

Boar Bot 2.0

#1 Boar Motivator in the World,
1.5 times faster than the original!

Keeping humans safe,
while reducing labor
turnover rates.



Improves Welfare:

The smooth soft-starts and soft-stops prevent any unexpected tugs on the boar. It is quieter and doesn't disrupt the barn with extra mechanical noise.



Improves Safety:

Help keep humans safe.

Boar Bot 2.0's five hundred pounds is brawny enough to control the boar with the human at a distance; and at the same time, easier to operate.

The new speed feature means the sturdy yet compact Boar Bot 2.0 can maneuver with precision and safety around pigs and people.



Improves Production Potential:

Females come into heat best when boar contact is optimized. Boar Bot 2.0 enables optimal face-to-face contact with females, better assuring that your team is finding every female pig in heat.

Research shows that boar contact matters when it comes to conception rates and total born.

Modern innovation combined with time-tested Boar Bot technology means that the newest version of the Swine Robotics Boar Bot 2.0 is a new and improved reincarnation of the machine that pork producers have trusted for a long time.

The original Boar Bot runs at one speed. Boar Bot 2.0 has variable speed with soft-start, soft-stop, and an infinite range of speed. Boar Bot 2.0 gradually accelerates, is less jumpy, runs quietly, has more refined technology, and is overall a smoother operating machine.

This technological advancement in heat checking answers the call for pig farmers to provide best welfare to every pig on our farm, including the boars that help us find females in heat. Boar Bot 2.0 exercises boars with smooth, gradual acceleration, respectful of the fact that the boar naturally starts slower and gradually picks up speed as he moves through the females. These boars have an important job to do for us. If we treat them with optimal welfare, they will be better at finding females in heat.



What the professionals are saying:

"The Boar Bot 2.0 helps bring boar and sow in closer contact (i.e. nose to nose) which can help with reproductive issues, and have some very positive effects." **Dr. Ross Kiehne, Swine Vet Center**

"I believe Boar Bots increase boar activity and sow response time." **Dr. David Bishop, PhD, Reproductive Designs**

The Research

Effects of Mechanical Lead System for Boar Control During Heat Detection on Libido and Salivary Androstenone and Androstenol

N. Sugai¹, S. Probst Miller, DVM², and R.V. Knox, PhD³

¹University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine, ²Ag Create Solutions, Inc, ³University of Illinois Department of Animal Science

Introduction

Daily boar exposure for weaned sows shortens weaning-to estrus interval.^{6,13} Boar libido impacts a technician's ability to correctly identify heat.⁶ Mechanical leads are used for human safety and to reduce labor for boar movement and heat detection. To date, we are unaware of other studies that have measured impact of mechanical lead on libido and salivary androstenone and androstenol levels.

Objective

This study compared two options for mechanical leads, the Boar Bot (BB) and Contact-O-Max (CM) on measures of boar libido during heat detection and effects on salivary androstenone and androstenol as a potential indicators for libido.

Materials & Methods

Twelve boars from 5 different farms were observed during morning heat detection from June through July 2017. Farms ranged in size from 2700 to 6200 sows. Boars observed were 50% Meishan and commercial breed. Different treatments were located on different farms. For BB, 5 boars were used to observe libido in response to 2759 sows over 9 days. For CM, libido of 7 boars to 2840 sows was observed over a 9-day period. Boar libido behaviors were ranked (1- 4) with 1=not interested and up to 4=strong activity. Scores on a per sow basis included contact time (head toward sow), chomping/saliva production, urination, vocalization, and the time for the boar to be moved from snout to tail while in front of a sow stall. Saliva samples were obtained from boars via ropes before and after a heat check shift. Samples were extracted and stored at -80oC and later processed for gas chromatography analysis of androstenone and androstenol¹.

Results

Statistics were performed using SAS for the main effects of mechanical lead, and boar and sow order of exposure (1-200, and 201-400 sows/day). BB boars showed doubled contact time ($p<0.0001$), increased chomping/saliva production ($p<0.0001$), and increased urination ($p<0.02$), with females over CM boars (Figure 1). There was no significant difference for vocalization. It was common to observe boar libido waning over time for both lead systems. CM libido waned more than BB ($P<0.05$).





Figure 2: Average Boar Androstenone and Androstenol Levels Before and After Heatchecking



There was a difference between pre- and post- androsterone and androstenol for all boars, but no significant difference between BB and CM boars (Figure 2).

Discussion

Of note to veterinary practitioners providing reproductive consulting, boars in CM tended to lay down more frequently, especially as heat detection shifts progressed. By choice, BB farms rotated boars more frequently than CM farms, resulting in better libido scores. In fact, all CM farms used the same boar for the entire morning. We observed that some farms had a favorite boar (usually elderly) they chose to use every day. Farms using the same boar daily had lower libido scores. In addition, psychological attachment may make staff reluctant to cull boars viewed as "pets." Training on why a boar replacement program is important to impact boar libido and human safety could be valuable to the industry. Of note is that the farm with highest post heat checking salivary androstenone and androstenol did the best job of rotating, culling old, and training new boars. This suggests that testing at height of boar excitement or just after, could be a better timing to measure boar libido. Further studies are needed with saliva collection during heat checking to determine if libido difference between method of boar control.

Overall, this study shows boar handling for heat checking has a significant difference on boar libido and performance. Investigating further on the effects of age and training for boars can help formulate better boar protocols for improving heat checking efficiency on sow farms.

References

- Booth, W.D., 1987. J. Reprod. Fert. 81, 427-431. - 2. Cassar, G., Kirkwood RN, Seguin MJ, et al. Influence of stage of gestation at grouping and presence of boars on farrowing rate and litter size of group-housed sows. J Swine Health Prod. 2008;16(2):81-85. - 3. Castaneda, J., Orihuela, A., Rocha, G., 2002. Poster, Production and Management, IPVS, 649-654. East, M.L., Dehnard, M., Rohrmann, H., and Kauffold, J., 2013. Chemical Signals in Vertebrates 12, 381-390. (ch 30 measure pheromones). - 5. Hemsworth, P.H., Hansen, C., 1990. Applied Animal Behavior Science 28, 281-285. - 6. Kemp, B., Soede, N.M., Langendijk, P., 2005. Theriogenology 63, 643-656. - 7. Kirkwood, R., 2009. American Association of Swine Veterinarians (AASV) AASVPCS, 9-14. - 8. Knox, R.V., (year) American Association of Swine Veterinarians (AASV). 1-10. - 9. Knox, R.V., 2004. Advances in Pork Production 15, 307-313. - 10. Knox, R.V., Miller, G.M., Willenburg, K.L., Rodriguez-Zas, S.L., 2002. J. Anim Sci 80, 892-899. - 11. Knox, R.V., Rodriguez-Zas, S.L., Slater, J.L., McNamara, K.A., Gall, J.J., Lewis, D.G., Saffranski, T.J., Singleton, W.L., 2013. J. Anim Sci 91, 433-445. - 12. Knox, R.V., Willenburg, K., Miller, G., 2001. American Association of Swine Veterinarians (AASV) 541-544. - 13. Knox, R.V., Willenburg, K., Miller, G., 2002. Poster Production and Management IPVS, 655-659. - 14. Langendijk, P., Soede, N.M., Kemp, B., 2002. J. Anim. Sci. 78, 871-873. - 15. Marchant-Foide, J.N., 2010. Proceedings of the 21st IPVA Congress, 36-38. - 16. Marchese, S., Per, D., Scaloni, A., Carbone, V., Pelosi, P., 1998. Eur J Biochem. 252, 563-568. (Upstairs of boar saliva...). - 17. Penafiel-Siller, J., Sosa-Ferreira, C.F., 2002. Poster Production and Management IPVS, 683-688. - 18. Petznick, J., 2013. American Association of Swine Veterinarians (AASV) Seminar topics, 23-24. - 19. Soede, N.M., Langendijk, P., Kemp, B., 2002. Proc. 17th IPVS 1:15-24. - 20. Sonderman, J.P., 2016. American Association of Swine Veterinarians (AASV) Annual Meeting (Proceedings), 3-5. - 21. Thacker, B., 2001. Iowa State University Swine Disease Conference for Swine Practitioners, 55-60.