

1           **What makes a good mother? Maternal behavioural traits important for piglet survival**

2

3 Marko Ocepek\*, Inger Lise Andersen

4

5 Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, PO Box

6 5003, 1432 Ås, Norway

7

8 \*Corresponding author: Marko Ocepek, e-mail: [marko.ocepek@nmbu.no](mailto:marko.ocepek@nmbu.no), Tel: +47 41430972, Fax:  
9 +47 64965101

10

## 11 **Abstract**

12 The primary aim of our work was to find maternal behaviours important for piglet survival and to  
13 develop qualitative scores of those traits. Second, we studied the relationship between maternal  
14 behavioural scores, piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets in sows of three different sow  
15 breeds (Norsvin Landrace (n=12), Norsvin Duroc (n=12) and crossbred Norsvin Landrace × Yorkshire  
16 (n=14)). The following qualitative maternal behaviours were scored as follows: nest building activities  
17 prior to farrowing, sow communication (q\_SC), and carefulness (q\_SCR) on while sows were  
18 standing, moving and just before lying down. We also continuously recorded maternal care behaviors  
19 (nest building activities (c\_NBA) and sow communication (c\_SC; while standing/moving, before lying  
20 down) to test the relationship with the respective qualitative scores. There was a moderate positive  
21 correlation between the continuous measured c\_NBA and the qualitative score for nest building  
22 q\_NBA ( $r = 0.469$ ) as well as between the qualitative score for communication, q\_SC and the  
23 continuous, video-based measure of communication while standing, c\_SC ( $r = 0.439$ ), and the  
24 qualitative and quantitative scores similarly affected piglet survival. Since q\_SC and q\_SCR were  
25 highly correlated ( $r = 0.883$ ), we tested the effect of those behavioural scores separately on production  
26 parameters (proportion of dead piglets and number of weaned piglets) using two models (model 1:  
27 q\_NBA, q\_SC; model 2: q\_NBA, q\_SCR), and compared their relative predictive accuracies using  
28 Akaike information criteria (AIC) and AIC weights. In models 1 and 2, piglet mortality decreased with  
29 higher q\_NBA ( $P = 0.004$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ; respectively) due to less crushing ( $P < 0.001$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ,  
30 respectively) and, thus, more weaned piglets ( $P = 0.043$ ;  $P = 0.035$ ; respectively). Increases in both  
31 q\_SC and q\_SCR were associated with lower overall piglet mortality ( $P < 0.001$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ,  
32 respectively), fewer crushing incidences ( $P < 0.001$ ;  $P = 0.002$ , respectively) and, therefore, more  
33 weaned piglets ( $P = 0.004$ ;  $P = 0.030$ ; respectively). Additionally, higher q\_SC in model 1 was  
34 associated with a lower proportion of starved piglets ( $P = 0.002$ ). Model 1 had better predictive  
35 accuracy than model 2 for all productive parameters. Our results demonstrated that our three defined  
36 maternal behaviour scores had a significant impact on piglet survival, and therefore we would like to

37 proceed with testing of these scores in nucleus herds of Norsvin Landrace sows to further calculate  
38 heritabilities and potentially implement the most successful behavioural trait in the breeding program.

39

40 Keywords: Piglet mortality; Nest building; Sow carefulness; Sow communication; Breed

41

## 42 **1. Introduction**

43 Although the domesticated pig differs in productive and reproductive efficiency compared to its wild  
44 ancestor, their behavioural repertoires have remained similar, especially around parturition (e.g.  
45 Jensen, 1986; Gustafsson et al., 1999). A day or so before parturition, domestic and wild sows engage  
46 in nest preparation to provide shelter and warmth for the newborn piglets (Wood-Gush and Stolba,  
47 1982; Jensen, 1993). From the onset of parturition, sows spend the majority of their time in the nest  
48 with the piglets (Stangel and Jensen, 1991). Social contact encourages sows to interact with their  
49 piglets, establishing mother-young bonds and providing warmth and nutrients from the udder (Fiala  
50 and Humik, 1983). Sows communicate with piglets through olfactory (sniffing), vocal (grunting) and  
51 tactile (nudging) cues (Jensen and Redbo, 1987), mainly during the first few days after parturition  
52 when piglet survival is most crucial (Andersson et al., 2011). It is well established that communication  
53 between sows and piglets is tightly synchronized during short nursing intervals (Algers and Jensen,  
54 1985; Algers and Uvnäs-Moberg, 2007). However, less attention has been given to the significance of  
55 sow communication over longer periods between nursings. During that time, sows communicate while  
56 standing and lying, and the relative costs and benefits of sow-piglet contacts may help to explain why  
57 communication is performed more in some situations but less in others. We think that a sow's  
58 motivation to care for her offspring is likely to manifest in how she communicates with offspring  
59 during others activities, outside nursing bouts. Until now, previous studies have focused on sow  
60 communication before lying down because it is at this point that piglets are at higher risk of being  
61 crushed. However, the results of the effect of sow communication have been inconsistent regarding  
62 whether nosing or sniffing before lying down improves piglet survival (Marchant et al., 2001; Valros  
63 et al., 2003; Andersen et al., 2005; Pokorná et al., 2008). According to Melišová (2011), sow  
64 communication should attract piglets to the sow without increasing mortality. In fact, the only logical  
65 explanation for the evolution of sow communication is to keep the piglets in close proximity and  
66 protect them from danger.

67

68 Piglet mortality is still a major welfare issue as approximately 15% of live born piglets die (Ocepek et  
69 al. 2016b) and crushing and starvation constitute more than 60% of all piglet deaths in loose-housed  
70 sows (e.g. Andersen et al., 2006; Vasdal et al., 2011). Both causes mainly occur during the first few  
71 days of life and increase in larger litters (Weary et al., 1998; Andersen et al., 2011; Vasdal et al.,  
72 2011). The sows highly motivated to nest build before parturition are more protective towards their  
73 piglets (Andersen et al., 2005; Yun et al., 2014). Differences in maternal care behaviours are likely to  
74 reflect different selection pressures (Knap and Merks, 1987; Canario et al., 2009) and primiparous  
75 sows appear to show better maternal behaviour skills than multiparous sows. Primiparous sows invest  
76 more in their present litter than more experience sows, because breeding goals have shifted the balance  
77 towards greater investment earlier in life (Ocepek et al., 2016b).

78

79 For maternal behaviour, the best method to obtain precise measures is from continuous video  
80 recordings. However, such methods are time consuming and costly. Under commercial conditions, we  
81 need to develop simple qualitative scorings of important maternal care behaviours and that is possible  
82 for the farmers to understand and implement in an efficient way into the breeding goals. Although  
83 many attempts have been made to develop valid scores of maternal behaviour characteristics, this has  
84 often been difficult due to methodological challenges related to how these traits are measured  
85 (Grandinson et al., 2002, 2003; Lovendahl et al., 2005; Vangen et al., 2005; Gäde et al. 2008). Thus, it  
86 is essential to understand the significance of sow communication (while standing and lying) for piglet  
87 survival and to develop and verify precise and simple direct measures of maternal behaviour (sow  
88 communication, sow carefulness), as well as for other maternal characteristics (e.g. nest building  
89 activities). Parity may be an important mediating factor affecting maternal behaviour, in addition to  
90 breed, since breeds have been subjected to different selection pressures for litter size. It is, thus, crucial  
91 to identify the relationships between maternal behavioural characteristics and piglet survival and to  
92 develop behavioural scores that can be used directly in the breeding program.

93

94 The primary aim of our work was to find maternal behaviours important for piglet survival and to  
95 develop qualitative scores of those traits. Second, we studied the relationship between maternal

96 behavioural scores, piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets in three different sow breeds  
97 (Norsvin Landrace, Norsvin Duroc and crossbred Norsvin Landrace × Yorkshire).

98

## 99 **2. Material and methods**

100 The present research was conducted in accordance with the Norwegian laws and regulations  
101 controlling experiments and procedures on live animals (Nara, 1998).

102

### 103 2.1. Experimental design

104 The experiment took place at the Pig Research Unit at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences.

105 Sows with their litters (n=38) from three different breed lines (purebred Norsvin Duroc (ND) sows

106 (n=12), purebred Norsvin Landrace (NL) sows (n=12) and crossbred Norsvin Landrace × Yorkshire

107 (LY) sows (n=14)) were evaluated for their maternal behaviour. Selection criteria were that sows were

108 healthy and 6 sows per breed were primiparous and 6 were multiparous. Sows in the respective breed

109 groups (ND, NL, LY) were with their first (n=6, 6, 8), second (n=5, 0, 1), third (n=0, 4, 0), fourth

110 (n=1, 0, 3), fifth (n=0, 1, 2), and sixth parity (n=0, 1, 0).

111

### 112 2.2. Housing and management

113 Housing and management routines are described in detail in Ocepek et al. (2016a) and the feeding

114 strategy is presented in Ocepek et al. (2016b). Except of farrowing assistance (if sows were restless for

115 more than 3-4 hours and had contractions for more than 1-2 hours without any newborn piglets) and

116 cross-fostering (when litter size exceeded the number of functional teats) no routines were carried out.

117 Human intervention was kept to a minimum, allowing feeding, provision of nest-building material

118 (i.e., straw in a hayrack) two days before expected birth of the piglets, providing new sawdust as

119 bedding material twice a day, cleaning the pen, giving iron orally to each piglet on day one, providing

120 peat to piglets on a daily basis and surgical castration when piglets were between 10 and 14 days of

121 age.

122

### 123 2.3. Litter size at birth and weaning

124 All the live-born piglets were individually counted and marked. Some piglets had to be cross fostered  
125 from the litter when the number of piglets exceeded the number of functional teats. Litter size at birth  
126 was defined as the number of each sow's live-born piglets plus the number of piglets fostered on,  
127 minus the number of piglets fostered off. The number of weaned piglets was defined as the number of  
128 piglets present in the litter at weaning (35 days of age).

129

### 130 2.4. Post mortem examination of dead piglets

131 All piglets that died before weaning were examined at the Norwegian Veterinary Institute, Pathology  
132 Section to identify causes such as stillborn (based on whether the lung tissue would float in water),  
133 postnatal mortality (piglets that died after the farrowing and before weaning), starvation (no  
134 colostrum/milk in the stomach), and maternal crushing (physical signs of crushing).

135

### 136 2.5. Sow assessment

137

#### 138 2.5.1. Sow behaviour

139 The sows were continuously video-recorded from 3 days before until 3 days after farrowing. Above  
140 each pen, a camera for video and audio recordings (Foscam FI9821W, 1280×720P, ShenZhen Foscam  
141 Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd., Shenzhen, China) was mounted. Data of nest building activities  
142 (c\_NBA) and sow communication while standing (c\_SC) and lying (c\_SCL) were obtained in order to  
143 verify the respective qualitative scores of nest building (q\_NBA) and sow communication (q\_SC).  
144 From the videos, c\_NBA were analysed (manipulating, rooting, pawing, carrying nest building  
145 material) 12h before farrowing using instantaneous sampling with 5 min intervals. Communication  
146 with piglets initiated by the sow (sniffing, grunting, nudging) between nursings (communication  
147 during nursing was not documented) and while sows were either active (c\_SC; standing, moving

148 around or is about to lie down) or resting (c\_SCL; lying) was recorded in the first 12h after parturition  
149 and 12h during the following day (0800 - 2000). Measures of c\_NBA are presented as overall  
150 activities (total per 12h), while c\_SC and c\_SCL as the mean occurrence per hour during both days.

151

## 152 2.5.2. Sow behavioural scores

153 Qualitative score of q\_NBA was assessed after sows begin to display farrowing preparation signs  
154 (restless behaviour, nesting behaviour, and teats ejected milk at hand milking) during morning and  
155 afternoon feeding within the last 24 hours before expected parturition. Q\_NBA included rooting  
156 (nosing in the nest building material on the floor), pawing (leg in the nest building material on the  
157 floor), carrying nest building material, and chewing nest building material while the sow was active  
158 (standing or moving around). Q\_NBA was scored using a scale from 1 to 3 as presented in table 1.

159

160 Sow maternal behavior score (q\_SC and carefulness (q\_SCR)) was assessed immediately after  
161 morning or afternoon feeding on day one postpartum while sow's change position, move around and at  
162 the moment the sow is about to lie down. Both maternal behavioral scores, Q\_SC (sniffing, grunting  
163 and nudging) and q\_SCR were assessed with a scale from 1 to 4 as presented in table 1. All  
164 behavioural scores were conducted by one trained observer (MO).

165

## 166 2.6. Statistical analysis

167 Statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 statistical software program (SAS Institute. Inc.,  
168 Cary, NC). The effects of breeds (ND, NL, NL×Y), parity (primiparous sows (Parity=1), multiparous  
169 sows (Parity>1)) and litter size were analyzed using a generalized linear model (GENMOD procedure)  
170 with a multinomial response distribution for the sows' qualitative behavioral scores (q\_NBA, q\_SC,  
171 and q\_SCR) and a general linear model (GLM-procedure) for continuous measures of sow behaviours  
172 (c\_NBA, c\_SC and c\_SCL).

173



174 Because residuals were not normally distributed, causes of piglet mortality (stillborn, starvation,  
175 maternal crushing) were analysed using a generalized linear model (GENMOD procedure) with  
176 Poisson response distribution. The model for the proportion of stillborn piglets included the fixed  
177 effect of c\_NBA. The model for postnatal mortality and causes of postnatal mortality (starvation,  
178 maternal crushing) included fixed effects of c\_NBA, c\_SC and c\_SCL. The differences in the number  
179 of weaned piglets were analysed using a GLM procedure including the effects of sow behaviours as  
180 continuous measures (c\_NBA, c\_SC, c\_SCL).

181

182 In order to validate the relationships between sow behaviours as continuous measures and as  
183 qualitative scores (between c\_NBA and q\_NBA, between c\_SC and q\_SC and between c\_SCL and  
184 q\_SC), polyserial correlation coefficients were calculated. To analyse the differences between c\_SC  
185 and c\_SCL for each type of communication (sniffing, grunting, nudging) while sows were active or  
186 resting, a paired samples t-test was used. The relationship between sow behaviours (c\_SC and c\_SCL)  
187 was investigated using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. Polychoric correlation coefficients  
188 were used when testing the relationships between sow behavioural scores (q\_NBA, q\_SC, and  
189 q\_SCR).

190

191 Because q\_SC and q\_SCR were highly correlated ( $r = 0.883$ ), two models were used for testing the  
192 effects of the qualitative scores on the number of weaned piglets as well as on piglet mortality  
193 variables (postnatal, starvation, maternal crushing). Model 1 included fixed effects of q\_NBA and  
194 q\_SC and model 2 included fixed effects of q\_NBA and q\_SCR.

195

196 The model for the proportion of stillborn piglets included the fixed effect of q\_NBA. Variables of  
197 piglet mortality (starvation, maternal crushing) were analysed using a generalized linear model  
198 (GENMOD procedure) with Poisson response distribution including the fixed effects of sow  
199 behavioural scores from model 1 and model 2. The differences in the number of weaned piglets were

200 analysed using a GLM procedure including the fixed effects of sow behavioural scores from model 1  
201 (q\_NBA, q\_SC) and model 2 (q\_NBA, q\_SCR). The model with the best relative predictive accuracy  
202 for piglet mortality/survival was determined using the Akaike information criterion (AIC). The AIC  
203 values were also transformed to Akaike weights according to Wagenmakers and Farrell (2004), which  
204 provide the relative probability of each model having the best predictive accuracy. Akaike information  
205 criterion (AIC) for the number of weaned piglets from model 1 and model 2 were obtained using the  
206 GLM select routine.

207

### 208 3. Results

209

210 3.1. Nest building activities measured with instantaneous sampling (c\_NBA) or by qualitative score  
211 (q\_NBA)

212

213 Nest building activities (c\_NBA), measured as their occurrence per 12 hours, were higher in the  
214 NL×Y sows than NL sows (Table 2; Fig. 1a). Sows with higher c\_NBA had significantly lower  
215 proportions of stillborn and crushed piglets ( $\chi^2_{1,37} = 44.0$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 7.3$ ;  $P = 0.007$ ;  
216 respectively; Fig. 2a). There was no effect of c\_NBA on overall postnatal mortality or proportion of  
217 starved piglets ( $\chi^2_{1,37} = 0.3$ ;  $P = 0.610$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 0.6$ ;  $P = 0.425$ ; respectively). The number of weaned  
218 piglets was not affected by c\_NBA ( $F_{1,34} = 1.2$ ;  $P = 0.242$ ).

219

220 There was a moderate positive correlation between c\_NBA and q\_NBA ( $r = 0.469$ ;  $P = 0.007$ ). During  
221 the last 12 hours before parturition, 43% of the sows showed no nest building activities (score 1; Fig.  
222 3a), whereas 14 % of the sows spent a lot of time on nest building activities (score 3). There was no  
223 significant effect of breed, parity, or litter size on q\_NBA (Table 2).

224

225 3.2. Communication as a continuous measure (c\_SC and c\_SCL) or a qualitative score (q\_SC).

226 Sow communication with piglets was less frequent while standing (c\_SC) than resting (c\_SCL;  
227 7.1±0.9 vs. 16.6±0.9;  $t_{37} = 7.7$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), especially sniffing (3.2±0.4 vs. 7.3±0.5  $t_{37} = 7.0$ ,  $P < 0.001$ )  
228 and grunting (2.8±0.3 vs. 8.5±0.6;  $t_{37} = 8.5$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), but there was no difference in nudging  
229 (0.8±0.2 vs. 1.0±0.2;  $t_{37} = -1.4$ ,  $P = 0.170$ ). C\_SC was not affected by breed, parity, or litter size  
230 (Table 2). There was no correlation between c\_SC and c\_SCL ( $r = -0.013$ ;  $P = 0.941$ ). The ND sows  
231 had the highest c\_SCL, with the NL×Y sows being intermediate (Table 2; Fig. 1b). Sows with larger  
232 litters had higher c\_SCL (Table 2; Fig. 4).

233

234 Sows with higher c\_SC had lower overall piglet mortality due to fewer piglets dying of starvation and  
235 maternal crushing ( $\chi^2_{1,37} = 16.9$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 9.7$ ;  $P = 0.002$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 9.1$ ;  $P = 0.002$ ;  
236 respectively, Fig. 2b). Sows with higher c\_SCL were the ones with higher overall postnatal mortality  
237 as well as a higher proportion of starved and crushed piglets ( $\chi^2_{1,37} = 19.5$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 54.3$ ;  $P$   
238  $< 0.001$ ;  $\chi^2_{1,37} = 9.9$ ;  $P = 0.002$ ; respectively, Fig. 2c). While sows with higher c\_SC had a higher  
239 number of weaned piglets ( $F_{1,34} = 17.4$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. 5a), there was no effect of c\_SCL on the  
240 number of weaned piglets ( $F_{1,34} = 0.0$ ;  $P = 0.994$ ).

241

242 There was a moderate positive correlation between q\_SC and c\_SC ( $r = 0.439$ ;  $P = 0.004$ ), whereas  
243 c\_SCL was negatively correlated with q\_SC ( $r = -0.383$ ;  $P = 0.012$ ). While 33% of the sows showed  
244 frequent communication and paid a lot of attention towards the piglets (score 4), 16 % of the sows did  
245 not communicate with the piglets in the observation period (score 1; Fig. 3b). The NL sows had higher  
246 q\_SC than the ND sows (Table 2; Fig. 1c).

247

#### 248 3.4. Sow carefulness score (q\_SCR)

249 Eight percent of the sows were classified as moving in a careless way, stepping/lying on piglets and/or  
250 showing aggressive behavior towards them, while 21% of the sows were categorized as attentive,

251 careful and protective towards the piglets (score 4; Fig. 3c). Q\_SCR was unaffected by breed, parity,  
252 or litter size (Table 2).

253

### 254 3.5. Interrelationship between behavioural scores

255 There was a high positive correlation between q\_SC and q\_SCR ( $r = 0.883$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ). Q\_NBA was  
256 not correlated with either q\_SC ( $r = 0.145$ ;  $P = 0.190$ ) or q\_SCR ( $r = 0.132$ ;  $P = 0.293$ ).

257

### 258 3.6. Relationship between behavioural scores and production parameters

259 The mean number of piglets at birth was  $12.5 \pm 0.5$ , at weaning  $10.8 \pm 0.5\%$ , whereas the mean  
260 proportion of stillborn piglets was  $7.3 \pm 1.5\%$ . The overall mean postnatal mortality was  $13.4 \pm 2.3\%$ .

261 The proportion of piglets that died due to starvation and maternal crushing was  $3.1 \pm 1.3\%$  and

262  $5.0 \pm 1.4\%$ , respectively. The effects of breed, parity and litter size on production parameters are

263 reported in Ocepek et al. (2016b). Since q\_SC and q\_SCR were highly correlated, meaning that the

264 scores represented similar information, we chose to test the effects of behavioural scores on production

265 parameters (proportion of died piglets and number of weaned piglets) with each of them in separate

266 models to find out which score has the best predictive accuracy for piglet mortality/survival using

267 AIC.

268

#### 269 3.6.1. Piglet mortality/survival in relation to sow behavioural scores (model 1, incl. q\_NBA and q\_SC)

270 The proportion of stillborn piglets was unaffected by q\_NBA ( $\chi^2_{1,37} = 3.6$ ;  $P = 0.072$ ). Sows with  
271 higher q\_NBA had lower postnatal mortality due to fewer piglets being crushed (Table 3; Fig. 2d).

272 The higher the q\_SC, the lower the overall postnatal mortality, due to fewer piglets being crushed and  
273 starving (Table 3; Fig. 2e).

274

275 The number of weaned piglets was positively affected by q\_NBA and q\_SC ( $F_{1,35} = 2.1$ ;  $P = 0.043$ ;  
276 Fig. 5b;  $F_{1,35} = 3.1$ ;  $P = 0.004$ ; Fig. 5c; respectively).

277

278 3.6.2. Piglet mortality/survival in relation to sow behavioural scores (model 2, incl. q\_NBA and  
279 q\_SCR)

280 Sows with higher q\_NBA had lower postnatal mortality due to lower maternal crushing (Table 3). The  
281 higher q\_SCR, the lower overall postnatal mortality as well as and the proportion of crushed piglets  
282 (Table 3; Fig. 2f).

283

284 The number of weaned piglets was positively affected by q\_NBA and q\_SCR ( $F_{1,35} = 2.2$ ;  $P = 0.035$ ;  
285  $F_{1,35} = 2.3$ ;  $P = 0.030$ ; Fig. 5d; respectively).

286

287 3.7. Predictive accuracy of behavioral scoring models (model 1 and model 2) for piglet mortality and  
288 survival

289 For each production parameter (postnatal mortality, starvation, maternal crushing, weaned piglets),  
290 model 1 (including q\_SC as an independent variable) had clearly lower AIC values and higher AIC  
291 weights compared to model 2 (including q\_SCR as an independent variable; Table 4). This implies  
292 that the q\_SC measure will be more predictive of those production parameters than the q\_SCR  
293 measure.

294

#### 295 **4. Discussion**

296 Consistent with previous studies, approximately 20% of total born piglets were stillborn or died before  
297 weaning (Andersen et al., 2011; Pedersen et al., 2011), which is representative of the Norwegian  
298 average of 21% (Norsvin, 2015). In Norway, sows are kept loose during farrowing and lactation,

299 allowing sows to move around and communicate freely with their offspring. Thus, finding maternal  
300 care behaviours important for piglet mortality/survival and developing qualitative scoring systems to  
301 promote those maternal care traits is crucial for ensuring the future sustainability of pig production and  
302 improving pig welfare. However, it is also important that maternal behavioural traits are as simple as  
303 possible to score for farmers if they are to have practical utility, while still being valid measures to  
304 include in breeding programs.

305

306 In this study, we identified maternal behaviour important for piglet survival. Current results provide  
307 first successfully developed qualitative scoring systems of those maternal care traits. We showed that  
308 both sow nest building activities (c\_NBA) and sow communication (c\_SC; while standing, moving or  
309 at the moment the sow is about to lie down), continuously measured behaviours analogous to the  
310 qualitative scores, have a large impact on improved piglet survival. We cannot confirm the same for  
311 sow communication while resting (c\_SCL). However, this trait was greatly affected by breed and litter  
312 size. More detailed analyses of the importance of continuously measured behaviours (c\_NBA, c\_SC,  
313 c\_SCL) for piglet survival will be a topic for further investigation and is currently under preparation.

314 In the present study, the continuously measured behaviours were included only to verify the quality of  
315 our behavioural scores in two ways: to determine the correlation between continuous measures and  
316 qualitative behavioural scores, and to analyse the relationship between those measures and production  
317 parameters (piglet mortality and number of weaned piglets).

318

319 Our results showed that there was a moderate positive correlation between c\_NBA and qualitative  
320 scores of nest building activities (q\_NBA). Moreover, c\_NBA and q\_NBA were similarly related to  
321 production parameters up until weaning. Sows with higher c\_NBA had lower proportions of stillborn  
322 piglets and there was also a tendency towards lower proportions of stillborn with increasing q\_NBA.  
323 We confirm that our qualitative q\_NBA is a good indicator of piglet survival as sows with higher  
324 scores weaned more piglets. In fact, sows that engaged more in nest building activities, whether  
325 obtained using c\_NBA or q\_NBA measures, had fewer piglet deaths due to maternal crushing.

326 Previously, it has been discussed that the level of pre-partum activities might predict sow behaviour  
327 during and after parturition (Jensen, 1993; Thodberg et al., 1999; Andersen et al., 2005; Yun et al.,  
328 2014; Illmann et al., 2015). Sows motivated in pre-partum nest building activates performed less  
329 postural changes during parturition (Thodberg et al, 1999; Johnson, 2007) and were more protective  
330 towards their offspring during and after parturition (Andersen et al., 2005; Yun et al., 2014). Indeed,  
331 our results showed direct links between higher pre-partum nest building and improved piglet survival.  
332 However, performance of nest building activities is also related to other factors such as environmental  
333 (pen vs. crates) and environmental enrichments (the provision of nest building material; Andersen et  
334 al. 2014; Yun et al., 2013). Even though sows were kept loose and had ad libitum access to nest  
335 building material prior to parturition in the present study, we demonstrated that there is still between-  
336 sow variation in q\_NBA. As q\_NBA was unaffected by parity and litter size, these traits could be  
337 selected for across sows' reproductive lifespans, irrespective of their litter size. Our findings suggest  
338 that this trait should be further investigated in larger-scale commercial farms and eventually  
339 implemented in the national breeding programme.

340

341 Another maternal care behaviour assessed in the present study was sow communication towards  
342 piglets. Our results showed that there was a moderate positive correlation between c\_SC and sow  
343 communication towards piglets (q\_SC), and both similarly influenced piglet mortality/survival. Sows  
344 with higher communication towards piglets, both c\_SC and q\_SC, had lower overall mortality due to  
345 fewer deaths of starvation and maternal crushing and those sows were capable of weaning more  
346 piglets. Consequently, we developed simple qualitative scorings of important maternal care traits.

347

348 Another very important finding of the present study is that qualitative scores of maternal care traits  
349 such as q\_SC and sow carefulness score (q\_SCR) were highly correlated. As we originally predicted,  
350 communication while standing, moving around, or before lying down orients the sow towards the  
351 piglets and, thus, she became careful, attentive and protective towards them. To test the impact of both

352 scores on production parameters (piglet mortality and the number of weaned piglets), we compared  
353 two statistical models: model 1 included q\_NBA and q\_SC as independent variables, and model 2  
354 included q\_SCR replaced q\_SC as independent variables. Although both q\_SC and q\_SCR  
355 significantly impacted piglet survival (i.e. lower overall mortality, lower maternal crushing and higher  
356 number of weaned piglets), model 1 including q\_SC had higher predictive accuracy for productive  
357 parameters than model 2 inducing q\_SCR (assessed by Akaike information criteria). However, as  
358 q\_SC and q\_SCR were unaffected by parity or litter size and because we found between-sow variation  
359 in both scores, it could be possible to select for both traits using those scores. Thus, we recommend  
360 that both scores should be further investigated in larger-scale commercial farms before making a  
361 decision on the best suited maternal care traits to implement in the national breeding programme.

362

363 Since in our study were three maternal care traits (q\_NBA, q\_SC, q\_SCR) important for piglet  
364 survival, it could be possible to develop one maternal care index. Chiang et al. (2002) successfully  
365 developed a maternal care index in mice using different interaction types with pups, including nest  
366 building activities before birth. Their care index was found to improve pre-weaning survival of pups  
367 with a heritability of 0.24. If maternal care index can be developed from our scores (q\_NBA, q\_SC,  
368 q\_SCR) and resulted in such high heritabilities, it could be possible to implement a care index in pig  
369 breeding programs. Since q\_SC and q\_SCR are highly correlated and of similar relevance for piglet  
370 survival, they could be merged into one redefined score before implementing it into a breeding goal.  
371 Previous work has attempted to define one modified score of maternal carefulness and  
372 communication. For instance, during each standing-to-lying event, the presence of sow behaviors such  
373 as sniffing piglets, rooting or pawing the floor, standing-to-lying carefully as well as the presence of  
374 piglets in the danger zone at standing-to-lying have been used (Špinka et al., 2000; Valros et al., 2002;  
375 Yun et al., 2013). However, under commercial conditions, maternal care traits should be scored as  
376 simply as possible and be validated to include it in the Norwegian national recording system “Ingris”.  
377 The Ingris database already has information on production (growth and feed efficiency), carcass and  
378 meat quality (lean meat, intramuscular fat, drip loss, killing out), reproduction (weaning to services



379 intervals), robustness (legs, toe, hernia, cryptorchism, arthritis, shoulder lesions, body condition, etc.),  
380 litter size (total born and stillborn) and indirect maternal ability (piglet survival, litter weight at 21  
381 days, total number of teats, and reduction in inverted teats). Thereafter, the relationship between  
382 maternal care traits and other registered traits included in Ingris will be investigated. Genetic  
383 parameters have to be estimated for maternal care traits and their inherited properties calculated.  
384 Calculation of genetic variation, heritability and genetic correlation between maternal traits and other  
385 important traits implemented in the breeding goal of Norsvin Landrace will be estimated. Maternal  
386 care traits will be analyzed regarding their effect on piglet mortality, both as phenotypes and breeding  
387 values. Finally, the results from the genetic analysis will be the basis for determining the behavioral  
388 traits that the producers will continue to record and that we will select for, give an optimal weight and  
389 implement the traits in the operative breeding goal.

390

391 Currently, we have knowledge of which maternal care traits are directly related to piglet survival. Still,  
392 we need to know what farmers or caretakers are able to register practically under commercial  
393 conditions, and how effective these scores are compared to other factors on the farm (i.e. management,  
394 environment) that also influence production parameters. Afterwards, we can determine which traits  
395 can be feasibly measured and identify ways of implementing maternal care traits into the breeding  
396 goal. Although this scores were already tested with three experimental persons and all farmers were  
397 pre-trained, there is still a need to ensure that the farmers perceive the scores in the same way in future  
398 studies.

399

400 In conclusion, this study defined maternal care traits important for reducing piglet deaths and  
401 improving pre-weaning survival, as well as successfully developed simple qualitative scoring systems  
402 of these maternal care traits. Our scoring systems showed that sows that spent more time preparing  
403 their nest prior to parturition and communicated more with piglets (sniffing, grunting, nudging), were  
404 more careful (while standing, moving around or before lying down), and had lower overall piglet  
405 mortality due to less crushing. Thus, those sows weaned more piglets. In addition, higher

406 communication with piglets was also associated with a lower proportion of starved piglets. Because of  
407 variance in our scores (nest building, sow communication and carefulness) and the fact they are not  
408 affected by parity or litter size, our findings indicate that it will be possible to select for this trait after  
409 testing in commercial herds.

410

#### 411 **Acknowledgements**

412 This study was financed by the Norwegian Research Council, Animalia, Nortura and Norsvin (grant  
413 number 207804). The authors wish to acknowledge staff at the Pig Research Unit for taking good care  
414 of the animals. We thank Conor M. Goold for useful discussion and help with the statistics.

415

#### 416 **5. References**

417 Algiers, B., Jensen, P. 1985. Communication during suckling in the domestic pig. Effects of continuous  
418 noise. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 14, 49-56.

419 Algiers, B., Uvnäs-Moberg, K. 2007. Maternal Behaviour in pigs. *Horm. Behav.* 52, 78–85.

420 Andersen, I.L., Berg, S., Bøe, K.E. 2005. Crushing of piglets by the mother sow (*Sus scrofa*) – purely  
421 accidental or a poor mother? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 93, 229-243.

422 Andersen, I.L., Berg, S., Bøe, K.E., Edwards, S. 2006. Positive handling in late pregnancy and the  
423 consequences for maternal behaviour and production in sows. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 99, 64-76.

424 Andersen, I.L., Nævdal, E., Bøe, K.E. 2011. Maternal investment, sibling competition, and offspring  
425 survival with increasing litter size and parity in pigs. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 65(6), 1159-1167.

426 Andersen, I.L., Vasdal, G., Pedersen, L.J. 2014. Nest building and posture changes and activity budget  
427 of gilts housed in pens and crates. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 159, 29–33.

428 Andersson, A., Äänismaa, R., Huusko, J., Jensen, P. 2011. Behaviour of European wild boar (*Sus*  
429 *scrofa*) in connection with farrowing in an enclosure. *Mamm. Biol.* 76, 332–338.

430 Canario, L., Billon, Y., Mormède, P., Poirel, D., Moigneau, C. 2009. Temperament, adaptation and  
431 maternal abilities of Meishan and Large White sows kept in a loose-housing system during lactation.

432 In: Book of abstracts from 60th annual meeting of European association of animal production,  
433 Barcelona, Spain, pp. 282.

434 Chiang, C.F., Johnson, R.K., Nielsen, M.K. 2002. Selection for maternal behavior in mice-direct and  
435 correlated responses. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 79, 311-323.

436 Fiala, S., Hurnik, J.F. 1983. Infrared scanning of cattle and swine. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 63, 1008.

437 Gäde, S., Bennewitz, J., Kirchner, K., Looft, H., Knap, P.W., Thaller, G., Kalm, E. 2008. Genetic  
438 parameters for maternal behaviour traits in sows. *Livest. Sci.* 114, 31-41.

439 Grandinson, K., Lund, M.S., Rydhmer, L., Strandberg, E. 2002. Genetic parameters for the piglet  
440 mortality traits crushing, stillbirth and total mortality, and their relation to birth weight. *Acta Agric.*  
441 *Scand., Sect. A, Animal Sci.* 52, 167-173

442 Grandinson, K., Rydhmer, L., Strandberg, E., Thodberg, K. 2003. Genetic analysis of on-farm tests of  
443 maternal behaviour in sows. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 83, 141-151.

444 Gustafsson, M., Jensen, P., de Jonge, F.H., Illmann, G., Špinka, M. 1999. Maternal behaviour of  
445 domestic sows and crosses between domestic sows and wild boar. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 65, 29-42.

446 Illmann, G., Chaloupková, H., Neuhauserová, K. 2015. Effect of pre- and post-partum sow activity on  
447 maternal behaviour and piglet weight gain 24 h after birth. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 163, 80-88.

448 Jensen, P. 1986. Observations on the maternal behaviour of free-ranging domestic pigs. *Appl. Anim.*  
449 *Behav. Sci.* 16, 131-142.

450 Jensen, P. 1993. Nest-building in domestic sows: the role of external stimuli. *Anim. Behav.* 45, 351-  
451 358.

452 Jensen, P., Redbo, I. 1987. Behaviour during nest leaving in free-ranging domestic pigs. *Appl. Anim.*  
453 *Behav. Sci.* 18, 355-362.

454 Johnson, A.K., Morrow, J.L., Dailey, J.W., McGlone, J.J. 2007. Prewaning mortality in loose-housed  
455 lactating sows: Behavioral and performance differences between sows who crush or do not crush  
456 piglets. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 105, 59-74.

457 Knap, P.W., Merks, J.W.M. 1987. A note on the genetics of aggressiveness of primiparous sows  
458 towards their piglets. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 17, 161– 167.

459 Lovendahl, P., Damgard, L.H., Nielsen, B.L., Thodberg, K., Su, G., Rydhmer, L. 2005. Aggressive  
460 behaviour of sows at mixing and maternal behaviour are heritable and genetically correlated traits.  
461 *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 93, 73–85.

462 Marchant, J.N., Broom, D.M., Corning, S. 2001. The influence of sow behaviour on piglet mortality  
463 due to crushing in an open farrowing system. *Anim. Sci.* 72, 19–28.

464 Melišová, M., Illmann, G., Andersen, I.L., Vasdal, G., Haman, J. 2011. Can sow pre-lying  
465 communication or good piglet condition prevent piglets from getting crushed? *Appl. Anim. Behav.*  
466 *Sci.* 134, 121-129.

467 Ocepek, M., Andersen-Ranberg, I., Edwards, S.A., Andersen, I.L. 2016a. Udder characteristics of  
468 importance for teat use in purebred and crossbred pigs. *J. Anim. Sci.* 94, 780-788.

469 Ocepek, M., Andersen-Ranberg, I., Edwards, S.A., Fredriksen, B., Framstad, T., Andersen I.L. 2016b.  
470 Can a super sow be a robust sow? Consequences of litter investment in purebred and crossbred sows  
471 of different parities. *J. Anim. Sci.* 94, 3550-3560.

472 Pedersen, L.J., Berg, P., Jørgensen, G., Andersen, I.L. 2011. Neonatal piglets trait of importance for  
473 survival in crates and indoor. *J. Anim. Sci.* 89, 1207-1218.

474 Pokorná, Z., Illmann, G., Simeckova, M., Chaloupkova, H., Kratinova, P. 2008. Carefulness and  
475 flexibility of lying down behaviour in sows during 24 h post-partum in relation to piglet position.  
476 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 114, 346–358.

477 Špinko, M., Illmann, G., Jonge, F., Andersson, M., Schuurman, T., Jensen, P. 2000. Dimensions of  
478 maternal behaviour characteristics in domestic and wild domestic crossbred sows. *Appl. Anim. Behav.*  
479 *Sci.* 76, 291-306.

480 Stangel, G., Jensen, P. 1991. Behaviour of semi-naturally kept sows and piglets (except suckling)  
481 during 10 days postpartum. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 30, 211–227.

482 Thodberg, K., Jensen, K.H., Herskin, M.S., Jørgensen, E. 1999. Influence of environmental stimuli on  
483 nest building and farrowing behaviour in domestic sows. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 63, 131-144.

484 Valros, A.E., Rundgren, M., Špinká, M., Saloniemi, H., Rydhmer, L., Algers, B. 2002. Nursing  
485 behaviour of sows during 5 weeks lactation and effects on piglet growth. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 76,  
486 93–104.

487 Valros, A.E., Rundgren, M., Špinká, M., Saloniemi, H., Rydhmer, L., Hultén, F., Uvnäs-Moberg, K.,  
488 Tomanek, M., Krejci, P., Algers, B. 2003. Metabolic state of the sow, nursing behaviour and milk  
489 production. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 79, 155–167.

490 Vangen, O., Holm, B., Valros, A., Lund, M.S., Rydhmer, L. 2005. Genetic variation in sows' maternal  
491 behaviour, recorded under field conditions. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 93, 63-71.

492 Vasdal, G., Østensen, I., Melišová, M., Bozděchová, B., Illmann, G., Andersen, I.L. 2011.  
493 Management routines at the time of farrowing - effects on teat success and postnatal piglet mortality  
494 from loose housed sows. *Livest. Sci.* 163, 225-231.

495 Wagenmakers, E.J., Farrell, S. 2004. AIC model selection using Akaike weights. *Psychon. B. Rev.*  
496 11(1), 292-196.

497 Weary, D.M., Phillips, P.A., Pajor, E.A., Fraser, D., Thompson, B.K. 1998. Crushing of piglets by  
498 sows: effects of litter features, pen features and sow behaviour. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 61, 103-111.

499 Wood-Gush, D.G.M., Stolba, A. (1982). Behaviour of pigs and the design of a new housing system.  
500 *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 8, 583–584.

501 Yun, J., Swan, K.M., Farmer, C., Oliviero, C., Peltoniemi, O., Valros, A. 2014. Parturition nest-  
502 building has an impact on postpartum nursing performance and maternal behaviour in early lactating  
503 sows. *Livest. Sci.* 160, 31-37.

504 Yun, J., Swan, K.M., Vienola, K., Farmer, C., Oliviero, C., Peltoniemi, O., Valros, A. 2013. Nest-  
505 building in sows: effects of farrowing housing on hormonal modulation of maternal characteristics.  
506 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 148(1), 77–84.