

Consensus Statement on the Translation and Application of Genomics in the Equine Industries

A group of scientists met at the 12th Dorothy Russell Havemeyer International Horse Genomics Workshop in Pavia, Italy from September 12-15, 2018 and have agreed the following:

- The overarching goal of the equine genomics research community, set out in 1995, is to improve the health and welfare of the horse. The developing field of genomics will continue to provide knowledge and tools to enable informed breeding and management for the improved welfare of the horse.
- In the ten years since the publication of the horse genome sequence, there has been continual development of new genomic tools to increase our understanding of the structure and function of the horse genome.
- These tools and knowledge have led to considerable advances in understanding the molecular variants underlying key equine health, appearance, and performance traits.
- These variants are likely to prove useful as genetic markers for risk of disease or other traits of economic importance.
- In addition, advances in functional genomics, bioinformatics, and computational biology are revealing the fine detail of the biochemical and cellular pathways underlying equine traits of interest, which may lead to novel diagnostic and therapeutic approaches to influence and regulate them.
- The equine genomics research community, however, recognises there are practical, educational, and societal challenges facing the translation of the outcomes from the Horse Genome Project into practice.

Therefore, the workshop participants note that:

1. It is important that industry stakeholders are provided with the appropriate opportunities for education so that scientific developments are best communicated for translation into practice that will have the greatest potential to benefit the horse.
2. Scientific discovery covers a wide spectrum of basic to applied research and resulting discoveries may be translated directly or indirectly into practice for the benefit of the horse. Given commercial motivations, however, clear disclosure of potential conflicts of interest should be made both in relation to funding sources for the reported study and professional affiliations of the authors.
3. Scientific discovery should be reproducible, the data should be publicly available, when not in conflict with confidentiality, and the results and conclusions must be published in peer-reviewed journals.
4. In industry communications, including journalism and other public media, there must be a clear distinction between published peer-reviewed science and anecdote or opinion.
5. Scientific research projects should conform to best practice in relation to informed owner consent for use of samples and research ethics.
6. Many of the current platforms allow for partitioning of genetic variants contributing to complex traits in horse breeds. Continued development of these tools will further enhance these capabilities.
7. As a consequence of the genetic population structure, the application of genetic information is more straightforward in horse breeds compared to humans.
8. For some Mendelian traits, genetic tests may be diagnostic. For complex traits involving multiple genes and gene-environment interactions, genetic testing may instead be viewed as a screening and selection tool.
9. The integration of genetic information with traditional breeding approaches will be valuable to the sustainability of a healthy horse population for the future.

Disclaimer: This Statement is based on conclusions voted on by the authors during the workshop. It does not purport to reproduce in extenso all debates and intervention. The conclusions represent the view of the authors as agreed by majority. Neither the authors, nor their affiliated institutions, assume any responsibility or liability for any use which may be made of the information or representations contained herein.

10. The equine genomics research community continues to welcome collaboration and cooperation with the equine industries.

Equine Genome Workshop Scientists' Approval of Consensus Statement:

1. Michela Ablondi, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
2. Doug Antczak, Cornell University, USA
3. Ernest Bailey, University of Kentucky, USA
4. Eric Barrey, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, France
5. Rebecca Bellone, University of California, Davis, USA
6. Samantha Brooks, University of Florida, USA
7. Monika Bugno-Poniewierska, University of Agriculture, Krakow, Poland
8. Nadine Buys, KU Leuven, Belgium
9. Gabriel Anaya Calvo-Rubio, University of Córdoba, Spain
10. Stefano Capomaccio, University of Perugia, Italy
11. Katia Cappelli, University of Perugia, Italy
12. Stephen Coleman, Colorado State University, USA
13. E. Gus Cothran, Texas A&M University, USA
14. Isabel Cervantes, Complutense University of Madrid, Spain.
15. Jakub Cieslak, Poznan University of Life Sciences, Poland
16. Gabriella Farries, University College Dublin, Ireland
17. Carrie Finno, University of California-Davis, USA
18. Elena Giulotto, University of Pavia, Italy
19. Annik Gmel, Haras National Suisse, Switzerland
20. Emmeline Hill, University College Dublin, Ireland
21. Petr Horin, University Brno, Czech Republic
22. Tosso Leeb, University of Bern, Switzerland
23. Gabriella Lindgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
24. Xuexue Liu, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Science, China
25. Shavahn Loux, University of Kentucky, USA
26. James MacLeod, University of Kentucky, USA
27. Annette McCoy, University of Illinois, USA
28. Molly McCue, University of Minnesota, USA
29. Julia Metzger, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover, Germany
30. James Mickelson, University of Minnesota, USA
31. Mike Mienaltowski, University of California-Davis, USA
32. Sofia Mikko, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
33. Markus Neuditschko, Swiss National Stud Farm, Switzerland
34. Ludovic Orlando, University of Toulouse, France
35. Laura Patterson Rosa, University of Florida, USA
36. Jessica Petersen, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA
37. Richard Piercy, Royal Veterinary College of London, UK
38. Jocelyn Poissant, University of Calgary, Canada
39. Androniki Psifidi, Royal Veterinary College of London, UK
40. Terje Raudsepp, Texas A&M University, USA
41. Anne Ricard, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, France
42. Maria Solé, Swedish University of Agriculture, Sweden
43. Monika Stefaniuk-Szmukier, University of Agriculture in Krakow, Poland
44. Teruaki Tozaki, Laboratory of Racing Chemistry, Japan
45. Brandon Velie, University of Sydney, Australia
46. Barbara Wallner, University of Vienna, Austria
47. Tomasz Zabek, National Research Unit of Animal Production, Krakow, Poland

Disclaimer: This Statement is based on conclusions voted on by the authors during the workshop. It does not purport to reproduce in extenso all debates and intervention. The conclusions represent the view of the authors as agreed by majority. Neither the authors, nor their affiliated institutions, assume any responsibility or liability for any use which may be made of the information or representations contained herein.