

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**ESTIMATION OF GESTATIONAL AGE BY THE USE OF FETAL
PARAMETERS; PLACENTOME, FEMUR LENGTH, AND BIPARIETAL
DIAMETER**

A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Veterinary Studies at Massey University

Aloyce Shukran Bunyaga

Institute of Veterinary, Animal and Biomedical Sciences Massey University Palmerston
North, New Zealand 2015.

Dedicated to Wilson Bunyaga, Theresia Kigadye, Mary Bunyaga and Zilatashe Bunyaga

Abstract

The research was conducted at (LATU) Large Animal Teaching Unit, Massey University, New Zealand. The study involved 23 beef cows and 60 dairy cows. The aim of the study was to test and assess the agreement between actual gestational age and that predicted using a model developed in previous studies based on placentome length (gestational age = placentome*2.88 - 6.11; Adeyinka et al., (2014) and to compare this agreement with that obtained using fetal measurements of femur length and head size (biparietal diameter). The research commenced on February 2015 and July 2015 for beef and dairy cows respectively and ended June 2015 and September 2015 for beef and dairy cows respectively. Beef cows were scanned transrectally every after three (3) weeks while dairy cows were scanned every after one (1) week.. Overall there was no evidence of bias in all the parameters studied. The strongest association ($R^2=0.85$) was seen in dairy cattle when biparietal diameter was measured and the weakest was placentome size in dairy cattle ($R^2=0.39$). This is the first study that has specifically focused on the agreement between estimates of gestational age from fetal size and actual gestational age. This study has shown biparietal diameter to be a better predictor of gestational age than mean placentome size across the range of gestational ages found in this study. However, because the limits-of-agreement for biparietal diameter increase as gestational age increases, by 120 days of gestation the difference between the limits-of-agreement for biparietal diameter and those for mean placentome size are much smaller than in early gestation, and the limits-of-agreement for biparietal diameter are similar to those previously reported where data from all placentomes measured were used to predict gestational age rather than just a single mean placentome size. At 120 days of gestation, placentomes can be measured in a much higher proportion of cattle than biparietal diameter, and even when the latter can be measured, placentome measurements are markedly easier to obtain. Femur length was by far the most difficult parameter to measure and especially by 120 days was much less precise than mean placentome size or biparietal diameter. Therefore, femur length should be restricted to use only in early gestation and then should be used alongside other parameters like biparietal diameter.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to my primary supervisor Richard Laven, my co-supervisor Lisa Whitfield for their guidance and support. It has been an absolute honor to share their experience and expertise.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the lecturers both present and past fellow, my fellow students and staff at farm services. My sincere thanks to Gia-Luvim S., who helped me collecting some of the data for this research. My profound appreciation goes to LATU team; Mike Reilly, Kerry Miller, and Gary Sparow.

I would like to thank my flatmates Vedastus, Christopher, Shaban and Nie for their useful suggestions and comments. Special thanks to the New Zealand government for providing financial assistance to my studies and my stay here in New Zealand. I am also grateful to the International Student Support team Silvia, Jamie, Suzan, Leuaina and Dave. They made my stay here in New Zealand safe, smooth and enjoyable.

I want to express special thanks to my supervisor Prof. Richard Laven for his patience and valuable input. I would like to acknowledge his continuous support and his great efforts he provided both morally and financially when editing the final document.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge all the effort and understanding of my family who has always supported me and encouraged me throughout my studies. Thank you for giving me the strength to go on, I will always endeavor to make you proud.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Abbreviations.....	vi
List of figures.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
1: Literature review of fetal and placentome growth.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Fetal growth.....	2
1.2.1 Fetal growth – data from post-mortem studies.....	3
1.2.2 Fetal growth – data from rectal palpation.....	4
1.2.3 Fetal growth- data from in vivo ultrasound studies.....	5
1.2.4 Fetal measurements.....	6
1.2.5 Biparietal diameter.....	8
1.2.6 Femur length.....	9
1.3 Placentome.....	11
1.3.1 Introduction.....	11
1.3.2 Placentome growth – data from rectal palpation.....	13
1.3.3 Placentome growth – data from ultrasound.....	13
2 Methodology.....	15
2.1 Materials and methods.....	15
2.1.1 Animals.....	15
2.1.2 Statistical analysis.....	19
2.2 Results.....	21
2.2.1 Regression analysis.....	21
2.2.2 Limits-of-agreement analysis.....	24
2.3 Discussion.....	29
2.4 Conclusion.....	32
3 References.....	32

List of Abbreviations

AI	Artificial insemination
BPD	Biparietal diameter
CL	Corpus luteum
CRL	Crown Rump Length
FTAI	Fixed-time artificial insemination
GH	Growth Hormone
IGF 1	Insulin-like growth factor 1
IVF	In vitro fertilization
LATU	Large animal research unit
MHz	megahertz
mm	millimetres
NT	Nuclear transfer
P	P-value
R ² Squared	correlation, R-squared
SPSS	Statistical Packages for Social Sciences
Vs	Versus

List of figures

Figure 1: Effect of age and sex on fetal growth rates (adapted from Eley et al., 1978)	3
Figure 2: Growth curves and stage means for fetal weight (kg) and heart girth against gestational age (weeks). Data from <i>Bos taurus</i> (squares) and <i>Bos indicus</i> (circles)	4
Figure 3: Correlation of the head diameter and gestational age in cows	6
Figure 4: Illustration of reference points for three fetal measurements which can be made using transrectal ultrasound	7
Figure 5: Representation of reference points for femur length (FML) used when measuring using ultrasound	8
Figure 6: Association between biparietal diameter (BPD) and gestational age in Murrah buffalos showing strong correlation in early gestation (from Ferreira et al., 2016)	9
Figure 7: Association between femur length and gestational age in cattle. Solid outer line – 2*SD.	10
Figure 8: Relationship between a) fetal and placentomal weight and gestational age and b) caruncular and cotyledonary weight and gestational age.	12
Figure 9: Change in mean placentome depth, width and length during gestation	12
Figure 10: Example of a digital image showing measurement of biparietal diameter	17
Figure 11: Example of a digital image showing measurement of biparietal diameter	18
Figure 12: Showing how the length of placentome was measured by using image J software	19
Figure 13: Relationship between placentome length (mm) and gestational age for dairy and beef cows measured using transrectal ultrasonography.....	21
Figure 14: Relationship between biparietal diameter (mm) and gestational age for dairy and beef cows measured using transrectal ultrasonography.....	22
Figure 15: Relationship between femur length (mm) and gestational age for dairy cows measured using transrectal ultrasonography.....	23

Figure 16: Limits-of-agreement for predicted gestational age (from biparietal diameter) and actual gestational age for Angus cattle.	24
Figure 17: Limits-of-agreement for predicted gestational age (from biparietal diameter) and actual gestational age for dairy cattle.....	25
Figure 18: Limits-of-agreement for predicted gestational age (from placentome size) and actual gestational age for dairy cattle.....	26
Figure 19: Limits-of-agreement for predicted gestational age (from placentome size using regression equation from Adeyinka et al., 2014) and actual gestational age for all cattle.....	27
Figure 20: Limits-of-agreement for predicted gestational age (from femur size) and actual gestational age for all cattle	28

List of Tables

Table 1: Illustration of the effect of breed on fetal growth (body weight)	2
Table 2: Effect of breed on change in leg length (cm) with gestational age.	10
Table 3: Association between gestational and size of three parameters measured using transrectal ultrasound	23
Table 4: Comparison of limits-of-agreement analysis for the estimates of gestational age for fetal and placentome measurements	31