## IMPROVAC® IMMUNIZED BOARS COMPARED TO SURGICAL CASTRATES: CONTROL OF BOAR TAINT AND GROWTH PERFORMANCE

E.T.F. Silveira\*<sup>1</sup>, E. Poleze<sup>2</sup>, O. Umehara<sup>2</sup>, A.P. Tonietti<sup>1</sup>, M.L.T. Buzelli<sup>1</sup>, M.M.H Haguiwara<sup>1</sup>, L. Miyagusku<sup>1</sup> and D. Hennessu<sup>3</sup>

Institute of Food Technology, Meat Technology Center, Av. Brasil, 2880, 17070-178, Campinas, SP, Brasil, 2 Institute of Food Technology, Medi Technology Center, Av. Brasil, 2880, 17070-178, Campinas, SP, Brasil, 2 Institute of Food Technology, Medi Technology Center, Av. Brasil, 2880, 17070-178, Campinas, SP, Brasil, 2 Institute of Food Technology, Medi Technology, Amalar 04717-000, São Paulo, Brasil, <sup>3</sup> Pfizer Australia, 231/1 Queens Road Melbourne, Vic Australia 3004. Email: tadeu.s@uol.com.br

Keywords: pigs, Improvac® vaccine, boar taint, growth performance, meat yields

Introduction
International competition is driving the pig meat production chain to invest more in food safety, animal welfare, International competition is a second control of the production of and enables better production efficiency when compared to castrated pigs. However, consumer acceptance of fresh pork and enables pigs is hindered by the taint compounds. Androstoppes (a clearly seems) and enables better production with the state of the state from intact mate pigs is finded by the state of the produced by testes) and skatole produced by bacteria in the gut) have been recognised to be the major causes of taint (Babol et al., 2002). This study could be evaluate the efficiency of Improvac® a vaccine dispersal assume that the efficiency of Improvac® a vaccine dispersal assume that the efficiency of Improvac® as vaccine dispersal assume that the efficiency of Improvac® as vaccine dispersal assume that the efficiency of Improvac® as vaccine dispersal assume that the efficiency of Improvac® as vaccine dispersal as the efficiency of Improvac® (produced by pacteria in the gas). This study was conducted to evaluate the efficiency of Improvac®, a vaccine directed against gonadotrophin – releasing factor (GRF), to control boar taint and to allow improved growth performance by rearing entire male pigs rather than surgically castrated male pigs.

Animals. A total of 48 male pigs, 18-22 days old, initial weight 4.2 – 8.5 kg, from the same farm and genetic origin Animals. A total of the same farm and genetic origin were allocated systematically according to presentation order into two experimental groups (T01-24 surgically castrated and T02-24 Improvac® vaccinated). Improvac® was administered subcutaneously as two 2mL doses; the first dose at and 102-24 impression and the second dose at about 19 weeks of age. Two critically ill pigs from group T01 were withdrawn

Production performance. At the end of the experimental period the following parameters were evaluated: mean weight (MW), average daily weight gain (ADG), feed efficiency (FE), and meat yields (MY) in half carcass.

Slaughter. The animals were kept in the evaluation station for 20 weeks then slaughtered in a commercial abattoir at 23 weeks. The chilled carcasses were transported to the Meat Technology Centre and prepared for boning purposes according to the methodology described by Walstra and Merkus (1996).

Evaluations Serum testosterone analysis was performed according to Nunes (1982). Skatole and androstenone fat assays evaluations followed the methodology modified by Oliveira et al., (1999).

Statistical analysis. The statistical design was based on randomised block design blocked on pen location. Mean of weights, feed efficiency, average daily weight gain, carcass evaluations, and androstenone levels were analysed using general linear models with terms including the fixed effect of treatment group and the random effect of block, assessed at 5% significance level.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1 contains the results of the boar taint compounds for both treatment groups. Only two animals (both in group 102) had a testosterone value above the limit of detection (0.1 pg/mL). No animals in either group had a value for skatole above the accepted sensory threshold limit of 0.2 µg/g (Desmoulin et al., 1982). There were no significant differences between Improvac® vaccinated and surgically castrated pigs for androstenone levels, which were under the accepted sensory threshold limit of 1.0 µg/g (Bonneau et al., 1993), confirming the efficiency of the Improvac® vaccine. Improvac® vaccinated pigs had a significantly higher mean weight, higher average daily weight gain and better feed efficiency, and higher meat yields than surgically castrated pigs (Table 2). This agrees with the results of Mecauley et al., (2003) who reported that Improvac vaccinated pigs may be a means of maintaining high weight gain in the period while maximizing growth performance in finishing boars. Carcass weight was higher in T02 but not significant. Moreover, there was an increase in the amount of meat in some commercial cuts such as leg (P=0.052), lenderloin (P<0.05), shoulder, belly, and ventral part of the belly (P<0.05), representing economical advantages for the pork industry since both markets, fresh and processed products, are reached simultaneously.

## Conclusions

Improvac® was highly effective in controlling boar taint compounds and in suppressing testosterone to levels comparable to those normally found in surgically castrated pigs. Improvac® boars had a significantly better mean weight, average daily weight gain, feed efficiency, and total meat yield compared to surgically castrated pigs.

Table 1: Serum testosterone, skatole and androstenone fat values.

Evaluations	Surgically Castrated (n=22)*	Improvac Vaccinated (n=24)	P Values
Testosterone (pg/ml):			
< 0.1 n (%)	22 (100%)	22 (92%)	N/A
0.4 – 2.2 n (%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	
katole (μg/g):	i f	. ,	
< 0.2 n (%)	22 (100%)	24 (100%)	N/A
androstenone (μg/g):	, , ,		14/2%
Beometric mean	0.32	0.28	0.37

<sup>\*</sup> Two critically ill pigs from the surgically castrated group were withdrawn from the study.

Table 2: Growth performance values.

Production	Surgically	Improvac	P
Parameters	Castrated	Vaccinated	Values
Mean Weight (kg)	124.41	137.76	0.0025
Average Daily Gain (kg/day)	0.851	0.944	0.0032
Feed Efficiency	2.467	2.237	< 0.0001
Carcass Weight (kg)	103.82	108.93	0.09
Meat Yields	26.640	29.057	0.0052

## References

Babol, J., Squires, E.J. and Gullet, E.A. (2002) Factors affecting the level of boar taint in entire male pigs as assessed by consumers' sensory panel. Meat Science, 61: 33-40.

Bonneau, M. (1993) Effects of different compounds on boar taint. 44<sup>TH</sup> Ann. Mtg. Europ. Assoc. Anim. Prod., Aarhus Desmoulin, B., Bonneau, M., Frouin, A. and Bidadrd, J. P. (1982) Consumer testing of pork and processed meat from boars: the influence of fat androstenone level. Livestock Production Science, 9, 707-715.

Mccauley, I.; Watt, M., Suster, D., Kerton, D. J., Oliver, W. T., Harrell, R.J. and Dunshea, F. R. A (2003) Gulff vaccine (Improvac®) and porcine somatotropin (Reporcin®) have synergistic effects upon growth performance in both boars and gilts. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research, 54: 11-20.

Oliveira, J.J.V., Silveira, E.T.F. and Viana, A. G. (1999) Determinação de escatol e androstenona em toucinho e glândula salivar submaxilar de suínos. Revista Brasileira de Análise de Alimentos, 5: 12-20.

Walstra, P. and Merkus, G.S.M. (1996) Procedure for assessment of the lean meat percentage as a consequence of the new EU reference dissection method in pig carcass classification. Report ID-DLO 96,014. Lelystad: DLO-Institute for Animal Science and Health, p. 22,