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Abstract

Increasing litter size has long been a goal of pig breeders and producers, and may have implications for pig (Sus scrofa domesticus) welfare. This paper reviews the scientific evidence on biological factors affecting sow and piglet welfare in relation to large litter size. It is concluded that, in a number of ways, large litter size is a risk factor for decreased animal welfare in pig production. Increased litter size is associated with increased piglet mortality, which is likely to be associated with significant negative animal welfare impacts. In surviving piglets, many of the causes of mortality can also occur in non-lethal forms that cause suffering. Intense teat competition may increase the likelihood that some piglets do not gain adequate access to milk, causing starvation in the short term and possibly long-term detriments to health. Also, increased litter size leads to more piglets with low birth weight which is associated with a variety of negative long-term effects. Finally, increased production pressure placed on sows bearing large litters may produce health and welfare concerns for the sow. However, possible biological approaches to mitigating health and welfare issues associated with large litters are being implemented. An important mitigation strategy is genetic selection encompassing traits that promote piglet survival, vitality and growth. Sow nutrition and the minimisation of stress during gestation could also contribute to improving outcomes in terms of piglet welfare. Awareness of the possible negative welfare consequences of large litter size in pigs should lead to further active measures being taken to mitigate the mentioned effects.
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Introduction

Following the initial domestication of the wild boar about 10,000 years ago (Larson et al 2011), humans began selecting for particular traits in pigs (Sus scrofa domesticus) creating a range of domestic breeds with different physical, behavioural, physiological and reproductive characteristics. In the last century, as knowledge about the principles of inheritance increased, the process of selection in pigs has been conducted in a more systematic fashion. Selection was initially focused on physical appearance but, from the 1950s onwards, production traits were increasingly used (Dekkers et al 2011). Initially, major progress was seen in carcase traits and growth rate while reproductive output showed little gain. As a consequence, over most of the history of pig production, litter size changed relatively little. However, as pig production further increased in intensity, improvements in litter size were achieved through better management and nutrition and, more recently, through effective implementation of genetic selection for litter size.

The pig industry is subject to numerous drivers, but ultimately its aim is to produce a quality product at a competitive price and in a socially acceptable way (Webb 1998; Spötter & Distl 2006). The drive for increased litter size is a consequence of the desire to improve production efficiency by increasing the number of slaughter animals produced per sow. This maximises financial gains and also reduces the environmental impact (per kg of product) of pork production. However, concern has been expressed that increasing litter size may be detrimental to animal welfare (Prunier et al 2010).

This paper aims to provide an overview of the main welfare concerns for piglets and sows resulting from biological factors associated with large litter size. The welfare concerns discussed include the association between large...
litter size and increased piglet mortality and morbidity, behavioural implications of large litters, and long-term outcomes of birth condition (including low birth weight; \[LBW\]) and early life experience. Sow welfare impacts are more uncertain, but are discussed in relation to the process of carrying, delivering and raising a large litter. In addition, the contributions of genetics and other sow factors to the issue of litter size are discussed. A companion paper (Baxter et al 2013; this issue) details how management factors associated with handling large litter sizes affect pig welfare.

Litter size is defined in this paper as all piglets born alive plus all piglets born dead (regardless of birth weight) that appear normally developed and coloured. This excludes fully or partly mummified piglets that did not survive to term (type 1 stillbirths), but includes any normally developed piglets, (classified as type 2 stillbirths: Alonso-Spilsbury et al 2005) that may have died either just before expulsion was initiated, during expulsion or just after being expelled, as well as piglets that possess any malformation that meant they were not viable. This definition is relevant as any piglet so defined has participated in any intra-uterine crowding and in the birth process. The exclusion of type 1 stillbirth piglets is necessary, particularly when reporting litter size data, as these animals are recorded in some countries but not in others, making international comparisons of stillbirth prevalence difficult. However, it is realised that mummified piglets may have participated in intra-uterine crowding at earlier stages in development and thus will be discussed in relevant sections where necessary. Since the pig industry often focuses on viable piglets, our definition may include more individuals than are recorded under practical conditions. In addition, this definition may differ from that used in other publications.

**Welfare impacts on the piglet**

For piglets, the biological consequences of large litter size can be divided into outcomes that are causally related to a crowded gestation environment and outcomes that are related to experiencing post-natal life in a large litter. These two do not perfectly co-vary since, through early piglet mortality or active management responses, such as cross fostering, litter size during neonatal life will be less variable than litter size during foetal life. Litter size at birth may not reflect litter size in early pregnancy because of foetal loss.

**Intra-uterine crowding**

The first point at which litter size could be expected to affect piglet biology is in the uterus. Pig species have a natural propensity to conceive large numbers of offspring and issues relating to foetal litter size have been reviewed and discussed previously (Ashworth et al 2001; Foxcroft et al 2006). Porcine ovulation rates are high, yet the uterine space and/or uterine blood supply represents a limiting resource. Of the released ova, 30–50% fail to survive (Anderson 1978; Pope 1994; Geisert & Schmitt 2002) and those that do survive must compete to acquire adequate placental area for bloodflow and delivery of vital nutrients. Embryos which implant later may be developmentally disadvantaged due to hormonal secretions from more developed embryos (Anderson 1978; Geisert et al 1991; Pope 1994; Krackow 1997) and this might explain why increased crowding in the uterine horns leads to the production of extremely small piglets at birth (Perry & Rowell 1969; Dzuik 1985). Asynchronous development may be part of the natural reproductive strategy of wild pigs; under sub-optimal conditions piglet heterogeneity may mean that larger siblings preferentially survive at the expense of smaller piglets (Fraser 1990).

In most mammalian species it has been noted that a larger litter size reduces average individual birth weight. This is most obvious in species like humans, cows or the horse that give birth to a small number of offspring, but has also been described in polytocous species such as the pig. In non-polytocous species the reduction of birth weight is partly explained by a shorter gestation length, whilst polytocous species will often go close to term even when carrying large litters. In humans, the term ‘small for gestational age’ (SGA) has been used to indicate if the offspring is under-weight even when compensating for reduced gestation length. This correction is seldom relevant in polytocous species. The consequences of reduced birth weight and increased birth weight variation (as created by intra-uterine conditions) for piglet welfare will be discussed later. However, weight is not the only valid indicator of viability and the consequences of the uterine environment. Measures of body proportionality, such as the ponderal index, provide a valuable indicator of mortality risk (Baxter et al 2008). As a consequence, the distinction between a piglet being SGA or having undergone intra-uterine growth retardation (IUGR) is important. Although definitions vary, piglets weighing less than the tenth percentile at birth, yet displaying normal allometry, are often classified as SGA whereas piglets that are disproportional (suggesting that they have not reached their intra-uterine growth potential) are classified as IUGR (Bauer et al 1998). The distinction matters because SGA piglets may have more potential to recover given proper management than IUGR piglets that have other abnormalities meaning that they have low viability. Some care does need to be taken when interpreting findings in this area due to the differing methods and definitions used across different studies. Many of the identified effects of LBW should be considered with an implicit caveat that the effect may not be of LBW per se but could relate to body proportionality or aspects of maturity.

**Stillbirths, birth difficulties and asphyxia**

Litter size is unfavourably associated (ie positively correlated) with stillbirth prevalence (Svendsen et al 1991; Roehe & Kalm 2000; Van Dijk et al 2005; Canario et al 2006a,b; Rosendo et al 2007; Kapell et al 2009) and also with hypoxia and the production of low viability piglets (Herpin et al 1996).

The extent of late foetal development and maturation plays a major role in piglet survival (Randall 1972; van der Lende et al 2001). In the last days preceding farrowing, the foetus experiences an increase in growth rate (Biensen et al 1998) and development, with final physiological preparations for
extra-uterine life. The risk of reduced gestation lengths increases with increasing litter size (Leenhouwers et al 1999; Canario et al 2006b; Rydmer et al 2008; Vanderhaeghe et al 2010a,b, 2011), possibly as a result of an acceleration in the maturation of the foetal hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, resulting in higher foetal cortisol levels reaching the uterus and the initiation of the parturition process (Van Dijk et al 2005).

Prolonged farrowing duration and a large litter size increase the risk of hypoxia (Herpin et al 1996). Hypoxia occurs when the neonate experiences oxygen deprivation. This can occur in utero as a result of poor oxygen supply via the placenta or as a result of peri-natal asphyxia during parturition. Hypoxia can also occur post-natally if a piglet is born inside the placenta or, in an immature piglet, if the lung surfactant factor is not functional. Lung maturation is facilitated by production of lung surfactant, which is a heterogeneous mixture of lipids and proteins that spreads in the lung tissue/air interface, preventing alveolar collapse during expiration and allowing the alveoli to open easily during inhalation (Winkler & Cheville 1985).

Meconium aspiration syndrome (MAS) may be more likely to occur with large litter sizes, and is a risk factor for still-birth or early post-natal death either by reduced vitality, myocardial dysfunction or lung damage (Mota-Rojas et al 2002; Alonso-Spilsbury et al 2005). MAS occurs when the foetal piglet experiences asphyxia and a surge in foetal cortisol levels cause the sphincter muscle to relax and thus a release of faecal matter (meconium) into the amniotic sac. When the foetuses experience severe distress (eg a surge in uterine pressure) it can aspirate this meconium and amniotic fluid. Some piglets are born alive but swallow a lot of amniotic fluid and/or meconium and then die; effectively these piglets drown in their own placental fluids and are often mistakenly classified as being stillborn.

Peri-natal mortality and morbidity

Overall, litter size has been found to be unfavourably associated with peri-natal mortality in many studies (van der Lende & de Jager 1991; Blasco et al 1995; Johnson et al 1999; Sørensen et al 2000; Lund et al 2002). However, recent work (discussed later) has shown that despite this antagonistic correlation, a positive genetic trend can be obtained in both traits (in line with quantitative genetic theory) (Nielsen et al 2013). Mortality may also be high in very small litters (Cecchinato et al 2008), often reflecting a pathology in reproduction. The negative relationship between litter size and birth weight is of critical importance to many aspects of piglet welfare including risk of mortality (Gardner et al 1989; van der Lende & de Jager 1991; Kerr & Cameron 1995; Roche 1999; Roche & Kalm 2000; Sørensen et al 2000; Tuchscherer et al 2000; Knol et al 2002a,b; Quiniou et al 2002; Wolf et al 2008; Fix et al 2010; Pedersen et al 2011a). As well as being associated with lower birth weight, large litter size is associated, as a consequence of asynchronous embryo development, with increased within-litter weight variation (Roche 1999; Milligan et al 2002; Quiniou et al 2002; Quesnel et al 2008; Wolf et al 2008).

The main causes of neonatal piglet mortality are chilling, starvation and crushing by the sow, and these three causes interact (Edwards 2002; Andersen et al 2011). Large litter size may be associated with increased risk of chilling (since LBW piglets show poorer thermoregulatory abilities: Hayashi et al 1987; Herpin et al 2002), starvation (since small and/or chilled neonates are less vigorous when competing at the udder) and crushing (since weakened piglets may be less responsive to the movements of the sow). For LBW piglets, the risk of crushing is increased because they spend longer near the sow’s udder (Weary et al 1996). Thus, it is possible that a vulnerable neonate may experience chilling, starvation and then crushing (Edwards 2002), which highlights the considerable welfare issues surrounding piglet mortality. The majority of pre-weaning mortality occurs in the first 72 h of life (Edwards 2002). However, piglets are at additional long-term risk from disease if they have failed to acquire sufficient immunity from colostrum as a result of delayed or limited suckling in the immediate post-natal period.

Large litter size was found to be a risk factor for piglet knee abrasions (Norring et al 2006), which are both a direct welfare problem and a risk factor for pathogen entry to the body. LBW has also been found to have a negative impact on bone development (Romano et al 2009). Moreover, large litter size and LBW are associated with increased prevalence of splayleg (Sellier & Ollivier 1982; Vogt et al 1984; Van Der Heyd et al 1989; Holl & Johnson 2005).

Teat competition and establishment of the ‘teat order’

 Piglets find and take ownership of a particular teat, or pair of teats, during the hours after birth (Scheel et al 1977; Pedersen et al 2011b), and then consistently return to this teat/pair at each suckling, displaying ‘teat fidelity’ (Gill & Thomson 1956; Newberry & Wood Gush 1985; de Passillé et al 1988). After approximately 12 h, milk is only let down from the teats for a few seconds (8–10 s: Pedersen et al 2011b) once or twice an hour (Fraser 1980). Consequently, there is competition to take possession of functional teats and a stable ‘teat order’ emerges whereby piglets occupy the same teats at each suckling bout (Fraser 1975; de Passillé & Rushen 1989). The heaviest piglets are more likely to win in fights for teats (Scheel et al 1977). In larger litters, since teat number has not increased in step with litter size, there is inevitably greater competition for teats (Milligan et al 2001; Andersen et al 2011). Piglets which cannot access a functional teat face a critical situation and typically starve to death in the first one to three days (English & Smith 1975; Hartsock & Graves 1976; Fraser et al 1995). Occasionally, more than one piglet will share one teat and this usually also causes problems for at least one of the sharing pair (de Passillé et al 1988) as the competition to defend a teat can be aggressive. Many of the effects of larger litter size discussed in this paper are continuous (ie they change gradually with increasing litter size), but in relation to teat competition, there is clearly a threshold effect: once a litter has more viable piglets than functional teats, fostering or some other management intervention is needed, and once a
batch of sows farrowing at the same time have more piglets than teats, a new level of intervention, such as nurse sows or artificial rearing methods, are needed. Baxter et al (2013) discuss in more detail management issues relating to large litters, such as cross-fostering and teeth resection.

**Long-term effects of litter size and birth weight**

A large experimental and epidemiological literature, across many species, shows that birth weight relates to many aspects of an individual’s biology throughout life.

**Stress physiology**

Birth weight has been shown to impact upon pigs’ stress reactivity later in life. LBW neonatal piglets had larger adrenal glands, increased circulating levels of cortisol, higher cortisol binding capacity and a greater cortisol output from adrenocortical cells compared to larger piglets (Klemcke et al 1993). Similar effects have been observed beyond the immediate neonatal period. Kranendonk et al (2006) found that LBW piglets had a higher cortisol response to challenge at day 41 of age compared to larger birth weight piglets. Poore and Fowden (2003) found that HPA reactivity was increased in LBW piglets at 3 months of age, along with overall adrenal size and an increased ratio of adrenal cortex to medulla in comparison to heavier piglets. In another study (Poore et al 2002), blood pressure at three months of age was found to be inversely associated with birth weight and, more significantly, with a measure of body disproportion. Heavier birth weight has also been associated with a stronger rhythm of cortisol release at nine weeks of age (Munsterhjelm et al 2010). Overall, these findings suggest that LBW piglets have a permanent alteration to the functioning of their HPA axis, implying an increased stress reactivity throughout their lifetime. However, without reference to other variables (such as behavioural indications of altered emotionality, or negative effects on immune function), the link between particular states of HPA function and animal welfare is often not clear (eg Mormède et al 2011), so only tentative conclusions about the impact of such changes on welfare can be drawn.

**Behavioural outcomes**

Litter size could impact on behavioural outcomes, with relevance for welfare, in a number of ways. Severe protein malnutrition may alter brain development and thus behaviour (eg Morgane et al 1993). Given that some piglets from large litters may starve to death without intervention, there are likely to be others that undergo severe under-nutrition in early life and this could have implications for later behavioural strategies. However, this possibility has not been addressed in piglets.

Aggressive experiences at the teat could affect future aggressive behaviour, although the available experimental data are equivocal. D’Eath and Lawrence (2004) found that piglets from larger litters in which there was more competition, were more aggressive after weaning. This result was not repeated in a larger study where pigs were mixed into new social groups at around seven weeks post weaning (Turner et al 2006). However, these two studies are not directly comparable since D’Eath and Lawrence (2004) kept piglets in their ‘natural’ birth litters and used a direct measure of aggression whereas Turner et al (2006) studied a commercial unit in which cross-fostering for large litter size did occur and they used lesion number as a proxy measure of aggression. Chaloupkova et al (2007) found some evidence of a relationship between increasing litter size and decreased likelihood of agonistic interactions, following post-weaning mixing, ending with one pig chasing and biting at another, and also with a decreased number of wounds. This might indicate, as suggested by D’Eath (2005), who observed the consequences of pre-weaning mixing of piglets, that piglets from larger litters are more socially skilled than those from smaller litters. A similar behavioural profile (early aggression, but longer-term social stability) is also seen in pigs with high social breeding values (Rodenburg et al 2010).

Although litter size could impact upon emotionality, as demonstrated in rodents (Janczak et al 2000; Dimitantas et al 2007), this possibility has not been explored in pigs. LBW piglets have been found to show memory deficits in a cognitive hole board test (Gieling et al 2011) and to have a decreased willingness to play (Litten et al 2003). Play represents a useful indicator of positive welfare and its absence is often associated with situations of decreased welfare (Held & Spinka 2011).

**Health implications**

The pig has been extensively studied as a model for the health effects of LBW/IUGR in humans. Small piglets, studied using either the natural variation in within-litter birth weight in modern genotypes, or through artificially induced growth retardation, show alterations in the trajectories of growth and development of major biological systems. The accelerated maturation of some of these systems may be seen as evidence of developmental adaptation to a compromised uterine environment. For example, rapid morphological development and enhanced contractile ability of skeletal muscle and an increased cardiac output have been described in LBW piglets (Bauer et al 2006).

However, many biological functions appear to be impaired by LBW and thus large litter size, and its associated uterine crowding and compromised placental efficiency, may be expected to exacerbate these developmental abnormalities. There is evidence of compromised growth of the gastrointestinal tract, liver, kidneys, thymus, ovaries, muscles and skeleton in LBW piglets (Handel & Stickland 1987; Xu et al 1994; Bauer et al 2002; Da Silva-Buttkus et al 2003; Mollard et al 2004; Wang et al 2005; Morise et al 2008; Cromi et al 2009). The tissue-specific decrease in expression of proteins that regulate immune function, intermediary metabolism and tissue growth may explain the abnormal growth and functioning of these systems (Wang et al 2008). Studies of the human health impacts of LBW have primarily focused on the incidence of chronic cardiovascular and metabolic diseases of adulthood. Of more immediate relevance for pig production are observations in humans of heightened risk for infectious diseases associated
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with LBW (Moore et al. 1999; McDade et al. 2001; Amarilyo et al. 2011). Although these effects have been little studied in pigs, there is evidence of increased adhesion of bacteria to the poorly developed ileum and colon of piglets born after IUGR (D’Inca et al. 2001) and such piglets show a reduced lymphocyte proliferation in response to a mitogen challenge (Tuchscherer et al. 2000). Renal functions are also compromised by an LBW leading to a reduction in glomerular filtration rate (Bauer et al. 2002) which could heighten the risk of urinary infection.

An important post-natal effect of the diffuse epitheliocorial nature of the porcine placenta is that piglets are born without immune protection, and have to acquire maternal antibodies through the ingestion of colostrum (Gaskin & Kelly 1995). The difficulty of acquiring colostrum, particularly in a large litter, has been described above. Some have argued that the competence of the passive immune response acquired in this way, in practice, differs little between piglets (Fraser & Rushen 1992; Damm et al. 2002). However, the sow’s colostrum yield appears to be independent of litter size (Devillers et al. 2007; Quesnel 2011). As a consequence, competition between large numbers of littermates would, on average, be expected to result in a smaller and more variable quantity of colostrum intake per piglet (Le Dividich et al. 2005), although it is not clear whether this lesser quantity is still sufficient for piglets. Colostrum intake below 200 g per piglet in the first 24 h of life is a significant risk factor for piglet mortality (Devillers et al. 2011). Issues to do with piglet colostrum intake have recently been thoroughly reviewed by Quesnel and colleagues (2012).

In combination with physical and mental developmental immaturity and the low vigour of small piglets from large litters, teat competition may constitute a further risk factor for disease. The pre-weaning mortality rate from infectious disease is seen to be disproportionately high in LBW piglets compared to heavier piglets (Tuchscherer et al. 2000). There is some evidence in rats that litter size can impact on later immune function. Prager et al. (2010) found evidence of negative correlations between litter size and aspects of adaptive immunity, and positive correlations with measures of innate immunity.

Welfare impacts of large litter size on the sow

Gestation

Although numerous studies have addressed welfare issues in gestating sows (eg Marchant-Forde 2009), these have not focused on the specific fact that the animals concerned are pregnant. Furthermore, they have not given any consideration as to whether the foetal litter size being borne has any impact on sow welfare. However, in late pregnancy, sows face many challenges, including the energetic and nutrient demands of growing foetuses, hormonal changes, general discomfort and restriction of movement, and effects on sleep and rest. Moreover, within commercial farming systems there are additional challenges such as group dynamics, access to resources and resting areas and issues related to feed quantity and delivery. Increased metabolic loading on sows during pregnancy could also increase the risk of heat stress in countries where this is an issue. Though not investigated in pregnant farmed animals, there is evidence in mice that litter size during pregnancy can affect behavioural characteristics of the mother; both maternal aggressiveness and anxiety increase with increasing litter size (D’Amato et al. 2006), presumably an adaptive response reflecting the greater reproductive value of the litter.

Parturition

Although, from human experience, giving birth is reported to be an extremely painful process (Melzack 1992), the pain experienced by non-human animals during parturition has received little scientific interest (although see Mainau & Manteca 2011). Labour pain is initiated in the uterus due to dilation of the cervix and contraction of the lower uterine segment and there is a correlation between the degree of dilation and the intensity of pain experienced by humans (Bonica 1986). There is also a correlation between the onset of uterine contractions and the onset of pain (Corli et al. 1986). An endogenous opioid-mediated analgesic system exists in parturient rats (Gintzler 1980), humans (Cogan & Spinatto 1986) and in the pig (Jarvis et al. 1997). Opioid-mediated analgesia at parturition may act as a defence against labour pain but increased release of opioids in response to noicception may also interfere with parturition and maternal behaviour by the inhibition of oxytocin (Lawrence et al. 1992). Thus, the prolonged farrowing duration associated with large litter size could cause increased release of opioids in response to nociception and thus impact on maternal-offspring bonding.

As litter size increases, average piglet birth weight decreases (Johnson et al. 1999; Roehe 1999). This may reduce pain at expulsion of each foetus but parturition may last longer and the cumulative effects may be greater. It has been suggested that longer farrowings and increased numbers of stillborn piglets (both of which are associated with larger litters) are risk factors for sows experiencing increased pain in the parturient period (Mainau et al. 2010; Mainau & Manteca 2011). Pain experienced by the sow during farrowing is of obvious welfare concern in its own right, but may have several additional consequences. It has been suggested that pain may be involved in the aetiology of savaging (Mainau & Manteca 2011) and could also have an impact on other aspects of poor mothering, such as likelihood of crushing (Hausseman et al. 1999), as sow discomfort is associated with increased postural changes (Mainau et al. 2010).

Parturition is energetically demanding and increasing litter size may increase those energy demands. In addition to parturition pain, sows can experience uterine and maternal fatigue, which can lead to dystocia (Lay et al. 2002) or the cessation of farrowing. Uterine fatigue or secondary uterine inertia means the uterus ceases to perform meaningful contractions and this can increase the risk of asphyxia and stillbirth. Maternal exhaustion refers to the inability to sufficiently increase intra-uterine pressure by contractions of the abdominal muscles and diaphragm. Serious health compli-
lations may arise in the sow from exhaustion during labour and such sows often require attention during parturition (to pass the last piglets either manually and/or medically with injections of a drug such as oxytocin to restart contractions) or after parturition (eg to treat hypocalcaemia). However, exogenous oxytocin has the potential to increase the risk of stillbirth and may cause additional stress for the sow (Mota-Rojas et al 2002, 2005, 2006).

Lactation and post weaning
During the immediate post-parturient phase, before any management interventions such as fostering might relieve the pressure of a large litter, the sow will be required to nurse her newborns. As cyclical let down starts, competition for teats becomes apparent. Disputes at the udder will influence maternal behaviour (by causing discomfort: Fraser 1975), but could also influence maternal health. Damage to the udder, caused by piglets’ needle teeth, may be painful to the sow and could lead to infection.

As lactation progresses, and the energy demands become more intense, sows will further mobilise their body reserves (Quesnel & Prunier 1995). During lactation, the sow often enters a catabolic state, facilitating the mobilisation of body fat into milk (Uvnäs-Moberg 1989). Demands for milk synthesis increase with litter size and, if sows cannot maintain a high feed and water intake, they will start to lose body condition and may be at greater risk of developing injuries such as shoulder sores. Shoulder sores may develop during the first and second week of lactation in sows that are too lean at farrowing and are presumed to be painful (Zurbrigg 2006; Herskin et al 2011). In an epidemiological study on Danish farms, weaning weight of the litter was shown to be positively associated with the prevalence of shoulder sores (Bonde 2008). This could be as a consequence of better nursing by the sow, and therefore more lateral recumbency, or a result of the energetic demands of raising a larger litter and its subsequent effect on body condition score.

Biological mitigation approaches

Genetic contributions to litter size issues
Approximately two decades ago, the introduction of the best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP), including large-scale pedigree information, facilitated selection for traits of lower heritability, making substantial genetic improvement in litter size possible in dam lines. A simulation study (Roche 1991) and a selection experiment (Sørensen et al 2000) indicated that a selection response (increase) of about 0.4 piglets per generation could be achieved. Subsequently, several pig-breeding companies have reported that selection has resulted in increased litter sizes. For example, in Denmark, selection for litter size (total born piglets) was initiated in 1992 and from 1996, the litter size (total born piglets per litter) increased by 0.3 piglets per year, on average (Table 1, which also shows UK figures for comparison). The National Pig Breeding Program of Australia reported an increase of 0.5 piglets from 1999 to 2004 (Taylor et al 2005), and a Serbian selection experiment reported an increase of 0.25 piglets per year on average from 2001 to 2011 (Vidović et al 2012). The Dutch TOPIGS company increased litter size by ~0.16 piglets per year on average from 2001 to 2009 (Merks et al 2010), as did the Pacific Ocean Breeding Co Ltd in Japan from 2003 to 2008 (Tomiyama et al 2011).

Whilst genetic selection methods have played an important role in increasing litter size in pigs, research also suggests that piglet survival can be improved genetically either through direct selection for survival or by selection for related traits. There are several alternative genetic strategies that may therefore play a role in mitigating some of the negative welfare outcomes of litter size and these are discussed briefly here, and in more detail by Rutherford et al (2011).

Selection for piglet survival
Piglet survival is affected by two genetic components, firstly direct genetic effects on the potential of the piglet for survival, and secondly maternal genetic effects on the mother’s potential to provide optimal conditions for piglet survival. The direct effect of piglet survival tends to be less heritable than the maternal effect under indoor conditions (Lund et al 2002; Arango et al 2006; Su et al 2008; Kapell et al 2011). Moreover, there are negative genetic correlations between direct genetic and maternal genetic effects (Arango et al 2006; Su et al 2008; Roehe et al 2010; Kapell et al 2011). Selection for overall survival in the pre-weaning period has the advantage that the trait is easy to record and has a relatively high prevalence. Heritabilities of overall survival are low (Grandinson et al 2002; Arango et al 2006; Strange 2011) and those for specific individual causes such as stillbirth or crushing, tend to be even lower (Grandinson et al 2002; Hellbrügge et al 2008; Strange 2011), suggesting that selection for overall mortality will yield a higher genetic response than selection for underlying mortality traits. Higher heritabilities of piglet survival traits have been found under outdoor conditions (Roehe et al 2010), suggesting that the more challenging environment of outdoor farrowing increases the amount of information available for genetic evaluation.

Selection against peri-natal mortality (up to day 5) yields slightly higher heritabilities (Grandinson et al 2002; Su et al 2008) than later pre-weaning mortality (Su et al 2008). Genetic correlations between peri-natal and later survival are reported to be low indicating that peri-natal and post-natal piglet survival are under different genetic control (Arango et al 2006; Su et al 2008; Roehe et al 2009, 2010), and should be treated as different traits. This supports research examining phenotypic traits of piglet survival under outdoor conditions (Baxter et al 2009, 2011): peri-natal survival was explained by piglet shape and size, whereas post-natal survival relied heavily on piglet and maternal behaviour. Similarly, in a recent Danish study, stillborn mortality was found not to be genetically correlated with mortality after birth until weaning (Strange 2011).

Selection on an indicator of survival was implemented in the Danish breeding programme in 2004, where the selection criterion was changed from litter size (total number born) to LP5 (number of live piglets at day 5). Since then, survival
rate until day 5 has increased by 6 percentage points in these breeding herds, resulting in ≥ 20% less mortality (Nielsen et al. 2013). Total number born and LP5 in Yorkshire sows increased by 0.3 and 1.4 piglets per litter and 1.3 and 2.1 piglets per litter in Landrace (Nielsen et al. 2013). This response should become apparent at the production level as dissemination of genes from the purebreds to the crossbred sows increases over the coming years. LP5 has a high, positive genetic correlation with number of weaned pigs as well as moderate, positive genetic correlations with survival rate at birth and survival rate until five days (Su et al. 2007) and should, therefore, include the majority of piglet mortality until weaning (Edwards 2002). Also, the Dutch TOPIGS company has shown that piglet mortality can be reduced simultaneously with increasing litter size, as they have obtained a reduction in mortality of ~1 percentage point from 2006 to 2009 simultaneously with increasing litter size by 0.4 piglets (Merks et al. 2010).

### Table 1 National litter size and piglet mortality statistics in Denmark and the UK between 1996 and 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live born</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillborn</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaned</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total born</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-natal mortality (%)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-weaning mortality (%)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live born</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillborn</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaned</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total born</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-natal mortality (%)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-weaning mortality (%)</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data taken from British Pig Executive (BPEX) Pig yearbooks 1996–2012 (British Pig Executive, Kenilworth, UK) and from Danish Pig Research Centre (PRC) annual reports 1999–2012 (PRC, Copenhagen, Denmark).**

1 Stillborn figures do not include mummified piglets.

2 Pre-natal mortality is % of total born that are stillborn.

3 Pre-weaning mortality includes pre-natal mortality.
Indirect selection for survival through birth weight traits

As noted earlier, phenotypically, individual birth weight is closely associated with piglet survival. However, genetically, the relationship between individual birth weight and survival seems to be complex. For example, Knol et al. (2002b) found no, or even unfavourable, genetic relationships between birth weight and survival, whilst Grandinson (2003) found a favourable correlation between crushing and birth weight. Whilst it might be presumed that LBW piglets are at the greatest risk from hypoxia and stillbirth, this is not necessarily the case. At the phenotypic level, there is a curvilinear relationship between birth weight and stillbirth (Roehe & Kalm 2000) and very large piglets can be equally at risk from hypoxia, most likely as a result of birthing difficulties. Whilst birth weight is positively genetically correlated to proportion of stillborn piglets (Grandison et al. 2002; Damgaard et al. 2003), these estimates may be biased, because the genetic analysis assumes that there is a linear association between traits. Researchers have therefore concluded that breeding for increased birth weight will not necessarily result in higher overall survival rate (Grandinson et al. 2002; Knol et al. 2002b; Su et al. 2008).

Alternatively, selection for an optimum birth weight may be advantageous, considering that there is a non-linear association between stillbirth and birth weight. Given the association of high neonatal weight variation with lower survival and more variable weaning weights (Roehe 1999; Milligan et al. 2002; Quiniou et al. 2002), there is an impetus to select for more homogeneous litters (Damgaard et al. 2003). Increased litter size increases the heterogeneity or within-litter birth weight variation (Roehe 1999; Milligan et al. 2002; Quiniou et al. 2002) and increases the risk of mortality (Roehe & Kalm 2000). Reducing the heterogeneity of litters could potentially be more important than the increase of individual birth weight and this is not a new observation (English & Smith 1975), yet it has not been effectively addressed.

Selection for survival through sow mothering ability

Another possible strategy would be to breed for the sow’s ability to nurse her piglets. Good mothering ability shows genetic potential (Baxter et al. 2011). Selection for sow nursing ability could, for example, be done through selection for more teats (Pumfrey et al. 1980; Hirooka et al. 2001). However, selection for greater teat number has practical difficulties and may have undesirable side-effects, e.g. it is associated with a longer spine and associated defects. It has also been suggested that genetic and phenotypic correlations between teat number and other genetic traits are undesirable (Pumfrey et al. 1980). Another option would be to select for a more general ability of the sow to nurse her piglets, integrating underlying traits such as milk yield and composition, teat number and sow maternal behaviour (Knol et al. 2002a).

Selection for survival through general robustness

Selection for a generally more robust neonate (Knap 2005) may allow for increased litter size with fewer complications. Such a strategy may also deal with some of the issues beyond mortality in which litter size has a contributory role. Given the possible negative impacts on stress responsiveness and increased disease risk, breeding for improvements in these traits has been explored in experimental studies with pigs. However, there is high uncertainty as to what is the best trait to breed for (e.g. Knap & Bishop 2000; Mormède et al. 2011) and care has to be taken that such changes do not have unintended side-effects (D’Eath et al. 2010). The concept of breeding for robustness has been suggested in a number of livestock species (e.g. Star et al. 2008). Knap (2005) has defined robust animals as animals: that combine high production potential with resilience to external stressors, allowing for unproblematic expression of high production potential in a wide variety of environmental conditions.

Although it is not immediately clear how to breed for general robustness, one possibility is through phenotypic plasticity or the environmental sensitivity of the expression of genetic production potential (De Jong & Bijma 2002; Knap 2005).

In terms of the biological characteristics of robustness, lessons could perhaps be learnt from the biological profile of the Meishan breed, which achieves a high level of prolificacy (Haley et al. 1995; Farmer & Robert 2003), yet has a lower risk of stillbirth (Canario et al. 2006a), and better postnatal piglet survival (Lee & Haley 1995), compared to many Western breeds. Early studies comparing Meishans to non-hyperprolific breeds found that they were able to support a greater litter size (of smaller, uniform, piglets) to term (Lee & Haley 1995; Ashworth et al. 1997; Finch et al. 2002). The biology underlying this is complex, but a few key differences have been identified. Over the course of gestation, the Meishan sow provides a more uniform supply of nutrients. Foetal Meishan piglets show a slower growth rate (Wilson et al. 1998) putatively limiting intra-uterine growth retardation and maintaining litter uniformity. Meishan pigs show homogeneity in early embryo size and this could be one reason why they have greater litter sizes and lower embryo loss (Bazer et al. 2001). In Meishans, the increased demands of foetuses in late pregnancy are met by a more efficient rather than larger placenta. Meishans show increased placental vascularisation in the final third of gestation (Biensen et al. 1998; Wilson et al. 1998), and maintain (rather than increase) placental size when adjacent foetuses die (Vonahme et al. 2002). As a consequence, within-litter variation in placenta size is lower in Meishans (Finch et al. 2002) and foetal Meishan piglets experience less intra-uterine competition than European breeds at equivalent litter sizes. Meishan piglets are more physically mature at birth, have more body fat, higher oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood, and have better thermoregulatory abilities relative to European breeds (Le Dividich et al. 1991; Herpin et al. 1993; Miles et al. 2012). Meishan piglets are also more active and achieve a higher colostrum intake (Miles et al. 2012). Meishan sows also show better quality maternal behaviour (Meunier-Salaun et al. 1991; Sinclair et al. 1998), and differences in milk composition (higher levels of milk fat: Zou et al. 1992). However, most of the comparisons with Meishan pigs were made when White breeds were less prolific than today and, in recent years, the difference in
litter size between European pig breeds and the Meishan has decreased (Canario et al 2006a) and direct comparisons with modern lines are scarce.

Non-genetic contributions to litter size issues

Litter size is determined by three biological factors: ovulation rate, conception rate and embryonic/foetal survival. Each of these factors can also be affected by a number of non-genetic factors (Spötter & Distl 2006). Amongst these, sow nutrition and stress could both be important contributors to mitigating the negative consequences of large litter size.

Nutrition

Studies suggest that sow nutrition plays an important role in dictating piglet health and welfare outcomes. This primarily relates to the ability of the sow to achieve the amount of energy that is needed to support both the developing piglets and her own health and welfare, and secondarily to different ingredients that may be added or omitted from the feed to influence sow and piglet physiology. This includes effects of gilt/sow nutrition before or during the conception period. For instance, sow nutrition can impact upon embryo survival (Ferguson et al 2006, 2007); piglet birth weight (Musser et al 1999; Edet et al 2001; Laws et al 2009; Long et al 2010), litter uniformity (Van den Brand et al 2006, 2009; Antipatis et al 2008; Wu et al 2010; Campos et al 2012), piglet body energy reserves and thermoregulation (Herpin et al 1996), neonatal viability and uptake of colostrum and important immune components (Rooke et al 2001; Corino et al 2009; Leonard et al 2010), and piglet survival (Jean & Chiang 1999; Rooke et al 2001). Sow gestational nutrition may also impact on milk and colostrum quality directly (Farmer & Quesnel 2009). Edwards (2005) provides a useful overview of some of the gilt/sow nutrition work which relates to reproduction and piglet viability. Maternal diet may also have a role in supporting offspring welfare beyond the immediate farrowing and lactation period (eg Oostindjer et al 2010). One widely investigated aspect of sow gestational nutrition is dietary fibre. Sows are feed-restricted during gestation and may feel hungry if only fed small quantities of concentrate feed. Dietary fibre promotes longer feeding times and may result in sensations of satiety (D’Eath et al 2009). In an epidemiological study, Norwegian herds where sows were fed a moderate (0.5–1.5 kg) amount of roughage during gestation had lower levels of piglet mortality compared to sows receiving no roughage (Andersen et al 2007). Sows receiving increased fibre diets during gestation have been reported to be behaviourally calmer during early lactation (Farmer et al 1995). However, the outcome of experimental studies investigating gestational dietary fibre is variable and any effects of feeding increased levels of dietary fibre during gestation may only become apparent over several parities (Reese et al 2008).

Maternal stress

In terms of reproductive variables, Hemsworth et al (1981) found a strong negative relationship between sow fear of humans and the number of piglets born per sow per year, while Hemsworth et al (1989) found the proportion of physical interactions with pigs that were negative was significantly related to both total litter size and number born alive. Furthermore, the attitude of stockhandlers on verbal effort required to move pigs was significantly correlated with numbers born alive. In another study, 18% of the variation between farrowing units in the proportion of stillborn piglets was accounted for by variation in how sows responded to approach from an unfamiliar human (Hemsworth et al 1999). Thus, farms using the same genetic stock, the same nutritional strategy, with the same housing and husbandry conditions can still vary widely in piglet outcomes as a consequence of how gilts/sows are handled before they ever reach the farrowing accommodation. Maternal stress during gestation can lead to higher pre-weaning mortality of live born piglets (Tuchscherer et al 2002). Part of this is related to human behaviour and pig fear levels interacting to influence piglet mortality. For example, when sow fear levels are high, human presence may be a risk factor for crushing- and savaging-related deaths (Hemsworth et al 1995). However, maternal stress will not only influence the sow’s behaviour but can impair the developing piglets’ physical and physiological characteristics.

The relationship between maternal stress and birth weight is more complicated with different studies finding either lowered (Haußmann et al 2000; Kranendonk et al 2006), increased (Otten et al 2007) or unchanged (Jarvis et al 2006; Lay et al 2008; Couret et al 2009a,b; Rutherford et al 2009) birth weight under different forms, timings and severities of maternal stress. Stress during pregnancy can also impair piglet colostrum uptake (as assessed through immunoglobulin levels) (Tuchscherer et al 2002). There is also the potential for trans-generational effects in relation to piglet outcomes such as survival: gilts born to mothers that experienced stress during pregnancy showed impaired maternal behaviour (Jarvis et al 2006). Since maternal stress can also act to increase offspring stress reactivity (eg Haussmann et al 2000; Jarvis et al 2006) optimising maternal housing may also help to minimise the stress reactivity of offspring. These studies support the premise that maternal stress during gestation could act to exacerbate many of the problems associated with large litter size. Therefore, close attention to gilt and sow management and the minimisation of fear and stress in reproducing females could help reduce some of the problems of large litter sizes. This is discussed in more detail in a companion review article (Baxter et al 2013).
Discussion

Animal welfare implications

The different possible ways that large litter size could affect animal welfare in pig production are summarised in Table 2. Based on the available literature, the evidence for relationships between litter size and different welfare outcomes has been classified as speculative, uncertain, sound or strong. Based on the possible level of welfare impact and the associated level of certainty, each possible issue has been assigned a level of priority for action. Although these assessments are inevitably subjective, they allow for attention to be focused on the most immediately important issues in this area. In some cases, the necessary action is further research to clarify uncertainties in how litter size and that outcome are related, whereas for other factors the onus is on the pig industry to act to mitigate such outcomes.

For piglets, three main areas of welfare impact were identified: piglet mortality, piglet pain and suffering, and long-term outcomes of birth condition and early life experiences. The most obvious welfare-relevant outcome of increasing litter size in pigs is increased pre-natal and neonatal mortality. Large litter size results in an intra-uterine environment with implications for foetal development that can have important welfare consequences in post-natal life. Piglets born into large litters are smaller on average and weight variability within each litter is greater. Furthermore, the consequences of intra-uterine crowding mean that overall piglet viability may be reduced. Piglet mortality is certainly a central issue where societal concern has been clearly expressed. It is also the main area where improvements could provide a win-win scenario, for both farm economics and animal welfare.

Data, such as those presented from Denmark in Table 1, suggest that there has been a disproportionate increase in pre-natal deaths compared to live-born mortality, meaning that a significant proportion of the selection effort has actually produced stillborn piglets. There are data relating to the extent to which we might expect piglets to be conscious and able to suffer that in principle allow us to make inferences over the severity of the welfare insults experienced by foetal and newly born piglets (discussed in Rutherford et al. 2011). These suggest that type 1 stillbirths and an uncertain proportion of type 2 stillbirths may not be associated with any suffering (Mellor 2010). However, it should be noted that this remains a challenging field of enquiry and other alternative interpretations of awareness in foetal and neonatal farm animals may develop with further research. Furthermore, many piglets recorded as being stillborn may actually have attained consciousness prior to death. However, even if the theory that stillborn piglets are unlikely to suffer is correct, the increased prevalence of stillborn piglets associated with increases in litter size could still represent a negative welfare impact on the sow, since farrowings involving stillborn or mummified piglets may be more uncomfortable for sows (Mainau et al. 2010).

In addition to actual mortality, and possibly involving a greater welfare impact, is the possibility that, due to being born into larger litters, some piglets, whilst surviving the peri-partum period, experience morbidity associated with, for instance, a difficult birth, partial crushing, trampling or savaging or intense teat competition. These conditions might involve sustained or intermittent pain. Small, light piglets are at risk of starvation as they are often excluded by teat competition from access to productive teats and, if they gain access to a teat, may be less efficient at stimulating and draining it effectively.

Further to sources of suffering in the first few days of life, the increased prevalence of LBW piglets may have longer term implications for pig welfare. LBW is associated with a range of possible detriments to welfare, including increased stress reactivity, and increased susceptibility to disease. Overall, the evidence suggests that LBW piglets that survive the peri-natal period are more likely to be of lower robustness throughout their lifetime. Thus, since large litter size increases the proportion of LBW offspring, more offspring in large litters will have their long-term welfare impaired. The concept of LBW is of course relative, for instance within rather than across breeds, and many studies do not distinguish LBW and physical/physiological maturity (ie IUGR versus SGA piglets). LBW (defined in relation to the population distribution) can also be statistically associated with certain outcomes without being causally related to them (Wilcox 2001). Few studies have properly attempted to disentangle outcomes of birth weight and litter size and the extent to which negative outcomes depend on absolute birth weight or weight relative to breed or litter norm remains largely undetermined. This area of pig biology requires further research to clarify the true importance of absolute or relative birth weight in dictating later welfare outcomes.

The biological impacts of large litter sizes on sow welfare are more uncertain but issues related to the process of carrying, delivering and raising a large litter, were identified. Moreover, work from other species suggests that there are likely to be negative impacts on sow welfare. Behavioural studies of sows in late gestation (when the impact of litter size will be at its greatest) could identify whether rest, resource use, social behaviour and signs of discomfort are altered depending on subsequent litter size at parturition. Possible impacts of litter size on the parturition experience could also be investigated through studies of farrowing sows. Sows may also suffer impairments to their welfare due to the increased metabolic pressure placed on them by selection for large litters.

Mitigating the effects of large litter sizes

Understanding pig biology may help to identify ways that the negative consequences of large litter size could be reduced. Genetic selection is a tool that can potentially reduce the issues related to large litter sizes; in particular those regarding stillborn piglets and post-natal piglet mortality.
Table 2  Summary of welfare impacts of large litter size on animal welfare outcomes for sows and piglets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare problem (proximate cause)</th>
<th>Relationship to litter size</th>
<th>Welfare impacts</th>
<th>Individual severity</th>
<th>Welfare impact certainty</th>
<th>Priority for action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues for offspring pigs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillbirths (Intra-uterine crowding; difficult birth)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-partum hypoxia (Intra-uterine crowding)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (All causes)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (Chilling)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (Starvation)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (Injury [crushing/savaging])</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (LBW)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (High within-litter variation in birth weight)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal mortality (Disease)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal pain (Injury [crushing/savaging])</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal pain (Increased teat competition)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal morbidity (Disease)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal morbidity (Injury)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal hunger (Teat competition)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splayleg (Intra-uterine environment)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced play behaviour (LBW)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased emotionality (LBW; social interactions in large litter)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased stress reactivity (LBW)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered social behaviour (Social interactions in large litter)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered organ development (Intra-uterine crowding; LBW)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired gut function (Intra-uterine crowding; LBW)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive dysfunction (Hypoxia; cerebral injury)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired immune function (Intra-uterine crowding; LBW)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues for sows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort during gestation (Carrying a large litter)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health during gestation (Carrying a large litter)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger during gestation (Increased foetal demand for nutrients)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear/anxiety during gestation (Hormonal signals of large litter)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain/discomfort at farrowing (Increased farrowing duration)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain discomfort at farrowing (Increased prevalence of stillborn piglets)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyschia (Increased farrowing duration)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infections and sickness (Tissue damage to reproductive tract)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear and neophobia (Parturition pain)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sow fatigue (Increased farrowing duration)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udder damage and infection (Piglets fighting at the udder)</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetically costly lactation (Feeding piglets)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired rest during lactation (Piglet activity)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced sow longevity (Injury; fertility; lameness; agalactia)</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Welfare impact is an estimate of the overall effect on the individual (severity × duration) combined with the proportion of individuals affected.
2 Individual severity scores, based on Smulders (2009; Table 5). Score 0 (negligible): No pain, malaise, frustration, fear or anxiety; Score 1 (limited): Minor pain, malaise, frustration, fear or anxiety; Score 2 (moderate): Some pain, malaise, frustration, fear or anxiety. Stress reaction, some change in motor behaviour, occasional vocalisation may occur; Score 3 (severe): Involving explicit pain, malaise, frustration, fear or anxiety. Strong stress reaction, dramatic change in motor behaviour, vocalisation may occur; Score 4 (critical): Fatal, death occurs either immediately or after some time. Physiological effects may be recorded as well as moderate behavioural change.
3 See Rutherford et al (2011) for how combinations of welfare impact and uncertainty dictate suggested priority for action.
Data from Denmark (Nielsen et al. 2013) and The Netherlands (Merks et al. 2010) are encouraging and suggest piglet mortality can be reduced simultaneously with increasing litter size. Direct selection for post-natal piglet survival has so far been seen as the most effective strategy, but it is complex. Cross-fostering of piglets has to be considered, but the direct genetic, maternal genetic and maternal environmental effects are difficult to disentangle because piglets to be fostered, stay at least for a short period with the biological mother, and correct and precise information on the nurse sow is often not available. Selection for birth weight homogeneity has more potential than selection for higher individual birth weight (English & Smith 1975; Damgaard et al. 2003) but very sophisticated genetic statistical approaches are required (Mulder et al. 2008) and this needs further research. Selection for good maternal behaviour has been shown to be possible (Baxter et al. 2011), but it is difficult to define and to identify suitable selection criteria. Likewise, selection for general robustness would require identification of suitable selection criteria, or the use of complex statistical methodology, such as reaction norms (Kolmodin & Bijma 2004) to select for phenotypic plasticity of the expression of genetic production potential (De Jong & Bijma 2002; Knap 2005). There is, however, a lack of clarity on the effect of this approach on survival. In the future, there is hope among quantitative geneticists that Genomic Selection based on high density Single Nucleotide Polymorphism arrays can enable more efficient use of phenotypes (Mark & Sandøe 2010), for example from crossbred pigs on production farms. However, knowledge on how and whether this can be utilised to improve survival is still limited.

Studies of Meishan pigs (see Farmer & Robert 2003 for a comprehensive review) support the contention that a large litter size is not incompatible with the production of robust, uniform, piglets. Meishan biology may suggest ways that hyper-prolific European breeds could be adapted to allow for better piglet outcomes at a higher average litter size. The importance of placental function and uterine environment to limit intra-uterine competition is clear. Equally, focusing on genetic or nutritional interventions that improve piglet thermoregulatory capability in early life will improve coping with occasional cold challenges, and support active behaviour, and milk intake. The behavioural profile and milk composition of sows themselves could also be improved to support piglet survival. However, other aspects of the pure Meishan are not suitable for the market demand for lean meat, and the industry demand for higher growth rates. As a consequence, partial inclusion of Meishan genetics in some synthetic lines has been examined as a way to gain some of the beneficial biology of the Meishans whilst maintaining production efficiency and meeting market demands. Inclusion of ¼ Meishan genetics in a White composite sow line increased litter size, but decreased piglet growth rate and lean carcase content (Hall et al. 2002). Such outcomes mean that attempts to include Meishan genes in modern commercial hybrid females may not be widely taken up by the industry.

Whilst genetics can help, progress via this route can take many years and depends upon the replacement strategies of the production herds. Over the shorter term, improvements in the welfare status of piglets born into large litters can be achieved through close attention to sow feeding and the minimisation of stress. Strategies relating to the way larger surviving litters are managed that can also contribute to improvements in welfare are discussed separately by Baxter et al. (2013).

In summary, whilst efforts to increase litter size in pig production are expected to continue, a broader awareness of the possible negative impacts on animal welfare of such efforts is important. Societal acceptance of pig production may be negatively affected if efforts are not made to mitigate the negative welfare outcomes of increasing litter size. However, there is good reason to think that changes can be made in the pig industry, which could allow for improved production performance that does not come at the expense of good animal welfare.
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