GASTROINTESTINAL PARASITES OF PIGS AND THEIR PRODUCERS: ASSOCIATING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND RURAL EXTENSION

CAMILA SOUZA CARVALHO CLASS[1], INGRID DA SILVA REIS[1], ANA LUIZA SOARES DE ARAUJO[1], LAÍS LISBOA CORRÊA[1], BRENO TORRES DA SILVA[1], RENAN DE SOUZA FERREIRA[2], FABIANA BATALHA KNACKFUSS[3], ROBERTO JÚNIO PEDROSO DIAS[4], ALYNNE DA SILVA BARBOSA[1]

[1]UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRASIL, [2]CENTRO UNIVERSITÁRIO SERRA DOS ÓRGÃOS, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRASIL, [3]UNIVERSIDADE DO GRANDE RIO, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRASIL, [4]UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE JUIZ DE FORA, MINAS GERAIS, BRASIL

Brazil stands out in pig production, with properties characterized as industrial and family-run. In these properties, parasitic diseases represent obstacles to production. In addition, there are zoonotic parasites, with pigs, such as *Balantioides coli*, being the main reservoir. This study aimed to estimate the prevalence and risk factors inherent to gastrointestinal parasites in pigs and their producers, as well as to mediate information. Visits were made to 15 pig farms in cities in Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais. Feces were collected from 1,148 pigs and 47 from producers of these animals. Forms were applied, and extension activities were conducted. These fecal samples were subjected to direct examination, sedimentation, flotation, FLOTAC techniques and molecular tools for research on *B. coli*. Parasites were detected in 69.9% of the pigs, with emphasis on Grupo Ciliophora (50%), coccidia (37.3%), *Trichuris suis* (19.7%) and strongyles (19%). Microscopy detected 2 individuals with hookworms and 1 with *Blastocystis* spp.. The circulation of *B. coli* in feces of pigs from all properties and in 12 rural producers was molecularly confirmed. Statistical differences were obtained when comparing the helminth egg count values between the types of properties. Several factors were associated with the frequency of parasites in pigs, such as the arrangement of drinkers on the floors of the stalls and the type of antiparasitic provided to the animals. Among the extension activities, the following stood out: “Happy Pig and Sad Pig”, a dynamic of self-recognition of animal management and “Correction of homework” to remember the mediated information. The results generated highlighted the need for improvements in national production, including the creation of programs that provide assistance and training for producers to invest in the control of these parasites, valuing animal welfare and producer health.

Keywords: Diagnosis, Prevalence, Zoonosis

Supported By: Capes, CNPq, FAPERJ