Growth and litter traits in crossbred pigs across the non-genetic factors

B.C. Naha¹, G.K. Gaur*, B.H.M. Patel and N.R. Sahoo¹

Livestock Production and Management,

ICAR- Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly-243 122, Uttar Pradesh, India.Received: 22-09-2015Accepted: 25-11-2015DOI: 10.18805/ijar.v0iOF.8500

ABSTRACT

Records of 195 crossbred pigs (75 % Landrace + 25% Desi), raised over a period of 2 years from 2014 to 2015, maintained at the Livestock Production Research (Pigs), Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh were used in this study to determine the effect of various environmental factors on growth and litter traits. Growth was recorded in terms of body weight at birth and thereafter at weekly interval up to 8 wks and then at 12, 16, 20 and 24 weeks of age. Generation interval had a significant effect on body weights at all ages. Piglets born in first generation had higher growth at most of the study period. Effect of sex was significant on body weight at most of the ages, except at 7, 8, 16 and 24 week. Male piglets had a higher growth at most of the weeks, except at 4 and 5 weeks. Piglets born in season II (March, April, May and June) had higher growth at most of the weeks of age. Effect of year of birth was significant on body weight at birth, 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 16 and 20 weeks of age. Effect of year of birth was significant on body weight at birth, 1, 2, 6, 16 and 20 weeks of age only. Piglets born in 2014 had higher growth at most of the weeks, except at 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 weeks of age. Generation I & II had a significant effect on litter traits, except average weight at birth. Piglets born in second generation had higher litter traits compared to the first generation. Effect of parity of dam was also significant on all litter traits.

Key words: Body weight, Crossbred pigs, Litter traits, Non-genetic factors.

Pig breeding programmes have been very successful with focus on few traits of economic importance, particularly growth and litter traits. Selection for growth is implemented at two stages in India. Piglets are formerly selected based on weaning weight and thereafter breeding pigs are selected during post-weaning period. Profitability of pig enterprise primarily depends on overall reproductive performance comprising age at first farrowing, farrowing interval, litter traits, sex ratio, and pre-weaning mortality (Singh and Khanna, 2000; Neopane, 2005; Siagian et al., 1986). These traits are also important to reduce the cost of rearing and generation interval and to increase genetic gain per unit of time (Das et al., 2005; Sharma and Singh, 1993). Crossbreeding has been widely used in India to improve the genetic makeup of local pigs. Various grades, developed during the process of crossbreeding reveal that performance declined in F2 due to many reasons including segregation loss (Gaur et al., 1999). The objective of the present study was to determine the influence of generation and other nongenetic factors on growth and litter traits in crossbred pigs.

The data were collected from Livestock Production Research (pigs), Indian Veterinary Research Institute (ICAR - IVRI), Izatnagar (UP), India, a unit of ICAR-AICRP on pigs which was started in 1970 to study the performance of exotic breeds of pigs under different agro-climatic conditions. This centre is situated at an altitude of 564 feet above the mean sea level at 28°N latitude and 79°E longitude. The climate of this place touches both the extremes and relative humidity ranges between 15 and 85 percent. A total of 195 crossbred (75% Landrace + 25% Desi) pigs, born during 2014 - 2015 were included in the present study. Weight at birth (W0), and that at 1 week interval upto 8 weeks of age (W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8), and at 12 (W12) ,16 (W16), 20 (W20) and 24 (W24) weeks ; litter size at birth (LSB), litter size at weaning (LSW), litter weight at birth (LWB), litter weight at weaning (LWW), average weight at birth (AWB) and average weight at weaning (AWW) were recorded and used for analyzed. Each year of birth was divided into 2 farrowing seasons based on agro-climatic conditions (November to February, season I; March to June, season II). Data were analyzed in two sets i.e. for growth & litter traits using SAS Package with the following models:

(i)
$$Y_{ijklm} = \mu + Y_i + S_j + SE_k + G_l + e_{ijklm}$$

where,

Y_{ijklm} = Observation on mth pig in ith year of birth, jth season of birth, kth sex group and lth generation

 μ = Overall mean

 $Y_i = Effect of ith year of birth (1 & 2)$

*Corresponding author's e-mail: gyanendrakg@yahoo.co.in

¹ Division of Animal Genetics, ICAR-IVRI, Izatnagar, Bareilly-243 122., Uttar Pradesh, India.

I

where, $Y_{ijk} = Observation on k^{th} pig in i^{th} parity and j^{th} generation \mu = Overall mean$ $PA_i = Effect of i^{th} parity (1 \& 2)$ $G_j = j^{th} generation (1 \& 2)$

 $e_{iik} = Random \, error \sim NID \, (0, \sigma_e^2)$

Least - squares analysis of variance and means of growth traits are shown in Table 1. Body weight showed a continuous increase over age from birth to 24 weeks. Similar results were also observed by Singh and Khanna (2000) and Das et al. (2005) in Large White Yorkshire and Hampshire Pig breeds. Generation had significant effect on body weights at all the weeks. Piglets born in first generation had higher growth at most of the weeks as compared to second generation. Similar results were also reported by Singh and Khanna (2000) in Large White Yorkshire pigs. Effect of sex was significant on most of the body weights, except at 0, 7, 8 & 16 week of age. Male piglets had a higher growth similar observation was also reported by Gaur et al. (1999). Season had a significant effect on body weight at birth, 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 16 & 20 week of age. Piglets born in season II had a higher growth at most of the weeks, except 4th and 5th week. Significant effect of season of birth on growth were also observed by Mukhopadhyay et al. (1992) and Deo et al. (1979) in crossbred pigs. Effect of year of birth was significant on body weight at birth, 1, 2, 6, 16 & 20 week of age only. Piglets born in 2014 had higher growth at most of the weeks, except 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th weeks.

Least - squares analysis of variance and means of litter traits are shown in Table 2. Effect of parity of dam was significant on all litter traits. First parity dams had lower litter traits compared to second parity dams. Second parity dams had better litter traits as compared to first parity dams. Significant effect of parity of dam on litter weight at birth and weaning in this study was in accordance with the reports of Thapa et al. (2009), Pokharel et al. (2013) and Mohanty and Nayak, (1986). Generation I & II had significant effect on litter traits, except average weight at birth. Second generation dams showed higher litter traits at birth and weaning as compared to 1st generation dams. Improvement in performance in 2nd generation was however, unexpected phenomena in crossbred population. Performance, in general, declines in F2 as a consequence of segregation loss. Unexpected results in the present investigation might be due to less number of observations in the study and varying status of parity of dams in two generations was in accordance with the report of Gaur et al. (1999).

able I	: Least – sq	uares analys.	is of variance	and means o	it growth trait	ts of crossbre	d pigs						
								Lea	st – squares r	nean			
Factor	W0	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W12	W16	W20	W24
n	1.06 ± 0.02	1.99 ± 0.04	3.19 ± 0.06	4.50 ± 0.09	5.60 ± 0.12	6.86 ± 0.15	7.83±0.15	8.98 ± 0.17	10.39 ± 0.19	18.21 ± 0.35	30.65 ± 0.49	44.19 ± 0.63	60.39±0.68
Sex-	*	*	*	*	*	*	ı	ı	*	ı	ı	ı	
Male	1.03 ± 0.51	1.99 ± 0.34	$3.40{\pm}0.08$	4.67 ± 0.15	5.67 ± 0.30	$6.84{\pm}0.19$	7.75 ± 0.18	$8.41{\pm}0.64$	9.55 ± 0.91	18.72 ± 0.34	30.83 ± 0.78	44.49 ± 0.44	60.87 ± 0.18
Female	1.05 ± 0.51	1.92 ± 0.34	$3.20{\pm}0.08$	4.41 ± 0.15	5.44 ± 0.30	6.49 ± 0.19	7.37 ± 0.18	8.27±0.64	9.59 ± 0.91	18.14 ± 0.34	31.12 ± 0.78	43.65 ± 0.44	59.22±0.18
Generai	ion *	*	*	*	*	*	* *	*	*	*	* *	*	*
_	1.02 ± 0.40	2.03 ± 0.03	3.43 ± 0.02	4.89 ± 0.03	6.25 ± 0.01	7.59 ± 0.01	$8.43{\pm}0.01$	9.38 ± 0.01	10.81 ± 0.01	19.92 ± 0.01	32.69 ± 0.03	46.13 ± 0.04	64.17 ± 0.01
2	1.05 ± 0.40	1.87 ± 0.03	3.16 ± 0.02	4.20 ± 0.03	4.85 ± 0.01	$5.74{\pm}0.01$	6.69 ± 0.01	7.29 ± 0.01	8.32 ± 0.01	19.92 ± 0.01	32.69 ± 0.03	46.13 ± 0.04	64.17±0.01
Season	of birth**	*	*	I	*	*	ı	*	*	* *	*	*	*
_	1.15 ± 0.01	2.09 ± 0.07	3.43 ± 0.12	4.57 ± 0.85	5.43 ± 0.44	6.48 ± 0.32	7.67±0.59	9.14 ± 0.02	10.40 ± 0.07	20.66 ± 0.01	34.23 ± 0.01	48.77 ± 0.01	60.47 ± 0.62
2	0.92 ± 0.01	1.82 ± 0.07	3.17 ± 0.12	4.52 ± 0.85	5.67 ± 0.44	6.85 ± 0.32	7.45±0.59	7.53±0.02	8.73 ± 0.07	16.19 ± 0.01	27.77±0.01	39.35 ± 0.01	59.62±0.62
Year of	birth *	*	*	ı		*	*	*	ı	·	* *	**	ı
2014	1.11 ± 0.03	2.03 ± 0.21	3.55 ± 0.22	$4.64{\pm}0.58$	5.43 ± 0.57	$6.31{\pm}0.15$	7.37±0.46	$8.29 {\pm} 0.85$	9.36 ± 0.52	20.63 ± 0.01	34.24 ± 0.01	47.95±0.02	60.16 ± 0.91
2015	0.96 ± 0.03	1.88 ± 0.21	3.05 ± 0.22	4.45 ± 0.58	5.67±0.57	$7.01{\pm}0.15$	7.76±0.46	8.39±0.85	9.77±0.52	16.23 ± 0.01	27.76±0.01	40.18 ± 0.02	59.93±0.91
$\mu = Ove$	rall mean, W	⁷ 0, W1, W2,	W3, W4, W5	i, W5, W6, W	7, W8, W12,	W16, W20,	W24 = Boc	ly weight at l	oirth, 1, 2, 3, ⁴	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1	2, 16, 20 and	l 24 wks of ag	ge

I

INDIAN JOURNAL OF ANIMAL RESEARCH

		Le	east – squares m	ean		
Factor	LSB	LSW	LWB	LWW	AWB	AWW
m	8.83±0.23	6.84±0.31	8.40±0.27	46.89±1.90	$0.97{\pm}0.02$	7.79±0.42
Generation	*	**	**	*	-	**
1	8.15±0.05	5.86 ± 0.02	7.66 ± 0.09	43.78±0.13	0.95 ± 0.79	9.00 ± 0.05
2	9.45±0.05	$7.80{\pm}0.02$	9.07 ± 0.09	49.67±0.13	0.97 ± 0.79	6.53±0.05
Parity	**	*	**	*	*	*
1	7.99±0.07	6.19±0.04	7.33±0.02	41.88±0.01	$0.94{\pm}0.36$	8.20±0.31
2	9.61±0.07	7.48 ± 0.04	$9.40{\pm}0.02$	51.57±0.01	0.99 ± 0.36	7.33±0.31
0 11		(1') I CWU I	• • • •		· 1 / / 1 · / T TTAT	т <u>т</u> , т <u>,</u> т

Table 2: Least - squares analysis of variance and means of litter traits of crossbred pigs

 μ = Overall mean, LSB = Litter size at birth, LSW= Litter size at weaning, LWB = Litter weight at birth, LWW = Litter weight at weaning, AWB = Average weight at birth, AWW = Average weight at weaning; **P < 0.01 and *P < 0.05

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study recorded that body weights in pigs at most of ages from birth to 24 weeks of age are influenced by generation, sex and season and year of

birth. Similarly litter traits are affected by parity of dam and generation. These results underline the need to adjust the performance records for non-genetic factors for genetic evaluation of crossbred pig herd.

REFERENCES

Das D., Deka D., Nath, D. R and Goswami R. N. (2005). Heritability and effect of some non-genetic factors on traits of reproduction in Hampshire Pigs. *Indian Vet. J.*, **82:** 847-850.

Deo S., Raina B. L and Bhat P. N. (1979). Studies on some reproductive traits in Landrace, Large White and their crossbreds. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, **49:** 807-811.

Gaur G. K., Chabbra A. K and Paul S. (1999). Best linear unbiased estimates of growth for different environmental factors in Landrace and desi crossbreds. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, **69(6):** 453-455.

Mohanty S and Nayak J. B. (1986). Reproductive performance of Large White Yorkshire Pigs and their crosses with indigenous Pigs in hot-humid climate of Orissa: A note. *Indian J. Animl Prod and Manage.*, **2:** 134-137.

Mukhopadhyay A., Singh R. L and Singh S. K. (1992). A comparative study on the effect of genetic and non-genetic factors of Landrace, Tamworth and some reproductive characters. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, **62**: 482-484.

Neopane S. P. (2005). Genetic and non-genetic factors affecting litter traits of Pakhribas black Pigs in Nepal. Nepal Vet. J. 28: 51-57.

Pokharel B. B., Bhatpara N., Sapkota M and Kafle P. (2013). Effect of Non-Genetic Factors on Litter Traits of Hurrah Pigs in Nawalparasi, Nepal. Int. J. Agri. Forestry, **3(4)**, 141-144.

Sharma B. D and Singh S. K. (1993). Effect of genetic and non-genetic factors on reproductive performances of Landrace, Large White and desi Pigs and their crosses. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, **63(2)**: 208-211.

Siagian P. H., Argan V. G., Alacantura P. F., Aquino A. G and Millena M. J. (1986). The reproductive performance of Yorkshire, Landrace, and Duroc breeds of swine. J. Philippine Agr., 69: 53-62.

Singh G. and Khanna A. S. (2000). Genetic and Phenotypic trends for economic traits in Large White Yorkshire Pigs. *Indian J. Anim Sci.*, **70**(7): 728-731.

Thapa D. B. (2009). Phenogenetic study on litter and reproductive traits of exotic swine breeds under farmer's managed condition. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal. 109 p.