

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.

A COMPARISON OF METHODS <sup>93</sup>  
<sub>6486</sub>  
FOR THE DIAGNOSIS OF BOVINE SUBCLINICAL MASTITIS  
WITHIN NEW ZEALAND DAIRY HERDS

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Veterinary Clinical Science  
at Massey University.

Robert John Holdaway

1990

## ABSTRACT

During the 1986-1987 and 1987-1988 dairy seasons, milk samples were taken from cows within three New Zealand dairy herds. Individual quarter foremilk samples were taken using aseptic precautions, and whole udder, composite samples were obtained using a milk meter, at monthly intervals.

The three herds differed with respect to herd size, milking shed design, use of teat spraying, and the incidence of mastitis, both past and present.

The bacteriological status of each quarter was determined, and the ability of the following parameters to distinguish between infected and uninfected quarters, and between infected and uninfected cows was ascertained.

- (1) Somatic cell count
- (2) Sodium concentration
- (3) Potassium concentration
- (4) Electrical conductivity
- (5) pH
- (6) Lactose concentration
- (7) N-acetyl- $\beta$ -d-glucosaminidase activity
- (8)  $\alpha$ 1-antitrypsin concentration

With the exception of the antitrypsin concentration, the concentration of each parameter in the milk changed during the course of milk removal. The effect of this variation on the composition of the composite milk sample is discussed.

The stage of lactation at which the sample was taken exerted a significant effect on the level of each parameter in quarter foremilk samples. Similar effects were observed with composite samples, although statistical significance was not reached in every instance. Both infected and uninfected udder quarters were affected by the stage of lactation.

The age of the cow exerted a significant effect on the levels of a number of the parameters within quarter foremilk samples. The effect of age of the cow on the level of each parameter within composite milk samples was generally not significant.

The bacteriological status of the udder quarter exerted a significant effect on the level of each parameter in at least one of the three herds. The effect of the bacteriological status on the pH and on the potassium concentration of the milk was smaller in degree than was the effect on the remaining parameters.

The herds differed with respect to bacteriological findings. Herd A showed a lower incidence of infection than did herds B or C. The incidence of infection with minor pathogens was highest within herd B, while the incidence of infection with major pathogens was highest within herd C. The incidence of infection tended to increase with the age of the cow.

While each of the eight parameters showed high specificity, the sensitivity was generally lower. An exception to this finding was the somatic cell count which showed both high sensitivity and high specificity.

The somatic cell count was able to correctly classify more than 75 % of quarter foremilk samples in each of the three herds, being more consistent in this respect than were any of the other parameters, the diagnostic abilities of which varied between herds.

The addition of second parameter to a model containing the somatic cell count generally did not increase the diagnostic accuracy of the system.

The threshold value was found to vary both between herds, and between stages of the lactation, this variation being greatest for the somatic cell count. Providing that the threshold is adjusted for the stage of lactation, the somatic cell count is able to accurately predict the infection status throughout the dairy season. The selected threshold should take into account the level of bacterial infection within the particular herd to which it will be applied.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work reported in this thesis was carried out with the generous financial assistance of the Livestock Improvement Corporation of the New Zealand Dairy Board.

Sincere thanks are due to the following persons:

Mr Ian Steffert and Dr Colin Holmes, my two supervisors, provided invaluable advice, constructive criticism and support during the course of the project.

Members of the Somatic Cell Counting Subcommittee of the Livestock Improvement Corporation, including Mr Harry Brown, Dr Graeme Morris, Mr Ian Hook and Dr Brian Wickham were very supportive.

Professor Robert Anderson and Dr John Rendel offered advice regarding the application of statistical procedures, and the use of the Massey University mainframe computer.

Professor Robert Jolly was very supportive throughout the project, and was responsible for supervising a course on the anatomy and pathology of the mammary gland. Similarly, Dr Duncan McKenzie is responsible for my knowledge of lactational physiology.

Cheryl Cooper and Jenny Wickham helped with the milk sampling, often under trying circumstances. Dr Bob Greenway, Geraldine Borrie, Janice Rumbal and Margaret Scott provided technical advice concerning the various assays, and were always very patient.

The somatic cell counting was carried out by Chris Bedford, Raewyn Smith and Joanne Jeffrey at the Wellington-Hawkes Bay Livestock Improvement Corporation, and latterly by the staff of the Hillcrest Testing Center in Hamilton.

Lynne Cullinane provided advice, encouragement, and invaluable assistance with word-processing and printing of the thesis, while Jan Schrama spent many hours making the bacteriological media, often at short notice, but always in good

humour. Rose Law and Peter Wildbore assisted with the ordering of chemicals and media.

The staff of the Massey University Computer Center provided a very professional, yet friendly service.

Special thanks are due to the owners and managers of the three dairy farms without whose co-operation this project would not have been possible. The sampling procedures caused disruption to the normal milking routine, and their tolerance and patience was sincerely appreciated.

Finally, a huge debt of gratitude is due to my family for their patience and support during the course of the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF GRAPHS.....	xiii
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BOVINE MASTITIS.....	1
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	
THE DIAGNOSIS OF SUBCLINICAL MASTITIS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	13
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>	
MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	60
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	
THE EFFECTS OF STAGE OF MILKING ( MILK FRACTION ) ON THE LEVEL OF SELECTED PARAMETERS IN MILK.....	73
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	
A DESCRIPTION OF THE BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS OF QUARTERS AND OF COWS DURING THE TRIAL PERIOD.....	103
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>	
THE EFFECTS OF BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS, STAGE OF LACTATION AND AGE OF COW ON LEVELS OF PARAMETERS IN MILK FROM INDIVIDUAL QUARTERS.....	139

TABLE OF CONTENTS ( CONTINUED )

**CHAPTER SEVEN**

THE DIAGNOSIS OF INFECTION IN QUARTER SAMPLES....206

**CHAPTER EIGHT**

THE EFFECTS OF AGE OF COW, STAGE OF LACTATION  
AND BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS ON THE LEVEL  
OF EACH PARAMETER IN COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.....251

**CHAPTER NINE**

THE DIAGNOSIS OF INFECTED UDDERS USING  
COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.....295

**CHAPTER TEN**

SUMMARY AND GENERAL DISCUSSION.....330

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.....351**

**APPENDIX.....390**

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2.1	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA MASTITIS TEST AND THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT.	21
2.2	COMPARISON OF TESTS WITH RESPECT TO THE SENSITIVITY, SPECIFICITY, REPEATABILITY, RAPIDITY AND OPERATING COSTS.	59
3.1	DESCRIPTION OF THE THREE SELECTED FARMS.	61
3.2	RESULTS OF STORAGE TRIAL: SOMATIC CELL COUNT.	66
4.1	STAGE OF MILKING TRIAL: BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS OF UDDER QUARTERS.	93
4.2	STAGE OF MILKING TRIAL: MEAN SOMATIC CELL COUNT.	94
4.3	MEAN SODIUM CONCENTRATION.	95
4.4	MEAN POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION.	96
4.5	MEAN ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY.	97
4.6	MEAN pH.	98
4.7	MEAN LACTOSE CONCENTRATION.	99
4.8	MEAN NAGase ACTIVITY.	100
4.9	MEAN ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION.	101
4.10	STAGE OF MILKING TRIAL: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	102
5.1	NUMBER OF COWS AND OF QUARTERS ANALYZED.	126
5.2a	INCIDENCE, DURATION AND LEVEL OF INFECTION: HERD A.	127
5.2b	HERD B.	128
5.2c	HERD C.	129

LIST OF TABLES ( CONTINUED )

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
5.3	BACTERIOLOGICAL FINDINGS AT A SUBSEQUENT SAMPLING GIVEN A SPECIFIC FINDING AT AN ARBITRARY SAMPLING.	130
5.4a	NO. OF BACTERIAL SPECIES ISOLATED PER QUARTER: HERD A.	131
5.4b	HERD B.	132
5.4c	HERD C.	133
5.5	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION IN PREVIOUS SURVEYS.	134
5.5 key	KEY TO TABLE 5.5.	135
6.1	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: INDIVIDUAL QUARTERS.	172
6.2	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUSES.	173
6.3a	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN AGE GROUPS: HERD A.	174
6.3b	HERD B.	175
6.3c	HERD C.	176
6.4a	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN STAGES OF LACTATION: HERD A.	177
6.4b	HERD B.	178
6.4c	HERD C.	179
6.5a	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN STAGES OF LACTATION UNINFECTED QUARTERS ONLY:	HERD A. 180
6.5b		HERD B. 181
6.5c		HERD C. 182
7.11	RESULTS FOR ALL HERDS: BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	239
7.111	RESULTS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1 .	240

LIST OF TABLES ( CONTINUED )

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
7.1111	RESULTS BY STAGE OF LACTATION, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	241
7.11v	RESULTS OF SOMATIC CELL COUNT WITHIN HERDS, BY STAGE OF LACTATION, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	242
7.1v	RESULTS FOR TOTAL DATA, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 2.	243
7.1vi	RESULTS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 2.	244
7.21	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS FOR ALL HERDS.	245
7.21i	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS.	246
7.2111	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS FOR ALL HERDS, SOMATIC CELL COUNT PLUS ONE OTHER PARAMETER.	247
7.21v	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS, SOMATIC CELL COUNT PLUS ONE OTHER PARAMETER.	248
7.3	CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT AND EACH SELECTED PARAMETER.	249
7.4	EFFECT OF USING CRITICAL THRESHOLD VALUES, OR SET THRESHOLD VALUES, ON THE DIAGNOSIS OF INFECTION WITHIN INDIVIDUAL UDDER QUARTERS.	250
8.1	EFFECTS OF BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS, STAGE OF LACTATION AND AGE OF COW ON THE LEVELS OF THE SELECTED PARAMETERS IN COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.	277
8.2	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN EACH BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS, IN COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.	278
8.3a	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN STAGES OF LACTATION FOR COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES: HERD A.	279

LIST OF TABLES ( CONTINUED )

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
8.3b	CONTRAST ANALYSIS BETWEEN STAGES OF LACTATION FOR COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES: HERD B.	280
8.3c	HERD C.	281
8.4	NUMBER OF INFECTED QUARTERS PER INFECTED UDDER.	282
9.11	RESULTS OF THE THRESHOLD PROGRAM WITHIN THE TOTAL DATA SET: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	320
9.111	RESULTS OF THE THRESHOLD PROGRAM WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	321
9.1111	RESULTS OF THE THRESHOLD PROGRAM BY STAGE OF LACTATION WITHIN THE TOTAL DATA SET: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	322
9.21	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS FOR THE TOTAL DATA SET, USING EACH PARAMETER ALONE: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	323
9.211	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS, USING EACH PARAMETER ALONE: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	324
9.2111	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS FOR THE TOTAL DATA SET, USING THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT PLUS ONE OTHER PARAMETER: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	325
9.21v	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS, USING THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT PLUS ONE OTHER PARAMETER: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES, BACTERIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION 1.	326
9.3	CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT AND EACH OTHER PARAMETER: COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.	327

LIST OF TABLES ( CONTINUED )

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
9.4	SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES INTO THE ABILITY OF THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN INFECTED AND UNINFECTED COWS.	328
9.5	EFFECT OF USING A FIXED THRESHOLD VALUE ON THE DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY OF THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT FOR COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES.	329
10.1	INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FEDERATION GUIDELINES FOR THE DIAGNOSIS OF SUBCLINICAL MASTITIS.	349
10.2	EFFECT OF INFECTION OF THE UDDER AND OF THE TEAT CANAL ON THE SOMATIC CELL COUNT OF MILK: RESULTS OF A PREVIOUS TRIAL.	350

LIST OF GRAPHS

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
5.1a	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN UDDER QUARTERS: HERD A	136
5.2a	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN COWS: HERD A	136
5.1b	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN UDDER QUARTERS: HERD B	137
5.2b	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN COWS: HERD B	137
5.1c	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN UDDER QUARTERS: HERD C	138
5.2c	PREVALENCE OF INFECTION WITHIN COWS: HERD C	138
6.1ai	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD A	183
6.1aii	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD A	183
6.1bi	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD B	184
6.1bii	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD B	184
6.1ci	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD C	185
6.1cii	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD C	185
6.2ai	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES. HERD A	186

LIST OF GRAPHS (CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
6.2a1i	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 186
6.2b1	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 187
6.2b1i	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 187
6.2c1	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 188
6.2c1i	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 188
6.3a1	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 189
6.3a1i	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 189
6.3b1	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 190
6.3b1i	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 190
6.3c1	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 191
6.3c1i	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 191

LIST OF GRAPHS ( CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
6.4ai	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 192
6.4aai	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 192
6.4bi	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 193
6.4bii	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 193
6.5ai	LOG(10) pH VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 194
6.5aai	LOG(10) pH VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 194
6.5bi	LOG(10) pH VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 195
6.5bii	LOG(10) pH VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 195
6.6ai	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 196
6.6aai	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 196

LIST OF GRAPHS ( CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
6.6bi	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 197
6.6bii	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 197
6.6ci	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 198
6.6cii	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 198
6.7ai	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 199
6.7aii	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 199
6.7bi	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 200
6.7bii	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 200
6.7ci	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 201
6.7cii	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 201
6.8ai	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 202

LIST OF GRAPHS ( CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
6.8a11	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD A 202
6.8b1	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 203
6.8b11	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD B 203
6.8c1	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY BACTERIOLOGICAL STATUS: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 204
6.8c11	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, BY AGE OF COW: QUARTER SAMPLES.	HERD C 204
6.9	COMPOSITE MILK YIELD DURING LACTATION, WITHIN INDIVIDUAL HERDS.	205
8.11	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	283
8.111	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	283
8.21	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	284
8.211	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	284
8.31	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	285
8.311	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	285

LIST OF GRAPHS ( CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
8.41	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	286
8.411	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	286
8.51	LOG(10) pH BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	287
8.511	LOG(10) pH BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	287
8.61	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	288
8.611	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	288
8.71	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	289
8.711	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	289
8.81	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION BY STATUS, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	290
8.811	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION BY AGE, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	290
8.1111	LOG(10) SOMATIC CELL COUNT VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	291
8.2111	LOG(10) SODIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	291
8.3111	LOG(10) POTASSIUM CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	292
8.4111	LOG(10) ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	292

LIST OF GRAPHS ( CONTINUED )

<u>GRAPH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
8.5111	LOG(10) pH VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	293
8.6111	LOG(10) LACTOSE CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	293
8.7111	LOG(10) NAGase ACTIVITY VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	294
8.8111	LOG(10) ANTITRYPSIN CONCENTRATION VS STAGE OF LACTATION, WITHIN HERDS: COMPOSITE SAMPLES.	294