Indian Journal of Animal Sciences **95** (12): 1123–1130, December 2025/Article
https://doi.org/10.56093/ijans.v95i12.172738

Pig multiplier units and artificial insemination at farmers' fields: Success, impact and constraints

SUNIL KUMAR[1]✉, RAFIQUL ISLAM[1], PRANTIK DEKA[1], PRIYAJOY KAR[2], KESHAB BARMAN[3], P.J. DAS[4] and VIVEK KUMAR GUPTA[5]

ICAR-National Research Center on Pig, Rani, Guwahati, 781 131, Assam, India

Received: 30 October 2025; Accepted:01 April 2026

Suppl. Table 1: Scale to measure Farmers' Attitude towards indicators for establishment of multiplier units

SN	Inter-ventions	Statements	Weightage		Response				
			RW	MRS	5	4	3	2	1
1		In utero care of embryos/fetuses	0.70	>3.5					
2		Birth to weaning growth (g/d) 300-600							
3		Deworming, vaccination of weaners							
4		Weaning							
5		Selection of male weaners							
6		Selection of female weaners							
7		Group housing of weaner males							
8		Group housing of weaner females							
9		Boar effect use for puberty induction							
10		Hormonal use to prevent delayed puberty							
11		Flushing in gilts							
12		use of boar for heat detection							
13		Gilts service at second heat							
14		Male or AI for service							
15	Knowledge scaling up	Single service or double service							
16		Avoiding service between sibs							
17		AI/ Service with skilled knowledge							
18		Restricted feeding							
19		21 Days post service heat detection							
20		Pregnancy detection							
21		Prefarrowing care and management							
22		Farrowing care and management of dam							
23		Supplementation of Vit-E and Se in periterm							
24		Maintaining BCS of dam							
25		Postweaning restricted feeding							
26		Post weaning Flushing							
27		Postweaning immediate service							
28		Hormonal use in post weaning anestrum							
29		Record keeping							
30	A.I. service	Artificial insemination service							
31	Veterinary	Needful Veterinary aids as when needed							
32	Physical Incentives	Inputs- dewormer, feed, supplements , Mineral mixture							

Response: (5) strongly satisfied, (4) satisfied, (3) undecided, (2) not satisfied, (1) strongly not satisfied. RW (relevancy weightage), MRS (mean relevancy score).

Suppl. Table 2: Statements to measure the farmers' attitude toward artificial insemination (AI)

Sl.	Statements	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA
1	AI is good for production					
2	AI is cost effective					
3	Conception is good in AI					
4	Litter size in AI					
5	Litter weight in AI					
6	It is easier to get AI dose					
7	It is easier to perform AI					
8	Heat detection in AI					
9	Time of AI					
10	Storage of AI dose					

SA- Strongly Agreed, A- Agree, UD- Undecided, DA- Disagree, SDA- Strongly Disagree

Suppl Table 3. Different constraint faced by the farmers for establishment of multiplier units and use of AI in their units (Levels of constraints: MC- More Serious Constraint, C-Constraint, LC-less Serious Constraint, NC- Not a Constraint)

SN	Constraints	Sub-constraints	MC	C	LC	NC	Mean Score	Rank
I	Breeding	Door step availability of semen dose						
		Door step availability male for breeding						
		Distance and time to get AI dose/boar						
		Cost of breeding or AI dose						
		Delayed puberty in gilts						
		Anestrus in sows						
		Repeat breeding						
		Dystocia						
		Heat detection						
		Pregnancy detection						
		Storage of AI dose						
II	Health	Agalactia						
		Mortality of piglets						
		Mortality of adult pigs						
		Cost of treatment						
		Availability of Veterinary aids						
		Vaccination						
		Diarrhoea						
III	Feeding	Cost						
		Market availability						
		Transportation						
		Storage of feed						
		Balance feeding						
IV	Management	Routine farm operations						
		Record maintenance						
		Poor growth (runt etc.)						
		Scientific Housing						
		Disposal of waste						
		Cost and Sale of animals						
		Extreme summer/winter						