



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Evidence for litter differences in play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs

Citation for published version:

Brown, S, Klaffenböck, M, Nevison, IM & Lawrence, A 2015, 'Evidence for litter differences in play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs', *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, vol. 172, pp. 17-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.09.007>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.applanim.2015.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.09.007)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Applied Animal Behaviour Science

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy


The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Accepted Manuscript

Title: Evidence for litter differences in play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs

Author: Sarah Mills Brown Michael Klaffenböck Ian Macleod Nevison Alistair Burnett Lawrence



PII: S0168-1591(15)00265-8
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2015.09.007>
Reference: APPLAN 4137

To appear in: *APPLAN*

Received date: 21-7-2015
Revised date: 22-9-2015
Accepted date: 27-9-2015

Please cite this article as: Brown, S.M., Klaffenböck, M., Nevison, I.M., Lawrence, A.B., Evidence for litter differences in play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs, *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.09.007>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Highlights

- First demonstration of between litter differences in play behaviour in pigs
- Litter differences in play behaviour appear independent of overall activity levels
- Litter differences in play behaviour associate strongly with post-natal growth
- Pre-natal factors (particularly birth weight and BMI) associate positively with play behaviour
- Pre-weaning play behaviour has potential as an indicator of positive welfare

Accepted Manuscript

1 **Evidence for litter differences in play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs.**

2 **Sarah Mills Brown¹, Michael Klaffenböck², Ian Macleod Nevison³, Alistair Burnett**
3 **Lawrence^{1,4}**

4 ¹Division of Neurobiology, The Roslin Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush,
5 Midlothian, EH25 9RG. [Tel:01316519117](tel:01316519117). Email: sarah.brown@ed.ac.uk

6 ²University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Gregor-Mendel-Straße 33, 1180 Vienna,
7 Austria.

8 ³Biomathematics and Statistics Scotland, James Clerk Maxwell Building, Peter Guthrie Tait
9 Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3FD.

10 ⁴Animal & Veterinary Sciences, SRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JG.

11

12 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Sarah M Brown, Division of Neurobiology, The Roslin Institute,
13 The University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush, Midlothian, EH25 9RG. [Tel:01316519117](tel:01316519117). Email:
14 sarah.brown@ed.ac.uk

15

16

17 **Abstract**

18 The aim of this study was to analyse spontaneous play behaviour in litters of domestic pigs
19 (*Sus scrofa*) for sources of variation at individual and litter levels and to relate variation in
20 play to measures of pre and postnatal development. Seven litters of commercially bred
21 piglets (n=70) were born (farrowed) within a penning system (PigSAFE) that provided
22 opportunities for the performance of spontaneous play behaviours. Individual behaviour was
23 scored based on an established play ethogram for two days per week over the three week
24 study period. We found strong evidence of litter differences in play behaviour ($F_{(6,63)}=27.30$,
25 $p<0.001$). Of the variance in total play, 50% was attributable to differences between litters
26 with a lesser proportion (11%) to between piglets within litters. We found similar evidence of
27 litter differences when we analysed the separate play categories (e.g. for locomotor play:
28 $F_{(6,63)} = 27.50$, $p<0.001$). For social and locomotor play the variance was partitioned in a
29 broadly similar way to total play; however for object play the variance was distributed with a
30 more even balance across and within litters. In terms of explanatory factors we found little
31 evidence that at the litter level differences in play were associated with differences in general
32 activity. Of the prenatal factors measured, we found that birthweight was positively
33 associated with total play and the play categories (e.g. with total play: $F_{(1,64)}=12.8$, $p<0.001$).
34 We also found that postnatal piglet growth up to weaning (as a percentage of birth weight)
35 had a significant positive association with total play and the play categories (e.g. with object
36 play: $F_{(1,66)} =20.55$, $p<0.001$). As found in other studies, on average males engaged in more
37 social play (e.g. non-injurious play fighting: $F_{(1,63)} = 39.8$, $p<0.001$). Males also initiated more
38 play bouts on average than females ($F_{(1,62)} = 4.41$, $p=0.040$). We conclude that the study of
39 differences between litters and individuals provides a robust approach to understanding
40 factors potentially influencing play behaviour in the pig. This work also provides support for
41 the use of play as a welfare indicator in pre-weaned piglets as the litter differences in play
42 we observed were associated positively with physical development.

43 **Key words** *Pig, spontaneous play behaviour, individual differences, litter differences, pre-*
44 *natal, post-natal, growth development, sex effects*

45 **Introduction**

46 Play is a commonly observed and characteristic behaviour of young mammals (e.g. Bekoff
47 and Byers, 1998). Despite difficulties posed by the scientific study of play behaviour (e.g.
48 Burghardt, 2005) it has been and remains a topic of considerable interest in the behavioural
49 sciences (see Graham and Burghardt, 2010; Held and Spinka, 2011 for recent reviews).
50 Recent studies have aimed to understand the function of play (e.g. Cameron et al., 2008),
51 and the mechanisms underlying play behaviour including analyses of the neural networks
52 associated with and potentially causal to play behaviour (e.g. Northcutt and Nguyen, 2014).
53 Play also has applied relevance as it has been suggested as a potential indicator of high
54 levels of animal welfare given that play tends to be expressed only under good or 'optimal'
55 environmental conditions (e.g. Lawrence, 1987; Held and Spinka, 2011).

56 Pig play behaviour has been described in wild and domesticated species (e.g. Frädich,
57 1974; Dobao et al., 1985), and generally has similarities to play found in other species of
58 young mammal. For example play in pigs is age-dependant. In a study of play in
59 domesticated pigs (*Sus scrofa*) living in a semi-natural environment (Newberry et al., 1988),
60 play increased in the first 6 weeks of life but thereafter declined to low levels by week 14 of
61 life. As with other species, play behaviour in pigs can be categorised into locomotor, object-
62 directed and social play (e.g. Blackshaw et al., 1997). The behaviours that are recognised as
63 play in pigs have some resemblance to adult behaviours (e.g. running; play fighting) but at
64 the same time are recognisably different, being performed in an exaggerated, energetic and
65 repetitive manner (e.g. Newberry et al., 1988).

66 The study of individual differences in behaviour has become of considerable interest in
67 behavioural science and there is a growing body of literature (reviewed by Bell et al., 2009)
68 reporting that individuals across different species show consistent differences in behaviour

69 (e.g. aggression (Dingemans et al., 2007); exploratory behaviour (Quinn and Cresswell,
70 2005)). Individual behavioural differences provide one approach to the study of behavioural
71 genetics (e.g. Turner et al., 2008), to the proximate mechanisms underlying behaviours (e.g.
72 Andari et al., 2014) and to the function of behaviour (e.g. Laskowski and Bell, 2014).
73 Despite the general interest in individual differences in behaviour, there are few studies that
74 set out to specifically look for stable individual differences in play behaviour (see Held and
75 Spinka, 2011). In polytocous species there have been only a few studies studying the
76 consistency of play within and across litters with reports of consistent litter differences in play
77 in cats (Martin and Bateson, 1985) and dogs (Pal, 2010). There have been no similar studies
78 in the pig although a recent study (Rauw, 2013) found that litter of origin was significantly
79 associated with play behaviour in post-weaned pigs.

80 The aim of this study was to analyse spontaneous play behaviour in pre-weaned pigs for
81 evidence of litter and individual differences in play behaviour and also to estimate the
82 proportional distribution of variation in play behaviour between its different constituents. The
83 pigs were born and reared in an environment that provided opportunities (space and
84 'enrichment') for the performance of play behaviours. We additionally collected other data on
85 the piglets relating to their pre and post-natal development in order to investigate
86 associations of potential explanatory variables with observed within and between litter
87 differences in play behaviour.

88

89 **Material and methods**

90 **Animals and housing**

91 The 70 piglets that were studied were bred from seven commercial cross-bred dams (Large
92 White x Landrace); the boar-line was American Hampshire. Litters were born within a 4 day
93 time window. Litter size was not standardised and was dependent on biological variation (9-

94 12 piglets per litter in this study). Cross fostering was kept to a minimum and only performed
95 where piglet welfare was considered at risk.

96 The experimental animals were housed in the *Pig and Sow Alternative Farrowing*
97 *Environment* (PigSAFE) pens (Edwards et al., 2012). PigSAFE pens allow species-specific
98 behaviours in both the sow and the piglets to be expressed by providing more space and the
99 possibility for provision of straw (1kg per pen per day approximately) as a substrate for
100 'environmental enrichment' compared to conventional farrowing environments (Fig. 1). No
101 other manipulable materials were provided. Temperature within the unit was controlled in
102 accordance to the Defra Code of Recommendations for the Welfare of Livestock (Defra,
103 2003), and pigs were maintained on a 12 hour light/dark cycle. Piglets were managed
104 according to standard farm practice (UK) including iron injection at 3 days of age,
105 vaccination against Porcine Circoviral Disease (PCVD) at 28 days of age and ear tagging for
106 identification at weaning. No tooth clipping was performed and males were not castrated.

107 Figure 1 here

108 **Piglet Measures**

109 Within 24 hours of birth piglets were measured manually from crown of the head to base of
110 tail (as reported in Baxter et al., 2008) to within 5mm. Piglets were also weighed at this stage
111 and at weekly intervals (based on birth date) up to weaning. We estimated Ponderal Index
112 ($PI = \text{weight (kg)} / \text{length (m)}^3$) and Body Mass Index ($BMI = \text{weight (kg)} / \text{length (m)}^2$) which
113 have both been shown to be relevant indicators of pre-natal development in the pig (e.g.
114 Baxter et al., 2008). Litter size was the number of piglets that survived beyond the first two
115 weeks post farrowing. Post-natal growth was calculated as the percentage change in mass
116 from birth to weaning.

117 **Ethical approval**

118 This project was reviewed and approved by SRUC (Scotland's Rural College) ethical review
119 committee. All routine animal management procedures were adhered to by trained staff and
120 health issues treated as required. All piglets were returned to commercial stock at the end of
121 the study.

122 **Experimental Design**

123 The experiment spanned approximately 27 days from farrowing until weaning. Play
124 behaviours were determined largely using an ethogram based on previous work in pigs (see
125 Table 1); non-harmful fighting was included in the category of social play.

126 Table 1 here

127

128 **Recording of play behaviours**

129 The animals were digitally recorded from day 1 using Sony LL20 low light cameras with
130 infra-red and a Geovision GV-DVR. Two cameras were set up per pen, one at the rear and
131 one at the front to provide maximal coverage. Piglets were not visible when in the creep box
132 but could be seen at all other times. Behavioural observations were started when piglets
133 were approximately one week old and continued with two observations per week (Mondays
134 and Fridays from 0900 until 1300) until the piglets were weaned (six observation days in
135 total).

136 On observation days (between 0800 and 0900), piglets were numbered on the back with
137 numbers corresponding to their post-farrowing ID's using a black permanent marker.
138 Cameras were set to record and video data analysed for the time period 0900-1300. The
139 time period was chosen to commence after early morning husbandry and to extend for a
140 period that would contain sufficient play bouts for analysis. The collected video material was
141 searched for play bouts, defined as episodes where at least one piglet was observed to
142 engage in playful behaviour. Play behaviour for each individual piglet during these play

143 bouts was then recorded using focal sampling with Noldus' *The Observer XT 11* (Noldus
144 Information Technology bv, Wageningen, The Netherlands) software package. A coding
145 scheme was created, relating each behaviour from the ethogram and every individual piglet
146 with a specific key. Where more than one animal were observed starting a play bout
147 simultaneously, the video was analysed for one animal and then rewound and analysed for
148 the others. All data recorded was in the form of frequency counts. One observer completed
149 all video analysis to remove any reliability issues relating to multiple observers.

150 **Activity score**

151 On observation days, an activity score for each individual piglet was recorded on an Excel
152 spread sheet during a 5 second window every half hour between 0900 and 1300. Individuals
153 were defined as active when they were moving around the pen or lying/sitting but showing
154 movement of the body and/or head. Individuals were inactive when lying with no movement
155 or out of site in the creep area. The activity score was calculated as the sum of all times
156 active during the observational period resulting in an individual activity score for each
157 experimental animal per observation day.

158 **Statistical analysis**

159 Basic descriptive statistics were calculated using Minitab 16. All further analysis was carried
160 out using Genstat (16th Edition). In order to more closely satisfy the assumptions underlying
161 the statistical methods applied, count data were square root transformed and percentage
162 data were arcsine transformed. The activity score did not require transformation.

163 We addressed the statistical analysis of within and between litter differences in play in two
164 ways. The first of these treated litter as a fixed effect, as did Martin and Bateson (1985). We
165 formally compared litters for differences in square root transformed counts of total play, the
166 different play categories (locomotor, object and social) and the different play elements (see
167 Table 1), and activity. We used one-way Analysis of Variance to compare litters with one
168 value per individual (being the average of the transformed values from each of the 6

169 observations days). The second approach was to fit a mixed model (i.e. a model comprising
170 both fixed and random effects) in the GenStat statistical package using the REML algorithm.
171 This approach broadens the inference from the specific litters studied to the population of
172 litters. The random effects part of the model comprised four terms: litter, litter X observation
173 day, piglet within litter and residual variation providing estimates of variance components for
174 these four sources of variation. Thus the variance component for litter is an estimate of the
175 variance in the population of litters from which the seven observed in this study were a
176 sample. The fixed effects part of the model comprised observation day and sex. This
177 provided a formal statistical test for sex differences. From the estimated variance
178 components the variance for the mean for a single observed animal was calculated together
179 with the percentage contribution of each of the four sources of variation to that variance. The
180 potential for correlation between observations on different measurement days was modelled
181 using a compound symmetry formulation; i.e. a common correlation for the residual variation
182 between observation days was assumed. More complex correlation structures were not
183 found to be useful based on a comparison of deviances.

184 Potential associations with prenatal and postnatal factors were explored through a stepwise
185 fixed effects selection process within a mixed model framework (REML) applied to piglet
186 means of the transformed behaviour data. The base model comprised litter as a random
187 effect and no fixed effects. Other covariates (such as birth weight, BMI, sex etc) were added
188 sequentially to the fixed effects model in the order of greatest statistical significance until no
189 further terms gave a significant improvement. Pearson's product moment correlations were
190 used to determine associations between measures at the between-litter level.

191 In the fixed effects model testing for litter differences by one-way Analysis of Variance the
192 residual degrees of freedom was 63 after estimating a parameter for each litter. There was a
193 slight imbalance between litters in the sex ratio and also the values of the various covariates
194 (e.g. piglet birth weight) varied both between and within litters. Hence at both these levels
195 there was information from which effects could be estimated. The REML analysis combined

196 the between-litter and within-litter estimates of effects to give a single estimate. However, the
197 relative prominence given to the two constituent estimates in the combined value depends
198 on the relative precisions of the constituent estimates and this is also reflected in the residual
199 degrees of freedom.

200

201 **Results**

202 **Total Play Behaviour**

203 Analysing litter as a fixed effect, we found mean total play (counts) differed significantly
204 between litters ($F_{(6,63)} = 27.30$, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 2A). There was weak statistical evidence for
205 litter differences in mean overall activity levels during the pre- weaning period ($F_{(6,63)} = 2.15$,
206 $p = 0.060$) (Fig 2B).

207 Figure 2 here

208 When we used REML to analyse the variance components for total play we estimated that
209 for total play (averaged over observation days for a randomly selected pig of any given sex)
210 50% of the variance originated at the litter level, with 24% from a litter x observation day
211 interaction and 11% from differences between piglets within litters (see Table 2). The REML
212 analysis therefore suggests there is both between and within litter variation in total play with
213 between litter variation being much the stronger effect. The REML analysis also showed that
214 males displayed marginally higher mean levels of total play than females (total play counts
215 (transformed): Males: 3.77 vs. Females: 3.36, $SED = 0.20$, $F_{(1,62)} = 4.41$, $p = 0.04$).
216 Estimation of the variance components for general activity using REML showed 76% of the
217 variation was due to residual variation (Table 2; Fig. 2B).

218 **Play categories**

219 On average, based on counts piglet play was 43% locomotor, 20.3% object and 36.7%
220 social. Analysing with litter as a fixed effect we found strong evidence of litter differences in
221 the mean absolute levels of all three play categories (Locomotor $F_{(6,63)} = 27.50$, $p < 0.001$;
222 Object $F_{(6,63)} = 10.94$, $p < 0.001$; Social $F_{(6,63)} = 12.94$, $p < 0.001$). Observed differences
223 between litters in the percentage of play in the different play categories did not reach
224 significance (Locomotor $F_{(6,63)} = 2.24$, $p = 0.051$; Object $F_{(6,63)} = 0.26$, $p = 0.955$; Social $F_{(6,63)}$
225 $= 2.21$, $p = 0.053$).

226 Using REML to estimate variance components we found, as with total play, evidence of
227 between and within litter differences in the absolute levels of the play categories. For
228 locomotor and social play the variance was partitioned in a broadly similar way to total play
229 (Table 2); however for object play the variance was distributed somewhat differently with a
230 more even balance across and within litters.

231 Table 2 here

232 The REML analysis also found that males engaged in more total social play behaviours than
233 females (counts for mean social play (transformed): Males = 2.447 vs. Females = 1.704,
234 $SED=0.142$, $F_{(1,63)} = 27.3$, $p < 0.001$). Neither locomotor nor object play showed any
235 evidence for sex differences in absolute values. Piglets also displayed sex differences in the
236 percentage of the type of play behaviour they performed, with females engaging on a
237 percentage basis in more locomotor play behaviours (mean percentage of locomotor play
238 (transformed): Females = 43.88 vs. Male mean=37.65, $SED=2.182$, $F_{(1,67)} = 8.2$, $p=0.006$)
239 while males engaged in more social play behaviours (mean percentage of social play
240 (transformed): Females = 31.88 vs. Males mean=41.16, $SED=1.471$, $F_{(1,66)} = 39.8$, $p < 0.001$).

241 **Play elements**

242 We found that the sex differences in absolute levels of social play could be attributed to
243 higher levels of non-harmful fighting in males (e.g. using REML: mean counts of non-harmful
244 fighting (transformed): Males = 1.74 vs. Females = 1.04, $SED 0.11$, $F_{(1,63)} = 39.8$, $p < 0.001$)

245 and pushing (mean counts of pushing (transformed): Males = 1.09 vs. Females = 0.76, SED
246 = 0.10, $F_{(1,63)} = 11.8$, $p < 0.001$). We found similar effects for percentages of non-harmful
247 fighting elements (e.g. mean percentage of counts of pushing (transformed): Males = 18.24
248 vs. Females = 14.24, SED = 1.41, $p = 0.006$).

249 REML analysis also indicated that the different play elements showed differences relative to
250 each other in their partitioning of variance across the components (Table 3). For example,
251 some elements (e.g. nudge and run) showed a similar distribution across the components to
252 the play categories and total play, whilst others (e.g. hop and pivot) showed higher residual
253 variation.

254 Table 3 here

255 At the litter level the percentage of the elements 'run' and 'flop' were positively correlated
256 with overall absolute total play in the pre-weaning period (correlations with total play using
257 litter means of totals of square roots ($n = 7$): Run: $r = 0.79$, $p = 0.033$; Flop: $r = 0.96$, $p < 0.001$).
258 No strong correlations were found between total play and other behavioural elements.

259 Play invitations and rejections were considered separately from social play (following Martin
260 et al., 2015). Using litter as a fixed factor there was a statistically significant difference in the
261 mean play invitations and rejections across litters (Mean invitations $F_{6,63} = 10.89$, $p < 0.001$;
262 Mean rejections $F_{6,63} = 23.72$, $p < 0.001$) which correlated strongly with total play levels
263 (correlations with total play using litter means ($n = 7$): Invitations $r = 0.858$, $p = 0.014$;
264 Rejections $r = 0.766$, $p = 0.045$; Fig. 3). There was no statistical evidence that the average
265 ratio of play invitations to rejections differed across litters ($F_{(6,63)} = 1.42$, $p = 0.22$). Overall
266 males initiated more play bouts per observation day than females (mean play initiations
267 (transformed): Males: 2.24 vs. Females = 1.55; SED = 0.16; $F_{1,63} = 19.22$, $P < 0.001$).

268 Figure 3 here

269 Estimation of variance components using REML indicated that invitations and rejections
270 showed a similar distribution of variance across components to total play and the play
271 categories (e.g. 42% of variance in invitations and 40% in rejections was at the litter level).

272 **Covariate analyses**

273 Of the prenatal measures we found that birth weight was positively associated with total play
274 ($F_{(1,64)} = 12.8$, $p < 0.001$) and the play categories (Locomotor: $F_{(1,65)} = 3.95$, $p = 0.051$; Object:
275 $F_{(1,67)} = 5.12$, $p = 0.027$; Social: $F_{(1,65)} = 10.59$, $p = 0.002$;). Birth weight was not associated with
276 general activity ($F_{(1,52)} = 0.14$, $p = 0.71$). We also found BMI to be positively associated with
277 total play and object play (e.g. total play: $F_{(1,65)} = 4.95$, $p = 0.030$); ponderal index was not
278 associated with total play or the play categories. There was no statistical evidence that litter
279 size at birth was associated with total play in this study.

280 Of the postnatal measures we found percentage piglet growth to be positively associated
281 with total play ($F_{(1,67)} = 10.02$, $p = 0.002$; see Fig. 4) and the play categories (Locomotor: $F_{(1,67)}$
282 $= 3.98$, $p = 0.05$; Object: $F_{(1,66)} = 20.55$, $p < 0.001$; Social: $F_{(1,67)} = 7.83$, $p = 0.007$).

283 When we sequentially added pre and postnatal measures to the fixed effects part of the
284 model in a stepwise manner using REML we found variation across the play categories with
285 respect to whether pre or postnatal measures entered the model first as the most highly
286 significant term. Social play had a more highly significant association with birthweight than %
287 weight gain to weaning whilst locomotor and object play showed the reverse. However, after
288 adjusting for the first covariate, inclusion of the other covariate was still significant, indicating
289 some association beyond that with the first covariate.

290 Figure 4 here

291 **Discussion**

292 The main aim of this paper was for the first time to analyse between and within litter
293 differences in spontaneously occurring play behaviour in pre-weaned piglets. There is a

294 general interest in individual behavioural differences and a growing awareness of their utility
295 as an approach to the study of animal behaviour (e.g. Bell et al., 2009). However there are
296 few studies that set out specifically to look for individual differences in play behaviour (Held
297 and Spinka, 2011). For example in a study of play in Belding's ground squirrels
298 (*Spermophilus beldingi*), Nunes et al. (2004) explored explanatory variables for spontaneous
299 play in free-living squirrels but do not report directly on whether there were stable individual
300 differences in play. Studies of dog 'personality' have suggested 'playfulness' as a stable
301 personality trait, although these studies tend to use 'tests' of playfulness (e.g. Svartberg and
302 Forkman, 2002) as opposed to observation of spontaneous play behaviour. For pre-weaned
303 young in litter bearing species we need to take into account that variation in play may be
304 affected by both individual and litter characteristics. Our study appears to be the first in any
305 species to estimate the proportional distribution of variance in play between and within litters.
306 In cats, previous work (Martin and Bateson, 1985) equalised litters and averaged play
307 behaviour across the litter and found marked differences in play behaviour between litters.
308 We have similarly identified litter differences in play. A recent study of play in wild dogs
309 (*Canis familiaris*) did report within and between litter differences in play behaviour through
310 the use of repeated Chi-square testing but was not able to comment on the relative strength
311 of the these (Pal, 2010). Our REML analysis indicates that litter is a much stronger source of
312 variation in play, over the six observation days that we used, than the individual piglet
313 perhaps with the exception of object play. We also found variability in both litter and
314 individual piglet play across different observation days.

315 Martin and Bateson (1985) pointed out that the causes and functions of the litter differences
316 they observed in their cat study represented an important challenge for the study of
317 behavioural development. In this study we can make some observations on potential
318 explanatory factors for litter differences in play behaviour in pigs. We observed that the litter
319 differences in play do not appear to be strongly related to litter differences in general activity.
320 There was little evidence of between litter variation in general activity and the estimation of

321 variance components for activity found a large residual variation which may indicate that play
322 and activity are under the control of different causal factors. Similarly Martin and Bateson
323 (1985) in their study of play in cats, found no evidence of litter differences in a measure of
324 general activity. Furthermore, similar to Martin and Bateson (1985) we found that both the
325 mean levels of total play and also the mean occurrence of different categories of play
326 differed significantly between litters. Another possible explanation for the litter differences
327 reported here is that in certain litters of pigs, play has a more 'contagious effect' with playing
328 animals being more likely to stimulate play behaviour in other animals (e.g. Leca et al.,
329 2007). We found that both the levels of what we defined as play invitations and rejections
330 were strongly correlated with overall levels of play, and that there was no statistical evidence
331 of the ratio of play invitations to rejections varying across litters. This would suggest that
332 there was a similar proportional response to play invitations across litters and hence
333 contagion is not having a strong influence on the litter differences in play we observed.

334

335 There have been only a few reported studies on the relationship between prenatal factors
336 and development of play; for example Morley-Fletcher et al. (2003) reported that prenatal
337 stress (caused by restraint of the mother) reduced social play in rats. In this study we found
338 evidence that birth weight and to an extent BMI were associated positively with differences in
339 total play and the play categories; ponderal index and litter size at birth were not associated
340 with play. These relationships are partly explained by the correlations between these pre-
341 natal variables (birthweight being correlated to BMI but not to ponderal index). Previous work
342 in pigs (Litten et al., 2003) also reported a relationship between birth weight and play
343 (measured in a standardised test) with low birth weight being associated with reduced play
344 behaviour.

345

346 In terms of post-natal life we found a strong relationship between average litter levels of play
347 and average litter growth between birth and weaning. Play is generally known to be sensitive
348 to reductions in food availability with play generally declining along with food availability (e.g.

349 deer (Muller-Schwarze et al. 1982); sheep (Reale et al., 1999); meerkats (Sharpe, 2002) and
350 primates (Baldwin and Baldwin, 1976). Nunes et al (2004) showed that body fat reserves
351 were a constraint on expression of social play in ground squirrels under ecological
352 conditions. As far as we can find there have been no studies which have associated
353 variability of milk supply from a nursing mother and development of spontaneous play.
354 Cameron et al (2008) suggest that play behaviour in feral foals (*Equus caballus*) mirrors
355 maternal investment (indicated by maternal condition). In domestic calves being artificially
356 fed milk, play has been shown to be reduced by a low milk allowance (Duve et al., 2012). In
357 a contradiction to the generally accepted relationship between nutrient availability and play,
358 Bateson et al. (1981) found that interrupting lactation with bromocriptine led to an increase in
359 levels of play in cats. In our study it seems most likely that the litter differences in growth rate
360 relate to sow milk yield (e.g. Noblet and Etienne, 1989). There are however other possible
361 explanations including across litter variation in the utilisation of milk nutrients by piglets (e.g.
362 Aguinaga et al., 2011), or variation in levels of success with which piglets stimulated milk
363 production from the sow (e.g. King et al., 1997; Farmer, 2013) or an interaction between
364 these. Although litter size can influence growth in pigs (e.g. Auldist et al., 1998), in this study
365 we found no association between litter size and play. Burghardt's (2005) Surplus Resource
366 Theory (SRT) proposes that play behaviour evolved where juveniles had available resources
367 to use for play behaviour; hence play is most likely to evolve in young endotherms (with the
368 ability to engage and recover from vigorous exercise), with extended juvenile phases with
369 food and protection provided by parent(s). Generally our observation that postnatal growth
370 and play are strongly associated appears to accord with the SRT although questions remain
371 over the 'rules' that govern the allocation of resources between growth and play.

372

373 In general we found sex differences in play that agree with other studies. Males engaged in
374 slightly more play overall as a result of them performing more non-harmful fighting
375 behaviours and pushing behaviour than females. Proportionally females performed more

376 locomotor play. Sexual dimorphism in play has been seen in other species (horses (*Equus*
377 *caballus*) Cameron et al 2008; sheep (*Ovis aries*) Sachs and Harris, 1978) and it is
378 suggested it plays a role in establishing social relationships with those likely to be interacted
379 with in the future (Holmes 1995). Male pigs would traditionally compete for access to
380 females for mating (Graves 1984), and the increased non-harmful fighting observed may
381 support the 'social training' hypothesis of play development (Smith 1982). Males also
382 initiated more play events (with both male and female partners), supporting the hypothesis
383 for a greater motivation for play initiation in males (e.g. Nunes 2004). However, these sex
384 differences cannot account for the total play difference between litters as sex ratios were
385 reasonably consistent across litters within the population.

386 There is considerable interest in the longer-term consequences of play behaviour (e.g.
387 Graham and Burghardt (2010). Our study ceased at weaning. However it is worth noting that
388 a recent study by Rauw (2013) on play in older (weaned) pigs, found that the litter of origin
389 affected the number of play movements and time spent in play behaviour. This suggests that
390 the litter effects we observed in our pre-weaning study may persist into the post-weaning
391 phase of life.

392

393 In relation to animal welfare there has been increasing interest in the concept of 'positive
394 welfare' (i.e. moving beyond providing for minimal welfare standards; e.g. Yeates and Main,
395 2008), and play behaviour has been proposed as a potential indicator for enhanced, positive
396 welfare states (e.g. Lawrence, 1987; Held and Spinka, 2011). The results we present here
397 support using play as an indicator of positive welfare in the pre-weaned pig. The litter
398 differences in play we observed were associated positively with physical development
399 (birthweight and weight change between birth and weaning). If play is to be used as an
400 indicator of positive welfare in a practical setting then we will need to develop efficient
401 approaches for measuring play. Previously Newberry et al (1988) proposed the use of
402 specific play elements as 'play markers'. In this study the proportion of counts 'run' and 'flop'

403 were positively correlated with total play suggesting these behavioural elements have the
404 potential to be used as play markers in future studies of play in pre-weaned pigs. Future
405 work should aim to examine why litters show differences in play behaviour, both in total play
406 and elements of play, and what effect this may have on the piglets' development.

407

408 **Conclusions**

409 As far as we are aware this is one of only a few studies that have set out to look for stable
410 individual differences in play behaviour and the first time litter differences in play behaviour
411 have been shown in pre-weaning pigs. The litter differences in play we observed, appear
412 independent of activity levels, and were associated strongly with post-natal growth. We also
413 found some evidence of pre-natal developmental effects on play and confirmed previously
414 observed sex effects on the different categories of play. We conclude that the study of
415 differences between litters and individuals provides a robust approach to understanding
416 factors potentially influencing play behaviour in the pig. This work also provides support for
417 the use of play as a welfare indicator in pre-weaned piglets as the litter differences in play
418 we observed were associated positively with physical development.

419

420

421 **Acknowledgements**

422 We would like to acknowledge funding support for this work from the BBSRC Strategic
423 funding to The Roslin Institute, and from the Scottish Government's Rural and Environment
424 Science and Analytical Services Division (RESAS).

425 Technical support was provided by the SRUC technicians Marianne Farish and Mhairi Jack.
426 Emma Baxter, Jess Hopkins, Sarah Ison and Simon Turner provided assistance during the

427 development of the ethogram and experimental design. Peter Finnie provided general
428 animal husbandry assistance throughout the experimental period.

429

430

431 **References**

432 Aguinaga, M.A., Gomez-Carballar, F., Nieto, R., Aguilera, J.F., 2011. Production and
433 composition of Iberian sow's milk and use of milk nutrients by the suckling Iberian piglet.
434 *Animal*, 5, 1390-1397.

435 Andari, E., Schneider, F.C., Mottolese, R., Vindras, P., Sirigu, A. 2014. Oxytocin's fingerprint
436 in personality traits and regional brain volume. *Cereb. Cortex*, 24, 479-486.

437 Auldust, D.E., Morrish, L., Eason, P. & King, R.H., 1998. The influence of litter size on milk
438 production of sows. *Anim. Sci.*, 67, 333-337.

439 Baldwin, J.D., Baldwin, J.I., 1976. The role of learning phenomena in the ontogeny and
440 exploration of play, in: Chevalier-Skolnikoff, S., Poirier, F.E. (Eds.), *Primate Bio-Social*
441 *Development: Biological, Social, and Ecological Determinants*. Garland, New York, pp 343-
442 406.

443

444 Bateson, P., Martin, P., Young, M., 1981. Effects of interrupting cat mother's lactation with
445 bromocriptine on the subsequent play of their kittens. *Physiol. Behav.*, 27, 841-845.

446 Baxter, E.B., Jarvis S., D'Eath R.B., Ross, D.W., Robson, S.K., Farish, M., Nevison, I.M.,
447 Lawrence, A.B., Edwards, S.A., 2008. Investigating the behavioural and physiological
448 indicators of neonatal survival in pigs. *Theriogenology*, 69, 773-783

449 Bekoff M., Byers, J.A. 1998. (Eds.), *Animal Play: Evolutionary, Comparative, and Ecological*
450 *Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- 451 Bell, A.M., Hankison, S.J., Laskowski, K.L., 2009. The repeatability of behaviour: a meta-
452 analysis. *Anim. Behav.*, 77, 771-783.
- 453 Blackshaw, J.K., Swain, A.J., Blackshaw, A.W., Thomas, F.J.M., Gillies, K.J., 1997. The
454 development of playful behaviour in piglets from birth to weaning in three farrowing
455 environments. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*, 55, 37-49
456
- 457 Bolhuis, J.E., Schouten, W.G.P., Schrama, J.W., Wiegant, V.M., 2005. Behavioural
458 development of pigs with different coping strategies in barren and substrate-enriched
459 housing conditions. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 93, 213-228.
460
- 461 Burghardt G.M. 2005. *The Genesis of Animal Play: Testing the Limits*. MIT Press,
462 Cambridge, Massachusetts.
463
- 464 Cameron, E.Z., Linklater, W.L., Stafford, K.J., Minot, E.O., 2008. Maternal investment results
465 in better foal condition through increased play behaviour in horses. *Anim. Behav.*, 76, 1511-
466 1518.
- 467 Chaloupkova, H., Illman, G., Bartos, L., Spinka, A., 2007. The effect of pre-weaning housing
468 on play and agonistic behaviour of domestic pigs. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*, 103, 25-34
- 469 Defra, 2003. *Code of Recommendation for the Welfare of Livestock: Pigs*. Defra
470 Publications, London.
471
- 472 Dingemans, N.J., Wright, J., Kazem, A.J. N., Thomas, D.K., Hickling, R., Dawnay, N., 2007.
473 Behavioural syndromes differ predictably between 12 populations of three-spined
474 stickleback. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 76, 1128-1138.
475

- 476 Dobao, M.T., Rodrigahez, J., Silio, L., 1985. Choice of companions in social play in piglets.
477 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci., 13: 259-266.
478
- 479 Donaldson, T.M., Newberry, R.C., Spinka, M., Cloutier, S., 2002. Effects of early play
480 experience on play behaviour of piglets after weaning. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci., 79, 221-231.
- 481 Duve, L.R., Weary, D.M., Halekoh, U., Jensen, M.B., 2012. The effects of social contact and
482 milk allowance on responses to handling, play, and social behavior in young dairy calves. J.
483 Dairy Sci., 95, 6571-6581.
- 484 Edwards, S.A., Brett, M., Ison, S., Jack, M., Seddon, Y.M., Baxter, E.M., 2012. Design
485 principles and practical evaluation of the PigSAFE free far rowing pen. In: Proceedings of
486 the Fourth European Symposium on Porcine Health Management, Brugges, Belgium, p.
487 113.
- 488 Farmer, C., 2013. Suckling effects in sows: importance for mammary development and
489 productivity. Animal, 7, 1964-1968.
- 490 Frädich H., 1974. A comparison of behaviour in the Suidae. In: Geist, V., Walther, F. (Eds.),
491 The Behaviour of Ungulates and its Relation to Management, Vol. 1. IUCN, Morges, pp. 133-
492 143.
- 493 Graham, K.L., Burghardt, G.M., 2010. Current perspectives on the biological study of play
494 signs of progress. Q. Rev. Biol., 85, 393-418.
- 495 Graves, H.B., 1984. Behavior and ecology of wild and feral swine (*Sus-Scrofa*). J. Anim.
496 Sci., 58, 482-492.
- 497 Held, S.D.E., Spinka, M. 2011. Animal play and animal welfare. Anim. Behav., 81, 891-899.
- 498 Holmes, W.G. 1995. The Ontogeny of Littermate Preferences in Juvenile Golden-Mantled
499 Ground-Squirrels: Effects of Rearing and Relatedness. Anim. Behav., 50, 309-322.

- 500 King, R.H., Mullan, B.P., Dunshea, F.R., Dove, H., 1997. The influence of piglet body weight
501 on milk production of sows. *Livest. Prod. Sci.*, 47, 169-174.
- 502 Laskowski, K.L., Bell, A.M., 2014. Strong personalities, not social niches, drive individual
503 differences in social behaviours in sticklebacks. *Anim. Behav.*, 90, 287-295.
- 504 Lawrence, A.B. 1987. Consumer demand theory and the assessment of animal welfare.
505 *Anim. Behav.*, 35, 293-294.
- 506 Leca, J.B., Gunst, N., Huffman, M.A., 2007. Age-related differences in the performance,
507 diffusion, and maintenance of stone handling, a behavioral tradition in Japanese macaques.
508 *J. Hum. Evol.*, 53, 691-708.
- 509 Litten, J.C., Drury, P.C., Corson, A.M., Lean, I.J., Clarke, L., 2003. The influence of piglet
510 birth weight on physical and behavioural development in early life. *Biol. Neonate*, 84, 311-
511 318.
- 512 Martin, J.E., Ison, S.H., Baxter, E.M., 2015. The influence of neonatal environment on piglet
513 behaviour and post-weaning social and cognitive development. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*,
514 163, 69-79.
- 515 Martin, P., Bateson, P., 1985. The ontogeny of locomotor play-behavior in the domestic cat.
516 *Anim. Behav.*, 33, 502-510.
- 517 Montgomery, S.H. 2014. The relationship between play, brain growth and behavioural
518 flexibility in primates. *Anim. Behav.*, 90, 281-286.
- 519 Morley-Fletcher, S., Rea, M., Maccari, S., Laviola, G., 2003. Environmental enrichment
520 during adolescence reverses the effects of prenatal stress on play behaviour and HPA axis
521 reactivity in rats. *Eur. J. Neurosci.*, 18, 3367-3374.

- 522 Müller-Schwarze, D., Stagge, B., Müller-Schwarze, C., 1982. Play behaviour: persistence,
523 decrease and energetic compensation during food shortage in deer fawns, *Science*, 215, 85-
524 87.
- 525 Newberry R.C, WoodGush D.G.M., Hall J.W., 1988. Playful behaviour of piglets. *Behav*
526 *Proc.* 17, 205-216
- 527 Noblet, J., Etienne, M., 1989. Estimation of sow milk nutrient output. *J. Anim. Sci.*, 67, 3352-
528 3359.
- 529 Northcutt, K.V., Nguyen, J.M.K. 2014. Female juvenile play elicits Fos expression in
530 dopaminergic neurons of the VTA. *Behav. Neurosci.*, 128, 178-186.
- 531 Nunes, S., Muecke, E.M., Sanchez, Z., Hoffmeier, R.R., Lancaster, L.T., 2004. Play behavior
532 and motor development in juvenile Belding's ground squirrels (*Spermophilus beldingi*).
533 *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*, 56, 97-105.
- 534 Pal, S.K., 2010. Play behaviour during early ontogeny in free-ranging dogs (*Canis familiaris*).
535 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 126, 140-153.
- 536 Quinn, J.L., Cresswell, W., 2005. Personality, anti-predation behavior and behavioral
537 plasticity in the chaffinch *Fringilla coelebs*. *Behav.*, 142, 1377-1402
538
- 539 Rauw, M.W., 2013. A note on the consistency of a behavioural play marker in piglets. *J.*
540 *Anim. Sci. Biotech.*, 4, 33.
541
- 542 Reale, D., Bousses, P., 1999. Effects of summer and winter birth on growth of lambs in a
543 population of feral sheep. *J. Mammal.*, 80, 1028-1037.
- 544 Sachs, B.D., Harris, V.S., 1978. Sex-differences and developmental changes in selected
545 juvenile activities (Play) of domestic lambs. *Anim. Behav.*, 26, 678-684.

- 546 Sharpe, L.L., Clutton-Brock, T.H., Brotherton, P.N.M., Cameron, E.Z., Cherry, M.I., 2002.
547 Experimental provisioning increases play in free-ranging meerkats. *Anim. Behav.*, 64, 113-
548 121.
- 549 Smith, P.K. 1982. Does play matter - Functional and evolutionary aspects of animal and
550 human play. *Behav. Brain Sci.*, 5, 139-155.
- 551 Svartberg, K., Forkman, B., 2002. Personality traits in the domestic dog (*Canis familiaris*).
552 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*, 79, 133-155.
- 553 Turner, S.P., Roehe, R., Mekkawy, W., Farnworth, M.J., Knap, P.W., Lawrence, A.B., 2008.
554 Bayesian analysis of genetic associations of skin lesions and behavioural traits to identify
555 genetic components of individual aggressiveness in pigs. *Behav. Genet.*, 38, 67-75.
- 556 Yeates J.W., Main, D.C., 2008. Assessment of positive welfare: A review. *Vet. J.*, 175, 3,
557 293-300.
- 558
- 559

560 **Figure Legends**

561 **Fig. 1** Diagram of PigSAFE pen (A) and building layout (B). Piglets and sows used in this
562 study were housed in pens L1, L2, L3, R2, R4, R5 and R6. There were also litters in pens
563 L4, R3 and R1 which were not part of the study

564 **Fig. 2:** Graphical representation of total play counts (A) and activity (scored separately to
565 play) (B) of each piglet in each litter averaged over the six observational days. In line with
566 analysis mean total play is displayed as total of square root transformed and average activity
567 counts as raw data. Horizontal coloured lines are the mean values for that litter while the
568 horizontal grey lines represent the overall mean. Litters are labelled as A-G on the x-axis.

569 **Fig. 3:** Litter means averaged over observation periods for invitation and rejections (square
570 root transformed counts) plotted against total play across litters. Invitations are denoted by
571 diamonds, rejections by squares.

572 **Fig. 4:** Graph of mean total play per litter (average total of square roots) against % weight
573 gain (change in weight from birth to weaning) per litter. Horizontal error bars represent the
574 SEM of the change in weight within the litter while vertical error bars represent the SEM of
575 average total play counts within the litter.

576

577 **Table Legends**

578 **Table 1:** Ethogram for piglet behaviours. Behaviours have been referenced to studies which
579 have used the same or similar definitions. Invitation, and the play behaviour used to invite,
580 were not mutually exclusive however neither invite nor reject counts were used in the
581 analysis of total play and play categories.

582 **Table 2:** The results of the REML analysis represented as contributions of each component
583 (litter, litter x observation day, piglet within litter, residual) to variation in total play, the three

584 play categories (locomotor, object and social play) and activity. The values in parentheses
585 are the overall percentage contributions of the components to variance in play behaviour
586 averaged over the six assessments for any randomly selected pig of any given sex.

587 **Table 3:** The results of the REML analysis represented as contributions of each component
588 (litter, litter x observation day, piglet within litter, residual) to variation in the different play
589 elements. The values in parentheses are the overall percentage contributions of the
590 components to variance in play elements averaged over the six observation days for any
591 randomly selected pig of any given sex.

592

Accepted Manuscript

Behaviour/Group	Definition/type	References
Locomotor play		
Running	Energetic running and hopping in forward motions within the pen environment. Often associated with excitability, using large areas of the pen, and occasionally coming into marginal/ accidental contact with other piglets (e.g. nudge).	Bolhuis et al., 2005; Chaloupková et al., 2007; Donaldson et al., 2002; Newberry et al., 1988.
Pivot	Twirling of body on the horizontal plane by a minimum of 90 degrees usually associated with jumping on the spot.	Chaloupková et al., 2007; Donaldson et al., 2002; Newberry et al., 1988.
Flop	Focal animal drops to the pen floor from a normal upright position to a sitting or lying position. There is no contact with an object or another individual (piglet or sow) which could cause the change of position.	Chaloupková et al., 2007; Donaldson et al., 2002.
Hop	Focal animal has either its two front feet or all four feet off the pen floor at one time through an energetic upwards jumping movement. The animal continues facing the same original direction for the whole of the behaviour.	Newberry et al., 1988.
Social play		

Nudge	Snout of focal piglet is used to gently touch another piglet's body, not including naso-naso contact. Usually occurs in bouts of behaviour in quick succession. More intensive than mere touching, more gentle than a push.	Donaldson et al., 2002.
Push	Focal animal drives its head, neck or shoulders with minimal or moderate force into another piglet's body. Occasionally the behaviour results in the displacement of the target piglet. Significantly more intensive than nudging.	Blackshaw et al., 1997; Chaloupková et al., 2007.
Climb	Placing both front hoofs on the back of another piglet or sow.	Bolhuis et al., 2005.
Non-harmful fighting	Two piglets mutually push in a head to head orientation. A general mild intensity of the performed fighting behaviours distinguished non-harmful fighting from potentially harmful fighting.	Defined for this study
Object play		
Object play	Animal manipulates an item or securely holds it in its mouth, energetically shaking it or carrying it around the pen.	Newberry et al., 1988.
Miscellaneous		
Invite	Focal piglet performs play behaviours, which are clearly directed at another non-playing piglet. The behaviours are often repeated rapidly and are highly energetic.	Martin et al., 2015.
Reject	Focal piglet which is a target of play invitation behaviours from another piglet, responds by	Martin et al., 2015.

	turning its head and body away from the 'inviting' piglet and does not reciprocate any play behaviours or does not react to the inviting piglet's attempts at all.	
--	--	--



Table 2

	Litter	Litter x observation day	Piglet within litter	Residual	Total
Total Play	1.181 (50%)	0.576 (24%)	0.270 (11%)	0.340 (14%)	2.37
Locomotor Play	0.514 (41%)	0.384 (31%)	0.145 (12%)	0.210 (17%)	1.254
Object Play	0.105 (23%)	0.118 (26%)	0.099 (22%)	0.136 (30%)	0.459
Social Play	0.486 (50%)	0.172 (18%)	0.154 (16%)	0.167 (17%)	0.979
Activity	0.000 (0%)	0.045 (22%)	0.005 (2%)	0.160 (76%)	0.210


Table 3

	Litter	Litter x observation day	Piglet within litter	Residual	Total
Nudge	0.085 (44%)	0.038 (19%)	0 (0%)	0.071 (37%)	0.194
Push	0.175 (47%)	0.047 (13%)	0.063 (17%)	0.086 (23%)	0.371
Non-harmful fighting	0.192 (41%)	0.085 (18%)	0.089 (19%)	0.108 (23%)	0.473
Flop	0.031 (30%)	0.014 (13%)	0.025 (24%)	0.035 (33%)	0.105
Hop	0.001 (6%)	0.001 (8%)	0 (0%)	0.010 (86%)	0.012
Pivot	0.011 (16%)	0.012 (17%)	0 (0%)	0.047 (67%)	0.070
Climb	0.042 (37%)	0.015 (13%)	0.016 (14%)	0.04 (36%)	0.112
Run	0.428 (39%)	0.356 (32%)	0.133 (12%)	0.179 (16%)	1.096
Shake	0.110 (25%)	0.106 (25%)	0.098 (23%)	0.119 (27%)	0.432
Carry	0.007 (9%)	0.009 (13%)	0.001 (2%)	0.055 (76%)	0.072

Figure 1



Manuscript



Manuscript




Figure3




Figure4

IScrip

