ORIENT review is a scientific journal publisher based in Asia, dedicated to disseminating high-quality research across various academic disciplines. With a strong commitment to fostering scholarly advancement and promoting cross-cultural understanding, ORIENT REVIEW has established itself as a reliable platform for researchers, academics, and professionals across the globe.

Precision Livestock Technologies for the Swine Industry - Challenges and Possible Alternatives

Hoang Van Huy, Department of Biology, Tra Vinh College of Natural Sciences, 50 Nguyen Thien

Thuat Street, Tra Vinh City, Tra Vinh Province, Vietnam

abstract

Pig farmers are routinely faced with challenges related to market volatility, animal diseases, compliance and regulatory concerns, labor shortage, and changing public demands. Some of these challenges can be mitigated by new technologies, especially to monitor animal health and disease propagation in the pig farms. Precision livestock tools tailored for the swine industry include a number of engineering tools and technologies that help to sense and monitor animal health and provide informed decision-making support for the pig farmers. This review talks about some of the sensors and IoT devices, along with data analytics, suited for the swine industry. We talk about the challenges at the ground level and possible walkarounds of these challenges that could benefit the pig farmers, including changes in regulatory policies, incentives for farmers, and appropriate training and knowhow to operate the new technologies. Livestock health monitoring is a growing field of research and development, and new tools and technologies need to be tailored to the demands of the pig farms while proving better cost to benefit margins for the users. This review attempts to capture the jargon of precision livestock farming while portraying the known benefits of adopting such technologies in the farm.

Need for Precision Farming Tools for the Swine Industry

Pig farmers confront numerous challenges that affect their operational efficiency and financial viability [1-10]. Market volatility, marked by fluctuations in pork and feed prices, can significantly impact farm income and profitability. Diseases like African Swine Fever (ASF) and Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea Virus (PEDv) pose substantial threats, leading to financial losses and heightened biosecurity measures. Compliance with stringent regulations concerning animal welfare, environmental conservation, and food safety entails additional costs and administrative complexities. Oscillations in the costs of feed, medications, and veterinary services further influence profitability, particularly during periods of economic uncertainty. Securing skilled labor remains a challenge, especially in rural areas, necessitating competitive wages and benefits. Managing waste and mitigating environmental impacts, such as odor and nutrient runoff, are ongoing concerns. Evolving consumer preferences for ethically sourced pork, organic products, or specific production methods necessitate adaptive farming practices and adjusted marketing strategies. Accessing financing for farm expansions, equipment upgrades, or infrastructure improvements can be particularly daunting for small-scale or new farmers 1-12].

Embracing and integrating new technologies, like precision farming tools and IoT, may necessitate initial investment and training, yet holds potential to enhance efficiency and competitiveness over time. Precision pig farming utilizes advanced technologies and data-driven methods to optimize various aspects of pig husbandry [2-15]. This encompasses monitoring pig health, nutrition, and environmental conditions such as temperature and humidity through sensors, data analytics, and automation. These innovations empower farmers to make informed decisions aimed at boosting efficiency, cutting costs, and enhancing animal welfare [32-44]. This modern approach aims to maximize productivity while minimizing environmental footprint and resource consumption [31-43].

Precision Swine Farming Tools – An Overview

Precision livestock farming (PLF) employs a variety of tools and technologies to oversee and regulate livestock, including pigs [2-20]. Sensors utilized in PLF encompass temperature sensors, humidity sensors, gas sensors (such as for ammonia), and motion sensors, which monitor both the environment and behavior of pigs. Electronic identification systems like RFID tags facilitate individual pig tracking within herds, enabling customized management. Monitoring systems encompass the surveillance of feed intake, water consumption, and health metrics like heart rate, respiratory rate, and activity levels [40-49]. Automated feeding systems deliver precise amounts of feed tailored to the nutritional requirements of individual pigs or groups based on real-time data [12-29]. Environmental control systems regulate factors such as temperature, ventilation, and lighting in pig housing to optimize comfort and health. Data analytics and software platforms analyze data gathered from sensors and other sources to provide insights into pig health, growth performance, and overall farm efficiency. Decision support systems utilize algorithms and models to aid farmers in decision-making regarding feeding, health management, breeding, and farm operations. Robotics are employed for tasks such as barn cleaning, pig sorting, and medication administration, reducing manual labor and enhancing efficiency. Farmers can monitor and control various aspects of their pig farms remotely through mobile apps or web-based interfaces, thereby improving real-time management capabilities. These tools collectively empower farmers to optimize production efficiency, enhance animal welfare, and minimize environmental impact through precise management practices in pig farming.

Sensors and IoT Devices for Precision Swine Farming

Sensors play a crucial role in precision pig farming by providing real-time data on various aspects of swine health, behavior, and environment [20-35]. Temperature sensors monitor ambient temperature in pig housing to ensure optimal comfort and health conditions. Humidity sensors measure humidity levels to prevent issues like heat stress and respiratory problems. Gas sensors detect gases such as ammonia (NH_3), carbon dioxide (CO_2), and hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) to maintain air quality and prevent respiratory issues. Activity sensors track pig activity and movement patterns, which can indicate health status and behavior changes [2-10]. Weight sensors can weigh pigs automatically or periodically to monitor growth rates and adjust feeding regimes accordingly. Feed intake sensors measure feed consumption by individual pigs or groups to optimize feeding strategies and detect changes in appetite. Water consumption sensors monitor water consumption to ensure adequate hydration and detect potential health issues. Health monitoring sensors: Include sensors for monitoring physiological parameters such as heart rate, respiratory rate, and body temperature. Environmental monitoring systems combine multiple sensors to monitor overall environmental conditions in pig housing, including temperature, humidity, gases, and air quality [1-5]. Electronic identification tags or systems used for individual pig tracking and management, often integrated with sensors for comprehensive data collection. These sensors provide farmers with valuable insights into pig health, behavior, and environmental conditions, enabling proactive management decisions to enhance welfare, productivity, and efficiency in swine farming operations.

Challenges in Deploying Sensors and IoT Devices for Precision Swine Farming

Implementing Sensors and IoT (Internet of Things) technologies in swine farming brings a set of challenges that farmers and technology developers need to address before deploying these tools in the pig farms[1-10]. Firstly, sensors and IoT devices and infrastructure can be expensive to install and maintain, especially for smaller farms. Furthermore, cost-effective solutions that provide clear ROI are needed. Handling large volumes of data generated by IoT sensors requires robust data management and storage solutions. Ensuring data security and privacy is also crucial. IoT devices must be reliable and resistant to harsh farm environments (e.g., humidity, dust, and temperature extremes) to provide continuous monitoring and data collection. Integrating different IoT devices and systems from various vendors can be challenging. Standards and protocols for data exchange need to be established. IoT devices often require continuous power supply, which can be a challenge in remote or off-grid farming locations. Battery life and energy-efficient solutions are important considerations.

In addition, pig farmers may require training to effectively use IoT technologies and interpret data insights for making informed decisions [30-43]. Adhering to regulations and standards regarding data privacy, animal welfare, and environmental monitoring is essential but can be complex in different field settings. IoT solutions should be scalable to accommodate varying farm sizes and production systems, from small-scale operations to large commercial farms. Regular maintenance and technical support for IoT systems are necessary to ensure optimal performance and longevity [21-29]. Ensuring that IoT technologies contribute positively to animal welfare and sustainable farming practices is essential. Addressing these challenges requires collaboration between farmers, technology providers, researchers, and regulatory bodies to develop and implement effective IoT solutions that benefit both pigs and farmers in the long term.

Possible Solutions in Deploying Sensors and IoT Devices for Precision Swine Farming

To effectively address the challenges of implementing IoT in swine farming, several solutions and strategies can be considered [40-49]. It is critical to develop and deploy IoT devices and systems that provide clear economic benefits to farmers, such as improved efficiency, reduced labor costs, and better resource utilization. It is important to implement secure and scalable data management platforms that can handle large volumes of data generated by IoT sensors, and use cloud-based solutions for data storage and analytics to optimize farm operations. For this, it is important to work with IoT device manufacturers to ensure devices are rugged, weather-resistant, and designed for farm environments, and regularly test and maintain devices to minimize downtime.

It is also needed to establish industry standards and protocols for IoT devices to ensure compatibility and seamless integration across different systems and vendors [35-43]. As IoT devices are power hungry, there is a need to develop energy-efficient IoT devices and explore alternative power sources such as solar energy or battery technologies to extend device lifespan and reduce operational costs. We need to provide training and resources to farmers on how to effectively use IoT technologies, interpret data, and apply insights to improve farm management practices. We want to stay informed about regulatory requirements related to data privacy, animal welfare, and environmental monitoring, and ensure IoT solutions comply with local regulations and standards. Finally to address scalability, we need to design IoT solutions that are scalable and adaptable to different farm sizes and production systems, from small family farms to large commercial operations, while establishing robust technical support and maintenance programs to address issues promptly and ensure continuous operation of IoT systems. By focusing on these solutions, stakeholders can overcome challenges and maximize the benefits of IoT in swine farming, leading to improved productivity, animal welfare, and sustainability in the industry.

Conclusion

Pig farmers have access to a variety of new tools and technologies that can improve efficiency, animal welfare, and overall farm management. These tools and technologies enable pig farmers to make informed decisions, enhance productivity, and meet evolving consumer demands for sustainable and ethically produced pork products [1-14]. As technology continues to advance, ongoing research and adoption of these innovations can further transform pig farming practices worldwide. Developing and implementing new tools for pig farmers comes with its own set of challenges, despite the potential benefits they offer. Here we discussed some of these challenges for pig farmers. Developing and deploying new technologies can be expensive, especially for smaller farms or in regions with limited financial resources. High upfront costs for equipment, installation, and ongoing maintenance may hinder adoption. New technologies often require specialized knowledge and training to operate effectively. Farmers may face challenges in understanding and integrating complex systems into their existing operations. Tools designed for agricultural environments must be robust, weather-resistant, and capable of withstanding the rigors of daily farm operations. Ensuring reliability and minimizing downtime is critical. Overcoming these challenges requires collaboration between technology developers, farmers, researchers, and regulatory bodies to create practical, cost-effective solutions that meet the needs of the pig farming industry while addressing broader societal and environmental goals [34-43].

References

[1]. Werkheiser, I. Technology and responsibility: A discussion of underexamined risks and concerns in Precision Livestock Farming. Anim. Front. 2020, 10, 51–57.

[2]. Santosh Pandey, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Baoqing Guo, Phillip C. Gauger, David Peters, Kyoung-Jin Yoon, “Behavioral Monitoring Tool for Pig Farmers: Ear Tag Sensors, Machine Intelligence, and Technology Adoption Roadmap“, Animals, Vol. 11, Issue 9, pages 2665, 2021.

[3]. Roberts, D.P.; Short, N.M.; Sill, J.; Lakshman, D.K.; Hu, X.; Buser, M. Precision agriculture and geospatial techniques for sustainable disease control. Indian Phytopathol. 2021, 74, 287–305.

[4]. Higgins, S.; Schellberg, J.; Bailey, J.S. Improving productivity and increasing the efficiency of soil nutrient management on grassland farms in the UK and Ireland using precision agriculture technology. Eur. J. Agron. 2019, 106, 67–74.

[5]. Haibo, L.; Shuliang, D.; Zunmin, L.; Chuijie, Y. Study and Experiment on a Wheat Precision Seeding Robot. J. Robot. 2015, 2015, 1–9.

[6]. X. Ding, Z. Njus, T. Kong, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. 2017, eaao1254.

[7]. Perakis, K.; Lampathaki, F.; Nikas, K.; Georgiou, Y.; Marko, O.; Maselyne, J. CYBELE—Fostering precision agriculture & livestock farming through secure access to large-scale HPC enabled virtual industrial experimentation environments fostering scalable big data analytics. Comput. Netw. 2020, 168, 107035.

[8]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman, Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[9]. Hertem, V. Objective sustainability assessment by Precision Livestock Farming. Agric. Food Policy Environ. Econ. Policy 2018.

[10]. Parashar, A., Plant-in-chip: Microfluidic system for studying root growth and pathogenic interactions in Arabidopsis. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 263703, 2011.

[11]. Ashley, C. and Maxwell, S. 2001. Rethinking rural development. Development Policy Review 19(4): 395–425.

[12]. Wezel, A., S. Bellon, T. Dore, C. Francis, D. Vallod, and C. David. Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 29: 503–515, 2009.

[13]. Whitmer, A., L. Ogden, J. Lawton, P. Sturner, P. M. Groffman, L. Schneider, D. Hart, B. Halpern, et al. 2010. The engaged university: providing a platform for research that transforms society. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 8: 314–321.

[14]. Beeman, Z. Njus, G. L. Tylka, Chip Technologies for Screening Chemical and Biological Agents against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes, Phytopathology, 106 (12), 1563-1571, 2016.

[15]. Niblack TL, Arelli PR, Noel GR, Opperman CH, Orf JH, Schmitt DP, Shannon JG, Tylka GL. A Revised Classification Scheme for Genetically Diverse Populations of Heterodera glycines. J Nematol. 34(4):279-88, 2002.

[16]. R. Lycke, A. Parashar, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics. Biomicrofluidics. 7(6), 64103, 2013.

[17]. Vishal Patel, Austin Chesmore, Christopher M. Legner, Santosh Pandey, Trends in Workplace Wearable Technologies and Connected-Worker Solutions for Next-Generation Occupational Safety, Health, and Productivity, Advanced Intelligent Systems, Article ID 2100099, 2021.

[18]. Christopher M. Legner, Gregory L Tylka. Robotic agricultural instrument for automated extraction of nematode cysts and eggs from soil to improve integrated pest management. Scientific reports, Vol. 11, Issue 1, pages 1-10, 2021.

[19]. Niblack TL, Lambert KN, Tylka GL. A model plant pathogen from the kingdom Animalia: Heterodera glycines, the soybean cyst nematode. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2006;44:283-303.

[20]. Fang, Y., Ramasamy, R. P. Current and prospective methods for plant disease detection. Biosensors 5 (3), 537–561, 2015.

[21]. Carr JA, Parashar A, Gibson R, Robertson AP, Martin RJ, Pandey S. A microfluidic platform for high-sensitivity, real-time drug screening on C. elegans and parasitic nematodes. Lab Chip. 11(14):2385-96, 2011.

[22]. J. Jensen, Z. Njus, G. Tylka, Video Analysis Software To Measure Nematode Movement With Applications For Accurate Screening Of Nematode Control Compounds. Journal of Nematology, Volume 48, Issue 4, pp. 335-336, 2016.

[23]. Ding X, Njus Z, Kong T, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. eaao1254, 2017.

[24]. J.P. Jensen, U. Kalwa, G.L. Tylka, Avicta and Clariva Affect the Biology of the Soybean Cyst Nematode, Heterodera glycines. Plant Disease,102(12):2480-2486, 2018.

[25]. D. Cruz, D. Mayfield, Z. Njus, M. Beattie, L. Leandro and G. Munkvold, “Sensitivity of Fusarium species from soybean roots to seed treatment fungicides”. Phytopathology Conference, 104(11), 29-29, 2014.

[26]. Sankaran S, Mishra A, Ehsani R, Davis C (2010) A review of advanced techniques for detecting plant diseases. Comput Electron Agric 72:1–13

[27]. Velkov VV, Medvinsky AB, Sokolov MS, Marchenko AI. Will transgenic plants adversely affect the environment? J Biosci. 2005 Sep;30(4):515-48.

[28]. S. Pandey, Analytical modeling of the ion number fluctuations in biological ion channels, Journal of nanoscience and nanotechnology, 12(3), 2489-2495, 2012.

[29]. Akwete Bortei-Doku, Marvin H. White, Simulation of biological ion channels with technology computer-aided design. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 85, 1, 1-7, 2007.

[30]. Augustine Beeman, Leland E Harker, Jared P Jensen, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Zach L Njus, Gregory L Tylka, Christopher M. Legner. Methods, apparatus, and systems to extract and quantify minute objects from soil or feces, including plant-parasitic nematode pests and their eggs in soil. US Patent 10,900,877, January 26, 2021.

[31]. B. Chen, A. Parashar, “Folded floating-gate CMOS biosensor for the detection of charged biochemical molecules”, IEEE Sensors Journal, 2011.

[32]. John, A.J.; Clark, C.E.F.; Freeman, M.J.; Kerrisk, K.L.; Garcia, S.C.; Halachmi, I. Review: Milking robot utilization, a successful precision livestock farming evolution. Animal 2016, 10, 1484–1492.

[33]. S. Pandey, Marvin H White, Parameter-extraction of a two-compartment model for whole-cell data analysis, Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 120(2), 131-143, 2002.

[34]. Njus Z, Kong T, Kalwa U, et al. Flexible and disposable paper- and plastic-based gel micropads for nematode handling, imaging, and chemical testing. APL Bioengineering. 1(1):016102, 2017.

[35]. Buckelew LD, Pedigo LP, Mero HM, Owen MD, Tylka GL. Effects of weed management systems on canopy insects in herbicide-resistant soybeans. J Econ Entomol. 2000 Oct;93(5):1437-43.

[36]. Upender Kalwa, Christopher M. Legner, Elizabeth Wlezien, Gregory Tylka. New methods of cleaning debris and high-throughput counting of cyst nematode eggs extracted from field soil, PLoS ONE, 14(10): e0223386, 2019.

[37]. Z. Njus, D. Feldmann, R. Brien, T. Kong, U. Kalwa. Characterizing the Effect of Static Magnetic Fields on C. elegans Using Microfluidics, Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology, Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 583-591, 2015.

[38]. J. A. Carr, R. Lycke, A. Parashar. Unidirectional, electrotactic-response valve for Caenorhabditis elegans in microfluidic devices. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 143701, 2011.

[39]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman. Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[40]. Mytelka, L.K. 2000. Local systems of innovation in a globalized world economy. Industry and Innovation 77(1): 15–32, 2000.

[41]. R. Lycke, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics, Biomicrofluidics 7, 064103, 2013.

[42]. Parashar A, Lycke R, Carr JA. Amplitude-modulated sinusoidal microchannels for observing adaptability in C. elegans locomotion. Biomicrofluidics. 5(2):24112, 2011.

[43]. T. Kong, S. Flanigan, M. Weinstein, U. Kalwa, C. Legner, “A fast, reconfigurable flow switch for paper microfluidics based on selective wetting of folded paper actuator strips”, Lab on a Chip, 17 (21), 3621-3633, 2017.

[44]. Owen MD, Zelaya IA. Herbicide-resistant crops and weed resistance to herbicides. Pest Manag Sci. 61(3):301-11, 2005.

[45]. Joseph, A., Lycke, R. Decision-making by nematodes in complex microfluidic mazes. Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology 2(6), 409-415, 2011.

[46]. J. Saldanha, J. Powell-Coffman. The effects of short-term hypergravity on Caenorhabditis elegans. Life Science Space Research, 10:38-46, 2016.

[47]. J.P. Jensen, A.Q. Beeman, Z.L. Njus et al. Movement and Motion of Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines Populations and Individuals in Response to Abamectin. Phytopathology. 108(7):885-891, 2018.

[48]. Wezel, A., and V. Soldat. A quantitative and qualitative historical analysis of the scientific discipline of agroecology. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability 7: 3–18, 2009.

[49]. Ben Azouz, A.; Esmonde, H.; Corcoran, B.; O’Callaghan, E. Development of a teat sensing system for robotic milking by combining thermal imaging and stereovision technique. Comput. Electron. Agric. 2015, 110, 162–170.