

Important notes:

Do NOT enter author and affiliation information on this document. You will be able to enter this information online when you submit the abstract.

Do NOT write outside the boxes. Any text or images outside the boxes **will be deleted**.

Do NOT alter the structure of this document. Simply enter your title and abstract in the gray boxes. The document will be automatically processed – if you alter its structure your submission will not be processed correctly.

Title: (Use Normal style. Only capitalise the first letter of the first word. No full stop at the end of the title)

A comparison of sole lesion development for Norwegian Dairy Cattle and Holstein Friesian dairy cattle on three different systems in lactation 1 and 2

Summary: (Your summary must use Body text style and must not be longer than this box)

Introduction Sole lesions and lameness are significant problems for dairy cow production and welfare. Producers are increasingly incorporating non-Holstein genetics into the make-up of dairy herds for a number of reasons, particularly to promote improved fertility and health. However, much of the evidence that alternative breeds improve hoof health characteristics is anecdotal. The aim of the present study was to assess the effects of Holstein Friesian (HF) and Norwegian dairy cattle (N) genotypes on lameness parameters in dairy cattle within different production systems.

Material and methods Following calving, HF (n = 39) and N (n = 45) heifers were allocated to one of three dietary treatments (high level of concentrate (“High”), low level of concentrate (“Low”), and grass-based (“Grass”), referred to as “Diet” in the model). Treatments were balanced for breed. In Lactation 1 and 2 animals on the “Low” treatment were offered a diet of grass silage and concentrate at a ratio of 70:30 and 65:35, respectively for the first 100d of lactation. After 100d of lactation the grass silage to concentrate ratio changed to 80:20 and 75:25, for Lactations 1 and 2 respectively. Animals offered the “High” treatment received a diet of grass silage and concentrate at a ratio of 40:60 and 35:65 for the first 100d of Lactation 1 and 2 respectively. Similar to the “Low” cows, the proportion of concentrates was reduced 100d post-calving to 50:50 and 45:55, in Lactations 1 and 2 respectively. “High” and “Low” animals were continuously housed indoors on a rotational system so that they spent similar amounts of time on slatted and solid concrete floors and were exposed to similar conditions produced by automatic scrapers. Animals on the “Grass” treatment grazed from Spring to Autumn in both years of the study, so that most animals on this treatment grazed from around peak to late lactation. Pathways used by “Grass” cows when moving to and from the parlour were mainly stone/dust lanes with short segments on grass and concrete. While housed, “Grass” cows were offered a diet based on grass silage with a low level of concentrate supplementation. In Lactation 1 “Grass” cows were offered a diet with a grass silage to concentrate ratio of 55:45 from calving to turnout. In Lactation 2 “Grass” cows were offered a total mixed ration with 9 kg of concentrates per day and fresh grass silage. Both hind hooves of each animal were scored for sole lesions 4 times during both the first and second lactations, at 4 observation periods during lactation as follows: (1) -8 to 70d post-calving, (2) 71 to 150d post-calving, (3) 151 to 225d post-calving, and (4) 226 to 364d post-calving. Sole lesions were scored for severity and extent of the hoof affected, using the methodology described by Livesey *et al.* (1998) and the hoof map described by Greenough and Vermunt (1991). Lesion scores over the 6 zones of the sole were added to obtain cumulative lesion scores for the whole claw (zones 1 to 6, “total lesion score”) and for the sole (zones 4 to 6) and white line (zones 1 to 3) separately. Scores for both hind claws were added so that each animal had one score. Data were analysed using each observation as a repeated measure in a REML variance components analysis with Lactation, Period (during lactation), Diet, Breed and interaction terms as fixed effects.

Results All cumulative lesion scores were higher in Lactation 1 than in Lactation 2 ($P < 0.001$ for total, sole, and white line lesion scores). Total cumulative lesion scores were highest in Period 2, which corresponds with peak lactation. Breed and Diet effects are shown in Table 1. HF cows had higher total lesion scores and higher white line lesion scores than N. Cows on the “Grass” treatment had higher total lesion and sole lesion scores compared to the “Low” treatment. There were no significant interactions between breed and diet.

Table 1 Breed and diet effects on hoof lesion scores

	Breed				Diet				
	HF	N	s.e.d	P	Grass	High	Low	s.e.d	P
Total Lesion Score	11.46	9.38	1.30	0.047	12.4 ^b	10.16 ^{a,b}	8.71 ^a	1.58	0.023
Sole Lesion Score	6.1	4.99	0.81	n.s.	6.95 ^b	5.23 ^{a,b}	4.45 ^a	0.98	0.009
White Line Lesion Score	5.37	4.39	0.56	0.023	5.43	4.93	4.28	0.68	n.s.

Conclusions These results show that both breed and nutritional/housing regimes influence the development of hoof lesions in dairy cows. The reduced levels of total lesions and white line lesions indicate potential breed differences in relation to predisposition to development of lameness. The increased levels of sole lesions in cattle on the “Grass” rather than the “Low” treatment merits further investigation of both nutritional effects and environmental aspects, for example the condition of laneways required to access pasture.

Acknowledgements The authors gratefully acknowledge funding from AgriSearch and DARDNI.

References

Greenough, P.R. and Vermunt, J.J. 1991. Veterinary Record. 128, 11-17.
Livesey, C.T., Harrington, T., Johnston, A.M., May, S.A., and Metcalf, J.A. 1998. Animal Science. 67, 9-16.

1. Submitting a summary

A. Important Information

1. A summary template was attached to your registration email. - This is a Microsoft Word file which is designed to ensure that your summary is prepared in the right way for publication. Please save this template file to your PC's hard drive and use it when you prepare your summary. Please do not alter the margins or A4 page size.
2. If you are submitting more than one summary you can use the same email address and password for each summary.
3. Summaries are required for all papers and posters. Summaries **MUST** be submitted using the template form provided. Please use the content of the template for guidance.
4. Each summary must fit within the summary template and use the 'Times New Roman' font and size as specified in the guidelines.

B. Preparation of Your Summary

1. The names of authors and their affiliations (institutions) will be submitted on-line when you submit the summary.
2. The title should be as brief as possible but long enough to indicate clearly the nature of the study. Only capitalise the first letter of the first word. No full stop at the end of the title.
3. Summaries should state briefly and clearly the purpose, methods, results and conclusions of the work. Please use the following headings in your summary.

Introduction:	Clearly state the purpose of the summary
Material and methods:	Describe your selection of observations or experimental subjects clearly including the method of statistical analysis (eg ANOVA) that you used.
Results:	Present your results in a logical sequence in text, tables and illustrations
Conclusion:	Emphasise new and important aspects of the study and conclusions that are drawn from them

4. Open the template file and enter your summary into it following the instructions above and given in the template. Save it and make a note of its saved location. **Please always save as a word file with the extension .doc (not word 2007 docx).**

C. The Submission Process

1. Log in to the submission system when your summary is completed and ready to send. To log in, enter your email address and the password you chose when you registered with the system.
2. When you click the "log in" button you will be taken to a screen from which the submission process starts. Please read the instructions on this screen carefully. If you have not yet submitted a summary to the system you should click the link that says "Click here to submit a new summary".
3. Submitting a summary is a multi-step process. Each step asks several questions:
 - Step 1: click the "Browse" button and locate your summary file on your PC's hard disk. Fill in answers to any other questions on this screen and then click the "Next" button. Your summary file will be sent to our system – this can take a few seconds if you have a fast internet connection, but may take longer if your connection is slow or you have included lots of graphics in your summary. Please be patient!
 - Step 2: you can copy the summary title from your Word document and paste it into the Title field on the submission form. Please note that because of web browser limitations some scientific symbols may not paste correctly into the form – you may have to correct this by writing the name of the symbol in full, for example "beta" instead of β . Your Word document will not be affected.
 - All steps: some questions are marked "Mandatory". We cannot accept your summary until these questions have been answered.
 - All steps: if you do not know the answer to a question – for example you may not be sure in which category your summary should be presented – you can skip the question and return on a later occasion to complete it.

- Final step: once you have completed this step click the “Finish” button. If you have answered all the mandatory questions then your summary will be assigned a reference number and you will receive email confirmation. If you have not answered all the mandatory questions your summary will be held in temporary storage until you return later and complete all the questions.

2. Amending a submission

You may wish to change your answers to some of the questions on the submission form, or even to change the summary file itself.

1. Log in to the submission system
2. You will see a list of the summaries that you have submitted. Click on the summary that you wish to change.
3. The process of amending a summary is the same as the original submission process, except that the submission form will be automatically filled in with the answers that you gave previously – you don’t have to change an answer if you don’t want to.
4. If you want to change your summary file you can click the “Browse” button to locate the revised file on your PC’s hard disk, then click “Next” to send it to the summary system. If you don’t want to change the file, just press “Next” to bypass this step.
5. When you reach the final step and press “Finish” you will be sent an email confirming that your summary has been amended – provided you have answered all the mandatory questions.

3. Withdrawing a summary

If you want to withdraw a summary please contact the conference administrator.

Bridget Hilton at bsas@sac.ac.uk, telephone +44 (0)131 445 4508, Fax +44 (0) 131 535 3103

BSAS/WPSA AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FORUM
Guidelines for the Preparation of Summaries for the Conference
12-14 April 2010, Queen's University, Belfast

A one-page summary allows BSAS/WPSA/Agricultural Research Forum to referee your proposed paper for scientific content, ethics, presentation and relevance. It may be published in the series Advances in Animal Biosciences or British Poultry Abstracts and must be suitable for use as a scientific reference. Submission of a summary is deemed a commitment to present the paper. Previews will not be accepted. Please ensure all authors are in agreement with being identified as being associated with the paper.

Deadline date for the receipt of summaries 31 October 2009

COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS

Where results on commercial products are being presented, authors should ensure, before submitting their summary, that both their organisation and the commercial company involved give permission to publish.

CONTENT

Summaries should be complete in themselves. The title should be descriptive, specific, and concise. It should state the species concerned. It should replace information otherwise found in the main text. The name of the presenting author should appear first. The Introduction should first state the background and objectives of the work. The Material and methods should describe clearly the methods used, including numbers and types of animals. The Results obtained, together with relevant statistical analysis should be presented in sufficient detail to support the conclusions drawn. The Conclusions should clearly state the author's view of the implications of the results to scientific understanding and practical use. Vague sentences are not acceptable. Authors will be asked to rewrite substandard summaries or the summary may be rejected. Changes and corrections in titles and authors, other than those requested are to be avoided. The summary should be discussed with any co-authors and read critically by a colleague who has not been closely involved. References should be given where appropriate and acknowledgements kept specific to the work being reported.

Statistical analyses and presentation of results

Statistical conventions should be those used in Animal. A copy of this can be obtained at www.animal-journal.eu/statistical.

- The experimental design and statistical methods must be clear. Experiments where treatments and pens (or groups) of animals are confounded are not acceptable.
- Treatment means should be presented with appropriate standard errors of means or differences. The minimum number of decimal places required to demonstrate significant differences should be used.
- Probability values must be presented to support conclusions. Probability levels of $P > 0.05$ are NOT significant.
- The use of percentages should be avoided wherever possible; concentrations or compositions should be expressed as mass per unit mass or mass per unit volume; decimal proportions should be used for common ratios such as digestibilities.
- The results of surveys will be accepted if the work has been conducted with the same scientific rigour as designed experiments

Format

The summary including any tables or figures must fit on to the one page template format A4, justified. Please do not alter the template or margins in anyway. **PLEASE USE .doc format. If you are working with WORD 2007 then please save as a lesser version .doc not .docx**

Typographical Conventions

Typographical conventions should be those used in Animal. A copy of this can be obtained at http://www.animal-journal.eu/documents/Instructions_to_authors.pdf

Please observe the following:

- i. **Title** On the first line type the title of the paper in Normal style (Times New Roman 12) lower case. The title should be two lines maximum and not have a full stop (point) at the end. No abbreviations please. Do not type anything above or below the title in the title box (author names and affiliations are added at a later stage).
- ii. **Text** Type the entire text of the summary with single spacing in Body text style (Times New Roman 10). Please ensure that British English spelling is used. Different sections (introduction, material and methods, etc.) should be separated by one clear line; section headings should be in bold and text should begin on the same line as the heading (see example). Summaries printed in smaller font sizes will be returned. Please use font Times New Roman. The summary may contain graphs and / or tables which complement the text. Summaries should be justified left and right, not centred on the page.
- iii. **Figures/Tables** Please ensure that the font size in a table is font size 10 (not bold or italics) and in Times New Roman. Graphs should be in black and white, with no border on the legend or the graph itself. Only

horizontal single lines (equal thickness) should be used in the table (see example). Table titles should be numbered sequentially and presented above the Table.

Figure titles should be numbered sequentially and presented underneath the Figure. All figures and tables must be supplied in black/white or grey scale mode. **We cannot accept figures, tables or text in colour or RGB.**

iv. **Acknowledgements** Please ensure that funders of the work are duly acknowledged.

v. **References.** Other studies referred to in the body of the summary should refer to the Author(s) and the year of the study. The list of references should be presented at the end of the summary in Times New Roman font size 10. In general the format of the references should follow the recommendations of Animal (Author(s) surname and initials, year, full title of the journal vol, pages.) however, the title of a Journal article or abstract need not be included (see example). References should be listed alphabetically by first author surname. No more than 5 references should be given

Please ensure that the layout corresponds with the example summary.

Checklist for summaries:

- Is British English used throughout the summary?
- Is the complete summary presented in black and white, including graphs and tables?
- Do the font size and styles conform to summary guidelines?
 - o Title: Times New Roman, bold, Font size 12, Lower case
 - o Summary: Times New Roman, Font size 10
 - o Section headings: Times New Roman, bold, Font size 10, immediately preceding the text of the section
 - o Tables and graphs: Times New Roman, Font size 10
- Do the tables conform to summary guidelines?
 - o Font: Times New Roman, Font size 10 (no bold or italic font)
 - o Borders: Only horizontal single lined borders used and kept to a minimum
- Do the graphs/images conform to summary guidelines
 - o Font: Times New Roman, Font size 10 (no bold or italic font)
 - o Borders: The graph/image should not be framed with a border
 - o Colour: Graphs/images are presented in Black and White
- Do the results comply with the statistical conventions used for Animal?
- Have the funding organisations that supported the work been acknowledged?
- Have all authors (and relevant funding bodies and/or commercial) agreed to the submission and publication of this summary in its current form?