

## Treatment of Disease by Organic Dairy Farmers – Preliminary Results of a Multistate Study

Pamela L. Ruegg<sup>1</sup>, DVM, MPVM, DABVP (Dairy Practice) and Roxann Weix Richert,<sup>1</sup>DVM  
Ynte Schukken<sup>2</sup>, DVM, Phd, Mike Gamroth<sup>3</sup>, MS, Kellie Cicconi<sup>2</sup>, Katie Stiglbauer<sup>3</sup>  
University of WI, Dept. of Dairy Science<sup>1</sup>  
1675 Observatory Dr. Madison, WI 53706 [plruegg@wisc.edu](mailto:plruegg@wisc.edu)  
Cornell University, Ithaca NY<sup>2</sup>  
Oregon State University, Corvallis OR<sup>3</sup>

### INTRODUCTION

Organic regulations in the US strictly regulate medications may be used on organic farms (USDA, 2011). While both Canadian and EU organic standards discourage the use of antibiotics or prohibited synthetic compounds, both standards contain provisions that allow limited usage of antibiotics (without loss of organic status of the animal) under strictly defined conditions and with extended withholding periods. In contrast, U.S. organic standards contain a unique and rigorous prohibition against use of most conventional allopathic veterinary treatments. While use of veterinary biological compounds is encouraged, only approved synthetic substances may be used, and hormones and antimicrobials are not allowed unless the animal is removed from organic production. Unfortunately, there are no FDA approved antimicrobial compounds on the USDA approved list of organic treatments and FDA guidelines do not allow for the use of unapproved drugs (regardless of whether or not the substance is a botanical, homeopathic remedy or food supplement) for treatment of food producing animals even under the supervision of a veterinarian. Organic producers in the U.S. face a confusing paradox regarding the provision of treatments to sick animals. The regulations require them to provide appropriate medical treatment for sick cows, but those animals that receive that care are permanently disqualified from organic production, thereby effectively providing a strong economic disincentive against the provision of necessary treatments and an incentive to use unproven alternative treatments for treatment of some diseases. This paper presents preliminary data collected in USDA NIFA project 2008-51106-19463, “Impact of Organic Management on Dairy Animal Health and Well-being.” Data collection and study design are briefly described in a companion paper (Ruegg, et al., 2011). The preliminary data presented in this paper presents new information about treatments used for ill animals on small dairy herds and contrasts treatments usage among conventional herds that utilize confinement and intensive grazing practices with similar herds that are certified organic producers.

### ROUTINE TREATMENTS USED FOR PREVENTIVE PURPOSES

Like the organic standards of Canada and the EU, the U.S. ORG standards for health management of livestock emphasize preventive health management. Producers are encouraged to “establish and maintain preventive animal health care practices” and to “establish appropriate housing, pasture conditions, and sanitation practices to minimize the occurrence and spread of diseases and parasites.” Emphasis is placed on reducing stress: “Animals in an organic livestock operation must be maintained under conditions which provide for exercise, freedom of movement, and reduction of stress appropriate to the species. Additionally, all physical alterations performed on animals in an organic livestock operation must be conducted to promote the animals' welfare and in a manner that minimizes stress and pain.” While it is apparent that ORG cattle are maintained on pasture, preliminary results of the current study do not indicate that a greater proportion of ORG farmers use traditional preventive practices such as vaccinations, footbaths, or hoof trimming as compared CON farmers that use both grazing and confinement practices (Table 1).


Table 1. Routine preventive practices based on farm management system

	Organic	Conventional Herds	
		Graze	Confined
<b>Maximum number of herds included in preliminary data for each question</b>	169	30	56
<b>Vaccinations</b>	70%	100%	98%
<b>Routine use of footbath</b>	14%	33%	43%
<b>Routinely trim hooves</b>	25%	53%	75%
<b>Written treatment records</b>	83%	33%	27%
<b>Routine injections</b>	12%	30%	40%
<b>Routine oral products</b>	46%	43%	43%
<b>Milking includes: strip, dip or wash, dry and postdip</b>	46%	60%	48%
<b>Other routine treatments (mostly dry cow treatment)</b>	13%	97%	95%

## TREATMENTS USED FOR SELECTED DISEASES

There are a couple of studies that discuss products used by ORG farmers to treat mastitis but data about products used by ORG farmers to treat other diseases is extremely limited. Occasional usage of ceftiofur for treatment of respiratory disease has been reported by a few ORG dairy farms (Zwald et al., 2004). In general, ORG farmers seem to utilize a variety of non-antimicrobial compounds to treat respiratory, uterine and foot infections (Pol and Ruegg, 2007). In the current study, comprehensive information about treatment protocols and retrospective and prospective information about treatment of selected diseases were collected. Very few herds of any management type reported that they had arrangement to move sick cows to other farms: 4% of ORG and 5% of CON herds reported using this strategy. Almost all cases of milk fever and >85% of all cases of ketosis were reported to be treated by farmers of all management strategies. Likewise the proportion of cases of calf pneumonia treated approached 100% for CON herds in comparison to 81% of treated cases in ORG herds. A greater proportion of cases of metritis, and pneumonia were treated by CON herds (both grazers and confinement) (Fig 1). There tended to be somewhat fewer cases of retained placenta and lameness that were treated by ORG as compared to CON farmers (Fig 1). About 22% of ORG farmers reported that they treated few or no cases of calf diarrhea in contrast to 11% of CON farmers.

Figure 1. Proportion of cases of selected adult cow disorders reported treated with any product



A variety of products and routes of administration are used to administer products to sick animals on both ORG and CON farms (Table 2). The data is reported only for herds that experience each disease.

Table 2. Proportion of herds reporting use of selected product types to treat selected diseases

Product	Mastitis		Ketosis		Pneumonia -cows		Pneumonia -calf	
	ORG	CON	ORG	CON	ORG	CON	ORG	CON
Aloe	15%	0%	11%	0%	28%	0%	29%	0%
Antimicrobials	0%	71%	0%	0%	11%	75%	16%	81%
Aspirin or NSAID	10%	14%	1%	4%	31%	20%	14%	16%
Colostrum whey	19%	1%	0%	0%	6%	0%	4%	0%
Fluids	0%	2%	47%	40%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Garlic	18%	0%	1%	0%	31%	0%	30%	0%
Glycerin	0%	0%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Herbal products	26%	2%	7%	0%	23%	0%	1%	0%
Homeopathy	9%	0%	4%	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%
Mineral or Mineral + herbal	1%	0%	14%	4%	1%	0%	7%	3%
Mint cream	60%	27%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multivitamin mixes (+probiotic)	7%	0%	22%	3%	29%	0%	19%	0%
Nutritional supplement	1%	0%	18%	4%	3%	0%	3%	0%
Propylene glycol	1%	0%	14%	49%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Oxytocin	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Vitamins	11%	5%	9%	27%	10%	0%	8%	3%

### SATISFACTION WITH TREATMENT OUTCOMES

Virtually no data about efficacy of alternative treatments for dairy cows is available but perception of cure after a treatment of clinical mastitis was not significantly different between CON and ORG farmers and almost 74% of ORG farmers were satisfied or very satisfied, with treatment outcomes, in contrast to only 40% of CON farmers (Pol and Ruegg, 2007). In the current study farmers were asked to categorize satisfaction with treatment outcomes for selected diseases. Almost all dairy farmers of all management types were satisfied or very satisfied with treatment outcomes for milk fever, ketosis and calf diarrhea. At least 20% of farmers of all types were dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied with treatments for metritis and lameness (Table 3). Considerable proportions of farmers were dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied with treatments administered for clinical mastitis (Table 3). A greater proportion of ORG farmers were dissatisfied with treatments administered for pneumonia in both calves and adult cows (Table 3).

Table 3. Proportion of farmers indicating satisfaction with treatment outcomes for selected diseases

Condition	Perception of Satisfaction	Organic	Conventional Herds	
			Graze	Confined
<b>Retained placenta</b>	Dissatisfied	4%	0%	0%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	11%	9%	30%
	Satisfied	45%	53%	30%
	Very satisfied	41%	37%	39%
<b>Metritis</b>	Dissatisfied	9%	0%	0a%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	17%	20%	33%
	Satisfied	44%	49%	44%
	Very satisfied	30%	31%	22%
<b>Lameness</b>	Dissatisfied	4%	2%	7%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	22%	34%	29%
	Satisfied	47%	47%	43%
	Very satisfied	27%	17%	21%
<b>Clinical Mastitis</b>	Dissatisfied	6%	7%	3%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	42%	30%	43%
	Satisfied	37%	48%	43%
	Very satisfied	16%	14%	10%
<b>Pneumonia – adult cows</b>	Dissatisfied	16%	2%	0%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	27%	20%	16%
	Satisfied	36%	50%	44%
	Very satisfied	22%	28%	40%
<b>Pneumonia – calves</b>	Dissatisfied	11%	4%	4%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	27%	11%	4%
	Satisfied	29%	55%	56%
	Very satisfied	34%	30%	36%

Treatment responses for some diseases are difficult to discern and the perceptions of satisfaction may be influenced by other confounding factors. There is some indication in this data that for some conditions, perception of response is associated with the proportion of animals that are treated (Table 4). The direction of the association cannot be determined and more research is needed to evaluate efficacy of treatment protocols for both alternative and conventional products.

Table 4. Proportion of farmers reporting that they are satisfied or very satisfied with treatment outcomes by proportion of animals that receive a treatment

Condition	Proportion of affected animals that receive a treatment for that condition	Organic	Conventional
Pneumonia - adults	All treated	58%	82%
	Many or most treated	56%	75%
	None treated	54%	na
Clinical mastitis	All treated	59%	65%
	Many or most treated	41%	59%
	None Treated	41%	0%
Ketosis	All treated	92%	83%
	Many or most treated	83%	75%
	All treated	100%	100%

## TREATMENT STRATEGIES FOR MASTITIS

Mastitis is the most frequently occurring disease in dairy cattle and a variety of management strategies are used by both ORG and CON farmers to management the disease. The research literature consistently indicates that ORG farmers comply with the prohibition against antimicrobial usage and rarely use these products for treatment of mastitis (Ruegg, 2009). Organic farmers enrolled in the current study appear to be more aggressively using strategies to manage the bulk tank SCC as a greater proportion segregate milk and use cowside tests to detect subclinical infections (Table 5). A greater proportion of cows on ORG herds are being milked on <4 quarters, indicating that a chronically infected quarter was dried off. Similar to previous research (Pol and Ruegg, 2007) definition of clinical mastitis cure varied based on management type.

**Table 5. Strategies used for mastitis control**

	Organic	Conventional Herds	
		Graze	Confined
<b>Use CMT</b>	73%	77%	57%
<b>Segregate milk from certain cows</b>	70%	27%	30%
<b>Proportion of herd with milk segregated</b>	6%	3%	4%
<b>Herd contains cows milking with &lt;4 quarters</b>	95%	87%	93%
<b>Proportion of herd milked with &lt;4 quarters</b>	11%	9%	6%
<b>Routinely use cowside SCC test</b>	39%	20%	21%
<b>Use non-antibiotic treatment for clinical mastitis</b>	96%	37%	50%
<b>Proportion of clinical mastitis cases treated</b>			
<b>Few or none</b>	10%	0%	7%
<b>Most</b>	29%	40%	48%
<b>All</b>	61%	60%	45%
<b>Proportion of subclinical mastitis cases treated</b>			
<b>Few or none</b>	41%	32%	56%
<b>Most</b>	24%	48%	27%
<b>All</b>	35%	20%	17%
<b>Definition of clinical mastitis cure</b>			
<b>Milk becomes normal</b>	43%	72%	75%
<b>Udder appears normal</b>	24%	36%	41%
<b>CMT negative</b>	44%	23%	24%

## CONCLUSION

The data presented herein is preliminary and final conclusions should be withheld until a more complete analysis is completed, however preventive practices appear to be no more frequently used on ORG as compared to CON farms. There is some indication in the preliminary data that the proportion of treatments for some diseases is less on ORG as compared to CON herds. While treatments for several diseases (eg, milk fever) are similar, a variety of treatments of unknown efficacy are used to treat several other diseases when they occur in cows on ORG farms. Satisfaction with treatment outcomes appears high for diseases that do not involve infectious agents but less for diseases (such as pneumonia and mastitis) of bacteria etiology.

## REFERENCES

- Pol, M. and P. L. Ruegg. 2007. Treatment practices and quantification of antimicrobial drug usage in conventional and organic dairy farms in Wisconsin. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90:249-261.
- Ruegg, P. L. 2009. Management of mastitis on organic and conventional dairy farms. *J. Anim. Sci.* 87:43-55.
- Ruegg, P.L., R. W. Richert, Y. H. Schukken, M. J. Gamroth, K. Cicconi, K. Sigelbauer. 2011. Perceptions of disease by organic dairy producers – preliminary results of a multistate study. *Proc. N.C. Veterinary Conference.* Nov, 4-6, 2011, Raleigh, NC.
- USDA, National Organic Program. 2011. National organic program. <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/nop>. Accessed March 28, 2011.
- Zwald, A. G., P. L. Ruegg, J. B. Kaneene, L. D. Warnick, S. J. Wells, C. Fossler, and L. W. Halbert. 2004. Management practices and reported antimicrobial usage on conventional and organic dairy farms. *J. Dairy Sci.* 87:191-201.