Brief Report
Volume 13:11, 2022

Journal of Veterinary Science & Technology

ISSN: 2157-7579 Open Access

A Brief Report on Growth Promotion in Pigs

Anteneh Wondimu*

Department of Veterinary Medicine, Stanford University, California, USA

Introduction

By influencing the growth hormone insulin-like growth factor (IGF) axis and encouraging cellular protein synthesis, cell division, and proliferation, growth hormone (GH) is an essential growth regulator. As a result, it has the potential to accelerate the development of muscle, bone, and other animal tissues. Somatostatin (SS) has been shown to inhibit GH, prolactin (PRL), thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH), glucagon, and insulin in a variety of ways. Additionally, SS prevents the functions of the digestive system, such as the secretion of digestive juice, intestinal motility, and blood flow in the small intestine. SS primarily binds to somatostatin receptors (SSTRs), which are prevalent in the body's tissues and are the source of its biological effects. Immunological methods that use specific antibodies to neutralize endogenous somatostatin to block somatostatin-somatostatin receptor binding and promote the release of growth hormones and other hormones to improve the efficiency of nutrient uptake in animals to promote growth can be used for either passive or active immunization against somatostatin. Through nasal immunization, the current study looked at how the SS DNA vaccine (pVGS/2SS-asd) affected growth characteristics in fattening pigs [1].

Description

It is common knowledge that somatostatin inhibits animal growth. The growth of animals like sheep and heifer is aided by the production of antibodies to SS by the body when exposed to active immunization according to previous research. The preceding evidence points to the effectiveness of SS-active immunization as a growth-promoting strategy for animals. However, the use of synthetic peptides and recombinant protein in livestock production is not widely promoted due to their high preparation costs. New approaches to somatostatin-based active vaccination have emerged as a result of the development of genetically engineered vaccines. DNA vaccines outperform conventional vaccines in a number of ways, including their simplicity of design, low production costs, ease of transport, absence of risky infectious agents, and the encoding of multiple immunogenic epitopes. However, there are some drawbacks to DNA vaccines as well, such as their relatively low immunogenicity and the possibility that the incorporation of foreign DNA into the host genome will cause the cell to develop cancer. Additionally, the live attenuated strain of Salmonella has the potential to spread through feces throughout the natural environment through the process. Consequently, the goal of this study was to (1) assess the impacts of the microbes conveyed SS DNA immunization on the development of stuffing pigs and (2) to assess the security of SS DNA antibody, including the general climate and inclusion of unfamiliar DNA into the host genome [2].

The loss of dose-dependence may be related to the immune stress caused by higher vaccine doses, as antibody positivity decreases at higher doses. This is the first study to examine the quality of meat following SS vaccination. The P group's pH1, pH24, meat color, marbling, cut resistance, moisture, ash, intramuscular fat, and crude protein did not differ significantly from the N groups. Immunization increases GH secretion, which reduces intramuscular fat by regulating lipid deposition in adipose tissue and stimulating lipolysis. This may be an indirect explanation for the significant negative correlation that exists between antibody titres and back fat thickness. There are genetic, immunologic, toxic, and environmental safety concerns regarding DNA vaccines. Administrative offices, like the European Prescriptions Office (EMA), the World Wellbeing Association (WHO) and the Food and Medication Organization (FDA), have distributed rules for DNA immunizations. It is necessary to conduct safety and performance tests on any DNA vaccine prior to submitting it for regulatory approval. Genomic DNA was extracted from muscle tissues, lung liver, and blood from pigs for this investigation. Consistent with Liang et al. experimental findings, no GS/2SS fusion gene fragment was found. DNA vaccine gene integration has not been reported yet, but it is theoretically less likely than the natural genome mutation rate. On the other hand, faecal samples from day 5 and water samples from days 3 and 5 both contained the GS/2SS gene. It was difficult to avoid spreading in the pen during the vaccination because the study was conducted through nasal immunization by aerosolizing the bacteriological solution. The live attenuated Salmonella strain has been shown in some studies to spread through feces in the natural environment. Importantly, no GS/2SS gene was found between 5 and 30 days after vaccination, indicating that the vaccine bacterium is unable to spread over a significant amount of time or in a natural environment. Finally, antibody-positive pigs exhibited no significant pathological toxicity changes when compared to antibody-negative pigs. This suggests that the SS DNA vaccine does not cause toxicity while simultaneously promoting growth in fattening pigs [3-5].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the nasal immunization with the SS DNA vaccine that was administered to the pigs in our study resulted in the production of anti-SS antibodies in a portion of the fattening pigs, which may have limited the ability to increase the pigs' daily gain and slaughter weight. In addition, there was no significant effect on the quality of the meat while encouraging pig growth. Finally, the vaccine's safety was evaluated, and there was no evidence of genomic integration, histopathology, or contamination of the animals' surroundings. However, it is necessary to determine whether optimizing the sampling time between vaccinations could increase the antibody positivity rate or whether additional research is required to improve the efficacy of this vaccine by evaluating vaccines containing a variety of immuno-adjuvants and administration routes.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest associated with this manuscript.

***Address for Correspondence:** Anteneh Wondimu, Department of Veterinary Medicine, Stanford University, California, USA, E-mail: wondimua@gmail.com*

Date of Submission: 02 November, 2022, Manuscript No. jvst-22-82071; **Editor assigned:** 04 November, 2022, PreQC No. P-82071; **Reviewed:** 18 November, 2022, QC No. Q-82071; **Revised:** 23 November, 2022, Manuscript No. R-82071; **Published:** 30 November, 2022, DOI: 10.37421/2157-7579.2022.13.154

References

1. Theodoropoulou, Marily and Günter K. Stalla. "Somatostatin receptors: From signaling to clinical practice." *Front Neuroendocrinol* 34 (2013): 228-252.
2. Paran, Haim, David Neufeld, Ofer Kaplan and Joseph Klausner. "Octreotide for treatment of postoperative alimentary tract fistulas." *World J Surg* 19 (1995): 430-433.
3. Patel, Yogesh C. "Somatostatin and its receptor family." *Front Neuroendocr* 20 (1999): 157-198.
4. Zhang, Fenghua, Fang Fang, Haiyan Chang and Bo Peng, et al. "Comparison of protection against H5N1 influenza virus in mouse offspring provided by maternal vaccination with HA DNA and inactivated vaccine." *Arch Virol* 158 (2013): 1253-1265.
5. Kobiyama, Kouji, Nao Jounai, Taiki Aoshi and Miyuki Tozuka, et al. "Innate immune signaling by and genetic adjuvants for DNA vaccination." *Vaccines* 1 (2013): 278-292.

How to cite this article: Wondimu, Anteneh. "A Brief Report on Growth Promotion in Pigs." J Vet Sci Techno 13 (2022): 154.