purpose) revealed that majority of the Indian native cattle (97.4%) have A2A2, the desirable genotype, followed by heterozygous A1A2 (2.6%) genotype. None of the animal showed homozygous A1A1 genotype. Out of 861animals screened, only few animals of Malnad Gidda and Kherigarh cattle showed heterozygous A1A2 genotype with frequency of 0.191 and 0.218, respectively. The study was further extended to 3400 animals representing 27 Indian native cattle, crossbred (Karan Fries and Frieswal) and exotic (Holstein Frisian and Jersey) cattle (Mukesh et al., 2022). Across the Indian native cattle, highest frequency was observed for A2A2 genotype (0.905), followed by heterozygous A1A2 (0.091) and homozygous A1A1 (0.004)genotype. The overall frequency of favourable A2 allele across all the 2500 animals genotyped was 0.95 and its distribution across the different utility types was 1.0, 0.95 and 0.92 for milch, dual and draft purpose breeds, respectively. As observed by Mishra et al. (2009), all the animals belonging to dairy/milch breeds (Gir, Tharparkar, Rathi, Red Sindhi, and Sahiwal) showed only homozygous A2A2 genotype that is fixation of A2 allele. The other cattle breeds showing complete absence of A1A1/A1A2 genotype were Belahi, Konkan Kapila, Kangyam, Nimari, Red Kandhari, Malvi, Amritmahal, Kankrej, Hariana and Mewati (Table 1). The percent of heterozygous genotype was higher in draft purpose breeds compared to dual purpose breeds. Across the different climatic regions, breeds from arid and semiarid region showed higher frequency of A2 allele that is 0.98 and 1.00, respectively. Frequency of A2 allele in breeds from humid subtropical region mainly consisting of mainly draft and dual-purpose breeds was 0.90.



273

S No	Breed/ Population	Allelic Frequency		Genotypic Frequency			Sample No	References
		A1	A2	A1A1	A1A2	A2A2		
1	Gir	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.146	0.854	-	-	0.833	24	Patel et al., 2020
		0.172	0.828	0.006	0.331	0.663	172	Patel et al., 2019
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	45	Mishra et al., 2009
	Gir Bulls	0.222	0.778	0.037	0.370	0.593	54	Patel et al., 2019
2	Rathi	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	30	Saran et al.,2019
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	46	Mishra et al., 2009
3	Red Sindhi	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	33	Mishra et al., 2009
4	Sahiwal	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.15	0.85	0.000	0.30	0.70		Pandey et al., 2019
		0.067	0.933	0.005	0.124	0.871	26	Saran et al., 2019
		0.37	0.63	0	0.75	0.25	12	Srinivas et al., 2019
		0.06	0.94	0	0.13	0.87	306	Kumar et al.,2018
		0.00	1	0	0	1.00	15	Haq et al., 2012
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	47	Mishra et al., 2009
5	Tharparkar	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	30	Saran et al., 2019
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	14	Haq et al., 2012
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	44	Mishra et al., 2009
6	Badri	0.09	0.91	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.12	0.88	0	0.24	0.76	90	Hussain et al., 2019
7	Belahi	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
8	Deoni	0.08	0.92	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.29	0.71	0	0.58	0.42	12	Srinivas et al., 2019
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	40	Ramesha et al., 2016
9	Gaolao	0.08	0.92	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
10	Hariana	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	48	Mishra et al., 2009
11	Kankrej	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.083	0.917	-	-	-	24	Patel et al., 2020
		0.107	0.893	0.000	0.214	0.786	28	Patel et al., 2019
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	30	Saran et al., 2019
		0.03	0.97					Rangel et al., 2017
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	32	Mishra et al., 2009
	Kankrej Bulls	0.067	0.933	0.000	0.154	0.867	60	Patel et al., 2019
12	Konkan Kapila	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
13	Ladakhi	0.08	0.92	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.100	0.900	0.000	0.210	0.790	82	Sodhi et al., 2018
14	Malnad Gidda	0.07	0.93	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
		0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	6	Sridharan et al., 2022
		0.20	0.80	0	0.40	0.60	10	Srinivas et al., 2019
		0.014	0.986	0.000	0.029	0.971	104	Ramesha et al., 2016
		0.096	0.904	0	0.191	0.809		Malarmathi et al., 2014
		0.21	0.79	0.13	0.18	0.69		Navyashree, 2014
		0.096	0.904	0	0.191	0.809	47	Mishra et al., 2009



Image: state in the s	S No	Breed/ Population	Allelic Frequency		Genotypic Frequency			Sample No	References
15Newait0.0001.0000			A1	A2	A1A1	A1A2	A2A2		
16 0 gole 0 gole 0 mark0.000 0.0000.000 0.0000.000 0.0010.000 0.0010.001 0.0020.001 0.0020.002 0.0020.002 0.0020.002 0.0020.002 0.0020.002 0.0000.000 0.000 </td <td>15</td> <td>Mewati</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td></td> <td>Mukesh et al., 2022</td>	15	Mewati	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
16 17 18 18 18 190.0800.0900.0910.0810.0820.0820.0820.0820.0820.0830.0830.0830.093 <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td>40</td> <td>Mishra et al., 2009</td>			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	40	Mishra et al., 2009
Image: state	16	Ongole	0.020	0.980	0.000	0.019	0.981		Mukesh et al., 2022
DraftCurrents<			0.040	0.96	0	0.080	0.92	12	Srinivas et al., 2019
Distribute definition of the section of the sectin of the section o			0.06	0.94	0	0.11	0.89	38	Ganguly et al., 2013
17 Amrimahal 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 5 Sitham et al., 2022 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 37 Makesh et al., 2021 18 Bargur 0.061 0.037 0.000 0.000 1.000 37 Mishra et al., 2022 19 Dangi 0.041 0.05 0.000 0.000 1.000 31 Javane et al., 2013 20 Angayam 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Angayam 202 Makesh et al., 2022 21 Kherigarh 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Angayam 22 Makesh et al., 2024 22 Khillar 0.010 0.000 0.000 1.000	Draft Cattle Breeds								
Image: state	17	Amritmahal	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
0.000 <th< td=""><td>0.000</td><td>1.000</td><td>0.000</td><td>0.000</td><td>1.000</td><td>5</td><td>Sridharan et al., 2022</td></th<>			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	5	Sridharan et al., 2022
Index <th< td=""><td>0.000</td><td>1.000</td><td>0.000</td><td>0.000</td><td>1.000</td><td>50</td><td>Inamdar et al., 2019</td></th<>			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	50	Inamdar et al., 2019
18 BargurBargur0.063 0.0140.037 0.0000.000 0.0000.012 0.000Raja et al. 202119 Pangi0.0100.0000.0000.0000.0001.00Makesh et al. 202220 Pangi0.0001.0000.0000.0001.000Makesh et al. 202120 Pangi0.0001.0000.0000.0001.000Makesh et al. 202121 Pangi0.0001.0000.0000.0001.00048Makra et al. 201421 Pangi0.000.8900.782.3Makesh et al. 202222Khillar0.000.0000.0001.00048Makra et al. 200923 Pangi0.000.0000.0000.0001.00012Ramesha et al. 201624 Pangi0.001.0000.0000.0001.00044Makesh et al. 202225 Pangi0.001.0000.0000.0001.00044Makesh et al. 202226 Panganur0.001.0000.0001.0003Sridharan et al. 201927 Ponwar0.130.87Makesh et al. 202228 Panganur0.001.0000.0001.0003Sridharan et al. 201929 Panginur0.030.890.0000.0001.000Makesh et al. 202220 Panginur0.030.890.0000.0001.000Makesh et al. 202229 Panginur0.030.600.000 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>1.000</td> <td>37</td> <td>Mishra et al., 2009</td>			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	37	Mishra et al., 2009
19 Dangi 0.14 0.86 . . . Maksks et al., 202 200 Kargayam 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Maksks et al., 202 200 Kargayam 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Maksks et al., 2021 200 Kardiravan et al., 2014 0.000 0.000 1.000 48 Malamath et al., 2014 201 Kherigarh 0.00 0.000 0.000 1.000 48 Mishra et al., 2009 21 Kherigarh 0.10 0.89 0 0.218 0.783 23 Mishra et al., 2009 22 Khillar 0.100 0.000 0.000 1.000 1.00 1.00 Maksh et al., 2022 23 Malvi 0.00 1.000 0.000 1.000 1.000 Maksh et al., 2022 24 Nagori 0.00 1.000 0.000 1.000 Maksh et al., 2022 26 Punganur 0.03 0.87 - <td>18</td> <td>Bargur</td> <td>0.063</td> <td>0.937</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.125</td> <td>0.875</td> <td>48</td> <td>Raja et al., 2021</td>	18	Bargur	0.063	0.937	0.00	0.125	0.875	48	Raja et al., 2021
Image: constraint of the section of the sectin of the section of the section of the section of the sect	19	Dangi	0.14	0.86	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
20 Kangayam 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Kathiravan et al., 2021 20 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 22 Malamathi et al., 2014 21 Kherigarh 0.00 0.000 0.000 4.000 4.00 Mishra et al., 2009 21 Kherigarh 0.00 0.000 0.000 4.078 2.3 Mishra et al., 2009 22 Khillar 0.01 0.88 - - - Mukesh et al., 2022 23 Malvi 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 1.00 Mukesh et al., 2022 24 Nagori 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 4.4 Mishra et al., 2022 25 Nimari 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Mukesh et al., 2022 26 Punganur 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 3 Sridharia et al., 2022 27 Ponwar			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	31	Jawane et al., 2018
Image: second	20	Kangayam	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mukesh et al., 2022
Image: second			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Kathiravan et al., 2021
Image: state in the state in			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	22	Malamathi et al., 2014
Image: state			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	48	Mishra et al., 2009
Image: constraint of the second sec	21	Kherigarh	0.00	0.89	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
22 Khillar 0.14 0.86 - - Mukesh et al. 2022 23 Malvi 0.00 1.00 0.000 0.000 1.000 Mukesh et al. 2016 23 Malvi 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Mukesh et al. 2022 24 Nagori 0.06 0.00 0.000 0.000 1.000 44 Mukesh et al. 2022 25 Nimari 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 1.000 Mukesh et al. 2022 26 Punganur 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 3 Sridharan et al. 2022 27 Ponwar 0.13 0.87 - - Mukesh et al. 2022 27 Ponwar 0.13 0.87 - - Mukesh et al. 2022 28 Red Kandhari 0.00 1.00 0.000 0.000 1.000 39 Mukesh et al. 2022 29 Imblachery 0.02 0.03 0.000 0.050 42 Raja et al. 2016 30 Vechur 0.20 0.89 0.60 0.89 0.99 42 Raja et al. 2016 30 Vechur 0.20 0.80 0.81			0.109	0.891	0	0.218	0.783	23	Mishra et al., 2009
Image: second	22	Khillar	0.14	0.86	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
23 Malvi 0.00 1.00 0.00 0.00 1.00 Mukesh et al., 2022 24 Nagori 0.06 0.94 - - Mukesh et al., 2022 25 Nimari 0.00 1.00 0.000 1.00 Mukesh et al., 2022 26 Punganur 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 Mukesh et al., 2022 26 Punganur 0.000 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 3 Srinkras et al., 2019 27 Ponwar 0.13 0.87 - - Mukesh et al., 2022 28 Red Kandhari 0.00 1.000 0.000 0.000 1.000 39 Mukesh et al., 2022 28 Red Kandhari 0.00 0.000 0.000 1.000 0.000 1.000 39 Mukesh et al., 2022 29 Umblachery 0.20 0.80 0.000 0.050 0.910 48 Raja et al., 2011 30 Vechur 0.20 0.8			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	12	Ramesha et al., 2016
Image: second	23	Malvi	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	44	Mishra et al., 2009
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	24	Nagori	0.06	0.94	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	25	Nimari	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		Mukesh et al., 2022
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		Mishra et al., 2009
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	26	Punganur	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	3	Sridharan et al., 2022
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline 27 & \text{Ponwar} & 0.13 & 0.87 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$			0.080	0.92	0	0.17	0.83	12	Srinivas et al., 2019
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c } 28 & \operatorname{Red Kandhari} & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 39 & Mukesh \ et \ al. \ 2022 & Mishra \ et \ al. \ 2029 & 0.000 & 0.00$	27	Ponwar	0.13	0.87	-	-	-		Mukesh et al., 2022
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	28	Red Kandhari	0.00	1.00 1.000	$\begin{array}{c} 0.00\\ 0.000\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.00\\ 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 1.000\end{array}$	39	Mukesh et al., 2022 Mishra et al., 2009
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	20	TT 11 1	0.000	0.00					
30Vechur0.020.080.0000.0300.0300.93042Raja <i>et al.</i> , 202130Vechur0.200.80Muhammed and Stephen, 2012 $Kasargod local0.390.610.0420.9580.0000.0830.91748Ramesha et al., 2016Crossbred Cattle31Karan fries0.290.710.090.400.51460Mukesh et al., 20220.1690.8310.0000.3380.66259Ramesha et al., 201617.582.50.080.190.7373Jaiswal K et al., 201332FrieswalHeifers0.320.670.120.400.48124Ganguly et al., 2013Bulls0.440.560.230.420.3548-Mean0.370.630.170.390.44100-$	29	Umblachery	0.20	0.80	-	-	-	40	Mukesn <i>et al.</i> , 2022
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	20	37 1	0.02	0.98	0.000	0.050	0.950	42	Raja <i>et al.</i> , 2021
Rasargod rocar0.030.01 $ -$	30	Vecnur Vecnur	0.20	0.80	-	-	-		Munammed and Stephen, 2012
Crossbred Cattle 0.042 0.338 0.000 0.083 0.317 488 Ramesha et al., 2018 31 Karan fries 0.29 0.71 0.09 0.40 0.51 460 Mukesh et al., 2022 31 Karan fries 0.29 0.71 0.09 0.40 0.51 460 Mukesh et al., 2022 0.169 0.831 0.000 0.338 0.662 59 Ramesha et al., 2016 17.5 82.5 0.08 0.19 0.73 73 Jaiswal K et al., 2013 32 Frieswal 0.208 0.792 0.125 0.166 0.709 24 Haq et al., 2012 32 Frieswal 0.32 0.67 0.12 0.40 0.48 124 Ganguly et al., 2013 34 Mean 0.37 0.63 0.17 0.39 0.44 100		Kasargod local	0.39	0.01	-	- 0.092	-	40	Boundary of 2016
31 Karan fries 0.29 0.71 0.09 0.40 0.51 460 Mukesh et al., 2022 0.169 0.831 0.000 0.338 0.662 59 Ramesha et al., 2016 17.5 82.5 0.08 0.19 0.73 73 Jaiswal K et al., 2013 32 Frieswal	Cuash	ad Cattle	0.042	0.958	0.000	0.085	0.917	48	Ramesna <i>et al.</i> , 2016
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	21	Varan frias	0.20	0.71	0.00	0.40	0.51	460	Multach at al. 2022
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	31	Karan Iries	0.29	0.71	0.09	0.40	0.51	400	Remeche et al. 2016
32 Frieswal 0.32 0.66 0.12 0.166 0.79 24 Haq et al., 2013 32 Frieswal 0.32 0.67 0.12 0.40 0.48 124 Ganguly et al., 2013 Mean 0.37 0.63 0.17 0.39 0.44 100			17.5	0.651	0.000	0.558	0.002	39 72	Kamesha <i>et al.</i> , 2010
$32 \qquad \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0.208	0.702	0.08	0.19	0.73	24	Hag at al. 2012
Bulls 0.44 0.56 0.23 0.42 0.35 48 Mean 0.37 0.63 0.17 0.39 0.44 100	32	Frieswal	0.208	0.792	0.125	0.100	0.709	24	11aq et al., 2012
Bulls 0.44 0.56 0.23 0.42 0.35 48 Mean 0.37 0.63 0.17 0.39 0.44 100	32	Haifars	0.32	0.67	0.12	0.40	0.49	124	Ganguly et al 2012
Datas 0.44 0.50 0.25 0.42 0.55 46 Mean 0.37 0.63 0.17 0.39 0.44 100		Bulls	0.52	0.07	0.12	0.40	0.48	124	Gangury et al., 2015
Weat 0.57 0.05 0.17 0.59 0.44 100		Mean	0.44	0.50	0.23	0.42	0.55	40	
33 Vrindvani 0.35 0.65 0.11 0.47 0.42 354 Kumar et al. 2018	33	Vrindvani	0.37	0.05	0.17	0.39	0.44	354	Kumar et al. 2018



S No	Breed/ Population	Allelic Fr	equency	Genotypic Frequency		Sample No	References	
		A1	A2	A1A1	A1A2	A2A2		
34	Hardhenu	0.66	0.34	0.32	0.68	0.00	50	Ramkaran et al., 2017
35	HF cross	0.64	0.36	0.29	0.71	0.00	14	Kathiravan et al., 2021
		0.479	0.521	-	-	-	24	Patel et al., 2020
		0.375	0.625	0.091	0.567	0.342	263	Patel et al., 2019
		0.50	0.50	0	1.0	0	12	Srinivas et al., 2019
		0.638	0.362	0.28	0.72	0.00	47	Shende et al., 2017
		0.294	0.706	0.000	0.588	0.412	17	Ramesha et al., 2016
	Rathi X HF	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	10	Saran et al., 2019
	Sahiwal X HF	0.32	0.68	0.00	0.64	0.36	50	Pandey et al., 2019
	Dangi X HF							
	HF 75 %	0.13	0.86	0.06	0.13	0.81	15	Jawane et al., 2018
	HF 62.5 %	0.03	0.97	0.000	0.06	0.94	17	
	Overall	0.08	0.92	0.03	0.09	0.88	32	
	Kangayem X HF	0.405	0.595	0.17	0.46	0.37	63	Malamathi et al.,, 2014
36	Jersey Cross	0.69	0.31	0.380	0.620	0.000	29	Kathiravan et al., 2021
37	Breeding Bulls							Sodhi et al., 2012
	Holstein	0.441	0.559	0.216	0.451	0.333	51	
	Jersey	0.325	0.675	0.025	0.600	0.375	40	
	Crossbred	0.298	0.702	0.101	0.393	0.506	89	
	Mean	0.355	0.645	0.114	0.481	0.405		
Taurine breeds								
38	Holstein Friesian							
		0.500	0.500	0.000	1.000	0.000	2	Kathiravan et al., 2021
		0.565	0.435				23	Patel et al., 2020
		0.169	0.831	0.000	0.338	0.662	59	Ramesha et al., 2016
39	Jersey	0.077						Ramesha et al., 2016
		0.25	0.75	0.000	0.50	0.50		Kathiravan et al., 2021
40	Karan Swiss	0.107	0.893	0.00	0.214	0.786	14	Haq et al., 2012

In line with data generated at ICAR-NBAGR, other researchers have also reported the complete absence of A1 allele in Kangayam (Malarmathi et al., 2014, Kathiravan et al., 2021), Amritmahal (Inamdar et al., 2019); Gir (Paradkar et al., 2021); Malvi & Nimari (Pandey et al., 2021) cattle; and predominance (≥ 0.90) of the A2 allele in Indian native cattle breeds including Kankrej-0.97; Malnad Gidda-0.98; Ongole-0.94; Umblachery-0.98; Kasargod-0.958; Bargur-0.937, Umblachery-0.98 and Ladakhi-0.90 (Table 1). The variations in the frequency of A2 allele was mainly due to the small sample size or collection of samples from the organized herds/farms, for instance frequency of A1 allele in Sahiwal cattle maintained in organized farm was 0.15 (Pandey et al., 2021). Complete absence of A1 allele has also been reported for Deoni, Khillar (Ramesha et al., 2016) and Dangi (Jawane *et al.*, 2018) cattle. Overall, the findings indicate the preponderance of A2 β -casein variant and also pointed towards the indicine origin of A2 allele.

Status of β -case in Variants in Crossbred Cattle

India continues to be the largest milk producing country in the world. Population statistics indicate approximately 51% of the Indian cattle population consist of registered/ recognized indicus breeds, crossbred cattle constitute only 13%, while others are nondescript cattle. However, in terms of milk production, crossbred cattle and Indicus breeds contribute 24.4 and 20.7 percent respectively to the national milk pool. Considering the contribution of crossbred cattle towards milk produced, it is important to genotype the crossbred population in the country for the status of A1/A2 allele of beta casein. Karan Fries, one





Fig. 3. Overall and utility wise status of β-casein A1/A2 alleles and genotypes in Indian cattle

of the crossbred populations developed using Holstein Friesian (exotic breed) and Tharparkar (indigenous breed) with the aim to enhance milk production coupled with high disease resistance and adaptability to local conditions; Frieswal (cross of Holstein Friesian and Sahiwal); Hardhenu and other crossbred cattle available across the country have been genotyped by different researchers (Table 1). Genotyping of 686 crossbred animals (Karan Fries and Frieswal) by Mukesh et al. (2022) revealed the predominance of A2 allele with a frequency of 0.71. Though the observed frequency of A1 allele (0.29) was much higher compared to Indian native cattle, the contribution towards A1 allele was majorly from the heterozygous A1A2 genotype rather than homozygous A1A1. Frequencies of the three genotypes A1A1, A1A2 and A2A2 was 0.09, 0.40 and 0.51 respectively. Similar allelic and genotypic profile (A1-0.32; A2-0.67; A1A1-0.12; A1A2-0.40; A2A2-0.48) with high frequency of A1A2 genotype was observed by Ganguly et al. (2019) while genotyping 124 Frieswal heifers. Frequency for A2 allele in HF crossbred cow was observed to be 0.595 (Malarmathi et al., 2014) while in Vrindavani (crossbred cattle) frequency of 0.65 has been recorded for A2 alleles. Most of the studies pointed towards higher frequency of A2 allele even in Indian crossbred populations except for HF crossbred (A2-0.31) as well as Jersey crossbred (A2-0.36) in Tamil Nadu (Kathiravan *et al.*, 2021), Hardhenu crossbred cattle of Haryana region (0.34: Ramkaran *et al.*, 2017), and HF crossbred of Maharashtra (0.36: Shende *et al.*, 2017).

Status of A1/A2 β-casein Variants in Breeding Bulls

In India, Holstein Friesian (HF) and Jersey cattle have been extensively used since 1960 for crossbreeding and genetic improvement programme. Considering the widespread use of taurine germplasm in our country's cross-breeding program and fact that these cattle could be the potential source for undesirable A1 allele, it is essential to ensure the status of A1/A2 alleles in breeding bulls being used at different AI centres. Frequency profiling of A1/A allele and corresponding genotypes in crossbred, taurine (Holstein Frisian and Jersey) and Indicus bulls being used in different AI centres was reported by Sodhi et al. (2012). As per the report, frequency of A2 allele was 0.88 in Indicus bulls, 0.702 in cross-bred bulls, while in Jersey and Holstein Frisian bulls, it was 0.675 and 0.559 respectively. Among the frequencies for three genotypes across taurine and crossbred bulls, least observed frequency was of



homozygous A1A1 genotype (0.114) followed by A2A2 (0.405) while maximum frequency of 0.481 was observed for heterozygous A1A2 genotype. Congruently, the mean frequencies of A1 and A2 alleles was 0.355 and 0.645 respectively (Fig. 3). Similar values of highest mean frequency of A1A2 genotype (0.475) and least mean frequency for A1A1 genotype (0.095) for semen samples from different breeding bulls have also been reported by Mukesh *et al.* (2022). Across different categories of breeding bulls, the frequency of A1A2 genotype was higher in Jersey (0.64) and HF bulls (0.449) in comparison to crossbred (0.39) and indigenous bulls (0.24) while trend of frequency of A2 allele was highest in indicus (0.88) followed by crossbred (0.70), Jersey (0.64) and HF bulls (0.56).

Kathiravan *et al.* (2021) also reported higher percentage of heterozygous genotypes for Jersey (0.50), HF(1.0), Jersey crossbred (0.62) and HF crossbred (0.71) bulls. Though, the data indicated predominance of the

desirable A2 allele across all studied breeding bulls, still there is a need for careful screening of sire lines being used in the breeding programmes as 65-70% of exotic (JSC and HF) or crossbred bulls being currently used in AI program in India are source of A1 allele.

The presence of large crossbred cattle populations and higher proportions of the A1 allele in exotic animals necessitates careful screening of animals and fine-tuning of existing breeding programmes. Such an approach would be an effective measure to prevent the dissemination of the undesirable A1 allele in our existing A2-predominant indigenous cattle populations. Initially, information regarding the screening of bulls for the A1A2 genotype in government semen stations was not available. But in recent years, many of the AI centres have availed the genotype testing facility at ICAR-NBAGR and got the bulls (semen straws) certified as A2 bulls. Specific herds can be converted to A2 type by selective breeding within 4 years using



Fig. 4. Overall Status of A1/A2 variants in breeding bulls

Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour. 35(3): 269–278 (2022)



intensive methods of animal selection that incorporate the use of certified A2 semen to eliminate all A1 betacasein from the milk (Pal *et al.*, 2015).

Conclusion

The A1/A2 hypothesis is both intriguing and potentially very important for public health, if it is proved correct. The BCM-7 released from A1 type has been the central theme for hypothesis, whereas the BCM-9 released from A2 type milk need be investigated for the claimed health ailments. The epidemiological data and animal trials point towards potential health hazards of consuming A1 type milk or derived BCM-7 while A2 milk is considered safe for drinking. Work is in progress in different labs across globe to authenticate the fact. Till that time, it is essentially important to monitoring the status of A1/ A2 alleles in dairy animals as a precautionary measure. The studies conducted on Indian native cattle strongly demonstrate that Indian cattle naturally harbor the preferred A2 allele and thus are a good resource for A2 milk. Further, though, the frequency of A1 allele is high in crossbred cattle and breeding bulls, its A1A2 genotype mainly contributing for this high A1 allele frequency. The overall frequency of homozygous A1A1 genotype is very low across all the categories of animals that is Indian breeds, taurine or crossbred populations, as well as breeding bulls. Hence, allelic profiling for A1/A2 beta casein in breeding bulls and bringing in changes in the breeding program accordingly can very easily help to drift the herds towards A2 and minimize the risk of disseminating the A1 allele in Indian cattle.

Suggested Readings

- Brooke-Taylor S, K Dwyer, K Woodford and N Kost (2017) Systematic review of the gastrointestinal effects of A1 compared with A2 β-Casein. Adv Nutr Bethesda Md. 8: 739–748. doi: 10.3945/an.116.013953.
- De Noni I (2008) Release of β-casomorphins 5 and 7 during simulated gastro-intestinal digestion of bovine β-casein variants and milk-based infant formulas. *Food Chem.* **110**: 897–903. doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2008.02.077.
- Kaminski S, A Cieslinska and E Kostyra (2007) Polymorphism of bovine β-casein and its potential effect on human health. J. Appl. Genet. 48: 189–198. doi: 10.1007/BF03195213.

- Kuellenberg de Gaudry D, S Lohner, K Bischoff, C Schmucker, S Hoerrlein, C Roeger, L Schwingshackl and JJ Meerpohl (2022) A1- and A2 beta-casein on health-related outcomes: a scoping review of animal studies. *Eur J Nutr.* **61**(1): 1-21. doi: 10.1007/s00394-021-02551-x. Epub 2021 Jun 1. PMID: 34075432; PMCID: PMC8783860.
- Kullenberg de Gaudry D, S Lohner, C Schmucker *et al.* (2019) Milk A1 beta-casein and health-related outcomes in humans: a systematic review. *Nutr Rev.* doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nuy063.
- Mencarini IR, KB Woodford and KM Old (2013) Comparing herd selection strategies for A2 beta-casein. Proc. N. Z. Soc. Anim. Prod. 73: 149–154.
- Mishra BP, M Mukesh, B Prakash, M Sodhi, R Kapila, A Kishore, RS Kataria, BK Joshi, V Bhasin, TJ Rasool and KM Bujarbaruah (2009) Status of milk protein, b-casein variants among Indian milch animals. *Indian J Anim Sci* 79: 722–725
- Mukesh M, S Swami, G Bhakhri, Vipul Chaudhary, V Sharma, N Goyal, P Vivek, V Dalal, AK Mohanty, RS Kataria, P Kumari, SK Niranjan and M Sodhi (2022) Demographic pattern of A1/A2 beta casein variants indicates conservation of A2 type haplotype across native cattle breeds (*Bos indicus*) of India. *Biotech* 12(3):, 167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-022-03232-0
- Ng-Kwai-Hang KF and F Grosclaude (2002) Genetic polymorphism of milk proteins. In: Fox PF, PLH McSweeney (eds). Advanced Dairy Chemistry: Volume 1: Proteins, Parts A & B. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers; New York, NY, USA. pp. 739–816.
- Pal S, K Woodford, S Kukuljan and S Ho. Milk Intolerance, Beta-Casein and Lactose. Nutrients. 2015 Aug 31; 7(9): 7285-97. doi: 10.3390/nu7095339.
- Phelan, Martha *et al.* (2009) "Casein-derived bioactive peptides: biological effects, industrial uses, safety aspects and regulatory status." *International Dairy Journal* **19**: 643-654.
- Sodhi M, M Mukesh, BP Mishra, A Kishore, B Prakash, R Kapil, K Khate, RS Kataria and BK Joshi (2012b) Screening of taurine and crossbred breeding bulls for A1/A2 variants of β-casein gene. *Indian J Anim Sci* 82: 2–9
- Sodhi M, M Mukesh, V Sharma, RS Kataria and R Sobti (2022) Harnessing potential of A2 milk in India: an overview.
 Book chapter in *Advances in Animal Experimentation and Modeling* DOI:10.1016/b978-0-323-90583-1.00016-7. Corpus ID: 245063397
- Yadav S, NDS Yadav, A Gheware *et al.* (2020) Oral Feeding of Cow Milk Containing A1 Variant of β Casein Induces Pulmonary Inflammation in Male Balb/c Mice. *Sci* Rep 10: 8053. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-64997-z