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Summary

This work seeks to address questions regarding the use of dried manure solids (DMS) as bedding for dairy cows, specifically the relationship of DMS bedding to herd health. The concentration of pathogens in bedding, on teat ends and their relationship to mastitis is discussed in this review of the literature. Caution is needed in reviewing data since concentration based on wet weight vs. dry weight vs. volume will be different. There can also be a seasonal effect on bacterial numbers.

There are two types of bedding, organic and inorganic. Organic bedding materials contain nutrients needed for bacterial growth, while inorganic bedding materials do not. However, once any type of bedding becomes soiled (with fecal matter and urine), pathogen growth can be supported. Inorganic bedding, such as sand, may start out with low pathogen concentrations. Some organic bedding materials start out with lower concentrations than others. However, research shows that within 24-48 hours of being in the stall, pathogen levels in all organic bedding materials rise to similar concentrations. The addition of lime to the stalls is not supported by the literature.

The desirable frequency with which fresh organic bedding is added to the stalls is unclear. While “common wisdom” suggests frequent rebedding, the research literature indicates that pathogen levels peak after a couple of days and may decline thereafter. This may be a result of bacteria having eaten up the available nutrients and that frequent rebedding provides a new source of food resulting in higher bacterial counts. More work is needed on this subject.

The literature shows inconsistency regarding the relationship of bacterial concentrations in bedding to the bacterial concentration on teat ends. Factors such as particle size may be more important than simply bacterial counts in the used bedding. The relationship of teat end counts to mastitis is unclear and is reviewed below.

 Researchers have generally stated the rule of thumb that bedding materials should be kept below a maximum bacterial count of $10^6$ colony forming units (cfu) per gram of bedding wet weight. This number appears to be based on one study where there were no new cases of coliform mastitis when bedding counts were at $10^4$ and $10^5$ one summer, but there were several new cases the following summer when bedding counts were at $10^7$ cfu/g wet weight (Bramley and Neave, 1975). This paper does not claim that $10^6$ colony forming units (cfu) per gram of bedding wet weight is a critical level and it represents data from only two summers on one farm. A few studies show a correlation between the number of bacteria in the bedding and/or the number on the teat ends and mastitis while a number of studies show no correlation. Few studies examined the relationship between bedding pathogens and milk quality.

Several studies have been conducted on the differences between herds that have low average SCC counts and herds that have high average SCC counts. Other studies look at the value of SCC count in determining intra-mammary infection (IMI) status in herds. High SCC is correlated with decreased milk production. SCC is measured both with a bulk tank sample (BTSCC) and with individual milk samples from each cow. BTSCC can be a good indicator of a herd’s general udder health status, with high BTSCC generally indicating a problem with contagious mastitis. Herds with lower BTSCC have lower subclinical mastitis and better general udder health. However, the presence of leucocytes in the udder helps protect it from getting other mastitis, therefore low SCC (less than 20,000) appears to predispose cows to getting environmental mastitis. By looking at individual cow SCC over a period of several months, patterns can be established for each cow. Spikes in individual cow SCC usually indicate environmental mastitis and are often short in duration. When SCC is done on a monthly or other low frequency basis, these spikes may be missed. Thus typical BTSCC cannot generally be used to diagnose environmental mastitis at the herd level unless it is pervasive and persistent.

The impact of bedding, cleanliness of the udder and/or legs on the mastitis rate of a herd is unclear. Bedding may play a role in the cleanliness of the udder, and pre-milking udder hygiene may play a role in the amount of mastitis seen.
Other issues that may affect intramammary infection in dairy herds include stage of lactation and the dry period, parity (number of lactations), milking and milking machine factors including the use of post milking dips, teat end roughness and callosity, seasons of the year, nutrition, and housing conditions other than bedding.

Introduction

Dairy farms in NYS are under increasing pressure to improve their management of manure. Increasing environmental regulation and neighbor odor concerns are factors encouraging the separation of manure solids rather than direct spreading of manure. Implementation of anaerobic digestion on farms for energy recovery and for odor management also generates manure solids. Thus, the need for a use for the separated solids becomes ever more apparent.

Bedding is a costly and time consuming component of dairy farming that has implications for herd health as well as the environment and economics. The cost and availability of bedding fluctuates and good consistent bedding can be hard to find and expensive. Some bedding materials (i.e. straw and sawdust) result in additional nutrients being brought onto the farm, adding to nutrient management concerns.

In the northeast, there is increasing interest in and some limited experience with the use of dried manure solids, the semi-solid (25% solids) material derived from a manure stream run through a separator (DMS) for bedding. While interest is high, there is resistance on the part of some veterinarians, farm advisors, and farmers to using DMS as bedding primarily due to concerns that use of DMS will cause elevated levels of environmental pathogens that may negatively affect udder health (increased environmental mastitis) and milk quality.

The potential financial savings of using dried manure solids (DMS) are substantial and the potential to avoid bringing additional nutrients in bedding materials onto the farm is another benefit. Farmers using dried manure solids (DMS) report greater cow comfort than with other bedding materials they have used.

Mastitis is a costly disease to the dairy farmer. It is broken down into contagious mastitis (caused by bacteria that are found in the mammary gland and spread from cow to cow largely through the milking process), and environmental mastitis (caused by bacteria that live in the environment and spread through exposure to them in the environment). Control of contagious mastitis is sought through milking hygiene, the use of teat dips, treatment of infected animals in lactation, culling of animals with chronic infections, and dry cow anti-biotic therapy. Control of environmental mastitis is sought through stall and animal hygiene and through improvement of host resistance.

Because mastitis is frequently sub-clinical, a number of tests have been developed for detecting mastitis. Most tests estimate the somatic cell count (SCC) of a milk sample. All milk contains white blood cells known as leucocytes which constitute the majority of somatic (derived from the body) cells. It has been generally accepted that the cell count for “normal” milk is nearly always less than 200,000 cells/ml. Higher counts are considered abnormal and indicate probable infection. SCC can be done on individual cows or on bulk tank milk samples. Elevated SCC for environmental mastitis are often short-lived, so periodic SCC counts are less useful in evaluating environmental mastitis infections. High SCC has been associated with milk yield loss.

Low levels of leucocytes in the mammary gland may increase the incidence of infection by environmental pathogens such as coliforms. Herds that have effectively controlled contagious mastitis pathogens (Streptococcus agalactiae, Streptococcus dysgalactiae, and Staphylococcus aureus) through programs of postmilking teat disinfection and dry-cow therapy, tend to have more problems with environmental mastitis pathogens.

The following bacteria are those commonly considered mastitis pathogens:

Contagious pathogens:
- *Staphylococcus aureus*
- *Streptococcus agalactiae* and *Streptococcus dysgalactiae*, to a lesser extent also *S. uberis*.
- Mycoplasmas

**Environmental pathogens:**
- *Streptococcus* species (other than the above)
- *Enterococcus* species
- Coliform bacteria (including: *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella* species, and *Enterobacter* species)
- *Pseudomonas* species
- *Proteus*
- *Serratia* species
- *Prototheca*
- *Corynebacterium* species

The following is a summary of research literature on the contribution of bedding to cow health and milk quality and other issues pertaining to bedding material.

**Bacterial Counts in Bedding**

There are two types of bedding, organic and inorganic. Organic bedding materials contain nutrients needed for bacterial growth, while inorganic bedding materials do not. However, once any type of bedding becomes soiled (with fecal matter and urine), pathogen growth can be supported. Inorganic bedding, such as sand, may start out with very low pathogen concentrations. Some organic bedding materials, such as composted manure solids, start out with lower concentrations than others. However, research shows that within 24-48 hours of being in the stall, pathogen levels in all organic bedding materials rise to similar concentrations. Thus the expense of composting DMS prior to bedding may not accomplish a reduction in pathogen exposure. Similarly, the addition of lime to the stalls is not supported by the literature. There can also be a seasonal effect on bacterial numbers.

The desirable frequency with which fresh organic bedding is added to the stalls is unclear. While “common wisdom” suggests frequent rebedding, the research literature indicates that pathogen levels peak after a couple of days and may decline thereafter. This may be a result of bacteria having eaten up the available nutrients and that frequent rebedding provides a new source of food resulting in higher bacterial counts.

**Calculating Concentrations**

The numbers of bacteria found in bedding materials is reported on both a dry and wet weight (“as is”) basis in the research literature which is confusing. One researcher has suggested reporting pathogen concentrations on a volume rather than a weight basis (Gabler, et al 2001). How the numbers are measured should be kept in mind when looking at data. When comparing bacterial counts within the same type of bedding material, it might makes sense to do it on a dry weight basis. For example, dry weights might be used when examining the change in concentrations over time in the same barn using the same bedding. Comparing different materials with very different densities, such as sand and DMS, is challenging since the bedding in a stall of sand will weigh more than a stall with DMS. For the same volume of material, the higher density of sand would result in lower reported concentrations than a lighter material so the sand would “look cleaner.” Knowing what is important in terms of what the cows are exposed to is unclear.

**Wet vs. Dry Weight Calculations:**

The number of bacteria can be reported as colonies per gram of material on an “as is” wet weight basis. In order to determine the concentration on a dry weight basis, the lab will dry the material after testing it for bacteria and convert the number of colonies to a dry weight basis.
Weight vs. Volume Calculations:

The number of bacteria can be reported as colonies per gram of material on an “as is” wet weight basis. In order to determine the number of colonies per ml of material on an “as is” basis, the lab will need to weigh a known volume of the bedding. The number of colonies per ml can then be calculated on a volume basis as follows: (cfu/g wet weight) * (wet weight/volume).

Sample calculation to convert wet to dry weight bacterial concentrations

\[
1000 \text{ colonies}/100 \text{ grams wet weight}
\]
Sample is 20% solids, 80% moisture by weight thus:

\[
1000 \text{ colonies}/20 \text{ grams solids}
\]

\[
= 50 \text{ colonies}/\text{gram solids}
\]

\[
= 5000 \text{ colonies}/100 \text{ grams dry solids}
\]

Sample calculation to convert weight to volume bacterial concentrations

\[
1,000,000 \text{ colonies}/\text{gram wet weight}
\]

100 milliliters of the bedding weighs 33 grams thus:

\[
(1,000,000 \text{ colonies/gram}) \times (33 \text{ grams/100 ml})
\]

\[
= 330,333 \text{ colonies/ml}
\]
Comparison of Fecal Coliform Counts in Used and Unused DMS on One Farm Calculated on Wet (as is), Dry and Volume Basis

NOTE: These data are from one set of samples and are provided only as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dry Matter (%)</th>
<th>Volume (g/ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fecal Coliforms in Unused and Used Green DMS

Figure 1.
Comparison of Fecal Coliform Counts in Different Bedding Materials Calculated on Wet (as is), Dry and Volume Basis

NOTE: These data are from one set of samples and are provided only as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dry Matter (%)</th>
<th>Volume (g/ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDMS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fecal Coliforms in Sand, Composted DMS and Green DMS

Figure 2.

Figures 1 and 2 show the difference between fecal coliform concentrations reported on a wet weight (as is), dry weight and volume basis. When comparing the same bedding source used vs. unused (Fig. 1), the fact that the material has dried in the barn so that the used is drier than the unused means that the difference between concentrations made on a wet weight basis is much greater than the difference on a dry weight basis or on a volume basis.

When comparing different materials, the impact of wet vs dry vs volume measures is more apparent. Fig. 2 shows that in one set of tests used, sand bedding was comparable to the green DMS and lower than composted DMS on a wet weight basis, but is much higher in fecal coliform when looked at on a volume basis. Note: These data are from one set of samples and are provided only as an example.

Organic vs. Inorganic Bedding Materials

Brim and Timms (1989) – wet weight basis
- Trial to evaluate growth of environmental mastitis pathogens (*E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae* and *S. uberis*) in various bedding materials (all materials were clean – never used in a barn)
- Inorganic bedding sources (sand, limestone, and limestone treated with pine disinfectant) showed rapid bacterial growth by 6 hours and significantly higher growth of all organisms in 6-54 hours as compared to oat straw and cedar sawdust.
- Organic bedding sources (oat straw and cedar sawdust) showed a bimodal growth curve with increased bacterial growth at 6-24 hrs (slower rate than inorganic), followed by a decline from 36-54
By 96-120 hours, coliform organisms in the oat straw and cedar sawdust were similar or higher than inorganic bedding sources.

- Coliform numbers remained elevated at 96 hours, while strep numbers declined for all bedding materials.

Hogan, et al (1989a) – dry weight basis
- Independent comparison of bedding materials showed mean seasonal bacterial counts measured over one year of used organic materials (sawdust and chopped straw) had significantly higher gram-negative, coliform, *Klebsiella* species and streptococcal bacteria than used inorganic materials (sand and crushed limestone).

- *E. coli*, Enterobacter and *Streptococcus* counts in used and unused crushed limestone bedding < than DMS = 50:50 mixture of limestone and DMS. (P < 0.05)
- *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Staph. epidermis* counts in crushed limestone < DMS = 50:50 mixture. (P < 0.05)

- Comparison of bacterial counts in clean sand (CS) and recycled sand (RS)
- There was a significant increase in bacterial counts from day 0 to d 1 for gram-negative bacteria, coliforms, and *Streptococcus* spp. in both winter and summer for both CS and RS.
- In the winter, counts of the above bacteria did not differ from days 1 – 7.
- In the summer, gram-negative counts did not differ from d 1-7, but coliform counts were lower on d1 than days 5-7 and *Klebsiella* spp. counts were lower on d 1 than on d 3-7.
- The number of *Streptococcus* spp was high in both CS and RS during the sampling periods.

- Took used bedding from the stalls and brought them into the lab and inoculated with *E. coli* O157:H7. Samples were taken over a period of 112 days.
- *E. coli* O157:H7 survived at higher concentrations in used sawdust bedding than in sand.

Newman and Kowalski (1973) – wet weight basis
- Large numbers of *Klebsiella* were isolated from unused sawdust bedding and storage bins in a 54-cow dairy herd having trouble with *Klebsiella* mastitis.
- At the second collection, *Klebsiella* numbers decreased which coincided with a change in bedding from sawdust to sand.
- According to the authors, the role of sawdust as a possible source of *Klebsiella* organisms is not unequivocal in this report and requires additional study. In this context it should be emphasized that changes in bedding from sawdust to sand preceded the decrease in the number of *Klebsiella* isolates in the milk and that a high percentage of sawdust samples from varied sources did contain *Klebsiella* organisms.

Zdanowicz (2002) dry weight basis – (fresh bedding added every 7 days)
- **Sand Bedding:**
  - Coliforms: d 0 < d 1 = d 2 = d 6
  - *Klebsiella* species: d 0 < d 1 < d 2
    - d 1 = d 6; d 2 = d 6
  - *Strep.* species: d 0 < d 2
    - d 1 < d 6
    - d 1 = d 2; d 6 = d 2

- **Sawdust Bedding:**
  - Coliforms: d 0 < d 1 < d 2 = d 6
  - *Klebsiella* species: d 0 < d 1 < d 2 = d 6
  - *Strep.* species: d 0 < d 1 = d 2 < d 6

Zdanowicz, et al (2004) dry weight basis - (fresh bedding added every 7 days)
- **Sand Bedding:**
  - Coliforms: d 0 < d 1 = d 2 = d 6
  - *Klebsiella* species: d 0 < d 1 < d 2 = d 6
  - *Strep.* species: d 0 < d 1 < d 2 < d 6
• Sawdust Bedding:
  o Coliforms: \( d_0 < d_1 < d_2 = d_6 \)
  o *Klebsiella* species: \( d_0 = d_1 < d_2 = d_6 \)
  o *Strep.* species: \( d_0 < d_1 < d_2 = d_6 \)

Fairchild (1982) – dry weight basis
• Average total coliform counts over 9 weeks in used bedding were higher in sawdust (4.1 x 10⁶) and paper (8.7 x 10⁴) than in sand (< 1.0 x 10³) and lime (< 1.0 x 10³). The same was true for *Klebsiella*.

**Comparison of Organic Bedding Materials**

Bramley and Neave (1975) – wet weight basis
• 10⁴ – 10⁵ coliforms/g wet weight in all used bedding materials (sand cubicles, straw yards, wood shaving yards, sawdust yards) on one farm in 1971-72.
• 10⁷ coliforms/g wet weight in used sawdust yards on the same farm in 1972-73.

Hogan, et al (1989a) – dry weight basis
• *Klebsiella*: used sawdust > straw
• Streptococcal counts: straw > sawdust.

• Gram-negative, coliform and streptococcal counts: used chopped newspaper = used corn cobs
• Staphylococcal counts: used chopped newspaper < used corn cobs
• Gram-negative and staphylococcal counts: used chopped newspaper > used wood shavings
• Streptococcal and coliform counts: used chopped newspaper = used wood shavings

Rendos, et al (1975) - wet weight basis
• Bedding only replaced where manure scraped – sampling at 7, 14 and 21 days old
• Unused bedding – pooled means from 9 samples/week
  o Total coliforms: straw > sawdust = shavings
  o *Klebsiella*: sawdust > shavings = straw
  o *Strep.*: straw > sawdust = shavings
  o *Staph.*: straw = sawdust > shavings
• Unused vs used: all organisms significantly different
• Used bedding – pooled means from 9 samples/week
  o Total coliforms: no difference
  o *Klebsiella*: no difference
  o *Strep.*: straw > sawdust = shavings
  o *Staph.*: straw > sawdust > shavings
• Used bedding by week (bedding remained in the stalls over a 3 week period)
  o Total coliforms: no difference between weeks
  o *Klebsiella*: no difference between weeks
  o *Strep.*: wk 1 = wk 3 > wk 2
  o *Staph.*: wk 3 > wk 2, no difference between wk 1 and 2 or 1 and 3.

Zehner, et al (1986) dry weight basis - bacteria grown in bedding materials that were not exposed to urine or feces or in a barn environment at all – all samples were sterilized before inoculation.
• Growth of all bacteria: DMS > straw > hardwood chips > paper = sawdust
• In general, paper and softwood sawdust did not support growth of any of the bacteria (*E. coli, K. pneumoniae* and *S. uberis*).
• *Klebsiella* counts were significantly greater than *E. coli* counts in all bedding materials. Coliforms were significantly greater than *S. uberis* counts.
• The most rapid changes in growth of *Klebsiella* occurred in the first 24 h after inoculation with populations stabilizing after about 54 h.
• Coliforms grow more rapidly and decline less rapidly than environmental streptococci on all types of bedding studied.
• By comparing these results with data from studies under barn conditions, it appears that high bacterial counts under barn conditions are influenced by factors more complex than type of bedding used.

**Composting and Addition of Lime and other Bacteriocides**

Carroll and Jasper (1978) – wet weight basis
- Total coliforms directly from the separator were about $10^7$/g wet weight at about 80% moisture.
- After composting for 9 months, they ranged from 0 to $10^4$.
- Once they were used as free stall bedding for several months, they ranged from $10^6$ to $10^8$.

- Composting manure solids in static piles decreased the number of coliforms and gram-negative bacteria to below detectable numbers, but as composting continued over the 10-wk period, both coliforms and gram-negative bacteria increased in numbers to that of fresh DMS (coincided with decline in internal temperature of piles).
- No justification for composting before use.

- *Klebsiella*: unused sawdust = unused sawdust plus lime.
- There was a significant difference between unused and used, but no significant increase after 1st week, with a reduction from wk 1 to wk 3. (the stalls were re-bedded after 1 week for 3 weeks)

- Studied 4 dairy farms that used straw yards for bedding
- The pH of the top layers of straw was usually between 8.5 and 9.5
- Adding lime daily to the top layer of the straw failed to raise the pH to levels at which *Escherichia coli* and *Streptococcus uberis* do not survive.
- Most of the counts of *E. coli* and fecal streptococci in the top layers of straw were above $10^6$ colony-forming units/g.

Hogan & Smith (1997) – looked at bacteria counts in sawdust only (control), sawdust plus lime (treatment 1) and sawdust rebedded daily (treatment 2)– dry weight study
- Treatment effects on bacterial numbers and pH were limited after 1 day in the stall. The ability of lime to alter bacteria counts and pH apparently was diminished within 48 hours after application.
- Day 1: All bacteria: treatment 1 < treatment 2 = control
- Day 2: *Klebsiella* species: treatment 1 < treatment 2; treatment 1 = control
- Control: *Strep.* species, *Klebsiella* species, dry matter, pH: d 1 = d 2 = d 6
  - Gram-negative, Coliforms: d 1 > d 6
- Treatment 1: All bacteria: d 1 > d 2 = d 6
- Treatment 2: All bacteria: d 1 = d 2 = d 6

Hogan, et al (1999) – additives to DMS and sawdust to reduce counts – dry weight basis
- Recycled manure – Gram negative counts
  - Unused: DMS > all treatments (DMS + lime = DMSL; DMS + acidic conditioner = DMSAcid; and DMS + alkaline conditioner = DMSAlk)
  - Day 1: DMS > DMSL; no other differences
  - Day 2 and 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
- Recycled manure – Coliform counts
  - Unused: DMS > all treatments
  - Day 2: DMS = DMSAcid > DMSAlk
  - Day 1 and 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
- Recycled manure – *Klebsiella* counts
  - Unused: DMS > all treatments
  - Day 1: DMS = DMSAcid > DMSL = DMSAlk
  - Day 2: DMS = DMSAcid > DMSL > DMSAlk
  - Day 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
• Recycled manure – Streptococcal counts
  o Unused: DMS > all treatments
  o Day 1: DMS > all treatments
  o Day 2: DMS = DMSL = DMSAcid > DMSAlk
  o Day 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
• Sawdust – Gram negative counts
  o Unused: SAW > all treatments (sawdust + lime = SAWL; sawdust + acidic conditioner = SAWAcid; sawdust + alkaline conditioner = SAWAlk)
  o Day 2: SAW > SAWAcid
  o Day 1 and 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
• Sawdust – Coliform counts
  o No effect on counts with use of any of the additives at any time.
• Sawdust – Klebsiella counts
  o Unused: No difference in counts for any treatment.
  o Day 2: SAW > SAWAcid
  o Day 1 and 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.
• Sawdust – Streptococcal counts
  o Unused: SAW > SAWAcid
  o Day 2: SAW = SAWL = SAWAlk > SAWAcid
  o Day 1 and 6: No difference in counts for any treatment.

**Seasons and Bacterial Counts in Bedding**

Hogan, et al (1989a) – dry weight basis

- Bacterial counts in long straw differed among seasons of the year:
  o Gram-negative: summer = fall > winter = spring
  o Coliforms: summer > winter
  o *Klebsiella* species: no seasonal differences
- *Klebsiella* counts in sawdust: summer = fall > winter = spring

Smith, et al, (1985a) – wet weight basis  [Note: Since concentrations were based on wet weight measures, the drier DMS in summer would show higher counts than the same material when wetter.]

- Highly significant effect of season on colony forming units (log10) of coliforms in recycled manure used in free stalls. Colony forming units in used DMS were higher in summer compared with other seasons. Summer > fall > spring = winter.
- The same was true for the pelleted corn cob bedding used in maternity units. Highest cfu coliforms in summer and lowest in winter.
- No data on streptococcal numbers.


- The number of streptococci in bedding materials exceeded 10^6 cfu/g of dry weight for all bedding types during all seasons of the year.
- Streptococcal numbers in bedding of pelleted corn cobs were similar across seasons of the year.
- Season of the year had no effect on numbers of streptococci in bedding of wood shavings.
- The number of streptococci in recycled manure was lower (P < .05) during the summer than during the winter and spring.

**Bacteria in Bedding and on Teat Ends**

The literature shows inconsistency regarding the relationship of bacterial concentrations in bedding to the bacterial concentration on teat ends. Factors such as particle size may be more important than simply bacterial counts in the used bedding. The relationship of teat end counts to mastitis is unclear and is reviewed below.
**Studies Showing Counts in Bedding Correlated with Counts on Teat Ends**

- There was a significant difference in *E. coli* and *Enterobacter* counts between composted DMS (higher) and rubber mats and a significant difference on the teat ends (higher on cows bedded on DMS).

Fairchild (1982)
- *Klebsiella* teat end swabs and bedding samples were highly correlated (more on teat ends of cows bedded with sawdust than those bedded on lime).

Hogan and Smith (1997)
- Bacterial counts in bedding positively correlated with teat skin swabs.

- Recycled Manure: Coliforms
  - Day 2: Teat ends: DMS > DMSAlk  
    Bedding: DMS > DMSAlk
  - Day 1 & 6: Teat ends: No difference  
    Bedding: No difference
- Recycled Manure: *Klebsiella*
  - Day 2: Teat ends: DMS = DMSAcid > DMSL > DMSAlk  
    Bedding: DMS = DMSAcid > DMSL > DMSAlk
  - Day 6: Teat ends: No difference  
    Bedding: No difference

- *E. coli*, *Enterobacter* and *Strep.* spp. counts on teat ends were significantly less in cows bedded on crushed limestone vs. DMS or 50:50 mixture.
- *Staph. aureus* and *Staph. epidermis* counts on teat ends were significantly less in cows bedded on crushed limestone vs. DMS or 50:50 mixture.

Natzke and LeClair (1975)
- Large numbers of coliform bacteria were found on teat ends of cows bedded with sawdust artificially contaminated with coliform bacteria as compared to controls (sawdust not contaminated with coliform bacteria).

Zdanowicz (2002)
- There was a significant correlation between the mean “cow-bedding count 1” (time spent lying in a stall multiplied by the bacterial count for the stall) and the bacterial counts on teat swabs for cows housed on sand for coliforms and *Klebsiella* spp.
- There was a significant correlation between the mean “cow-bedding count 1” and the bacterial counts on teat swabs for cows housed on sawdust for coliforms, *Klebsiella* spp. and *Streptococcus* spp.

- There were 2 times more coliforms and 6 times more *Klebsiella* bacteria on teat ends of cows housed on sawdust compared with those housed on sand.
- There were 10 times more *Strep.* spp. bacteria on teat ends of cows when housed on sand compared with sawdust.

**Studies Showing Counts in Bedding Not Correlated with Counts on Teat Ends**

Hogan, et al (1990) There is a positive correlation when data for all bacteria from each bedding type is pooled, but not necessarily each bacteria separately.
- Correlations between bedding counts and teat skin counts were not significant within bedding type.
- All bacteria:  
  - Teat Ends: week 1 > week 2 = week 3  
  - Bedding: week 1 = week 2 = week 3
- Gram-negative, coliform and *Klebsiella*: Teat ends: chopped newspaper = corn cobs  
  - Bedding: chopped newspaper = corn cobs
Gram-negative: Teat ends: newspaper = wood shavings  
Bedding: newspaper > wood shavings

Strep. spp.: Teat ends: newspaper > wood shavings  
Bedding: newspaper = wood shavings

Appeared that adherence of bedding (due to particle size) had more to do with the difference in teat swab counts than the amount of bacteria in the bedding. (i.e. teat swab counts for gram-negative, coliform and Klebsiella differed between cows bedded on newspaper and corn cobs, but the amount of bacteria in the bedding didn’t – corn cobs adhered more to the teats because of fine particle size and those cows had higher teat swab counts).

Hogan, et al (1999) – There is a positive correlation when data for all bacteria from each bedding type is pooled, but not necessarily each bacteria separately.

Recycled Manure: Gram-negative  
• Day 1: Teat ends: DMS = DMSL > DMSAlk = DMSAcid  
   Bedding: DMS > DMSL and DMS = DMSAlk = DMSAcid
• Day 2: Teat ends: DMSL > DMSAlk  
   Bedding: DMSL = DMSAlk

Recycled Manure: Strep. species  
• Day 1: Teat ends: DMS > DMSAcid only  
   Bedding: DMS > DMSL = DMSAlk = DMSAcid
• Day 2: Teat ends: DMS > DMSAcid only  
   Bedding: DMS = DMSL = DMSAcid > DMSAlk

Recycled Manure: Klebsiella  
• Day 1: Teat ends: DMS = DMSL > DMSAcid = DMSAlk  
   Bedding: DMS = DMSL > DMSAcid = DMSAlk

Sawdust – None of the bacterial counts on teat ends correlated with those in the bedding.

Total Coliform counts on teats in sawdust > shavings = straw. There were no differences in coliform counts in the different bedding materials.

Klebsiella counts on teats in sawdust > shavings > straw. There were no differences in bedding counts.

Strep. spp. counts on teats in straw > shavings > sawdust. In bedding, straw > sawdust = shavings.

Staph. spp. counts on teats in straw = sawdust > shavings. In bedding, straw > sawdust > shavings.

Teat swab means between groups of cows (3 different sets in this trial) were significantly different from each other for all bacteria, indicating a cow effect on teat end contamination.

Zdanowicz (2002)  
There was no significant correlation for “cow-bedding counts 1” and teat end streptococci counts for cows bedded on sand.

Relationship of Bacteria in Bedding and on Teat Ends to Mastitis and Milk Quality

Researchers have generally stated the rule of thumb that bedding materials should be kept below a maximum bacterial count of 10^6 colony forming units (cfu) per gram of bedding wet weight. This number appears to be based on one study where there were no new cases of coliform mastitis when bedding counts were at 10^4 and 10^5 one summer, but there were several new cases the following summer when bedding counts were at 10^7 cfu/g wet weight (Bramley and Neave, 1975). This paper does not claim that 10^6 colony forming units (cfu) per gram of bedding wet weight is a critical level and it represents data from only two summers on one farm. A few studies show a correlation between the number of bacteria in the bedding and/or the number on the teat ends and mastitis while a number of studies show no correlation. Few studies examined the relationship between bedding pathogens and milk quality.
Counts in Bedding and Mastitis

Bramley (1982)
- Large numbers of Strep. uberis were isolated from samples of straw bedding for cattle from farms which suffered a high incidence of S. uberis mastitis, but the results did not demonstrate a direct relationship between exposure to S. uberis from straw bedding and udder disease.

Fairchild (1982)
- Coliform counts > 10^6 in sawdust, but no new infections
- Unable to demonstrate a direct relationship between bacterial counts in bedding and rates of coliform or environmental IMI.
- High populations of coliforms will not necessarily cause infection under good management conditions.
- Type of bedding may be just one link in a chain of possible situations that promote mastitis.

Hogan, et al (1989a)
- Neither percentages of quarters infected at calving nor mean rates of clinical mastitis during the first 7 days of lactation were correlated with long straw bacterial counts (maternity area bedding).
- Linear relationships were significant among total rates of clinical mastitis during lactation and counts of gram-negative bacteria and Klebsiella species in lactating cow bedding.

- Prevalence of cows’ environmental pathogen IMI was similar between high and low SCC herds as was the number of environmental organisms in bedding materials.

- In recycled manure bedding, no correlation existed between the rate of environmental streptococcal IMI during the dry period and streptococcal numbers in bedding by season of the year.

- In a 5-mo study in a NY dairy herd performed during the summer of 2005, all of 9 samples of unused sand bedding tested negative for Klebsiella.
- 14 of 18 samples of used sand bedding contained Klebsiella at a median level of 10^{4.6} cfu/g
- It is hypothesized that fecal shedding of Klebsiella by dairy cows contributes to the presence of Klebsiella in the environment regardless of bedding type.

Counts on Teat Ends and Mastitis

- IMI status of the quarters had no effect on teat swab counts

Neave and Oliver (1962)
- If teats are experimentally contaminated (> 30,000 colonies) with Staph. aureus (contagious mastitis pathogen) at the end of lactation, the quarters are much more likely to become infected than if the teats are lightly contaminated (30,000 colonies or less).
- The association of large numbers (15 x 10^6) of Staph. aureus at the apex and infection of the quarter was highly significant (P < 0.001) (15 x 10^6 > 30,000 = 60 = none).
- Strep. uberis was not recovered from either teats or orifices at the end of lactation, but was present in large numbers in six orifices 21 days later. All of these were associated with infected quarters. As Strep uberis was not applied to the teats at drying-off, it was assumed that those udders found to harbor it became contaminated from the environment of the dry cow.

Natzke and LeClaire (1975)
- No new coliform IMI despite large numbers on teat ends
Counts in Bedding Correlated with Counts in Milk

- Gram-negative, coliform, and streptococcal counts in bulk tank milk were associated with bacterial counts in bedding materials
- Significant correlations among bacterial counts in bulk tank milk and bacterial counts in bedding were: gram-negative and gram-negative, coliform and coliform, coliform and Klebsiella species, and streptococcal and streptococcal.

Counts on Teat Ends Correlated with Counts in Milk

- \textit{E. coli}, \textit{Enterobacter} and \textit{Strep.} spp. counts on teat ends and in the milk were significantly less in cows bedded on crushed limestone than in DMS or 50:50 mixture
- \textit{S. aureus} counts on teat ends and in the milk were less in crushed limestone than DMS or 50:50 mixture.

Hygiene and Mastitis

The impact of bedding, cleanliness of the udder and/or legs on the mastitis rate of a herd is unclear. Bedding may play a role in the cleanliness of the udder, and pre-milking udder hygiene may play a role in the amount of mastitis seen.

Housing Hygiene and Mastitis

- Herds with prolonged periods on straw bedding in yards (exposed to rain, cleaned less frequently) were more likely to acquire environmental mastitis (12 herds in Ireland).

- General sanitation in lactating cow housing was an important disease determinant of both coliforms and environmental streptococci.
- Improving general sanitation by 1 unit (scores of 1 – above average, 2 – approximately average and 3 – worse than average) was associated with a 57% reduction in the prevalence of coliform infection.

Howell, (1972)
- Survey of 50 herds in England having trouble with environmental mastitis (comparison of management)
- Cause of \textit{E. coli} infection is believed to be the feces and infection is due to gross fecal contamination of the teat orifice. \textit{E. coli} mastitis was rare in summer when cattle are pastured and only occurred in herds where zero grazing was practiced or where cows were kept for long periods in dirty yards during milking. Where \textit{E. coli} occurred in cubicle herds, it was when there were obvious faults of the cubicles (i.e. wrong length, so dung fell in cubicle rather than alleyway and cows lay in it).

- Survey of management practices of British dairy herds with low somatic cell count (average 76,000 cells/ml) showed the following bedding variables lead to increased rate of clinical mastitis: straw in milking cow accommodations and mucking out the calving area less than once/month.
- The following bedding variables were shown to decrease the rate of clinical mastitis: cleaning out dry cow accommodation at least once/week, sawdust/wood shavings in the calving area and sawdust/wood shavings in dry cow accommodations.

- Looked at 4 dairy farms that used straw for bedding.
- The farm with the lowest incidence of mastitis had the cleanest cows and the most satisfactory beds.
Counts of E. coli and S. uberis were much higher in the beds of early lactation cows than in those of dry cows. Many of the early lactation cows were heavily and persistently contaminated with feces. Dry cows were much cleaner.

- *E. coli* incidence higher if lactating cows are not allowed to graze at night.
- *S. aureus* and *S. dysgalactiae* incidence lower with thicker layer of straw in calving pen
- *S. dysgalactiae* incidence lower with thicker layer of straw in cubicles of dry cows
- *S. uberis* incidence higher with disinfection of cubicles of lactating cows.

- *E. coli* mastitis incidence lower if cubicles cleaned of manure, and with rubber mats at calving site, higher with complete cleaning of dry cow cubicles.
- *S. aureus* incidence lower with higher amount of bedding in cubicles.

- The following risk factors were associated with a higher rate of clinical mastitis caused by *E. coli*: no disinfection of the maternity area after calving, use of a thick layer of bedding in the stall.
- The following risk factors were associated with a higher rate of clinical mastitis caused by *S. aureus*: no regular disinfection of the stall, no regular replacement of stall bedding.

**Animal Hygiene and Mastitis**

- Herds using a full hygiene milking routine (use of disinfectants, paper towels, or boiled cloths for washing each individual udder, the wearing of rubber gloves by the milker, and the pasteurization of teat cup clusters before each cow is milked, together with post-milking disinfectant teat dips) had a 45% reduction in new udder infection in one trial and a 58% reduction in the 2nd trial when compared with herds that practiced only washing with water and a shared cloth.
- Herds using a partial hygiene milking routine (same as full, but without the pasteurization of teat cup clusters) showed a 44% reduction in new udder infection when compared to control cows.

- Rate of IMI by major mastitis pathogens was reduced significantly by predipping plus good udder preparation compared with good udder preparation alone.
- Predipping reduced IMI due to environmental pathogens in each herd. Reduction in IMI with environmental pathogens ranged from 47% to 56%.
- This study suggests that the environmental pathogens cause new infections during milking. The inference is that the number of environmental pathogens on teats prior to milking is reduced significantly by predipping with an effective germicide, and consequently, the rate of new infections is reduced. It appears that environmental pathogens contaminate teat skin between milkings but may or may not cause new infections between milkings.

Schreiner and Ruegg (2003)
- Udder hygiene scores (UHS) were significantly associated with leg hygiene scores (LHS).
- Linear somatic cell scores increased as UHS increased (dirtier udders).
- Significant differences in somatic cell scores were observed for clean (UHS scores of 1 [completely free of or has very little dirt] and 2 [slightly dirty]) versus dirty (UHS of 3 [mostly covered in dirt] and 4 [completely covered, caked-on dirt]) udders.
- There was a significant association between the prevalence of intra-mammary contagious pathogens in the milk and UHS but not LHS.
- The prevalence of intra-mammary environmental pathogens was significantly associated with UHS but not associated with LHS.
- Cows with UHS of 3 and 4 were 1.5 times more likely to have major pathogens (both contagious and environmental) isolated from milk samples compared with cows with hygiene scores of 1 and 2.
- The type of surface of the free-stall bed and the type of bedding used on that surface are likely to have a large influence on UHS but probably have less influence on LHS.
• Manure management systems, frequency of cleaning of barn alleys, and the ease of movement of cattle are likely factors that have a larger influence on LHS than on UHS.
Zarkower and Scheuchenzuber (1977)
• Pre-milking washing and drying of teats with iodine solution had no effect on total colonies, staphylococci, streptococci, gram-negative lactose fermenters and gram-negative lactose non-fermenters on the teat apex as compared to unwashed teats.
• When washed and dried thoroughly (with special care to include the teat orifice area), total number of colony-forming units was decreased significantly.
• Udders of cows housed on sand had higher grid counts (dirtier udders) than those on sawdust.
• No clear correlation between udder cleanliness and teat end bacterial counts.

Somatic Cell Count (SCC) and Mastitis

Several studies have been conducted on the differences between herds that have low average SCC counts and herds that have high average SCC counts. Other studies look at the value of SCC count in determining intra-mammary infection status in herds. High SCC is correlated with decreased milk production. SCC is measured both with a bulk tank sample (BTSCC) and with individual milk samples from each cow. BTSCC can be a good indicator of a herd’s general udder health status, with high BTSCC generally indicating a problem with contagious mastitis. Herds with lower BTSCC have lower subclinical mastitis and better general udder health. However, the presence of leucocytes in the udder helps protect it from getting other mastitis, therefore low SCC appears to predispose cows to getting environmental mastitis. By looking at individual cow SCC over a period of several months, patterns can be established for each cow. Spikes in individual cow SCC usually indicate environmental mastitis and are often short in duration. When SCC is done on a monthly or other low frequency basis, these spike may be missed. Thus typical BTSCC cannot generally be used to diagnose environmental mastitis at the herd level unless it is pervasive and persistent.

SCC and Milk Yield

• As bulk milk somatic cell count (BTSCC) decreased, milk production increased (P<0.0001). Herds with a low BTSCC had a mean cumulative fat corrected milk production during 305 d of lactation of 8589 kg compared with 8072 kg for herds with a high BTSCC.
• Both elevated SCC and clinical mastitis were associated with milk yield losses.
• The milk yield loss associated with clinical mastitis represented 5% of yield in the first 119 d postpartum.
• A 6% yield loss was associated with a mean SCC of 383,370 cells/ml, compared with a mean SCC of 47,465 cells/ml.
Raubertas and Shook (1982)
• Regression coefficients for the average loge of SCC were negative and highly significant for all lactations, indicating that increased average log cell count is associated with reduction in yield. Coefficients become larger with lactation number through the first three lactations.
• Yield loss per unit increase in average loge cell count was 135 +/- 20 kg in first lactation and 270 +/- 30 kg for all other lactations.
• These relationships were linear indicating that loss per unit increase in actual cell count is greatest when cell count is low.
Hortet and Seegers (1998)
• At test-day level (milk production on the day of testing), the average trend was a loss of 0.4 kg of milk in primiparous cows and 0.6 kg in multiparous, by each 2-fold increase of SCC above 50,000 cells/ml.
• At the lactation level (cumulative milk production over the lactation), the average trend was a loss of 80 kg of milk in primiparous and 120 kg in multiparous, by each 2-fold increase of the geometric mean of SCC above 50,000 cells/ml.
• Protein content of milk showed a small increase of 0.15 g/kg (at the test-day level) while fat content showed a small decrease of 0.20 g/kg (both at the test-day and at the lactation level), by each 2-fold increase of SCC.

• One unit increase in the loge of the geometric mean of the somatic cell count was associated with a loss of 247 kg of 305 day milk production.
• One unit increase in the loge of the 24 hour somatic cell count was associated with a decrease of 0.65 kg of test day milk production.

• A unit increase in the log count of SCC resulted in a loss of 1.44 kg of milk at test day.

The Value of SCC in Determining Intramammary Infection Status

DeHaas (2004)
• Clinical mastitis can be predicted better by SCC patterns than by the average of 200,000 cells/ml in lactation.
• Short peaks in SCC are associated with clinical E. coli.
• Long increased SCC is associated with Staph. aureus.
• No pattern for streptococcus was shown.

• In a low SCC herd free of Staph. aureus, Strep. agalactiae or Strep. dysagalctiae, cows with clinical mastitis were characterized by a high SCC prior to clinical mastitis diagnosis; SCC increased further around the time of diagnosis and returned to high premastitis counts after about 10 d following the end of treatment.

• Rates of total clinical mastitis were significantly correlated with bulk tank milk SCC (82.3% were environmental).

Smith, et al (1985b)
• SCC counts from individual or bulk tank counts are of questionable value for surveillance of environmental mastitis. This is because IMI are of short duration, and percent quarters infected at any time is generally not great.

Suriyasathaporn, et al (2000a)
• Very low somatic cell counts during the udder inflammation-free state (no mastitis) are associated with increased risk of clinical mastitis.

• The association between quarter somatic cell counts (QSCC) of milk and the risk of clinical mastitis (CM) was investigated in a one year study on three dairy herds in Somerset, UK.
• QSCC was categorized and the risk of CM occurring in the month after the QSCC was examined.
• When all cases of CM were considered, quarters with SCC 21,000 – 100,000 cells/ml had reduced odds and quarters with SCC > 200,000 cells/ml had over three times the odds of CM compared with QSCC 1,000 – 20,000 cells/ml.
• When only coliform CM were investigated, quarters with SCC 6,000 – 200,000 cells/ml had reduced odds of coliform CM compared with QSCC 1,000 – 5,000 cells/ml, and SCC > 200,000 cells/ml were not significantly different from the baseline.
• When S. uberis CM were investigated, quarters with SCC > 200,000 cells/ml had more than three times the odds of S. uberis CM compared with QSCC 1,000 – 20,000 cells/ml.
• QSCC < 21,000 and > 200,000 cells/ml are associated with increased odds of CM in the following 4 – 6 weeks: this association may be pathogen specific.
- SCC was not associated with the risk of infection with S. uberis
- low SCC was associated with a lower risk of infection with S. aureus

**Differences in Mastitis Between Low and High SCC Herds – Types of Bacteria**

- The mean incidence rate of clinical mastitis (IRCM) was approximately equal for herds in the low (SCC ≤ 150,000/ml), medium (SCC 150,000 to 250,000) and high (SCC 250,000 to 400,000) bulk milk somatic cell count (BTSCC), but the pathogens were different and the severity of the disease was higher at the lowest BTSCC.
- The IRCM caused by *Strep. agalactiae, Strep. dysgalactiae or Staph. aureus* was lower for herds in the low BTSCC category than for herds in the medium or high BTSCC categories.
- Mixed cultures and contaminated samples were found less often in herds in the low BTSCC category than in herds in the high BTSCC category.
- The IRCM caused by *E. coli, Klebsiella spp., Pseudomonas spp.*, and culture negative was higher for herds in the low BTSCC category than in the medium or high categories.
- The IRCM for cows that were reported by the farmer to be systemically ill was higher for herds in the low BTSCC category than for herds in the medium and high BTSCC categories.

- The incidence of clinical coliform (environmental) mastitis was significantly higher in the low SCC herds, but the incidence of clinical mastitis attributable to *Str. agalactiae and S. aureus* (contagious IMI) was significantly higher in the high SCC herds.

Hogan, et al (1989b)
- In a study of nine well managed herds with low somatic cell counts, a total of 646 clinical cases of mastitis were diagnosed. Coliforms, bacteriologically negative and environmental streptococci accounted for 82.3% of these cases, while contagious mastitis pathogens accounted for only 3.4% of the clinical cases.

- The only significant difference in the prevalence of intra-mammary infection major pathogens between high and low SCC herd groups was the pathogen *Staph aureus*. Eight times more cows had *S. aureus* in high than in low herds.

- Case histories of herds in California with coliform mastitis problems showed varying probable reasons for the problem.
- One herd’s coliform mastitis problem coincided with their decrease in contagious mastitis problems.

**Differences in Mastitis between Low and High SCC Herds – Management**

- Postmilking teat disinfection and dry cow therapy were practiced most frequently with herds with low bulk milk somatic cell count (BMSCC).
- For herds with a low BMSCC, more attention was paid to hygiene and detail than was paid to these areas for herds with medium or high BMSCC.
- Cubicles, drinking buckets and cows were cleaner in herds with a low BMSCC

- 300 Dutch dairy herds were studied for management style and its association with BMSCC.
- Cluster analysis was used to identify groups of farmers who had similar management styles for the prevention of mastitis – two management styles (clusters) were identified as clean and accurate, and quick and dirty.
- The relationship between clusters and BMSCC was high, but the relationship between clusters and mastitis was weak.
Farms with herds that had a low bulk milk SCC had better hygienic conditions than those farms with herds that had a high bulk milk SCC.


Low SCC herds (greatest % of animals with SCC <= 283,000 cells/ml) had lower moisture content of cow bedding than “high” SCC herds, however the prevalence of non-contagious mastitis was similar between low and high groups, thus it is not clear how drier bedding relates to lower SCC.


Risk factors associated with the mastitis rate in herds with low bulk tank SCC included the use of mats in cubicles, and the percentage of dirty cubicles. Rubber mats were generally associated with a moist surface giving an environment that may support bacterial growth. Percentage of dirty cubicles was correlated to the rate of mastitis and also correlated to the cleanliness score of the cows.

A high frequency of cubicle disinfection per month (with formalin) was associated with higher mastitis, possibly by causing skin irritation and lesions which are predisposing to clinical mastitis.


Presence of rubber mats in herds with low bulk tank SCC was associated with an increase in the incidence rate of both E. coli and S. aureus mastitis.

More frequent cleaning of manure by hand from the cubicle was associated with lower incidence rate of E. coli mastitis.

Greater amount of bedding in cubicles of the lactating herd was associated with lower incidence rate of both E. coli and S. aureus mastitis.

Other Mastitis Issues

Other issues that may affect intramammary infection in dairy herds include stage of lactation and the dry period, parity (number of lactations), milking and milking machine factors including the use of post milking dips, teat end roughness and callosity, seasons of the year, nutrition, and housing conditions other than bedding.

Stage of Lactation


- The highest incidence rate of clinical mastitis (IRCM) was in early lactation. Peak incidence around calving was higher in heifers than in older cows: >30% of the cases of clinical mastitis in heifers occurred during the first 14 d of lactation, but, in cows, this prevalence was at 13%. After the 2nd wk of lactation, the IRCM was higher in cows than in heifers.


- A greater prevalence of environmental streptococcal infection was associated with herds that had increased number of days dry.

Hogan, et al (1989b)

- Rates of clinical mastitis were highest the first 90 d and decreased throughout lactation.
- Rates of clinical cases was highest the week following calving for each of coliform, environmental streptococcal and bacteriologically negative clinical cases.


- Low SCC herds had a high incidence of clinical mastitis during the first month of lactation, while clinical mastitis in high SCC herds tended to be uniform during the entire lactation period.


- The rate of clinical mastitis decreased with a dry period of <40 days.

Smith, et al (1985a)

- Dry treatment significantly influenced the rate of environmental streptococcal IMI during the dry period. Rate of strep IMI was highest in cow groups not dry treated (6 to 7 times higher).
• However, for coliform mastitis, after adjusting for parity and season, there was little or no indication that any of the treatments (dry cow therapy, immunization, artificial infusion and combinations thereof) including immunization significantly altered the rate of coliform IMI during the dry period. Smith, et al (1985b)
• Rate of coliform IMI was highest in first 76 days of lactation and decreased progressively as lactation advanced.
• Rate of streptococcal IMI was twice as high as coliform IMI and decreased as lactation advanced, but not as markedly as coliform IMI.
• Rate of coliform IMI in the dry period was 3 to 4 times higher than the rest of lactation.
• Rate of streptococcal IMI in the dry period was 1.6 times higher than rest of lactation.
• Dry cow therapy had an effect on streptococcal IMI, but not coliform.
Smith, et al (1985b)
• Rate of new environmental streptococcal IMI was highest during the 1st month of lactation, and were highest in that period for cows in lactation >= 4 and heifers.
• The rate of IMI declined from 31 to 150 DIM for all cows.
• The rate of IMI further declined from 151 DIM to drying off for cows in 1st or 2nd lactation, but rates of new infection in late lactation increased for cows in 3rd and 4th lactation compared with rates at 31 to 150 DIM.

Parity
• The incidence rate of clinical mastitis increased as parity increased.
Smith, et al (1985a)
• Parity group had an influence on IMI. Heifers had less coliform IMI than 2nd and 3rd lactation.
Smith, et al (1985b)
• Rate of coliform IMI was approx 3x as high in multiparous cows as heifers in first lactation.
• Parity had an effect on both coliform and streptococcal IMI. Rate of both increased approximately 5 times from 1st lactation to lactation 6 or greater.
• Rate of IMI by *S. uberis* and *S. aureus* are lower in first and 2nd parity than in older cows.

Milking and Milking Machine Factors
• Milking machine factors were associated with the incidence rate of clinical mastitis (IRCM) caused by *E. coli*, *Streptococcus dysgalactiae*, and *Streptococcus uberis*. As milking vacuum pressure increased, prevalence of IMI increased.
• Postmilking teat disinfection was associated with an increased overall IRCM and IRCM caused by *E. coli*, especially in herds in the low BTSCC category.
• A greater prevalence of coliform infection was associated with herds that had a comparatively large amount of milk left in the udders after being milked, herds with longer milking times, herds that used running water to clean cows before milking and herds with more liner slippage.
• A lower prevalence of environmental streptococcal infection was associated with herds that used individual rags or cloths for drying udders.
Eberhart and Buckalew, (1977)
• The level of infections with streptococcal species other than *Str. agalactiae*, which was initially low (1.8%), has increased to 6.3% over the years since post-milking teat dipping and dry-cow therapy were introduced in the Pennsylvania State University dairy herd.
• Comparison of incidence of clinical mastitis over several years indicates that the incidence was not appreciably reduced by the use of teat dipping and dry cow therapy, but that there were changes in the types or organisms isolated. Streptococcal species other than *Str agalactiae* and gram-negative organisms became the cause of about two-third of the clinical mastitis. 
• Bulk tank milk bacterial counts were associated with the number of quarter-milkings that liners were used. Liners used greater than 1200 quarter-milkings were associated with higher total bacterial and staphylococcal counts than were liners used less than 1200 quarter-milkings. This could be caused by teat skin bacteria adhering to the worn surface of the liners. 
• Case histories of herds in California with coliform mastitis problems showed varying probable reasons for the problem. 
• Two years after virtually eliminating contagious mastitis problems, one herd began to have trouble with acute coliform mastitis. In this case, a batch of liners was defective and rapidly became cracked. The problem disappeared almost immediately after the liners were replaced. 
• The problem in another herd illustrates that bacterial build-up and infection can also occur through the efforts of man that change the ecologic environment. In this instance, chlorhexidine of unknown and imprecise concentrations was being used to disinfect teat cup clusters between cows and between milkings. The chlorhexidine had effectively eliminated the natural microbial competition and had left the field free for abundant growth of pseudomonas. Exposure to the heavily colonized liner during milk was sufficient to bring about quarter infections. 
• Large differences in new infection rates between herds using full hygiene systems to control mastitis were most probably due to milking machine differences that result in an increase in infection during milking, i.e. vacuum reserve, air bleed, pulsation characteristic, milk lift and inflation design. 
• Survey of management practices of British dairy herds with low somatic cell count (average 76,000 cells/ml) 
• The following milking variables were associated with increased rate of clinical mastitis: 
  o Herds that always practiced post milking teat disinfection 
  o Herds that changed the teat liner at > 6000 or more milkings 
  o Herds where there were cows leaking milk on entering the parlor 
• The following milking variables were associated with decreased rate of clinical mastitis 
  o Herds that used a rotary parlor 
  o Herds that used a confinement yard (loafing) after milking 
  o Herds using automatic cluster removal. 
Zarkower and Scheuchenzuber (1977)
• Use of a post-milking iodophor teat dip significantly reduced the total bacterial and staphylococcal populations but no effects were noticed on the streptococcal bacteria counts.

**Teat Ends**

• In herds practicing full hygiene a significant relationship was found between the new infection rate and the number of cows with teat lesions. 
• In the within-cow analysis (teat end callosity thickness - TECT and roughness - TECR compared between quarters with mastitis and lateral quarters of the same cow without mastitis), TECT was significantly higher in the mastitic quarters than in those without clinical mastitis. There was no difference in TECR. 
• In the between cow analysis (cows with mastitis were paired with similar cows without mastitis based on parity and date of calving), clinical mastitis cows had thicker, and more frequently rough, callous
rings on their teat ends than cows that did not have clinical mastitis, both before and after the clinical mastitis occurred, if it occurred between the 1st and 6th month of lactation. On the other hand, cows with clinical mastitis in the first month of lactation showed less TECT and TECR during lactation than other cows.

- Clinical mastitis cases which were culture-negative or caused by less frequently found pathogens like yeast, *K. pneumoniae* and *E. aerogenes* were associated with higher teat end callosity, while clinical *E. coli* mastitis was associated with less TECT.

- Teat end roughness and extreme teat end callosity increased the rate of *S. aureus* mastitis but not *S. uberis* mastitis.

**Seasonality**

- Rates of clinical mastitis differed among seasons of the year and were associated with bulk tank milk somatic cell counts.
- Rates of total and coliform clinical cases were higher during summer than spring.

Hogan, et al (1989b)
- Mean rate of clinical mastitis cases was highest during summer and decreased throughout fall and winter to a low in spring.
- Rates of coliform and bacteriologically negative clinical cases were highest during summer, lowest during spring.
- Rates of clinical mastitis caused by environmental streptococci did not differ among seasons of the year.

- The peak incidence of clinical coliform mastitis was recorded during August. Peak percentages of clinical mastitis caused by other environmental mastitis organisms were recorded in July or August, and the peak incidence of contagious pathogens was in June, July and August.

Smith, et al (1985a)
- Season of the year has an influence on IMI. Coliform IMI was lower in winter (Dec, Jan, Feb) and fall (Sep, Oct, Nov) than in spring (Mar, Apr, May) and summer (Jun, Jul, Aug).
- Parity group had an influence on IMI. Heifers had less coliform IMI than 2nd and 3rd lactation.
- After adjusting for parity and season, there was little or no indication that any of the treatments (dry cow therapy, immunization, artificial infusion and combinations thereof), including immunization significantly altered rate of coliform IMI during the dry period.

Smith, et al (1985b)
- Rate of coliform IMI was elevated by a factor of 3 during summer and the effect was primarily associated with multiparous cows.

- Rates of environmental streptococcal IMI during the dry period and during lactation were greatest during summer.

**Nutrition**

- Nutrition was associated with the incidence rate of clinical mastitis (IRCM) caused by *E. coli*, *Streptococcus dysgalactiae*, and *Streptococcus uberis*. The presence of minerals in the diets of lactating cows was associated with a decreased IRCM caused by *S. dysgalactiae* and *S. uberis*. When lactating cows were fed corn silage, a lower overall IRCM and IRCM caused by *S. uberis*, and a higher IRCM caused by *E. coli* were observed.

- Offering fresh feed after both milkings decreased the rate of clinical mastitis.
- A review of the role of ketosis resulting from negative energy balance in the risk of mastitis.
- Udder defense mechanisms are reduced in cows with ketosis, resulting in increased risk of mastitis.

- Cows were assigned to one of three treatments at 60 d before anticipated calving:
  - Treatment 1 – 100 IU/d of supplemental vitamin E during the dry period and 100 IU/d during the first 30 d of lactation.
  - Treatment 2 – 1000 IU/d of vitamin E during the dry period and 500 IU/d during lactation.
  - Treatment 3 – 1000 IU/d of vitamin E during the first 46 d of the dry period, 4000 IU/d during the last 14 d of the dry period, and 2000 IU/d during lactation.
- The percentage of quarters with new infections at calving was not different (32.0%) between cows receiving treatments that contained low and intermediate concentrations of vitamin E but was reduced (11.8%) in cows receiving the high vitamin E treatment.
- Clinical mastitis affected 25.0, 16.7, and 2.6% of the quarters during the first 7 d of lactation for cows receiving the low, intermediate, and high vitamin E treatments, respectively.

**Housing Other than Bedding**

- A lower incidence rate of clinical mastitis caused by *E. coli* was associated with complete slatted floors and alleys, and lower animal density.

- Herds with less than 110 cubicles per 100 cows were more likely to experience environmental mastitis.

- A greater prevalence of coliform infection was associated with herds that used freestalls in the winter.
- A greater prevalence of environmental streptococcal infection was associated with herds that housed animals in tie stalls.

- Survey of management practices of British dairy herds with low somatic cell count (average 76,000 cells/ml) showed the following housing variables lead to increased rate of clinical mastitis: lactating cows housed in straw yards compared with cubicles, dry cows housed in straw yards compared with cubicles and access of milking cows to outdoor yards (when housed).
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