2

Can we improve maternal care in sows? Maternal behavioural traits important for piglet survival in loose-housed sow herds

5

6

7   M. Ocepek[*], E. M. Rosvold[*§], I. Andersen-Ranberg[†], and I. L. Andersen[*]

8

9   *Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, PO

10   Box 5003, 1432 Ås, Norway

11   §Nord University, PO Box 2501, 7729 Steinkjer, Norway

12   †Topigs Norsvin, PO Box 504, 2304 Hamar, Norway

13

14

18

19   Corresponding author: Marko Ocepek. e-mail: marko.ocepek@nmbu.no

20

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this survey was to investigate the relationship between qualitative maternal behavioural scores (nest building activities, sow communication and sow carefulness), piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets on commercial farms with loose-housed lactating (Norsvin Landrace × Yorkshire) sows. Secondly, the impact of these scores on productivity compared to the physical condition of sows (movement disorders, body condition, and shoulder lesions) was assessed. Data on maternal care behaviours and physical condition were collected on 895 sows from 45 commercial farms. Farmers scored sows on their physical condition (movement disorder: MD, body condition: BCS, shoulder lesions: SL) and qualitative maternal care behaviours (nest building activities prior to farrowing: NBA; and sow communication: SC, and carefulness: SCR after farrowing, while sows were standing, moving and just before lying down). There was a low positive correlation between NBA and SC ($r = 0.102$; $P = 0.026$) and between NBA and SCR ($r = 0.149$; $P = 0.010$), but a high positive between SC and SCR ($r = 0.565$; $P < 0.001$). Higher SC and SCR were associated with lower piglet mortality ($P < 0.001$, $P = 0.013$, respectively), and a greater number of weaned piglets were associated with higher scores for NBA ($P = 0.009$), SC ($P < 0.001$) and SCR ($P = 0.009$). Maternal care behaviour had a greater impact on piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets than sow physical condition (MD, BCS, SL). We tested 7 different models (combinations of behavioural scores) and compared their relative predictive accuracies using Akaike information criteria (AIC). The model including SC and SCR had the best predictive accuracy for piglet mortality/weaned piglets. There was between-sow variation in maternal care behaviours (SC and SCR) and both were unaffected by litter size. Since these behaviours were also easy to score for the farmers, combining SC and SCR have the

45 greatest potential to be tested in nucleus herds for calculation of genetic variation and heritability,

46 and should be taken into account into future breeding programmes for sows.

47

50

51

INTRODUCTION

53

54

55 Although modern maternal sow breeding programmes have resulted in more piglets weaned

56 (Ocepek et al., 2017), piglet mortality is still a major welfare and economic issue as approximately

57 20% of born piglets are dead or eventually died before weaning (Ocepek et al., 2016a). Piglet

58 survival until weaning depends on interacting factors such as the physical environment (Andersen

59 et al., 2007), management routines (Andersen et al., 2007, Rosvold et al., 2016), piglet viability

60 (Pedersen et al., 2011), and maternal behaviour (Andersen et al. 2005; Ocepek and Andersen,

61 2017). Promoting maternal care behaviours in sows kept loose during farrowing and lactation, can

62 result in fewer piglet deaths, improve the welfare of pigs and, thus, contribute to more sustainable

63 breeding.

64

65 Despite attempts to promote maternal care traits (Grandinson et al., 2003; Lovendahl et al., 2005;

66 Vangen et al., 2005), there are methodological challenges with measuring traits accurately.

67 Recently, Ocepek and Andersen (2017) defined simple qualitative scorings of maternal care

68 behaviours important for piglet survival (sow nest building, sow communication and carefulness).

69   To be useful under commercial conditions, these scores need to be simple and practical for farmers

70   to be able to assess those traits on the farm.

71

72   The primary objective of this survey was to investigate the relationship between qualitative

73   maternal behavioural scores (nest building activities, sow communication and sow carefulness),

74   piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets on commercial farms with loose-housed

75   lactating (Norsvin Landrace × Yorkshire) sows. Secondly, the impact of these scores on

76   productivity compared to the physical condition of sows (movement disorders, body condition,

77   and shoulder lesions) was assessed.

78

79

80   **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

81

82

83   The present experiment was conducted in accordance with the laws and regulations controlling

84   experiments and procedures on live animals in Norway and was approved by the Norwegian

85   Animal Research Authority, following the Norwegian Regulation on Animal Experimentation Act

86   of 1996.

87

88

89   *Farm selection and study design*

90

91

92   Forty-five commercial pig farms were visited, meeting the following criteria: 1) had loose-housed

93   lactating Norsvin Landrace × Swedish Yorkshire sows; 2) were located within the three major pig

94   production regions in Norway (East, n = 16; West, n = 12; and Middle, n = 17); 3) differed in size

95   (the numbers of litters born per year in each herd (Small = 30 – 110 litter per year (n = 14);

96   Medium = 110 – 200 (n = 18); Large = 200 - … (n = 13); and 4) kept farm production records in

97   Ingris (The National Efficiency Control Database, administrated by Animalia (Norwegian Meat

98   and Poultry Research Centre) and Norsvin (Norwegian Pig Breeding Association)). To investigate

99   the importance of sow behavioural and physical characteristics, an on-farm registration form was

100   designed. The registration form, together with instructions (see below – 'On farm registration'),

101   were sent to the farmers approximately one month before the onset of the study, which was

102   followed up by a phone call and farm visitation by one of the trained researchers (MO or EMR).

103   During the visit, additional information regarding environment and management routines on the

104   farm was collected. The completed registration forms with behavioural and physical scores for

105   each sow from one batch on the farm was sent to us, whereas the following production records for

106   the same sows were collected from the Ingris database: parity number; number of live-born

107   piglets; number of piglets that died after farrowing but before weaning; and number of weaned

108   piglets (defined as number of the sow's own live-born piglets plus the number of piglets fostered

109   on minus the number of piglets fostered off and minus the number of piglets that died after

110   farrowing but before weaning).

111

112

113   ***On farm registration***

114

115

116　The on farm registration form included qualitative behavioural scores developed by Ocepek and

117　Andersen (2017), and physical scores as tested in Ocepek et al. (2016a).

118

119

120　***Sow - physical scores.*** Sow physical condition scores (movement disorder (**MD**), body condition

121　(**BCS**), shoulder lesions (**SL**)) were assessed while moving the sows from the gestation unit to the

122　farrowing unit. MD were scored using a scale from 1 to 3 (1: normal, without visible movement

123　problems; 2: marked movement disorders, walks slowly or limps in a stiff way; 3: severe

124　movement problems, can hardly get up from a lying position or walk; Ocepek et al., 2016a). BCS

125　was assessed using a grading scale from 1 to 5 and half points were used (Fig. 1). Presence of SL

126　was assessed using a five-category scale. Score 0 was used when the shoulder region was intact,

127　with healthy skin and without reddening or swelling. If SL were determined, scores from 1 to 4

128　were used (Fig. 2).

129

130

131　***Sow - behavioural scores.*** Nest building score (**NBA**) was assessed after sows began to display

132　preparation signs of farrowing (restless behaviour, nesting behaviour, and/or teats ejecting milk at

133　hand milking) during morning or afternoon feeding within the last 24 hours before expected

134　parturition. The NBA score included rooting (nosing in the nest building material on the floor),

135　pawing (leg in the nest building material on the floor), carrying nest building material, and

136　chewing nest building material while the sow was active (standing or moving around) using a

137　scale from 1 to 3 as presented in table 1. Sow communication (**SC**, sniffing, grunting, and

138　nudging) and sow carefulness (**CSR**) was assessed immediately after morning or afternoon feeding

139　on day one or two postpartum while sows changed position, moved around and at the moment the

140   sow was about to lie down. Both scores, SC and SCR, were assessed with a scale from 1 to 4 as

141   presented in table 1.

142

143

144   ***Housing and management routines***

145

146

147   ***Housing.*** According to the Norwegian animal welfare regulations, gestation stalls and farrowing

148   crates are banned (www.lovdata.no). During pregnancy, all sows must be kept in group-housing

149   systems from four weeks after service. From day three before expected parturition, sows shall have

150   access to nest building material. During farrowing and lactation, sows must be kept loose in a

151   farrowing pen larger than 6.0 m^2 with a width of more than 1.8 m, allowing the sow to turn around.

152   Plenty of the litter should be on the pen floor. Furthermore, the farrowing pen must be designed in

153   a way that provides sufficient space for the sows during farrowing (and for farrowing assistant if

154   needed) and a separate microclimate for the piglets that is inaccessible to the sow. Exceptions

155   regarding confinement can be made for restless or aggressive sows but only for one week (from

156   parturition until seventh day afterwards) in crates longer than 2.0 m with a width of 0.7 to 0.8 m,

157   depending on the sow's size.

158

159   The mean size of the farrowing pens in the 45 farms was 7.5 ± 0.1 m^2 (range 6.0 - 10.5 m^2), with a

160   mean width of 2.3 ± 0.0 (range 1.9 - 3.4) and none of the sows were crated at any time. Each sow

161   was on average provisioned with 2.2 ± 0.32 kg (range 0.1 - 10 kg) of nest building material.

162

163

164   *Management routines.* The farms can be divided into four management groups (farms without

165   routines, farms conducting more than two contacts per day with the sows (defined as touching,

166   talking to and/or being present near the sow in the farrowing pen), farms performing three

167   management routines at farrowing (defined as farmer presence at 80 – 100 % of farrowing's,

168   drying and massaging newborn piglets, and practicing split suckling) and farms conducting both,

169   contact with the sows and all management routines (Rosvold et al., 2016). All groups were

170   included in the present study. Out of 45 farms, 10 farms did not perform any of the four

171   management routines, 11 farms had contact with sows more than 2 times per day, 11 farms

172   performed the three mentioned routines at farrowing, and 13 farms combined contact and the

173   routines.

174

175

176   ***Collected data***

177

178

179   The data contained information on 895 sows out of which 20 sows without BCS, 17 without MD,

180   18 without SL, 15 without NBA, 3 without SC.

181

182   To facilitate subsequent calculations, BCS scores were transformed into values from 1 to 3; thin

183   (1.0-2.5), normal (3.0-3.5), fat (4.0-5.0). Around 13% percent of the sows were thin, 63 % of the

184   sows were categorised as normal and 24 % of the sows were classified as fat. Approximatively,

185   93% of the sows had no signs of movement disorders, 6% were slower (limping, score 2), and less

186   than 1% had severe movement problems (score 3). Furthermore, around 93% of the sows had

187   healthy skin without SL, more than 6% were classified with initial shoulder injuries and less than

188   1% with moderate skin lesions (score 2) as well as serious shoulder lesions (score 3). As there

189 were very few higher scores for MD and SL, both traits were categorized into two classes (sows

190 without MD and/or SL = class 1; sow with MD and/or SL = class 2).

191

192

193 *Statistical analysis*

194

195

196 Descriptive statistics were presented as arithmetic mean and SE. Statistical analyses were

197 performed using SAS 9.4 statistical software program (SAS Institute. Inc., Cary, NC).

198

199 The effects of physical condition (MD, BCS, SL) as fixed effects (class variables) on behavioural

200 scores (NBA, SC, SCR) were analysed using the GLIMMIX procedure (Multinomial distribution).

201 Parity and litter size were included as continuous variables. Farm was specified as a random effect.

202

203 Polychoric correlation coefficients were used when testing the relationships between sow

204 behavioural scores (NBA, SC, SCR).

205

206 The effect of behavioural (NBA, SC, SCR) and physical (MD, BCS, SL) scores as fixed class

207 variables on piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets were analysed using a mixed model

208 (Proc Mixed). Farm (class variable) and parity and litter size (continuous variables) were included

209 in the model. Sow nested within the farm was specified as a random effect.

210

211 To find the best combination of behavioural scores (7 combinations of defined scores), the model

212 with the best relative predictive accuracy for piglet mortality/weaned piglets was determined using

213   the Akaike information criterion (AIC). The AIC values were transformed to Akaike weights to

214   provide the relative probability of each model having the best predictive accuracy.

215

216

RESULTS

217

218

219

Descriptive data

220

221

222

223   The mean number of sows per farm in a farrowing batch was 20.0 ± 0.9 (range 10 - 31), and sow

224   parity ranged from 1 to 9, with 33.9 % of the sows in first, 23.3 % in second, 18.7 % in third, 12.5

225   % in fourth, 7.1 % in fifth, 2.3 in sixth, 1.6 % in seventh, 0.3 % in eight, and 0.3 % in ninth parity.

226   The mean number of piglets at birth was 14.1 ± 0.1 (range 3 - 23) and at weaning 11.6 ± 0.1 (Fig.

227   3a), whereas the overall mean postnatal mortality was $16.3 \pm 0.5\%$ (Fig 3b).

228

229

Sow behaviour

230

231

232

233   ***Nest building behaviour score (NBA).*** During the last 24 hours before parturition, 22.8 % of the

234   sows showed no nest building activities (score 1), whereas 28.0 % of the sows spent the majority

235   of their time on NBA (score 3; Fig. 4a). There was no significant effect of parity, nor litter size on

236   NBA (Table 2). Sows with MD had a lower NBA than sows without (Table 2; Fig. 5a). Sows with

237   normal BCS had higher NBA compared to thin or fat sows (Table 2; Fig. 6). NBA was unaffected

238   by SL (Table 2).

239

240

241   ***Sow communication score (SC).*** While 34.9 % of the sows communicated every time they

242   changed position or moved around (score 4), 17.0 % of the sows communicated less than 50% of

243   the time they changed position or moved around (score 2; Fig. 4b). There was a negative

244   relationship between parity and SC (Table 2; Fig. 7a). SC was not significantly affected by litter

245   size (Table 2). Sows with MD had lower SC than sows without (Table 2; Fig. 5b). SC was not

246   significant effect by BCS nor SL (Table 2).

247

248

249   ***Sow carefulness score (SCR).*** More than half of the sows (50.1 %) were classified as attentive,

250   careful and protective in more than 50% of the events when they changed position or moved

251   around (score 3), while 30.3 % of the sows were categorized as attentive, careful and protective

252   every time they changed position or moved around (score 4; Fig. 4c). There was a negative

253   relationship between parity and SCR (Table 2; Fig. 7b). SCR was not significantly affected by

254   litter size (Table 2). Sows with MD had lower SCR than sows without (Table 2; Fig. 5c). SCR was

255   not significantly affected by BCS nor SL (Table 2).

256

257

Interrelationship between behavioural scores. There was a low positive correlation between NBA
and SC ($r = 0.102$; $P = 0.026$) and SCR ($r = 0.149$; $P = 0.010$) and a high positive correlation
between SC and SCR ($r = 0.565$; $P < 0.001$).

261

262

Production parameters

264

265

Postnatal mortality. There was no significant effect of NBA on postnatal mortality (Table 3).
Sows with higher SC had lower postnatal mortality (Table 3; Fig. 8a). The higher the SCR, the
lower the postnatal mortality (Table 3; Fig. 8b). There was no significant effect of parity on
postnatal mortality (Table 3). Mortality significantly increases in larger litters (Table 3; Fig. 9).
Postnatal mortality was not significantly affected by sow physical condition (MD, BCS, and SL,
Table 3). There was significant difference in postnatal mortality between farms (Table 3).

272

273

Number of weaned piglets. A high degree of NBA (Table 3; Fig. 10a), SC (Table 3; Fig. 10b) and
SCR (Table 3; Fig. 10c) was associated with more piglets weaned. There was no significant effect
of parity on number of weaned piglets (Table 3). More piglets were weaned in larger litters (Table
3; Fig. 11). Number of weaned piglets was not significantly affected by MD, BCS, and SL (Table
3). There was a significant difference between farms in number of weaned piglets (Table 3).

279

280

Predictive accuracy of behavioural scores for production parameters. Out of the 7 models (all

combinations of defined scores), we found that model 6 including SC and SCR had the best

predictive accuracy (lowest AIC values and highest AIC weights) for piglet mortality/weaned

piglets (Table 4).

285

286

DISCUSSION

288

289

In accordance with recent experimental study that documented a clear relationship between

maternal behavioural scores and piglets survival (Ocepek and Andersen, 2017), we succeed in

finding similar results on 45 commercial farms with 895 LY sows. While an increased nest

building activity (NBA) resulted in an increased number of weaned piglets, sow communication

(SC) and carefulness (SCR) had the strongest effects on both mortality and the number of weaned

piglets in loose-housed sows. In fact, the maternal behavioural scores had a stronger impact on

piglet survival per se than physical traits such as movement disorders (MD), body condition score

(BCS) and lesion score (SL). However, these physical traits along with parity, influenced the

behavioural scores, indicating that the physical condition of the sow will affect maternal skills.

299

Our results showed that farmers understood the qualitative scoring system just by verbal advice

(without on-site pre-training) and that the behavioural scores were important predictors for piglet

survival. Using model selection, our results showed that a combination of SC and SCR had the

303   best predictive accuracy for determining levels of piglet mortality/weaned piglets. Thus, these

304   maternal care behaviours (SC and SCR) could be implemented in the breeding goal as a novel

305   approach to improve piglet survival and thus ensure future sustainable pig breeding.

306

307   Sows that communicated to large extent with their piglets and were careful with their own

308   movements when piglets were in close proximity (i.e. high scores for SC and SCR), had

309   substantially lower postnatal mortality and weaned more piglets. In Ocepek and Andersen (2017),

310   sows with higher SC and SCR were capable of weaning more piglets mainly due to fewer deaths

311   from maternal crushing. Additionally, higher SC was associated with a lower proportion of starved

312   piglets. Starvation and crushing constitutes more than 60% of all piglet deaths in loose-hosed sows

313   (Andersen et al., 2006; Vasdal et al., 2011; Ocepek et al., 2016b). Our study suggests that there

314   could be a great potential in selecting for maternal care directly. Sows with SC score 4 (highest) as

315   opposed to 1 (lowest) had almost 37% lower mortality and 15% more piglets weaned, while the

316   respective values for SCR were 15% and 8%. The trend of improving survival continued between

317   scores 4 and 2: sows with SC scores 4 compared to 2 had 35% lower mortality and 8% more

318   weaned piglets, whereas the respective values for SCR were 41% and 12%.

319

320   Another important finding was that SC and SCR scores were highly correlated, replicating results

321   in Ocepek and Andersen (2017). It appears that SC and SCR both represent good measures or

322   indicators of maternal care behaviour during the first few days after parturition when piglet losses

323   are most likely to occur. As sows establish contact with their piglets, through olfactory (sniffing),

324   auditory (grunting) and tactile (nudging) communicative cues, they can locate the piglets' position.

325   From an evolutionary point of view, this mechanism aids sows to keep the piglets in close

326   proximity, protecting them from danger. Awareness of the piglets' presence helps the sow to

327 become careful, attentive and protective around the piglets (without trampling on them or lie on

328 them). Thus, stimulating sow motivation to care for her young is crucial for ensuring the future

329 welfare and sustainability of pig production. This can be brought about through selecting for these

330 particular maternal traits and by stimulating the sow to become more attentive through

331 environmental factors (i.e. nest building material, good handling to prevent fear etc.). The simple

332 scoring, the large individual variation and stability of the traits irrespective of litter size and breed

333 (e.g. three different breeds show similar results: Ocepek and Andersen, 2017) make them

334 particularly suited for selection.

335

336 Maternal care scores (SC and SCR) also decreased with parity. Thus, sows in earlier reproductive

337 life appear to show better maternal care behaviour. This is not surprising, because breeding goals

338 have emphasised greater maternal investment earlier in life (Canario et al., 2009; Ocepek et al.,

339 2016a). A high maternal investment early in life has a substantial future cost in that it reduces the

340 residual reproductive value of the sow, compromising longevity. We would like to pinpoint the

341 importance of selection during the sows' reproductive live, rather than focus on the first two litters.

342

343 Furthermore, sows at farrowing might respond to suboptimal physical conditions of the sow by

344 reducing maternal care. Here, we showed that if sows had problems with moving, they had lower

345 scores for maternal care (i.e. SC and SCR) than sows without movement problems. It is, therefore,

346 crucial to have healthy sows while promoting maternal care behaviours.

347

348 Even though sows have the internal motivation to prepare a proper nest for newborn piglets, this is

349 mediated by their physical condition. We found that MD and BCS, two physical conditions,

350 influenced NBA. Sows with movement disorders or sows that are classified as thin or fat invest

351 less time in NBA. Suboptimal MD or BCS causes difficulties for sows to lie down and stand up, as

352 well as to move around (Bonde et al., 2004). This result highlights the necessity of making sure

353 that the sow is healthy and in good physical condition before farrowing to ensure so that maternal

354 behaviour can proceed as optimal as possible.

355

356 Piglet survival was partly affected by NBA. Higher NBA was associated with more piglets

357 weaned, although this higher NBA was not clearly related to lower mortality. In Ocepek and

358 Andersen (2017), sows that engaged in more NBA also weaned more piglets as fewer piglets died

359 from maternal crushing. However, in their study, sows had ad libitum access to nest building

360 material prior to parturition, while in our study access varied from 0.1 to 10.0kg. The performance

361 of NBA is related to environmental factors (i.e. provision of nest building material). If amount of

362 relevant external stimuli is insufficient or the timing before farrowing is wrong nest building

363 activity may fail to make the sow relaxed and become attentive towards her young (e.g. Wischner

364 et al., 2009). Although, there was between-sow variation in NBA scores and NBA was positively

365 correlated with the other two behavioural scores as well as unaffected by parity and litter size,

366 NBA had a minor effects on piglet survival under commercial conditions. On farms we cannot be

367 sure that sufficient amount of nest building material is provided at the right time.

368

369 Finally, we identified impact of maternal care behaviours on productivity compared to physical

370 conditions of the sows. Our results showed that maternal care behaviours are more direct

371 predictors of piglet survival than the physical condition of the sow. However, suboptimal physical

372 conditions at farrowing can reduce maternal care, indicating that physical condition is likely

373 related to productivity through its effect of the expression of maternal care. Thus, improving sows

374 physical condition at farrowing promotes maternal care behaviours important for determining

375 piglet survival.

376

377

CONCLUSSION

379

380

381 This study investigated the relationships between qualitative scores of maternal care behaviours

382 (NBA, SC, SCR), sow physical condition variables (MD, BCS, SL) and piglet survival under

383 commercial conditions. We found that farmers were able to implement the qualitative scoring

384 system, and that maternal care behaviours were more predictive of piglet survival (low piglet

385 morality and more weaned piglets) than physical condition of the sow. In particular, our results

386 showed that a combination of SC and SCR had the best predictive accuracy for piglet

387 mortality/weaned piglets. The large individual variation in SC and SCR, the fact that they were not

388 affected by litter size, and easy to record for the farmer, indicates that they are suitable behavioural

389 parameters for testing in nucleus herds to be implemented in the future breeding programme.

390

391

LITERATURE CITED

393

394

395 Andersen, I. L., G. M. Tajet, I. A. Haukvik, S. Kongsrud, and K. E. Bøe. 2007. Relationship

396   between postnatal piglet mortality, environmental factors and management around farrowing in

397   herds with loose-housed, lactating sows. Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. A 57:38-45.

398   doi:10.1080/09064700601159626.

399 Andersen, I. L., S. Berg, and K. E. Bøe. 2005. Crushing of piglets by the mother sow (Sus scrofa) -

400   purely accidental or a poor mother? Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 93:229-243.

401   doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2004.11.015.

402 Andersen, I. L., S. Berg, K. E. Bøe, and S. Edwards. 2006. Positive handling in late pregnancy and

403   the consequences for maternal behaviour and production in sows. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.

404   99:64-76. doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2005.09.007.

405 Animalia annual report. 2014. Postboks 396 Økern, Oslo, Norway. The shoulder lesions report

406   from the pig health services at Animalia. 2014.

407 Bonde, M., T. Rousing, J. H. Badsberg, and J. T. Sørensen. 2004. Associations between lying-

408   down behaviour problems and body condition, limb disorders and skin lesions of lactating

409   sows housed in farrowing crates in commercial sow herds. Livest. Prod. Sci. 87:179-187.

410   doi:10.1016/j.livprodsci.2003.08.005.

411 Canario, L., Y. Billon, P. Mormède, D. Poirel, and C. Moigneau. 2009. Temperament, adaptation

412   and maternal abilities of Meishan and Large White sows kept in a loose-housing system during

413   lactation. In: Book of abstracts from 60th annual meeting of European association of animal

414   production, Barcelona, Spain, pp. 282.

415 Grandinson, K., L. Rydhmer, E. Strandberg, and K. Thodberg. 2003. Genetic analysis of on-farm

416   tests of maternal behaviour in sows. Livest. Prod. Sci. 83:141-151. doi:10.1016/S0301-

417   6226(03)00095-2.

418   Lovendahl, P., L.H. Damgard, B. L. Nielsen, K. Thodberg, G. Su, and L. Rydhmer. 2005.

419   Aggressive behaviour of sows at mixing and maternal behaviour are heritable and genetically

420   correlated traits. Livest. Prod. Sci. 93:73–85. doi:10.1016/j.livprodsci.2004.11.008.

421   Ocepek, M., and I. L. Andersen. 2017. What makes a good mother? Maternal behavioural traits

422   important for piglet survival. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. in press.

423   doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2017.03.010.

424   Ocepek, M., I. Andersen-Ranberg, S. A. Edwards, B. Fredriksen, T. Framstad, I. L. Andersen.

425   2016a. Can a super sow be a robust sow? Consequences of litter investment in purebred and

426   crossbred sows of different parities. J. Anim. Sci. 94:3550–3560. doi:10.2527/jas2016-0386.

427   Ocepek, M., I. Andersen-Ranberg, S. A. Edwards, and I. L. Andersen. 2016b. Udder

428   characteristics of importance for teat use in purebred and crossbred pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 94:780-

429   788. doi:10.2527/jas.2015-9420.

430   Ocepek, M., R. C. Newberry, and I. L. Andersen. 2017. Trade-offs between litter size and

431   offspring fitness in domestic pigs subjected to different genetic selection pressures. Appl.

432   Anim. Behav. Sci. in press. doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2017.03.008.

433   Pedersen, L. J., P. Berg, G. Jørgensen, and I. L. Andersen. 2011. Neonatal piglets trait of

434   importance for survival in crates and indoor. J. Anim. Sci. 89:1207-1218.

435   doi:10.2527/jas.2010-3248.

436   Rosvold E. M., C. Kielland, M. Ocepek, T. Framstad, B. Fredriksen, I. Andersen-Ranberg, G.

437   Næss, and I. L. Andersen. 2017. Management routines influencing piglet survival in loose-

438   housed sow herds. Livest. Prod. Sci. 196:1-6. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2016.12.001.

439   Vangen, O., B. Holm, A. Valros, M. S. Lund, and L. Rydhmer. 2005. Genetic variation in sows'

440   maternal behaviour, recorded under field conditions. Livest. Prod. Sci. 93:63-71.

441   doi:10.1016/j.livprodsci.2004.11.007.

442   Vasdal, G., I. Østensen, M. Melišová, B. Bozděchová, G. Illmann, and I. L. Andersen. 2011.

443   Management routines at the time of farrowing - effects on teat success and postnatal piglet

444   mortality from loose housed sows. Livest. Sci. 163:225-231. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2010.09.012.

445   Wischner D., N. Kemper, and J. Krieter. 2009. Nest-building behaviour in sows and consequences

446   for pig husbandry. Livest. Prod. Sci. 124:1–8. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2009.01.015.

447

448   Table 1. Scale definition of qualitative behavioural scores (reproduced by Ocepek and Andersen, 2017)

449

Behavioral scores	Definition of scale values
NBA[1]	1 - No nest building events observed
	2 - Less than 50 % of the active time spent nest building
	3 - More than 50 % of the active time spent nest building
SC[2]	1 - No events with communication, when the sow change position or move around
	2 - The sow communicates less than 50% of the event when she changes position or move around
	3 - The sow communicates more than 50% of the event when she changes position or move around
	4 - The sow communicates every event she changes position or move around
SCR[3]	1 - No events when sow is observed showing attentive, careful and protective behaviours
	2 - The sow is attentive, careful and protective less than 50% of the events when she changes position or move around
	3 - The sow is attentive, careful and protective more than 50% of the events when she changes position or move around
	4 - The sow is attentive, careful and protective every time she changes position or move around

450   [1]NBA = Nest building activities score
451   [2]SC = Sow communication score
452   [3]SCR = Sow carefulness score

453

454

455 Table 2. Influence of fixed effects on qualitative behavioural scores

456

Sow behavioural score	Parity		Litter size		MD[1]		BCS[2]		SL[3]	
	$F_{1, 805}$	P	$F_{1, 805}$	P	$F_{1, 805}$	P	$F_{2, 805}$	P	$F_{1, 805}$	P
NBA[4]	0.2	ns	0.0	ns	6.3	0.012	3.8	0.022	0.2	ns
SC[5]	14.3	<0.001	0.6	ns	3.7	0.050	1.5	ns	2.0	ns
SCR[6]	15.7	<0.001	1.5	ns	7.7	0.006	0.0	ns	0.3	ns

457 [1]MD = Movement disorder score
458 [2]BCS = Body condition score
459 [3]SL = Shoulder lesions score
460 [4]NBA = Nest building activities score
461 [5]SC = Sow communication score
462 [6]SCR = Sow carefulness score

463

464 Table 3. Influence of fixed effects on piglet mortality and survival trait

465

Fixed effects	Mortality, %		Weaned piglets, n	
	$F_{()}$	P	$F_{()}$	P
NBA[1]	$2.8_{(1, 799)}$	ns	$6.8_{(1, 799)}$	0.009
SC[2]	$13.7_{(1, 799)}$	<0.001	$14.0_{(1, 799)}$	<0.001
SCR[3]	$6.2_{(1, 799)}$	0.013	$6.8_{(1, 799)}$	0.009
Parity	$3.1_{(1, 799)}$	ns	$3.3_{(1, 799)}$	ns
Litter size	$695.1_{(1, 799)}$	<0.001	$42.1_{(1, 799)}$	<0.001
MD[4]	$0.1_{(1, 799)}$	ns	$0.1_{(1, 799)}$	ns
BCS[5]	$2.5_{(2, 799)}$	ns	$0.7_{(2, 799)}$	ns
SL[6]	$0.5_{(1, 799)}$	ns	$0.5_{(1, 799)}$	ns
Farm	$2.9_{(43, 799)}$	<0.001	$2.7_{(43, 799)}$	<0.001

466 [1]NBA = Nest building activities score
467 [2]SC = Sow communication score
468 [3]SCR = Sow carefulness score
469 [4]MD = Movement disorder score
470 [5]BCS = Body condition score
471 [6]SL = Shoulder lesions score
472

Table 4. Predictive accuracy differences between different combination of behavioural scores for piglet mortality and survival traits

Model	Postnatal mortality, %	AIC[1]	AIC weights[2] (%)
1	NBA[3]	3787.3	0.0
2	SC[4]	3735.5	0.0
3	SCR[5]	3738.5	0.0
4	NBA & SC	3735.9	0.0
5	NBA & SCR	3738.2	0.0
6	SC & SCR	3714.5	58.7
7	NBA, SC & SCR	3715.2	41.3
Model	Weaned piglets, n	AIC[1]	AIC weights[2] (%)
1	NBA	3896.4	0.3
2	SC	3889.0	10.8
3	SCR	3887.8	19.8
4	NBA & SC	3890.2	6.0
5	NBA & SCR	3889.0	10.9
6	SC & SCR	3886.7	34.3
7	NBA, SC & SCR	3888.0	17.9

[1]AIC = Akaike information criterion (smaller value, better predictive accuracy)
[2]AIC weights = Akaike weights (higher percentage, higher predictive accuracy)
[3]NBA = Nest building activities score
[4]SC = Sow communication score
[5]SCR = Sow carefulness score

Score	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0
Definition	Very thin, with hips and backbone very prominent without fat covering hips and backbone		Thin, hip bones and backbone are easily felt without any pressure on the palms		Normal-good, it takes firm palm pressure to feel the hip bones and backbone		Fat; impossible to feel the bones at all, even when pressed with palm		Very fat, so fat that it is impossible to feel the hip bones and backbone even by pushing down with a single finger

482

483   Fig. 1: Body condition scores (Animalia, 2014)

Score 1

Initial stage, mild lesions of the skin, including reddening or swelling or minor non-bleeding patches/wounds (diameter < 2cm)

Score 2

Moderate skin lesions, the wound includes the entire skin thickness and causes bleeding; crusts are common (diameter 2-3 cm), and the amount of granulation tissue is very moderate

Score 3

Serious lesions, these lesions include subcutaneous tissue, but not bone; swelling around the wound and production of granulation tissue are common (diameter 3-5 cm)

Score 4

Very serious lesions, serious injury involving the scapula bone. The tissue around the lesion is thickened and often adherent to the underlying bone, granulation tissue is common. The wound has commonly a diameter of 5 cm or more

484

485   Fig. 2: Shoulder lesion scores (Animalia, 2014)

486
487   Fig. 3: Distributions of sows in relation to; (a) number of weaned piglets; (b) piglet mortality

Fig. 4: Distributions of sows in relation to behavioural scores: (a) nest building; (b) sow communication to piglets; (c) sow carefulness to piglets

Fig. 5: Relation between movement disorder and behavioural scores: (a) nest building ($F_{1, 805} = 6.3$; P = 0.012); (b) sow communication to piglets ($F_{1, 805} = 3.7$; P = 0.050); (c) sow carefulness to piglets ($F_{1, 805} = 7.7$; P = 0.006)

493
494   Fig. 6: Relation between body condition score and nest building score ($F_{2, 805}$ = 3.8; P = 0.022)
495

496
497 Fig. 7: Relation between sow parity number and behavioural scores: (a) sow communication to piglets
498 $(F_{1, 805} = 14.3; P < 0.001)$; (b) sow carefulness to piglets $(F_{1, 805} = 15.7; P < 0.001)$
499

Fig. 8: Relation between postnatal mortality and behavioural scores: (a) sow communication to piglets
($F_{1, 799} = 13.7$; $P < 0.001$); (b) sow carefulness to piglets ($F_{1, 799} = 6.2$; $P = 0.013$)

504
505 Fig. 9: Relation between litter size and postnatal mortality ($F_{1, 799} = 695.1$; $P < 0.001$)
506

Fig. 10: Relation between number of weaned piglets and behavioural scores: (a) nest building ($F_{1, 799} = 6.8$; $P = 0.009$); (b) sow communication to piglets ($F_{1, 799} = 14.0$; $P < 0.001$); (c) sow carefulness to piglets ($F_{1, 799} = 6.8$; $P = 0.009$)

510
511 Fig. 11: Relation between number of weaned piglets and litter size at birth ($F_{1, 799} = 42.1$; $P < 0.001$)
512