 Peer reviewed

The replacement gilt: Current strategies for improvement of the breeding herd

Martyna M. Małopolska, MS; Ryszard Tuz, PhD; Barry D. Lambert, PhD; Jacek Nowicki, PhD; Tomasz Schwarz, PhD

Summary

The efficiency of swine production is affected by many factors. One of the most economically important factors is gilt reproductive performance. To achieve satisfactory results in breeding, both environmental and genetic factors must be monitored and constantly improved. For many years, intensive selection in the swine industry for increased carcass muscle to fat ratio has led to deterioration in some reproductive traits (eg, less favorable development of the reproductive system in gilts, problems with fertilization, large litters but tiny piglets). In recent years, many producers have focused on increasing litter size and weaning weights of piglets in addition to an emphasis on increasing sow productive life span. In replacement gilts, the systematic evaluation of both reproductive and structural soundness is of paramount importance. The main aim of this review is to summarize the current criteria for selecting replacement gilts.

Keywords: swine, gilt selection, reproductive efficiency, replacement gilts, breeding herd

Received: June 14, 2017
Accepted: March 11, 2018

Resumen – La hembra de reemplazo: Estrategias actuales para la mejora del hato de cría

La eficiencia de la producción porcina es afectada por muchos factores. Uno de los factores económicamente más importantes es el desempeño reproductivo de la hembra de reemplazo. Para lograr resultados satisfactorios en las hembras de cría, se deben monitorear y mejorar constantemente, tanto los factores los medioambientales y genéticos. Por muchos años, la selección intensiva en la industria porcina para el aumento en la relación músculo grasa de la canal ha llevado al deterioro de algunas características reproductivas (vg, un desarrollo menos favorable del sistema reproductivo en hembras de reemplazo, problemas de fecundación, camadas grandes pero lechones pequeños). En años recientes, muchos productores se han enfocado en el aumento el tamaño de la camada y peso de destete de los lechones, además del énfasis en el aumento de la vida reproductiva de la hembra. En las hembras de reemplazo, la evaluación sistemática de la solidez reproductiva y estructural es de primordial importancia. El principal objetivo de esta revisión es resumir los criterios actuales para la selección de hembras de reemplazo.

Résumé – La cochette de remplacement: Stratégies actuelles pour l'amélioration du troupeau reproducteur

L'efficacité de la production porcine est affectée par plusieurs facteurs. Un des plus importants facteurs économiques est la performance reproductrice des cochettes. Afin d'obtenir des résultats satisfaisants en reproduction, les facteurs environnementaux et génétiques doivent être surveillés et constamment améliorés. Pendant plusieurs années la sélection intensive dans l'industrie porcine pour l'augmentation du ratio muscle de la carcasse/gras a mené à la détérioration de certaines caractéristiques liées à la reproduction (eg, développement moins favorable du système reproducteur des cochettes, problèmes de fertilisation, portées nombreuses mais petits porcelets). Au cours des dernières années plusieurs producteurs se sont concentrés à augmenter la taille des portées et sur le poids des porcelets au sevrage en plus de mettre une emphase sur l'augmentation de la vie reproductive des truies. Chez les cochettes de remplacement l'évaluation systématique des qualités reproductive et structurale sont d'importance primordiale. L'objectif principal de la présente revue est de résumer les critères courants pour sélectionner les cochettes de remplacement.

Reproduction is one of the most important factors influencing the efficiency of livestock production. In swine production systems, management and selection of replacement gilts is of great importance as these gilts represent the future production potential of the herd.[1] Unfortunately, heritability of most reproductive traits is low, and thus it may be difficult to improve reproductive traits through selection.[2,3] Those low heritable traits, such as fertility and piglet survival rate, are dependent on complex interactions between sow, boar, and embryo or piglet genotypes. Although, traits dependent on the female genotype (ie, ovulation rate and age at puberty) are possible to improve.[4] Proper selection of replacement gilts is based on many factors ranging from predicted reproductive ability to phenotypic production traits. The culmination of genetic factors, such as adequate growth and development, as well as

MMM, RT, JN, TS: Department of Swine and Small Animal Breeding, University of Agriculture in Krakow, Krakow, Poland.

MMM: Department of Pig Breeding, National Research Institute of Animal Production, Balice n. Krakow, Poland.

BDL: Department of Animal Science and Veterinary Technology, Tarleton State University, Stephenville, Texas.

Corresponding author: Martyna Małopolska, Department of Swine and Small Animal Breeding, University of Agriculture in Krakow, al. Mickiewicza 24/28 room 341, 30-059 Krakow, Poland; Tel: +48508561300; E-mail: martyna.malopolska@izoo.krakow.pl.

This article is available online at http://www.aasv.org/shap.html.

Małopolska MM, Tuz R, Lambert BD, et al. The replacement gilt: Current strategies for improvement of the breeding herd. *J Swine Health Prod.* 2018;26(4):208-214.

environmental factors, such as management and selection, must be efficiently managed to maximize profit. This review article presents the current state of knowledge regarding selection of replacement gilts and the reproductive issues associated with gilts.

Herd management

The future production potential of a herd is closely related to replacement selection. Proper gilt selection is not a guarantee of profit, stability, or high business efficiency, but is a prerequisite for success. The number of sows culled annually by a farm depends on many factors such as health, climate, management, and breeding system. Annual sow culling rates have been reported to be 35% to 59%.[5-11] According to Früh,[12] in organic farms, more sows are culled in indoor (47.7%) than outdoor housing systems (45.8%). High replacement rates during the year may adversely affect the herd performance and production costs. The main reasons for culling sows are reproductive issues, such as return to service, failure to conceive, and anestrus, but production issues such as small litter size and lameness also contribute.[7,13] Reproductive issues comprise 27% to 34% of all culled sows,[5,7] while lameness disorders account for 22.5%.[14] The occurrence of reproductive failure increasing non-productive days in the herd can cause frequent replacement of females.[15] Early culling practices reduce profit from the investment while late culling practices for low performing individuals can affect herd profitability.[16]

Years of unilateral pig selection to achieve a high growth rate and faster rates of lean muscle gain has negatively impacted sow reproductive performance.[17,18] Szostak[19] showed that a high rate of growth negatively influences fertilization effectiveness and number of piglets born and reared in the first litter. According to Hermesch et al,[20] litter size was negatively correlated with growth rate, especially in the first parity (r_g = -0.30 for 3 to 18 weeks; r_g = -0.42 for 18 to 22 weeks). The results of other studies showed fast growing gilts were less likely to farrow (r = 0.52).[21] Additionally, rapid growth can lead to infantile development of the reproductive system[22] and has negative genetic associations with sow reproductive lifetime (r = -0.02 to -0.08).[23] Despite this, development of new methods for improving breeding herd and genomic knowledge provides an opportunity to improve rearing ability. Su et al[24] reported that selection for total number born between 1992 and 2004 led to an increase of 3.8 piglets per litter for Danish Landrace and 3.0 piglets for Danish Yorkshire, reaching 15.6 and 16.7 piglets per litter respectively in 2015.[25] Reproductive traits have a low to moderate heritability and are affected largely by external and internal environment.[26,27] Heritability estimates range from 0 to 0.73 for age at puberty, 0 to 0.76 for total number piglets born, 0 to 0.66 for number of piglets born alive, and 0 to 0.23 for prenatal survival rate.[4] Therefore, many factors can cause problems with reproduction including management, lack of or unsystematic production results, semen quality, poor estrus detection, length of lactation, health, feed quality, feeding management (especially during lactation), ineffective insemination, and other reproductive disorders.[15,26] Those factors lead to return to service, thereby decreasing reproductive efficiency and increasing non-productive days. It also negatively impacts farm economics because producers are not able to maintain production levels.[28] Research conducted by Iida and Koketsu[29] on Japanese herds showed 11.6% of gilts and 9% of sows returned to service. In the United States, the percentage of animals returning to service were 14% for gilts and 7% to 9% for sows.[15,30] Gilts were more likely to return to service than sows but occurrence of anestrus is higher in groups of multiparous sows when lactation duration is 15 to 19 days.[31] Moreover, incorrect detection of estrus reduces farrowing rate and causes a decreased number of litters per sow per year.[32]

Age at puberty

Onset of puberty in gilts is associated with the occurrence of first estrus. Age of first estrus and mating or insemination of gilts has an impact on subsequent reproductive performance and longevity.[33-36] Age at puberty is moderately heritable (r = 0.38), so potential opportunities for selection exist.[37] To decide when to start breeding gilts and how long they can be retained in the breeding herd, producers should consider the housing system to be used, herd management practices, longevity, and reproductive performance.[38] The onset of puberty is influenced by many factors including genotype, technique and effectiveness of estrus detection, season, environment, boar exposure, nutrition, and health.[11,39-41]

Both longevity and future reproductive efficiency are dependent on age at first mating.[35,42] Ovulation rate at first estrus is lower than in subsequent cycles,[43] indicating that artificial insemination (AI) or natural breeding should be carried out in the second or third estrus.[44] Le Cozler et al[34] and Young et al[11] demonstrated that the age of first farrowing affects herd management and showed that younger gilts (< 185 days of age) had more piglets over parities 1 to 3 than older gilts. Whereas, Tummaruk et al[45] showed that females whose dams were gilts grew slower, had less backfat at 100 days of age, and were mated later than their counterparts reared from multiparous sows. Moreover, it was observed that females from smaller litters reached sexual maturity earlier than gilts from larger litters. Lammers et al[46] reported that gilts reach sexual maturity between 160 and 190 days of age. Similarly, Tummaruk et al[36] reported that sexual maturity occurred at 180 to 210 days of age (6 to 7 months), while the results of previous studies indicate 200 to 220 days.[38] In tropical climates, the first estrus of gilts was observed from 188 to 251 days of age.[36,47] In Scandinavian countries, the reported average age for onset of sexual maturity was: 229 days in March and 245 in November (Sweden),[48] 210 to 270 days with 120 kg body weight (Sweden),[45] and 235 days (Finland).[49]

Delayed age of first mating in gilts increases the number of non-productive days and can negatively influence subsequent reproductive performance. According to Kapelańska et al,[50] it is possible to decrease the age of first mating to less than 6.5 months of age without negative consequences to their future productivity. Moreover, it would be beneficial for a farm's economic efficiency in pig production. On the other hand, the rapid development of a gilt's reproductive system starts from 6 months of age and is usually concurrent with the first estrus cycle. Therefore, mating gilts at this time may have negative effects on growth of the gilt and number of piglets born.

Weight and backfat thickness

Body weight and backfat thickness have an impact on gilt reproduction.[51] The proper body weight at breeding is necessary to protect females against excessive weight loss during their first lactation.[52] In a study conducted by Williams et al,[53] gilts with lower body weight (< 135 kg) had smaller litters their first three parities (31.1 total piglets born) than heavier females (32.3 to 33.1 total piglets born). Small litter size occurred among gilts whose backfat thickness was more than 20 mm.[51] The studies conducted by Tummaruk et al[36] showed on average that Landrace × Yorkshire females had their first estrus at 195 days of age with 106 kg body weight and 13 mm backfat thickness. Recent research from the same laboratory showed that replacement gilts should be bred at 240 days of age, with 130 kg body weight and 17 mm backfat thickness.[47] It was confirmed by Amaral Filha et al[54] that the largest litters were from sows with backfat thickness 16 to 17 mm. Appropriate backfat thickness results in a positive effect on litter weight and consequently limits piglet losses in the rearing period. Kummer et al[55] suggested that AI in gilts between 185 and 209 days of age is possible without adverse effects if the growth rate of individuals exceeds 700 g/day.

Season and climate

Reproductive efficiency is significantly correlated with season due to seasonal infertility. Seasonal infertility is defined as the difference between the number of successful inseminations in the summer (weeks 25 to 42) and winter seasons (weeks 1 to 18) in the same year.[56] It has been shown that the farrowing rate is lower in spring and summer than in winter.[48] Additionally, gilts born in the spring reach puberty later than those born in autumn.[57] Jarczyk and Nogaj[58] found that birth in the spring and summer seasons, positively affected reproductive efficiency and lifetime performance. Moreover, sows born from September to February had smaller litters with a higher number of males than those sows born from March to August.[59] Kawęcka et al[60] found no effect of season on the effectiveness of AI. Additionally, they noted the beneficial effect of AI, especially in summer, on the fertilization rate and the number of piglets born alive per litter. These findings were confirmed by Rekiel et al[26] which showed that stabilization of the environment inside modern pig facilities eliminated the seasonal influence on reproduction efficiency.

Studies conducted in Thailand showed that reproductive efficiency is lower in tropical than in temperate zones. The factors negatively affecting reproduction, especially the delay of first estrus and decreased litter size, include high temperature and humidity.[61-65] Pigs are very sensitive to ambient temperatures, especially in the absence of proper ventilation and can quickly become overheated. Heat stress results in decreased ovulation rate, conception rate, decreased embryo survival, and abnormal development and mortality of embryos. Gilts are the most vulnerable to adverse environmental conditions.[65]

Selection criteria

Gilt selection criteria often vary based on production goals.[66] Routine selection of gilts provides the opportunity to choose the best female for breeding. First, pre-selection should be made on the day of weaning, choosing two or three more piglets than needed as replacements, and focused on the health of individuals and pre-weaning average daily gain.[67,68] Pre-weaning growth rate positively affected post weaning growth performance and subsequent reproductive performance of sows in later life.[68-70] Moreover, Vallet et al[70] reported that selection of gilts with high birth weight characterized by slow growth rate (0.05 kg/day) during the pre-weaning period reached puberty later than gilts with lower birth weight but with higher pre-weaning growth rate. Previous results showed a relationship between weaning age and a gilt's subsequent reproduction where an increased weaning age by one day resulted in an increase of 0.185 piglets per sow per year.[68] The author[68] suggested increasing weaning age to 25 days. Additionally, gilts selected for breeding should weigh at least 7.5 kg at weaning. Final selection should be carried out around 140 days of age and should include a visual evaluation of structure with respect to feet and legs, underline, and external genitalia.[67]

Another form of selection is a one-step selection, carried out at 5 to 6 months of age. During this time, traits such as body weight, body condition, structure, backfat thickness, number of estrus cycles, and growth rate[44,71,72] are used in selection. Some researchers expanded those criteria to include structural soundness, body condition, vulva size, number of nipples, body weight, and litter size at birth.[41,46]

Criterion 1: Structural soundness and condition

Hooves and legs indicate strength and durability. Desirable legs are strong, straight, set to pasterns, and wide apart. Legs with very soft pasterns, buck kneed, too steep hock joints, or with any other abnormalities are undesirable. Properly developed limbs will support the added weight of the boar during mating, maintain proper condition during pregnancy, and prevent piglet crushing during farrowing. The problems with poor feet and leg soundness and osteochondrosis are one of the main reasons to replace sows.[32,73] Those weaknesses are visible during locomotion and changes in leg position.[74] Osteochondrosis is caused by a few factors including rapid growth, inheritance, or nutrition.[75] According to Yazdi et al,[76] correlation between osteochondrosis and longevity was low ($r = 0.07$) but significant ($P < .01$). Consequently, higher risk of culling occurs, impacting sow longevity. Heritability estimates for leg structure traits, leg score, and locomotion are low to moderate depending on the population and favorably associated with sow longevity.[23,77,78] Direct selection for improved leg soundness provides an opportunity to increase sow lifetime productivity. The two types of scoring systems for leg confirmation traits are binary and linear.[79] Both types depend on observers' training and experience, which may cause wide variations.[80]

Criterion 2: Reproductive organs

The udder is a very important criterion for replacement gilts, especially when modern females can farrow more piglets than the number of functional nipples. The evaluation is based on the number, size, shape, and location of the nipples. The udder should be wide and properly developed. Gilts should have at least 12 to 16 nipples.[41,44,46,81] Regardless of the number, the nipples should be in a straight line and evenly spaced to provide free access to all piglets. The last 3 or 4 pairs of nipples tend to tilt, making it difficult for piglets to access them. It is important to avoid clogged nipples as this is a serious problem during farrowing.[81] The number of nipples is affected by the presence of males in the litter from which the gilt was born (more males in the litter results in gilts with fewer nipples).[27,82] The gilt should have a well-developed and well-shaped vulva, proportional in size, with the tip pointing downward.[41,81]

Criterion 3: Body weight and litter size at birth

Gilts are impacted by the dam's fertility, milk production, and reproductive history, which is based on performance in the same housing conditions of the dam, gilt offspring of the dam, and siblings to the gilt undergoing selection from previous litters.[32] Additionally, a dam's reproductive history is based on good maternal ability. This trait is very individual, so elimination of sows with poor maternal responsiveness should be based on behavioral observations.[83,84] There are two main trends of choosing gilts based on litter size. First, replacement gilts should be chosen from the largest and heaviest litter and their dams should have a high fertility rate, at least 12 to 13 piglets per litter.[26] Moreover, gilts should be chosen from sows in their third parity, when it is possible to assess the fertility of the dam.[85] On the other hand, Jarczyk et al[86] showed that replacement gilts should be selected from smaller litters because they have more uterine space, and consequently had better conditions for development and growth during gestation. Additionally, research conducted by Flowers[87] showed positive effects of being raised in a small litter which consequently increased gilt longevity (to parity 6) and lifetime reproductive performance. Replacement gilts from litters with a larger number of females had more piglets than gilts from litters with more male siblings.[88] Litters with more than 12 piglets and a large number of males (67%) can cause problems with reproduction for gilts from this litter.[77,89] This is due to the occurrence of one-way blood flow in the uterus and because fetuses are exposed to hormones produced by the embryos that preceded them, which may be the other sex.[27,82]

Criterion 4: Growth rates

Gilts, which consume more feed, grow faster but tend to accumulate fat. Overweight gilts at breeding are a possible risk factor for reduced longevity and herd reproductive efficiency.[90] It is important to choose gilts with a good appetite but to prevent their excessive fattening.[46]

Construction of reproductive organs and uterine capacity

The length of the vagina and cervix and uterine capacity are increasingly used as indicators of reproductive efficiency. Uterine capacity is defined as the ability of the uterus to provide the appropriate development of some number of embryos from implantation until birth.[91,92] Each incremental increase in uterine size increases the number of offspring obtained because the uterine horn length is correlated with ovulation rate.[91,93,94] Thus, uterine size is an important limiting factor affecting litter size at birth. Prenatal mortality is mostly caused by intrauterine crowding .[95] Fetuses that die in a crowded uterus are more likely to be male.[82] In addition to limited space in the uterus, another important conceptus survival factor is the appropriate transport of necessary nutrients.[96] It is observed that localization of an embryo within the uterine horn is correlated with its survival and growth.[26,27] Thus, longer uterine horns can interfere with the ability of the uterus to provide the necessary nutrients for all fetuses.[93] There are several scientific theories which try to explain this relationship. According to the theory from Mossman,[97] embryos implanted closest to the ovary demonstrate the greatest degree of development. In turn, Hammond[98] proposed that the rate of metabolic processes in different tissues influences the distribution of nutrients carried by the blood. Therefore, with limited nutrients, just the most important tissue may continue to grow at the expense of lower tissue metabolism.[27] Consequently, in numerous litters, the fetal development was delayed and reduced birth body weight occurred. It is caused by the rate of blood flow through the placenta, not by uterine mass.[26] A unidirectional flow of blood passes through the pig uterus washing all fetuses inside the uterine horns.[27] Another theory seeking to explain the relationship between the embryo growth and survival was formulated by Eckstein et al,[99] whereby the number of embryos in the uterine horns affects the weight of the fetus and mass of the placenta. Embryos are exposed to two impact factors: a larger number of embryos in the uterine horn results in lower blood pressure and reduced blood pressure indirectly impacts the size of the fetus.[27] Even in the early stage of pregnancy, the competition for nutrients and space is observed among fetuses.[100] The optimum space for each embryo in the uterine horn should be 20 to 35 cm.[27] Previous research suggested 36 cm as the minimal space for normal development for every fetus.[101] The uterine horn length can only be measured posthumously, so it leads to the search for correlations with other reproductive organs. Rillo et al[102] reported that for each centimeter the vagina increased in length, the uterine horns increased 8 to 9 cm. Furthermore, other research showed a relationship between vaginal and cervix length (VCL) and litter size.[9,103,104] It is confirmed by Dybała et al,[105] who also reported that sows with a longer VCL were from litters that had 0.98 more piglets when compared to gilts with a shorter VCL. On the other hand, Tarocco and Kirkwood[106] obtained opposite results. They suggested the measurement of VCL in the second estrus was not an indicator of litter size. Uterine size and VCL showed great diversity between females and increased with gilt age and subsequent litters.[93,107,108] Although, according to Dominguez et al,[109] the reproductive tract of gilts stabilized after the first litter, so gilts have a shorter VCL than sows after first parity. Therefore, the length of reproductive organs is not a significant factor for gilt selection and determination for their future potential. However, other researchers have reported correlations between: ovulation rate and length of uterine horn ($r = 0.38$), prenatal survival of fetuses and uterine capacity ($r = 0.95$), uterine length and capacity ($r = 0.51$), and VCL and litter size ($r = 0.36$).[9,93,108]

Boar exposure

Replacement gilts with body weights between 90 and 100 kg should be introduced into the breeding herd, as it is the optimal time to use boar exposure. The stimulation should be started around 140 days of age because age at puberty has been shown to be associated with age at onset of boar exposure.[110] On the other hand, van Wettere et al[42] suggested that first boar exposure should be delayed until 182 days of age because greater synchrony occurred within gilt groups. After stimulation, gilts achieved first estrus sooner and consequently their lifetime productivity was greater. Kaneko and Koketsu[111] noticed gilts in herds using boar exposure were around 13 days younger at first mating than those in herds using only indirect boar contact. It is assumed that gilts that experience estrus within 30 days of boar stimulation will have more piglets in their first litter and reach greater lifetime productivity.[33]

Longevity

High breeding herd productivity is associated with sow longevity. Many factors impact sow longevity, including genetics, nutrition, housing, disease, age at first mating, length of lactation, body condition, and growth rate.[32,112,113] The goal is for the first litter produced by a replacement gilt to recuperate the cost of her introduction into the herd. Subsequent litters will bring economic profit to producers.[46] To maximize profitability of sows, females are replaced after 4 to 5 parities[16] or longer on small farms and at 3 to 4 parities or earlier on large farms.[7,114] The decision to replace sows depends mostly on average herd productivity. The most productive parities are 2, 3 and 4[33,63,115] with a reduction of 0.3 to 1 piglets beginning with parity 5. A high sow culling rate decreases farm productivity, especially in terms of the average number of piglets weaned per sow per year and increases the risk of introducing diseases into the herd by replacement gilts.

Summary

Over the last 20 to 30 years, the swine industry has undergone numerous changes. Despite those substantial technological and scientific changes, methodology involved in replacement gilt selection has remained largely the same as 20 years ago. The traditional selection of replacement gilts does not completely guarantee suitable reproductive efficiency. The greatest hopes are focused on genetic improvement, increased selection intensity, and the opportunity for producers to select animals with improved reproductive efficiency. Methods such as maternal responsiveness and VCL hold promise for such improvements, but more research and development is needed to perfect and disseminate these methodologies as selection tools.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the University of Agriculture in Krakow (DS 3265 ZHT-ChiDI).

Conflict of interest

None reported.

Disclaimer

Scientific manuscripts published in the *Journal of Swine Health and Production* are peer reviewed. However, information on medications, feed, and management techniques may be specific to the research or commercial situation presented in the manuscript. It is the responsibility of the reader to use information responsibly and in accordance with the rules and regulations governing research or the practice of veterinary medicine in their country or region.

References

*1. Safranski T. Management of replacement gilts. Paper presented at: PORK Academy; June 2005; Des Moines, Iowa.

2. Suwanasopee T, Koonawootrittriron S. Genetic markers on reproductive traits in pigs. *Thai J Vet Med Suppl*. 2011;41:73-76.

3. Wilkie PJ, Paszek AA, Beattie CW, Alexander LJ, Wheeler MB, Schook LB. A genomic scan of porcine reproductive traits reveals possible quantitative trait loci (QTLs) for number of corpora lutea. *Mamm Genome*. 1999;10:573-578.

4. Bidanel JP. Biology and genetics of reproduction. In: Rothschild MF, Ruvinsky A, eds. *The Genetics of the Pig*. 2nd ed. Wallingford, UK: CAB International; 2011:222-232.

5. Engblom L, Lundeheim N, Dalin AM, Andersson K. Sow removal in Swedish commercial herds. *Livest Sci*. 2007;106:76-86.

6. Kaneko M, Iida R, Koketsu Y. Herd management procedures and factors associated with low farrowing rate of female pigs in Japanese commercial herds. *Prev Vet Med*. 2013;109:69-75.

7. Lucia T Jr, Dial GD, Marsh WE. Lifetime reproductive performance in female pigs having distinct reasons for removal. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2000;63:213-222.

8. Onteru SK, Fan B, Nikkilä MT, Garrick DJ, Stalder KJ, Rothschild MF. Whole-genome association analyses for lifetime reproductive traits in the pig. *J Anim Sci*. 2011;89:988-995.

9. Martin Rillo S, de Alba Romero C, Romero Rodriguez A, Cidoncha R, Ziecik AJ. Litter size and vagina-cervix catheter penetration length in gilts. *Reprod Domest Anim*. 2001;36:297-300.

10. Stalder KJ, Saxton AM, Conatser GE, Serenius TV. Effect of growth and compositional traits on first parity and lifetime reproductive performance in U.S. Landrace sows. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2005;97:151-159.

11. Young MG, Tokach MD, Aherne FX, Dritz SS, Goodband RD, Nelssen JL, Loughin TM. Effect of space allowance during rearing and selection criteria on performance of gilts over three parities in a commercial swine production system. *J Anim Sci*. 2008;86:3181-3193.

*12. Früh B. *Organic Pig Production in Europe. Health Management in Common Organic Pig Farming*. Switzerland: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL); 2011:4. http://orgprints.org/19166/1/MB_OrganicPigProduction_en_11_leicht.pdf. Accessed May 16, 2014.

13. Tummaruk P, Kesdangsakonwut S, Kunavongkrit A. Relationships among specific reasons for culling, reproductive data, and gross morphology of the genital tracts in gilts culled due to reproductive failure in Thailand. *Theriogenology*. 2009;71:369-375.

14. Zhao Y, Liu X, Mo D, Chen Q, Chen Y. Analysis of reasons for sow culling and seasonal effects on reproductive disorders in Southern China. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2015;159:191-197.

15. Vargas AJ, Bernardi ML, Bortolozzo FP, Mellagi AP, Wentz I. Factors associated with return to estrus in first service swine females. *Prev Vet Med*. 2009;89:75-80.

16. Rodriguez-Zas SL, Davis CB, Ellinger PN, Schnitkey GD, Romine NM, Connor JF, Knox RV, Southey BR. Impact of biological and economic variables on optimal parity for replacement in swine breed-to-wean herds. *J Anim Sci*. 2006;84:2555-2565.

17. Kernerová N, Václavovský J, Matoušek V, Hanyková Z. The use of performance test parameters for selection of gilts before their placement into breeding. *Czech J Anim Sci*. 2006;51:253-261.

18. Matysiak B, Kawęcka M, Pietruszka A, Jacyno E, Kołodziej-Skalska A. Użytkowość rozpłodowa loch w zależności od stopnia umięśnienia w dniu pierwszego pokrycia [Reproduction performance of sows depending on level of meatiness during first service]. *Acta Sci Pol, Zootechnica*. 2010;9:153-160.

19. Szostak B. The influence of the intensity of the growth of gilts on the reproduction performance in first farrow. *Acta Sci Pol, Zootechnica*. 2011;10:141-148.

20. Hermesch S, Luxford BG, Graser HU. Genetic parameters for lean meat yield, meat quality, reproduction and feed efficiency traits for Australian pigs: 3. Genetic parameters for reproduction traits and genetic correlations with production, carcase and meat quality traits. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2000;65:261-270.

21. Knauer MT, Cassady JP, Newcom DW, See MT. Phenotypic and genetic correlations between gilt estrus, puberty, growth, composition, and structural conformation traits with first-litter reproductive measures. *J Anim Sci*. 2011;89:935-942.

22. Kapelański W, Jankowiak H, Bocian M, Grajewska S, Dybała J, Cebulska A. The effect of the growth rate and meatiness of young gilts during rearing on the growth and development of their reproductive system. *Acta Vet Brno*. 2013;82:19-24.

23. Serenius T, Stalder KJ. Genetics of length of productive life and lifetime prolificacy in the Finnish Landrace and Large White pig populations. *J Anim Sci*. 2004;82:3111-3117.

24. Su G, Lund MS, Sorensen D. Selection for litter size at day five to improve litter size at weaning and piglet survival rate. *J Anim Sci*. 2007;85:1385-1392.

*25. SEGES Pig Research Centre. Annual Report 2015. http://www.pigresearchcentre.dk/~/media/Files/PDF%20-%20Aarsberetning%20VSP%20English/VSP%C3%A5rsberetning%20UK%202015.pdf. Published March 2016. Accessed October 2, 2017.

26. Rekiel A, Więcek J, Rafalak S, Ptak J, Blicharski T. Effect of size of the litter in which Polish Landrace and Polish Large White sows were born on the number of piglets born and reared. *Roczniki Naukowe Polskiego Towarzystwa Zootechnicznego*. 2013;9:41-48.

27. Rekiel A, Więcek J, Wojtasik M, Kulisiewicz J, Batorska M. The internal environment and reproduction in multifetal species. *Roczniki Naukowe Zootechniki Monografie i Rozprawy*. 2010;44:79-88.

28. Bertoldo M, Grupen CG, Thomson PC, Evans G, Holyoake PK. Identification of sow-specific risk factors for late pregnancy loss during the seasonal infertility period in pigs. *Theriogenology*. 2009;72:393-400.

29. Iida R, Koketsu Y. Interactions between climatic and production factors on returns of female pigs to service during summer in Japanese commercial breeding herds. *Theriogenology*. 2013;80:487-493.

30. Koketsu Y, Dial GD, King VL. Returns to service after mating and removal of sows for reproductive reasons from commercial swine farms. *Theriogenology*. 1997;47:1347-1363.

31. Vargas AJ, Bernardi ML, Paranhos TF, Gonçalves MA, Bortolozzo FP, Wentz I. Reproductive performance of swine females re-serviced after return to estrus or abortion. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2009;113:305-310.

32. Kraeling RR, Webel SK. Current strategies for reproductive management of gilts and sows in North America. *J Anim Sci Biotechnol*. 2015;6:3.

33. Koketsu Y, Takahashi H, Akachi K. Longevity, lifetime pig production and productivity, and age at first conception in a cohort of gilts observed over six years on commercial farms. *J Vet Med Sci*. 1999;61:1001-1005.

34. Le Cozler Y, Dagorn J, Lindberg JE, Aumaître A, Dourmad JY. Effect of age at first farrowing and herd management on long-term productivity of sows. *Livest Prod Sci*. 1998;53:135-142.

35. Patterson JL, Beltranena E, Foxcroft GR. The effect of gilt age at first estrus and breeding on third estrus on sow body weight changes and long-term reproductive performance. *J Anim Sci*. 2010;88:2500-2513.

36. Tummaruk P, Tantasuparuk W, Techakumphu M, Kunavongkrit A. Age, body weight and backfat thickness at first observed oestrus in crossbred Landrace × Yorkshire gilts, seasonal variations and their influence on subsequence reproductive performance. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2007;99:167-181.

37. Tart JK, Johnson RK, Bundy JW, Ferdinand NN, McKnite AM, Wood JR, Miller PS, Rothschild MF, Spangler ML, Garrick DJ, Kachman SD, Ciobanu DC. Genome-wide prediction of age at puberty and reproductive longevity in sows. *Anim Genet*. 2013;44:387-397.

38. Evans ACO, O'Doherty JV. Endocrine changes and management factors affecting puberty in gilts. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2001;68:1-12.

39. Christenson RK. Swine management to increase gilt reproductive efficiency. *J Anim Sci*. 1986;63:1280-1287.

40. Karlbom I. Attainment of puberty in female pigs: Influence of boar stimulation. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 1982;4:313-319.

*41. Stalder KJ, Johnson C, Miller DP, Baas TJ, Berry N, Christian AE, Serenius TV. *Replacement Gilt Evaluation Pocket Guide*. Des Moines, IA: National Pork Board; 2010.

42. van Wettere WH, Revell DK, Mitchell M, Hughes PE. Increasing the age of gilts at first boar contact improves the timing and synchrony of the pubertal response but does not affect potential litter size. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2006;95:97-106.

43. Bidanel JP, Gruand J, Legault C. Genetic variability of age and weight at puberty, ovulation rate and embryo survival in gilts and relations with production traits. *Genet Sel Evol*. 1996;28:103-115.

44. Tummaruk P, Kesdangsakonwut S. Uterine size in replacement gilts associated with age, body weight, growth rate, and reproductive status. *Czech J Anim Sci*. 2014;59:511-518.

45. Tummaruk P, Lundeheim N, Einarsson S, Dalin AM. Factors influencing age at first mating in purebred Swedish Landrace and Swedish Yorkshire gilts. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2000;63:241-253.

*46. Lammers PJ, Stender DR, Honeyman MS. *Niche Pork Production*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University; 2007.

47. Tummaruk P, Tantasuparuk W, Techakumphu M, Kunavongkrit A. The association between growth rate, body weight, backfat thickness and age at first observed oestrus in crossbred Landrace × Yorkshire gilts. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2009;110:108-122.

48. Peltoniemi OA, Love RJ, Heinonen M, Tuovinen V, Saloniemi H. Seasonal and management effects on fertility of the sow: a descriptive study. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 1999;55:47-61.

49. Tummaruk P, Lundeheim N, Einarsson S, Dalin AM. Effect of birth litter size, birth parity number, growth rate, backfat thickness and age at first mating of gilts on their reproductive performance as sows. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2001;66:225-237.

50. Kapelańska J, Bocian M, Kapelański W. Użytkowość rozpłodowa loch mieszańców specjalistycznych linii matecznych rasy holenderskiej białej zwisłouchej i wielkiej białej [Reproductive performance of crossbred Netherlands Landrace × Large White sows]. Biuletyn Naukowy UWM Olsztyn [Scientific Newsletter University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn]. 2000;7:91-96.

51. Flisar T, Malovrh Š, Urankar J, Kovač M. Effect of gilt growth rate and back fat thickness on reproductive performance. *Acta Agriculturae Slovenica*. 2012;100:199-203.

*52. Gasiński M. Wybór loszki remontowej – cechy za i przeciw oraz czy pierwszy miot musi być decydujący o przydatności danej sztuki do rozrodu [Choosing replacement gilts – advantages and disadvantages and whether the first litter determine the reproductive potential of female]. Hoduj z głową świnie [Breeding pigs]. 2013;5.

*53. Williams NH, Patterson J, Foxcroft G. Non-negotiables of gilt development. *Advances in Pork Production*. 2005;16:281-289.

54. Amaral Filha WS, Bernardi ML, Wentz I, Bortolozzo FP. Reproductive performance of gilts according to growth rate and backfat thickness at mating. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2010;121:139-144.

55. Kummer R, Bernardi ML, Wentz I, Bortolozzo FP. Reproductive performance of high growth rate gilts inseminated at an early age. *Anim Reprod Sci*. 2006;96:47-53.

56. Auvigne V, Leneveu P, Jehannin C, Peltoniemi O, Sallé E. Seasonal infertility in sows: a five year field study to analyze the relative roles of heat stress and photoperiod. *Theriogenology* 2010;74:60-66.

57. Irgang R, Scheid IR, Wentz IVO, Favero JA. Ovulation rate, embryo number and uterus length in purebred Duroc, Landrace and Large White gilts. *Livest Prod Sci*. 1993;33:253-266.

58. Jarczyk A, Nogaj J. Wpływ pory roku urodzenia loch na ich wartość rozpłodową [Influence sow bearing season on their reproductive value]. *Roczniki Naukowe Polskiego Towarzystwa Zootechnicznego*. 2008;4:85-93.

59. Górecki MT. Sex ratio in litters of domestic pigs (*Sus scrofa* f. *domestica* Linnaeus, 1758). *Biol Lett*. 2003;40:111-118.

60. Kawęcka M, Dłużak Z, Pietruszka A, Delikator B. Reproductive performance of sows depending on season and method of natural mating or artificial insemination. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum Zootechnica*. 2007;6:29-38.

61. Suriyasomboon A, Lundeheim N, Kunavongkrit A, Einarsson S. Effect of temperature and humidity on reproductive performance of crossbred sows in Thailand. *Theriogenology*. 2006;65:606-628.

62. Tantasuparuk W, Lundeheim N, Dalin AM, Kunavongkrit A, Einarsson S. Reproductive performance of purebred Landrace and Yorkshire sows in Thailand with special reference to seasonal influence and parity number. *Theriogenology*. 2000;54:481-496.

63. Tantasuparuk W, Techakumphu M, Dornin S. Relationships between ovulation rate and litter size in purebred Landrace and Yorkshire gilts. *Theriogenology*. 2005;63:1142-1148.

64. Tummaruk P. Effects of season, outdoor climate and photo period on age at first observed estrus in Landrace × Yorkshire crossbred gilts in Thailand. *Livest Sci*. 2012;144:163-172.

65. Tummaruk P, Tantasuparuk W, Techakumphu M, Kunavongkrit A. Effect of season and outdoor climate on litter size at birth in purebred Landrace and Yorkshire sows in Thailand. *J Vet Med Sci*. 2004;66:477-482.

66. Rząsa A. The effect of anatomical structure of sow teats or the assessment of serum anti-H. somnus on piglets' rearing results. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczego we Wrocławiu. Rozprawy*. 2007;549.

*67. See MT. Selecting gilts for lifetime productivity. Paper presented at North Carolina Healthy Hogs Seminar; 2006; Clinton, NC.

*68. Knauer M. Effects of Preweaning factors on Sow Lifetime Productivity. `https://www.pork.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/11-146-KNAUER-NCSU.pdf`. National Pork Board Research Report #11-146. Published February, 2016. Accessed October 4, 2017.

69. Koketsu Y, Tani S, Iida R. Factors for improving reproductive performance of sows and herd productivity in commercial breeding herds. *Porcine Health Manag*. 2017;3:1-10.

70. Vallet JL, Calderón-Díaz JA, Stalder KJ, Phillips C, Cushman RA, Miles JR, Rempel LA, Rohrer GA, Lents CA, Freking BA, Nonneman DJ. Litter-of-origin trait effects on gilt development. *J Anim Sci*. 2016;94:96-105.

71. Knox R. How to manage replacement gilts for breeding. `http://porkgateway.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/how-to-manage-replacement-gilts-for-breeding1.pdf`. Pork Information Gateway Pork Production How-To. Published August 2005. Accessed January 21, 2014.

72. Matysiak B, Kawęcka M, Jacyno E, Kołodziej-Skalska A, Pietruszka A. Parametry oceny loszek przed pierwszym pokryciem a wyniki ich użytkowości rozpłodowej [Relationships between test of gilts before day at first mating on their reproduction performance]. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum Zootechnica*. 2010;9:29-37.

73. Stern S, Lundeheim N, Johansson K, Andersson K. Osteochondrosis and leg weakness in pigs selected for lean tissue growth rate. *Livest Prod Sci*. 1995;44:45-52.

74. Jørgensen B. Effect of different energy and protein levels on leg weakness and osteochondrosis in pigs. *Livest Prod Sci*. 1995;41:171-181.

75. Nakano T, Brennan JJ, Aherne FX. Leg weakness and osteochondrosis in swine: A review. *Can J Anim Sci*. 1987;67:883-901.

76. Yazdi MH, Lundeheim N, Rydhmer L, Ringmar-Cederberg E, Johansson K. Survival of Swedish Landrace and Yorkshire sows in relation to osteochondrosis: A genetic study. *Anim Sci*. 2000;71:1-9.

77. Knauer MT, Cassady JP, Newcom DW, See MT. Phenotypic and genetic correlations between gilt estrus, puberty, growth, composition, and structural conformation traits with first-litter reproductive measures. *J Anim Sci*. 2011;89:935-942.

78. López-Serrano M, Reinsch N, Looft H, Kalm E. Genetic correlations of growth, backfat thickness and exterior with stayability in large white and landrace sows. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2000;64:121-131.

79. Serenius T, Stalder KJ. Selection for sow longevity. *J Anim Sci*. 2006;84 Suppl:166-171.

80. D'Eath RB. Repeated locomotion scoring of a sow herd to measure lameness: consistency over time, the effect of sow characteristics and interobserver reliability. *Anim Welf*. 2012;21:219-231.

*81. Roese G, Taylor G. Basic pig husbandry — gilts and sows. `https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/56134/Basic_pig_husbandry-Gilts_and_sows_-_Primefact_70-final.pdf`. Primefacts 70. Published February 2006. Accessed January 21, 2014.

82. Ryan BC, Vandenbergh JG. Intrauterine position effects. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2002;26:665-678.

83. Nowicki J, Schwarz T. Maternal responsiveness of sows housed in two farrowing environments measured in behavioural tests. *Ann Anim Sci*. 2010;10:179-186.

84. Nowicki J, Klocek C, Schwarz T. Factors affecting maternal behaviour and responsiveness in sows during periparturient and lactation periods. *Ann Anim Sci*. 2012;12:455-469.

*85. Burblis J. Matki przyszłych tuczników [The mothers in the fatteners production]. Twój doradca - Rolniczy Rynek [Your Advisor – Agricultural Market]. 2014;1:38-39.

86. Jarczyk A, Rogiewicz A, Grochowska M. Kolejność miotu urodzenia i średnia płodność loch jako czynniki efektów matczynych, wpływających na jakość oraz liczbę odchowanych prosiąt i warchlaków [Litter rank of birth and mean prolificacy of sows as factors of maternal effects affecting the quality and number of reared piglets and weaner piglets]. Zeszyty Naukowe Akademi Rolniczej im. H. Kołłątaja w Krakowie [Scientific Bulletin of Agricultural Academy in Krakow]. 1999;89-95.

*87. Flowers WL. Effect of neonatal litter size and early puberty stimulation on sow longevity and reproductive performance. `https://www.pork.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/05-082-FLOWERS-NCSU.pdf`. National Pork Board Research Report #05-082. Published February 2009. Accessed October 4, 2017.

*88. Orzechowska B, Tyra M, Mucha A. Czy udział płci w miocie, z którego pochodzi loszka ma wpływ na jej późniejszą użytkowość rozpłodową [Does gender participation inside the litter affect female reproductive performance]. *Trzoda Chlewna* [*Pigs*]. 2006;3:39-40.

89. Drickamer LC, Arthur RD, Rosenthal TL. Conception failure in swine: importance of the sex ratio of a female's birth litter and tests of other factors. *J Anim Sci*. 1997;75:2192-2196.

90. Calderón Díaz JA, Vallet JL, Lents CA, Nonneman DJ, Miles JR, Wright EC, Rempel LA, Cushman RA, Freking BA, Rohrer GA, Phillips C, DeDecker A, Foxcroft G, Stalder K. Age at puberty, ovulation rate, and uterine length of developing gilts fed two lysine and three metabolizable energy concentrations from 100 to 260 d of age. *J Anim Sci*. 2015;93:3521-3527.

*91. Vallet JL, Freking BA. Research on uterine capacity and litter size in swine. `https://www.ars.usda.gov/ARSUserFiles/30400515/Publications/UterineCapacity.pdf`. USDA Agricultural Research Service. Published 2000. Accessed October 5, 2014.

92. Vallet JL, McNeel AK, Miles JR, Freking BA. Placental accommodations for transport and metabolism during intra-uterine crowding in pigs. *J Anim Sci Biotechnol*. 2014;5:55.

93. Chen ZY, Dziuk PJ. Influence of initial length of uterus per embryo and gestation stage on prenatal survival, development, and sex ratio in the pig. *J Anim Sci*. 1993;71:1895-1901.

94. Vianna WL, Pinese ME, de Campos Rosseto A, Bombonato PP, Rodrigues PHM, de Sant'Anna Moretti A. Relationship between prenatal survival rate at 70 days of gestation and morphometric parameters of vagina, uterus and placenta in gilts. *Reprod Domest Anim*. 2004;39:381-384.

95. Bérard J, Pardo CE, Béthaz S, Kreuzer M, Bee G. Intrauterine crowding decreases average birth weight and affects muscle fiber hyperplasia in piglets. *J Anim Sci*. 2010;88:3242-3250.

96. Argente MJ, Santacreu MA, Climent A, Blasco A. Effects of intrauterine crowding on available uterine space per fetus in rabbits. *Livest Sci*. 2008;114:211-219.

97. Mossman HW. Comparative morphogenesis of the fetal membranes and accessory uterine structures. *Contributions to Embryology*. 1937;26:129-246.

98. Hammond J. Physiological factors affecting birth weight. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 1944;2:8-14.

99. Eckstein P, McKeown T, Record RG. Variation in placental weight according to litter size in the guinea-pig. *J Endocrinol*. 1955;12:108-114.

100. Pere MC, Dourmad JY, Etienne M. Effect of number of pig embryos in the uterus on their survival and development and on maternal metabolism. *J Anim Sci*. 1997;75:1337-1342.

101. Wu MC, Chen ZY, Jarrell VL, Dziuk PJ. Effect of initial length of uterus per embryo on fetal survival and development in the pig. *J Anim Sci*. 1989;67:1767-1772.

*102. Rillo SM, De Alba C, Falceto V, Peralta W, Bustamante J. Importance du development de l'appareil genital des cochettes pour la future productivite de la truie [The importance of reproductive system development of gilts for their future reproductive performance]. Paper presented at: Synthese Eevage; June 26, 1998; Loudeac, France. pp. 50-61.

*103. Tuz R, Małopolska M, Nowicki J, Schwarz T. Wpływ kolejnego miotu na stan narządów rozrodczych loch [Effect of subsequent litter on female reproductive system]. Paper presented at: IX Szkoła Zimowa "Od Hodowli Świń Do Przetwórstwa - Wczoraj i Dziś" [IX Winter School "From breeding to processing – yesterday and today"]; February 16-19, 2016; Ustroń, Poland.

*104. Tuz R, Schwarz T, Nowicki J, Małopolska M, Olczak K. Differentiation of vagina cervix length and reproductive performance of sows between the first and second litter. Paper presented at: International Conference on Biotechnology and Welfare in Animal Husbandry; June 15-16, 2015; Krakow, Poland.

105. Dybała J, Kapelański W, Kapelańska J, Wiśniewska J. Gilt fertility relation to vagina-cervix length. *Ann Anim Sci Suppl*. 2004;2:17-20.

106. Tarocco C, Kirkwood R. Vaginal length is not related to subsequent litter size of gilts. *J Swine Health Prod*. 2002;10:124-125.

107. Kapelanski W, Jankowiak H, Bocian M, Grajewska S, Dybała J, Żmudzińska A. Morphometric characteristics of the reproductive system in Polish Large White and Polish Landrace gilts at 100 kg body weight. *Ann Anim Sci*. 2013;13:45-53.

*108. Małopolska M, Tuz R, Nowicki J, Schwarz T. Morfometryczne cechy układu rozrodczego loch jako wskaźnik ich potencjalnej płodności [Morphometric measurements of reproductive tract of sows as an indicator of their potential fertility]. Paper presented at: IX Szkoła Zimowa"Od Hodowli Świń Do Przetwórstwa - Wczoraj i Dziś" [IX Winter School "From breeding to processing – yesterday and today"]; February 16-19, 2016; Ustroń, Poland.

109. Dominguez A, Rosales TAM, Lemus C. An approach to relationships between vagina length and prolificity of sows. *J Anim Vet Adv*. 2007;6:1152-1154.

110. Magnabosco D, Cunha ECP, Bernardi ML, Wentz I, Bortolozzo FP. Effects of age and growth rate at onset of boar exposure on oestrus manifestation and first farrowing performance of Landrace × Large White gilts. *Livest Sci*. 2014;169:180-184.

111. Kaneko M, Koketsu Y. Gilt development and mating in commercial swine herds with varying reproductive performance. *Theriogenology*. 2012;77:840-846.

112. Hoge MD, Bates RO. Developmental factors that influence sow longevity. *J Anim Sci*. 2011;89:1238-1245.

113. Rozeboom DW, Pettigrew JE, Moser RL, Cornelius SG, el Kandelgy SM. Influence of gilt age and body composition at first breeding on sow reproductive performance and longevity. *J Anim Sci*. 1996;74:138-150.

114. Segura-Correa JC, Ek-Mex E, Alzina-López A, Segura-Correa VM. Frequency of removal reasons of sows in Southeastern Mexico. *Trop Anim Health Prod*. 2011;43:1583-1588.

115. Kasprzyk A, Łucki M. Analysis of the variation of reproductive traits of Danhybryd LY sows. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska*. 2014;32:7-15.

* Non-refereed references.