EFFECTS OF MILK FEVER, KETOSIS, AND LAMENESS ON MILK YIELD IN DAIRY COWS

BU-1415-MA January, 1999

P.J. Rajala
Section of Epidemiology
College of Veterinary Medicine
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Y.T. Gröhn
Department of Clinical Veterinary Sciences
PO Box 57
FIN-00014 Helsinki University
Finland

C.E. McCulloch
Departments of Biometrics and Statistical Science
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Keywords: *metabolic diseases, milk yield, repeated measures, mixed model analysis.*

Abstract

The effects of milk fever, ketosis, and lameness were studied in 23, 416 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation (i.e., until culling or the next calving). Monthly test day milk yields were treated as repeated measurements within an animal in a mixed model analysis. Disease index variables were created to relate the timing of a disease to the test day milk measures. Statistical models for each parity and disease included fixed effects of calving season, stage of lactation, and disease index. An autoregressive correlation structure was used to model the association among the repeated measurements. Clustering of cows within herds was also accounted for in the model.

The milk yield of cows contracting milk fever was affected for a period of four to sex weeks after calving, the loss ranging from 1.1 to 2.9 kg/d, depending n parity and the time elapsed after mild fever diagnosis. In general, healthy cows produced 1.1 to 1.7 kg/d less milk than cows with mild fever. Milk yield started to decline two to four weeks before the diagnosis of ketosis and continued to decline for a varying time period after it. The daily milk loss was greatest within the 2 weeks after the diagnosis, varying from 3.0 kg/d to 5.3 kg.d, depending on parity. Cows in parity 4 or higher were most severely affected by ketosis, the total loss amounting to 353.4 kg. Lameness also affected milk yield: milk loss of cows diagnosed with foot and leg disorders varied between 1.5 and 2.8 kg/d during the first two weeks after the diagnosis.

ABSTRACT

The effects of milk fever, ketosis and lameness were studied in 23,416 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation (i.e., until culling or the next calving). Monthly test day milk yields were treated as repeated measurements within an animal in a mixed model analysis. Disease index variables were created to relate the timing of a disease to the test day milk measures. Statistical models for each parity and disease included fixed effects of calving season, stage of lactation, and disease index. An autoregressive correlation structure was used to model the association among the repeated measurements. Clustering of cows within herds was also accounted for in the model.

The milk yield of cows contracting milk fever was affected for a period of four to six weeks after calving, the loss ranging from 1.1 to 2.9 kg/d, depending on parity and the time elapsed after milk fever diagnosis. In general, healthy cows produced 1.1 to 1.7 kg/d less milk than cows with milk fever. Milk yield started to decline two to four weeks before the diagnosis of ketosis and continued to decline for a varying time period after it. The daily milk loss was greatest within the two weeks after the diagnosis, varying from 3.0 kg/d to 5.3 kg/d, depending on parity. Cows in parity 4 or higher were most severely affected by ketosis, the total loss amounting to 353.4 kg. Lameness also affect milk yield; milk loss of cows diagnosed with foot and leg disorders varied between 1.5 and 2.8 kg/d during the first two weeks after the diagnosis.

Key words: metabolic diseases, milk yield, repeated measures, mixed model analysis

INTRODUCTION

Milk fever and ketosis are metabolic diseases of dairy cows that occur at the time of calving or usually early in lactation, respectively. Lameness can, on the other hand, occur at any time during the lactation.

The literature gives controversial results on the effects of these diseases on milk yield. Dohoo and Martin (5) reported clinical ketosis and foot and leg disorders to have a beneficial effect on milk yield, and subclinical ketosis to have a detrimental effect. Detilleux et al. (4) found milk yield to be affected by ketosis, but despite that, the ketotic cows produced more than their healthy herd mates. Many studies have not found any association between milk fever and reduced milk yield (5, 10, 13). Several statistical approaches have been used to evaluate milk losses due to diseases. Some of the discrepancies found in the literature with regard to the effects of diseases on milk yield are likely to result from differing statistical methods and different measures of milk yield used.

The purpose of this study was to estimate the effects of milk fever, ketosis and lameness on milk yield in Finnish Ayrshire cows using monthly test day milk measures in a mixed model analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data

The data for this study were from 23,416 Finnish Ayrshire dairy cows that calved during 1993 and were followed until the next calving or culling. The cows were in herds that belonged to the milk registry and the national dairy cow health recording system. These data are a subset of a larger study population of 39,727 Finnish Ayrshire cows, which have been described earlier (11).

The veterinary diagnoses of milk fever, ketosis, and lameness were used for this study. Finnish farmers do not have access to veterinary drugs without supervision of a veterinarian so virtually all diseases were diagnosed and treated by a veterinarian during farm visits. Diagnoses were made according to ordinary clinical methods under normal field conditions. Only the first occurrence of the diseases was considered in this study. Calving dates, disease dates and dates for monthly test day milk sampling were available.

Monthly test day milk yields, taken at approximately 30 d intervals, were used to study the effects of milk fever, ketosis and lameness on milk yield. The lactation was divided into 17 stages: milk records taken within 60 d after calving were grouped by 10-d intervals, records from 61 to 180 d were grouped into 20-d intervals and records from 181 d on formed 30-d intervals. Only test day milk yields until 330 d after calving were considered.

Parity had four levels: 1, 2, 3, and 4 or higher. Four calving seasons were defined by 3-month intervals: winter, December to February; spring, March to May; summer, June to August; and fall, September to November.

***Milk fever*.** Only cows with no diseases during the study lactation (n=20,983) and such cows with milk fever that did not have any other diseases before and within 4 weeks after milk fever diagnosis (n=1,259) were included in the analyses. Only cows in parities 2, 3 and 4 or higher were considered. To relate the test day milk yields to the time of disease diagnosis, a disease index variable was created for each test day milk yield in order to study the effects of milk fever on milk yield. Two different ways of estimating the milk loss were tested: 1) the milk yield of the healthy cows and 2) the yield of the milk fever cows more than eight weeks after the diagnosis were used as the reference level.

The milk fever index variable, when the cow's own yield later in lactation was the reference, was defined as follows: 1 if the cow was healthy (i.e., had not been diagnosed with any disease during the lactation), 2 for test day yields collected within 14 d after the diagnosis, 3 for test day yields collected between 15 and 28 d after the diagnosis, 4 for test day yields collected between 29 and 42 d after the diagnosis, 5 for test day yields collected between 43 and 56 d after the diagnosis, and 6 for test day milk yields collected more than 56 d after the milk fever diagnosis (the reference level).

Ketosis. Only cows with no diseases during the study lactation (n=20,983) and cows with ketosis but no other diseases during the entire study lactation (n=719) were included in the analysis. In these analyses the milk yield level prior to disease onset (more than four weeks before the diagnosis of the disease) of the ketotic cows was used as the reference level.

The ketosis index was defined as follows:1 if the cow was healthy (i.e., had not been diagnosed with any disease during the entire lactation), 2 for test day yields collected between 15 and 28 d before the diagnosis, 3 for test day milk yields collected within 14 d before the diagnosis, 4 for test day yields collected within 14 d after the diagnosis, 5 for test day yields collected between 15 and 28 d after the diagnosis, 6 for test day yields collected between 29 and 42 d after the diagnosis, 7 for test day yields collected later than 42 d after the diagnosis, and 8 for test day milk yields collected more than 28 d before the ketosis diagnosis (the reference level).

Lameness. Only cows with no diseases (n=20,983) and cows with foot and leg disorders, but no other diseases within 4 weeks before and after the lameness diagnosis (n=455), were included in the analyses. To differentiate between cows with and without foot and leg disorders, a lameness index variable was created for each test day milk yield in order to study the effects of lameness on milk yield. It was defined as follows: 1 if the cow was healthy (i.e., had not been diagnosed with any disease during the lactation), 2 for test day yields collected between 15 and 28 d before the diagnosis, 3 for test day milk yields collected within 14 d before the diagnosis, 4 for test day yields collected within 14 d after the diagnosis, 5 for test day yields collected between 15 and 28 d after the diagnosis, 6 for test day yields collected between 29 and 42 d after the diagnosis, 7 for test day yields collected later than 42 d after the diagnosis, and 8 for test day milk yields collected more than 28 d before the diagnosis (the reference level).

Statistical analysis

Repeated measurements were present in both space and time. Cows within the same herd were clustered in space, and repeated measurements of daily milk yields of the same cow were correlated in time. What makes the repeated measures data analysis distinct from simple linear models is the covariance structure of the observed data. In a typical experiment utilizing repeated measures, two measurements taken at adjacent times are typically more highly correlated than two measurements taken several time points apart (9).

One type of statistical analysis that can be used for repeated measures is based on the mixed model with a special parametric structure for the covariance matrices. This type of methodology has been computationally feasible only in recent years and is applied in PROC MIXED of SAS, typically using the REPEATED statement (9). This procedure was used for these data with the monthly test day milk yields as the outcome variable. A cow usually has approximately 10 monthly test day milk yields recorded during a lactation. Because milk yield measurements from the same lactation for a cow are correlated, it is important to account for this correlation in estimating the effects of disease on milk yield.

In our previous study we compared three commonly used correlation structures (simple, compound symmetry and first-order autoregressive) and found the first-order autoregressive correlation structure to provide the best fit to these data (12).

In PROC MIXED, the standard linear model is generalized to form a mixed model: $\mathbf{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} + Z\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \epsilon$ with Var($\boldsymbol{\gamma}$)=G and Var(ϵ) = R, so that Var(**y**) = ZGZ' + R, where **y** = vector of test day milk yields, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ = vector of fixed effects, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ = random herd effects and ϵ = vector of random errors.

A correlation pattern can be modeled in PROC MIXED in two ways, by introducing a correlation pattern in the random effects $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ through a nonidentity matrix G, or by an R matrix so that it equals σ^2 multiplied by some nonidentity matrix.

The effects of milk fever, ketosis and lameness on test day milk yields were studied separately for each parity (i.e., parities 1, 2, 3, and 4 or higher). For milk fever the effects were studied also for parities 2 or higher together (pooled data). Calving season, stage of lactation, and disease variables were fixed effects in each model. Clustering of cows within herds was accounted for by indicating in the model, in the REPEATED statement, that cows were nested within herds.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The lactational incidence risks (LIR) of milk fever, ketosis and lameness and the number of cows with these disorders are presented in Table 1. Lactational incidence risks were calculated by dividing the number of cows with a disease by the total number of cows at risk and they are presented as percentages. Because LIR of milk fever among parity 1 cows was so low, data on parity 1 cows were excluded from the analysis. To avoid the confounding effect of any other diseases, only those milk fever cows with no other diseases before and within 4 weeks after the milk fever diagnosis were included in the analysis, even though some information was lost by excluding those other records. For the ketosis analysis only cows diagnosed with ketosis and no other diseases during the entire lactation were included to avoid the confounding effect of any other diseases. Also, only cows diagnosed with foot and leg disorders that did not have any other diseases within 4 weeks before or after the diagnosis were included in the study.

Calving season was a very significant factor in each model for all of the diseases. Cows calving during the fall were the highest producers and cows calving in spring and summer produced significantly less. In most models cows calving in winter did not significantly differ from cows calving in fall.

Milk fever

When yield of milk fever cows was compared with that of the healthy cows, milk fever did not have a clear milk reducing effect in our data. On the contrary, the results suggested that cows contracting milk fever were higher producing cows; two to four weeks after the disease cows in parities 2 or higher (the pooled data) milked on average 0.9 kg/d more, during the next two weeks they milked 1.2 kg/d more and during the remainder of lactation they milked 1.6 kg/d more than healthy cows (results not shown). Therefore, the milk yield of the milk fever cows more than eight weeks after the diagnosis was chosen as the comparison level. Milk yield at this point gives an indication about the cow's own potential and about what level she would have been at from the beginning of lactation had she not contracted milk fever.

Table 2 presents the results when the cow's own yield was used as the reference level. During the first two weeks after the diagnosis cows with milk fever in parities 2 or higher (the pooled data) produced 1.8 kg/d less milk than they did later on in the lactation. During the following two weeks the loss was 1.1 kg/d and during the next two weeks it was 0.5 kg/d (Table 2). In general, healthy cows produced 1.6 kg/d less than cows that contracted milk fever. Cows with milk fever in parity 2 produced 2.7 kg/d less milk during the first two weeks than later on in the lactation. In parity 3 the losses from milk fever during the three 2-week periods after calving were 2.9 kg/d, 1.6 kg/d and 1.2 kg/d, chronologically. The oldest cows lost 1.4 kg/d during the first two weeks after the diagnosis and 1.0 kg/d during the following two weeks. The healthy cows produced 1.1 to 1.7 kg/d less milk than cows with milk fever later in the lactation, depending on parity (Table 2).

Increasing milk yield has been found to be a risk factor for milk fever in several studies (1, 2, 6, 7, 11). However, results found in the literature state that milk fever is not associated with milk loss: Rowlands and Lucey (13) and Lucey et al. (10) reported no significant associations between hypocalcemia and milk yield. Also, Deluyker et al. (3) reported no association between milk yield and milk fever. Dohoo and Martin (5) found no direct effect of milk fever on milk yield, but they speculated that a negative association may have been masked by the positive association found between previous milk yield and the occurrence of milk fever.

Probably because of the method used to study the question of milk loss, these studies were not able to show any effect. Due to the fact that milk fever cows seem to be higher producing cows and that the disease occurs so early in lactation, it is difficult to show the milk reducing effect of the disease. When compared with the yield of the healthy cows, no negative effects can be seen as a consequence of milk fever; the milk yield just drops to the level of that of the healthy cows. If using 305-d milk yield as a milk measure, cows with milk fever still can produce more than healthy cows in spite of having contracted the disease and no effect can be seen. Our method of comparing the milk yield of cows with milk fever to their own yield potential later in lactation, however, enabled us to estimate the milk loss due to milk fever. Our estimates could still underestimate the true effect of milk fever if the cows had some other diseases that caused reduced milk yield more than eight weeks after calving (yield at that time was used as the reference level).

Ketosis

Ketosis had a significant negative effect on milk yield. The milk reducing effect started even before the diagnosis of clinical ketosis (Table 3), which agrees with the findings of Lucey et al. (10) who reported that milk yield declined for 2-4 weeks before diagnosis of ketosis. They estimated the total losses in milk yield associated with ketosis to be 60-70 kg, which is less than our estimates. In our study the milk loss continued for at least two weeks after diagnosis and the overall loss during the entire lactation e.g., in parity 1 and in parity 4 or higher was 126.0 kg and 535.4 kg, respectively (Table 3). In both of these parity groups the milk reducing effect started four weeks prior to the diagnosis. The daily milk loss was greatest within the first two weeks after the diagnosis, being 3.0 kg/d, 4.0 kg/d, 3.3 kg/d and 5.3 kg/d for parities 1, 2, 3, and 4 or higher, respectively. In parity 4 or higher the milk loss continued for the rest of the lactation. This could be an indication that these cows' energy requirements were not met. The healthy cows in parity 1 and in parity 4 or higher produced significantly less than the cows that contracted ketosis; healthy cows in parity 1 produced on average 1.1 kg/d and in parity 4 or higher 1.8 kg/d less milk than ketotic cows in the same parity.

This is in agreement with the results of Detilleux et al. (4), who also reported that ketotic cows yielded more milk over the entire lactation than did the healthy cows. They also reported a significant depression in the lactation curve of the ketotic cows in early lactation. Gröhn et al. (8) reported that cows with ketosis yielded significantly less milk per day both before and after diagnosis than did non-ketotic cows.

Dohoo and Martin (5), however, reported that a case of ketosis appeared to increase yield by approximately 2.5% and they attributed that to the initial and follow-up therapy followed after the diagnosis. Another possible, and maybe even more likely, explanation could be that cows with ketosis were higher producing and simply milked more even after contracting ketosis, as was found in our study. Rowlands and Lucey (13) reported an average significant reduction of 6-7 % in peak yield in lactations in which the cows had ketosis. There was, however, no overall significant difference in 305-d milk yield. All of these findings indicate that cows with ketosis are, in general, higher producing and that the milk loss often is only temporary.

Lameness

The lactational incidence risk of lameness (foot and leg disorders) was very low in our data, only 2.1 %. Our current data consisted of healthy cows and lame cows that had no other diseases within four weeks before and after the lameness diagnosis. Thus, we were able to exclude the confounding effect due to any other diseases occurring close to the lameness diagnosis. We compared the milk yield of cows with foot and leg disorders to their own yield more than four weeks before the diagnosis. Milk yield of cows in parity 1 began to decline two weeks before the clinical diagnosis of the disorder, the loss being 1.5 kg/d (Table 4). Within the first two weeks after the diagnosis the loss was 1.5 kg/d, during the following two weeks it was 1.6 kg/d and during the following two weeks the loss was 1.0 kg/d. The negative effect continued even longer, i.e., for the rest of the lactation, and the loss was 1.1 kg/d.

In parity 2 lameness had a negative effect on milk yield; however, it was not significant. The lactational incidence risk of lameness was lowest in parity 2 and a small sample size might partly explain why we were not able to detect significant effects. In parity 3, the loss during the first two weeks after the diagnosis was 2.0 kg/d (only of borderline significance, however) and during the following two weeks it was 2.2 kg/d. In parity 4 or higher, the milk reducing effect began two weeks before the diagnosis (2.6 kg/d) and continued for six weeks after the diagnosis; the loss was 2.8 kg/d, 2.8 kg/d and 1.7 kg/d during the three 2-week periods following the diagnosis. Only in parity four or higher did the healthy cows produce more milk (1.8 kg/d) than the cows with foot and leg disorders; among younger cows there was no significant difference. Dohoo and Martin (5) reported a large positive direct effect of foot and leg disorders on milk yield (expressed as kg of milk per day of life), the overall effect representing an increase of approximately 1.6 % in milk yield per day of life. Again, this could probably be explained by the fact that in their data cows with foot and leg disorders were higher producing cows. Also, Rowlands et al. (13) reported that cases of lameness were more common in cows which had higher than average peak milk yields and Deluyker et al. (3) reported that limping diagnosed within 49 d after calving coincided with higher daily yield during 1-5 d postpartum and higher cumulative yield up to 21 d and 49-119 d postpartum. That would agree with our observation that cows in parity 4 or higher produced 1.8 kg/d more milk than the healthy cows. Our estimates could be underestimating the true effect of lameness, if the cows had some other diseases causing reduced milk yield more than four weeks before the lameness diagnosis.

CONCLUSIONS

Milk fever affected milk yield for a period of four to six weeks after calving, the loss varying between 1.1 and 2.9 kg/d, depending on parity and the time elapsed after the diagnosis. Cows contracting milk fever were higher producers than healthy cows. Ketosis had a negative effect on milk yield; milk yield began to decline 2-4 weeks before the diagnosis of ketosis and the milk reducing effect continued for a varying length of time, depending on parity. The losses were greatest during the two weeks following the diagnosis (varying from 3.0 to 5.3 kg/d). Also, lameness had a negative effect on milk yield; cows in parity 1 were affected most.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study was supported by the Finnish Academy, Walther Ehrström Foundation, Foundation of Veterinary Medicine in Finland (Suomen eläinlääketieteen säätiö) and the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine in Helsinki University. This research was conducted using the resources of the Cornell Theory Center (Cornell University, Ithaca, NY), which receives major funding from the National Science Foundation (Arlington, VA) and New York State with additional support from the Advanced Research Projects (Arlington, VA), the National Center for Research Resources at the National Institute of Health (Bethesda, MD), IBM Corporation (Armonk, NY), and other members of the Centers Corporate Partnership Program. The work of Charles E. McCulloch was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9625476.

REFERENCES

1. Bendixen, P. H., B. Vilson, I. Ekesbo, and D. B. Åstrand. 1987. Disease Frequencies in Dairy Cows in Sweden. III. Parturient paresis. Prev. Vet. Med. 5:87-97.
2. Bigras-Poulin, M., A. H. Meek, and S. W. Martin. 1990. Interrelationships among health problems and milk production from consecutive lactations in selected Ontario Holstein cows. Prev. Vet. Med. 8:15-24.
3. Deluyker, H. A., J. M. Gay, L. D. Weaver, and A. S. Azari. 1991. Change of milk yield with clinical diseases for a high producing dairy herd. J. Dairy Science 74:436-445.
4. Detilleux, J. C., Y. T. Gröhn, and R. L. Quaas. 1994. Effects of Clinical Ketosis on Test Day Milk Yields in Finnish Ayrshire Cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 77:3316-3323.
5. Dohoo, I. R. and S. W. Martin. 1984. Disease, production and culling in Holstein-Friesian cows. IV. Effects of disease on production. Prev. Vet. Med. 2:755-770.
6. Dohoo, I. R., S. W. Martin, A. H. Meek, and W. C. D. Sandals. 1984. Disease, production and culling in Holstein-Friesian cows III. Disease and production as determinants of disease. Prev. Vet. Med. 2:671-690.
7. Gröhn, Y. T., H. N. Erb, C. E. McCulloch, and H. S. Saloniemi. 1989. Epidemiology of Metabolic Disorders in Dairy Cattle: Association Among Host Characteristics, Disease and Production. J. Dairy Sci. 72:1876-1885.
8. Gröhn, Y. T., J. J. McDermott, Y. H. Schukken, J. A. Hertl, and S. W. Eicker. 1998. Analysis of correlated continuous repeated observations: Modeling the effect of ketosis on milk yield in dairy cows. submitted to Prev. Vet. Med. .

9. Littell, R. C., G. A. Milliken, W. W. Stroup, and R. D. Wolfinger. 1996. SAS System for Mixed Models. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc. 633 pp.

10. Lucey, S., G. J. Rowlands, and A. Russell. 1986. Short-term associations between disease and milk yield of dairy cows. J. Dairy Res. 53:7-15.

11. Rajala, P. J. and Y. T. Gröhn. 1998. Disease occurrence and risk factors analysis in Finnish Ayrshire cows. Acta Vet. Scand. 39:1-13.

12. Rajala, P. J. and Y. T. Gröhn. 1998. Effects of dystocia, retained placenta and metritis on milk yield in Finnish Ayrshire cows. Accepted to J. Dairy Sci. .

13. Rowlands, G. J. and S. Lucey. 1986. Changes in milk yield in dairy cows associated with metabolic and reproductive disease and lameness. Prev. Vet. Med. 4:205-221.

Table 1. Lactational incidence risks (%) of milk fever[1], ketosis[2] and lameness[3] and number of cases of each disease by parity in 23,416 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation (until the next calving or culling).

Disease	Parity 1	Parity 2	Parity 3	Parity 4+	Overall
Milk fever	0.2 (14)	1.1 (63)	5.7 (215)	16.7 (967)	5.7 (1259)
Ketosis	2.5 (178)	3.2 (182)	4.2 (157)	4.1 (202)	3.3 (719)
Lameness	2.5 (185)	1.3 (75)	1.7 (61)	2.8 (134)	2.1 (455)

[1] cows with milk fever and no other diseases before or within four weeks after the diagnosis
[2] cows with ketosis and no other diseases during the entire lactation
[3] cows with foot and leg disorders and no other diseases within four weeks before and after the lameness diagnosis

Table 2. Effects of milk fever on milk yield (kg) by parity in 22,242 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation[1].

	Parity $\geq$ 2		Parity 2		Parity 3		Parity 4+	
Effect[2]	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
0-14 d AD	-1.8***	0.2	-2.7*	1.1	-2.9***	0.5	-1.4***	0.3
15-28 d AD	-1.1***	0.2	1.4	0.9	-1.6**	0.5	-1.0***	0.3
29-42 d AD	-0.5**	0.2	-1.3	0.9	-1.2**	0.4	-0.4	0.2
43-56 d AD	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	0.7	-0.6	0.4	-0.3	0.2
healthy	-1.6***	0.1	-0.9	0.7	-1.7***	0.3	-1.1***	0.2
Total loss[3]	-47.6		-37.8		-79.8		-33.6	

[1] Yield of the cows with milk fever more than eight weeks after the diagnosis was used as the reference level.

[2] Period when the test day milk sample was collected with respect to the diagnosis of the disease (AD= after diagnosis)

[3] Total loss =Σ (14 * a significant daily loss in each period)

* $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$

Table 3. Effects of ketosis on milk yield (kg) by parity in 21,702 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation[1].

	Parity 1		Parity 2		Parity 3		Parity 4+	
Effect[2]	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
28-14 d BD	-1.2*	0.6	-1.5	1.0	-1.2	0.9	-2.1*	0.8
1-14 d BD	-1.7***	0.5	-2.7***	0.8	-1.5*	0.7	-4.9***	0.8
0-14 d AD	-3.0***	0.5	-4.0***	0.9	-3.3***	0.8	*5.3***	0.8
15-28 d AD	-1.5**	0.5	-2.3**	0.9	-0.5	0.8	-2.6***	0.8
28-42 d AD	-1.6**	0.5	-1.4	0.9	-0.2	0.8	-3.2***	0.8
>42 d AD	-0.8	0.5	-1.5	0.8	0.9	0.8	-1.2***	0.8
Healthy	-1.1*	0.5	-1.5	0.8	0.3	0.8	-1.8*	0.8
Total loss[3]	-126.0		-126.0		-67.2		-535.4	

[1] Milk yield of the cows with ketosis more than 4 weeks before disease diagnosis was used as the reference level.

[2] Period when the test day milk sample was collected with respect to the diagnosis of the disease (BD= before diagnosis, AD = after diagnosis)

[3] The total loss was calculated assuming a 305 d lactation and ketosis occurring on day 28.

* $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$

Table 4. Effects of lameness on milk yield (kg) by parity in 21,438 Finnish Ayrshire cows that calved in 1993 and were followed for one lactation[1].

	Parity 1		Parity 2		Parity 3		Parity 4+	
Effect[2]	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
28-14 d BD	-0.3	0.4	-1.0	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.1	0.7
1-14 d BD	-1.5***	0.4	-0.9	1.1	-0.4	0.8	-2.6**	0.8
0-14 d AD	-1.5***	0.4	-0.9	0.9	-2.0	1.1	-2.8***	0.8
15-28 d AD	-1.6***	0.4	-0.5	1.1	-2.2*	0.9	-2.8***	0.8
28-42 d AD	-1.0*	0.5	-0.7	1.0	-0.8	1.1	-1.7*	0.8
>42 d AD	-1.1**	0.4	-0.3	1.0	-0.6	0.9	-0.8	0.7
Healthy	-0.3	0.3	-0.5	0.8	-0.7	0.8	-1.8**	0.7
Total loss[3]	-310.5		-		30.8		-138.6	

[1] Milk yield of cows with foot and leg disorders more than 4 weeks before the disease diagnosis was used as the reference level.

[2] Period when the test day milk sample was collected with respect to the diagnosis of the disease (BD= before diagnosis, AD = after diagnosis)

[3] The total loss was calculated assuming a 305 d lactation and lameness occurring on day 52.

* $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$