Sponsors

We thank the following sponsors:

Platinum
Bayer Animal Health
National Pork Board
Pfizer Animal Health

Silver
Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc.

Bronze
Cargill
Merck Animal Health
Novartis Animal Health

Copper
AgStar Financial Services
Elanco Animal Health
IDEXX
Newport Laboratories
PIC USA
PRRS CAP

University of Minnesota Institutional Partners
College of Veterinary Medicine
University of Minnesota Extension
College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Sciences

Formatting
Tina Smith Graphics
www.tinasmithgraphics.com

CD-ROM
David Brown
www.davidhbrown.us

Logo Design
Ruth Cronje, and Jan Swanson;
based on the original design by Dr. Robert Dunlop

COMPARATIVE FIELD EFFICACY OF INGELVAC® PRRS ATP VERSUS INGELVAC® PRRS MLV IN GROWING PIGS EXPOSED TO HETEROLOGOUS FIELD VIRUS.

JANA GRAUERHOLZ DVM[1], MIKE EISENMENGER DVM[2], TOM WETZELL DVM[3]

[1]CHRISTENSEN FAMILY FARMS, SLEEPY EYE, MINNESOTA; [2]SWINE VET CENTER, ST. PETER, MINNESOTA; [3] BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM VETMEDICA, INC., ST. JOSEPH, MISSOURI

jgrauerholz@christensenfarms.com

Introduction

The objective was to compare the efficacy of a full dose of Ingelvac® PRRS ATP vs. a full dose of Ingelvac® PRRS MLV given within 1-2 weeks post weaning for protection against the respiratory form of PRRSv challenge in the nursery-finishing phase of production. The efficacy of the two treatment groups was measured by difference in barn close out data. The primary parameter measured was finishing mortality. Performance data for cull rates, total mortality and cull rate (pigs not going to primary market), average daily gain (ADG) and feed efficiency (FE) were also measured.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted at 20 double sided curtain, wean to finish (WTF) sites with 40 total barns in the Christensen Family Farms (CFF) system. The sites were located in northern Iowa where weaned pigs were transported from sow farms producing all PRRS PCR negative pigs. The flow is *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* positive, with a history of Mycoplasma pneumonia at some finishing sites. Three sites were eliminated from the study because of movement of pigs between buildings and rooms that confounded the data.

Pigs were randomly allocated to treatment group by a coin flip between barns upon arrival to the WTF sites. Vaccine was administered 1-2 weeks after arrival to the sites. A full dose of Ingelvac PRRS ATP was administered following label recommendations; (2cc per pig I.M.), to all pigs in treatment group one. A full dose of Ingelvac PRRS MLV was administered following label recommendations; (2 cc per pig I.M.), to all pigs in treatment group two. Performance results were measured for the finishing period. Pigs averaged 54 pounds at 51 days of age at the beginning of the finishing period. Mortalities were recorded at each individual barn; (treatment group). Culls were evaluated from recorded pigs in each treatment group sent to the cull market versus prime market.

Results

Results of the trial indicated that 10 of the 17 finishing barns in the Ingelvac PRRS ATP treatment groups were exposed to a field isolate of PRRS and 9 of the 17 finishing barns in the Ingelvac PRRS MLV treatment groups were exposed to a field isolate of PRRS. There was no statistical difference between the two treatment groups in mortality, cull rates, total mortality and cull rate, average daily gain, and feed conversion, in the finishing phase of production, when comparing field virus infected barns; (Table 1). There was also no statistical difference in any performance results measured when comparing the two treatment groups in the non infected barns; (Table 2).

Table 1: Finishing performance results (Field virus infected barns)

	ATP	MLV	pvalue
No. Barns	10	9	
% Mortality [1]	3.21	3.85	.96
% Culls [1]	3.66	3.52	.9
% Mortality & Culls[1]	6.87	7.38	.9
ADG, lbs[2]	1.71	1.74	.53
FE, lbs[2]	3.05	3.05	.91

[1]Analyzed using Wilcoxin rank sums test.
[2]Analyzed using two-sample t-test

Table 2: Finishing performance results (Non field virus infected barns)

	ATP	MLV	pvalue
No. Barns	7	8	
% Mortality [1]	2.44	2.09	.39
% Culls [1]	2.22	2.60	.86
% Mortality & Culls[1]	4.66	4.68	.86
ADG, lbs[2]	1.78	1.76	.69
FE, lbs[2]	3.05	3.02	.64

[1]Analyzed using Wilcoxin rank sums test.
[2]Analyzed using two-sample t-test

Discussion

In this field study, there was no statistically significant difference in the level of heterologous protection against field virus challenge demonstrated by Ingelvac PRRS ATP and Ingelvac PRRS MLV.