

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Veterinary and Animal Science



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/vas

# Blood in milk in horned dairy cows–Exploration of incidences and prevention opportunities

## Asja Ebinghaus<sup>\*</sup>, Julia Johns, Ute Knierim

Farm Animal Behaviour and Husbandry Section, University of Kassel, Nordbahnhofstr. 1a, 37213 Witzenhausen, Germany

#### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Dairy cattle Horned cows Udder health Blood in milk

## ABSTRACT

Husbandry of horned cows is one alternative to disbudding that respects the animals' integrity. Concurrently, housing and management should be aligned with the animals' needs to minimize social interactions that can result in integument damage (ID) and udder injuries associated with blood in milk (BM). No information is available on incidences of BM, nor on specific preventive measures. Thus, this study aimed at investigating BM incidences in horned herds and testing whether compliance with guideline recommendations on the prevention of ID also contributes to mitigate BM. Twenty-one farms documented BM, cows' parity, social rank, and udder damage over seven months covering part of summer with pasture and winter in the barn. A total of 52 factors relating to the guideline were recorded and grouped into 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking/activity' and 'herd management'. Each factor was categorised into fulfilled or not, and for each group percentages of fulfilment were calculated. Monthly BM incidences varied from 0.3 to 7.8% with 38% being associated with visible udder damage (BMvD). Most cows affected were in the 2nd to 4th lactation (44%) and middle-ranking (58%). A mixed model regarding 'monthly binomial BMvD' per farm revealed a higher BMvD risk during the barn season (OR = 2.39), highlighting the importance of pasture to alleviate social conflicts. Higher fulfilment of recommendations concerning 'feeding' and 'walking/activity' was associated with a lower risk (OR = 0.94 and 0.95), indicating that the conflict potential in these areas also plays a role for BMvD and can be lowered by a combination of improvement measures.

## 1. Introduction

More than 80% of dairy farms in Europe keep hornless cows, mostly to reduce the risk of injuries among pen mates and for the stockmen under intensive production conditions (Cozzi et al., 2015). However, the procedure of disbudding (i.e., destruction or excision of the horn-producing cells) or dehorning (i.e., removal of grown horns) is criticized for several reasons, including inflicting pain and not respecting the integrity of the animals (Kling-Eveillard et al., 2015). The two alternatives to disbudding or dehorning are breeding for polledness (e.g., Windig et al. 2015) or the husbandry of horned cattle. In a European project on this issue, Mirabito et al. (2009) concluded that both alternatives should be pursued, and that the husbandry of horned cattle should be supported not only by financial means, but also by providing information and advice. However, only a few scientific studies have been conducted so far that have focused on possible measures to reduce horn-related integument damage in dairy cows in loose housing (Johns & Knierim, 2019; Menke et al., 1999; Schneider, 2010). A further possible problem is blood in milk (BM) when horn thrusts result in udder injuries with burst blood vessels. To our knowledge, the occurrence of BM has not yet been scientifically investigated specifically in horned herds. Blood milk, though, also occurs in hornless dairy herds. The clinical picture on the milk of affected cows can vary from a few blood clots to almost pure blood. One or several udder quarters can be affected at the same time (Blowey & Edmondson, 2010; Moroni et al., 2018; Stampa et al., 2006). Prolonged bleeding can be associated with an increased risk of mastitis (Moroni et al., 2018; Stampa et al., 2006). This and the inflicted pain are welfare relevant, but also economic losses for the farm are associated, as the milk of affected animals is not marketable.

It is suspected that trauma, even without external involvement, is usually the ultimate cause of BM (Moroni et al., 2018). Although no comparative data are available, incidences of externally caused BM are likely higher in horned dairy herds as a consequence of horn thrusts. Drawing from studies on agonistic interactions and horn-induced integument damage, it can be expected that incidences of BM vary

\* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* ebinghaus@uni-kassel.de (A. Ebinghaus).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vas.2023.100307

Available online 20 July 2023

2451-943X/© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

#### Table 1

Descriptive data on herd, management, and housing characteristics of the investigated farms (n=21).

| Herd                                       | Median (Min-Max)                | Mean±SD        |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Hord size                                  | 45 (20, 82)                     | 46.0           |
| Heru size                                  | 43 (20-83)                      | +16.7          |
| % Horned cows in the herd                  | 95 (50–100)                     | 91.1           |
| in the field control in the field          | 50 (00 100)                     | +12.5          |
|  |                                 | Number         |
| Main breed                                 | Holstein Friesian               | 4              |
|  | Fleckvieh                       | 10             |
|  | Brown Swiss                     | 5              |
|  | Grey cattle                     | 1              |
|  | German black pied               | 1              |
| Management                                 |                                 | Number         |
| General farm management                    | organic                         | 20             |
|  | conventional                    | 1 <sup>a</sup> |
| Status of husbandry of horned<br>cows      | established herd <sup>b</sup>   | 4              |
|  | transition: hornless to horned  | 11             |
|  | transition: tethering to loose  | 5              |
|  | housing                         |                |
| Location of concentrate<br>provision       | feeding table                   | 10             |
| *  | milking parlour                 | 6              |
|  | concentrate station             | 2              |
|  | no concentrate feeding          | 3              |
|  | Median (Min-Max)                | Mean           |
|  |                                 | ±SD            |
| Concentrates (max. kg/cow*d)               | 3.0 (0.0-6.0)                   | $2.7{\pm}1.9$  |
| Housing                                    | Median (min-max)                | Mean           |
|  |                                 | ±SD            |
| Number of feeding places per<br>cow        | 1.0 (0.9–1.5)                   | $1.1\pm0.1$    |
| Feed alley width (m)                       | 3.2 (2.2–5.1)                   | $3.5{\pm}0.8$  |
| Number of cows per drinking<br>place       | 7.7 (4.0–12.7)                  | 8.4±2.6        |
| Number of lying places per cow             | 1.1 (0.9–1.6)                   | $1.1{\pm}0.2$  |
| Outdoor loafing area (m <sup>2</sup> /cow) | 2.6 (0.0–9.0)                   | $2.8{\pm}2.8$  |
|  |                                 | Number         |
| Cubicle type                               | deep-bedded cubicles            | 13             |
|  | raised cubicles                 | 6              |
|  | deep bedded and raised cubicles | 2              |
| Milking parlour                            | fishbone                        | 13             |
|  | tandem                          | 6              |
|  | side-by-side                    | 1              |
|  | swing-over                      | 1              |

<sup>a</sup> this farm had changed from tethered to loose housing with a fully horned herd

 $^{\rm b}\,$  herds had consisted of at least 95% horned cows in loose housing for at least five years

between farms and that this is related to factors affecting social conflicts and the opportunity to avoid physical encounters. Related to housing conditions, these comprise the total space allowance per cow (Menke et al., 1999), stocking density in terms of number of cows per cubicle or feeding place (Collings et al., 2011; de Vries et al., 2015; Krawczel et al., 2012; Lobeck-Luchterhand et al., 2015; Talebi et al., 2014), barn design affecting the cows' overview, distribution and optimal height of water troughs, the width of alleys (Schneider, 2010), space allowance in the waiting area of the milking parlour (Irrgang et al., 2015; Schneider, 2010), dimensions of the lying area (Schneider, 2010), access to and space allowance in the outdoor loafing area (Lutz et al., 2019; Schneider, 2010), and access to pasture providing extensive space for the avoidance of conflicts within the herd (Irrgang, 2012; Waiblinger et al., 2000; Wierenga, 1984).

With regard to management, relevant factors include feeding (Collings et al., 2011; Val-Laillet et al., 2008), separation of cows in heat, regrouping, the way of integration of new animals (de Vries et al., 2015; Johns & Knierim, 2019; Menke, 1996; von Keyserlingk et al., 2008), and the human-animal relationship (Menke et al., 1999) or the number of stockpersons (Schneider, 2010). Also breed differences, with Holstein-Friesian herds being more affected by horn-induced damage, have been reported (Johns & Knierim, 2019; Schneider, 2010).

Based on these research results and the exchange of knowledge between farmers, advisors and scientists, a guideline to prevent social conflicts and horn-induced integument damage (Johns et al., 2019) was developed within the German project 'horns in loose housing'. Results of this project suggested that the interplay between housing, herd management, stockperson, and animals is more important than the influence of individual factors. At the same time, it was also found that the more recommendations covered in the guideline were implemented on the farms, the less horn-related integument damage was recorded (Knierim et al., 2020).

In addition, on the individual level, lower-ranking cows may be more frequently recipients of agonistic interactions, and most primiparous cows may be lower ranking due to lower body size, and experience (review in Bouissou et al., 2001; Lindberg, 2001). They may also be involved in agonistic interactions more frequently (Hasegawa et al., 1997). Accordingly, Waiblinger et al. (2000) found a negative correlation between horn-related integument damage and the age of the cows.

Regarding incidences of BM in horned herds, there is hardly any scientific information to date, nor on specific preventive measures at farm level. Therefore, the objectives of the present investigation were to explore in a sample of horned dairy herds in loose housing (1) incidences of BM with and without visible damage to the udder (BMvD) and associations between BMvD and horn-induced integument damage, (2) whether primiparous or low-ranking cows are more frequently affected than multiparous or high-ranking cows, and (3) whether compliance with the guideline recommendations for the prevention of horn-related integument damage also contributes to the mitigation of BMvD.

## 2. Material and methods

## 2.1. Farms and animals

The present investigation was part of the German project 'Horns in loose housing: monitoring and assisting transition from dehorned to horned dairy herds or from tethered to loose housing systems with horned cows involving demonstration farms as a basis for qualified advisory services for dairy cattle farming'. Farms were acquired via advisory organizations, organic farming associations, internet platforms, research organizations, and agricultural press. Out of 90 responders, a total of 40 farms participated in the project. They comprised five farms that already kept an established horned dairy herd in loose housing and 35 farms changing from hornless to horned dairy cows in loose housing, or from tethered to loose housing with completely horned herds. Of the 40 project farms, 21 farms also agreed to participate in the present investigation and documented blood milk cases. Table 1 provides descriptive data on herd, management, and housing characteristics of these 21 farms. All farms offered half or full day access to pasture during the vegetation period from March/April to October/November (summer pasture) and milked in milking parlours. Calving took place throughout the year on all participating farms.

## 2.2. Data collection

## 2.2.1. Blood in milk

From July 2019 (around mid of summer pasture period) to January 2020 (around mid of winter barn period), the participating farmers continuously recorded all instances of BM (light pink to reddish colour in the foremilk of one or more udder quarters) via conventional visual method for which reliable detection of blood content  $\geq 2.0\%$  by experienced and inexperienced persons had been shown (Rasmussen & Bjerring, 2005). The documented instances were reported by the farmers monthly. However, one farm with alpine grazing during summer months did not document BM cases until September. Thus, only 5 months of data were available from this farm; all other farms provided data for 7 months. On this basis, a total of 145 monthly BM recordings at herd level



**Fig. 1.** Examples of visible damage to the udder potentially causing blood in milk (photos: University of Kassel).



Fig. 2. Examples of different horn-related integument damages (from left to right): hairless patches, older and fresh wounds, swellings (photos: University of Kassel).

were available. Along with BM cases the farmers also documented the parity and estimated social rank (categorisation in low, medium, high, based on daily observations during routine work with their animals) of the affected individuals and whether any wound or swelling of the udder (Fig. 1) was visible. A new instance of BM within an animal was counted when at least two milkings without BM had passed.

The farmers were not systematically trained to detect BM, but they were in general familiarized with the monitoring of horn-related problems by previous active involvement in the project and participation in project seminars over several years. Sixteen of the farmers involved in this study also participated in an inter-assessor agreement check regarding horn-related integument damage: each farmer independently, but at the same time with a trained and experienced person (silver standard), assessed ten individual cows of his/her own herd regarding a classification of individual animals ( $\leq$  5, 6–9, and  $\geq$  10 damages/cow). The median reflected very good agreement (prevalence and bias adjusted kappa (PABAK) = 0.85) following the interpretation of kappa values by Landis and Koch (1977).

## 2.2.2. Horn-related integument damage

Horn-related integument damage was systematically recorded once per herd during the winter period (November 2019 to January 2020) on 16 of the 21 farms that had improvable levels regarding horn-related integument damages (on average > 5 damages/cows) in the previous year. Recording was done by a trained experimenter, whose interassessor reliability was tested prior to data collection. For this purpose, a total of 88 cows on four different farms were directly assessed regarding horn-related integument damage by the experimenter and three other trained individuals simultaneously, but independently of each other. Acceptable agreement was achieved with all individuals (Pearson correlations (r) = 0.83–0.96, with no indication of systematic bias (slopes of the trend line in the scatter plot: 0.75–1.20).

Depending on herd size, in a sample of 22 to 47 cows per herd (calculated according to Welfare Quality®, 2009), the integument of the individual animals (entire left and right side of the body including vulva and udder) was examined. Every horn-related damage was counted (modified after Schneider, 2010). This included hairless patches, old and fresh wounds, and swellings (Fig. 2). Technopathies, i.e., areas of hair loss, ulcers or swellings which are caused by inappropriate housing equipment, were differentiated from horn-related damage, and not considered in the analyses. Technopathies typically occur in several animals in similar body regions and in a similar form, particularly at the hocks, carpal joints, hip bones, shoulder, or neck. At herd level the mean number of horn-related damages/cow was calculated for later correlation analysis with BM incidences during winter season.

## 2.2.3. Housing and management factors

A total of 52 housing and management factors were recorded on the farms relating to recommendations from the guideline for the husbandry of horned dairy cows in loose housing (Johns et al., 2019). The various factors were grouped into five areas: 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking and activity' and 'herd management' according to the structure of the guideline. The first four groups describe the design of the respective functional areas in the barn, but also contain related

## A. Ebinghaus et al.

## Table 2

Guideline recommendations on factors in the areas of 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking/activity' and 'herd management' and the respective numbers (proportions) of investigated farms complying with the recommendations.

| Nation pares         ≥ 2.5 m²/rene (at mar of milling) or an waiting arm         19 (81)           Design of waiting parks         square (instand of indular) or awaiting area         11 (52)           Type of milling parks         no         13 (73)           Cancentrate feeding in miking parks         no         16 (71)           Concentrate feeding in miking parks         no         16 (71)           Nather of feeding places per core         ≥ 1.1         9 (43)           Feeding gates type         21.1         9 (43)           Feeding gates type         21.0         9 (43)           Feeding gates type         21.0         9 (43)           Feeding gates type         21.0         9 (43)           Feeding gates type         18 (86)         70.0           Reading places per core         ≥ 1.1         10 (45)           Reading gates type         18 (86)         10.0 (45)           Roophage provision frequency <sup>2</sup> > 0 (10)         10 (43)           Roophage provision frequency <sup>2</sup> > 0 (10)         10 (43)           Roophage provision frequency <sup>2</sup> > 0 (10)         10 (43)           Concentrate stations         yee or to station         20 (55)           Recommendation         no (00)         11 (52)   | Milking   | Recommendation  | n (%) complying farms |  |  |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| Design of waiting area5 (24)Pore view of Male con waiting over11 (52)Type of milking parloarindividual milking salla"8 (38)Concentrate feeding in milking parloarno21 (100)Obtatede in the cows boad from area in the perfourno21 (100)Peeding in milking parloarno9 (30)Peeding parce per cow2.1.19 (43)Peeding parce per cow2.1.19 (43)Peeding parce protoging mained from gamma for an explored on one crait)11 (52)Peeding parce voiting main feeding9 (30)8 (38)Peeding parce voiting main feeding9 (30)8 (38)Peeding parce voiting main feeding9 (30)11 (52)Peeding parce voiting main feeding9 (30)12 (57)Pres feeding area (100)12 (57)12 (57)Pres feeding area (100)10 (30)12 (57)Pres feeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)11 (52)10 (30)Peeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)10 (30)10 (30)Peeding area (100)2 (10)10 (30)Peeding area (100)2 (10)<  | Waiting area  | $> 2.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ (at start of milking) or no waiting area | 19 (91)               |  |  |
| precision of million on voting and  | Design of waiting area                                      | square (instead of tubular) or no waiting area                          | 5 (24)                |  |  |
| Type of nulking parloarindividual nulking stalls*8 (38)Concerrute feeding induces performno15 (71)Obtacle in the cosy head/horn area in the parloarno21 (100)PeedingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of feeding places per cosypallade (inscool or neck rall)11 (52)Feeding gate typepallade (inscool or neck rall)11 (52)Feeding places per cost20 (53)20 (53)Feeding faces per cost20 (53)20 (53)Feeding faces per cost20 (55)20 (55)Feeding faces cost cost cost cost cost cost cost cos  | Free view of milker on waiting cows                         | ves   | 11 (52)               |  |  |
| Concentrate feeding in milking parlowin order at manage matter15 (7)PeedingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of feeding places per cow≥ 1.19 (43)Peeding at the cow that far and feeding96 (3)8 (38)Freeding pate vidth80 -95 cm8 (38)Rootgbage per vision frequency?≥ 0 threes a 4gy13 (57)Freeding at the far and feedingyet13 (57)Rootgbage per vision frequency?≥ 0 threes a 4gy13 (57)Freeding at the far and langyet13 (57)Rootgbage per vision frequency?≥ 0 threes a 4gy13 (57)Freeding at the far and langyet13 (57)Rootgbage per vision frequency?≥ 0 threes a 4gy13 (57)Freeding at the far and langyet or only when restrained20 (95)Rootgbage per vision frequency?≥ 0 threes a 4gy20 (95)Rootgbage per vision at concentrate stationsyet or on station19 (91)Side portection at concentrate stationsyet or no station10 (91)Side portection at concentrate stationsyet or no station13 (62)LyingRecommendation of raised)13 (62)Lift con cables2 10 chr10 (15)Lift con cables2 13 m² (concentrate stations9 (94)Walling alley width2 5 m5 (24)Walling alley width2 5 m5 (24)Walling alley width2 13 m² (concentrate stations9 (49)Walling alley width2 13 m² (concentrate stations14 (19) <t< td=""><td>Type of milking parlour</td><td>individual milking stalls<sup>a</sup></td><td colspan="3">8 (38)</td></t<>  | Type of milking parlour                                     | individual milking stalls <sup>a</sup>                                  | 8 (38)                |  |  |
| obstacks in the cost head/horn area in the parlour         no         21 (100)           Feeding         Recommendation         n (%) complying farms           Number of feeding places per cost         p 11         9 (43)           Feeding park vight         90 5 cm         8 (30)           Freading park vight         9 6 sm         8 (30)           Freading park vight         9 (43)         16 (20)           Recating park vight         20 (100)         20 (100)           Recating park vight         10 (100)         20 (100)           Recating vight vight (100)         10 (100)         20 (100)           Recating vight (100)         20 (100)         20 (100)           Recating vight (100)         20 (100)         20 (100)           Recating vight (100)         20 (100)         10 (20)           Recating vight (100)         20 (100)         10 (20)           Lying         Recommendation         10 (20)           Recating vight (100)         20 (20)   | Concentrate feeding in milking parlour                      |   | 15 (71)               |  |  |
| Preding         Recommendation         n (b) complying frams           Number of feeding places per cow         ≥ 1.1         9 (43)           Feeding gate type         pallasted (instead of diagonal or neck rail)         11 (52)           Feeding gate type         18 (86)         8 (38)           Roogbage availability         ad libitum (2 h)         16 (76)           Roogbage availability         10 (76)         10 (76)           By proportion infergency?         ≥ 0 times a day         12 (57)           Prash feed after milking         yes         15 (71)           By proportion infergency?         ≥ 0 times a day         12 (57)           Prash feed after milking         yes         15 (71)           By proportion in the feed frag information         10 (95)         10 (95)           Accessibility of concentrate stations         yes or no station         20 (95)           State protection at concentrate stations         yes or no station         20 (95)           Lysing         Recommendation         a (9k) complying frams           Number of type places per cow         ≥ 1.1         11 (52)           Calibit res table         (bit contend of rigid)         7 (33)           Lysing         Recommendation         n (9k) complying frams           Number  | Obstacles in the cows head/horn area in the parlour         | no  | 21 (100)              |  |  |
| Number of feeding places per cow<br>Peeding places per cow<br>Peeding place vight $\geq 1.1$ $9(4)$ Peeding gater type<br>Peeding place with<br>Peeding place with<br>Peeding place with<br>Perding place with<br>Perding place with<br>Perding place with<br>Peeding place per cow<br>Concentrate stations<br>Peeding place per cow<br>Conheler with<br>Peeding place per cow<br>Coher place per cow<  | Feeding   | Recommendation  | n (%) complying farms |  |  |
| number1 and textury packet provide1 and textury1 and texturyproduction from the form00 + 9 cm1 and texturyFlandin of cross during main feedingyrs16 (8)Roughage provision frequency'2 to times a day12 (57)Peah feed after millingyrs10 (48)Roughage arabidoting at ceding tableno or only when restrained20 (95)Hay proportion in the feed ration'10 (48)20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationsys or no station10 (91)Side protection at concentrate stationsys or no station20 (95)Number of lying places per cov'2 1.111 (52)Value of lying places per cov'2 1.111 (52)Fread feed after stations2 0 cm'0 (01)Texabidet argue accentrate stations2 100 cm'0 (01)Texabidet argue accentrate stations2 100 cm'0 (01)Value of lying places per cov'2 1.111 (52)Value of lying places per cov'2 1.0n (8) complying farmsTotal barn area6 2 bo mi0 (01)Walking Alley withh2 5 m9 (41)Valking alley withh2 5 m9 (41)Valking alley withh2 5 m9 (42)Valking alley withh2 5 m10 (48)Valking alley withh2 13 m <sup>2</sup> /cov  | Number of fooding places per cour                           | > 1.1   | 0 (42)                |  |  |
| leading pairs of the second base of the second bas | Feeding gate type   | $\geq$ 1.1<br>palicade (instead of diagonal or pack rail)               | 5 (43)<br>11 (52)     |  |  |
| instantion of cons during main feedingyes18 (8b)Roughage variabilitydibium (2h)16 (7b)Roughage provision frequency $\geq$ 6 times a day12 (57)Roughage provision frequency $\geq$ 6 times a day12 (57)Hay proportion in the feed rationNigh ( $\geq$ 95%)10 (48)Concentrate feeding at feeding tableno or only when retrained20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> or no station20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (95)LyingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of ying places per cow $\geq$ 1.0(instead of raised)13 (62)Chiele typedeep bedded (instead of raised)7 (33)Beit from cubiclesabo possible to the fromn (%) complying farmsTotal bran area $\geq$ 13 m <sup>2</sup> /cow9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq$ 4 m2 (06)Walking / activitynone10 (48)Dotacet in passage $\leq$ 3 m5 (24)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 3 m5 (24)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet in passage in the barn' $\geq$ 2 1 S cubicles20 (95)Dotacet   | Feeding place width   | 80_95 cm  | 8 (38)                |  |  |
| nonpage realiability16 (70)roughage provide frequency> 5 dimes alay15 (71)Presh for after millingPresh15 (71)Presh for after millingPresh15 (71)Approprote in the feed ration"19 (91)20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (95)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station19 (91)Side protection at concentrate stations> 9 (93)16 (92)Number of lying places per cow2.1.111 (52)Chiler of lying places per cow2.1.113 (62)Head maps space> 200 cm <sup>2</sup> 0 (0)Head maps space> 200 cm <sup>2</sup> 0 (3)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front1 (8) complying farmsVallarg alge y width> 5 m4 (19)Wallarg alge y width> 5 m4 (19)Vallarg alge y width> 5 m4 (19)Vallarg alge y width> 2 more10 (48)Vallarg alge y width> 0 nore10 (48)Vallarg alge y width> 2 more6 (20)Vallarg alge y width> 0 nore10 (48)Vallarg alge  | Fixation of cows during main feeding                        | ves   | 18 (86)               |  |  |
| nongings<br>provision requess? $2 \le 6 times at ay12 \le 157How press find after millingps15 < (71)Hay proportion in the foot ration'high (2 \le 9\%)10 < (48)Concentrate feeding at feeding table20 < (95)20 < (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationssufficient free space around' or no station20 < (95)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station20 < (95)LyingRecommendationn < (%) complying firms$  | Roughage availability                                       | ad libitum (24 h)   | 16 (76)               |  |  |
| news         issue of a field after milking         issue of a field after milking         issue of a field after milking           high to propriote in the field million         no or only when restrained         20 (95)           Accessibility of concentrate stations         sufficient free space around <sup>1</sup> or no station         20 (95)           Rear protection at concentrate stations         yes or no station         a (98) complying farms           Number of lying places per cow         ≥ 1.1         11 (52)           Choice the discussion of raised)         31 (62)           Head lunge space         ≥ 100 cm <sup>2</sup> 7 (33)           Exit from cubicles         also possible to the front         4 (19)           Walking alley width         ≥ 5 m         9 (33)           Feeding alley width         ≥ 4 m         2 (30)           Valking alley width         ≥ 4 m         2 (30)           Valking alley width         > 4 m         2 (30)           Valking alley width         > 2 10 cm <sup>2</sup> 10 (48)           Valking alley width         > 4 m         2 (30)           Valking  | Roughage provision frequency <sup>b</sup>                   | > 6  times a day  | 12 (57)               |  |  |
| inp propriorinp (> 9%)10 (48)Concentrate feeding at foding tablesufficient free space around' or no station20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationssufficient free space around' or no station20 (95)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (95)LyingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Loide typedeep beldded (instead of raised)10 (9)Hed Ingres space $\geq 100  cm^2$ 00)Exit from cubiclesab possible to the front4 (19)Vallating / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13  m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley vidth $\geq 5  m$ 4 (19)Wallating / activity $\geq 13  m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Total barn area $\geq 13  m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley vidth $\geq 4  m$ 2 (10)Wallating alley vidth $\geq 2  m$ 5 (24)Dotated en balleys' (e.g., trans), statis)none10 (48)Obtated en balleys' (e.g., trans), statis)none10 (48)Obtated en alleys' (e.g., trans), statis)none10 (48)Number of transages (e.g., trans), statis)none10 (48)Number of cubotor longing area $\geq 4.5  m^2/cow$ 9 (33)Cubate (e.g., trans), statis)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn $\geq 2.2  m^2/cow$ 10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., trans), statis)none(24)Number  | Fresh feed after milking                                    | ves   | 15 (71)               |  |  |
| concentrate feeding at leading tableno or only when retariand20 (95)Accessibility of concentrate stationssufficient free space around or no station20 (95)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (95)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station10 (91)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station10 (90)Number of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Chible typedeep bedded (instead of raised)31 (62)Head lung space $\geq 100$ cm <sup>1</sup> 0 (0)Net railflexible (instead of raised)7 (33)Sitt from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal bara area $\geq 13 m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 1 m$ 2 (0)Number of passages $\geq 23 m$ 5 (24)Dead end alley (e.g., ramps, statis)none10 (48)Obstace lin passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Distance between two passages $\leq 15 cubicles$ 20 (95)Walking grance $\leq 45 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4, 5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Conselbility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 12 (57)Distance between two passages $\geq 10 cubicles$ 20 (95)Walking sarificesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 2 (27)Outdo  | Hav proportion in the feed ration <sup>c</sup>              | high (> 95%)  | 10 (48)               |  |  |
| Accessibility of concentrate stationssufficient free space around, or no station20 (95)Ever protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (95)LyingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Chicle type $\geq 0.00 \text{ mi}$ 3 (62)Head lunge space $\geq 0.00 \text{ mi}$ 0 (0)Stati free space around, or ligit of the space space $\geq 0.00 \text{ mi}$ 0 (0)Number of lying places per cow $\geq 1.00 \text{ mi}$ 0 (0)Malking / activityRecommendation of rigit of the front4 (13)Total barn area $\geq 1.3 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 9 (43)Total barn area $\geq 1.3 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 9 (43)Total barn area $\geq 1.3 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 9 (43)Dead end alleys, within $\geq 4 \text{ m}$ 2 (10)Width of narrowest passage <sup>1</sup> $> 0 \text{ moe}$ 5 (24)Obstack in barges (e.g., trongs, stains)none10 (48)Obstack in alleys (e.g., rangs, stains)none10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., trongs, stains)none10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., trongs, stains)auficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Number of passages (e.g., trongs, stains)none10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., trongs, stains)auficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43) <td>Concentrate feeding at feeding table</td> <td>no or only when restrained</td> <td>20 (95)</td>  | Concentrate feeding at feeding table                        | no or only when restrained  | 20 (95)               |  |  |
| Rear protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station19 (01)Side protection at concentrate stationsyes or no station20 (05)LigingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Cubicit ypedeep bedded (instead of raised)31 (62)Head lung space $\geq 1.0$ 0 (on)Nex ralflexible (instead of raised)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal bara area $\geq 13 n^2/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dead alleys <sup>6</sup> $\Rightarrow 0 mone$ 10 (48)Obstacte in alley (e.g., ramps, statist)none10 (48)Obstacte in alley (e.g., ramps, statist)none10 (48)Obstacte in passage: $\Rightarrow 15 cubicles$ 20 (95)Walking area $\Rightarrow 24 m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Coressibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Coressibility of trainkers $\Rightarrow 15 cubicles$ 20 (95)Valking surface $\Rightarrow 15 cubicles$ 20 (95)Valking surface $\Rightarrow 15 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Coressibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 12 (57)Accessibility of drinkers $\Rightarrow 16 (27) Commendation16 (27)Durador loafing area\Rightarrow 4.5 m^2/cow6 (29)Paricheme of outdoor loafing area\Rightarrow 4.5 m^2/cow12 (57)$   | Accessibility of concentrate stations                       | sufficient free space around <sup><math>d</math></sup> or no station    | 20 (95)               |  |  |
| Side protection at concentrate stations20 (95)LyingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Choicle typedeep bedded (instead of raised)13 (62)Head lunge space $\geq 100  cm^2$ 0 (0)Neck railflexible (instead of raised)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsValking / activityRecommendation9 (43)Feeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Obstacle in passage' $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., rowth)none10 (48)Number of passages (e.g., rowth)sufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of trakessufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of trakessufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 12 (57)Accessibility of trakessufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of trakessufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $e_{4.5} m^2 cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $e_{4.5} m^2 cow$ 6 (29)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $e_{4.5} m^2 cow$ 14 (67)The d managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmaReparation of   | Rear protection at concentrate stations                     | ves or no station   | 19 (91)               |  |  |
| LyingRecommendationn (%) complying farmsNumber of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Cubicle typedeep bedded (instead of raised)13 (62)Head lunge space $\geq 100  cn^{\circ}$ 0 (0)Next rulflexible (instead of raised)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13  m^2 cow$ 9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq 5  m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 5  m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 5  m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 10  m^2 cow$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys <sup>6</sup> none10 (48)Obstack in passage' (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Obstack in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn' $\geq 2$ 19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15  cubicles$ 20 (95)Walking area $\geq 4, m^2 cow$ 6 (29)Cutodro loading area $\geq 4, m^2 cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loading area $\geq 4, m^2 cow$ 6 (29)Lerd nanagementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Purchase of animalsno11 (52)Herd managementRecommendation19 (91)Malking for cocia in height on theirssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)<  | Side protection at concentrate stations                     | ves or no station   | 20 (95)               |  |  |
| Number of lying places per cow $\geq 1.1$ 11 (52)Cubicle typedeep bedded (instead of raised)13 (62)Head lungs space $\geq 100 \text{ cm}^4$ 0 (0)Neck railflexible (instead of rigid)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13 \text{ m}^3 / \text{cow}$ 9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq 5 \text{ m}$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 4 \text{ m}$ 2 (10)Walking alley width $\geq 3 \text{ m}$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys*none10 (48)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Number of passages (c.g., prush)none10 (48)Number of passages (c.g., prush)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn $\geq 2$ 15 cubiclesDistance between two passages $\leq 15 \text{ cubicles}$ 20 (95)Walking aurfacesufficient free space around*9 (43)Accessibility of drukerssufficient free space around*12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $e.g., trough, brush, hay rack$ 12 (57)Part cheight60-90 (cm)11 (52)Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Muther of ows per druking place $< 10$ 14 (67)Miftiger of free space around*3 (14)Imme of integration of heiferssingle animalas <td< td=""><td>Lying</td><td>Recommendation</td><td>n (%) complying farms</td></td<>  | Lying   | Recommendation  | n (%) complying farms |  |  |
| Humen of place place of<br>choice typedeep bedded (instead of raised)11 (b2)Head lunge space $\geq 100  \mathrm{cm}^2$ 0 (0)Neck railResible (instead of rigid)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsToral barn area $\geq 13  m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley width $\geq 5  \mathrm{m}$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 4  \mathrm{m}$ 2 (10)Walking alley width $\geq 4  \mathrm{m}$ 2 (10)Walking alley width $\geq 2  \mathrm{m}$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys*none5 (24)Obstacle in alley (e.g., rangs, stairs)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Unuber of passages $\leq 15  \mathrm{cubicles}$ 20 (95)Walking arrac $\leq 45  \mathrm{m}^2/cow$ 6 (23)Cacessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around*9 (43)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around*12 (57)Outdoor loading area $e.g., rough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Number of oxs per drinking place< 10 e^{-90}  \mathrm{cm}11 (52)Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatsigle aninals3 (14)Itrin$   | Number of lving places per cow                              | >11   | 11 (52)               |  |  |
| Head lunge space $\geq 100 \text{ cm}^{2}$ $000^{2}$ Neck railfiexible (instead of rigid)7 (33)Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13 \text{ m}^{2}/\text{cow}$ 9 (43)Feeding alley with $\geq 5 \text{ m}$ 4 (19)Walking alley with $\geq 5 \text{ m}$ 4 (19)Walking alley with $\geq 4 \text{ m}$ 2 (10)Width of narrowest passage $\geq 3 \text{ n}$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys <sup>§</sup> none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (s.g., prush)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn' $\geq 2$ 19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15 \text{ cubicles}$ 20 (95)Walking alley didt, area $sufficient free space around49 (43)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around412 (57)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around412 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area< 4.5 \text{ m}^{2}/\text{cow}6 (29)Number of rows per drinking place< 10$   | Cubicle type  | $\leq$ 1.1<br>deep bedded (instead of raised)                           | 13 (62)               |  |  |
| Neck rallfield0Exit from cubiclesalso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13 m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 2 (20)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys' $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dostacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Outdoor loafing area $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Valking surfacesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $e.g., trough, brush, may rack12 (57)Outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, may rack12 (57)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, may rack12 (57)Mumber of cows per drinking place< 10$  | Head lunge space  | $> 100 \text{ cm}^{\text{e}}$   | 0 (0)                 |  |  |
| but malso possible to the front4 (19)Walking / activityRecommendationn (%) complying farmsTota barn area $\geq 13 m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Peeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 4 m$ 2 (10)Width of narrowest passage' $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dead end alley s <sup>o</sup> none10 (48)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stars)none10 (48)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stars)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn' $\geq 2$ 19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>d</sup> 12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Controlo rolafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place<10   | Neck rail   | flexible (instead of rigid)   | 7 (33)                |  |  |
| InterventionIntervention $(16)^{2}$ Walking / activityRecommediationn (%) complying farmsTotal barn area $\geq 13 m^{2}/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 2 (10)Width of narrowest passage' $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dead end alleys'none5 (24)Obstack in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Obstack in alley (e.g., rough, stairs)none10 (48)Obstack in alley (e.g., rough)none10 (48)Obstack in alley (e.g., rough)staff car alley (e.g., rough)15 (71)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^{2}/cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^{2}/cow$ 10 (48)Number of passages10 (40)10 (46)Number of outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^{2}/cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $<= 0.90 cm$ 11 (52)Herd managementRecommedationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyesbefore calving8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifersbefore c  | Exit from cubicles  | also possible to the front  | 4 (19)                |  |  |
| Number $2 13 m^2/cow$ 9 (43)Feeding alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 5 m$ 4 (19)Walking alley width $\geq 3 m$ 2 (10)Width of narcowest passage $\geq 3 m$ 5 (24)Dead end alleysnone5 (24)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn <sup>1</sup> $\geq 2$ 19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfacesufficient free space around <sup>1</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>1</sup> 9 (43)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Curdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Drinker beight60-90 cm11 (52)Herd managementkeconsmediation10 (48)Separation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnov11 (52)Herd managementkeconsmediation19 (91)Method of hieferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of beiferssingle animals11 (67)Milking routie for hieferssingle animals14 (67)Milking routie for hieferssingle animals14 (67)Method of niefers (for sociability)yes18 (86)Feedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Freedothers than Holstein Frisian12 (57)Method of niefersyes, in case of problems<  | Walking / activity  | Recommendation  | n (%) complying farms |  |  |
| lotal part area $2 \pm 1 \text{ m}$ / kow $9 + (4_3)$ Valking alley width $\geq 5 \text{ m}$ $4 (19)$ Walking alley width $\geq 3 \text{ m}$ $2 (10)$ Width of narowest passage' $\geq 3 \text{ m}$ $5 (24)$ Dead end alleys <sup>6</sup> none $10 (48)$ Obstacke in passage' (e.g., ramps, stairs)none $10 (48)$ Obstacke in passage's in the barn' $\geq 2$ $19 (91)$ Distance between two passages in the barn' $\geq 2$ $20 (95)$ Walking surfaceslip-resistant $15 (71)$ Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>41</sup> $9 (43)$ Accessibility of brush and lick stone $sufficient free space around412 (57)Outdoor loafing area\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area< 40 \text{ says}^2, via \ge 2 passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 1014 (67)Drinker height60-90 \text{ cm}14 (67)Drinker heightno19 (91)Separation of cows in heatsingle animals9 (43)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno16 (50)Drinker height60-90 \text{ cm}14 (67)Milking outside of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Drinker heightother shan Holstein Frisian7 (81)Dreeding for sociabilityyes$   | Tetal have and  | > 10  | 0 (40)                |  |  |
| recting alrey with $2 \ Jin$ $4 \ (19)$ Wildting alley with $2 \ 4 \ m$ $2 \ (10)$ Wildting filey with $2 \ 3 \ m$ $5 \ (24)$ Dead end alleys <sup>6</sup> none $5 \ (24)$ Dead end alleys <sup>6</sup> none $10 \ (48)$ Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none $10 \ (48)$ Number of passage (e.g., brush)none $10 \ (48)$ Distance between two passages $\leq 15 \ cubicles$ $20 \ (95)$ Walkting surfaceslip-resistant $2 \ 2$ Number of passage (in the bara' $2 \ 2$ $20 \ (95)$ Vaccessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> $2 \ (57)$ Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> $2 \ (57)$ Outdoor loafing area $e.g.$ , trough, brush, hay rack $12 \ (57)$ Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $e.g.$ , trough, brush, hay rack $10 \ (48)$ Number of cows per drinking place $< 10$ $11 \ (52)$ Herd managementRecommendation $n \ (%) $  | Fooding allow width   | ≥ 13 III / COW  | 9 (43)                |  |  |
| Making and y with $2 + m$ $2 + m$ With of narrowest passage $2 + m$ $2 + m$ Dead end alleysnone $5 (24)$ Dead end alleysnone $10 (48)$ Obstacle in passage in the barn $2 2$ $19 (91)$ Distance between two passages $51 5 cubicles$ $20 (95)$ Walking surfaceslip-resistant $15 (71)$ Accessibility of drinkers $9 (43)$ $42 (57)$ Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around $12 (57)$ Outdoor loafing area $e_s e_s$ , rough, brush, hay rack $2 (57)$ Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $e_s e_s$ , rough, brush, hay rack $12 (57)$ Drinker height $60 - 90  cm$ $11 (52)$ Herd managementRecommendation $n (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Purchase of animals3 (14)Time for integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time for integration of heiferswalting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes8 (38)Purchase of animals3 (14)11 (52)Herd managementyes18 (86)Differes'waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Time of integration of heifersyes16 (76)Additional monitoring after integrationyes, in case of problems12 ($  | Walking alley width   | $\geq 5 \text{ m}$  | 4(19)                 |  |  |
| International motion $2 \text{ Jm}$ $3 \text{ GP}$ Deal end alleys <sup>6</sup> none5 (24)Obstacle in alley (e.g., ramps, stairs)none10 (48)Obstacle in passage (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Number of passage (e.g., brush)none10 (49)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfacesulficent free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stone $\leq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $e.g.,$ trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $< 10$ 14 (67)Drinker height60-90 cm11 (52)Herd managementges6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Milking routine for heifers <sup>4</sup> walting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes, in case of problems13 (267)Rereedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animalsves, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animalsves, in case of problems12 (57)<  | Width of parrowest passage                                  | > 3 m   | 5 (24)                |  |  |
| Letter little little (leg., ramps, stairs)none0 (48)Obstack in passage' (e.g., brush)none10 (48)Number of passages in the barn $\geq 2$ 19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 21 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of orditor loafing area $< 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $< 4.0 mental mars, 'i a \geq 2$ passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 10  | Dead end allevs <sup>g</sup>                                |   | 5 (24)                |  |  |
| Obstack in may (e.g., map, stand)nome10 (48)Number of passage's, brush)nome19 (91)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>1</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>1</sup> 12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{ cow}$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., rrough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of drinking place< 10   | Obstacle in alley (e.g. ramps stairs)                       | none  | 10(48)                |  |  |
| Solution in parages in the barn'10 (10)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing area $= g.$ , trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $= g.$ , trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $= g.$ , trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $= 0.90 \text{ cm}$ 11 (52)Purchase per drinking place $< 10$ 14 (67)Drinker height $60 - 90 \text{ cm}$ 11 (52)Herd managementges6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersyes8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers that Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Reasers for aggressive animals'education <sup>4</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Obstacle in passage <sup><math>f</math></sup> (e.g., hrush) | none  | 10 (48)               |  |  |
| Number of packages in the only $10$ (9)Distance between two passages $\leq 15$ cubicles20 (95)Walking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around <sup>41</sup> 9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>41</sup> 12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack14 (67)Drinker height60-90 cm11 (52)Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Time of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heiferswaiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes11 (52)Treatment of hord <sup>1</sup> yes11 (52)Treatment of hord <sup>1</sup> yes12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals12 (67)Separation of or solutingyes in the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes14 (67)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)  | Number of passages in the barn <sup>f</sup>                 | > 2   | 19 (91)               |  |  |
| Balance former into paradigIn ControlIn ControlWalking surfaceslip-resistant15 (71)Accessibility of drush and lick stonesufficient free space around <sup>4</sup> 9 (43)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 m^2/cow$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>6</sup> , via $\geq 2$ passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place<10  | Distance between two passages                               | $\leq 15$ cubicles  | 20 (95)               |  |  |
| Accessibility of drinkerssufficient free space around9 (43)Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around12 (57)Outdoor loafing area≥ 4.5 m²/cow6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>1</sup> , via ≥ 2 passages10 (48)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>1</sup> , via ≥ 2 passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 10   | Walking surface   | slip-resistant  | 15 (71)               |  |  |
| Accessibility of brush and lick stonesufficient free space around12 (57)Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$ 6 (29)Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>h</sup> , via $\geq 2$ passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 10  | Accessibility of drinkers                                   | sufficient free space around <sup>d</sup>                               | 9 (43)                |  |  |
| Outdoor loafing area $\geq 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cov}$ $= 6 (29)$ Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack $= 12 (57)$ Accessibility of outdoor loafing area $= always^3$ , via $\geq 2$ passages $= 10 (48)$ Number of cows per drinking place $< 10$ $= 4 (67)$ Drinker height $= 60-90 \text{ cm}$ $= 11 (52)$ Herd managementRecommendation $n (\%)$ complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes $= 6 (29)$ Regroupingsnever $= 8 (38)$ Purchase of animals $n 0$ $= 9 (14)$ Method of integration of heiferssingle animals $= 3 (14)$ Time of integration of heifers $= 4 (38)$ $= 4 (67)$ Milking routine for heifers $= 8 (38)$ $= 8 (38)$ Additional monitoring after integrationyes $= 8 (38)$ Breedothers than Holstein Frisian $= 7 (81)$ Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems $= 12 (57)$ Measures for aggressive animals $= 2 (27)$ $= 2 (27)$ Keasures for aggressive animals $= 2 (27)$ $= 2 (27)$ Keasures for aggressive animals $= 2 (27)$ $= 2 (29)$ Staff changes $< 0$ once a year $= 2 (95)$  | Accessibility of brush and lick stone                       | sufficient free space around <sup>d</sup>                               | 12 (57)               |  |  |
| Enrichment of outdoor loafing areae.g., trough, brush, hay rack12 (57)Accessibility of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>h</sup> , via $\geq 2$ passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 10  | Outdoor loafing area  | $> 4.5 \text{ m}^2/\text{cow}$  | 6 (29)                |  |  |
| Accessibility of outdoor loafing areaalways <sup>h</sup> , via $\geq 2$ passages10 (48)Number of cows per drinking place< 10  | Enrichment of outdoor loafing area                          | e.g., trough, brush, hay rack   | 12 (57)               |  |  |
| Number of cows per drinking place< 1014 (67)Drinker height60–90 cm11 (52)Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year   | Accessibility of outdoor loafing area                       | $always^h$ , via $\geq 2$ passages                                      | 10 (48)               |  |  |
| Drinker height60–90 cm11 (52)Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>16</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Number of cows per drinking place                           | < 10  | 14 (67)               |  |  |
| Herd managementRecommendationn (%) complying farmsSeparation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems16 (76)Measures for aggressive animalseducation <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year   | Drinker height  | 60–90 cm  | 11 (52)               |  |  |
| Separation of cows in heatyes6 (29)Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> witing outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers in Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education's or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Herd management   | Recommendation  | n (%) complying farms |  |  |
| Regroupingsnever8 (38)Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Separation of cows in heat                                  | yes   | 6 (29)                |  |  |
| Purchase of animalsno19 (91)Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heiferswaiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education's or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Regroupings   | never   | 8 (38)                |  |  |
| Method of integration of heiferssingle animals3 (14)Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heifers <sup>1</sup> waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education's or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Purchase of animals   | no  | 19 (91)               |  |  |
| Time of integration of heifersbefore calving14 (67)Milking routine for heiferswaiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes11 (52)Treatment of hornsyes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals< once a year   | Method of integration of heifers                            | single animals  | 3 (14)                |  |  |
| Milking routine for heifers'waiting outside of the waiting area8 (38)Additional monitoring after integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes11 (52)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals< once a year   | Time of integration of heifers                              | before calving  | 14 (67)               |  |  |
| Additional monitoring atter integrationyes18 (86)Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes11 (52)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education' <sup>1s</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Milking routine for heifers'                                | waiting outside of the waiting area                                     | 8 (38)                |  |  |
| Breedothers than Holstein Frisian17 (81)Breeding for sociabilityyes11 (52)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Additional monitoring after integration                     | yes   | 18 (86)               |  |  |
| Breeding for sociabilityyes11 (52)Treatment of horns <sup>1</sup> yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year  | Breed   | others than Holstein Frisian  | 17 (81)               |  |  |
| Treatment of horns'yes, in case of problems12 (57)Measures for aggressive animals'education <sup>1k</sup> or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year   | Breeding for sociability                                    | yes   | 11 (52)               |  |  |
| Measures for aggressive animals'education'* or exclusion from herd16 (76)Staff changes< once a year   | Treatment of horns'   | yes, in case of problems  | 12 (57)               |  |  |
| Statt changes < once a year 20 (95)   | Measures for aggressive animals                             | 'education' or exclusion from herd                                      | 16 (76)               |  |  |
|   | Statt changes   | < once a year   | 20 (95)               |  |  |

<sup>a</sup> tandem, drive-through or butterfly parlour

<sup>b</sup> daily frequency of fresh feed provision and feed remains pushed back to the feeding places

<sup>c</sup> except pasture

 $^d$  accessible from  $\geq 2$  sides, no placement in confined areas

<sup>e</sup> distance between neck rail and wall or head rail

f passages between cubicle rows connecting feeding and walking alleys

<sup>g</sup> dead end alleys that are < 4.5 m wide <sup>h</sup> apart from times at pasture

 $^{\rm i}\,$  during the first days after integration into the lactating herd

<sup>j</sup> e.g. rounding off the horn tips

<sup>k</sup> intervention by stockpersons in case of aggressive behaviour within the herd



**Fig. 3.** Box plots (minimum, lower quartile, median, upper quartile, maximum, and potential outliers (interquartile range\*1.5) of blood in milk (BM) incidences/ month at farm level (n = 5 months in the case of farm 9, n = 7 months in the case of all other farms).

#### Table 3

Descriptive data on the percentages of fulfilled guideline recommendations at farm level (n = 21) in the areas 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking/activity', and 'herd management'.

| Variables            | Median | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | SD    |
|----------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| Milking (%)          | 66,67  | 33,33   | 83,33   | 62,70 | 12,81 |
| Feeding (%)          | 75,00  | 41,67   | 91,67   | 70,63 | 12,53 |
| Lying (%)            | 40,00  | 0,00    | 80,00   | 33,33 | 20,33 |
| Walking/activity (%) | 47,06  | 17,65   | 82,35   | 48,46 | 13,53 |
| Herd management (%)  | 58,33  | 41,67   | 83,33   | 60,32 | 12,05 |

management factors. 'Herd management' exclusively includes factors that describe management decisions. Table 2 provides an overview of all factors covered, the respective recommendations and information on the number and proportion of investigated farms that complied with these recommendations.

Data on housing were collected during farm visits using standardised recording sheets; information on the management was gathered from the farmers via interviews using standardised recording sheets and via written questionnaires. However, some additional factors covered in the guideline were not considered because they were not reliably recorded. These were aspects of human-animal relationship (use of driving aid, quality of handling, contact times between stockpersons and animals), details on feeding gates (opening angle, functionality), drinkers (frost resistance, cleanliness, accessibility at the exit of the milking parlour) and heifer habituation before integration into the dairy herd.

#### 2.3. Statistical analyses

Descriptive analyses at farm level were used to quantify monthly incidences of BM (% of cases in relation to the total number of lactating cows at farm) with visible damage to the udder (BMvD) compared to the total incidences of all BM (objective 1), and at animal level to characterize affected animals in terms of age and social rank (objective 2).

Graphical tests via normal quantile-quantile plots showed that monthly BMvD incidences (mean over the winter barn season 2019/20) and mean numbers of horn-induced integument damages/cow (recorded once during the winter season 2019/20) were non-normally distributed. Hence, to investigate associations between BMvD and integument damage (objective 1), the Spearman rank correlation coefficient ( $r_s$ ) was calculated.

To test whether compliance with guideline recommendations can contribute to mitigate the occurrence of BMvD (objective 3), monthly

#### Table 4

Generalized mixed model regarding monthly BMvD occurrence (no/yes); fit by maximum likelihood method (n = 145 recordings from 21 farms): confidence intervals (CI) and p-values calculated via bootstrap procedure.

| Fixed effects   | Model estimate | 95%CI          | Odds ratios | р      |  |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------------|--------|--|
| Winter barn (ref. summer pasture)                                 | 0.867          | 0.021 - 1.905  | 2.39        | 0.0492 |  |
| Milking (%)   | -0.014         | -0.064 - 0.024 | 0.99        | 0.5746 |  |
| Feeding (%)   | -0.066         | -0.1170.029    | 0.94        | 0.0141 |  |
| Lying (%)   | 0.009          | -0.043 - 0.065 | 1.01        | 0.7503 |  |
| Walking/Activity (%)  | -0.061         | -0.1420.002    | 0.95        | 0.1009 |  |
| Herd management (%)   | -0.003         | -0.088 - 0.060 | 1.00        | 0.9312 |  |
| VIF = 1.02–3.73, marginal $R^2 = 0.26$ , conditional $R^2 = 0.30$ |                |                |             |        |  |

#### Table A1

Spearman rank correlation coefficient ( $r_s$ ) between independent variables (% of recommendations fulfilled in the areas milking, feeding, lying, walking/activity, herd management at farm level, n=21) considered for multivariable analysis.

| Variable         |    | Milking | Feeding | Lying | Walking/Activity |
|------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|------------------|
| Feeding          | rs | 0.06    |         |       |                  |
|                  | р  | 0.793   |         |       |                  |
| Lying            | rs | 0.20    | 0.19    |       |                  |
|                  | р  | 0.396   | 0.421   |       |                  |
| Walking/Activity | rs | 0.11    | -0.18   | 0.52  |                  |
|                  | р  | 0.624   | 0.432   | 0.015 |                  |
| Herd management  | rs | -0.11   | 0.22    | 0.48  | -0.11            |
| -                | р  | 0.625   | 0.339   | 0.028 | 0.635            |

values at farm level were used. However, as data distribution of the proportion of affected cows was strongly right skewed, a binomial outcome variable (occurrence no/yes) was chosen, and the analysis carried out using a generalized mixed model fit via maximum likelihood method from the lme4 package (version 1.1-30, Bates et al., 2015) in RStudio (version 2022.12.0+353 for Mac OS X, Posit team, 2022). Each farm factor relating to the guideline recommendations (Table 2) was binomially categorised into 'recommendation fulfilled' or 'not fulfilled', and for each factor group (i.e., 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking/activity', 'herd management'), the percentage of fulfilled recommendations was calculated at farm level and used as independent variables. Potential collinearity between these five factor groups was tested using Spearman rank correlations. All coefficients were in range of negligible to moderate correlation ( $r_s = 0.06-0.52$ , Appendix Table A1). Thus, a full model was set up with the fixed effects of the percentages of fulfilled recommendations regarding 'milking', 'feeding', 'lying', 'walking/activity', and 'herd management' at farm level, and 'season' (months with pasture access versus months with all-day housing in the barn) at the level of monthly recordings. The farm was included as random effect to account for repeated monthly recordings and possible within-farm variability.

Model diagnostics were done using a simulation-based approach (DHARMa package, version 0.4.5, Hartig, 2022). Model assumptions regarding the distribution of residuals were satisfied. No misspecification regarding over-/underdispersion, zero-inflation, or presence of outliers were identified. Confidence intervals of 95% were calculated via bootstrap procedure (number of simulations: 1,000), as were p-values for single fixed effects, the latter using 'PBmodcomp' from the 'pbkrtests' package (version 0.5.1).

#### 3. Results

Cases of BM (with or without damage to the udder) occurred at all 21 participating farms during the seven-month survey period. The average monthly herd incidences ranged from 0.3 to 7.9%; the mean  $\pm$  SD over all herds was 2.2  $\pm$  1.9%. In addition, there was a high variance between monthly incidences within farms, ranging from 0.0 to 2.1% on farm 14 to 1.3 to 16.3% on farm 19 (Fig. 3). In absolute numbers, the incidences corresponded to 0 to 13 affected cows per herd and month in the present sample (mean  $\pm$  SD = 1.1  $\pm$  1.8). External damage to the udder indicating a horn thrust was visible in 38% of cases: the average monthly herd incidence varied between 0.0 and 4.1% (mean  $\pm$  SD = 0.7  $\pm$  0.9%). On six farms (farm 4, 6, 7, 12, 16, and 20), however, no cases of BM with visible damage to the udder (BMvD) were recorded during the period covered (Fig. 3).

Over the whole survey period, a total of 149 BM cases were recorded in 125 cows. With visible damage to the udder, 56 cases were recorded in 52 cows. Accordingly, four cows were affected twice. The majority of the 52 cows affected by BMvD were between the 2nd and 4th lactation (44%), followed by primiparous cows (33%). The proportion of older cows with more than four lactations was correspondingly 23%.

According to the farmers' subjective estimation of the cows' social

position in the herd, most of the individuals affected by BMvD were medium ranking (58%), followed by low-ranking cows (31%). Two of the cows affected twice were primiparous and low-ranking, the other two were older (>4 lactations) and medium ranking. Within the group of primiparous cows, 9 out of 17 (53%) were classified as low-ranking, the others as medium ranking.

Between herd incidences of BMvD during winter in the barn and mean number of horn-related integument damages, a low positive but non-significant correlation existed ( $r_s = 0.39$ , p = 0.132, n = 16).

Regarding the percentages of fulfilled guideline recommendations, there were marked differences between farms (Table 3). However, farms that met a high percentage of recommendations in one area were not necessarily 'good' in the other areas. The correlation coefficients between areas were at maximum in the range of moderate strength ( $r_s = 0.06-0.52$ , Appendix Table A1).

The multivariable analysis (Table 4) revealed a higher BMvD risk during the barn season compared to the season with pasture access (odds ratio (OR) = 2.39). At farm level, each percentage point of higher fulfilment of recommendations concerning 'feeding' and 'walking/activity' was associated with a lower BMvD risk (OR = 0.94 and 0.95, respectively). However, the effect of compliance in the area of 'walking/ activity', as well as in the areas 'milking', 'lying' and 'herd management' could not be statistically supported. The sum of fixed effects explained 26% of variance in the data set (marginal  $R^2$ ). The random effect contributed an additional 4% (conditional  $R^2 = 0.30$ ).

## 4. Discussion

The 21 herds studied were a convenience sample based on the voluntary participation of farms and thus probably reflect only part of the diversity within the German dairy farms with horned dairy cows in loose housing. However, official statistics and structural data on horned dairy herds at state or national level for an evaluation of the sample are not available.

#### 4.1. Incidences of blood in milk

During the seven-month survey period, each farm had at least one case of blood in milk that could be due to various causes. A large proportion of BM was not associated with a visible injury or swelling at the udder (BMvD), and thus unlikely induced by horn thrusts, even though this cannot completely be excluded. Other causes of BM may for example be hind limbs bruising the udder during parturition, especially in primiparous or high-yielding cows (Blowey, 2016). Particularly after calving also physiological or pathological changes may be responsible. Particularly as consequence of prolonged or severe udder oedema, the increased pressure can promote tissue damage and ruptured blood vessels (Blowey, 2016; Moroni et al., 2018). Beyond calving, BM may also be caused by impaired rising or lying down due to insufficient cubicle dimensions, unusual gaits or pendulous udders being knocked by the legs during walking, but also by external trauma from kicking or head butting (without horns) by conspecifics (Blowey & Edmondson, 2010; Moroni et al., 2018).

BMvD occurred with distinctly lower incidences and only in 15 of the 21 participating herds. BMvD and horn-related integument damages were positively correlated, but statistically non-significant and of low strength. A possible explanation is that horn thrusts directed towards the udder and leading to BM occur in specific situations and are not necessarily influenced by all farm factors that affect horn thrusts directed at other higher body regions (e.g., hindquarter, flank, or shoulder). On the other hand, the recording method might have introduced uncertainties: while integument damages were recorded by a trained experimenter in a standardised way, BM cases and udder damage were based on recordings by the farmers. Even though the farmers were informed by several years of active participation in the project, limited reliability cannot be ruled out.

In the scientific literature, hardly any comparative data on BM incidences can be found. To our knowledge, the occurrence of BM specifically in association with horn-related damage to the udder has not yet been systematically recorded. In automatic milking systems discoloration of milk due to blood admixture is recorded as an indicator of milk quality and udder health (review in Hovinen & Pyörälä, 2011), but the method of data recording and data analysis in single studies preclude comparison with the incidence values used here. For example, in a study on breeding traits in relation to AMS, Dechow et al. (2020) recorded the occurrence of BM daily on three dairy farms in the US including altogether 1,714 hornless cows. They found a total average daily percentage of 6.01 with a high standard deviation of 23.76 (compared to monthly incidences of  $2.2 \pm 1.9\%$  found in the present investigation). However, if BM occurred over several milkings, one animal was included several times in the analysis. Moreover, the automated recording of discoloration that was used can lead to false positives, e.g., in case of yellow colour associated with higher milk fat contents (review in Hovinen & Pyörälä, 2011).

## 4.2. Characteristics of affected cows

We hypothesized that particularly primiparous cows would be lower ranking due to lower body size, and experience (review in Bouissou et al., 2001; Lindberg, 2001). At the same time, in the process of establishing their social status in the herd, they might be involved in more agonistic interactions (Hasegawa et al., 1997), altogether leading to a higher risk for horn-induced BM in primiparous cows. In the sample studied, only one third of the affected cows were primiparous (33%), of which, however, 53% were categorised as low-ranking and no cow as high-ranking. Overall, cows between the 2nd and 4th lactation (44%) and cows of medium social rank (58%) were most affected. There are three possible interpretations of these results: (1) The fact that the proportion of affected cows with different lactation numbers corresponded approximately to the typical distribution within German dairy herds (VIT, 2021) suggests that the risk of BM was rather evenly distributed over the different lactation/age categories. (2) The farmers' judgement of the social ranks of the affected cows might have been biased, although in a study in 12 Swiss dairy herds with horned and hornless cows, farmer's estimations of their cows' social rank was consistent with frequencies of initiated versus received agonistic interactions based on systematic behavioural observations (Lutz et al., 2019). However, the farmers could have partly been influenced by their knowledge of the cows' age. In addition, they might have tended to assign a medium rank to most cows, if they were not particularly conspicuous individuals from the lower and upper end of the social hierarchy. (3) Although medium-ranking cows are sometimes reported to be intermediate in terms of social interactions and behavioural restriction, for example regarding feeding time (e.g., Val-Laillet et al., 2008), findings in the literature are mixed. Medium-ranking cows may also be involved in social conflicts more often as a higher fluctuation in the dominance order of dairy herds was found in the medium range compared to the upper and lower third (Arave et al., 1973; Arave & Albright, 1976; Oberosler et al., 1982). In addition, contrary to our expectation that primiparous and low-ranking cows experience many displacements due to the high number of dominant counterparts, it is also possible that these animals more often avoid conflicts with physical contact, if they have the possibility of withdrawal (Lindberg, 2001).

## 4.3. Effects of pasture and compliance with recommendations

The recording period of the present study covered similarly long periods with pasture access and with all day housing on all investigated farms. We expected more BMvD cases to occur in the winter barn season when all animals are kept indoors all day and are less able to avoid each other compared to pasture (Irrgang, 2012; Miller & Wood-Gush, 1991). This was confirmed in the present study, although on some farms or on

individual days only half-day grazing was provided and cows used resources in the barn during the second half of the day.

An earlier analysis of an extended sample of the herds studied here showed that the more guideline recommendations on barn resources and herd management were implemented on the farm, the less horn-related integument damage occurred (Knierim et al., 2020). Also, in relation to BMvD, the multivariable analysis revealed that a higher percentage of fulfilled recommendations in the areas of 'feeding' and in tendency of 'walking/activity' were associated with a lower risk of occurrence over the seven-month monitoring. No relationship to the sum of factors regarding 'milking', 'lying', and 'herd management' could be found. The factor 'feeding' summarises 12 recommendations, both on housing and on management aspects relating to an enhanced access to feed and better protection from other animals during feeding. The 'walking/activity' factor summarises 17 recommendations regarding housing and housing facilities that provide the animals with better opportunities for mutual avoidance in the walking area and in the use of resources (drinkers, cow brush, lickstone) located in the walking area (Table 2). The results suggest that horn thrusts against the udder in the sample studied occurred particularly in these barn areas and indicate that the risk for BMvD can be reduced accordingly by a combination of improvement measures in these areas. However, the lack of associations with recommendations in the areas of 'milking', 'lying' and 'herd management' should not be interpreted to mean that these areas are to be neglected. Although most of the recommendations developed for the prevention guide were considered in the present study (52 out of a total of 61), details on heifer integration as well as factors of the human-animal relationship, which were found to be associated to agonistic interactions and horn-related integument damage in previous studies (Menke et al., 1999; Schneider, 2010), could not be considered.

Specific indications whether the present guideline for the husbandry of horned dairy cows in loose housing should be adapted or extended regarding the prevention of horn-induced BM cannot be derived from the present study. For further examination and quantification of the effects of individual measures, broader epidemiological studies in larger samples or experimental studies under more controlled conditions would be necessary in the future.

## 4.4. Limitations of the study

In the present study, cases of BM were continuously recorded by the farmers and reported monthly. All farmers were familiar with BM and the evaluation whether milk is fit for human consumption due to legal requirements. However, they were not specifically trained in the assessment, and deviations in the evaluation of milk discoloration cannot be excluded. In future studies, it would be useful to provide farmers with a more precise definition of BM (i.e., using colour charts regarding the degree of coloration in milk, for example), and to train and test its use in advance to minimize potential differences in recording. Alternative detection methods, such as spectrophotometric measurements (Garro-Aguilar et al., 2023), could also be considered. Furthermore, despite the external inspection of the udder for visible damage, uncertainties remain regarding the causes of BM. For this, closer examination of affected udders, possibly including thermal imaging would be helpful.

## 5. Conclusion

We found large variation in incidences of blood in milk between different horned dairy herds. To a considerable degree they are likely due to agonistic interactions and resulting udder damage. The aim should be to reduce such cases. No age or social rank category of cows could be identified that are in general particularly vulnerable. However, in the investigated sample horn-induced blood in milk cases during summer with half- or full-day access to pasture were reduced compared to winter months with all-day indoor-housing. Apparently, pasture grazing may alleviate the social conflict potential between animals due to the extended space for movement and the different feeding situation compared to indoors. Moreover, higher compliance with existing practice recommendations for the prevention of horn-related integument damage on housing and management in the area of feeding and by tendency of walking/activity was associated with a lower blood in milk risk. The results suggest that the social conflict potential in these areas is also relevant for the occurrence of blood milk cases and can be mitigated by a combination of improvement measures.

## **Ethics** approval

The participation of farms in the study was voluntary. Farmers were assured that all information would be kept confidential and that results would only be published anonymously. A written declaration of participation was obtained from each farm before the start of the survey.

The study was performed in accordance with the "Guidelines for ethical treatment of animals in applied animal behaviour and welfare research" (International Society for Applied Ethology, 2017). It involved no handling causing the animals pain, suffering, distress, or harm. The commercial farms kept the cows in line with national law and guidelines.

## Data availability

As this study collected data from commercial farms, some of which are sensitive, none of the data are available in an official repository. On request, however, the data can be made available in anonymized form.

#### Author contributions

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

#### Funding

This research was funded by the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL) based on a decision of the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany via the Federal Office for Agriculture and Food (BLE) under the Federal Organic Farming Scheme (BÖLN), grant no. 2812NA104 'Horns in loosing housing: Accompanying dairy herds during the changeover from dehorned to horned animals or from tethered to loose housing with the inclusion of model farms as the basis for qualified consulting in dairy farming'.

## Ethical statement

Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, as approved by the Designated Veterinarian for Institutional Animal Care of the University of Kassel, because the cows did not undergo any experimental procedures and were only monitored by non-invasive clinical scoring. They were reared and kept for production for human consumption according to national law and guidelines, and not for experimental purposes. The study was conducted in accordance with the German Animal Protection Act (implementing the Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes) and the Guidelines for the Ethical Treatment of Animals in Applied Animal Behaviour and Welfare Research of the International Society for Applied Ethology (2017). International Society for Applied Ethology. (2017). Guidelines for Ethical Treatment of Animals in Applied Animal Behaviour and Welfare Research. https://www.appliedethology. org/res/EthicalGuidelinesISAErevised2017 for council meeting. pdf

#### CRediT authorship contribution statement

Asja Ebinghaus: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis,

Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft. **Julia Johns:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – review & editing, Project administration. **Ute Knierim:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

## **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Ebinghaus, Asja reports financial support was provided by Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Johns, Julia reports financial support was provided by Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL).

Knierim, Ute reports financial support was provided by Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL).

## Acknowledgements

Our sincere thanks go to the participating farmers for their openness, cooperation, and for sharing their data. We are grateful to our colleague Erhard Aubel for support in data collection, and to our student assistant Shamalla Zacharias for support in data preparation.

#### Appendix

Table A1

#### References

- Arave, C. W., & Albright, J. L. (1976). Social rank and physiological traits of dairy cows as influenced by changing group membership. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 59(5), 974–981.
- Arave, C. W., Albright, J. L., Yungblut, D. H., & Malven, P. V. (1973). Social status and physiological traits as affected by group interchange of dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 56(5), 667.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software, 67(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/ 10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- Blowey, R., & Edmondson, P. (2010). Mastitis control in dairy herds. In R. Blowey, & P. Edmondson (Eds.), *Mastitis Control in Dairy Herds* (2nd ed.). CABI. https://doi.org/ 10.1079/9781845935504.0000.
- Blowey, R. W. (2016). The veterinary book for farmers. *The veterinary book for dairy farmers* (4th ed.). 5M Publishing.
- Bouissou, M.-F., Boissy, A., Le Neindre, P., & Veissier, I (2001). The social behaviour of cattle. In L. J. Keeling, & H. W. Gonyou (Eds.), Social behaviour in farm animals (pp. 113–145). CABI.
- Collings, L. K. M., Weary, D. M., Chapinal, N., & Von Keyserlingk, M. A. G (2011). Temporal feed restriction and overstocking increase competition for feed by dairy cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 94(11), 5480–5486. https://doi.org/10.3168/ ids.2011-4370
- Cozzi, G., Gottardo, F., Brscic, M., Contiero, B., Irrgang, N., Knierim, U., Pentelescu, O., Windig, J. J., Mirabito, L., & Eveillard, F. K. (2015). Dehorning of cattle in the EU member states: A quantitative survey of the current practices. *Livestock Science*, 179, 4–11.
- de Vries, M., Bokkers, E. A. M., van Reenen, C. G., Engel, B., van Schaik, G., Dijkstra, T., & de Boer, I. J. M. (2015). Housing and management factors associated with indicators of dairy cattle welfare. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 118(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2014.11.016
- Dechow, C. D., Sondericker, K. S., Enab, A. A., & Hardie, L. C. (2020). Genetic, farm, and lactation effects on behavior and performance of US Holsteins in automated milking systems. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(12), 11503–11514.
- Garro-Aguilar, Y., Fernández, R., Calero, S., Noskova, E., Gulak, M., de la Fuente, M., Adell, A., Simón, E., Muzquiz, U., & Rodríguez-Piñón, D. (2023). Acute stressinduced changes in the lipid composition of cow's milk in healthy and pathological animals. *Molecules*, 28(3), 980.
- Hartig, F. (2022). DHARMa: Residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level /mixed) regression models (0.4.5). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMa.
- Hasegawa, N., Nishiwaki, A., Sugawara, K., & Ito, I. (1997). The effects of social exchange between two groups of lactating primiparous heifers on milk production, dominance order, behavior and adrenocortical response. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 51(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(96)01082-9
- Hovinen, M., & Pyörälä, S. (2011). Invited review: Udder health of dairy cows in automatic milking. Journal of Dairy Science, 94(2), 547–562.
- International Society for Applied Ethology. (2017). Guidelines for ethical treatment of animals in applied animal behaviour and welfare research. https://www.applied-etholo gy.org/res/EthicalGuidelinesISAErevised2017 for council meeting.pdf.

#### A. Ebinghaus et al.

Irrgang, N. (2012). Horns in cattle-implications of keeping horned cattle or not. University of Kassel.

- Irrgang, N., Zipp, K. A., Brandt, S., & Knierim, U. (2015). Effects of space allowance in the waiting area on agonistic interactions and heart rate of high and low ranking horned dairy cows. *Livestock Science*, 179, 47–53.
- Johns, J., & Knierim, U (2019). Effects of herd, housing and management conditions on horn-induced alterations in cows. In R. C. Newberry, & B. O. Braastad (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 53rd Congress of the ISAE, Animal lives worth living, 5th-9th August* 2019 (p. 266). Bergen, Norway: Wageningen Academic Publishers.
- Johns, J., Mück, U., Sixt, D., Kremer, H.-J., Poddey, E., & Knierim, U. (2019). Werkzeugkasten für die Haltung horntragender Milchkühe im Laufstall [Toolbox for the husbandry of horned dairy cows in loose housing]. https://orgprints.org/id/ep rint/40225/1/Werkzeugkasten\_Downloadversion\_final\_2019-10-15.pdf.
- Kling-Eveillard, F., Knierim, U., Irrgang, N., Gottardo, F., Ricci, R., & Dockès, A. C. (2015). Attitudes of farmers towards cattle dehorning. *Livestock Science*, 179, 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.012
- Knierim, U., Johns, J., Ebinghaus, A., Mück, U., Sixt, D., Poddey, E., & Kremer, H.-J. (2020). Schlussbericht: Begleitung von Milchviehherden bei der Umstellung von enthornten auf behornte Tiere oder von Anbinde- auf Laufställe unter Einbeziehung von Modellbetrieben als Basis für eine qualifizierte Beratung in der Milchviehhaltung. University of Kassel. https://orgprints.org/id/eprint/38406/1/Schlussberichtges amt.pdf.
- Krawczel, P. D., Klaiber, L. B., Butzler, R. E., Klaiber, L. M., Dann, H. M., Mooney, C. S., & Grant, R. J. (2012). Short-term increases in stocking density affect the lying and social behavior, but not the productivity, of lactating Holstein dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 95(8), 4298–4308. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4687
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). An application of hierarchical kappa-type statistics in the assessment of majority agreement among multiple observers. *Biometrics*, 363–374.

Lindberg, A. C (2001). Group life. In L. J. Keeling, & H. W. Gonyou (Eds.), Social behaviour in farm animals (pp. 37–58). CAB International.

- Lobeck-Luchterhand, K. M., Silva, P. R. B., Chebel, R. C., & Endres, M. I. (2015). Effect of stocking density on social, feeding, and lying behavior of prepartum dairy animals. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 98(1), 240–249. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8492
- Lutz, J., Burla, J.-B., Gygax, L., Wechsler, B., Würbel, H., & Friedli, K. (2019). Horned and dehorned dairy cows differ in the pattern of agonistic interactions investigated under different space allowances. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 218, Article 104819. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2019.05.008
  Menke, C. A. (1996). *Laufstallhaltung mit behornten Milchkühen*. Zurich: ETH.
- Menke, C. A. (1996). Laufstallhaltung mit behornten Milchkühen. Zurich: ETH. Menke, C., Waiblinger, S., Fölsch, D. W., & Wiepkema, P. R. (1999). Social behaviour and
- injuries of horned cows in loose housing systems. *Animal Welfare*, 8(3), 243–258. Miller, K., & Wood-Gush, D. G. M. (1991). Some effects of housing on the social behaviour of dairy cows. *Animal Science*, 53(3), 271–278.

- Mirabito, L., Veissier, I., Cozzi, G., Kling-Eveillard, F., Knierim, U., Windig, J. J., Pentelescu, O., Waiblinger, S., Velarde, A., & Dalmau, A. (2009). Final recommendations to DG-SANCO regarding alternatives to dehorning. Study on the Improved Methods for Animal-Friendly Production. Particular on Alternatives to the Castration of Pigs and on Alternatives to the Dehorning of Cattle. http://www.vuzv. sk/DB-Welfare/telata/calves\_alcasde\_D-2-3-3.pdf.
- Moroni, P., Nydam, D. V., Ospina, P. A., Scillieri-Smith, J. C., Virkler, P. D., Watters, R. D., Welcome, F. L., Zurakowski, M. J., Ducharme, N. G., & Yeager, A. E (2018). Diseases of the teats and udder. In S. F. Peek, & T. J. Divers (Eds.), *Rebhun's diseases of dairy cattle* (3rd ed., pp. 389–465). Elsevier.
- Oberosler, R., Carenzi, C., & Verga, M. (1982). Dominance hierarchies of cows on alpine pastures as related to phenotype. Applied Animal Ethology, 8(1–2), 67–77.
- Posit team. (2022). RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R (2022.12.0.353). Posit Software, PCS.
- Rasmussen, M. D., & Bjerring, M. (2005). Visual scoring of milk mixed with blood. Journal of Dairy Research, 72(3), 257–263. https://doi.org/10.1017/ S0022029905000853
- Schneider, C. (2010). Dimensionierung und Gestaltung von Laufställen für behornte Milchkühe unter Berücksichtigung des Herdenmanagements. University of Kassel [Dissertation].
- Stampa, F., Brunotte-Schütte, G., & Kalchreuter, S. (2006). Handbuch Mastitis (2nd ed.). Kamlage Verlag.
- Talebi, A., von Keyserlingk, M. A. G., Telezhenko, E., & Weary, D. M. (2014). Reduced stocking density mitigates the negative effects of regrouping in dairy cattle. *Journal* of Dairy Science, 97(3), 1358–1363. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6921
- Val-Laillet, D., de Passillé, A. M., Rushen, J., & von Keyserlingk, M. A. G. (2008). The concept of social dominance and the social distribution of feeding-related displacements between cows. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 111(1–2), 158–172.
- VIT. (2021). Trends, Fakten, Zahlen 2020. Vereinigte Informationssysteme Tierhaltung (VIT) w.V.
- von Keyserlingk, M. A. G., Olenick, D., & Weary, D. M. (2008). Acute behavioral effects of regrouping dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 91(3), 1011–1016. https://doi.org/ 10.3168/jds.2007-0532
- Waiblinger, S., Baars, T., & Menke, C. (2000). Understanding the cow-the central role of human-animal relationship in keeping horned dairy cows in loose housing. In Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop of the NAHWOA, Clermont-Ferrand (pp. 62–76). France.

#### Welfare Quality®. (2009). Welfare Quality® assessment protocol for cattle.

- Wierenga, H. K. (1984). Social behaviour of dairy cows: some differences between pasture and cubicle system. In J. Unshelm, G. van Putten, & & K. Zeeb (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Congress on Applied Ethology in Farm Animals, Kiel* (pp. 135–138). Kuratorium für Technik und Bauwesen in der Landwirtschaft.
- Windig, J. J., Hoving-Bolink, R. A., & Veerkamp, R. F. (2015). Breeding for polledness in Holstein cattle. *Livestock Science*, 179, 96–101.