



# Simmental

- As the most powerful Galileo son on the market, Konza is a reliable source of muscle and stoutness.
- Use with confidence to boost weaning and yearling performance, milk, and docility.
- He brings added carcass performance to the table and is an improver for API and TI.

**Semen: Available in Conventional and Ultraplus™ high fertility sex-sorted semen at STgenetics® Beef**

**Conventional semen: \$20/unit**

**Ultraplus™ Female: \$40/unit**

**Ultraplus™ Male: \$35/unit**

Semen available at STgenetics® 866-589-1708.



ASA# 4053827 • PB SM • Homozygous Black • Homozygous Polled  
 Sire: Hook's Galileo 210G  
 Hook's Evita 18E  
 Dam: Miss Elegance 13E  
 Hook's Yellowstone 97Y  
 Miss Beauty 46B

Trait	CE	BW	WW	YW	ADG	DMI	\$Gain	MCE	Milk	MWW	Stay	DOC	CW	YG	Marb	Fat	REA	Shr	API	TI
EPD	12.8	.6	93.6	142.1	.3	1.02	.04	8.5	34.9	81.6	16.3	18.5	52.5	-.33	.87	-.082	.93	-.38	182	108.9
ACC	.48	.51	.49	.49	.49	.35	.38	.29	.24	.32	.35	.47	.44	.36	.43	.40	.42	.03		
%	35	40	10	15	20	80	50	15	2	1	45	2	4	75	1	30	40	30	3	1

EPD as of 1.27.25

## Dikeman Simmentals

Dr. Michael and Earline  
 6125 Lake Elbo Road  
 Manhattan, KS 66502  
 785-770-2977  
 mdikeman@ksu.edu

or those that eat minimally but fail to grow, are penalized within the prediction. This balance ensures that selection decisions are aligned with true economic efficiency, rather than simply reducing intake without considering performance outcomes. Many studies have found a positive genetic correlation between DMI and growth traits (weaning weight, yearling weight, etc.) exists. For instance, studies have shown that DMI is positively correlated with ADG, meaning that selection for reduced DMI alone can inadvertently lead to slower-growing, smaller-framed cattle. This trade-off underscores the importance of an economically driven approach like \$Gain rather than a narrow focus on intake reduction.

Many breeders might argue that a tool that addresses this problem already exists in the Residual Feed Intake (RFI) EPD. Residual feed intake (RFI) has been widely used as a measure of feed efficiency, but it presents inherent challenges. RFI is calculated as the difference between an animal's actual feed intake and its predicted intake based on maintenance and growth requirements. However, RFI merely quantifies variation rather than reflecting true feed efficiency. The issue lies in its failure to account for differences in growth and output, which are crucial in determining profitability. For example, two animals with the same RFI may differ significantly in total pounds gained, affecting their overall economic value in the feedlot.

Furthermore, biological efficiency — the concept underlying RFI — does not always align with economic

efficiency. Different types of cattle can be profitable depending on the level of input received and their outputs. For example, cattle that consume more feed but achieve superior gains may be more valuable than those that consume less but grow at a suboptimal rate. While RFI may be related to profit in its attempt to identify more biologically efficient animals, it does not directly predict differences in profit. Because of this, there can be a large disparity between animals with the same RFI and actual profit. It is certainly possible for animals identified as being ideal for RFI to have a significantly poor ability to produce profit in the feedyard. A holistic approach that incorporates the economics of intake and growth is essential to optimizing profitability.

Producers should exercise caution when making genetic selections based solely on DMI reduction or RFI. While reducing feed intake may seem appealing, it can lead to unintended consequences such as smaller, slower-growing cattle that do not maximize economic returns. The \$Gain prediction offers a more comprehensive selection tool by incorporating both intake and gain into a single economic framework. ■