

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Growth Performance and Pork Quality of
Two New Zealand Pig Genotypes**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of**

**Master of Science
in
Physiology**

**at Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand.**

Steven James Kerr

2012

ABSTRACT

In the pig industry, feed is a major cost which contributes 60 - 80% of production costs, thus it is important that feed specifications reflect the needs for modern genotypes to express their genetic growth potential. The major genetic drivers for growth are the minimum whole body lipid to protein ratio (Minlp) and the upper limit to protein deposition (Pdmax). The objective of the present study was to evaluate the growth performance potential and pork quality of two genotypes (G1 and G2) commonly used in New Zealand.

Sixty four pigs were reared indoors for 12 weeks, and fed two diets to slaughter. The first diet was limited in energy (to provide expression of Minlp); and the second was not limited in energy or protein/amino acids (to provide expression of Pdmax). After slaughter, carcass measurements were recorded and pork quality was tested.

During the Minlp and Pdmax diet phases the key overall findings were that G1 had improved average daily gain (940 vs. 890 g/d) and feed conversion ratio (1.75 vs. 1.87), had lower calculated Minlp slope (i.e., 0.0248, 0.0327) and greater Pdmax values (i.e., 226 vs. 204 g/d) compared to G2. No difference was found for daily feed intake.

For carcass traits G1 had the lower backfat thickness. There was no difference found for dressing % or carcass weight. For pork quality, G2 had the lower pH and also had greater thawloss % compared to G1.

In conclusion G1 had overall better growth performance and were leaner than G2. The pork from both G1 and G2 was not found to have pale soft and exudative (PSE) quality and was considered to be very tender.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank my chief supervisor Associate Professor Patrick Morel for his guidance and sense of humour throughout this project.

Also, I would like to thank my co-supervisors Associate Professor Roger Purchas and Dr Tim Wester. Associate Professor Purchas helped with collecting the carcass data and meat quality assessments, and Dr Tim Wester helped with the writing-up process of this thesis.

Thanks to Dr Eric Newman for being our pig vet, and providing medical aid to the pigs when required.

A special thanks to Niki Nuijten for enthusiastically looking after the pigs during the growth phase of the trial.

A big thanks to John Fitness and his team at Land Meat New Zealand Ltd. in Wanganui for helping us with the pH and carcass measurements, loin dissection and packaging.

Thanks to Ed James for making up the diets and for tattooing the pigs at the end of the trial.

I would also like to acknowledge Gajen, Rebecca, and Kitty for their help with the weekend feedings.

Also thanks to Fliss Jackson and the rest of her team at the nutrition lab at the Institute of Food, Nutrition and Human Health for analysing the samples.

Thanks to Garry Radford for providing me with a workstation in the pilot plant.

I would also like to thank my friends: Zhongwei (Sumy) Xing, Kunsik Park, Forrest Richmond, Mehak Dhillon, Andres Paniagua, Ping Yang, Ashish Kumar and Duncan Wallace for the good laughs and support during this thesis.

I would like to thank my parents and family for their love and support.

Finally I would like to thank PorkCRC for funding this research project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
2.1 Background.....	4
2.2 Growth characteristics and energy partitioning in grower-finisher pigs ..	4
2.1.1 Energy for maintenance	4
2.1.2 Protein.....	5
2.3 Energy partitioning for growth in grower-finisher pigs	5
2.3.1 Protein deposition.....	6
2.4 Modelling	7
2.4.1 Static and dynamic models	8
2.4.2 Empirical and mechanistic models	8
2.4.3 Deterministic and stochastic models	8
2.4.4 Model framework.....	9
2.4.5 Modelling Growth Performance	10
2.5 Restricted feeding vs. ad libitum feeding – effect on growth performance	12
2.6 Compensatory growth.....	13
2.7 Carcass Traits and the influence of genotype.....	13
2.7.1 Fatness	15
2.8 Pork quality	16
2.8.1 Tenderness	18

2.8.2	Water holding capacity	20
2.8.3	Colour.....	21
2.8.4	Other factors which may affect meat quality traits	22
3.3.2	Nutritive value of pork.....	26
CHAPTER 3: MATERIALS AND METHODS		27
3.1	Animals	27
3.2	Experimental design	28
3.2.1	Diets	28
3.2.1	Feeding regimen	30
3.2.2	Diets.....	30
3.2.3	Diet analysis methodology	31
3.2.4	Dry matter intake	31
3.2.5	Growth performance.....	32
3.4	Carcass measurements	33
3.5	Pork quality assessments	34
3.5.1	Pork loin measurements.....	34
3.5.2	Thaw loss	35
3.5.3	Preparing the pork loin for pork quality	35
3.5.4	Colour.....	36
3.5.5	Ultimate pH	37
3.5.6	Expressed juice loss.....	37
3.5.7	Sarcomere length	37
3.5.8	Cooking losses and shear force measurement	38
3.5.9	Drip loss	38
3.5.10	Intramuscular Fat	39
3.6	Statistical analysis	39
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS		40

4.1	Selected pigs	40
4.2	Diet analysis	40
4.3	Growth performance	42
4.3.1	Minlp diet.....	42
4.3.2	Pdmax diet	42
4.4	Carcass traits.....	44
4.5	Pork chop Image analysis.....	46
4.6	Pork quality analysis	48
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION		50
5.1	Growth performance	50
5.2	Carcass traits.....	55
5.3	Pork Quality	58
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		64
CHAPTER 7: REFERENCES		65
APPENDIX 1: CALCULATION OF TARGET L/P AND PDMAX.....		73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. A flow chart showing the simple pig growth model for energy and protein partitioning from feed intake.....	10
Figure 2.2. The Linear Plateau concept. Showing the partitioning of digestible energy intake (DEI) between retained energy (i.e., Ld and Pd) when DEI is above body maintenance	11
Figure 2.3. Carcass weight trend of New Zealand domestic pigs from 1975 - 2010.....	15
Figure 2.4. Relationship between patterns of post-mortem changes in pH of muscle and pork quality.	18
Figure 2.5. Comparison of muscle pH vs. muscle temperature by Meat Standards Australia for optimal pH rate of decline (solid line), cold shortening (dashed line) and heat shortening (dotted line).....	19
Figure 2.6. Relationship between ultimate pH and shear force values from sheep loins treated with zinc chloride and without zinc chloride.....	20
Figure 2.7. Comparison of the relationship between bound water and ultimate pH for beef between fresh meat and the same meat after freezing and thawing ..	21
Figure 3.1. Shown where the measurements were taken from the picture of the pork loin chop.....	34
Figure 3.2. The cutting-up procedure of the pork loin.	36
Figure 5.1. Comparison of the slope from G1 (dotted bar) and G2 (striped bar) against other genotypes during the energy dependant phase of the growth trial ..	52
Figure 5.2. The relationship between P _{dmax} and ADG in the current trial against eight other trials.....	54

Figure 5.3. Relationship between driploss 48hr vs. ultimate pH from the data presented in Table 5.4 for the different genotypes including G1 and G2.62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. Comparison of production of four main meat groups between 1987 and 2007 by region and world. Modified from FAO (2007).	1
Table 1.2. Major world traders of beef, pork and poultry from 2001-2006. Modified from USDA (2006).	1
Table 2.1. Comparison of carcass traits for slaughter generation pigs from 1978, 1989, 2008 and 2011.	14
Table 2.2. Recent pricing schedule from NZ pork and bacon. Modified from interest.co.nz (2011).	16
Table 2.3. Summary of colour and loss of exudate in pork longissimus dorsi muscle of pork from quality. Modified from Warris (2000).	22
Table 2.4. Comparison of intramuscular fat content for sensory evaluation of cooked pork from Meishan, Ming and Landrace x Duroc crossbred pigs (percent distribution of overall evaluation). Modified from Suzuki et al. (1991).	24
Table 2.5. Comparison of the effects of RN ⁻ genotype on pork quality traits and chemical composition of the longissimus dorsi muscle. Modified from Lebret et al. (1999).	26
Table 3.1. The selection procedure for the pigs used in this trial.	27
Table 3.2. Diet composition summaries for Minlp and Pdmax diets.	29
Table 4.1. Laboratory analyses and predicted values of the Minlp and Pdmax diets based on dry matter basis.	41
Table 4.2 Least squares means for growth performance data for genotype, sex and genotype*sex interaction for grower-finisher pigs	43
Table 4.3. Least squares means for slaughter and carcass measurements for genotype, sex and genotype*sex interaction	45

Table 4.4. Least squares means for image analysis for the loin chop picture for genotype, sex and genotype*sex interaction.	47
Table 4.5 Least squares means for pork quality tests performed for genotype, sex and genotype*sex interaction.	49
Table 5.1. Comparison of traditional growth performance traits for the grower diet ^a phase of the current trial with other recent trials.	50
Table 5.2. Comparison of traditional growth performance traits of the current trial with other recent trials for finisher diet ^a phase.....	51
Table 5.3. Comparison of carcass traits of the current trial with those from other recent trials.	57
Table 5.4. Comparing pork quality traits from the present trial with other recent trials.	60

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

α	Slope
a*	Relative redness
ADFI	Average daily feed intake
ADG	Average daily gain
AI	Adequate intake
b*	Relative yellowness
BF	Backfat
BFA	Backfat surface area
BW	Body weight
CP	Crude protein
DEI	Digestible energy intake
DFD	Dark firm dry
DM	Dry matter
EJL	Expressed juice loss
FCR	Feed conversion ratio
FI	Feed intake
G	Genotype
GE	Gross energy
G*S	Genotype*sex interaction
He-Ne	Helium-neon
HI	Heat increment
kcal	Kilocalories

KJ	Kilojoules
L*	Relative lightness
Ld	Lipid deposition
LM	Longissimus muscle
LA	Longissimus dorsi surface area
LSMeans	Least squares means
LW	Live weight
ME	Metabolisable energy
ME _m	Metabolisable energy for maintenance
MFI	Myofibrillar fragmentation index
Minlp	Minimum Ld to Pd ratio
MIRINZ	Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand
N	Newton
n	Sample size
NDF	Neutral-detergent fibre
NRC	National Research Council
Pd	Protein deposition
Pdmax	Protein deposition maximum
pHu	Ultimate pH
PSE	Pale soft and exudative
S	Sex
SD	Standard deviation
SEM	Standard error of the mean

SL	Sarcomere length
Target L/P	Target lipid to protein ratio
WBSF	Warner-Bratzler shear force
WHC	Water holding capacity