## EFFECTS OF COMPENSATORY GROWTH FEEDING STRATEGY ON FATTY ACID

S.A. Hogan\* and J.P. Kerry

Department of Food & Nutritional Sciences, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland. Email: s.hogan@ucc.ie

Keywords: compensatory growth, pigs, fatty acids, grass

Introduction
Compensatory growth may be defined as a physiological process whereby growth is accelerated after a period of Compensatory growth has been a physicing from the process whereby growth is accelerated after a period of restricted development, usually due to reduced energy intake, such that the animal's weight equals or approaches that of restricted development, was never reduced (Hornick et al., 2000). Increased growth return these growth was never reduced (Hornick et al., 2000). restricted development, usually the to reduced energy make, such that the animal's weight equals or approaches that of animals whose growth was never reduced (Hornick et al., 2000). Increased growth rates and carcass leanness have been animals whose growth production strategies.

demonstrated in pigs using such production strategies. demonstrated in pigs using such production shadeges.

Foods containing high n-6:n-3 PUFA ratios have been implicated in the onset of certain cancers and heart disease. It is Foods containing the first of n-6:n-3 PUFA of pork might be improved by feeding grass-based diets high in  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid feasible that the ratio of n-6:n-3 PUFA of pork might be improved by feeding grass-based diets high in  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid feasible that the ratio of n-6:n-3 PUFA of pork might be improved by feeding grass-based diets high in  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid feasible that the ratio of it only the state of the stat (as in rummanis). Class is use for in includentative energy (restricted energy feed source) compared to conventional pig concentrate diets. Feeding grass-based diets to pigs could, therefore, produce leaner pork whilst improving fatty acid pig concentrate with contemporary health guidelines. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of profiles in accordance with close on the fatty acid composition of muscle from Landau was to determine the effects of profiles in acceptance of the fatty acid composition of muscle from Landrace and Duroc pigs.

Materials and Duroc (D) × (Large White × L) female pigs (n=72) were assigned to one of six diets: (1) Control – Landrace (L) or Duroc (D) × (Large White × L) female pigs (n=72) were assigned to one of six diets: (1) Control concentrate weaner and finisher diets to slaughter (C), (2) grassmeal diet (GM – included at 100 and 200 g/kg) of weaner and finisher diets respectively) to slaughter (GM105), (3) GM to 50 kg followed by finisher diet (GM50), (4) GM to 80 kg followed by finisher diet (GM80), (5) as (4) except α-tocopheryl acetate (200 mg/kg feed) and 5% rapeseed oil added to finisher diet (α-TOC), and (6) as (5) except green tea catechins (200 mg/kg feed) as antioxidant (GTC). Grass was included in pelleted form. Pigs were slaughtered at 105 kg and stored (24 h at 3°C) prior to removal of M. longissimus dorsi for subsequent analysis.

Muscle lipid extract was fractionated (neutral (NL) and polar lipid (PL) fractions) by the solid phase extraction (SPE) procedure of Lauridsen et al., (1999). Lipid fractions were transesterified using 0.05 M sodium methylate solution. Fatty acid methyl esters (FAMEs) were quantified using a Varian CP-3800 gas chromatograph equipped with FID and Varian CP-Sil 88 column (50 m × 0.25 mm i.d.). Helium was used as carrier gas at 30 psi. Oven temperature was programmed at 150°C for 35 min, increased at 4°C/min to 240°C and held for 2 min. Injector and detector temperatures were 270°C and 300°C respectively. FAMEs were identified by comparison with pure standards and expressed as a percentage of total fatty acids. Statistical analysis was carried out by GLM procedure (ANOVA) of SPSS (Chicago, IL,

Results and Discussion

Dietary treatments significantly affected SFA and MUFA contents of NL and MUFA and PUFA contents of PL (Table 1). Inclusion of rapeseed oil during re-alimentation (α-TOH and GTC diets) increased MUFA levels of both NL and PL fractions and improved (lowered) the n-6:n-3 balance of porcine muscle. The higher oleic acid (C18:1 n-9) levels observed in both lipid fractions resulting from dietary rapeseed oil inclusion is supported by the findings of Rhee et al. (1988). Animals fed rapeseed oil, however, also had significantly lower PL PUFA content than other dietary treatments (with the exception of GM50). Levels of arachidonic acid (C20:4 n-6) were highest in pigs fed GM105 diets, an effect supported by Bee et al., (2002), who reported an increase in this fatty acid in pigs fed low energy diets. It would appear that the increased levels of α-linolenic acid (C18:3 n-3) in PL fractions of α-TOH and GTC fed pigs were due to addition of rapeseed oil rather than the effects of grassmeal consumption.

With the exception of the palmitoleic acid (C16:1) content of NL, all MUFA contents of NL and PL fractions from Duroc pigs were higher than those from Landrace animals (Table 1). This effect is probably related to the higher IMF content of the former breed (Suzuki et al., 2003). Arachidonic acid (C20:4 n-6) contents were significantly higher in lipids from Landrace pigs. Pig genotype did not affect either SFA content or n-6:n-3 ratios of NL or PL fractions.

Table 1: Fatty acid compositions (%) of neutral and polar lipids of M. Longissimus dorsi muscle from pigs fed

		Neutral lipid								
Dietary treatment							Breed			
_ C	GM105	GM50	GM80	α-ТОН	GTC	sig	L	D		
	1.50	1.38	1,26	1.40	1.43		1.45	1.33		
22.16		21.80	22.31	21.55	21.75			22.10		
3.65°		$3.38^{ab}$	3.25 <sup>b</sup>	3.46ab	3.38ab	*		3.41		
12.39 <sup>a</sup>	11.63 <sup>ab</sup>	$11.17^{bc}$	11.41 <sup>bc</sup>	10.61°		***		11.43		
42.93°	43.06 <sup>a</sup>	42,34a	42.95ª	44-67 <sup>b</sup>		***		43.93		
7.32	7.30	7.68	7.08			ns		10		
0.75	0.76	0.73	0.67					7.36		
$0.35^{a}$	0.46°	$0.34^{a}$	0.42bc			***		0.74		
0.10	0.10	0.10						0.35		
0.24	0.26	0.29						0.10		
36,65°	35.21 <sup>ab</sup>	35.01 <sup>ab</sup>						0.30		
47.36 <sup>a</sup>	47.25°	46.67 <sup>a</sup>				***		35.51		
9.45	9.60							48.19		
7.42	7.28							9.52		
			7.4.1.2			IIS	1.37	7.14		
	1.36 22.16 3.65° 12.39° 42.93° 7.32 0.75 0.35° 0.10 0.24 36,65° 47.36° 9.45	1.36 1.50 22.16 21,39 3.65° 3,49° 12,39° 11.63° 142,93° 43.06° 7.32 7.30 0.75 0.76 0.35° 0.46° 0.10 0.10 0.10 0.24 0.26 36,65° 35,21° 47.25° 9.45 9.60	1.36         1.50         1.38           22.16         21.39         21.80           3.65a         3.49ab         3.38ab           12.39a         11.63ab         11.17bc           42.93a         43.06a         42.34a           7.32         7.30         7.68           0.75         0.76         0.73           0.35a         0.46c         0.34a           0.10         0.10         0.10           0.24         0.26         0.29           36.65a         35.21ab         35.01ab           47.36a         47.25a         46.67a           9.45         9.60         9.78           7.42         7.28         7.51	1.36         1.50         1.38         1.26           22.16         21,39         21.80         22.31           3.65°         3.49°         3.38°         3.25°           12,39°         11.63°         11.17°         11.41°           42.93°         43.06°         42,34°         42,95°           7.32         7.30         7.68         7.08           0.75         0.76         0.73         0.67°           0.35°         0.46°         0.34°         0.42°           0.10         0.10         0.10         0.10           0.24         0.26         0.29         0.28           36,65°         35,21°         35,01°         35.63°           47.36°         47.25°         46.67°         46.96°           9.45         9.60         9,78         9,23           7.42         7.28         7.51         7.49	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.36         1.50         1.38         1.26         1.40         1.43           22.16         21,39         21.80         22.31         21,55         21.75           3.65a         3.49ab         3.38ab         3.25b         3.46ab         3.38ab           12,39a         11.63ab         11.17bc         11.41bc         10.61c         10.76c           42.93a         43.06a         42.34a         42.95a         44.67b         44.94b           7.32         7.30         7.68         7.08         7.38         7.37           0.75         0.76         0.73         0.67         0.73         0.74           0.35a         0.46c         0.34a         0.42bc         0.37ab         0.38ab           0.10         0.10         0.10         0.10         0.10         0.09           0.24         0.26         0.29         0.28         0.32         0.26           47.36a         47.25a         46.67a         46.96a         49.01b         49.25b           9.45         9.60         9.78         9.23         9.60         9.54           7.42         7.28         7.51         7.49         7.07         7.35	1.36	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		

	Dietary treatment							Breed			
	C	GM105	GM50	GM80	α-ТОН	GTC	sig	I	D		
C14:0	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.40	0.43	0.44	ns	0.45	0.40	sig	
C16:0	19.49	19.67	19.90	19.43	19.49	19.71	ns	19.49		**	
C16:1	$0.76^{a}$	0.65ab	$0.66^{ab}$	$0.50^{b}$	0.58ab	0.60ab	*	0.58	19.74 0.67	ns *	
C18:0	8.68	9.99	8.75	9.20	9.27	9.86	*	9.19	9.40		
C18:1 (n-9)	12.08 <sup>a</sup>	11.94°	11.30°	11.83°	19.92 <sup>b</sup>	20.55b	申申米	14.12	15.09	ns **	
C18:2 (n-6)	28.93 <sup>ab</sup>	27.97 <sup>b</sup>	28,50 <sup>ab</sup>	29.49°	25.44°	25.21°	***	28.10	27.08	***	
C18:3 (n-3)	$0.74^{\rm ab}$	0.75 <sup>ab</sup>	$0.75^{ab}$	0.70°	0.84°	0.84°	*	0.77	0.77		
C20:4 (n-6)	11.82°	13.29°	11.16 <sup>a</sup>	$12.10^{b}$	11.77 <sup>ab</sup>	11.89 <sup>ab</sup>	***	12.35	11.66	11S ***	
C20:5 (n-3)	0.92	0.95	1.04	0.95	1.00	0.90	ns	0.99	0.93		
C22:6 (n-3)	1.26	0.97	1.07	1.11	1.16	1.25	ns	1.16	1.11	ns	
$\Sigma$ SFA <sup>1</sup>	31.25	32.99	31.96	32.07	31.98	32.88	ns	31.99	32.38	ns	
$\Sigma$ MUFA	13.24 <sup>a</sup>	12.92°	12.43"	12.85°	20.93 <sup>b</sup>	21.59b	***	15.11	16.21	ns **	
$\Sigma$ PUFA	45.97°	46.07°	44.47 <sup>b</sup>	46.44 <sup>a</sup>	42.40°	42,46 <sup>hc</sup>	***	45.51	43.76	***	
n-6/n-3	14.73 <sup>ab</sup>	16.51 <sup>a</sup>	15,56 <sup>ab</sup>	16.10 <sup>ab</sup>	13.05 <sup>e</sup>	13.14 <sup>c</sup>	**	14.95	14.75	ns.	

Sum of fatty acids: Not all data shown. Means within the same row with different superscripts significantly different, \* = P < 0.05, \*\* = P < 0.05, \*\* = P < 0.05.

## Conclusions

Lipid composition of porcine muscle was most affected by inclusion of rapeseed oil to re-alimentation diets. Such treatments enhanced the nutritional quality of pork through augmentation of MUFA content and improvement of the n-6:n-3 balance of PL fractions. Inclusion of grassmeal to pig diets or pig genotype did not affect n-6:n-3 ratios. Overall, diet and breed affected the PL fraction of muscle lipids to an extent greater than NL.

## References

- Bee, G., Gerbert, S., Messikommer, R. (2002). Effect of low energy supply and fat source on the fatty acid pattern of adipose and lean tissue and lipogenesis in the pig. Journal of Animal Science, 80: 1564–1574.
- Hornick, J.L., Van Eenaeme, C., Gerard, O., Dufrasne, I., Istasse, L. (2000). Mechanisms of reduced and compensatory growth. Domestic Animal Endocrinology, 19: 121-132.
- Lauridsen, C., Nielsen, J.H. Henckel, P., Sørensen, M.T. (1999). Antioxidative and oxidative status in muscles of pigs fed rapeseed oil, vitamin E, and copper. Journal of Animal Science, 77: 105-115.
- Rhee, K.S., Ziprin, Y.A., Ordonez, G., Bohac, C.E. (1988). Fatty acid profiles of the total lipids and lipid oxidation in pork muscles as affected by canola oil in the animal diet and muscle location. Meat Science, 23: 201-210.
- Suzuki, K., Shibata, T., Kadowaki, H., Abe, H., Toyoshima, T. (2003). Meat quality comparison of Berkshire, Duroc and crossbred pigs sired by Berkshire and Duroc. Meat Science, 64: 35-42.