

1  
2  
3**JAST (Journal of Animal Science and Technology) TITLE PAGE**

Upload this completed form to website with submission

ARTICLE INFORMATION	Fill in information in each box below
Article Type	Research article
Article Title (within 20 words without abbreviations)	Correlation Analysis of Primal Cuts Weight, Fat Contents, and Auction Prices in LYD Pig Carcasses by VCS2000
Running Title (within 10 words)	LYD Pig Carcass Traits measured by VCS2000, Auction Prices Correlations
Author	Youngho Lim1, Yunhwan Park1, Gwantae Kim1, Jaeyoung Kim1, Jongtae Seo2, Jaesik Lee2, Jungseok Choi1
Affiliation	1 Department of Animal Science, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju, Korea 2 Bugyeong Pig Farmers cooperative, Gimhae, Korea
ORCID (for more information, please visit <a href="https://orcid.org">https://orcid.org</a> )	Youngho Lim ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0238-4736">https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0238-4736</a> ) Yunhwan Park ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2239-6697">https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2239-6697</a> ) Gwantae Kim ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7237-9673">https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7237-9673</a> ) Jaeyoung Kim ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2847-1731">https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2847-1731</a> ) Jongtae Seo ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7399-8047">https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7399-8047</a> ) Jaesik Lee ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3700-2552">https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3700-2552</a> ) Jungseok Choi ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8033-0410">https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8033-0410</a> )
Competing interests	No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.
Funding sources State funding sources (grants, funding sources, equipment, and supplies). Include name and number of grant if available.	This work was supported by the Bugyeong Pig Farmers Cooperative.
Acknowledgements	This work was supported by the Bugyeong Pig Farmers Cooperative.
Availability of data and material	Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.
Authors' contributions Please specify the authors' role using this form.	Conceptualization: Kim J, Seo J, Lee J Data curation: Kim J, Seo J, Lee J Formal analysis: Lim Y, Park Y, Kim J Methodology: Lim Y, Park Y Software: Lim Y, Park Y Validation: Kim J, Choi J Investigation: Lim Y, Kim J, Park Y, Kim G Writing - original draft: Lim Y Writing - review & editing: Lim Y, Park Y, Kim J, Kim G, Seo J, Lee J, Choi J
Ethics approval and consent to participate	This article does not require IRB/IACUC approval because there are no human and animal participants.

4

**5 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION**

For the corresponding author (responsible for correspondence, proofreading, and reprints)	Fill in information in each box below
First name, middle initial, last name	Jungseok, Choi
Email address – this is where your proofs will be sent	<a href="mailto:jchoi@chungbuk.ac.kr">jchoi@chungbuk.ac.kr</a>
Secondary Email address	
Address	Department of Animal Science, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju 28644, Korea
Cell phone number	+82-10-3235-2127
Office phone number	+82-43-261-2551
Fax number	

6

7     **Abstract**

8     Currently, in pork auctions in Korea, only carcass weight and backfat thickness provide information on meat  
9     quantity, while the production volume of primal cuts and fat contents remains largely unknown. This study aims  
10    to predict the production of primal cuts in pigs and investigate how these carcass traits affect pricing. Using the  
11    VS2000, the production of shoulder blade, loin, belly, shoulder picnic, and ham was measured for gilts (17,257  
12    pigs) and barrows (16,365 pigs) of LYD (Landrace × Yorkshire × Duroc) pigs. Single and multiple regression  
13    analysis were conducted to analyze the relationship between the primal cuts and carcass weight. The study also  
14    examined the correlation between each primal cut, backfat thickness (1st thoracic vertebra backfat thickness,  
15    grading backfat thickness, and Multi-brached muscle middle backfat thickness), pork belly fat percentage, total  
16    fat yield, and auction price. A multiple regression analysis was conducted between the carcass traits that showed  
17    a high correlation and the auction price. After conducting a single regression analysis on the primal cuts of gilt  
18    and barrow, all coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ) were 0.77 or higher. In the multiple regression analysis, the  $R^2$   
19    value was 0.98 or higher. The correlation coefficient between the carcass weights and the auction price  
20    exceeded 0.70, while the correlation coefficients between the primal cuts and the auction prices were above 0.65.  
21    In terms of fat content, the backfat thickness of gilt exhibited a correlation coefficient of 0.70, and all other  
22    items had a correlation coefficient of 0.47 or higher. The correlation coefficients between the Forequarter,  
23    Middle, and Hindquarter and the auction price were 0.62 or higher. The  $R^2$  values of the multiple regression  
24    analysis between carcass traits and auction price were 0.5 or higher for gilts and 0.4 or higher for barrows. The  
25    regression equations between carcass weight and primal cuts derived in this study exhibited high determination  
26    coefficients, suggesting that they could serve as reliable means to predict primal cut production from pig  
27    carcasses. Elucidating the correlation between primal cuts, fat contents and auction prices can provide economic  
28    indicators for pork and assist in guiding the direction of pig farming.

29  
30  
31    **Keywords (3 to 6):** LYD pig, Carcass traits, regression analysis, Correlation coefficient, Auction price,  
32    VCS2000

33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## Introduction

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68

The per capita consumption of livestock products in the Republic of Korea increased from 40.6 kg in 2010 to 56.1 kg in 2021, marking a growth of 15.5 kg. Among the different types of meat, pork consumption was the highest from 1985 to 2021. Consequently, the number of pigs raised in South Korea also increased, rising from 8.2 million pigs in 2011 to around 11.2 million pigs in 2021, an increase of approximately 3 million pigs [1]. Thus, the Korean government is increasing the processing speed of slaughterhouses by designating centralized slaughterhouses equipped with modern facilities. In 2016, as a pilot project, the government introduced the VCS2000, an automated grading machine, to improve the accuracy of pork grading and reduce the need for additional labor [2]. As of November 2022, VCS2000 equipment has been installed in 11 domestic slaughterhouses [3].

The VCS2000 device is non-invasive carcass measurement equipment that analyzes images of pigs captured using a monochromatic camera and two-color cameras during the pig slaughtering process. Through this, it is possible to measure the production quantity of primal cuts, such as shoulder picnic, ham, shoulder blade, ribs, belly, and loin, as well as the backfat thickness, total fat yield, and belly fat percentage of the pig [2, 3, 4, 5]

As of 2021, among the pigs sent to market in South Korea, gilts accounted for 50.5%, while barrows, which are castrated pigs, accounted for 49.0% [6]. Furthermore, the castration rate of male pigs increased from 98.1% in 2010 to 99.1% in 2021 [6]. Barrows are pigs in which the testes have been removed to eliminate reproductive functions [7, 8]. Females and castrated males exhibit differences in feed intake and feed efficiency during the rearing and fattening periods [9, 10]. Previous studies showed differences in carcass characteristics, including weight, the quantity of pork cuts produced, fat content, and back fat thickness, between females and castrated males [10, 11, 12, 13].

In South Korea, pig auctions are conducted for wholesale buyers, including trading participant and auction participants, who bid on graded meat [14]. During the auction, the half carcass, as well as its gender, carcass weight, grade, and breed, is displayed on electronic boards [15]. Pig grading is based on the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs Notice No. 2020-112 (MAFRA. 2020. 12. 29) detailed standards for livestock product grading. The grading consists of a first grading, which measures carcass weight and backfat thickness, and a second grading of appearance and meat quality. In pork auctions, bidding is based solely on the visual appearance of the half carcass and the grading results without considering the actual primal cut quantity. Therefore, until now, meat quantity could only be inferred based on the carcass weight and back fat thickness, and the weight of specific pork cuts could only be determined after the auction when the pig carcass was processed into primal cuts.

69 Currently, the auction price of pork is determined through primary and secondary grading, and some data, such  
70 as carcass traits and lean meat yield predictions made by the VCS 2000, are only minimally used as reference  
71 data in some slaughterhouses [3]. This study utilized the VCS 2000 to investigate the differences in production  
72 quantity of each primal cut between gilts and barrows and established a means to predict primal cut production  
73 quantity. Additionally, by clarifying the correlation between primal cuts and the backfat of pigs with auction  
74 prices, this research aimed to provide important economic indicators for pork production in the swine industry.

75  
76  
77

## 78 **Materials and Methods**

79

### 80 **Animals**

81 Pigs were selected from a total of 33,622 individuals, consisting of 17,257 female LYD (Landrace × Yorkshire  
82 × Duroc) pigs and 16,365 castrated male pigs, that were slaughtered from June 2 to July 29, 2022, in the  
83 Bukyeong Livestock Auction Market in Juchon-myeon, Gimhae-si, Gyeongsangnam-do. All pigs were  
84 slaughtered according to the Livestock Products Sanitation Control Act (Livestock Sanitation Control Act, 2021  
85 revision).

86

### 87 **VCS2000 equipment**

88 The VCS2000 equipment (E+V Technology GmbH, Germany) consists of a monochromatic camera, color  
89 camera, lighting device, background device, carcass guide, carcass holder, control box, vision program,  
90 computer, and spare parts.

91 The measurements were taken after dividing the pig carcass into two parts during the slaughtering process,  
92 where the half carcass was fixed on the carcass holder, and the rear portion of the half carcass was captured  
93 using a monochromatic camera. After that, two color cameras were used to photograph the upper and lower  
94 surfaces of the half carcass front, respectively, and then these images were input into a computer for analysis.  
95 The accuracy of the VCS2000 equipment was demonstrated by Park et al. [16].

96 The following measurements were obtained for pigs using the VCS2000: production quantity of five primal  
97 cuts (shoulder picnic, ham, loin, belly, and shoulder blade), backfat thickness at the first thoracic vertebra,  
98 backfat thickness used for grading (average thickness between the last rib and the first lumbar vertebra, and the

99 thickness between the 11th and 12th ribs), multi-branched muscle middle backfat thickness, pork belly fat  
100 percentage, and total fat yield, as well as the quantity of forequarter, middle, and hindquarter produced.

101

## 102 **Statistical analysis**

103 Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were calculated to compare the VCS2000 measurements  
104 between gilts and barrows, and t-tests were conducted for the mean and standard deviation. Through One-way  
105 ANOVA, we confirmed the significance tests for the five primal cuts and three backfat thickness, and post hoc  
106 tests were conducted using the Duncan test. the VCS2000 measurements between female pigs and castrated  
107 male pigs, and t-tests were conducted for the mean and standard deviation. A simple regression analysis was  
108 performed to analyze the relationship between primal cuts and carcass weight in gilts and barrows, with carcass  
109 weight as the dependent variable and primal cut production quantity as the independent variable. Pearson's  
110 correlation coefficients were calculated to analyze the correlation between VCS2000 measurements and auction  
111 prices for gits and barrows. A multiple regression analysis was also conducted, with carcass weight as the  
112 dependent variable and the production quantity of all primal cuts as the independent variable. All statistical  
113 analyses were performed using SPSS software, version 25.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

114

115

116

## 117 **Results and Discussion**

118

### 119 **Investigation of carcass weight and primal cuts production of gilt and barrow**

120 To investigate the production of gilts and barrows based on primal cuts, the weights of shoulder blade, loin,  
121 belly, shoulder picnic, and ham were measured in gilts and barrows using the carcass weight and the VCS2000.  
122 There was no difference in carcass weight between gilts and barrows (Table 1). In both gilts and barrows, the  
123 highest weight was observed in ham among the five primal cuts, followed by the belly, shoulder picnic, loin,  
124 and shoulder blade ( $p < 0.0001$ , Table 1). Similar results were reported in a study that investigated the  
125 production quantity of seven major primal cuts (ham, belly, shoulder picnic, loin, shoulder blade, spare rib, and  
126 tenderloin) in LYD pigs using non-invasive ultrasound equipment [17, 18, 19]. In a study examining the impact  
127 of carcass weight on primal cuts, both gilts and barrows showed higher ham production than that of shoulder  
128 picnic, belly, loin, and shoulder blade, and shoulder picnic production was higher than that of the shoulder blade

129 [11]. In a study on the production quantity of primal cuts in Meishan and Yorkshire gilts and barrows, both gilts  
130 and barrows showed a higher production of ham compared to loin, shoulder picnic (shoulder), and shoulder  
131 blade cuts, with shoulder blades having the lowest production quantity [12]. Another study investigating carcass  
132 characteristics based on gender found that the production quantity of ham was higher than that of shoulder  
133 picnic (shoulder) [10].

134 In the comparison of production quantity by primal cut between gilts and barrows, gilts had lower production  
135 quantities of shoulder blade, loin, and belly and higher production quantities of shoulder picnic and ham ( $p <$   
136  $0.05$ , Table 1). As the backfat thickness of pig carcasses increased, the quantity of shoulder picnic and ham  
137 decreased, whereas the quantity of belly cuts increased [20, 21]. Furthermore, in a study on the primal cuts  
138 (shoulder picnic, ham, loin, and belly) of pigs by carcass weight, the fat content was highest in the belly,  
139 followed by loin, ham, and shoulder picnic cuts [22]. In the comparison of the fat content of different parts  
140 (tenderloin, loin, shoulder blade, foreshank, jowls, ham, eye of round, belly, skirt meat, and ribs) in LYD pigs,  
141 the belly had the highest fat content, while the shoulder blade had higher fat content compared to tenderloin,  
142 loin, foreshank, ham, eye of round, skirt meat, and rib cuts, excluding the belly and jowls ( $p < 0.05$ ) [23]. As the  
143 backfat thickness increased, the loin area and the amount of loin meat decreased ( $p < 0.01$ ) [24]. Additionally,  
144 when processing primal cuts, a fat thickness of 0.5 cm is typically left, and the remaining backfat and excess fat  
145 are trimmed [25]. The data obtained from the VCS2000 used in this experiment included the predictions of  
146 primal cut quantities without trimming excessive fat or thick backfat. The untrimmed loin weight of Yorkshire  
147 gilts and barrows was higher in barrows than in gilts ( $p < 0.05$ ) [12]. Therefore, due to the thinner backfat and  
148 lower overall fat content in gilts, the production quantity of relatively low-fat shoulder picnic and ham was  
149 higher in gilts compared to barrows ( $p < 0.05$ , Tables 1 and 4).

150

## 151 **Regression analysis of carcass weight and production of each primal cut yield of gilt and** 152 **barrow**

153 Simple regression analysis was performed to investigate the relationship between carcass weight and the  
154 weights of each primal cut. In the simple regression analysis, the dependent variable  $y$  was set as the carcass  
155 weight, and the weight of each primal cut was set as the independent variable  $x$  to determine the regression  
156 equation (Table 2).

157 It was observed that as the production of each part increased, the slope became small, and the slope increased  
158 when production decreased. This trend was observed in both gilts and barrows. The slopes of the gilts and  
159 barrows were similar (Table 2). The coefficient of determination (R-squared) was lowest for ham (0.7699) in

160 gilts, while shoulder blade, loin, belly, and shoulder picnic all had R-squared values above 0.8. The coefficients  
161 of determination for each regression analysis were similar between gilts and barrows (Table 2). In a study that  
162 used 175 pig carcasses and performed regression analysis between carcass weight and the lean meat percentage  
163 of the primal cuts using the VCS2000, the coefficients of determination of the the predicted regression equations  
164 were 0.90 for shoulder picnic, 0.85 for loin, 0.91 for the belly, and 0.87 for ham, showing similar results to this  
165 experiment [5].

166 Multiple regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between carcass weight and the five  
167 primal cuts. In the multiple regression analysis, the dependent variable y was set as the carcass weight, and the  
168 independent variable xi was the weight of each primal cut (x1 = shoulder blade, x2 = loin, x3 = belly, x4 =  
169 shoulder picnic, x5 = ham). The multiple regression equation and coefficient of determination for carcass weight  
170 and the five primal cuts were as follows:

171 Gilt:  $y = 1.09x_1 + 3.06x_2 + 0.07x_3 + 3.01x_4 + 0.33x_5 + 8.37, R^2=0.9833$

172 Barrow:  $y = 1.35x_1 + 2.80x_2 + 0.21x_3 + 2.65x_4 + 0.42x_5 + 8.98, R^2=0.9832$

173 In the multiple regression analysis, the relationship between the production quantity of each primal cut and  
174 their respective slope was different between gilts and barrows, unlike the simple regression analysis results.  
175 However, the coefficients of determination were above 0.98. In a regression analysis using ham, belly, shoulder  
176 picnic, loin, shoulder blade, spare rib, and tenderloin as independent variables for Korean pork grading, the  
177 coefficients of determination were 0.99 for all grades [17]. When multiple independent variables are considered,  
178 higher coefficients of determination are obtained compared to single-variable regression analysis. A coefficient  
179 of determination value of 0.73 indicates a reasonable degree of accuracy, while a value of 0.80 or above  
180 indicates a high degree of accuracy [5, 26]. In the single regression analysis, both gilts and barrows had  
181 coefficients of determination above 0.73 for ham, indicating a reasonable degree of accuracy, and coefficients of  
182 determination above 0.80 for the other four primal cuts, indicating a high degree of accuracy (Table 2).  
183 Therefore, the single and multiple regression equations obtained in this study could be used to predict the  
184 production quantity of each primal cut based on the carcass weight of LYD pigs.

185

186

187

188 **Correlation analysis between carcass weight, production of primal cuts and auction**  
189 **price of gilt and barrow**

190 The correlation between carcass weight, shoulder blade, belly, shoulder picnic, ham, and auction prices for  
191 gilts and barrows was analyzed to investigate the impact of carcass weight and individual primal cuts on pork  
192 prices. The correlation coefficients for carcass weight were above 0.7 for both gilts and barrows, indicating a  
193 strong correlation with auction prices. The correlation of each primal cut with auction prices differed between  
194 gilts and barrows. In gilts, shoulder blade, loin, and belly cuts showed higher correlation coefficients with  
195 auction prices compared to shoulder picnic and ham (Table 3). In barrows, shoulder blade and loin had higher  
196 correlation coefficients with auction prices compared to shoulder picnic and ham, and belly had higher  
197 correlation coefficients compared to shoulder picnic (Table 3). Pulkrábek et al. [27] reported a positive  
198 association between carcass weight and primal cuts. Korean consumers' preference for the belly, shoulder blade,  
199 and loin as favored cuts may be reflected in the auction prices [3]. Correlation coefficients between 0.40 and  
200 0.69 indicate a moderate correlation, while correlation coefficients between 0.70 and 0.89 indicate a strong  
201 correlation [28]. Both gilts and barrows showed correlation coefficients above 0.70 for carcass weight,  
202 indicating a strong correlation with auction prices. The shoulder blade, loin, belly, shoulder picnic, and ham all  
203 had correlation coefficients above 0.60, indicating a moderate correlation with auction prices.

204

### 205 **Investigation of fat contents of gilt and barrow**

206 Backfat thickness was highest for the first thoracic vertebra backfat thickness, followed by Backfat thickness  
207 used for grading and multi-branched muscle middle backfat thickness ( $p < 0.0001$ , Table 4). Backfat thickness  
208 tends to decrease from the thoracic vertebrae to the lumbar vertebrae. A study investigating the characteristics of  
209 pig carcasses using the VCS2000 yielded similar results, showing that backfat thickness was highest for the first  
210 and second thoracic vertebrae, followed by the 11th and 12th thoracic vertebrae, and the 14th thoracic to the  
211 first lumbar vertebrae and the seventh branched muscle [18]. When comparing backfat thickness, pork belly fat  
212 percentage and the total fat percentage of gilts and barrows, barrows had higher values than gilts ( $p < 0.0001$ ,  
213 Table 4). These results are consistent with the inverse relationship between testosterone concentration in the  
214 bloodstream and fat accumulation in the body [29]. As testosterone concentration decreased, muscle mass,  
215 strength, and bone density decreased, whereas the proportion of fat tissue increased [30]. When comparing the  
216 backfat thickness of barrows and gilts, barrows had thicker backfat due to lower testosterone concentrations  
217 caused by castration [10, 11]. Additionally, in a study on fat content in 171-day-old Yorkshire gilts and barrows,  
218 barrows had higher fat content than gilts [12].

219

### 220 **Correlation analysis between fat contents and auction price of gilt and barrow**

221 In the Korean pork grading system, the criterion for grading is the average backfat thickness between the last  
222 rib and the first lumbar vertebra, as well as between the 11th and 12th ribs. The correlation coefficients between  
223 backfat thickness, belly fat percentage, total fat yield, and auction prices were calculated to investigate the  
224 correlation between backfat thickness and auction prices in pigs. The correlation coefficient with the auction  
225 price was high in the order of backfat thickness measured according to Korean pork carcass grading, total fat  
226 yield, first thoracic vertebra backfat thickness, pork belly fat percentage, and multi-branched muscle middle  
227 backfat thickness (Table 5).

228 The correlation coefficient between backfat thickness and auction prices in gilts was 0.703, indicating a strong  
229 correlation, while the correlation coefficients for the other measurements were above 0.40, indicating a  
230 moderate correlation. Both the backfat thickness and fat content in gilts were lower than in barrows, and the  
231 correlation coefficient between pork fat content and auction prices was higher for gilts than for barrows (Table  
232 5). As backfat thickness increases, the fat yield of pork increases, and the meat yield decreases [24]. Higher  
233 backfat thickness results in lower pork carcass grades [31]. Thus, the correlation between backfat thickness and  
234 auction prices was found to be higher than that of other factors.

235

### 236 **Analysis of production of forequarter, middle and hindquarter of gilt and barrow**

237 The production quantity of the forequarter, middle, and hindquarter was measured for gilts and barrows using  
238 the VCS2000, and the production quantity of each part was compared between the two groups. No significant  
239 difference in forequarters was observed between gilts and barrows (Table 6).

240 The forequarter consists of the shoulder blade, spare ribs, and shoulder picnic. The shoulder blade was found to  
241 be higher in barrows compared to gilts ( $p < 0.05$ , Table 1). The lack of difference in forequarter production  
242 quantities can be attributed to the larger production quantity of spare ribs or shoulder picnic in gilts. In terms of  
243 the middle and hindquarter, gilts showed a lower production quantity of the middle and a higher production  
244 quantity of the hindquarter compared to barrows ( $p < 0.005$ , Table 6). The middle consists of the loin, belly, and  
245 tenderloin, with the tenderloin occupying a very small proportion in the middle compared to the belly and loin  
246 [32]. Since barrows had higher production quantities of loin and belly compared to gilts, it was observed that  
247 barrows had a higher production quantity in the middle ( $p < 0.05$ , Tables 1 and 6). As gilts had a higher  
248 production quantity of ham compared to barrows, it was evident that gilts had a higher production quantity in  
249 the hindquarter ( $p < 0.05$ , Tables 1 and 6).

250

251 **Correlation analysis between forequarter, middle, and hindquarter of gilt and barrow**  
252 **and auction price**

253 To examine the influence of the production quantities of the Forequarter, middle, and hindquarter on auction  
254 prices in pork, The correlation between the production quantity of each division and the auction prices for pork  
255 forequarter, middle, and hindquarter was investigated. Both gilts and barrows showed a moderate correlation  
256 with auction prices for all three divisions, with correlation coefficients of 0.61 or higher (Table 7). Among the  
257 three divisions, the forequarter had the lowest correlation coefficient, whereas the middle had the highest  
258 correlation coefficient (Table 7). The middle division showed the highest correlation coefficient, primarily due  
259 to the inclusion of the belly, which forms the most expensive cut and has the highest meat production quantity  
260 among all the cuts (Table 6) [6]. The higher correlation coefficient for the hindquarter compared to the  
261 forequarter is likely due to the important role of the hindquarter in assessing the body condition score (BCS).  
262 The body condition score (BCS) evaluation of pigs is based on visual and tactile assessments of the hindquarter  
263 area [33, 34]. It assesses the pig's body condition by categorizing it into five levels: Emaciate, Thin, Ideal, Fat,  
264 and Overfat [33, 34]. It is used to evaluate the nutritional status and degree of fat deposition in pigs [33, 34]. It is  
265 presumed that the correlation with auction prices is higher for the hindquarter than the forequarter because the  
266 BCS is evaluated using the hindquarter. As the amount of fat deposition and overall health of pigs can be  
267 inferred through the hindquarter, it is presumed that the correlation with auction prices is higher compared to the  
268 forequarter.

269

270 **Multiple regression analysis of gilt and barrow's carcass trait and auction price**

271 To investigate the extent to which auction prices can be predicted through various factors of pig carcass, a  
272 multiple regression analysis was conducted between the auction price and several carcass traits that exhibited a  
273 relatively high correlation with the auction price.

274 Gilt:  $y = 40.55x_1 + 84.40x_2 + 63.065$ ,  $R^2 = 0.556$

275 Barrow:  $y = 33.65x_1 + 36.87x_2 + 1872.37$ ,  $R^2 = 0.408$

276 The first multiple regression equations of gilt and barrow were set with the auction price (y) as the dependent  
277 variable and body weight (x1) and backfat thickness used for grading (x2) as independent variables, which are  
278 used to evaluate the carcass quality of pigs.

279 Gilt:  $y = 48.70x_1 + 98.32x_2 + 18.53x_3 + 28.52x_4 + 78.09x_5 + 80.58x_6 + 848.32$ ,  $R^2 = 0.560$

280 Barrow:  $y = 97.86x_1 + 51.35x_2 + 12.72x_3 + 3.58x_4 + 77.31x_5 + 35.14x_6 + 2025.39$ ,  $R^2 = 0.411$

281 The second multiple regression equations of gilt and barrow were set with the auction price(y) as the dependent  
282 variable and five primal cuts (shoulder blade = x1, loin = x2, belly = x3, shoulder picnic = x4, ham = x5) and  
283 backfat thickness used for grading (x6) as independent variables.

284 Based on the  $R^2$  values of the first and second multiple regression equations, it can be observed that the  $R^2$   
285 value for Gilt is higher than that for Barrow. This suggests that the correlation between the independent  
286 variables used in each equation and the auction price is generally stronger for Gilt compared to Barrow, as  
287 indicated in Table 3 and Table 5. Additionally, it can be observed that both Gilt and Barrow show slightly  
288 higher  $R^2$  values in the second multiple regression equation compared to the first one. This suggests that the  
289 analysis using the five primal cuts measured by VCS2000 provides a better understanding of the auction price  
290 than carcass weight alone.  
291 However, the  $R^2$  values for Gilt and Barrow in both equations are not high. The reason for this can be found in  
292 the current structure of pig auctions in Korea. As mentioned in the introduction, pig auctions are conducted  
293 through a bidding system targeting wholesalers and trading participant [14]. The participants in the bidding may  
294 have different preferences for pig carcasses, and furthermore, they may have varying requirements for specific  
295 primal cuts or the degree of fat. Due to these reasons, the  $R^2$  values for Gilt and Barrow in the first and second  
296 equations did not show a high correlation. However, despite this, it can be sufficiently confirmed through this  
297 regression equation the tendency in which auction prices are formed. Therefore, it is deemed usable as a  
298 reference material for auction prices.

299  
300

## 301 **Conclusion**

302

303 In this study, we compared the production quantity of primal cuts between LYD gilts and barrows using data  
304 measured by the VCS2000 equipment, analyzed the relationship between carcass weight and primal cuts, and  
305 investigated their correlation with auction prices. Regression analysis was conducted to derive formulas that  
306 predicted the production quantity of primal cuts based on the carcass weight of LYD pigs in Korea. The  
307 obtained formulas showed high reliability with determination coefficients ranging from 0.77 to 0.98. The  
308 correlation analysis between primal cuts and auction prices found that primal cuts and fat content had a  
309 moderate or strong correlation with auction prices. Therefore, this study provides a means to predict the  
310 production quantity of primal cuts based on carcass weight and establishes a correlation with auction prices,  
311 making it a useful indicator for determining pig specifications in the swine industry.

312

313

314

315

## **Acknowledgments**

316

This work was supported by the Bugyeong Pig Farmers Cooperative.

317

318

ACCEPTED

## References

- 320 1. Korea Institute for Animal Products Quality Evaluation. 2021 Livestock Distribution Information Survey  
321 Report. Sejong-si: Korea Institute for Animal Products Quality Evaluation; 2022.
- 322 2. Kim GT, Kang SJ, Yoon YG, Kim HS, Lee WY, Yoon SH. Introduction of automatic grading and  
323 classification machine and operation status in Korea. *Food Science of Animal Resources and Industry*.  
324 2017;6(1):34-45.
- 325 3. Kim K. A Study on the Application of Mechanical Measurement Data of Pig Carcass Traits for the  
326 Development of the Pig Industry. Cheongju: Chungbuk National University; 2023.
- 327 4. Kim J, Han H-D, Lee WY, Wakholi C, Lee J, Jeong Y-B, Bae JH, Cho B-K. Economic analysis of the use  
328 of vcs2000 for pork carcass meat yield grading in Korea. *Animals*. 2021;11(5):1297.  
329 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11051297>
- 330 5. Lohumi S, Wakholi C, Baek JH, Do Kim B, Kang SJ, Kim HS, Yun YK, Lee WY, Yoon SH, Cho B-K.  
331 Nondestructive estimation of lean meat yield of South Korean pig carcasses using machine vision  
332 technique. *Korean journal for food science of animal resources*. 2018;38(5):1109.  
333 <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2018.e44>
- 334 6. Korea Meat Trade Association (KMTA). Korean beef & Korean pork. *The Meat Trade Journal*.  
335 2023;93:41-56.
- 336 7. Jeong S-G. Breeding system and shipping weight of castrated pigs. *The Korea Swine Journal*.  
337 1987;9(11):132-4.
- 338 8. Lee J-H. Pig castration method and breeding management of castrated pigs. *The Korea Swine Journal*.  
339 1997;19(8):174-9.
- 340 9. National Research Council (NRC). Nutrient requirements of swine. 11th Edition. Washington, DC ; 2012.  
341 <https://doi.org/10.17226/13298>
- 342 10. Latorre M, Lázaro R, Valencia D, Medel P, Mateos G. The effects of gender and slaughter weight on the  
343 growth performance, carcass traits, and meat quality characteristics of heavy pigs. *Journal of animal  
344 science*. 2004;82(2):526-33. <https://doi.org/10.2527/2004.822526x>
- 345 11. Cisneros F, Ellis M, McKeith F, McCaw J, Fernando R. Influence of slaughter weight on growth and  
346 carcass characteristics, commercial cutting and curing yields, and meat quality of barrows and gilts from  
347 two genotypes. *Journal of Animal Science*. 1996;74(5):925-33. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1996.745925x>
- 348 12. White B, Lan Y, McKeith F, Novakofski J, Wheeler M, McLaren D. Growth and body composition of  
349 Meishan and Yorkshire barrows and gilts. *Journal of animal science*. 1995;73(3):738-49.  
350 <https://doi.org/10.2527/1995.733738x>
- 351 13. Martin A, Sather A, Fredeen H, Jolly RW. Alternative market weights for swine. II. Carcass composition  
352 and meat quality. *Journal of Animal Science*. 1980;50(4):699-705.  
353 <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas1980.504699x>

- 354 14. Market HL. carcass auction [Available from: <http://m.hongjumeat.co.kr/page/page48>].
- 355 15. Pork auction cost 9,999 won <per 1kg of carcass> [press release]. Seoul: chuksannews2011.  
356 <http://www.chuksannews.co.kr/news/article.html?no=63769>
- 357 16. Park Y, Kim K, Kim J, Seo J, Choi J. Verification of reproducibility of VCS2000 equipment for mechanical  
358 measurement of Korean LYD pig carcasses. *Food Science of Animal Resources*. 2023.  
359 <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2023.e17>
- 360 17. Park Y, Ko E, Park K, Woo C, Kim J, Lee S, Park S, Kim Y-a, Park G, Choi J. Correlation between the  
361 Korean pork grade system and the amount of pork primal cut estimated with AutoFom III. *Journal of*  
362 *Animal Science and Technology*. 2022;64(1):135. <https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2021.e135>
- 363 18. Lim S-W, Hwang D, Kim S, Kim J-M. Relationship between porcine carcass grades and estimated traits  
364 based on conventional and non-destructive inspection methods. *Journal of Animal Science and Technology*.  
365 2022;64(1):155. <https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2021.e133>
- 366 19. Choi JS, Kwon KM, Lee YK, Joeng JU, Lee KO, Jin SK, Choi YI, Lee JJ. Application of AutoFom III  
367 equipment for prediction of primal and commercial cut weight of Korean pig carcasses. *Asian-Australasian*  
368 *journal of animal sciences*. 2018;31(10):1670. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.18.0240>
- 369 20. Pringle T, Williams S. Carcass traits, cut yields, and compositional end points in high-lean-yielding pork  
370 carcasses: effects of 10th rib backfat and loin eye area. *Journal of animal science*. 2001;79(1):115-21.  
371 <https://doi.org/10.2527/2001.791115x>
- 372 21. Martin A, Fredeen H, Weiss G, Fortin A, Sim D. Yield of trimmed pork product in relation to weight and  
373 backfat thickness of the carcass. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*. 1981;61(2):299-310.  
374 <https://doi.org/10.4141/cjas81-038>
- 375 22. d'Souza D, Pethick D, Dunshea F, Suster D, Pluske J, Mullan B. The pattern of fat and lean muscle tissue  
376 deposition differs in the different pork primal cuts of female pigs during the finisher growth phase.  
377 *Livestock Production Science*. 2004;91(1-2):1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livprodsci.2004.04.005>
- 378 23. Jang H-L, Park S-Y, Lee J-H, Hwang M-J, Choi Y, Kim S-N, Kim J-H, Hwang J, Seo D, Nam J-S.  
379 Comparison of fat content and fatty acid composition in different parts of Korean beef and pork. *Journal of*  
380 *the Korean Society of Food Science and Nutrition*. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.3746/jkfn.2017.46.6.703>
- 381 24. Hoa VB, Seo HW, Seong PN, Cho SH, Kang SM, Kim YS, Moon SS, Choi YM, Kim JH, Seol KH.  
382 Back-fat thickness as a primary index reflecting the yield and overall acceptance of pork meat. *Animal*  
383 *Science Journal*. 2021;92(1):e13515. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asj.13515>
- 384 25. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Guidelines for Slaughtering, Meat  
385 Cutting and Further Processing (FAO Animal Production and Health Paper): Food and Agriculture  
386 Organization of the United Nations; 1991. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470061572.eqr173>
- 387 26. Di Bucchianico A. Coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>). *Encyclopedia of statistics in quality and reliability*.  
388 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470061572.eqr173>

- 389 27. Pulkrábek J, Pavlík J, Vališ L. Pig carcass quality and pH1 values of meat. Czech Journal of Animal  
390 Science. 2004;49(1):38-42. <https://doi.org/10.17221/4269-CJAS>
- 391 28. Schober P, Boer C, Schwarte LA. Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. Anesthesia &  
392 analgesia. 2018;126(5):1763-8. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864>
- 393 29. De Maddalena C, Vodo S, Petroni A, Aloisi AM. Impact of testosterone on body fat composition. Journal of  
394 cellular physiology. 2012;227(12):3744-8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.24096>
- 395 30. Kaufman JM, Vermeulen A. The decline of androgen levels in elderly men and its clinical and therapeutic  
396 implications. Endocrine reviews. 2005;26(6):833-76. <https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2004-0013>
- 397 31. Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA). Livestock product auctions are also online,  
398 leading to non-face-to-face distribution innovation [press release]. 2021.  
399 <https://www.korea.kr/briefing/pressReleaseView.do?newsId=156489300>
- 400 32. Pulkrábek J, Pavlík J, Valis L, Vítek M. Pig carcass quality in relation to carcass lean meat proportion.  
401 Czech Journal of Animal Science. 2006;51(1):18. <https://doi.org/10.17221/3904-cjas>
- 402 33. National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC). Code of practice for the care and handling of pigs; 2014.  
403 ISBN 978-1-988793-26-9
- 404 34. Pryce J, Coffey M, Simm G. The relationship between body condition score and reproductive performance.  
405 Journal of dairy science. 2001;84(6):1508-15. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302\(01\)70184-1](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302(01)70184-1)
- 406
- 407
- 408
- 409
- 410

411

**Tables**

412

413 Table 1. Carcass weights and production of primal cut measured by the VCS2000 in gilts and barrows

	Gilts	Barrows
Carcass weight	83.22±7.59	83.18±7.67
Shoulder blade	5.48±0.55 <sup>bE</sup>	5.53±0.56 <sup>aE</sup>
Loin	9.54±1.04 <sup>bD</sup>	9.6±1.08 <sup>aD</sup>
Belly	16.01±1.97 <sup>bB</sup>	16.1±2.03 <sup>aB</sup>
Shoulder picnic	10.77±1.13 <sup>aC</sup>	10.75±1.14 <sup>bC</sup>
Ham	18.30±1.89 <sup>aA</sup>	18.21±1.86 <sup>bA</sup>

414 Unit: kg, gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. Each value is presented as the mean ± standard deviation. <sup>A-E</sup>415 Different superscripts in the same column are significantly different from each other ( $p < 0.0001$ ). <sup>a-b</sup> Different416 superscripts in the same row are significantly different from each other ( $p < 0.05$ ).

417

418

419

420

421 Table 2. Simple regression analysis of carcass weights and production of each primal cut measured by the  
422 VCS2000 in gilts and barrows

	Linear regression slope		Intercept		Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> )	
	Gilts	Barrows	Gilts	Barrows	Gilts	Barrows
Shoulder blade	12.86	12.78	12.74	12.46	0.8551	0.8609
Loin	6.85	6.64	17.82	19.38	0.8820	0.8815
Belly	3.35	3.47	26.34	27.18	0.8496	0.8487
Shoulder picnic	6.43	6.42	13.84	17.10	0.9137	0.9089
Ham	3.53	3.66	18.57	16.37	0.7699	0.7901

423 Gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs.

424

ACCEPTED

425 Table 3. Correlation coefficient between the carcass weight, production of primal cuts measured by the  
426 VCS2000, and auction price in gilts and barrows

	Gilts	Barrows
Carcass weight	0.700**	0.706**
Shoulder blade	0.665**	0.665**
Loin	0.711**	0.683**
Belly	0.693**	0.660**
Shoulder picnic	0.653**	0.653**
Ham	0.653**	0.664**

427 Gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. \*\* $p < 0.01$ .

428

429

430

431

432

ACCEPTED

433 Table 4. Pork backfat thickness, belly fat content, and total fat percentage measured by the VCS2000 in gilts and  
 434 barrows

	Gilts	Barrows
First thoracic vertebra backfat thickness (mm)	36.73±4.56 <sup>bA</sup>	38.83±4.40 <sup>aA</sup>
Backfat thickness used for grading (mm) <sup>1</sup>	20.87±4.48 <sup>bB</sup>	22.77±4.65 <sup>aB</sup>
Multi-branched muscle middle backfat thickness (mm)	16.28±4.52 <sup>bC</sup>	18.15±4.71 <sup>aC</sup>
Pork belly fat percentage (%)	32.34±6.05 <sup>b</sup>	33.83±6.07 <sup>a</sup>
Total fat yield (%)	26.29±3.52 <sup>b</sup>	27.50±3.58 <sup>a</sup>

435 Gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. <sup>1</sup>Average of two backfat thickness (the backfat thickness between the  
 436 last rib and the first lumbar vertebra, and the backfat thickness between the 11th and 12th ribs). Each value is  
 437 presented as the mean ± standard deviation. <sup>A-E</sup>Different superscripts in the same column are significantly  
 438 different from each other ( $p < 0.0001$ ). <sup>a-b</sup>Different superscripts in the same row are significantly different from  
 439 each other ( $p < 0.05$ ).

440  
 441  
 442

443 Table 5. Correlation between pork backfat thickness, belly fat content, and total fat percentage measured by the  
444 VCS2000 and auction price in gilts and barrows

	<b>Gilt</b>	<b>Barrow</b>
First thoracic vertebra backfat thickness	0.596**	0.535**
Backfat thickness used for grading <sup>1</sup>	0.703**	0.607**
Multi-branched muscle middle backfat thickness	0.537**	0.476**
Pork belly fat percentage	0.556**	0.519**
Total fat yield	0.680**	0.618**

445 Gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. <sup>1</sup>Average of two backfat thickness (the backfat thickness between  
446 the last rib and the first lumbar vertebra, and the backfat thickness between the 11th and 12th ribs). \*\* $p < 0.01$

447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453

454 Table 6. Forequarter, middle, and hindquarter production measured by the VCS 2000 in gilts and barrows

Items	Gilts	Barrows
Forequarter <sup>1)</sup>	19.81±1.95	19.83±1.98
Middle <sup>2)</sup>	27.11±3.03 <sup>b</sup>	27.23±3.14 <sup>a</sup>
Hindquarter <sup>3)</sup>	18.29 ±1.88 <sup>a</sup>	18.20±1.85 <sup>b</sup>

455 Unit: kg, gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. <sup>1)</sup> Forequarter: spare ribs, shoulder blade, and shoulder picnic;

456 <sup>2)</sup> middle: loin, belly, and tenderloin; and <sup>3)</sup> Hindquarter: ham. Each value is presented as the mean ± standard

457 deviation. <sup>a-b</sup> Different superscripts in the same row are significantly different from each other ( $p < 0.05$ ).

458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463

ACCEPTED

464 Table 7. Correlation coefficient between forequarter, middle, and hindquarter production measured by the VCS  
465 2000 and auction price in gilts and barrows

	<b>Gilts</b>	<b>Barrows</b>
Forequarter <sup>1)</sup>	0.615**	0.619**
Middle <sup>2)</sup>	0.697**	0.654**
hindquarter <sup>3)</sup>	0.640**	0.641**

466 Gilts: 17,602 pigs, barrows: 16,579 pigs. <sup>1)</sup>Forequarter: spare ribs, shoulder blade, and shoulder picnic; <sup>2)</sup>  
467 middle: loin, belly, and tenderloin; and <sup>3)</sup> hindquarter: ham. \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

ACCEPTED