



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks

Citation for published version:

Davies, P, Remnant, J, Green, M, Gascoigne, E, Gibbon, N, Hyde, R, Porteous, J, Schubert, K, Lovatt, F & Corbishley, A 2017, 'A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks', *Veterinary Record*, vol. 181, no. 19, pp. 511-+. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104501>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1136/vr.104501](https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104501)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Veterinary Record

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks

Citation for published version:

Davies, P, Remnant, J, Green, M, Gascoigne, E, Gibbon, N, Hyde, R, Porteous, J, Schubert, K, Lovatt, F & Corbishley, A 2017, 'A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks' *Veterinary Record*.
DOI: 10.1136/vr.104501

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1136/vr.104501](https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104501)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Veterinary Record

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Confid

A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Veterinary Record</i> |
| Manuscript ID | vetrec-2017-104501.R2 |
| Article Type: | Paper |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 29-Aug-2017 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Davies, Peers; University of Nottingham, Veterinary Medicine Remnant, John; University of Nottingham, School of Veterinary Medicine and Science Green, Martin; University of Nottingham, School of Veterinary Medicine and Science Gascoigne, Emily; Synergy Farm Health LTD, Gibbon, N; Belmont Farm & Equine Ltd Hyde, Robert; University of Nottingham, Veterinary Medicine Porteous, Jack; Browne & McKinney Schubert, Kiera; Torch Farm and Equine Lovatt, Fiona; Flock Health Ltd, ; Castle Veterinary Surgeons, Corbishley, Alexander; R(D)SVS, Farm Animal Practice |
| Abstract: | The aim of this study was to examine the variation in antibiotic usage between 207 commercial sheep flocks using their veterinary practice prescribing records. Mean and median prescribed mass per Population Corrected Unit (mg/PCU) was 11.38 and 5.95 respectively and closely correlated with Animal Defined Daily Dose (ADDD) 1.47(mean), 0.74(median) ($R^2 = 0.84$, $p < 0.001$). This is low in comparison with the suggested target (an average across all UK livestock sectors) of 50mg/PCU. In total, 80% of all antibiotic usage occurred in the 39% of flocks where per animal usage was greater than 9.0 mg/PCU. Parenteral antibiotics, principally oxytetracycline, represented 82% of the total prescribed mass, 65.5% of antibiotics (mg/PCU) were prescribed for the treatment of lameness. Oral antibiotics were prescribed to 47% of flocks, 64% of predicted lamb crop/farm. Lowland flocks were prescribed significantly more antibiotics than hill flocks. Variance partitioning apportioned 79% of variation in total antibiotic usage (mg/PCU) to the farm level and 21% to the veterinary practice indicating that veterinary practices have a substantial impact on overall antimicrobial usage. Reducing antibiotic usage in the sheep sector should be possible with better understanding of the drivers of high usage in individual flocks and of veterinary prescribing practices. |
| | |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Confidential: For Review Only

A quantitative analysis of antibiotic usage in British sheep flocks

Authors: Davies PL^{1*}, Remnant JG¹, Green MJ¹, Gascoigne E^{2,3}, Gibbon NJ⁴, Hyde R¹, Porteous JR⁵, Schubert KL⁶, Lovatt FM¹, Corbishley A^{7,8}

* Corresponding author Peers.Davies@nottingham.ac.uk

¹ University of Nottingham, School of Veterinary Medicine and Science, Sutton Bonington, Leicestershire LE12 5LJ

² Synergy Farm Health Ltd, West Hill Barns, Evershot, Dorset DT2 0LD

³ RAFT Solutions Ltd, Mill Farm, Studley Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2QR

⁴ Belmont Farm & Equine Ltd, 92 Belmont Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 7JS

⁵ Browne & McKinney, East View, Church St, Broughton-in-Furness LA20 6HJ

⁶ Torch Farm and Equine, 15 Habat Enterprise Park, Bideford, Devon, EX39 3HN

⁷ Dairy Herd Health and Productivity Service, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, The University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush, Midlothian, EH25 9RG, UK.

⁸ Division of Immunity and Infection, The Roslin Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush, Midlothian, EH25 9RG, UK.

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the variation in antibiotic usage between 207 commercial sheep flocks using their veterinary practice prescribing records. Mean and median prescribed mass per Population Corrected Unit (mg/PCU) was 11.38 and 5.95 respectively and closely correlated with Animal Defined Daily Dose (ADDD) 1.47(mean), 0.74(median) ($R^2 = 0.84$, $p < 0.001$). This is low in

1
2
3 22 comparison with the suggested target (an average across all UK livestock sectors) of 50mg/PCU. In
4
5 23 total, 80% of all antibiotic usage occurred in the 39% of flocks where per animal usage was greater
6
7 24 than 9.0 mg/PCU. Parenteral antibiotics, principally oxytetracycline, represented 82% of the total
8
9 25 prescribed mass, 65.5% of antibiotics (mg/PCU) were prescribed for the treatment of lameness. Oral
10
11 26 antibiotics were prescribed to 49% of flocks, 64% of predicted lamb crop/farm. Lowland flocks were
12
13 27 prescribed significantly more antibiotics than hill flocks. Variance partitioning apportioned 79% of
14
15 28 variation in total antibiotic usage (mg/PCU) to the farm level and 21% to the veterinary practice
16
17 29 indicating that veterinary practices have a substantial impact on overall antimicrobial usage.
18
19 30 Reducing antibiotic usage in the sheep sector should be possible with better understanding of the
20
21 31 drivers of high usage in individual flocks and of veterinary prescribing practices.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

32 Introduction

33 Antibiotic usage in farmed species is under scrutiny because of increasing concern surrounding
34 antimicrobial resistance, with imprudent patterns of prescribing and use representing a potential
35 risk to human and animal health (O'Neill, 2015).

36 Antibiotic usage is measured across the EU at a national level using the metric of total mass (mg) of
37 any and all antibiotic active ingredients per Population Corrected Unit (mg/PCU). The PCU
38 denominator is calculated as a standardised figure for each farmed species for breeding and
39 slaughtered animals (EMA, 2013). There is significant variation between countries, with the UK's
40 usage at 62.1 mg/PCU ranked 15th out of 26 EU countries in order of highest antibiotic usage (EMA,
41 2013).

42 The UK government has identified reducing antibiotic usage as a priority and has adopted the
43 mg/PCU metric to measure usage across all livestock sectors (UK Government, 2016) with a target
44 for UK livestock production set at 50mg/PCU. The UK is the 4th largest livestock producer in the EU
45 as calculated by PCU biomass (EMA, 2013) and the sheep industry in the UK is the largest in the EU.
46 The sheep sector is also the largest single sector of UK livestock agriculture, representing 40% of the
47 PCU biomass (EMA, 2013). For this reason, antibiotic usage in the UK sheep industry has a
48 disproportionate impact on the total mg/PCU figure for the whole UK livestock sector.

49 Species or sector specific targets are also expected to be set (UK Government, 2016), for which a
50 detailed understanding of current usage patterns is required in order to make informed decisions in
51 this area. To understand how to reduce antibiotic usage in each sector, we need to understand the
52 farm level usage, variability between farms within a species and reasons for use within farm.

1
2
3 53 The aim of this study was to collate information from a large number of British sheep farms,
4
5 54 primarily to evaluate the magnitude and variation in antibiotic usage and secondarily to assess
6
7 55 factors that impact on farm level antibiotic usage.
8
9

10 56 Methodology

11 12 13 14 15 16 58 Farm selection criteria

17
18
19 59 Two hundred and seven anonymised flock records were collated from a convenience sample of eight
20
21 60 veterinary practices that were able to contribute sales and prescription records for all antibiotic
22
23 61 products supplied to a minimum of ten sheep farm enterprises which met specific selection criteria.
24
25 62 Practices were recruited with client farms located in the following regions: West Wales, Mid Wales,
26
27 63 Central Scotland and the following English regions: South West, South East, West Midlands, East
28
29 64 Midlands and North West. Each practice provided details of all antibiotic products and quantity
30
31 65 prescribed to all their sheep farming clients during the study period of August 2015-July 2016 along
32
33 66 with flock level information on breeding flock size, flock type (categorised as Hill (18), Upland (25),
34
35 67 Lowland (164)) and management system (Organic (11), Conventional (196)). A single, recent year
36
37 68 was selected for analysis to reduce recall bias in the recording of the breeding ewe flock size, which
38
39 69 were used as the denominator for antibiotic calculations. Data were requested from farms that
40
41 70 were sheep only holdings with a minimum of 100 breeding ewes; to avoid the risk of antibiotics
42
43 71 being used in other species the study was restricted to farms exclusively with sheep. A minimum
44
45 72 breeding ewe flock size was used to reduce the potential bias associated with unnecessarily large
46
47 73 pack sizes of antibiotic products being supplied for small flocks, where unused product could
48
49 74 represent a large proportion of the purchased total. The threshold also represented a reasonable cut
50
51 75 off for commercial vs leisure/hobby flocks. The flock size ranged from 100 to 4000 ewes, with a
52
53 76 mean and median size of 529 and 300 respectively. The threshold was selected based upon the
54
55 77 maximum number of doses per product unit available in the UK.
56
57
58
59
60

78 Calculation of antibiotic usage per population correction unit (PCU)

79 The mass of antibiotic active ingredients per PCU was calculated for each prescribed product using
80 the manufacturer supplied product specification and the ESVAC standard methodology (EMA, 2015)
81 using approximate average body weights of adults (75kg) and weighted average weight for
82 slaughtered lambs drawn from the Eurostat census. To calculate the lamb component of the PCU the
83 mean rearing % of lambs per ewe (143.5%) in the reference period was estimated using the UK levy
84 board benchmarking data (AHDB 2016) as a coefficient of the standard ESVAC lamb weight value
85 (20kg). This metric was applied to all flocks in the study.

86 The average ESVAC ewe and lamb weights were considered reasonable estimates for lowland flocks
87 by the authors, however breeds used in hill farming in UK systems are generally smaller and less
88 fecund than their lowland counterparts. To account for this potential bias, a sub-analysis was
89 conducted where a separate 'Hill-PCU' was used as the denominator for antibiotic usage in hill flocks
90 specifically. This was calculated based on a mature ewe body weight of 55kg, a lamb average body
91 weight of 16kg and a rearing percentage of 115% (Welsh Farm Survey, 2016).

92 Calculation of antibiotic usage by Defined Daily Doses (DDDvet), Defined Course 93 Doses (DCDvet) and Animal-Defined Daily Dose (ADDD).

94 Antibiotic usage at flock level was estimated using standardized methods as follows. The number of
95 Defined Daily Doses (DDDvet) and Defined Course Doses (DCDvet) as Animal Defined Daily Dose
96 (ADDD) per farm for the one year reference period were estimated for each farm. The breeding
97 female population was used as the flock denominator and a standardized body weight of adult
98 sheep of 75kg and was applied to convert the mg/kgBW into a per head unit in line with the
99 standardised methodology set out by the ESVAC (EMA/710019/2014)(EMA, 2015). For oral and
100 parenteral products DDDvet and DCDvet were calculated for each antibiotic product using either; (a)
101 the licenced recommended maintenance dose for sheep where available, (b) the licenced
102 recommended maintenance dose for cattle or pigs [dependent on the species licencing of the

1
2
3 103 product] where the product used was not licenced for sheep but prescribed under the Veterinary
4
5 104 Medicines Directorate 'cascade'. Topical preparations were excluded from the calculation of DDDvet
6
7 105 and DCDvet in line with the ESVAC methodology. All products and preparations, including topical
8
9 106 and oral preparations, were included in the mg/PCU metric. The ADDD metric was generated for
10
11 107 comparison with mg/PCU and was calculated as previously described (Bos et al., 2013) and used for
12
13 108 comparison of antibiotic usage in dairy herds (Kuipers, Koops, & Wemmenhove, 2016). An additional
14
15 109 Lamb DCDvet metric was calculated for oral antibiotics licenced exclusively for neonatal lambs
16
17 110 where dose was independent of body weight. These products were assigned a lamb DCDvet per
18
19 111 animal rather than mg/kg body weight. In this study, the dose rates for these products were
20
21 112 calculated on a fixed volume per animal as directed by manufacturer recommendations, rather than
22
23 113 mg/kg bodyweight. The number of lamb DCDvet doses was then divided by the breeding ewe
24
25 114 population per farm to generate an index of lamb doses per breeding ewe per flock.
26
27
28

29 115 **Statistical modelling**

30
31
32 116 A Linear regression model was used to assess the correlation between mg/PCU, ADDD (DDDvet and
33
34 117 DCDvet) using MiniTab17 (Minitab 17 Inc, 2015). A multivariable regression model was developed
35
36 118 with antibiotic use (mg/PCU) as the response variable. A multi-level structure was used to account
37
38 119 for correlations in antibiotic use between farms, within a veterinary practice. The number of
39
40 120 breeding ewes, farm type (organic, conventional) and farm stratification (Lowland, Upland, Hill) were
41
42 121 forced into the model. Based on the a priori hypotheses of this study, all variables were retained in
43
44 122 the model. The model was built using MLwiN version 2.36 (Charlton, et al, 2017) and parameter
45
46 123 estimates generated using iterative generalised least squares (IGLS). Model fit was assessed by
47
48 124 examining q-q plots of residuals. The mg/PCU of antibiotic calculated for each farm were
49
50 125 transformed to meet the assumptions of the multivariable regression model. The optimal
51
52 126 transformation (mg/PCU to the power 0.28) was calculated using the *boxcox* function in the MASS
53
54 127 package in R (Venables, W. N. & Ripley, 2002). Variance partition coefficients (VPCs) were calculated
55
56 128 using the final model to evaluate the proportion of unexplained variance occurring at both the farm
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 129 and veterinary practice level. To facilitate interpretation of the final model, predictions were
4
5 130 calculated by fixing explanatory variables at their mean value except the variable of interest.
6
7 131 Predictions and their corresponding confidence interval estimates were back transformed to the
8
9 132 mg/PCU scale.

133 Antibiotic use by disease

134 Analysis of the disease for which each antibiotic product was prescribed was possible for 24 flocks
135 from one practice that routinely and accurately collected this information. Diseases were
136 categorised for comparison of antibiotic usage by antibiotic class in mg/PCU. Disease incidence rates
137 were estimated for the two most common prescribed reasons for antibiotic usage, using the DCDvet
138 metric and the following assumptions: licenced dose rate was used for each dose, 75kg ewe body
139 weight for each administered dose, all doses administered to ewes not lambs, zero wastage of
140 antibiotic product.

141 Results

143 Distribution of total antibiotic usage per farm and comparison of metrics.

144 Flock usage of antibiotics during the reference period ranged from 0 mg/PCU to 116.9 mg/PCU, with
145 a mean of 11.38 (sd = 15.35) and median of 5.95 (IQR = 2.47 – 13.95) mg/PCU respectively. 4.3%
146 of flocks recorded no antibiotic prescriptions during the reference period, while 1.9% of flocks
147 recorded over 50 mg/PCU (Figure 1). In total, 80% of all antibiotic usage occurred in the 39% of
148 flocks where per animal usage was greater than 9.0 mg/PCU

149 Antibiotic usage at the farm level, using the ADDD metric, calculated using the DDDvet method
150 indicated mean daily doses per animal of 1.47 (sd = 2.1) and a median of 0.74 (IQR = 0.299 – 1.97).
151 Mean and median usage as calculated by DCDvet per ewe per flock were 0.39 (sd = 0.53) and 0.20
152 (IQR = 0.17, 0.26) respectively.

1
2
3 153 Correlation between mg/PCU and ADDD using DDDvet for farms in this study was $R^2 = 0.84$
4
5 154 ($P < 0.001$). The correlation between mg/PCU and ADDD using DCDvet was $R^2 = 0.77$ ($P < 0.001$). There
6
7 155 was no significant correlation between Lamb DCDvet and any of the other metrics.
8
9

156

157 Distribution of antibiotic usage by antibiotic group

158 The mass of antibiotic products prescribed were ranked by antibiotic class (Table 1). The most
159 commonly prescribed antibiotic was oxytetracycline, which comprised 57.4% of the total, followed
160 by penicillin (including extended spectrum penicillins) 23.7%, aminoglycosides 10.7%, lincomycin
161 4.7%, macrolides 1.7%, fluoroquinolones 0.5% and florfenicol 0.5%, with the remaining 0.9% being
162 made up of cephalosporins, sulphonamides, trimethoprim and thiamphenicol.

163 Distribution of antibiotic usage by route of administration

164 Parenterally administered products represented 84.4% of the total mass used, whilst topical
165 preparations represented 12.3% and oral represented 3.3% of the total mg/PCU (Table 1).

166 *Table 1 Percentage distribution of antibiotic prescriptions by mass (mg/PCU), antibiotic class and administration route per*
167 *class across all farms.*

| Antibiotic class | Administration route (% of each class) | | | % of Total mass of all classes |
|---|--|------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| | Oral | Parenteral | Topical | |
| Oxytetracycline | | 91% | 9% | 57.4% |
| Penicillin (inc extended spectrum) | | 98% | 2% | 23.6% |
| Aminoglycoside | 29% | 66% | 6% | 10.7% |
| Lincomycin | | | 100% | 4.7% |
| Macrolides | | 60% | 40% | 1.7% |
| Florfenicol | | 100% | | 0.5% |
| Fluoroquinolones | | 38% | 62% | 0.5% |
| Other | 25% | 55% | 21% | 0.9% |

168

169

170 Comparison of antibiotic group and route of administration between 1st and 4th

171 quartile (high and low users)

172 A comparison was made between the antibiotic usage of the upper quartile of flocks (Q1) (High
173 users >13.95mg/PCU) and lower quartile flocks (Q4) (Low users < 2.47 mg/PCU). All the antibiotic
174 classes were represented in the Q1 group of flocks, however the Q4 group used fewer antibiotic
175 classes (oxytetracycline, penicillin (including extended spectrum), aminoglycosides, lincomycin). The
176 total usage of all of these individual classes was significantly lower in Q4 compared to Q1. There was
177 no significant difference in the proportional usage of antibiotic classes i.e. oxytetracycline was still
178 the predominant antibiotic used, followed by penicillins, or in administration route.

179 Seasonality of antibiotic usage by antibiotic group

180 Antibiotic prescriptions were distributed throughout the year with a significant increase in spring
181 along with a significant relative increase in the mg/PCU of penicillins and aminoglycosides (Figure 2).
182 Oxytetracycline usage also increased in the spring but to a lesser extent than the increase observed
183 with penicillin and the aminoglycosides. February was the only month in which oxytetracycline was
184 surpassed by penicillins as the most commonly prescribed antibiotic class. All of the oral
185 aminoglycoside antibiotics (neomycin and spectinomycin) were prescribed during the spring months,
186 which coincides with the majority of lambing periods in UK flocks.

187

188 Oral antibiotic usage in lambs

189 In this study, 47% (95% CI: 41% - 62%) of flocks used oral antibiotics licenced for
190 treatment/prophylaxis of colibacillosis in lambs. A further 2% of flocks, (4 farms from 2 practices)
191 were prescribed oral antibiotic tablets. Of the lowland flocks sampled, 77% (95% CI: 42% - 90%) were
192 prescribed oral antibiotics, whereas 44% (95% CI: 41% - 69%) of upland flocks and 25% (95% CI: 17%
193 - 50%) of hill flocks were prescribed oral antibiotics. Licenced oral antibiotic products in this study

1
2
3 194 were explicitly only approved for use in neonatal lambs. In those flocks using oral antibiotics, the
4
5 195 mean number of lamb oral antibiotic doses prescribed per ewe per flock was 1.23 (95% CI: 0.034,
6
7 196 5.181) and median of 0.92 (95% CI: 0.8, 1.2) doses per ewe per flock.
8
9

10 197 Topical antibiotic preparations

11
12 198 Topical antibiotic preparations were assigned to one of three categories for comparison of the
13
14 199 percentage prescribed total mass (mg/PCU) across all farms: ophthalmic preparations (4%), aerosol
15
16 200 sprays (45%) and soluble powders (51%). Ophthalmic preparations were prescribed to 22% of farms,
17
18 201 aerosol sprays were prescribed to 47% of farms and soluble powders were prescribed to 7% of
19
20 202 farms. DDDvet and DCDvet metrics were not established for topical preparations in line with EMA
21
22 203 standard methodology.
23
24

25 204 Farm Stratification

26
27
28 205 Considerable variation was observed in antibiotic usage between farms both within and between
29
30 206 farm stratification categories (Figure 3). The distributions of mg/PCU within all categories of farm
31
32 207 were positively skewed.
33
34
35

36 208

37 38 209 Multivariable analysis: Influence of veterinary practice, management system and 39 40 210 farm stratification on antibiotic use

41
42
43 211 Accounting for influence of practice in the multi-level model structure, lowland farms were shown to
44
45 212 use significantly more antibiotics (mg/PCU^{0.28}) than hill farms (p=0.02), principally due to higher
46
47 213 usage of parenteral oxytetracycline. When a 'Hill-PCU' coefficient (accounting for the lower body
48
49 214 weights and lamb output) was applied to the antibiotic usage of hill flocks as opposed to the
50
51 215 standard PCU coefficient appropriate to lowland flocks, a significantly lower antibiotic usage in hill
52
53 216 flocks was still identified (p = 0.03). There was a non-significant trend for organic farms to use less
54
55 217 antibiotic than conventional farms (p=0.06). In the final model, 21% of the unexplained variation in
56
57
58
59
60

218 mg/PCU^{0.28} occurred between veterinary practices, with the remaining 79% of variation being
 219 between farms. Additional detail on model results are provided in supplementary material.

220

221 **Distribution of antibiotic usage by clinical diagnosis**

222 A subset analysis of antibiotic class prescription patterns by clinical diagnosis was conducted on the
 223 data supplied by one veterinary practice with unusually detailed records of all antibiotics prescribed.
 224 Analysis of these 24 flocks data revealed that lameness accounted for 65.5% of antibiotics prescribed
 225 by this practice (Table 2) and oxytetracycline was the most commonly prescribed antibiotic
 226 accounting for 63.5% of the total, followed by penicillins (26.8% of total). Penicillins were prescribed
 227 for the widest range of clinical diagnoses (9 of 11 disease categories, Table 2), while oxytetracycline
 228 was prescribed for 4 of 11 categories and 85.1% of all oxytetracycline was prescribed for treatment
 229 of lameness (Table 2). The mean proportion of oxytetracycline prescribed for the treatment of
 230 lameness per farm was 91% (95% CI: 81%, 99%).

231 *Table 2. Antibiotic prescription patterns by diagnosis from a subset of 24 flocks supplied by one veterinary practice with*
 232 *unusually detailed prescription records. The proportions of antibiotics per class prescribed for each diagnosis are stated as a*
 233 *percentage of the total prescribed for that antibiotic class. The number of flocks prescribed a given class for a given*
 234 *diagnosis is stated in brackets. The Lameness category includes Contagious Ovine Digital Dermatitis, Footrot and*
 235 *Interdigital Dermatitis.*

| Treatment Diagnosis | Aminoglycosides | Penicillins (including extended spectrum) | Macrolides | Oxytetracycline | Lincomycin | % Total mg/PCU by cause |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Abortion | | | | 5.4% (1) | | 3.2% |
| Colibacillosis | 43.4% (11) | | | | | 2.2% |
| Lambing (inc dystocia, prolapse) | | 29.4% (18) | | | | 9.7% |
| Lameness (inc CODD, FR, ID) | 24.6% (1) | 34.5% (13) | 75.6% (10) | 85.1% (23) | 100.0% (4) | 65.5% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------|------|
| Listeriosis | | 0.3% (1) | | | | 0.1% |
| Mastitis | | 10.3% (4) | | | | 3.4% |
| Metritis | | 0.4% (1) | | | | 0.1% |
| Ophthalmic | | 1.7% (5) | | 9.2% (4) | | 6.0% |
| Pneumonia | | 0.4% (1) | | 0.3% (1) | | 0.3% |
| Polyarthritis | 32.0% (2) | 18.8% (9) | 24.4% (4) | | | 8.2% |
| Not recorded | | 4.3% (5) | | | | 1.4% |
| % Total mg/PCU by antibiotic class | 2.0% | 26.8% | 6.3% | 63.5% | 1.3% | |

236

237 Incidence of lameness treatments and treatments associated with lambing were estimated using the

238 DCDvet for each flock (Table 3). DCDvet based estimates of lameness incidence between farms

239 indicate a wider and higher range of treatment rates for lameness with a median of 29.6 ewe

240 treatment DCDvet per 100 ewes per year.

241 *Table 3 Disease incidence estimates for lameness and lambing associated events based upon prescribed antibiotic DCDvet*

242 *values for parenteral antibiotics prescribed for each.*

| | Mean | Median | Range |
|---|---|---|--------------|
| Parenteral treatments for lameness | 42.7 ewe treatment DCDvet per 100 ewes per year | 29.6 ewe treatment DCDvet per 100 ewes per year | 9.6 – 67.0 |
| Parenteral treatments for lambing associated events (including dystocia, prolapse) | 7.8 ewe treatment DCDvet per 100 ewes per year | 6.8 ewe treatment DCDvet per 100 ewes per year | 3.2 – 10.3 |

243

244 Discussion

245

246 The results of this study suggest that antibiotic use in all sectors and management systems of the UK

247 sheep industry is very low in comparison with the overall average of 56mg/PCU recorded across all

1
2
3 248 UK livestock sectors in 2015 (UK government VARSS 2015). The relatively low usage of antibiotics in
4
5 249 the sheep sector should not give rise to complacency. This study highlights a number of areas where
6
7 250 potential improvements in our use and monitoring of antibiotics can be made.
8
9

10 251 If antibiotic usage is to be reduced in line with the stated EU and UK policy statements (UK
11
12 252 Government, 2016) then it would be logical to target those diseases which drive highest usage with a
13
14 253 'Refine, Reduce, Replace' strategy, whilst keeping in mind the other priorities, principally animal
15
16 254 welfare. In identifying the most appropriate strategy for minimising any potential antibiotic
17
18 255 resistance selection risk, the metric used needs to be appropriate. It would be counterproductive if a
19
20 256 targeted adoption of one metric, led inadvertently, to antibiotic use patterns that did not reflect the
21
22 257 best evidence based clinical practice or neglected high risk antibiotic use.
23
24
25

26 258 It should be noted that the dominance of parenteral oxytetracycline and to a lesser extent penicillins
27
28 259 identified in this study resulted in a close correlation between the two main metrics for antibiotic
29
30 260 usage; Population Corrected Unit (PCU) and Animal Defined Daily Dose ADDD (DCDvet/DDDvet). The
31
32 261 close correlation between mg/PCU and ADDD (DDDvet/DCDvet) in the sheep sector may be very
33
34 262 helpful in simplifying monitoring of antibiotic usage, however the use of oral aminoglycosides in
35
36 263 neonatal lambs and the use of soluble antibiotic powders for topical use in footbaths or hand sprays
37
38 264 to control lameness (particularly contagious ovine digital dermatitis (CODD)) present two important
39
40 265 challenges that may be obscured by the scale of oxytetracycline use. Both of these practices have
41
42 266 the potential to subject a larger proportion of the flock, as well as the wider farm environment, to
43
44 267 antibiotic resistance selection, than targeted individual parenterally administered treatments.
45
46
47

48 268 Overall, 79% of the variation in antibiotic usage observed between flocks was attributable to
49
50 269 differences between farms. These are likely to include a combination of biological and management
51
52 270 differences, which influence the force of infection and genetic differences in disease susceptibility to
53
54 271 infection. However, the between farm variation in antibiotic use will also likely be influenced by the
55
56 272 priorities, understanding and attitudes of the farmers and shepherds responsible. Previous studies
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 273 have demonstrated differences in attitude to population health management between sheep and
4
5 274 pig farmers (Garforth, Bailey, & Tranter, 2013). In the context of antibiotic usage this study has
6
7 275 demonstrated that flock type (Hill, Upland, Lowland) was significantly associated with different
8
9 276 levels of antibiotic use and the basis for these differences warrant further investigation.
10
11
12 277 There was an important further 21% of variation attributable to the veterinary practice serving the
13
14 278 individual flocks after the effects of stratification, region, flock size and management system were
15
16 279 accounted for. This suggests there is an important influence of practice prescribing policy and
17
18 280 practice culture on the quantity of antibiotics prescribed for sheep. Reasons for these differences
19
20 281 cannot be elucidated from the current study and this would be a worthwhile topic for future
21
22 282 research. Surveys that rely on the voluntary contribution of data from participants (veterinary
23
24 283 practices in this case) are subject to bias and it is unclear the extent to which this convenience
25
26 284 sample is representative of the national flock. With the current absence of a universal, robustly
27
28 285 audited, mandatory reporting system of antibiotic use/prescription, these study findings represent
29
30 286 initial data that may indicate current prescription patterns in the UK sheep industry. Further studies
31
32 287 that incorporate true random sampling would be of value.
33
34
35
36 288 The subset analysis of antibiotic prescriptions per disease process from one practice (24 flocks)
37
38 289 suggested that the pattern of antibiotic usage across the 24 flocks was comparable to the dataset as
39
40 290 a whole in terms of overall usage per flock, relative usage by antibiotic classes and seasonality of
41
42 291 usage. It would therefore seem reasonable to conclude that some useful estimates of the disease
43
44 292 diagnoses underpinning antibiotic usage may be drawn from this subset of data. Principally the
45
46 293 treatment of lameness was the most common reason for the use of antibiotics (mainly
47
48 294 oxytetracycline) in sheep flocks, accounting for approximately 65 % of total mg/PCU. This result is
49
50 295 not surprising given the prevalence of footrot, interdigital dermatitis and contagious ovine digital
51
52 296 dermatitis. However, since important variation between practices in prescribing policies was also
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 297 identified in this study, it should also be recognised that records from one veterinary practice may
4
5 298 not be representative of practices in general.
6
7

8 299 Prompt parenteral antibiotic treatment (PAT) forms part of the accepted best practice guidelines for
9
10 300 the control of footrot (Kaler et al, 2010) and has been shown to reduce the prevalence of footrot in
11
12 301 flocks. In many upland and hill flocks, where grazing management is more extensive and PAT is not
13
14 302 practical, regular periodic treatment with parenteral antibiotics has also been suggested to be
15
16 303 effective in reducing lameness prevalence (Angell & Duncan, 2015). The authors suggest that some
17
18 304 of the significant variation observed in this study between lowland and hill flocks in the usage of
19
20 305 oxytetracycline may be due to the greater difficulty in adopting PAT protocols for lameness
21
22 306 management in comparison to their lowland counterparts. Infection pressure and risk of clinical
23
24 307 disease may also vary between these hill and lowland farms.
25
26
27

28 308 Whilst lameness prevalence is referred to widely (J. R. Winter, Kaler, Ferguson, Kilbride, & Green,
29
30 309 2015), there is little published data on the incidence rates of lameness in commercial flocks under
31
32 310 typical management conditions. The extrapolated treatment rate calculated in this study from the
33
34 311 subset of 24 flocks with detailed diagnosis data on each antibiotic product unit is an attempt to use
35
36 312 readily available data to provide a crude estimate of treatment rate as a proxy for disease incidence.
37
38 313 Accepting that the treatment rate measure used makes several key assumptions as detailed
39
40 314 previously, the high median treatment rates of 29.6 cases per 100 ewes per year and wide range
41
42 315 between farms may represent a reasonable benchmark when considering appropriate strategies for
43
44 316 lameness control.
45
46
47

48 317 Whilst the use of parenteral oxytetracycline would seem most plausibly attributed to its perpetual
49
50 318 use in the control of infectious lameness a small seasonal increase observed in February and March
51
52 319 could be attributed, at least in part, to the prophylactic or metaphylactic use in the control of
53
54 320 *Chlamydophila abortus*. This use of oxytetracycline was estimated in this study at 5% of flocks (table
55
56 321 2) per year and by others as high as 10% of flocks per year (Lovatt et al, unpublished data).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 322 Oral aminoglycosides are licenced for the treatment and/or prophylaxis of enteric *E.coli* infections in
4
5 323 neonatal lambs. The ESVAC methodology for calculating DDDvet and DCDvet values for oral
6
7 324 antibiotics dramatically underestimate the number of individuals and thus the proportion of the
8
9 325 population that are treated. For this reason it seems logical that neonatal antibiotic preparations
10
11 326 should be recorded as a 'per animal' dose rather than as mg/kg body weight. In this study, 49% of
12
13 327 farms were prescribed oral antibiotics. Extrapolating from the UK benchmarked mean rearing
14
15 328 percentage of lambs per ewe (143.5%), the mean and median doses per lamb reared per flock using
16
17 329 oral antibiotics is approximately 0.86 and 0.64 respectively.

20
21 330 The most common aminoglycoside antibiotic preparation prescribed in this study is also licenced for
22
23 331 use in piglets. In piglets, the exposure of the developing gastrointestinal flora to antibiotics has been
24
25 332 shown to have enduring effects on the microbiota (Schokker et al, 2015). It is unclear if similar
26
27 333 results would be expected in ruminant species. It has been shown that there is significant variation
28
29 334 in microbiota between calves from different beef herds (Weese & Jelinski, 2017) and early life
30
31 335 exposure of calves to antibiotics was hypothesised as a potential contributory factor. More research
32
33 336 is required to understand the dynamics of the microbiota development in lambs and what affect
34
35 337 peri-natal antibiotic treatment may have on antimicrobial resistance as well as their long term
36
37 338 health.

39
40
41 339 Topical use of antibiotics presents a different but no less important challenge. Topical antibiotic
42
43 340 preparations are excluded from ESVAC DDDvet/DCDvet metrics, however in the sheep and cattle
44
45 341 industries, these products are commonly used both in antibiotic footbaths and also as topical sprays,
46
47 342 primarily for the treatment of pathogens causing lameness. A wide range of soluble antibiotic
48
49 343 products including macrolides, aminoglycosides, lincomycin and fluoroquinolones were prescribed
50
51 344 to a small proportion of flocks (7%). In the authors' experience, these products, licenced for oral
52
53 345 administration to pigs, poultry and calves, are prescribed overwhelmingly for the treatment and
54
55 346 control of lameness caused by CODD. The use of such preparations by this route for treating
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 347 lameness is a well-established clinical approach for CODD in sheep and the cattle equivalent
4
5 348 condition, digital dermatitis, in the UK and internationally (Laven & Logue, 2006; A. C. Winter,
6
7 349 2011).In the case of CODD in particular, there is no published evidence to support this form of use,
8
9 350 whilst the evidence to support the use of antibiotic footbaths to control of digital dermatitis in cattle
10
11 351 is weak. The lack of an evidence base to guide decisions on dose rate and effective application
12
13 352 protocols raises the possibility that sub-therapeutic dosing may be common in this clinical scenario,
14
15 353 whilst spent footbath solutions are commonly discharged into slurry or the environment. It must be
16
17 354 recognised that in addition to the causative pathogens, a wide variety of other bacterial species on
18
19 355 the foot and in the soil environment will also be exposed as a result of the use of these antibiotic
20
21 356 products in this way. This is an undesirable and potentially imprudent use of antibiotics, which is
22
23 357 difficult to justify unless substantially better welfare outcomes can be demonstrated compared to
24
25 358 targeted treatment with parenteral antibiotics, which is known to be highly efficacious (Duncan et al.
26
27 359 2011, 2012, Angell et al, 2014, Angell & Duncan, 2015). CODD is estimated to affect approximately
28
29 360 35% of UK flocks (Angell et al, 2014) Assuming a similar prevalence of CODD for the flocks in this
30
31 361 study, it can be inferred that the majority of CODD affected flocks are not using antibiotic footbaths
32
33 362 to control this disease on a regular basis.

34
35
36
37
38 363 It cannot be assumed that low antibiotic usage correlates with low disease or good welfare and
39
40 364 there is a great danger in conflating the two measures. Low, targeted usage of antibiotics in all
41
42 365 veterinary species is desirable but this must be balanced with concern for animal welfare and
43
44 366 sustainable productivity. This study has demonstrated significant variation in antibiotic usage
45
46 367 between farms and between veterinary practices. Further research is required to understand the
47
48 368 biological, managerial and physiological drivers of antibiotic prescription and use among sheep
49
50 369 farmers and their prescribing veterinary surgeons in order to achieve a sustainable reduction in
51
52 370 antibiotic use.

53
54
55
56 371
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 372 **Figures**
4
5

6 373
7
8

9 374 *Figure 1 Distribution of antibiotic usage in total mg/PCU from 207 individual sheep flocks in England,*
10
11 375 *Wales and Scotland compiled from prescribing records of eight veterinary practices over a 12 month*
12
13 376 *period from 1st August 2015 to 31st July 2016.*
14
15

16 377
17

18 378 *Figure 2 Percentage of total antibiotic usage mg/PCU per month for all flocks by antibiotic class.*
19
20

21 379
22
23

24 380 *Figure 3 Distribution of flock antibiotic usage in mg/PCU by farm stratification. Box indicates the*
25
26 381 *interquartile range. Whiskers indicate upper and lower quartiles excluding outliers calculated as*
27
28 382 *those > 1.5 IQR from Q1/Q2 or Q3/Q4 boundary. Median is identified by horizontal line, mean is*
29
30 383 *identified by black diamond.*
31
32
33

34 384 **References**
35
36

37 385
38
39

40 386 Angell JW, Grove-White DH and Duncan JS 2015. Sheep and farm level factors associated with
41
42 387 contagious ovine digital dermatitis: a longitudinal repeated cross-sectional study of sheep on six
43
44 388 farms. *Prev Vet Med* 122, 107-120. Angell, J. W., Duncan, J. S., Carter, S. D., & Grove-white, D. H.
45
46 389 (2014). Farmer reported prevalence and factors associated with contagious ovine digital dermatitis
47
48 390 in Wales : A questionnaire of 511 sheep farmers. *Prev Vet Med*, 113(1), 132–138.
49
50 391 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.09.014>
51
52
53

54 392 Bos, M. E. H., Taverne, F. J., Geijlswijk, I. M. Van, Mouton, J. W., Mevius, D. J., Heederik, D. J. J., &
55
56 393 Authority, M. (2013). Consumption of Antimicrobials in Pigs , Veal Calves , and Broilers in The
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 394 Netherlands : Quantitative Results of Nationwide Collection of Data in 2011, PLOS One 8(10).
4
5 395 <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077525>
6
7
8 396 Duncan JS, Grove-White D, Moks E, Carroll D, Oultram JW, Phythian CJ and Williams HW 2012.
9
10
11 397 Impact of footrot vaccination and antibiotic therapy on footrot and contagious ovine digital
12
13 398 dermatitis. Veterinary Record 170, 462.
14
15
16 399 Duncan JS, Grove-White D, Oultram JW, Phythian CJ, Dijk JV, Carter SD, Cripps PJ and Williams HJ
17
18
19 400 2011. Effects of parenteral amoxicillin on recovery rates and new infection rates for contagious
20
21
22 401 ovine digital dermatitis in sheep. Veterinary Record 169, 606.
23
24
25 402 EMA - European Medicines Agency. (2013). Sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in 26 EU / EEA
26
27 403 countries in 2013 Fifth ESVAC report.
28
29
30 404 EMA - European Medicines Agency. (2015). Principles on assignment of defined daily dose for
31
32 405 animals (DDDA) and defined course dose for animals (DCDA) Table of contents, 44(March), 1–64.
33
34
35 406 Garforth CJ, Bailey AP and Tranter RB 2013. Farmers' attitudes to disease risk management in
36
37 407 England: a comparative analysis of sheep and pig farmers. Prev Vet Med 110, 456-466
38
39
40 408 Kaler J, Daniels JL, Wright JL and Green LE 2010. Randomized clinical trial of long-acting
41
42 409 oxytetracycline, foot trimming, and flunixin meglumine on time to recovery in sheep with footrot.
43
44
45 410 Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine 24, 420-425. Kuipers, A., Koops, W. J., & Wemmenhove, H.
46
47 411 (2016). Antibiotic use in dairy herds in the Netherlands from 2005 to 2012. Journal of Dairy Science,
48
49 412 99(2), 1632–1648. <http://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8428>
50
51
52 413 Laven, R. A., & Logue, D. N. (2006). Treatment strategies for digital dermatitis for the UK, Veterinary
53
54 414 Journal: 171, 79–88. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2004.08.009>
55
56
57 415 Minitab 17 Inc. (2015). Minitab 17. Minitab Statistical Software.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 416 MLwiN Version 3.00, Charlton, C., Rasbash, J., Browne, W.J., Healy, M. and Cameron, B. (2017).
4
5
6 417 Schokker, D., Zhang, J., Vastenhouw, S. A., & Heilig, H. G. H. J. (2015). Long-Lasting Effects of Early-
7
8 418 Life Antibiotic Treatment and Routine Animal Handling on Gut Microbiota Composition and Immune
9
10 419 System in Pigs, (day 55), PLOS One: 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116523>
11
12
13 420 Stocktake report 2016. (2016), www.AHDB.co.uk.
14
15
16 421 Timmerman, T., Dewulf, J., Catry, B., Feyen, B., Opsomer, G., Kruif, A. De, & Maes, D. (2006).
17
18 422 Quantification and evaluation of antimicrobial drug use in group treatments for fattening pigs in
19
20 423 Belgium, *Prev Vet Med*: 74, 251–263. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2005.10.003>
21
22
23 424 VARSS report 2015: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/veterinary-antimicrobial-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/veterinary-antimicrobial-resistance-and-sales-surveillance-2015)
24
25 425 [resistance-and-sales-surveillance-2015](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/veterinary-antimicrobial-resistance-and-sales-surveillance-2015)
26
27
28 426 Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. (2002). MASS Package in R.
29
30
31 427 Weese, J. S., & Jelinski, M. (2017). Assessment of the Fecal Microbiota in Beef Calves, *Journal of*
32
33 428 *internal veterinary medicine*, 176–185. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jvim.14611>
34
35
36 429 Welsh Farm Survey 2016, TABLE B3 . Hill sheep farms Farm Business Income TABLE B3. Hill sheep
37
38 430 farms 1 . Under 28 ESU, Aberystwath University.
39
40
41 431 Winter, A. C. (2011). Treatment and control of hoof disorders in sheep and goats, *Vet Clin North Am*
42
43 432 *Food Anim Pract*: 27, 187–192. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cvfa.2010.10.018>
44
45
46 433 Winter, J. R., Kaler, J., Ferguson, E., Kilbride, A. L., & Green, L. E. (2015). Changes in prevalence of ,
47
48 434 and risk factors for , lameness in random samples of English sheep flocks : 2004 – 2013, *Prev Vet*
49
50 435 *Med* 122, 121–128.
51
52
53 436
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Distribution of antibiotic usage in total mg/PCU from 207 individual sheep flocks in England, Wales and Scotland compiled from prescribing records of eight veterinary practices over a 12 month period from 1st August 2015 to 31st July 2016.

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2 Percentage of total antibiotic usage mg/PCU per month for all flocks by antibiotic class.

Figure 2 Percentage of total antibiotic usage mg/PCU per month for all flocks by antibiotic class.

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3 Distribution of flock antibiotic usage in mg/PCU by farm stratification. Box indicates the interquartile range. Whiskers indicate upper and lower quartiles excluding outliers calculated as those > 1.5 IQR from Q1/Q2 or Q3/Q4 boundary. Median is identified by horizontal line, mean is identified by black diamond.

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)