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The importance of nutrition during gestation for lamb vigour and survival

• Research into practice
• Knowledge gaps

• Information base
  – systematic review with strict study acceptance criteria

The importance of the gestation period for welfare of lambs: maternal stressors and lamb vigour and well-being

[Rooke et al., Journal of Agricultural Science (in press)]
The importance of nutrition during gestation for lamb vigour and survival

• To state the obvious

• Nutrition is critical

• No feed

• A ewe survival problem!

• The importance of nutrition is therefore how much can we deviate from ideal
**In practice - annual targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Mating</th>
<th>Mid Pregnancy</th>
<th>Lambing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowland</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolific</td>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected that ewes lose body condition during pregnancy - fed less than requirements

From “Year round feeding the ewe for lifetime production” SAC.
Does research adequately describe practice?

• The problem with experiments
  – Severity of treatments constrained by legislation/ethics
    is not allowed
  – Measurement increases level of husbandry / intervention at lambing

• Research probably under-represents severity of practical conditions
Review - end points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End-point</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth-weight</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe / lamb behaviour</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colostrum intake / IgG absorption</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermogenesis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since birth-weight consistently reported and reduced birth-weight associated with increased risk of mortality

Birth-weight used as proxy for mortality

Nutritional interventions
• Under-nutrition (less than requirement for maintenance+pregnancy)
• Over-nutrition (more than requirements)
• Specific nutrients (trace elements / vitamins)
Under-nutrition

Timing of intervention

• Imposed later than gestation day (GD) 90 – 100
  – Under-nutrition reduced birth-weight in all studies

• Imposed before GD 90 – 100
  – More variable, birth-weight reduced in minority of studies (5 of 17)
  – The studies in which birth-weight was reduced (5) are interesting
Over-nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth-weight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No benefit to feeding ewes more than requirement for maintenance and pregnancy – in fact may be negative
Specific nutrients

- Co, I, Se, Vitamin E considered
- Interpretation of many studies difficult because of baseline status of ewes (deficient / marginal / adequate)
- Aim to ensure requirements met
- Are there benefits to feeding in excess of requirement?
- Possibly for n-3 fatty acids (no specific requirement in most systems) but negative implications for milk yield / quality
Under-nutrition: interactions

Extent and severity of under-nutrition

- Imposed later than GD 90 – 100
  - As expected, increasing extent or severity of challenge, increases extent of reduction in birth-weight

- Imposed before GD 90 – 100
  - More variable most under-nutrition in range 0.5 – 0.9 of requirement
  - Exception: Vincent et al. 1985: 0.15 requirement GD 0 - 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Birth-weight (kg)</th>
<th>Mortality (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 x requirement</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under-nutrition: interactions

Under-nutrition treatment: 0.70 of requirement from GD 1-90.

Lamb birth-weights (kg)

Suffolk : Birth weight reduced by under-nutrition
Blackface: No effect

Hill-breed (Blackface), adapted to poorer environment, partitioned more nutrients to lamb than lowland breed (Suffolk)

Rooke et al. (2011).
Under-nutrition: interactions

• Litter size
  Triplets more adversely affected by under-nutrition; differences between singles and twins more variable

• Other challenges – handling, housing, shearing, disease, thermal

  Few studies
Under-nutrition - interactions

- **Ewe body reserves** (Kenyon et al. 2009; van der Linden et al. 2010); 2 x 2 factorial: Large (L, 60kg; BCS 3.0) v Small (S, 43 kg; BCS 2.0) ewes; Ad libitum (A) v maintenance (M) feeding, GD 21-140

Ewes with greater body reserves better able to withstand under-nutrition

Ewe lamb performance as mothers
Under-nutrition - interactions

- **Ewe body reserves** (Kenyon et al. 2009; van der Linden et al. 2010); 2 x 2 factorial: Large (L, 60kg; BCS 3.0) v Small (S, 43 kg; BCS 2.0) ewes; Ad libitum (A) v maintenance (M) feeding, GD 21-140

Ewes with greater body reserves better able to withstand under-nutrition

But lambs born to M ewe lambs were heavier than borne to Ad lib ewe lambs. No effect of grandparent size.
Conclusions

• Under-nutrition is the practical concern
• Adequate feeding in last third of pregnancy important to maintain birth-weight
• Earlier under-nutrition less critical

But
• Interactions important and deserve more research
• Trans-generational effects of nutrition on birth-weight exist
# Annual targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Mating</th>
<th>Mid Pregnancy</th>
<th>Lambing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowland</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolific</td>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breed?**

**Weight as % of weight at mating**

- **3.5**
- **3.0**
- **2.5**
- **2.0**

**Months**

- Mating
- Pregnancy
- Lambing
- Weaning
- Recovery

**OK? economics**
Acknowledgments

- Thanks to all SRUC staff and students, past and present involved with research

- We gratefully acknowledge funding from
  - Defra
    - Project AW0509: Early environment effects on animal welfare, health and productivity
  - Scottish Government
    - SPASE Module 2: Effects of early environment on behaviour, reproduction, welfare and product quality of livestock