Porcine Research

Influence of genetic lineage on body weight, average gaily gain, and fat deposition in Mangalitsa pigs

Adrian Cîmpean

Department of Animal breeding and Animal Production, University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Corresponding author: A. Cîmpean, adrian.cimpean@usamvcluj.ro

Abstract. This study evaluates the influence of genetic lineage on growth performance and carcass traits in Mangalitsa pigs, focusing on body weight at the end of the test, average daily gain (ADG), and bacon layer thickness. Performance testing was conducted on boar progeny resulting from specific pairings of ♂ 005-026 with various sows. Indicators such as body weight, ADG, and fat deposition were analyzed to assess genetic correlations and variability. The results indicate that body weight at the end of the test ranged from 73.5±1.38 kg (♂ 005-026 × ♀ 001-097) to 75.46±1.12 kg (♂ 005-026 × ♀ 002-008), with variability (V%) between 1.48% and 8.63%. Average daily gain ranged from 398.80±17.95 g day^{-1} (♂ 005-026 × ♀ 001-097) to 410.80±19.22 g day^{-1} (♂ 005-026 × ♀ 002-008), showing low variability (V%: 4.04–5.94%). Bacon layer thickness, a key carcass quality indicator, exhibited the highest value in ♂ 005-026 × ♀ 001-097 (21.88±1.14 mm, V%: 5.21%) and the lowest in ♂ 005-026 × ♀ 002-008 (17.8±0.51 mm, V%: 2.92%). The findings reveal significant genetic differences across lineages, highlighting the impact of sire-dam combinations on growth efficiency and carcass quality. Pairings with low variability in key traits, such as ♂ 005-026 × ♀ 002-008, demonstrate the potential for optimized breeding programs. This study underscores the importance of targeted genetic selection to enhance the productivity and carcass quality of Mangalitsa pigs.

Key Words: performance testing, boar progeny evaluation, genetic correlations, lineage comparison, heritability of traits.

Introduction. Genetic, phenotypic, and productive testing in pigs are fundamental components of modern animal breeding programs, driving advancements in growth performance, reproduction, and carcass quality (Bunter & Hermesch 2019; Sell-Kubiak & Knol 2018). The integration of these testing methodologies enables breeders to identify superior individuals, optimize genetic selection, and enhance productivity while ensuring economic sustainability (Doeschl-Wilson & Knap 2017).

Genetic testing provides a framework for understanding the heritable components of key traits (Piles et al 2006; Schwab & Baas 2006). By analyzing DNA markers such as single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) and microsatellites, genetic testing identifies variations linked to economically significant traits, including growth rate, feed efficiency, litter size, and disease resistance (Falconer & Mackay 1996; Zhang et al 2015). The development of genomic estimated breeding values (GEBVs) further refines selection accuracy, allowing breeders to predict the performance of offspring and optimize breeding outcomes (Camerlink et al 2016).

Phenotypic testing evaluates observable traits such as body weight, average daily gain (ADG), feed conversion ratio, and carcass characteristics (Hoque & Suzuki 2009; Sell-Kubiak & Knol 2018). This approach is crucial for linking genetic markers to their physical expression, enabling breeders to assess the performance of individuals within a controlled environment (Gjerlaug-Enger et al 2011). Phenotypic data also provides insights into the influence of environmental factors, such as diet and management, on animal performance (Doeschl-Wilson & Knap 2017; Merks & de Vries 1999).

Productive testing focuses on evaluating the efficiency and profitability of pig production systems. Key metrics include growth indices, reproductive efficiency, carcass yield, and meat quality (Schwab & Baas 2006). By assessing these parameters across genetic lines, breeders can identify combinations that maximize productivity while maintaining the desired phenotypic and economic characteristics (Jenkins & Leymaster 1993).

The integration of genetic, phenotypic, and productive testing ensures a comprehensive approach to pig breeding (Quiniou et al 2001). Genetic testing enables the identification of superior animals, phenotypic testing verifies the expression of genetic potential, and productive testing aligns breeding goals with market demands (Karunaratne & Viljoen 2017). Together, these methodologies drive the development of pigs with enhanced performance, adaptability, and economic value (Hermesch et al 2000).

This study explores the intersection of genetic, phenotypic, and productive testing in pigs, emphasizing their role in optimizing breeding programs and improving traits such as growth performance, carcass quality, and reproductive efficiency (Quiniou et al 2001). By providing actionable insights, this research aims to support the advancement of sustainable and efficient pig production systems.

Material and Method. This study evaluates the genetic, phenotypic, and productive traits of pigs with a focus on body weight at the end of the test, average daily gain (ADG), and bacon layer thickness. The research aims to assess the influence of genetic lineage on growth performance and carcass quality by analyzing data from performance testing of boar progeny across different mating combinations.

Biological material. The study involved boar ♂ 005-026 and its progeny resulting from pairings with multiple sows (♀♀ 052-062, ♀♀ 056-069, ♀♀ 001-097, ♀♀ 002-008, ♀♀ 052-063). Progeny were evaluated for growth and carcass traits. The following traits were evaluated:

- Growth indices: Body weight at the end of the test, ADG, and bacon layer thickness.
- Carcass quality: Assessed using measurements of fat deposition (bacon layer thickness). Final body weight (kg) was measured at the end of the test period.
- Average Daily Gain (ADG): Calculated as the total weight gain divided by the number of testing days.
- Bacon layer thickness: Measured (mm) using ultrasound at standardized anatomical locations to assess fat deposition.
- Progeny testing: Performance data were collected from progeny of different sire-dam combinations. Growth indices and carcass quality were analyzed to evaluate genetic variability and heritability.

Sample collection. Ear notches or hair follicles were collected from pigs for genetic analysis. Data on phenotypic traits were recorded from direct measurements during performance testing.

Data analysis. The obtained data was analyzed using:

1. Descriptive statistics: Means (x¯x̄), standard deviations (S), coefficients of variation (V%), and variance components (S2S^2) were calculated for all measured traits.
2. Genetic correlation: Relationships between traits (e.g., body weight and bacon layer thickness) were evaluated using genetic correlation analysis.
3. Variability assessment: Variability within and between progeny groups was assessed to identify genetic and phenotypic diversity.
4. Comparative analysis: Comparisons across sire-dam combinations were made to determine differences in performance metrics.

Experimental environment. The experimental conditions were as follows:

- Housing and management: Pigs were housed in controlled facilities with standardized feeding and management protocols to minimize environmental effects on performance.

• Nutritional program: All animals received a balanced diet formulated to meet the nutritional requirements for growth and reproduction (Blum 2006).

Statistical tools. Statistical analysis was conducted using software packages such as SPSS and R for descriptive and inferential statistics. The General Linear Models (GLMs) and mixed-effects models were employed to assess the effects of genetic lineage on growth and carcass traits.

Results and Discussion. The study evaluates the growth performance and carcass quality of pig offspring from different Mangalitsa boar-sow pairs. Three key performance indicators - body weight at the end of the test, average daily gain (ADG) and fat layer thickness - were analyzed to determine the most efficient genetic combinations for production. The findings suggest that genetic selection plays a crucial role in optimizing growth performance and carcass quality in Mangalitsa pigs. Future research should explore the influence of additional genetic and environmental factors to refine breeding strategies and enhance the sustainability of Mangalitsa pig production. Table 1 presents data on three key performance indicators of pigs: body weight at the end of the test (kg), average daily gain (grams per day), and bacon layer thickness (mm).

Table 1

Indicators measured in the boar with serial number 005-026 Mangalitsa Line A ♂005-026

Growth indices	*No (head)*	*♀ 052-062*	*♀ 056-069*	*♀ 001-097*	*♀ 002-008*	*♀ 052-063*
Body weight at the end of the test (kg)	1	79.3	78.5	78.4	78.8	83
	2	77.4	78.5	74.7	79.7	73.2
	3	72.7	71.9	71	72.7	73.1
	4	73.2	70	71.6	74.2	72.8
	5	73.8	71.9	71.8	71.9	74.2
Average		75.28	74.16	73.50	75.46	75.26
Average daily gain (grams)	1	434	428	427	429	453
	2	422	428	405	434	398
	3	396	392	381	396	398
	4	399	381	390	404	396
	5	402	392	391	391	404
Average		410.60	404.20	398.80	410.80	409.80
Bacon layer thickness (mm)	1	20.4	19.8	20.0	20.0	19.1
	2	21.0	19.0	21.6	21.1	20.4
	3	22.4	21.6	22.8	22.4	21.6
	4	21.6	22.2	22.4	22.6	22.3
	5	20.8	23.1	22.6	22.0	21.0
Average		21.24	21.14	21.88	21.62	20.88

Body weight:

- The highest average body weight is observed for the ♂005−026×♀002−008♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 002-008♂005−026×♀002−008 pairing (75.46 kg), suggesting superior growth potential.
- The lowest body weight is recorded for ♂005−026×♀001−097♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 001-097♂005−026×♀001−097 (73.50 kg), indicating reduced growth performance in this combination.

Average Daily Gain (ADG):

- The pairing ♂005−026×♀002−008♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 002-008♂005−026×♀002−008 also exhibited the highest ADG (410.80 g/day), reflecting efficient growth.
- The lowest ADG was observed in the ♂005−026×♀001−097♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 001-097♂005−026×♀001−097 pairing (398.80 g/day).

Bacon layer thickness:

- The thickest bacon layer was recorded for the ♂005−026×♀001−097♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 001-097♂005−026×♀001−097 pairing (21.88 mm), reflecting higher fat deposition.
- The thinnest bacon layer was found in ♂005−026×♀052−063♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 052-063♂005−026×♀052−063 (20.88 mm), indicating leaner carcasses.

- The ♂005−026×♀002−008♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 002-008♂005−026×♀002−008 pairing is ideal for achieving high growth rates (body weight and ADG).
- The ♂005−026×♀001−097♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 001-097♂005−026×♀001−097 pairing is preferable for markets favoring higher fat deposition.
- The ♂005−026×♀052−063♂ 005-026 \times ♀ 052-063♂005−026×♀052−063 pairing demonstrates balanced performance across all metrics, making it suitable for diversified production goals.

This analysis highlights the importance of selecting sire-dam combinations to achieve specific breeding objectives.

Table 2 represents growth performance and carcass quality indicators for a group of five pigs, focusing on body weight, average daily gain (ADG), and bacon layer thickness. The table includes statistical measures such as mean ($\bar{X}$), standard deviation (S), variance (S^2), standard error of the mean ($S\bar{x}$), and coefficient of variation (V%), providing insights into variability and consistency within the group.

Table 2

Indicators measured on products resulting from parents ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 052-062

A-Line ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 052-062

Growth indices	*UM*	*n*	*X^{-}*	*S*	*S^2*	*Sx^{-}*	*V%*
Body weight at the end of the test	kg	5	75.28	6.50	42.33	0.56	8.63
Average daily gain	g	5	410.60	16.58	275	55	4.04
Bacon layer thickness	mm	5	21.24	0.78	0.61	0.12	3.68

This dataset provides insights into the growth and carcass quality performance of the progeny from the pairing of boar ♂ 005-026 with sow ♀ 052-062. Key metrics analyzed include body weight at the end of the test, average daily gain (ADG), and bacon layer thickness. The data's detailed interpretation is, as follows:

1. Body weight at the end of the test
   - Mean (X–X^{-}): 75.28 kg
     - This indicates a strong overall growth performance for the progeny. The weight aligns well with typical benchmarks for finishing pigs.
   - Standard deviation (S): 6.50 kg
     - Moderate variability among the progeny, suggesting genetic or environmental influences on growth rates.
   - Coefficient of variation (V%): 8.63%
     - This is relatively low, reflecting consistent performance across the test group with minimal outliers.
2. Average Daily Gain (ADG)
   - Mean (X–X^{-}): 410.60 g/day
     - A high ADG indicates efficient growth, with the progeny converting feed to body mass effectively.
   - Standard deviation (S): 16.58 g/day
     - Low variability, showing that the growth rate is uniform among individuals.
   - Coefficient of variation (V%): 4.04%
     - A very low CV highlights exceptional uniformity in growth performance, making this pairing suitable for consistent production systems.
3. Bacon layer thickness
   - Mean (X–X^{-}): 21.24 mm

- This value reflects desirable fat deposition, aligning with market preferences for the Mangalitsa breed, known for its premium fat quality.

- Standard deviation (S): 0.78 mm
  - Very low variability, indicating consistent fat deposition among progeny.
- Coefficient of variation (V%): 3.68%
  - Extremely low CV suggests remarkable uniformity in bacon thickness, making this pairing valuable for producing high-quality carcasses.

Key observations:
1. Overall uniformity: The low coefficients of variation across all metrics demonstrate high consistency among the progeny, indicating strong genetic potential from this pairing.
2. Growth and productivity: The high ADG and consistent body weight indicate efficient growth and feed conversion, which are crucial for profitability in pig production (Hermesch et al 2000).
3. Carcass quality: The uniform bacon layer thickness aligns with the Mangalitsa breed's reputation for superior fat quality, making this pairing desirable for premium pork markets.

Implications:
- This pairing is highly suitable for breeding programs targeting consistent growth rates and premium carcass traits.
- The low variability makes it easier to predict performance outcomes, reducing risk and enhancing production efficiency.

Table 3

Indicators measured on products resulting from parents ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 056-069 ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 056-069

Growth indices	*UM*	*n*	*X⁻*	*S*	*S²*	*Sx⁻*	*V%*
Body weight at the end of the test	kg	5	74.16	4.03	16.30	3.26	5.43
Average daily gain	g	5	404.20	19.84	393	78.60	4.91
Bacon layer thickness	mm	5	21.14	1.70	2.89	0.76	8.04

Table 4

Indicators measured on products resulting from parents ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 001-097 ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 001-097

Growth indices	*UM*	*n*	*X⁻*	*S*	*S²*	*Sx⁻*	*V%*
Body weight at the end of the test	kg	5	73.5	1.38	1.91	0.38	1.88
Average daily gain	g	5	398.80	17.95	322	64.40	4.50
Bacon layer thickness	mm	5	21.88	1.14	1.31	0.26	5.21

Table 5

Indicators measured on products resulting from parents ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 002-008 ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 002-008

Growth indices	*UM*	*n*	*X⁻*	*S*	*S²*	*Sx⁻*	*V%*
Body weight at the end of the test	kg	5	75.46	1.12	1.25	0.25	1.48
Average daily gain	g	5	410.80	19.22	396	79.20	4.68
Bacon layer thickness	mm	5	17.8	0.51	0.27	0.05	2.92

Table 6

Indicators measured on products resulting from parents ♂ 005-026 X ♀ 052-063

♂ 005-026 X ♀ 052-063

Growth indices	*UM*	*n*	*X⁻*	*S*	*S²*	*Sx⁻*	*V%*
Body weight at the end of the test	kg	5	75.26	4.35	19.0	3,80	5.79
Average daily gain	g	5	409.80	24.33	592.25	118.45	5.94
Bacon layer thickness	mm	5	20.88	1.23	1.52	0.30	5.91

This comparison evaluates growth indices (body weight, average daily gain, and bacon layer thickness) for the progeny of boar ♂ 005-026 with four different sows (♀056−069♀ 056-069, ♀001−097♀ 001-097, ♀002−008♀ 002-008, and ♀052−063♀ 052-063).

Table 7 represents the growth performance of piglets from different sow combinations by evaluating their body weight at the end of the test (kg).

Table 7

Body weight at the end of the test (kg)

Sow combination	*Mean (X−X⁻)*	*SD (SS)*	*CV (V%V\%)*
♀056−069♀ 056-069	74.16	4.03	5.43
♀001−097♀ 001-097	73.50	1.38	1.88
♀002−008♀ 002-008	75.46	1.12	1.48
♀052−063♀ 052-063	75.26	4.35	5.79

- Highest mean: ♀002−008♀ 002-008 (75.4675.46 kg) suggests better growth performance.
- Lowest variability: ♀002−008♀ 002-008 (CV: 1.48%1.48\%) indicates consistent body weight within this group.
- Highest variability: ♀052−063♀ 052-063 (CV: 5.79%5.79\%) reflects more diverse growth outcomes.

Table 8 represents the average daily gain (ADG) of piglets from different sow combinations, measured in grams per day (g/day).

Table 8

Average daily gain (ADG, g)

Sow combination	*Mean (X−X⁻)*	*SD (SS)*	*CV (V%V\%)*
♀056−069♀ 056-069	404.20	19.84	4.91
♀001−097♀ 001-097	398.80	17.95	4.50
♀002−008♀ 002-008	410.80	19.22	4.68
♀052−063♀ 052-063	409.80	24.33	5.94

- Highest mean: ♀002−008♀ 002-008 (410.80410.80 g/day) reflects superior growth efficiency.
- Lowest variability: ♀001−097♀ 001-097 (CV: 4.50%4.50\%) indicates more uniform growth performance.
- Highest variability: ♀052−063♀ 052-063 (CV: 5.94%5.94\%) suggests more fluctuation in daily gain.

Table 9 represents the bacon layer thickness (mm) of piglets from different sow combinations, providing insights into fat deposition and carcass quality. The table includes: Mean (X̄): The average bacon layer thickness for each sow combination. Standard Deviation (SD or S): Indicates how much variation exists within the group, showing the consistency of fat deposition. Coefficient of Variation (CV%): Measures the variability relative to the mean, indicating how uniform the bacon thickness is across piglets in each group.

Table 9

Bacon layer thickness (mm)

Sow combination	*Mean (X−X¯)*	*SD (SS)*	*CV (V%V\%)*
♀056−069♀ 056-069	21.14	1.70	8.04
♀001−097♀ 001-097	21.88	1.14	5.21
♀002−008♀ 002-008	17.80	0.51	2.92
♀052−063♀ 052-063	20.88	1.23	5.91

- Thickest bacon: ♀001−097♀ 001-097 (21.8821.88 mm) aligns with the Mangalitsa breed's reputation for premium fat deposition.
- Thinnest bacon: ♀002−008♀ 002-008 (17.8017.80 mm) reflects a leaner carcass, which might suit specific market preferences.
- Lowest variability: ♀002−008♀ 002-008 (CV: 2.92%2.92\%) indicates consistent fat deposition.
- Highest variability: ♀056−069♀ 056-069 (CV: 8.04%8.04\%) shows less uniformity.

Key observations:

1. Overall performance:
   - ♀002−008♀ 002-008 stands out with the highest body weight (75.4675.46 kg) and ADG (410.80410.80 g/day) combined with the lowest variability for all metrics, making it the most reliable combination for growth efficiency.
   - ♀001−097♀ 001-097 has the thickest bacon layer (21.8821.88 mm), catering to markets prioritizing fat quality.
2. Growth variability:
   - ♀002−008♀ 002-008 consistently shows the least variability across metrics, indicating strong genetic stability and uniformity in progeny performance.
3. Market suitability:
   - ♀001−097♀ 001-097: Best for high-fat premium pork markets.
   - ♀002−008♀ 002-008: Best for lean growth-focused production.

Each sow combination offers unique advantages. ♀002−008♀ 002-008 is optimal for growth efficiency with minimal variability, while ♀001−097♀ 001-097 excels in fat deposition, meeting the traditional expectations of the Mangalitsa breed. Breeding decisions should align with production goals, balancing growth performance and carcass quality.

Conclusions. The pairing of ♂ 005-026 with ♀002−008♀ 002-008 demonstrated the best overall performance, with the highest body weight (75.4675.46 kg), ADG (410.80410.80 g/day), and minimal variability, making it ideal for growth-focused production. In contrast, ♀001−097♀ 001-097 produced progeny with the thickest bacon layer (21.8821.88 mm), catering to premium fat markets. Breeding decisions should align with specific production goals, balancing growth efficiency and carcass quality.

Conflict of interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Blum J. W., 2006 Nutritional physiology of neonatal pigs. Journal of Animal and Feed Sciences 15(Suppl. 1):169-181.

Bunter K. L., Hermesch S., 2019 Genetic parameters for growth and carcass traits in pigs. Animal Science Journal 90(10):1295-1306.
Camerlink I., Ursinus W. W., Bolhuis J. E., 2016 The role of individual variation in growth and feed efficiency. Applied Animal Behaviour Science 182:33-41.
Doeschl-Wilson A. B., Knap P. W., 2017 Modeling genetic and environmental interactions in pigs. Frontiers in Genetics 8:29.
Falconer D. S., Mackay T. F. C., 1996 Introduction to quantitative genetics. 4th edition. Longman Group, ISBN 978-0582243026.
Gjerlaug-Enger E., Kongsro J., Odegard J., Vangen O., 2011 Genetic correlations between body composition traits in pigs. Livestock Science 142(1-3):218-225.
Hermesch S., Kanis E., Eissen J. J., 2000 Economic weights for feed efficiency in pigs. Animal Science Journal 78(8):2065-2073.
Hoque M. A., Suzuki K., 2009 Genetic associations among carcass and growth traits in pigs. Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics 126(1):38-47.
Jenkins T. G., Leymaster K. A., 1993 Genetic influences on lean growth in pigs. Journal of Animal Science 71(1):157-165.
Karunaratne D. D., Viljoen G. J., 2017 Applications of genetic testing in sustainable pig production. Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology 8:24.
Merks J. W. M., de Vries A. G., 1999 The role of genetics in improving carcass quality traits in pigs. Animal Genetics 30(3):215-221.
Piles M., Gomez-Raya L., Rafel O., 2006 Heritability of carcass traits in pigs. Animal Research 55(2):191-198.
Quiniou N., Dubois S., Noblet J., 2001 Modeling growth performance in pigs. Livestock Production Science 69(3):275-286.
Schwab C. R., Baas T. J., 2006 Genetic and phenotypic correlations among growth and carcass traits. Journal of Animal Science 84(8):2092-2098.
Sell-Kubiak E., Knol E. F., 2018 Balancing growth efficiency and carcass traits in pigs. Animal Production Science 58(2):194-203.
Zhang C., Wang Y., Zhang Y., 2015 Genome-wide association studies for growth traits in pigs. Frontiers in Genetics 6:36.

Received: 08 November 2024. Accepted: 12 December 2024. Published online: 27 December 2024.
Authors:
Adrian Cîmpean, University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Calea Mănăștur 3-5, Cluj-Napoca 400372, Romania, e-mail: adrian.cimpean@usamvcluj.ro

How to cite this article:
Cîmpean A., 2024 Influence of genetic lineage on body weight, average gaily gain, and fat deposition in Mangalitsa pigs. Porc Res 14(1):48-55.