service CR were 69% (38/55), 41% (11/27), 27% (6/22), and 27% (3/11) for cows with no endometritis, or for cows with mild, moderate, or severe endometritis, respectively. Cows with mild, moderate, or severe endometritis were 4.2 (p< 0.01), 7.7 (p< 0.01), and 5.3 (p< 0.01) times less likely to be pregnant following first service,

respectively, compared to cows with no endometritis. These data suggest that endometritis at the beginning of the breeding period has a high incidence rate, is associated with decreased first service CR, and that CR deceases as the severity of endometritis increases.

Results of a Seven-Year Surveillance of Milk Safety Related to Use of Ceftiofur Sodium and Ceftiofur Hydrochloride

Gary L. Gillette, DVM

Pharmacia Animal Health, Kalamazoo, MI 49001

Introduction

In 1991 and 1998, respectively, Pharmacia Animal Health (PAH) received FDA approval to use Naxcel[®] Sterile Powder (ceftiofur sodium) and Excenel[®] Sterile Suspension (ceftiofur hydrochloride) in lactating dairy cattle. Currently, these cephalosporin (penicillin-family) products are the only two that can be used with no milk-discard period. Since 1991, PAH has received about 50 complaints each year where milk adulteration incidents allegedly resulted following proper (labeled) use of these products. To resolve these complaints, we developed a system to determine what actually caused these adulterations.

Materials and Methods

High-pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) conclusively identified the violative antibiotic(s) in most (80%) of these reported adulterations.

Results and Conclusions

See Tables 1 and 2, below. When used by their labeled routes of administration, Naxcel and Excenel have not caused a single adulteration incident. When used in an extra-label manner (i.e., by intra-mammary infusion), Naxcel and Excenel have caused adulterations. When improper use of Naxcel/Excenel has not caused the adulterations reported to us, the cause has invariably been determined to be either penicillin g or cephapirin, with amoxicillin, ampicillin, and cloxacillin only rarely identified.

Adulterations due to:	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Ceftiofur metabolite residues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parent ceftiofur residues							
[extra-label/intramammary use]	8	33	17	12	18	18	3
Other beta-lactams	23	22	13	20	18	26	19
Inhibitor detected, no positive ID	2	2	3	2	3	1	0
Negative [no inhibitor found]	3	5	8	6	9	4	5
Total No. Cases	36	62	41	40	48	49	27

Table 1.Cases of adulteration by year.

1998	1999	2000	0
18 11 8 2 3 9	18 17 15 4 1 4	$ \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 14 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 5 \\ 5 \end{array} $	opyright American
51	59	29	Ass
ith C	Other		sociation of Bovine Practitioner

HPLC results of inhibitory substances found. Table 2.

Inhibitors Positively Identified	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Parent ceftiofur							
[extra-label/ intramammary use]	8	33	17	12	18	18	3
Penicillin, amoxicillin or ampicillin	12	4	10	11	11	17	14
Cephaparin	8	4	3	7	8	15	6
Cefazolin	1	0	0	0	2	4	1
Inhibitor detected, no positive ID	6	16	3	5	3	1	0
Negative [no inhibitor found]	1	5	8	5	9	4	5
Total No. of Inhibitors Detected	36	62	41	40	51	59	29

Association of Lameness in Dairy Cattle wi Diseases

Dorothee Janssen, Tierarzt; Charles L. Guard, DVM, PhD; Lorin Warnick, DVM, PhD College of Veterinary Medicine, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853

Introduction

Lameness has been recognized as a frequently occurring disease syndrome in dairy cattle. The dimensions of the problem are immense. Consider that, according to Greenough and Vermunt,⁴ a herd should be considered a "problem herd" when the yearly incidence has surpassed 10%-while multiple studies show yearly incidences between 14% and 25% not to be uncommon.^{1,2,3,5} Not only is lameness a major animal welfare concern; its likely impact on productivity and development of concurrent diseases makes it an important economic factor. The results presented here propose to illuminate the correlation between lameness and other diseases in two large herds in New York state.

Materials and Methods

Study herds were two large commercial dairy herds in the Ithaca area which had daily milk weight measuring systems installed. Both herds used DairyComp 305® to keep their records, which were excellent in both herds. Lame cows were identified by the herdsmen, and examined and treated by well trained-personnel. In Herd A this was the hoof trimmer, and in Herd B treatments were performed by one of the farm employees. Results of the examinations and treatments were entered into DairyComp 305[®]. This study examines the relationship between lameness diagnosed in different stages of lactation and its impact on the occurrence of ketosis, left displaced abomasum and mastitis.

Results and Conclusions

At the time of manuscript submission, these data were not analyzed. Results will be presented during my presentation at the Conference.

References

1. Clarkson MJ, et al: Incidence and prevalence of lameness in dairy cattle. Vet Rec 138: 563-567, 1996.

2. Coulon JB, Lescourret F, Fonty A: Effects of foot lesions on milk production by dairy cows. J Dairy Sci 79: 44-49, 1996.

3. Faye B, Lescourret F: Environmental factors associated with lameness in dairy cattle. Prev Vet Med 7: 267-287, 1989.

4. Greenough PR, Vermunt JJ: In search of an epidemiologic approach to investigating bovine lameness problems. Pro 8th International Symposium on disorders of the ruminant digit, Banff, Canada S. 186-196, 1994.

5. Wells SJ, Trent AM, et al: Individual cow risk factors for clinical lameness in lactating dairy cows. Prev Vet Med 17: 95-109, 1993.