

Pakistan Veterinary Journal

ISSN: 0253-8318 (PRINT), 2074-7764 (ONLINE) Accessible at: www.pvj.com.pk

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Possible Risk Factors Associated with Mastitis in Indigenous Cattle in Punjab, Pakistan

Riaz Hussain[§], Ahrar Khan^{*}, M. Tariq Javed and Farzana Rizvi

Department of Pathology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad; [§]Present address: University College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan *Corresponding author: ahrar1122@yahoo.com

ARTICLE HISTORY ABSTRACT

Received: December 14, 2011 The present study was conducted on 453 lactating cattle of various breed present at Revised: March 02, 2012 21 farms. The milk samples from these animals were collected to diagnose mastitis May 10, 2012 Accepted: using California Mastitis Test (CMT). The epidemiological data related to animals Key words: and management was collected and analyzed to draw conclusions. The results of t-Cattle test revealed significant association between body weight, udder depth, and lower Mastitis teat end to floor distance (P<0.01) with mastitis. The bivariate frequency analysis Pakistan revealed significant association for lactation stage (P<0.0001), teat end to floor Risk factors distance, parity, udder shape, teat shape, live body weight, teat and/or udder pathology, use of oxytocin, feeding system and milk leakage with mastitis. The results of logistic regression analysis revealed significant negative association between teat length, frequency of culling and number of attendants, while positive association between mastitis teat involved, teat diameter (apex, mid and base), milk leakage, udder shape, pendulous udder, feeding system, udder depth, teat shape, calf suckling, milk yield, teat and/or udder pathology and live body weight. From the results of present it can be concluded that some risk factors were strongly associated with mastitis in cattle.

©2012 PVJ. All rights reserved

To Cite This Article: Hussain R, A. Khan, MT Javed and F. Rizvi, 2012. Possible risk factors associated with mastitis in indigenous cattle in Punjab, Pakistan. Pak Vet J, 32(4): 605-608.

INTRODUCTION

The productive efficiency of dairy herds is negatively affected by poor management, different diseases and various host/environmental risk factors. In modern dairy industry, animals face stress during different physiological phases during development, pregnancy/calving and lactation period. The optimum physiological condition of animal is crucial for the repair/regeneration of damaged/ diseased tissues and for optimum functioning of immune system. Physiological stress of any kind reduces the ability of the immune system and when compromised, it favors the occurrence of various diseases including mastitis.

Mastitis occurs if the pathogens gain entry through teat orifice into the mammary tissue. The morphology of teat/udder and the presence of injuries play crucial role in the pathogenesis of mastitis (Chrystal *et al.*, 2001; Ali *et al.*, 2011; Hussain *et al.*, 2012a). Few studies have shown presence of different teat and udder lesions as important risk factors for mastitis (Bhutto *et al.*, 2010) along with inverted and less pointed teat shapes (Slettbakk *et al.*, 1995). The risk factors including milking techniques, husbandry practices and irrational use of antibiotics to

treat mastitis also favor the occurrence of mastitis (Bhutto et al., 2010). Several studies under varying conditions have identified various risk factors including increased numbers of cows at the premises, milk leakage from teat orifice, heavy milk production, asymmetric udders and use of post-milking teat disinfectants (Barnouin et al., 2005; Breen et al., 2009; van den Borne et al., 2011). There have been few reports published showing association of various risk factors with mastitis in cattle in Pakistan, however, previously none of the published data under local conditions have been analyzed by logistic regression procedures. Thus, there was a strong need to investigate various potential risk factors associated with mastitis involving old but well established dairy farms and those at under private control those are newly established. Therefore, the present study was designed to investigate the possible association of various risk factors in cattle with use of logistic analysis and chi-square methods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out on a total of 453 cattle present at 21 dairy herds. All the lactating animals at these farms were tested with California Mastitis Test following the standard protocol (Schalm et al., 1971). The results of the test of each animal were recorded on a specially designed proforma. All other information about each animal was also recorded including the age of the animal, body weight, lactation staged, breed, parity, milk yield, calf suckling, feeding system, use of oxytocin, housing system/space, frequency of culling and number of attendants at the farm. Other parameters including teat length, udder depth, pendulous udder, udder shape, treat shape, teat diameter (apex, middle and base), teat end to floor distance, tail length, teat lesions/injuries and milk leakage from the teat sphincter were also recorded. The teat length and teat diameter were recorded with the help of Vernier Caliper, other all measurements were made with the help of measuring tape.

Statistical analysis: The data obtained in this study were analysed by using SAS 9.1 statistical software (SAS, 2004). Data on teat length and diameter were analyzed by analysis of variance technique and means were compared by t-test. Data on various epidemiological factors were analyzed by using chi-square and logistic analysis procedures. In logistic procedure, the analysis for various risk factors was controlled for farm; farm and breed; farm, breed and age; breed and age. The univariate logistic analysis was also carried out by taking single variable in the model with mastitis as outcome variable. Where appropriate odds ratio and 95% confidence interval were also worked out.

RESULTS

The results for various physical parameters of mastitic and healthy cattle are presented in Table 1. The data analysis by t-test did not show significant difference for parameters including age, parity and tail length between mastitic and healthy cattle (Table 1). However, live body weight (P<0.01), teat floor distance (P<0.01) and udder depth (P<0.01) showed significant difference between mastitic and healthy cattle (Table 1). The live body weight of mastitic cattle was higher, teat floor distance lower and the udder depth was higher than healthy cattle.

 $\label{eq:stability} \textbf{Table I:} Analysis of various physical parameters (Mean\pmSD) of infected and healthy cattle$

Parameters		Healthy	Infected/Mastitic	P-
				Value
Age		6.7±2.3	7.0±2.2	<0.29
Parity		3.2±2.0	3.5±1.9	<0.12
Tail size		36.3±5.0	37.2±5.0	<0.15
Live weight		353.8±57.7	403.2±52.5	<0.001
Teat	floor	21.3±2.7	17.3±2.3	<0.001
distance				
Udder depth		5.5±0.5	7.30±0.7	<0.001

The frequency analysis did not show statistical difference between mastitic and healthy animals for parameters including age, tail length, breed and housing space. However, lactation stage, floor distance, parity, udder shape, teat shape, live body weight, teat and/or udder pathology, use of oxytocin, feeding system and milk leakage (P<0.005) showed significant difference between mastitic and healthy animals (Table 2). The

mastitis was significantly higher in animals at their third lactation stage, increase in parity, heavy live body weight, having bowl or round udder, cylindrical, round or flat teats, cattle having teat and udder lesions, animals in which oxytocin was frequently injected for milk letdown, animals fed on stall + grazing (P<0.01) and animals having milk leakage (P<0.005) throughout the day. However the frequency analysis failed to show significant difference between mastitic and healthy animals for parameters including breed and housing space (Table 2). The results of bivariate logistic regression analysis revealed significant negative association of mastitis with teat length, frequency of culling and teat to floor distance, while positive association with teat involved, teat diameter (apex, mid and base), milk leakage, udder shape, pendulous udder, feeding system, udder depth, teat shape, calf suckling, milk yield, teat lesions and live body weight (Table 3). The multivariate logistic analysis after controlling for farm revealed significant association of all the parameters as were found with bivariate analysis with exception of base diameter of teat, however, an additional association was found with number of attendants at the farm. The multivariate logistic analysis after controlling for farm and breed, breed and age and for farm, breed and age revealed significant association of all the parameters as were found with bivariate analysis with exception of mid and base diameter of teat and frequency of culling, however, an additional association was found with number of attendants and lactation stage.

DISCUSSION

The control of bovine mastitis depends on the detection and elimination of different host and environ-mental risks factors associated with mastitis. Many risk factors associated with mastitis can be eliminated by adopting hygienic measures, good management and selecting dairy animals which are less prone to mastitis (Nash *et al.*, 2003; Hussain *et al.*, 2012a). The study was carried out to find out the association of certain risk factor with mastitis in cattle under local conditions.

During present study, age, parity and tail length did not show association with mastitis while live body weight, teat to floor distance and udder depth showed significant association. In previous studies, an association of mastitis with age (Barkema et al., 1999; Nyman et al., 2007; Hammer et al., 2012), parity (Parker et al., 2007; Nyman et al., 2009; Kavitha et al., 2009; Salem-Bekhit et al., 2010), body condition (Kivaria et al., 2007) teat to floor distance (Waage et al., 2001; Svensson et al., 2006; Compton et al., 2007; Bhutto et al., 2010) have been reported. However, some workers have not found as association of parity (Slettbakk et al. 1995) live weight (Fregonesi and Leaver, 2001) with occurrence of mastitis. There are differences in literature as for involvement of these parameters with mastitis is concerned. We could not found an association of age with mastitis while most others have which is difficult to be explained. It may be due to the breed differences and genetic makeup of the animals in different regions of the world but this has to be proved in future studies. About data on parity, we found significant association with logistic procedure and

Table 2: Bivariate frequency analysis of different parameters in infected and healthy cattle Positive Negative Mental

Table 3: Logistic regression procedure for various parameters showing significant association in cattle _____

n%Haenszel Chi1-41812.00132P<0.00014.1-81911.311498.1-125137.7884Floor distance (inches)751.6544P<0.000114.174751.6544P<0.000117.1-203227.838320.1-2362.331.94152Parity11716.5086P<0.052.32315.5412.54.5109.0111716.5086P<0.052.32.320-302025.6458P<0.122.44.520-302025.6458P<0.122.44.520-302025.6458P<0.122.44.6Cup156.88203P<0.0001RoundRound3627.6994Bowl3735.2468191P<0.0001Cylindrical36Round1824.3256Flat29Age44.<4911.5469P>0.214.1-63221.621166.1-83331.1-01616.826910.1-121224.003813.52.357BreedCross-bred2221.1582Cross-bred2221.1582P>0.37Nondescript2621.4995Sahiwal4017.54 <t< th=""><th>Parameters</th><th>P</th><th>ositive</th><th>Negative</th><th colspan="2">Mental-</th></t<>	Parameters	P	ositive	Negative	Mental-				
Lactation stage (months) 1-4 18 12.00 132 P<0.0001 4.1-8 19 11.31 149 8.1-12 51 37.78 84 Floor distance (inches) 14-17 47 51.65 44 P<0.0001		n	%		Haenszel				
1-4 18 12.00 132 P<0.0001					Chi				
4.1-8 19 11.31 149 Floor distance (inches) 77.8 84 Floor distance (inches) 77.83 83 20.1-23 6 6.52 86 >23 3 1.94 152 Parity 1 17 16.50 86 2.3 23 15.54 125 4.5 10 9.01 101 6-7 38 41.76 53 Tail length (inches) 20.30 20 25.64 58 P>0.12 30.40 48 18.97 205 >40 20 16.39 102 Udder shape U 14.16 17 65 88 203 P<0.0001	Lactation stage (months	5)							
8.1-12 51 37.78 84 Floor distance (inches) 47 51.65 44 P<0.0001			12.00		P<0.0001				
Floor distance (inches) 14-17 47 51.65 44 P<0.0001 17.1-20 32 27.83 83 20.1-23 6 6.52 86 >23 3 1.94 152 Parity 1 17 16.50 86 P<0.05	4.1-8	19		149					
14-17 47 51.65 44 P<0.0001 17.1-20 32 27.83 83 20.1-23 6 6.52 86 >23 3 1.94 152 Parity 1 17 16.50 86 P<0.05		51	37.78	84					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $									
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					P<0.0001				
>2331.94152Parity11716.5086P<0.05	17.1-20	32	27.83	83					
Parity I 17 16.50 86 P<0.05 2-3 23 15.54 125 4.5 10 9.01 101 6-7 38 41.76 53 733 20-30 20 25.64 58 P>0.12 20-30 20 25.64 58 P>0.12 30-40 48 18.97 205 >40 20 16.39 102 102 104 104 106 107	20.1-23	6	6.52	86					
11716.5086 $P<0.05$ 2-32315.541254-5109.011016-73841.7653Tail length (inches)2025.6458 $P>0.12$ 30-404818.97205>402016.39102Udder shape755.2468Cup156.88203 $P<0.0001$ Round3627.6994Bowl3735.2468Teat shape9156.88Pointed52.55191Pointed52.55191Pointed3635.6465Round1824.3256Flat2935.373Age48<	>23	3	1.94	152					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Parity								
4-5109.011016-73841.7653Tail length (inches)20.302025.6458 $P>0.12$ 20-302016.39102102Udder shape	I	17	16.50	86	P<0.05				
6-7 38 41.76 53 Tail length (inches) 20 25.64 58 P>0.12 30-40 48 18.97 205 >40 20 16.39 102 Udder shape	2-3	23	15.54	125					
Tail length (inches) 20-30 20 25.64 58 P>0.12 $30-40$ 48 18.97 205 >40 20 16.39 102 Udder shape Cup 15 6.88 203 P<0.0001	4-5	10	9.01	101					
20-302025.6458 $P>0.12$ 30-404818.97205>402016.39102Udder shapeCup156.88203 $P<0.001$ Round3627.6994Bowl3735.2468Teat shapePointed52.55191 $P<0.001$ Cylindrical3635.6465Round1824.3256Flat2932.753Age4&911.5469P>0.2111.54694.1-63221.621166.1-81920.65738.1-101618.826910.1-121224.0038Live body weight250&0010250&2500010251.300620.024301-350136.66183351.4003829.4591>4003135.2357BreedCross-bred2221.1582P<0.37	6-7	38	41.76	53					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Tail length (inches)								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	20-30	20	25.64	58	P>0.12				
Udder shape IS 6.88 203 P<0.0001 Round 36 27.69 94 Bowl 37 35.24 68 Teat shape Pointed 5 2.55 191 P<0.0001	30-40	48	18.97	205					
Cup 15 6.88 203 P<0.0001 Round 36 27.69 94 Bowl 37 35.24 68 Teat shape Pointed 5 2.55 191 P<0.0001	>40	20	16.39	102					
Round 36 27.69 94 Bowl 37 35.24 68 Teat shape 7 52.55 191 $P<0.0001$ Cylindrical 36 35.64 65 Round 18 24.32 56 Flat 29 35.37 53 Age $48<4$ 9 11.54 69 $P>0.21$ $4.1-6$ 32 21.62 116 $6.1-8$ 19 20.65 73 $8.1-10$ 16 18.82 69 $10.1-12$ 12 24.00 38 Live body weight 251.300 6 20.024 $208<250$ 0 0 10 $P<0.0001$ 2251.300 6 20.024 301.350 31 35.23 57 Breed C 22 21.15 82 $P>0.37$ 81.400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed C $22.91.15$ 82 $P>0.37$ Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 $P>0.037$ Nondescript 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions N N 11 None 41 15.07 231 P<0.001	Udder shape								
Bowl3735.2468Teat shape $Pointed$ 52.55191 $P<0.0001$ Cylindrical3635.6465Round1824.3256Flat2935.3753Age 4 911.5469 $P>0.21$ 4.1-63221.621166.1-81920.65738.1-101618.826910.1-121224.0038Live body weight $250&<250$ 0010250&<250	Cup	15	6.88	203	P<0.0001				
Teat shapePointed52.55191P<0.0001Cylindrical3635.6465Round1824.3256Flat2935.3753Age	Round	36	27.69	94					
Pointed52.55191P<0.0001Cylindrical3635.6465Round1824.3256Flat2935.3753Age	Bowl	37	35.24	68					
Cylindrical 36 35.64 65 Round 18 24.32 56 Flat 29 35.37 53 Åge	Teat shape								
Round18 24.32 56Flat29 35.37 53 Age	Pointed	5	2.55	191	P<0.0001				
Flat29 35.37 53 Age4&911.5469P>0.21 $4.1-6$ 3221.62116 $6.1-8$ 1920.6573 $8.1-10$ 1618.8269 $10.1-12$ 1224.0038Live body weight250&<250	Cylindrical	36	35.64	65					
Age $4\&<4$ 911.5469P>0.21 $4.1-6$ 3221.62116 $6.1-8$ 1920.6573 $8.1-10$ 1618.8269 $10.1-12$ 1224.0038Live body weight $250\&<250$ 0010 $2251-300$ 620.024 $301-350$ 136.66183 $351-400$ 3829.4591 >400 3135.2357Breed $Cross-bred$ 2221.1582 $Cross-bred$ 2221.1582P>0.37Nondescript2621.4995Sahiwal4017.54188Teat Lesions $None$ 4115.07231None4115.07231P<0.0001	Round	18	24.32	56					
4&<4911.5469P>0.21 $4.1-6$ 3221.62116 $6.1-8$ 1920.6573 $8.1-10$ 1618.8269 $10.1-12$ 1224.0038Live body weight2508<250	Flat	29	35.37	53					
4&<4911.5469P>0.214.1-63221.621166.1-81920.65738.1-101618.826910.1-121224.0038Live body weight250&<250	Age								
6.1-8 19 20.65 73 8.1-10 16 18.82 69 10.1-12 12 24.00 38 Live body weight 250& 0 0 10 P<0.0001		9	11.54	69	P>0.21				
8.1-10 16 18.82 69 10.1-12 12 24.00 38 Live body weight 250& 0 0 10 P<0.0001	4.1-6	32	21.62	116					
10.1-12 12 24.00 38 Live body weight 250&<250	6.1-8	19	20.65	73					
Live body weight 250&<250 0 0 0 10 P<0.0001 2251-300 6 20.0 24 301-350 13 6.66 183 351-400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 P>0.37 Nondescript 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001 Teat apex 11 23.91 35 Skin abrasion 12 30.77 27 Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001 Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01 Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01 Stall 60 24.29 187 feeding+grazing Housing More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.005	8.1-10	16	18.82	69					
Live body weight 250&<250 0 0 0 10 P<0.001 2251-300 6 220.0 24 301-350 13 6.66 183 351-400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 P>0.37 Nondescript 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001 Teat apex 11 23.91 35 Skin abrasion 12 30.77 27 Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001 Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01 Frequent 60 24.29 187 feeding+grazing More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.005	10.1-12	12	24.00	38					
250& 0 0 10 P<0.0001 2251-300 6 20.0 24 301-350 13 6.66 183 351-400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions 30.77 27 None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001									
301-350 13 6.66 183 351-400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed - - - Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 P>0.37 Nondescript 26 21.49 95 - Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 - Teat Lesions - - - - None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001		0	0	10	P<0.0001				
351-400 38 29.45 91 >400 31 35.23 57 Breed	2251-300	6	20.0	24					
>400 31 35.23 57 Breed Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 P>0.37 Nondescript 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions Teat Lesions None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001	301-350	13	6.66	183					
>400 31 35.23 57 Breed	351-400	38	29.45	91					
Cross-bred 22 21.15 82 P>0.37 Nondescript 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions 1 15.07 231 P<0.0001	>400	31	35.23	57					
Nondescript Sahiwal 26 40 21.49 17.54 95 188 Teat Lesions	Breed								
Nondescript Sahiwal 26 21.49 95 Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions	Cross-bred	22	21.15	82	P>0.37				
Sahiwal 40 17.54 188 Teat Lesions		26		95					
Teat Lesions None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001				188					
None 41 15.07 231 P<0.0001 Teat apex 11 23.91 35 Skin abrasion 12 30.77 27 Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001									
Teat apex 11 23.91 35 Skin abrasion 12 30.77 27 Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001		41	15.07	231	P<0.0001				
Skin abrasion 12 30.77 27 Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001									
Inflammation 7 30.43 16 Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001									
Cord formation 6 19.35 25 Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin									
Hemorrhages 2 10.53 17 Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin									
Necrosis 3 21.43 11 Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin									
Udder edema 6 66.67 3 Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001									
Oxytocin Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001 Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system 5tall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01									
Rare 21 11.41 163 P<0.001 Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system 3 3 3 Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01		5	00.07	2					
Frequent 67 24.91 202 Feed system 28 13.59 178 P<0.01		21	11.41	163	P<0.001				
Feed system Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01 Stall 60 24.29 187									
Stall feeding 28 13.59 178 P<0.01 Stall 60 24.29 187 feeding+grazing 14.96 108 P>0.13 More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005		0,	- 1.71						
Stall 60 24.29 187 feeding+grazing Housing Housing More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005		28	13 59	178	P<0.01				
feeding+grazing Housing More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005	0				1 0.01				
Housing More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005		00	£ 7.£/	107					
More space 19 14.96 108 P>0.13 Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage 7es 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005	000								
Less space 69 21.17 257 Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005		19	14 94	108	P>0 13				
Milk Leakage Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005					1-0.15				
Yes 14 37.84 23 P<0.0005		57	21.17	251					
		14	37 04	22					
No 74 2117 242	No	74	21.17	342	1 ~0.0005				
ио /т 21.1/ 34 2	INU	/"1	21.17	J72					

frequency procedure but not with means which is in line with most other reports. However, further studies are required to clarify the association of udder depth and tail

During present study an association of teat length and teat diameter was found. Similarly, other workers also

length with mastitis.

Variable	Odd	95% Confidence limits		P-value
	ratio	Lower	Upper	•
Bivariate logistic regressi	on in the m	odel		
Teat length	0.021	0.009	0.050	<0.0001
Frequency of culling	0.021	0.003	0.153	<0.0001
Floor distance	0.534	0.466	0.610	<0.0001
Teat involved	>999.999	120.605	>999.999	<0.005
Apex diameter	>999.999	>999.999	>999.999	<0.0001
Mid diameter	>999.999	369.749	>999.999	<0.0001
Base diameter	>999.999	>999.999	>999.999	<0.0001
Milk leakage	2.813	1.383	5.724	<0.005
Udder shape	2.574	1.904	3.480	<0.0001
Pendulous udder	2.549	1.489	4.363	<0.001
Feeding systems	2.040	1.245	3.340	<0.005
Udder depth	2.012	1.637	2.473	<0.0001
Teat shape	1.940	1.573	2.393	<0.0001
Calf suckling	1.440	1.275	1.706	<0.001
Milk yield	1.230	1.093	1.385	<0.001
Teat lesions	1.157	1.035	1.295	<0.01
Live body weight	1.013	1.009	1.018	<0.0001
Multivariate logistic regres	sion includi	ng farm and i	ndividual var	iable in the
model				
Teat length	0.009	0.003	0.027	<0.0001
Frequency of culling	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.0001
Floor distance	0.494	0.424	0.576	<0.0001
Number of	0.941	0.889	0.996	<0.05
attendants				
Teat involved	>999.999	117.337	>999.999	<0.005
Apex diameter	>999.999	>999.999	>999.999	<0.0001
Mid diameter	>999.999	426.553	>999.999	<0.0001
Milk leakage	2.822	1.386	5.745	<0.005
Feeding systems	2.275	1.348	3.841	<0.005
Udder shape	2.580	1.907	3.489	<0.0001
Pendulous udder	2.548	1.489	4.362	<0.001
Udder depth	2.041	1.655	2.518	<0.0001
Teat shape	1.945	1.576	2.400	<0.0001
Calf suckling	1.414	1.252	1.679	<0.0005
Milk yield	1.235	1.095	1.391	<0.001
Teat lesions	1.157	1.035	1.295	<0.01
Live body weight	1.018	1.013	1.023	<0.0001
Multivariate logistic regres	sion includi	ng breed, age	e and individu	ial variable
in the model				
Teat length	0.005	0.002	0.017	<0.0001
Floor distance	0.439	0.367	0.524	<0.0001
Number of attendants		0.840	0.998	< 0.05
Teat involved	>999.999	116.913	>999.999	< 0.005
Apex diameter	>999.999	>999.999	>999.999	<.0001
Pendulous udder	2.589	1.510	4.440	< 0.0005
Udder shape	2.575	1.902	3.486	<.0001
Milk leakage	2.760	1.352	5.632	<0.01
Feeding systems	2.241	1.326	3.788	< 0.005
Udder depth	2.058	1.660	2.550	<0.0001
Lactation stage	1.941	1.899	1.985	<0.0001
Teat shape	1.937	1.568	2.393	<0.0001
Milk yield	1.236	1.086	1.406	< 0.005
Calf suckling	1.402	1.244	1.661	< 0.0005
Teat lesions	1.161	1.037	1.299	< 0.01
Live weight	1.018	1.013	1.023	<0.0001

found an association of teat length and teat diameter with occurrence of mastitis (Slettbakk et al., 1995; Chrystal et al., 1999). These results suggest that the chances of mastitis are higher if the teat length is shorter and if the teat diameter is greater. The results of present study suggested that there is no breed association as the mastitis can occur in both Sahiwal breed, Cross-bred and non-descript cattle at almost same rate and there is also no difference in occurrence of mastitis in animals with relation to housing space provided. This was in line with previous report where also no effect of space has been found in relation to mastitis (Fregonesi and Leaver, 2001).

Present results also suggested strong association of lactation stage, udder shape, teat shape, teat lesions,

feeding system, milk leakage from teat and use of oxytocin with occurrence of mastitis. The mastitis in cattle was higher in animals in their third lactation, having round/bowl shaped udder, cylindrical/flat/round teats, who were stall fed along with grazing and where oxytocin was frequently used. As the orifice is the first line of defense against invading pathogens, lesions or damage to this part may reduce its effectiveness in preventing mastitis (Gleeson et al., 2004). In present study among different teat and udder lesions udder edema was an important risk factor for mastitis which may impairs milk removal (Waage et al., 2001; Bhutto et al., 2010). The higher prevalence of mastitis was in cattle having round and pendulous udder. It may be due to the reason that long and pendulous udder gets injuries and helps the pathogens to grow. The higher prevalence of mastitis in advanced lactation period and parity may be due to the removal of protective keratin "plug" in teats (Dingwell et al., 2004), and reduction in teat end to floor space may causes contamination of teat and udder which support bacterial invasions into mammary gland (Slettbakk et al., 1990). The use of oxytocin may have been linked to the opening of teat orifice which remains open for longer time and the teat muscles remain in relaxed position thus enabling the easy entry of pathogens to the udder eventually leading to mastitis.

Conclusion: Some risk factors are negatively, while others are positively associated with mastitis. The association of age was not found, while udder depth and use of oxytocin was found associated with mastitis along with other known risk factors.

Acknowledgement: The grant provided by Higher Education Commission, Government of Pakistan vide Project No. 20-979/R&D/07 entitled "Histomorphometry and molecular pathobiology of naturally occurring mastitis in buffaloes and cows" is highly acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- Ali MA, MD Ahmad, K Muhammad and AA Anjum, 2011. Prevalence of sub clinical mastitis in dairy buffaloes of Punjab, Pakistan. J Anim Plant Sci, 21: 477-480.
- Barkema HW, YH Schukken, TJG M Lam, ML Beiboer, G Benedictus and A Brand, 1999. Physiology and management practices associated with the incidence rate of clinical mastitis. J Dairy Sci, 82: 1643-1654.
- Barnouin J, S Bord, S Bazin and M Chassagne, 2005. Dairy management practices associated with incidence rate of clinical mastitis in low somatic cell score herds in France. | Dairy Sci, 88: 3700-3709.
- Bhutto AL, RD Murray and Z Woldehiwet, 2010. Udder shape and teatend lesions as potential risk factors for high somatic cell counts and intra-mammary infections in dairy cows. Vet J, 183: 63–67.
- Breen JE, AJ Bradley and MJ Green, 2009. Quarter and cow risk factors associated with a somatic cell count greater than 199,000 cells per milliliter in United Kingdom dairy cows. J Dairy Sci, 92: 3106-3115.
- Chand P, GD Behra and P Chand, 1995: Factors influencing occurrence of mastitis, genetic and environmental factors. Indian J Dairy Sci, 48: 271-273.
- Chrystal MA, AJ Seykora and LB Hansen, AE Freeman, DH Kelley and MH Healey, 2001. Heritability of teat-end shape and the

relationship of teat-end shape with somatic cell score for an experimental herd of cows. J Dairy Sci, 84: 2549–2554.

- Compton CW, C Heuer, K Parker and S McDougall, 2007. Risk factors for peripartum mastitis in pasture-grazed dairy heifers. J Dairy Sci, 90: 4171-4180.
- Dingwell RT, KE Leslie, YH Schukken, JM Sargeant, LL Timms, TF Duffield, GP Keefe, DF Kelton, KD, Lissemore and J Conklin, 2004. Association of cow and quarter-level factors at drying-off with new intramammary infections during the dry period. Prev Vet Med. 63: 75–89.
- Fregonesi JA and JD Leaver, 2001. Behaviour, performance and health indicators of welfare for dairy cows housed in strawyard or cubicle systems. Livest Prod Sci, 68: 205–216.
- Gleeson DE, WJ Meaney and EJ Ocallagham, 2004. Effect of teat hyperkeratosis on somatic cell counts of dairy cows. Int J App Res Vet Med, 2: 115-122.
- Hammer JF, JM Morton and KL Kerrisk, 2012. Quarter-milking-, quarter-, udder- and lactation-level risk factors and indicators for clinical mastitis during lactation in pasture-fed dairy cows managed in an automatic milking system. Aust Vet J, 90: 167–174.
- Kavitha KL, K Rajesh, K Suresh, K Satheesh and NS Sundar, 2009. Buffalo mastitis - risk factors. Buffalo Bull, 28: 135-137.
- Kivaria FM, JPT M Noordhuizen and HM Msami, 2007. Risk factors associated with the incidence rate of clinical mastitis in small holder dairy cows in the Dares Salaam region of Tanzania. Vet J, 173: 623-629.
- Nash DL, GW Rogers, JB, Cooper, GL Hagrove and JF Keown, 2003. Heritability of intramammary infections at first parturition and relationships with sire transmitting abilities for somatic cell score, udder type traits, productive life and protein yield. J Dairy Sci, 86: 2684–2695.
- Nyman AK, T Ekman, U Emanuelson, AH Gustafsson, K Holtenius, KP Waller and CH Sandgren, 2007. Risk factors associated with the incidence of veterinary-treated clinical mastitis in Swedish dairy herds with a high milk yield and a low prevalence of subclinical mastitis. Prev Vet Med, 78: 142-160.
- Nyman AK, U Emanuelson, AH Gustafsson and KP Waller, 2009. Management practices associated with udder health of first-parity dairy cows in early lactation Prev Vet Med, 88: 138-149.
- Parker KI, CWR Compton, FM Anniss, A Weir and S McDougall, 2007. Management of dairy heifers and its relationships with the incidence of clinical mastitis. N Z Vet J, 55: 206-216.
- Hussain R, MT Javed and A Khan, 2012a. Changes in some biochemical parameters and somatic cell counts in the milk of buffalo and cattle suffering from mastitis. Pak Vet J, 32: 418-421.
- Hussain R, MT Javed, A Khan, F Mahmood and R Kausar, 2012b. Mastitis and associated histo-pathological consequences in context of udder morphology. Int J Agric Biol, 14: In Press.
- Salem-Bekhit MM, MM Muharram, IM Alhosiny and MESY Hashim, 2010. Molecular detection of genes encoding virulence determinants in *Staphylococcus aureus* strains isolated from bovine mastitis. J Appl Sci Res, 6: 121-128.
- Schalm OW, EJ Carol and NC Jain, 1971. Bovine Mastitis. Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia, pp: 128-157.
- Slettbakk T, A Jerstad, TB Farver and DW Hird, 1990. Impact of milking characteristics and teat morphology on somatic cell counts in first-lactation Norwegian cattle. Prev Vet Med, 8: 253-267.
- Slettbakk T, A Jerstad, TB Farver and JC Holmes, 1995. Impact of milking characteristics and morphology of udder and teats on clinical mastitis in first- and second-lactation Norwegian cattle. Prev Vet Med, 24: 235-244.
- Svensson C, AK Nyman, KP Waller and U Emanuelson, 2006. Effects of housing, management, and health of dairy heifers on firstlactation udder health in southwest Sweden. J Dairy Sci, 89: 1990-1999.
- van den Borne BHP, JCM Vernooij, AM Lupindu, G van Schaik, K Frankena, TJGM Lam and M Nielen, 2011. Relationship between somatic cell count status and subsequent clinical mastitis in Dutch dairy cows. Prev Vet Med, 102: 265–273.
- Waage S, SA Odegaard A Lund, S Brattgjerd and T Rothe, 2001. Casecontrol study of risk factors for clinical mastitis in postpartum dairy heifers. J Dairy Sci, 84: 392-399.