



Response of cull cows to different ration concentrate levels
by Felicia Ann Drumm LaMontagne

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE
in ANIMAL SCIENCE

Montana State University

© Copyright by Felicia Ann Drumm LaMontagne (1981)

Abstract:

Four levels of energy were fed to cull cows in three trials to determine the effect of ration energy level upon weight gain and body condition as indicated by live-animal and carcass measurements.

Trial 1 was conducted for 72 days; trials 2 and 3 for 59 days.

In each trial, 48 mature, non-pregnant, non-lactating beef cows were fed barley, beet pulp, and grass hay. Alfalfa was added in trial 1. Percent grain mixture in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4 was 8.5, 27.0, 45.0, and 60.0 in trial 1, respectively; 20, 40, 57, and 69 in trial 2; 20, 37, 53, and 67 in trial 3. Average daily consumption was 9.69, 10.42, and 10.68 kg dry matter in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Cows were allotted by weight, body condition score (1 = poor, 10 = extremely fat), number of incisors, and breed and balanced among treatments accordingly. One cow died in trial 1 and associated data were removed. Weight, score, height and, in trial 1, heart girth were evaluated.

Cows were slaughtered and data were collected.

In all trials, total weight gain, average daily gain (ADG), and weight:height (wt:ht) increased ($P < .05$) as percent concentrate increased; in trial 3, condition score increased ($P < .05$). In trials 1 and 2, higher feed efficiency was associated with higher grain proportions ($P < .05$). In all trials, hot carcass weight was greater in treatments with more grain ($P < .01$). Rib eye area was positively affected by treatment in trial 2 ($P < .05$).

Condition score was a better predictor of carcass quality than weight:height and heart girth. Score was significantly ($P < .05$) correlated to carcass grade, marbling, fat at 12th rib, and kidney, pelvic, and heart fat. Cows with lower initial scores required less weight to increase condition than cows with higher scores ($P < .05$). Thin cows with lowest hip height showed greatest potential for increasing condition as measured by weight gains and condition scores.

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Felicia Ann LaMontagne

Date June 17, 1981

*Whom have I in heaven but Thee?
And besides Thee, I desire nothing on earth
My flesh and my heart may fail,
But God is the strength of my heart
and my portion forever.*

Psalm 73:25,26

RESPONSE OF CULL COWS TO DIFFERENT RATION CONCENTRATE LEVELS

by

FELICIA ANN DRUMM LaMONTAGNE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree


of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

ANIMAL SCIENCE


Approved:



Chairperson, Graduate Committee



Head, Major Department



Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

June, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Dedication.	i
	Vita.	iii
	Table of Contents	iv
	List of Tables.	v
	List of Figures	viii
	Abstract.	ix
1	INTRODUCTION.	1
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	2
	Factors Influencing Weight Gain.	2
	Estimating Body Condition.	7
3	EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE.	11
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	21
	Weight Gain Required to Change Body Condition.	35
	Relationships Between Live-Animal and Carcass Traits	38
	Conclusions.	42
5	SUMMARY	56
	LITERATURE CITED.	49
	APPENDIX.	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page
1	Proximate Analysis ^a and Metabolizable Energy ^b of Diets .	12
2	Average Daily Metabolizable Energy ^b and Feed ^a Intake by Trial and Treatment.	14
3	Weights and Feed/Gain Ratios, Trials 1, 2, and 3	22
4	Summary of Statistical Tests ^a for Effects ^b of Feed Treatments; Trials 1, 2, and 3.	24
5	Summary of Weather Conditions in Trials 1, 2, and 3. . .	26
6	Average Body Condition Scores ¹ ; Trials 1, 2, and 3 . . .	27
7	Average Height (cm) and Weight:Height Ratios: Trials 1, 2, and 3.	29
8	Means of Heart Girth Measurement, cm; Trial 1.	30
9	Means Carcass Measurements; Trials 1, 2, and 3	31
10	Simple Correlation Coefficients for Trials 1, 2, and 3, Respectively	39
11	Changes in R ² as Additional Variables Are Added; Trials 1, 2, and 3.	44
12	Repeatability Estimates of Body Condition Scores	45

APPENDIX TABLES

1	Distribution of Cows According to Physical Character- istics, Trial 1	58
2	Distribution of Cows According to Physical Character- istics, Trial 2	59
3	Distribution of Cows According to Physical Character- istics, Trial 3	60

APPENDIX TABLE
Number

Page

4	Metabolizable Energy ^a Intake by Trial and Treatment ^b . .	61
5	Feed Intake ^a by Trial and Treatment ^b	62
6	Energy/Gain (Mcal ME/kg Weight Gain) and Feed/Gain (kg dry matter/kg Weight Gain) Ratios; Trials 1, 2, and 3.	63
7	Means and Standard Errors of Weight, kg; Trial 1	64
8	Means and Standard Errors of Weight, Kg; Trial 2	65
9	Means and Standard Errors of Weight, Kg, Trial 3	66
10	Description of Weather Conditions in Trials 1, 2, and 3.	67
11	Means and Standard Errors of Body Condition Scores, Trial 1.	68
12	Means and Standard Errors of Body Condition Scores; Trial 2.	69
13	Means and Standard Errors of Body Condition Scores; Trial 3.	70
14	Means and Standard Errors of Height (cm) and Weight: Height (kg/cm); Trial 1.	71
15	Means and Standard Errors of Height (cm) and Weight: Height (kg/cm); Trial 2.	72
16	Means and Standard Errors of Height (cm) and Weight: Height (kg/cm); Trial 3.	73
17	Means and Standard Errors of Heart Grith, cm; Trial 1 .	74
18	Means and Standard Errors of Carcass Weight, Carcass Grade, and Marbling, Trials 1, 2, and 3.	75

APPENDIX TABLE

Number

Page

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 19 | Means and Standard Errors of Carcass Fat, Rib Eye
Area and Percent Kidney, Pelvic and Heart Fat,
Trials 1, 2, and 3 | 76 |
| 20 | Average Weight Change (kg) by Initial Condition
Scores and Changes in Condition, Trials 1, 2, and 3. . | 77 |

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Number		Page
1	Schedule of Periodic Body Measurements Taken in Trials 1, 2, and 3	17
2	Palpable and Visual Body Condition Scoring System . . .	18
3	Average Weight Change (kg) by Initial Condition Score and Changes in Condition Score	36

ABSTRACT

Four levels of energy were fed to cull cows in three trials to determine the effect of ration energy level upon weight gain and body condition as indicated by live-animal and carcass measurements.

Trial 1 was conducted for 72 days; trials 2 and 3 for 59 days. In each trial, 48 mature, non-pregnant, non-lactating beef cows were fed barley, beet pulp, and grass hay. Alfalfa was added in trial 1. Percent grain mixture in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4 was 8.5, 27.0, 45.0, and 60.0 in trial 1, respectively; 20, 40, 57, and 69 in trial 2; 20, 37, 53, and 67 in trial 3. Average daily consumption was 9.69, 10.42, and 10.68 kg dry matter in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Cows were allotted by weight, body condition score (1 = poor, 10 = extremely fat), number of incisors, and breed and balanced among treatments accordingly. One cow died in trial 1 and associated data were removed. Weight, score, height and, in trial 1, heart girth were evaluated. Cows were slaughtered and data were collected.

In all trials, total weight gain, average daily gain (ADG), and weight:height (wt:ht) increased ($P < .05$) as percent concentrate increased; in trial 3, condition score increased ($P < .05$). In trials 1 and 2, higher feed efficiency was associated with higher grain proportions ($P < .05$). In all trials, hot carcass weight was greater in treatments with more grain ($P < .01$). Rib eye area was positively affected by treatment in trial 2 ($P < .05$).

Condition score was a better predictor of carcass quality than weight:height and heart girth. Score was significantly ($P < .05$) correlated to carcass grade, marbling, fat at 12th rib, and kidney, pelvic, and heart fat. Cows with lower initial scores required less weight to increase condition than cows with higher scores ($P < .05$). Thin cows with lowest hip height showed greatest potential for increasing condition as measured by weight gains and condition scores.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Cull cows provide substantial amounts of beef to the meat industry. Approximately 9.7 billion kilograms of beef were produced in the United States in 1979, of which 1.4 billion kilograms were provided by 6 million cull beef cows. If cull cows are in thin body condition, cattle producers could hold and feed the cows to take advantage of increases in weight and carcass grade, as well as seasonal price increases.

When initial body condition differs, beef cows respond differently to feed programs designed to change body condition. Performance of beef cows during realimentation might be more accurately predicted if the weight change and feed needed to alter body condition were known and would enable producers to more effectively evaluate feeding strategies.

The objectives of this study were to:

- (1) determine response of cull cows to different energy intake levels;
- (2) determine the weight gain needed to increase cow body condition; and
- (3) determine the feed required for the weight gains identified in (2).

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Response of beef cows to a ration has been observed in weight change and in the corresponding change in body condition. Feeding for desired changes in condition has been complicated by many factors which influence rate of gain and by difficulty in accurately measuring body condition.

Factors Influencing Weight Gain

One objective in feeding cull beef cows is to increase weight and therefore improve carcass quality. Because weight gain is desirable, energy intake must be increased above the amount needed for body maintenance. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the factors that influence maintenance requirements and weight gain. Factors considered in this study were body size, weight, condition, climatic environment, muscular activity, and dietary energy.

Body size is described as metabolic body size as an exponential function of weight. Metabolic body size has been used by researchers to determine and express maintenance requirements in terms of total digestible nutrients (Gaines, 1943; Brody, 1945; Garrett, 1959). Other researchers have expressed energy requirements of cattle in terms of net energy (Kleiber, 1961; Klosterman et al., 1968; Lofgreen and Garrett, 1968). The most widely accepted relationship for determining

cow maintenance requirements for net energy has been:

$$\text{Net Energy}_{\text{maintenance}} = 77 \text{ Kcal/kg}^{0.75} \text{ body weight.}$$

This equation is now used by the National Research Council (NRC, 1976) to establish levels of dietary requirements.

Body condition has been shown to be important in accurately estimating the amount of energy needed by beef cows for maintenance. Blaxter (1962) stated that fatty tissue in cattle had a maintenance cost comparable to that of the body as a whole. Blaxter's statements are supported by the study of Klosterman et al. (1968). Klosterman reported that cows with a high degree of finish tended to gain weight while those in thin condition lost weight when fed a constant amount of feed per metabolic body weight (because fatter, heavier cows received more feed per head daily). Neville (1971) and Marshall et al. (1976) also showed that fatter cows required more energy for maintenance than thinner cows.

Body condition has been reported to be related to weight gain and fat deposition in beef cows. Thin cows required less weight gain than fatter cows to deposit the same amount of body fat (Kropp et al., 1973; Bellows et al., 1979; Long et al., 1979; Swingle et al., 1979). Riley (1978) reported that thin cows had a greater opportunity than fat cows to change body condition by increasing in weight. The greater potential for thin cows to increase their body weight beyond the gains of fatter cows was probably due to the fact that thin cows tended to be lighter

in weight (Wiltbank et al., 1962; Klosterman et al., 1968; Bellows et al., 1971; Kropp et al., 1973; Long et al., 1979; Swingle et al., 1979).

Climatic environment has been shown to affect the maintenance requirements of beef cows during cold periods. Adverse winter conditions resulted in increased feed requirements by 30 to 70 percent (Jordan et al., 1968; Hironaka and Peters, 1969; Bond et al., 1970; Young and Berg, 1970; Lister et al., 1972; Young, 1975a). Increased appetites of cattle during adverse weather were noted by some researchers (Sharma and Kehar, 1961; Webster et al., 1970; Young, 1975a). Decreased average daily gains were also reported as temperature decreased (Mulligan and Christison, 1974; Young 1975b; Paine et al., 1977). Some researchers reported minimal effects of winter environment on cattle, perhaps due to large body size, increased metabolism, type of diet or housing (Graham et al., 1959; Blaxter and Wainman, 1961; Kleiber, 1961; Webster et al., 1970; Hellickson et al., 1972; Milligan and Christison, 1974; Young, 1975a, b; Christopherson, 1976). The effect of cold stress on beef cows appeared to be primarily on the energy requirement for maintenance as pregnancy, development of the conceptus and consequently calf birth weight were unaffected (Wiltbank et al., 1962; Jordan et al., 1968; Hironaka and Peters, 1969).

Muscular activity has been reported to be related to energy requirements of cattle. Increased energy requirements for maintenance

were associated with cattle standing (Ritzman and Bendict, 1938; Morrison et al., 1970; Ganyou et al., 1976). Muddy conditions resulted in increased energy expenditure, increased maintenance requirements, and decreased weight gains (Bond et al., 1970; Teter et al., 1973; Riskowski et al., 1976; Mahoney et al., 1977; Long et al., 1979). The adverse effects on performance from standing and walking through mud have been reduced by increasing available feed to cattle and providing housing (Bond et al., 1970; Webster, 1970; Butchbaker et al., 1973).

The effect of dietary energy on weight gain and changes in body condition of cull cows cannot be predicted because the energy requirements for maintenance and weight gain have not been fully established. Riley (1978) reported that cows gained .74 kg of weight per day when grazing on lush brome grass pasture during spring months. Cows that grazed range forage (Northern Great Plains mixed prairie forage) gained .67 kg per day in the spring (Bellows et al., 1979). These reports indicate that roughage rations satisfied the maintenance requirements of the cows. However, cows in the breeding herd that weigh 400 to 500 kg have high maintenance requirements according to NRC (1976) and if large gains are desired, the ration must have a high percentage of grain (Riley, 1978).

Researchers have fed different amounts of concentrates to gain information on the level of performance that could be expected from

cull cows when placed in a feedlot. A wide range of percent grain mixture has been fed to cull cows: 20 percent by Batterman et al. (1952); 22, 40 and 80 percent by Swingle et al. (1979); 0, 60 and 80 percent by Riley (1978); 85 and 95 percent by Howes et al. (1972); and 90 percent by Price and Berg (1979). Average daily gains were 1.21 and 1.15 kg for 20 percent (Batterman et al., 1952) and 22 percent grain (Swingle et al., 1979); 1.74, 1.20 and 1.46 kg for 80 percent (Swingle et al., 1979), 90 percent (Price and Berg, 1979), and 95 percent grain (Howes et al., 1972). The most rapid and efficient weight gains in cull cows were obtained from the higher concentrate diets (Howes et al., 1972; Riley, 1978; Swingle et al., 1979).

Studies in the past have not determined the percentage of grain that results in the greatest change in body condition. However, Swingle et al. (1979) observed that cows that consumed a higher percentage of grain (80 percent concentrate) deposited fat faster and reached the desired condition sooner than cows receiving less grain (22 and 40 percent concentrate). Improved carcass quality, grades and weights have been attained by feeding cull cows a variety of rations ranging between 20 and 95 percent concentrate (Batterman et al. 1952; Howes et al., 1972; Riley, 1978; Price and Berg, 1979; Swingle et al., 1979. However, composition of gains (e.g. proportion of lipid to protein deposition) was not influenced by concentrate level in the diet (Jesse et al., 1976; Swingle et al., 1979).

Estimating Body Condition

Body condition has been measured subjectively and objectively by many researchers. Among the live animal evaluations used were visual and palpable systems, weight:height ratio, and heart girth measurement. Certain carcass traits were also effective for evaluating condition, e.g., marbling and body fat cover at the 12th rib.

Visual and palpable methods of determining fat cover have been easy to use and yet have been very subjective. At the discretion of the appraiser, animals have been assigned a numerical score indicating the thinness or fatness. The range of scores used in the systems has varied from one to five (Klosterman et al., 1968), one to nine (Wiltbank et al., 1961), one to ten (Bellows et al., 1971), and four to twelve (Warnick et al., 1979). Palpable criteria were used with visual reference points to describe body condition by Long and Everly (1971) and Lowman et al. (1976).

Although none of the scoring systems cited earlier have been examined in terms of predictive potential, researchers have attempted to subjectively estimate carcass characteristics. Jeremiah et al. (1970) reported that predictions of carcass grade based on visual appraisal of 1710 live steers were significantly correlated with actual carcass grades. In contrast, other researchers note that systematic subjective evaluations have had limited accuracy in ranking cattle according to carcass quality (Gregory et al., 1962; Gregory et al.,

1964; Wilson et al., 1964). Crouse et al. (1974) had less success estimating quality grade than quantitative characteristics such as fat thickness and yield grade. Lewis et al. (1969) explained that the difficulty in estimating quality grades has been due to the appraisers' inability to estimate marbling. In an attempt to estimate marbling score based on fat thickness within breed types, Jeremiah, Smith and Hiller (1970) found a low association between subcutaneous fat thickness and marbling score. They noted that levels of fat thickness and live weight in each breed were not associated with concomitant increases in marbling scores. Clearly more work is needed to establish an accurate method of predicting carcass merit and quality grade in the live animal.

Weight:height ratio is an objective measurement and may be useful in describing body condition (Klosterman et al., 1968). The vertical distance from the highest point of the withers or hips is measured and the ratio of weight in kilograms to height in centimeters (wt:ht ratio) is calculated. The wither and hip height measurements have been highly repeatable and considered to be equivalent (Lush, 1928; Yao et al., 1953; Kidwell, 1955; Williams et al., 1979). However, hip height may be a more accurate measurement than wither height (Lush, 1928; Tallis et al., 1959) and easier to obtain, since it is measured away from the animal's head (Williams et al., 1979).

Using the wt:ht ratio, it may be possible to select cattle which possess desirable carcass characteristics. Wt:ht was found to be positively and significantly correlated with dressing percentage, area of ribeye, and fat at the 12th rib by Tallis et al. (1959). Although Wooten et al. (1979) used wt:ht to select cows for slaughter, no correlations were given between wt:ht and carcass characteristics. The wt:ht ratio was significantly correlated with carcass grade in 1938 (Black et al.) but succeeding studies correlated only wither height with carcass grade. Cook et al. (1951) and Yao et al. (1953) reported a negative and significant correlation between height and quality grade. However, in another study, Cook et al. (1951) and Kidwell et al. (1955) showed a nonsignificant relationship. Because of the lack of information which shows that wt:ht is an accurate indicator of condition, wt:ht has not been used extensively to predict carcass quality.

Heart girth has been a highly repeatable, objective measure of condition (Tallis et al., 1959). The measurement is taken with a nonelastic tape at the smallest heart girth circumference. The possibility of error exists because the measurement can be affected by tautness of the tape and manure on the chest of cows. Kidwell (1955) showed that heart girth was significantly correlated with carcass grade. However, a review of the literature does not lend great support

for the use of heart girth as a quantitative indicator of carcass characteristics as reported by Hultz (1927), Lush (1932), Black et al. (1938), Cook et al. (1951), Kohli et al. (1951), White and Green (1952), Yao et al. (1953), Orme et al. (1959), Crouse et al. (1974).

Body fat cover and marbling of the ribeye muscle measured at the 12th rib, indicate actual fat deposition and are important criteria in assigning carcass grades. The amount of external fat on a carcass is evaluated in terms of thickness of this fat over the ribeye muscle at the 12th rib, measured perpendicular to the outside surface at a point three-fourths of the length of the ribeye from its chine bone end (U.S.D.A., 1975). Marbling is determined in the ribeye muscle of a properly chilled carcass. Marbling scores range from devoid (1) to abundant (10) by increments of one; more marbling is needed for higher quality grades than lower grades.

Chapter 3

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Four levels of energy were fed to cull cows in three trials to determine the effect of ration energy level upon weight gain and body composition as indicated by live-animal and carcass measurements. In each trial, 48 mature, non-pregnant, non-lactating beef cows were fed in a concrete drylot at the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman, Montana. The drylot was protected by windbreaks and had partial roof cover over fenceline feed bunks. The pens provided each cow with an area of 7.5 m^2 and .89 m of bunk space. Weather data were collected at the Bozeman, Montana State University Climatological Station.

Cows were group-fed twice daily and had access to water and trace mineralized salt. Daily feed consumption per pen was recorded. Proximate analysis of feeds were determined according to methods described by the A.O.A.C. (1970).

In trial 1 cows were fed for 72 days (January 11 to March 23, 1979) four rations which consisted of barley, beet pulp, grass hay and alfalfa (table 1). From day 0 to 36, ration energy levels were 60, 65, 70, and 75 percent total digestible nutrients (TDN) for treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The energy levels were attained by increasing grain by .91 kg per head every two days and

TABLE 1. PROXIMATE ANALYSIS^a AND METABOLIZABLE ENERGY^b OF DIETS.

Diet	Dry Matter	Crude Protein	Ash	Ether Extract	Crude Fiber	Nitrogen Free Extract	Metabo- lizable Energy
<u>Trial 1:</u>							
Barley, grain, grnd	90.4	12.4	2.8	2.2	7.4	75.0	3.15
Beet pulp, dehy	90.6	9.4	8.8	0.1	17.4	64.3	2.77
Native grass hay, chopped	87.8	6.7	6.8	4.2	34.0	48.3	2.10
Alfalfa hay, s-c, mature	89.9	11.4	9.9	1.9	31.8	44.8	1.89
<u>Trials 2,3:</u>							
Barley, grain, grnd	91.5	13.7	2.6	1.7	2.1	79.6	3.21
Beet pulp, dehy	94.0	11.8	6.7	0.9	17.1	63.5	2.80
Native grass hay, chopped	87.8	6.7	6.8	4.2	34.0	48.3	2.10

^aPercent composition on dry matter basis.

^bMcal/kg dry matter intake.

decreasing hay accordingly. Average dry matter consumption by cows in light-weight replications as 8.73 kg per day and 9.82 kg per day by cows in heavy-weight replications (Appendix table 5). Due to cold stress, energy intake was raised 5 percent on day 36 and maintained from days 37 to 72 at 65, 70, 75, and 80 percent TDN in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Daily dry matter intake was increased to 9.55 and 10.67 kg per head for light-weight and heavy-weight replication, respectively. The feeding regime resulted in an average grain content of 8.5, 27.0, 45.0, and 60.0 percent for treatments 1 through 4. One cow died on day 36 in treatment 2 (heavy replication); feed was adjusted for five animals in that pen.

In trial 2, cows received rations of barley, beet pulp, and grass hay (table 1) for 59 days (November 26, 1979 to January 24, 1980). The experimental design called for feeding 20, 40, 60, and 80 percent concentrate in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Energy intake increased from treatments 1 through 4 (table 2). Desired percent concentrate was attained by increasing grain .91 kg per head every two days and reducing hay accordingly. Daily feed intake per head was 13.61 kg (as fed basis) on day 39 and was maintained at that level for the remainder of the trial. The feeding regime resulted in average percent concentrate intakes of 20, 40, 57, and 60 for treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively (table 2). Bloat guard was added to the grain mixture at a rate of .18 kg per head per day.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE DAILY METABOLIZABLE ENERGY^b AND FEED^a INTAKE BY TRIAL AND TREATMENT

	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Trial 1</u>				
Concentrate, %, Avg.	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
Energy	21.44	23.67	25.35	27.43
Feed	9.48	9.68	9.70	9.89
<u>Trial 2</u>				
Concentrate, %, Avg.	20.0	40.0	57.0	69.0
Energy	23.43	26.18	28.63	29.85
Feed	10.10	10.38	10.64	10.56
<u>Trial 3</u>				
Concentrate, %, Avg.	20.0	37.0	53.0	67.0
Energy	23.86	26.25	28.83	30.83
Feed	10.34	10.53	10.85	11.01

^aMcal ME/cow/kg dry matter intake.

^bKg dry matter/cow.

In trial 3, barley, beet pulp, and grass hay (table 1) were fed to cows for 59 days (February 4 to April 3, 1980). The feeding regime of trial 3 replicated trial 2 (tables 1 and 2) with two exceptions: daily feed intake per head was 13.61 kg (as fed basis) on day 30 and average percent grain mixtures were 20, 37, 53, and 67 percent for treatments 1 through 4.

The 48 cows in each trial were assigned to treatment according to weight, body condition, breed, and number of incisor teeth as follows:

- (1) Cows were first separated by weight into light and heavy groups. Animals below the median of the initial weight were assigned to the light feed group and those above were assigned to the heavy feed group.
- (2) Within each weight group, the cows were ranked according to body condition and assigned sequentially to one of four groups beginning with the lowest ranked cows. However, assignment of cows by body condition did not maintain balance with respect to breed and teeth. Therefore, animals that were essentially equal in all traits except breed and number of teeth were interchanged between groups, which gave a semblance of balance among groups (Appendix tables 1, 2, 3).
- (3) Four feed treatments were randomly assigned to the four light and four heavy groups; this assignment resulted in a

light and heavy replication of each feed treatment. The treatments were then randomly distributed among eight feedlot pens.

In each trial, cows were allotted by weight; initial, interim, and final body weights were taken according to the time schedule as shown in Figure 1. Individual cow weights were taken prior to the morning feeding, after the cows had been restricted from feed and water overnight. A dial scale with a capacity of 727 kilograms (1600 pounds) was used to weigh all cows; weights were recorded to the nearest pound and converted to kilograms for analyses. In order to reduce error, the scale was balanced after every 12th animal.

Cow body condition was evaluated by three technicians using a palpable and visual scoring system (Figure 2) before allotment and at each weigh date. Two technicians scored cows in all three trials and one technician was replaced in the last two trials. The condition scoring system used six reference points described by Long and Everly (1971). Evaluation criteria were developed using criteria described by Lowman et al. (1976) and Spitzer (1977). Cows were palpated at the point of the shoulder, the ribs, and spinal processes while they stood on the scale. Each cow was then moved to a pen to permit visual examination of the brisket, tailhead, and twist. Each technician independently assigned condition scores (Figure 2) which ranged from one (thin) to ten (fat).




FIGURE 1. SCHEDULE OF PERIODIC BODY MEASUREMENTS TAKEN IN TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

SCORE		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Poor	V. Thin	Thin	Borderline	Moderate	Mod-Good	Good	Fat	Extremely	Fat
PALPABLE	Shoulder	Very sharp	Fairly sharp →		Rounded →	→	→		Rounded and smooth		Bulging
	Ribs	Very sharp	Fairly sharp →	(Only slightly prominent)	Easily felt (no longer seen individually)		Spongy fat →		Folds of fat developing: large deposits		Great folds of fat
	Spinous Processes	Very sharp	Fairly sharp →		Rounded →		Felt with firm pressure by fingertips		Cannot be felt →		
VISUAL	Brisket	Folds of skin only Lower surface of breastbone 1/4 the distance down on forearm to knee.		Some fat →		Lower surface of solid brisket 1/2 the distance down on forearm to knee			Fat despoits becoming larger-lengthening		Knee length
	Tail Head	No fat →		Some tissue cover on top (prominence depends on conformation)		Fat cover on both sides of tailhead (easily felt)		Slight fat "rounds" (soft to touch)	Almost completely buried		Completely buried
	Twist	"Cut up" Skin only Narrow stance →	→		Some tissue →		Moderate fat depth		Full of fat Broad stance Beginning to fat down to hocks →		Fatted down to hocks (mobility impaired)

18

FIGURE 2. PALPABLE AND VISUAL BODY CONDITION SCORING SYSTEM

Teeth and breed were recorded before allotting cows to feed treatments. Approximate cow ages were determined by examination of permanent incisor teeth (Watts, 1965). Cows with sets of permanent teeth (whether or not the teeth were broken and/or worn) were considered at least four years of age and mature. The number of incisor teeth was counted and recorded. "Full", "missing some", and "smooth" designated mouths with all incisors present, one or more broken incisors, and all incisors absent, respectively. Angus, Hereford-Angus, and Hereford were the predominant breeds. Also included were Charolais-Angus in trial 2 and Hereford-Shorthorn in trial 3.

Additional measurements were taken but not used in allotting cows to feed treatments. In all trials, hip height was determined for use in the ratio of weight in kilograms to height in centimeters (weight: height ratio) as an objective measurement of body condition (Klosterman *et al.*, 1968). Cows stood on the scale while hip height was measured to the nearest .5 cm. A steel caliper was used which hung over the cow and extended downward from a pre-set height to the lumbar vertebrae midway between the tuber coxae. In trial 1, heart girth was also measured; the measurement was not taken in trials 2 and 3 due to manure padding on chests of cows. Animals were held in a squeeze chute while heart girth was measured. A nonelastic tape was drawn snugly around the body in a plane perpendicular to the long axis of the body at the smallest circumference just behind the front legs. Heart girth was

recorded to the nearest .5 inch and converted to centimeters for analyses.

At the termination of each trial, shrunk weights and final measurements were taken prior to shipment for slaughter. The cows were transported a distance of 193 km to Midland Packing Company, Billings, Montana. Slaughter occurred within 12 hours of arrival at the packing plant. The carcasses were processed according to U.S.D.A. standards (1975), weighed, and chilled for 2.5 days prior to data collection.

A federal grader evaluated all carcasses and quality grades were assigned in third intervals (U.S.D.A., 1975). Degree of marbling was evaluated at the 12th rib. Slaughter grade and marbling score were assigned numerical values for statistical analyses (A.M.S.A., 1977). Fat thickness was measured to the nearest .1 inch at the 12th rib and then converted to centimeters. Ribeye area was obtained by planimeter measurement of a tracing of the L. dorsi muscle sectioned between the 12th and 13th ribs. In trials 2 and 3, percent kidney, pelvic, and heart fat was also evaluated.

Treatment effects were analyzed for differences by analysis of variance using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (Nie et al., 1975) with statistical procedures from Snedecor and Cochran (1967).

Chapter 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data were analyzed to determine the effects of feed treatment, weight groups (light- and heavy-weight), and two-way interactions. Initial condition score was included as a covariate. Treatment effects were analyzed for differences by analysis of variance (Nie et al., 1975) with statistical procedures according to Snedecor and Cochran (1967). The response of cows to feed treatment was expected to have a linear order because ration energy increased from treatments 1 through 4. Therefore, a test for linear effect of feed treatment was applied to the data and considered more valid than analysis of variance. Cow breed, teeth, and age were not included as main effects because they were nonsignificant in preliminary analyses (Harvey, 1975).

Weight. Cows initially weighed an average of 437.0, 402.8, and 402.9 kg in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively (appendix tables 7, 8, and 9). Average final weights were 476.7, 448.8, and 459.8 kg in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Within each trial, initial and final weights did not differ ($P > .05$) among feed treatments (table 3). Initial and final weights differed significantly between light and heavy replications in all trials (appendix tables 7, 8, and 9).

In all trials, feed treatment had a positive effect ($P < .05$;

TABLE 3. WEIGHTS AND FEED/GAIN RATIOS; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Item	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Trial 1:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
Average Weights, kg:				
Initial	444.4	449.5	426.3	429.0
Final	469.8 ^a	481.1 ^a	476.8 ^b	479.4 ^b
Total Gain	25.4 ^a	31.6 ^{ab}	50.5 ^b	50.4 ^b
Daily Gain	0.35 ^a	0.44 ^a	0.70 ^b	0.70 ^b
Energy, Mcal/Gain, kg	61.1 ^a	53.6 ^a	36.1 ^b	39.1 ^b
Feed, Kg Dry Matter/Gain, kg	27.0 ^a	22.0 ^a	13.8 ^b	14.1 ^b
<u>Trial 2:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	40.0	57.0	69.0
Average Weights, kg:				
Initial	399.3	399.3	410.8	401.6
Final	428.8	452.5 ^b	461.7 ^b	452.0 ^b
Total Gain	29.5 ^a	53.2 ^b	50.9 ^b	50.4 ^b
Daily Gain	0.50 ^a	0.90 ^b	0.86 ^b	0.85 ^b
Energy, Mcal/Gain, kg	46.9 ^a	29.0 ^b	33.1 ^b	34.9 ^b
Feed, Kg Dry Matter/Gain, kg	20.2 ^a	11.5 ^b	12.3 ^b	12.4 ^b
<u>Trial 3:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	37.0	53.0	67.0
Average Weights, kg:				
Initial	404.3	392.7	409.8	404.9
Final	453.1	444.8	467.6	473.8
Total Gain	48.8	52.1	57.8	68.8
Daily Gain	0.83	0.88	0.98	1.17
Energy, Mcal/Gain, kg	28.8	29.7	29.4	26.4
Feed, Kg Dry Matter/Gain, kg.	12.5	11.9	11.1	9.4

a,ab,b Means in same row with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

table 4) on weight gain (table 3). In trial 1, gains were 25.4, 31.6, 50.5, and 50.4 kg in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. In trial 2, weight gains in treatments 1 through 4 were 29.5, 53.2, 50.9, and 50.4 kg. Weight gains in trial 3 were 48.8, 52.1, 57.8 and 68.8 kg in treatments 1 through 4. By comparison, cows in trial 3 tended to gain more weight than cows in trials 1 and 2 although trial 3 was 59 days in length in comparison to 72 days in trial 1.

Average daily gains were affected ($P < .05$) in a linear order (table 4) by percent concentrate in the rations in all trials. In trial 1, average daily gains were .35, .44, .70, and .70 kg in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Daily gains in trial 2 were .50, .90, .86, and .85 kg in treatments 1 through 4. In trial 3, average daily gains were .83, .88, .98, and 1.17 kg in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

Rations with the most grain produced most efficient weight gains ($P < .05$) in cows in trials 1 and 2. In trial 1, cows in treatments 1 and 4 required 27.0 and 14.1 kg dry matter per kg weight gain. Metabolizable energy was 61.1 versus 39.1 Mcal for treatments 1 and 4, respectively. In trial 2, cows in treatments 1 and 4 required 20.2 and 12.4 kg dry matter per kg weight gain. Cows in treatment 1 required 46.9 Mcal versus cows in treatment 4 required 34.9 Mcal metabolizable energy per kg weight gain. Feed treatment did not significantly influence feed efficiency in trial 3 as indicated by

TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TESTS^a FOR EFFECTS^b OF FEED TREATMENTS; TRIALS 1, 2 AND 3.

Test	Degrees of Freedom Numerator Denominator	Total Weight Change	Average Daily Gain	Total Score Change	Total Wt:HT Change	Total Heart Girth Change	Hot Carcass Weight	Carcass Quality Grade	Marbling Score	Fat at 12th Rib	Rib Eye Area	Kidney, Pelvic, Heart Fat
<u>Trial 1:</u>												
Linear	$\frac{1}{38}$	**	**	NS	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	--
ANOV	$\frac{3}{38}$	*	*	NS	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	--
<u>Trial 2:</u>												
Linear	$\frac{1}{39}$	*	*	NS	*	--	**	NS	NS	NS	*	NS
ANOV	$\frac{3}{39}$	*	*	NS	*	--	NS	NS	NS	*	*	NS
<u>Trial 3:</u>												
Linear	$\frac{1}{39}$	*	*	*	*	--	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
ANOV	$\frac{3}{39}$	NS	NS	*	NS	--	**	*	NS	NS	NS	NS

24

^a"Linear" specifies a 1 degree of freedom test for a linear effect of feed treatment.
 "ANOV" specifies a 3 degrees of freedom analysis of variance based test for effect of feed treatment.

^bNS = no significant differences between means (P > .05).

*Differences between means were significant (P < .05).

**Differences between means were highly significant (P < .01).

the similar feed/gain and energy/gain ratios among treatments.

The fact that cows in trial 1 tended to gain weight less efficiently may have been due to the additional energy needed to maintain cow body processes during winter stress. Cows in trial 1 were exposed to more cold and wet days than cows in trials 2 and 3 (table 5).

Body condition score. Initially, cows tended to have more fat cover in trial 2 than cows in trials 1 and 3 as evidenced by higher condition scores in trial 2. Cows had average initial scores of 4.1, 4.8, and 4.0 in trials 1, 2, and 3 respectively (appendix tables 11, 12, 13). Within each trial, initial cow condition was not significantly different among feed treatments (table 6), which was expected since cows were balanced within treatments according to initial condition scores (appendix tables 11, 12, 13). However, light-weight cows tended ($P > .05$) to have less condition than heavy-weight cows in all trials, as shown by the condition scores (3.6, 4.5, and 3.6 versus 4.7, 5.0, and 4.4; appendix tables 11, 12 and 13).

Average final cow condition was similar between trials as indicated by final scores 5.3, 6.0, and 6.0 in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively (appendix tables 11, 12, 13).

In trial 3, final body condition and change in condition were significantly greater in treatments with more energy

TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF WEATHER CONDITIONS IN TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Trial	Total Days in Trial	Precipitation Total number of days	% of total number of days cows were wet	Average maximum temp. °C	Average minimum temp. °C	Mean Temp. °C	Number of days -17.8 °C or less
1	72	46	63.9	38.0	13.4	25.7	14
2	59	25	42.4	37.6	17.0	27.3	10
3	59	35	59.3	39.4	20.9	30.2	4

TABLE 6. AVERAGE BODY CONDITION SCORES¹; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Item	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Trial 1:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
No. Observations	12	11	12	12
Initial Scores	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0
Final Scores	5.5	5.0	5.2	5.7
Score Change	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.7
<u>Trial 2:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	40.0	57.0	69.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Initial Scores	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8
Final Scores	5.6	6.0	6.3	6.0
Score Change	0.9	1.3	1.5	1.2
<u>Trial 3:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	37.0	53.0	67.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Initial Scores	4.1	3.8 _b	4.0	4.0 _b
Final Scores	5.7 ^a	6.2 ^b	5.8 ^{a,b}	6.3 ^b
Score Change	1.6 ^a	2.4 ^c	1.8 ^{a,b}	2.3 ^{b,c}

¹Condition scores based on a ten-point system; 1 = poor, 2 = very thin, 3 = thin, 4 = borderline, 5 = moderate, 6 = moderate-good, 7 = good, 8 = fat, 9 and 10 = extremely fat.

^{a,b,c}Means in same row with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

than treatments with less energy (table 6). Final condition scores were 5.7, 6.2, 5.8, and 6.3 in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Score changes were 1.6, 2.4, 1.8, and 2.3 in treatments 1 through 4. Treatment did not significantly affect final condition score or score changes in trials 1 and 2.

Weight:height ratio. Average cow heights in trials 1, 2, and 3 were 118.7, 116.5, and 119.4 cm, respectively (appendix tables 14, 15, 16). Although cow height did not differ ($P > .05$) among feed treatments (table 7), light-weight cows were significantly shorter than heavy-weight cows in trials 1 and 2. Average cow height of light-weight groups was 116.1, 114.3, and 119.0 cm versus 121.4, 118.7, and 120.0 cm for cows in heavy groups in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively (appendix tables 14, 15, 16).

Weight:height ratios in table 7 were calculated after height measurements were averaged within each trial. Initial weight:height was 3.7, 3.5, and 3.4 kg/cm for trials 1, 2, and 3 (appendix tables 14, 15, 16). Within each trial, initial weight:height was not significantly different among feed treatments (table 7). This was expected since cows were allotted and balanced with respect to body condition in the treatments (appendix tables 1, 2, 3).

Final weight:height ratios in trials 1, 2, and 3 were 4.0, 3.8, and 3.9 kg/cm (appendix tables 14, 15, 16) and total increases in weight:height were .3, .4, and .5 kg/cm, respectively. The final

TABLE 7. AVERAGE HEIGHT (CM) AND WEIGHT:HEIGHT RATIOS; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Item	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Trial 1:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
No. Observations	12	11	12	12
Avg. Height, cm	118.2	119.6	118.9	118.3
Initial wt:ht, kg/cm	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.6
Final wt:ht, kg/cm	4.0	4.0	4.0 _b	4.0 _b
Wt:ht change, kg/cm	.2 ^a	0.2 ^a	0.4 ^b	0.4 ^b
<u>Trial 2:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	40.0	57.0	69.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Avg. Height, cm	115.7	116.7	116.6	117.2
Initial wt:ht, kg/cm	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4
Final wt:ht, kg/cm	3.7	3.9 _b	4.0 _b	3.9 _b
Wt:ht change, kg/cm	.3 ^a	.5 ^b	.5 ^b	.5 ^b
<u>Trial 3:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	37.0	53.0	67.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Avg. Height, cm	120.3	117.8	118.3	121.4
Initial wt:ht, kg/cm	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.3
Final wt:ht, kg/cm	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9
Wt:ht change, kg/cm	.4	.5	.5	.6

^{a,b}Means in same row with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

TABLE 8. MEANS OF HEART GIRTH MEASUREMENT, CM; TRIAL 1

Heart Girth	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
Concentrate, Avg. %	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
No. Observations	12	11	12	12
Initial, cm	178.1	184.5	180.9	178.8
Final, cm	185.2	200.3	188.2	193.9
Total change, cm	7.2	15.8	7.3	15.1

TABLE 9.. MEAN CARCASS MEASUREMENTS; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Item	Treatment			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Trial 1:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	8.5	27.0	45.0	60.0
No. Observations	12	11	12	12
Hot Carcass Weight, kg	239.7	257.5	250.8	253.1
Quality Grade ¹	3.8	5.1	4.6	4.5
Marbling Score ²	3.6	4.2	4.4	3.8
Fat Thickness, cm.	.71	.82	.98	.89
Rib Eye Area, cm. ²	66.3	70.9	68.0	67.1
<u>Trial 2:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	40.0	57.0	69.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Hot Carcass Weight, kg	212.1	224.6	230.4	229.4
Quality Grade ¹	5.3	6.5	6.3	7.4
Marbling Score ²	3.5	4.1	3.8	3.8
Fat Thickness, cm	.78 ^{ab}	.61 ^a	.70 ^a	.95 ^b
Rib Eye Area, cm ²	53.4 ^a	64.1 ^{ab}	68.2 ^b	67.8 ^{ab}
Kidney, Pelvic, Heart, Fat, %	1.01	.89	1.00	1.00
<u>Trial 3:</u>				
Concentrate, Avg. %	20.0	37.0	53.0	67.0
No. Observations	12	12	12	12
Hot Carcass Weight, kg	224.5 ^a	225.3 ^a	238.3 ^{ab}	242.6 ^b
Quality Grade ¹	3.9 ^a	5.1 ^b	4.2 ^{ab}	5.0 ^{ab}
Marbling Score ²	3.3	3.9	3.8	4.1
Fat Thickness, cm	.58	.56	.77	.77
Rib Eye Area, cm ²	64.4	63.9	67.1	66.9
Kidney, Pelvic, Heart Fat, %	.83	1.00	.92	1.20

a,ab,b Means in same row with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

¹ Carcass quality grade: 3 = low utility, 4 = average utility, 5 = high utility, 6 = low standard, 7 = average standard, 8 = high standard.

² Marbling score: 3 = traces, 4 = slight, 5 = small, 6 = modest.

less than carcasses from heavy-weight cows (appendix table 18).

Average carcass quality grades were utility-minus in trials 1 and 3 and utility-plus in trial 2 (4.5 and 6.4, appendix table 18). Carcass grades differed significantly between the light- and heavy-weight groups in trial 2 (7.5, commercial-minus versus 5.4, utility-average). However, carcass grade did not differ ($P > .05$) among initial weight groups in trials 1 and 3. As percent concentrate increased, there was no significant response in quality grade. This is indicated by the nonsignificant linear component of carcass grade in all trials (table 4).

Carcasses in all trials averaged "slight" marbling as indicated in appendix table 18 by marbling scores 4.0, 3.8, and 3.8 for trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Marbling was significantly different in trial 2 for the light and heavy groups of cows even though the carcasses had "traces" to "slight" marbling. The light-weight group scored 3.9 and the heavy-weight group scored 3.7. Carcasses within each trial, had "slight" marbling and was not significantly different among feed treatments.

Fat at the 12th rib was .85, .76, and .67 cm in carcasses in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively (appendix table 19). Carcass fat did not have a linear relation to the amount of energy in the ration among treatments ($P > .05$). This is shown by the insignificant linear

component of fat in all trials (table 4). Heavy-weight cows in trial 2 had significantly more fat than light-weight cows (.65 and .87 cm, respectively); although there were no differences ($P > .05$ in trials 1 and 3 (appendix table 19).

Area of the rib eye muscle for trials 1, 2, and 3 was 68.0, 63.4 and 65.6 cm², respectively. In trial 2, feed treatment had a positive linear effect ($P < .05$) on rib eye: rib eye area was larger in cows that had consumed more energy (table 4). Rib eye area in carcasses in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4 was 53.4, 64.1, 68.2, and 67.8, respectively. Feed did not significantly affect rib eye area in trials 1 and 3. Rib eye areas were smaller ($P < .05$) in light-weight cows in trial 1 than heavy-weight cows (appendix table 19). Average rib eyes were 63.5 and 72.8 cm² in light and heavy replications, respectively.

Kidney, pelvic, and heart fat (KPH) was 99 percent in trials 2 and 3 (appendix table 19). Feed treatment did not significantly affect KPH in either trial (table 9). There were no significant differences among light- and heavy-weight cows within trials 2 and 3.

Conclusions. As ration energy increased, total weight gain, average daily gain, condition scores (trial 3) and weight:height significantly increased. Cows utilized high concentrate rations more efficiently than lower concentrate rations in trials 1 and 2.

Percent concentrate in the ration significantly influenced hot carcass weight and rib eye area. However, there were no significant differences as a result of feed treatment in carcass quality grade, degree of marbling, fat thickness at the 12th rib, and kidney, pelvic, and heart fat. Jones et al. (1978) reported that bulls consuming higher roughage rations had to be 150 kg heavier to attain the same carcass grade as animals on concentrate rations. In addition, Price (1978) reported that slow fattening animals consuming low dietary energy increased weight with little or no increase in carcass fat thickness. Guenther et al. (1965) found that cattle of similar origin, fed to same final weight, on different planes of nutrition produced similar gains of fat and lean. However, greater differences in these carcass traits might have occurred if cows were fed for a longer period of time. Wooten et al. (1979) reported that fat at the 12th rib and marbling appeared closely associated with length of time cows were fed rather than level of concentrate in the diet. The findings that marbling increased in cows with increased time on feed agrees with Howes et al. (1972) and Dinius and Cross (1978). Price and Berg (1979) found that after nine weeks of feeding, cull cows had heavier carcasses, greater dressing percent, more fat, and larger rib eye area than cows slaughtered at culling time.

Weight Gain Required to Change Body Condition

Average weight change by initial body condition score of cows that changed 0, 1, 2, and 3 scores is depicted in figure 3. In order to facilitate examination of the data, groups of cows with few numbers were not included in the figure. The weight changes of all cows by initial condition score and score change is in appendix table 20.

Cows with higher initial body condition scores gained more weight without experiencing a change in condition score than cows with lower initial condition scores. Cows with initial scores 5, 6, and 7 gained 39.7, 41.0, and 38.5 kg; cows with initial scores 3 and 4 changed -2.7 and 14.8 kg.

Among cows changing condition, less weight was required by cows with lower scores than cows with higher scores. Cows with initial score 3 gained an average of 30.6, 49.1, and 56.9 kg to change body condition by 1, 2, and 3 scores (figure 3). Cows with initial scores 4, 5, and 6 gained 36.0, 43.2, and 53.8 kg to change 1 condition score. Animals with initial scores 4 and 5 gained 63.0 and 53.0 kg to change 3 scores and 64.3 and 50.5 kg to change 3 scores. Riley (1978) also reported that thin cows had a greater potential than fat cows for large weight gains and changes in body condition. These findings were consistent with Kropp et al. (1973), Bellows et al. (1979), Long et al. (1979), and Swingle et al. (1979), who showed that cows of low condition experienced more weight and condition change than




FIGURE 3. AVERAGE WEIGHT CHANGE (kg) BY INITIAL CONDITION SCORE AND CHANGES IN CONDITION SCORE.

high-conditioned cows.

It was observed that cows deposited more fat as weight increased. More weight was gained by cows that changed 2 or 3 condition scores than cows that changed 0 or 1 scores (figure 3). Calculations from figure 3 showed that cows averaged 55.0 and 57.2 kg of weight gain when scores changed 2 or 3 units, and 26.3 and 40.9 kg when scores changed 0 or 1 units. The data of other researchers (Long et al., 1979; Swingle et al., 1979; Wooten et al. 1979) also showed that more weight gain was accompanied by greater fat deposition. However, in the present study weight gain did not differ (55.0 versus 57.2 kg) between animals that changed 2 and 3 condition scores. They may have been caused by different patterns of fat deposition in short and tall animals as evidenced by the fact that shorter cows changed 3 condition scores. Distribution of fat on shorter, smaller framed cows may have been more noticeable than in taller cows, causing assignment of higher condition scores.

Conclusions. Thin cows with the lowest hip height measurement showed the greatest potential for changing body condition as measured by weight gains and condition scores. Thin cows tended to require less weight gain than fatter cows to change body condition score by a like increment. Also, fat deposition was more noticeable in shorter cows than in taller animals.

Relationships Between Live-Animal and Carcass Traits.

The relationships between live-animal estimates of body condition and carcass measurements were studied to determine the accuracy of methods for evaluating cow body condition. Live-animal traits studied were final weight, condition score, weight:height, and heart girth. The carcass measurements considered were quality grade, degree of marbling, fat thickness at the 12th rib, rib eye area, and percent kidney, pelvic, and heart fat.

Condition score was a fairly good indicator of carcass quality grade as indicated by the significant correlations .29 and .38 in trials 1 and 3. Condition score was a better predictor of fat deposits than weight:height and heart girth as shown by the higher correlations between score and grade in all trials (table 10). Cows that had higher condition scores tended to grade higher as indicated by the positive nature of the correlations. The simple correlations between weight and carcass grades in trials 2 and 3 were negative and the corresponding partial correlations were negative after adjusting for condition score and weight:height in all trials.

Body condition was significantly correlated to carcass marbling and, therefore, may be a good predictor of marbling. Cows with more body condition had more marbling as indicated by the significant positive correlations (.47, .25, .36) between condition score and

TABLE 10. SIMPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3, RESPECTIVELY.

Variable		B			C			D			E			F			G			H			I		
Final weight	A	.59	.38	.54	.97	.95	.88	.63	--	--	.16	-.09	-.05	.28	.17	-.07	.53	.33	-.02	.49	.33	.52	--	-.14	.18
Final condition score	B				.68	.47	.65	.29	--	--	.29	.13	.38	.47	.25	.36	.64	.05	.33	.42	.12	.32	--	.06	.48
Final weight height	C							.60	--	--	.22	-.04	.10	.34	.29	.11	.61	.30	.18	.45	.29	.41	--	-.22	.31
Heart girth	D										.16	--	--	.12	---	---	.32	---	---	.30	---	---	--	---	---
Quality carcass grade	E													.60	.61	.82	.45	.06	.27	-.06	.21	-.16	--	.33	.32
Degree of marbling	F																.57	-.02	.31	.15	.11	-.18	--	-.08	.36
Fat thickness	G																			.15	.14	-.05	--	.12	.61
Rib eye area	H																						--	.20	.00
Percent kidney, pelvic, heart fat	I																								

Coefficients $\geq .24$ are significant ($P < .05$) and coefficients $\geq .30$ are highly significant ($P < .01$).

marbling in all trials (table 10). The fact that marbling increases with increasing body condition is further supported by the positive correlations between marbling and weight:height. Condition score was a better explanatory variable of marbling in trials 1 and 3 than weight, weight:height, and heart girth as shown by significance and the higher correlations between score and marbling.

Condition score and weight:height appeared to be good predictors of carcass fat at the 12th rib. Cows that had higher condition scores and weight:height ratios had more carcass fat as implied by the positive correlation coefficients. Condition score and weight:height significantly explained fat in trials 1 and 3 as shown by the significant correlations. Condition score seemed to be the best predictor of fat in trials 1 and 3 as indicated by the highest correlations of any independent variable. However, weight:height was a good explanatory variable of carcass fat in trial 2 as shown by the correlation of .30 between weight:height and fat. Weight was an accurate predictor of fat in trials 1 and 2 because the correlations with carcass fat were significant. Heart girth may be an accurate predictor of fat because they were significantly correlated in trial 1.

There was a significant relationship between final live-weight and area of carcass rib eye. Larger rib eye muscles associated with

weight:height measurement was not significantly different among feed treatments in any trial. However, the change in weight:height increased linearly as ration energy increased in all trials ($P < .05$; table 4). In trial 1, weight:height change was .2, .2, .4, and .4 kg/cm in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively (table 7). In trial 2, weight:height change was .3, .5, .5, and .5 kg/cm in treatments 1 through 4, respectively. Weight:height change in trial 3 was .4, .5, .5, and .6 kg/cm in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Heart girth was measured in trial 1 and is presented in table 8. Initial heart girth was not significantly different between feed treatments but differed significantly between light- and heavy-weight cows (173.2 and 185.0 cm; appendix table 17). Feed treatment did not significantly affect the final heart girth measurement or heart girth change (table 8). In treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4, final heart girth was 185.2, 200.3, 188.2, and 193.9 and heart girth change was 7.2, 15.8, 7.2, and 15.1, respectively.

Carcass characteristics. Average hot carcass weights are presented in table 9. Feed treatment had a positive linear effect on carcass weight in trials 2 and 3 (table 4). As percent concentrate increased from 20 to 69 (trial 2) and 67 (trial 3), carcass weight also increased. Hot carcass weights increased from 212.1 to 229.4 kg in treatments 1 to 4 in trial 2 and 224.5 to 242.6 kg in trial 3 (table 9). Carcasses from light-weight cows weighed significantly

with heavier weights as indicated by the positive correlations in table 10 (.49, .33, .52 for trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively). The relationship was significant in trials 1 and 3. The fact that rib eye area is a function of weight and red meat is further supported by the smaller correlations between rib eye and condition estimators (i.e., condition score, weight:height, heart girth).

Condition score was significantly correlated to percent kidney, pelvic, and heart fat (KPH) and may be an accurate indicator of KPH. Cows that were assigned higher condition scores had more KPH as suggested by the positive correlation coefficients. Condition score and KPH were significantly related in both trials and highly correlated in trial 2. Although weight and weight:height were significantly related to KPH in trial 1, the independent variables were not consistently related to KPH (negative and positive correlations between the same parameters).

Conclusions

It was important to determine the best condition estimator by criteria other than analysis of variance and covariance. This need to analyze the data differently was pointed out by the inconclusive results from the statistical analyses in the previous discussion.

An alternate but related statistic is the coefficient of determination or R^2 . It indicates the amount of variation explained

by all independent variables in any given regression. If only a single independent variable is used, R^2 is the square of the correlation coefficient. As additional variables are added into the regression, changes in R^2 provide insight into the importance of the variables.

Table 11 contains changes in the coefficients of determination as final weight, condition score, and weight:height are brought into the regression model. Relatively speaking, the amount of variation explained by condition score was greater in nine of the fourteen regressions than the explanation by weight:height. Therefore, condition score seemed to be the best estimator of carcass traits in this experiment, especially when judged by trial 1.

Repeatability estimates of body condition scores obtained in trials 1, 2, and 3 are presented in table 12. The average repeatability of three judges as measured by intra-class correlations were .89, .80, and .80 in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Bellows et al. (1979) reported an intraclass correlation coefficient of .87 for a 10-point scoring system used by two judges.

Results of these studies indicate (1) body condition score, as assigned in the experiment, can be useful in estimating differences in body fat stores among mature beef cows and (2) condition score is a repeatable measurement.

TABLE 11. CHANGES IN R^2 AS ADDITIONAL VARIABLES ARE ADDED; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES														
	Trial 1					Trial 2					Trial 3				
	CGRD ¹	MSCR ²	FAT ³	REA ⁴	KPH ⁵	CGRD ¹	MSCR ²	FAT ³	REA ⁴	KPH ⁵	CGRD ¹	MSCR ²	FAT ³	REA ⁴	KPH ⁵
<u>Regression 1</u>															
Weight	.02713	.07905	.27885	.24254	---	.00865	.03017	.10770	.11073	.02017	.00238	.00462	.00024	.27460	.0313
Condition Score	.05580	.13904	.16230	.02480	---	.03034	.04038	.00657	.00073	.01510	.21750	.22096	.15673	.00223	.2131
Weight: Height	.01671	.00539	.04079	.04729	---	.00703	.11506	.00008	.00751	.11831	.01190	.03117	.07383	.02239	.0193
<u>Regression 2</u>															
Weight	.02713	.07905	.27885	.24254	---	.00865	.03017	.10770	.11073	.02017	.00238	.00462	.00024	.27460	.0313
Weight: Height	.05406	.06507	.14492	.01107	---	.02095	.15253	.00055	.00721	.07267	.09859	.13603	.17686	.01265	.1099
Condition Score	.01845	.07937	.05817	.06102	---	.01642	.00291	.00610	.00047	.06073	.14561	.11610	.05370	.01197	.1225

¹CGRD = Carcass quality grade.

²MSCR = Carcass marbling score.

³FAT = Fat at the 12th rib.

⁴REA = Rib eye area.

⁵KPH = Percent kidney, pelvic, and heart fat.

TABLE 12. REPEATABILITY ESTIMATES OF BODY CONDITION SCORES.

Trial	No. of Cows	No. of Judges	Times Measured	Total No. of Measurements	r_I
1	47	3	3	423	.89
2	48	3	5	720	.80
3	48	3	5	720	.80

Chapter 5

SUMMARY

Three trials were conducted to determine response of cull beef cows to different energy intake levels in terms of weight gain and change in body condition. In each trial, 48 mature, non-pregnant, non-lactating cows were allotted to four feed treatments according to number of teeth, breed, weight, and body condition. Trial 1 was conducted for 72 days using rations that consisted of different proportions of barley, beet pulp, grass hay, and alfalfa. Average daily dry matter consumption was 9.14 kg per head in light-weight replications and 10.25 kg per head in heavy-weight replications. Rations in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4 averaged 8.7, 27.0, 45.0, and 60.0 percent concentrate, respectively. Trials 2 and 3 were conducted for 59 days and cows received rations of barley, beet pulp, and grass hay. Average percent concentrate intakes in treatments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were 20, 40, 57, and 69 in trial 2 and 20, 37, 53, and 67 in trial 3. Average daily dry matter intake was 10.42 kg in trial 2 and 10.68 kg in trial 3.

In all trials, cows were weighed, assigned body condition scores, and measured for height. In addition, heart girth was measured in trial 1. Weights and body measurements were obtained on days 0, 36, and 72 in trial 1; 0, 18, 39, and 59 in trial 2 and 0, 18, 30, 51, and

59 in trial 3.

Cows were slaughtered at the termination of each trial and carcasses were processed according to U.S.D.A. standards. Carcass weights, quality grades, degree of marbling, fat thickness at the 12th rib, rib eye area (REA), and in trials 2 and 3 kidney, pelvic, and heart fat were evaluated.

The response of cows to feed treatment was expected to have a linear order because ration energy increased from treatments 1 through 4. Therefore, a test for linear effect of feed treatment was applied to the data and considered more valid than analysis of variance. In all trials, total weight gain, average daily gain, and wt:ht significantly increased as ration energy increased. Cows in treatment 4 gained significantly more weight and at a faster rate than cows in treatment 1. In trials 1 and 2, cows consuming lower percent concentrate rations (treatment 1) required significantly more energy and feed per kg weight gain than cows consuming higher percent concentrate rations (treatments 3 and 4). In trial 3, condition score significantly increased with increasing ration energy, an indication that body condition was greater for cows that had been on higher percent concentrate rations.

In all trials, hot carcass weight was significantly greater for cows receiving more energy, and rib eye area was positively and significantly affected by treatment in trial 2. Although feed

treatment did not significantly affect carcass traits other than weight and REA (i.e., quality grade, degree of marbling, fat at 12th rib, and kidney, pelvic and heart fat); there was a tendency ($P > .05$) for trait improvement to be associated with augmented energy levels. These results support the hypothesis that carcass traits may be improved by feeding cull cows.

Body condition score was a better predictor of carcass quality than wt:ht and heart girth. Condition score was significantly correlated with carcass quality grade, marbling, fat at the 12th rib, and kidney, pelvic, and heart fat and often had the highest correlation coefficients of any explanatory variable. Condition score was a highly repeatable measurement as shown by the high intraclass correlations of .89, .80, and .80 in trials 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Cows with lower initial condition scores needed to gain less weight to increase body condition than cows with higher initial scores. Cows deposited more fat as weight gain increased as indicated by the increased condition scores associated with weight gain. Thin cows with the lowest hip height measurements showed the greatest potential for increasing body condition as measured by weight gains and condition scores.

LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

- AMSA. 1977. Recommended Procedures for Beef Carcass Evaluation and Carcass Contests (2nd Ed.). Am. Meat Sci. Assoc., Chicago, Ill.
- AOAC. 1979. Official Methods of Analysis (11th Ed.). Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, Washington, D. C.
- Batterman, W. E., R. W. Bray and P. H. Phillips. 1952. Effect of fattening upon certain characteristics of connective tissue in aged cows. J. Anim. Sci. 11:385.
- Bellows, R. A., R. B. Staigmilller, J. B. Carr and R. E. Short. 1979. Beef production from mature cows on range forage. J. Anim. Sci. 49:654.
- Bellows, R. A., R. E. Short, D. C. Anderson, B. W. Knapp, and O. F. Pahnish. 1971. Cause and effect relationships associated with calving difficulty and calf birth weight. J. Anim. Sci. 33:407.
- Black, W. H., Bradford Knapp, Jr., and A. C. Cook. 1938. Correlation of body measurements of slaughter steers with rate and efficiency of gain and with certain carcass characteristics. J. Agr. Res. 56:465.
- Blaxter, K. L. 1962. The Energy Metabolism of Ruminants. Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., London, England.
- Blaxter, K. L. and F. W. Wainman. 1961. Environmental temperature and the energy metabolism and heat emission of steers. J. Agric. Sci. 56:81.
- Bond, T. E., W. N. Garrett, R. L. Givens, and S. R. Morrison. 1970. Comparative effects of mud, wind, and rain on beef cattle performance. ASAE Paper No. 70:406.
- Brody, Samuel. 1945. Bioenergetics and Growth. Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York.
- Butchbaker, A. F., G. W. A. Mahoney, J. E. Garton. 1973. Climate and the selection of a beef housing and waste management system. ASAE 16:734.

- Christopherson, R. J. 1976. Effects of prolonged cold and the outdoor winter environment on apparent digestibility in sheep and cattle. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 56:201.
- Cook, A. C., M. L. Kohli, and W. M. Dawson. 1951. Relationship of five body measurements to slaughter grade, carcass grade and dressing percentage in milking Shorthorn steers. *J. Anim. Sci.* 10:386.
- Crouse, John D., Michael E. Dikeman and Dell M. Allen. 1974. Prediction of beef carcass composition and quality by live-animal traits. *J. Anim. Sci.* 38:264.
- Dinius, D. A. and H. R. Cross. 1978. Feedlot performance carcass characteristics and meat palatability of steers fed concentrate for short periods. *J. Anim. Sci.* 47:1109.
- Gains, W. L. 1943. Feeding standard equations for cows and goats in milk. *J. Anim. Sci.* 2:304.
- Garrett, W. N., J. H. Meyer, G. P. Lofgreen. 1959. The comparative energy requirements of sheep and cattle for maintenance and gain. *J. Anim. Sci.* 18:528.
- Gonyou, H. W., R. J. Christopherson, and B. A. Young. 1976. Effects of environment and feeding level on behavior of feed steers. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeders' Day Rep. p. 45.
- Graham, N. McC., F. W. Wainman, K. L. Blaxter, and D. G. Armstrong. 1959. Environmental temperature, energy metabolism, and height regulation in sheep. I. Energy metabolism in closely clipped sheep. *J. Ag. Sci.* 52:13.
- Gregory, K. E., L. A. Swiger, B. C. Breiderstein, V. H. Arthaud, R. B. Warren and R. M. Koch. 1964. Subjective appraisal of beef carcass traits. *J. Anim. Sci.* 23:1176.
- Gregory, K. E., L. A. Swiger, V. H. Arthaud, R. B. Warren, D. K. Halte and R. M. Koch. 1962. Relationships among certain live and carcass characteristics of beef cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 21:720.

- Guenther, J. J., D. H. Bushman, L. S. Pope, and R. D. Morrison. 1965. Growth and the development of the major carcass tissues in beef calves from weaning to slaughter weight, without reference to the effect of plane of nutrition. J. Anim. Sci. 24:1184.
- Harvey, Walter R. 1975. Least squares analysis of data without equal subclass numbers. U.S.D.A. ARS H-4.
- Hellickson, Mylo A., William B. Witmer, and Robert Barringer. 1972. Comparison of selected environmental conditions and beef cattle performance in pole type and closed environments. ASES 15:536.
- Hironaka, R., and H. F. Peters. 1969. Energy requirements for wintering mature pregnant beef cows. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 49:323.
- Howes, A. D., R. T. Berg, and M. E. Stiles. 1972. Performance carcass characteristics and economic considerations of finishing cows for a speciality market. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeders' Day Rep. p. 22.
- Hultz, Fred S. 1927. Type in beef calves. Wyoming Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 153.
- Jeremiah, L. E., G. C. Smith, and J. K. Hillers. 1970. Utilization of breed and traits determined from the live beef steer for prediction of marbling score. J. Anim. Sci. 31:1089.
- Jesse, G. W., G. B. Thompson, J. L. Clark, H. B. Hedrick, K. G. Weimer. 1976. Effects of ration energy and slaughter weight on composition of empty body and carcass gain of beef cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 43:418.
- Jones, S. D. M., M. A. Price, and G. W. Mathison. 1978. The effects of dietary roughage level on the growth and productivity of intensively fed bulls. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeder's Day Rep. 5T:22
- Jordan, W. A., E. E. Lister, and G. I. Rowlands. 1968. Effect of plane of nutrition on wintering pregnant beef cows. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 48:145.
- Kidwell, James F. 1955. A study of the relation between body conformation and carcass quality in fat calves. J. Anim. Sci. 14:233.

- Kleiber, Max. 1961. The Fire of Life. John Wiley & Sons, New York, and London.
- Klosterman, E. W., L. G. Sanford, C. F. Parker. 1968. Effect of cow size and condition and ration protein content upon maintenance requirements of mature beef cows. J. Anim. Sci. 27:242.
- Kohli, M. L., A. C. Cook, and W. M. Dawson. 1951. Relations between some body measurements and certain performance characteristics in milking short horn steers. J. Anim. Sci. 10:352.
- Kropp, J. R., D. F. Stephens, J. W. Holloway, J. V. Whiteman, Leon Knori, and Robert Totusek. 1973. Performance on range and in drylot of 2-year-old Hereford, Hereford X Holstein, and Holstein females as influenced by level of winter supplementation. J. Anim. Sci. 37:1222.
- Lewis, T. R., G. G. Suess and R. G. Kauffman. 1969. Estimation of carcass traits by visual appraisal of market livestock. J. Anim. Sci. 28:601.
- Lister, E. E., W. A. Jordan, J. M. Wavthy, J. E. Comeau and W. J. Pigden. 1972. Effects of housing and type of forage on the response of pregnant beef cows to dietary energy intake in winter. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 52:671.
- Lofgreen, G. P. and W. N. Garrett. 1968. A system for expressing net energy requirements and feed values for growing and finishing beef cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 27:793.
- Loman, B. G., N. A. Scott, S. H. Somerville. 1976. Condition scoring of cattle. East of Scotland College of Agric. Bull. 6.
- Long, C. R., T. S. Stewart, T. C. Cartwright and J. F. Baker. 1979. Characterization of cattle of a five breed diallel: 11 Measures of size, condition, and growth in heifers. J. Anim. Sci. 49:432.
- Long, C. R., T. S. Stewart, T. C. Cartwright and T. G. Jenkins. 1979. Characterization of cattle of a five breed diallel: I. Measures of size, condition and growth in bulls. J. Anim. Sci. 49:418.
- Long, Robert A., and Jack C. Everly. 1971. Identifying the Cutability of Live Beef Cattle. Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., Danville, Ill. pp. 11.

- Lush, Jay. L. 1928. Changes in body measurements of steers during intensive fattening. Texas Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. #385.
- Lush, Jay L. 1932. The Relation of body shape of feeder steers to rate of gain, to dressing percentage, and to value of dressed carcass. Texas Ag. Exp. Sta., Bull. 471.
- Mahoney, G. W. A., A. F. Butchbaker, J. I. Bryrear, S. Monstafa. 1977. Performance of beef animals as affected by crowding and thermal environment during a fall-winter period. Am. Soc. Ag. Eng. Tran. 20:1129.
- Marshall, D. A., W. R. Parker and C. A. Kinkel. 1976. Factors affecting efficiency to weaning in Angus, Charolais, and reciprocal cross cows. J. Anim. Sci. 54:1176.
- Morrison, S. R., V. E. Mendel, T. E. Bond. 1970. Influence of space on performance of feedlot cattle. ASAE 13:145.
- Milligan, J.D. and G. I. Christison. 1974. Effects of severe winter conditions on performance of feedlot steers. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 54:605-610.
- Neville, W. E., Jr. 1971. Effect of age on the energy requirements of lactating Hereford cows. J. Anim. Sci. 33:855.
- Nie, N. H., C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner and D. H. Bent. 1975. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. (Ed. 2) McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York.
- N.R.C. 1976. Nutrient Requirements of Beef Cattle, No. 4. Revised 1976. National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D. C.
- Orme, L. E., A. M. Pearson, W. T. Magee and L. J. Bratzler. 1959. Relation of live animal measurement to various carcass measurements in beef. J. Anim. Sci. 18:991
- Paine, M. D., G. W. A. Mahoney, A. F. Butchbaker. 1977. Feedlot cattle efficiency as a function of climate. Am. Soc. Ag. Eng. Trans. 20:314.
- Price, M. A. 1978. Some factors affecting beef carcass grade. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeder's Day Rep. p. 30.

- Price, M. A. and R. T. Berg. 1979. Grain-finishing beef cows culled from the breeding herd. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeder's Day Rep. p. 53.
- Riley, Jack. 1978. Feeding cull beef cows in feedlots. Kansas State University Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeder's Day Prog. Rep. 320.
- Riskowski, G. L., and J. A. DeShazer. 1976. Work requirements for beef cattle to walk through mud. ASAE. 19:111.
- Ritzman, E. G. and F. G. Bendict. 1938. Nutritional physiology of the adult ruminant. Carnegie Inst. of Wash. Publ. No. 494.
- Sharma, D. C. and N. D. Kehar. 1961. Effect of environmental temperature and humidity on intake and digestion of nutrients. J. Appl. Physiol. 16:61.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran. 1967. Statistical Methods. (6th Ed.) Iowa State College Press, Ames, IA.
- Spitzer, John C. 1977. Body condition and rebreeding in the cow. Proc. Tex. Anim. Agr. Conf. 17:1.
- Swingle, R. S., C. B. Roubicek, R. A. Wooten, J. A. Marchello and F. D. Dryden. 1979. Realimentation of cull range cows: I. Effect of final body condition and dietary energy level on rate, efficiency and composition of gains. J. Anim. Sci. 48:913.
- Tallis, G. M., Earle W. Klosterman and V. R. Cahill. 1959. Body measurements in relation to beef type and to certain carcass characteristics. J. Anim. Sci. 18:108.
- Teter, N. C., J. A. DeShazer, T. L. Thompson. 1973. Operational characteristics of meat animals: Part II - Beef. ASAE 16:740.
- U.S.D.A. 1975. Official United States Standards for grades of carcass beef. Title 7, Ch. 1, Pt. 53, Sects. 53.100 - 53.105.
- Warnick, A. C., D. D. Hargrove, H. L. Chapman, Jr. and F. M. Peacock. 1979. Effect of level of winter feed supplementation and body condition score on reproduction and weight in Brahman cows. Florida Beef Cattle Res. Rep. 1979:33.
- Watts, R. E. 1965. Aging cattle by examination of teeth. Agric. Exp. Sta. and Coop. Ext. Serv. Fold. #96.

- Webster, A. J. F. 1970. Direct effects of cold weather on the energetic efficiency of beef production in different regions of Canada. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 50:563.
- Webster, A. J., F., J. Chumehy and B. A. Young. 1970. Effects of cold environments on the energy exchanges of young beef cattle. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 50:89.
- White, F. E. and W. W. Green. 1952. Relations of measurements of live animals to weights of wholesale cuts of beef. *J. Anim. Sci.* 11:370.
- Williams, J. H., D. C. Anderson and D. D. Kress. 1979. Milk production in Hereford cattle. II. Physical measurements: repeatabilities and relationships with milk production. *J. Anim. Sci.* 49:1443.
- Wilson, L. L., C. A. Dinkel, H. J. Tuma and J. A. Minyard. 1964. Live animal prediction of cutability and other beef carcass characteristics by several judges. *J. Anim. Sci.* 23:1102.
- Wiltbank, J. N., W. W. Rowden, J. E. Ingalls, K. E. Gregory and R. M. Koch. 1962. Effect of energy level on reproductive phenomena of mature Hereford cows. *J. Anim. Sci.* 21:219.
- Wooten, R. A., C. B. Roubicek, J. A. Marchello, F. D. Dryden and R. S. Swingle. 1979. Realimentation of cull range cows. Two changes in carcass traits. *J. Anim. Sci.* 48:823.
- Yao, T. S., W.M. Dawson and A. C. Cook. 1953. Relationships between meat production characteristics and body measurements in beef and milking Shorthorn steers. *J. Anim. Sci.* 12:775.
- Young, B. A. 1975a. Effects of winter acclimatization on resting metabolism of beef cows. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 55:619.
- Young, B. A. 1975b. Temperature-induced changes in metabolism and body weight of cattle (*Bos taurus*). *Can. J. Physiol. Pharm.* 53:947.
- Young, B. A. and R. T. Berg. 1970. Energy requirements for maintenance of pregnant beef cows. Univ. of Alberta (Canada) Dept. of Anim. Sci. Feeder's Day Rep. p. 38.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF COWS ACCORDING TO PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS, TRIAL 1.

	Total No. Obs.	Treatment			
		1	2	3	4
No. Observations	47	12	11	12	12
<u>Breed</u>					
Angus	18	5	3	4	6
Hereford-Angus	18	4	5	5	4
Hereford	11	3	3	3	2
<u>Incisor Teeth</u>					
Absent	11	3	2	3	3
Broken	6	1	3	0	2
All present	30	8	6	9	7
<u>Initial Condition Score¹</u>					
2	2	0	0	1	1
3	15	4	5	3	3
4	13	3	2	4	4
5	12	3	3	3	3
6	3	1	0	1	1
7	2	1	1	0	0

¹Body condition score: 2 = very thin, 3 = thin, 4 = borderline, 5 = moderate, 6 = moderate-good, 7 = good.

APPENDIX TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF COWS ACCORDING TO PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS; TRIAL 2.

Item	Total No. Obs.	Treatment			
		1	2	3	4
No. Observations	48	12	12	12	12
<u>Breed</u>					
Angus	32	8	8	8	8
Hereford-Angus	4	1	1	1	1
Hereford	8	2	2	2	2
Charolais-Angus	4	1	1	1	1
<u>Incisor Teeth</u>					
Absent	2	0	0	1	1
Broken	2	1	1	0	0
All present	44	11	11	11	11
<u>Initial Condition Score¹</u>					
3	3	1	1	0	1
4	16	5	3	4	4
5	21	4	7	6	4
6	6	1	1	2	2
7	2	1	0	0	1

¹Body condition score: 3 = thin, 4 = borderline, 5 = moderate, 6 = moderate-good, 7 = good.

APPENDIX TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF COWS ACCORDING TO PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS; TRIAL 3.

Item	Total No. Obs.	Treatment			
		1	2	3	4
No. Observations	48	12	12	12	12
<u>Breed</u>					
Angus	24	6	6	6	6
Hereford-Angus	11	3	3	2	3
Hereford	9	2	2	3	2
Hereford-Shorthorn	4	1	1	1	1
<u>Incisor Teeth</u>					
Absent	12	3	3	3	3
Broken	11	3	3	3	2
All present	25	6	6	6	7
<u>Initial Condition Score</u>					
3	17	4	5	4	4
4	15	3	4	4	4
5	16	5	3	4	4

¹Body condition score: 3 = thin, 4 = borderline, 5 = moderate.

APPENDIX TABLE 4. METABOLIZABLE ENERGY^a INTAKE BY TRIAL AND TREATMENT^b.

Feeding period	Treatment							
	1		2		3		4	
	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H
<u>Trial 1:</u>								
Day 0 - 36	18.58	20.94	20.44	23.00	22.14	25.04	24.39	27.30
37 - 72	22.07	24.16	24.01	27.24	25.63	28.58	27.19	30.85
0 - 72	20.32	22.55	22.22	25.12	23.89	26.81	25.79	29.07
<u>Trial 2:</u>								
Day 0 - 18	18.83	19.14	22.15	21.83	24.12	24.12	25.52	23.87
19 - 39	23.40	23.40	25.76	25.76	28.00	28.00	28.68	27.58
40 - 59	27.45	27.45	30.39	30.39	33.33	33.33	36.28	36.28
0 - 59	23.38	23.47	26.23	26.13	28.63	28.63	30.29	29.40
<u>Trial 3:</u>								
Day 0 - 18	18.49	18.49	20.07	20.07	21.83	22.83	23.47	23.55
19 - 30	22.90	22.90	25.21	25.21	27.52	27.52	28.03	29.83
31 - 51	27.47	27.47	30.41	30.41	33.34	33.34	35.85	36.28
52 - 59	27.95	27.47	30.76	30.76	33.59	33.59	36.40	36.40
0 - 59	23.86	23.86	26.25	26.25	28.68	28.98	30.56	31.10

^aAverage daily Mcal ME/cow/kg dry matter intake.

^bL = light-weight and H = heavy-weight replications.

APPENDIX TABLE 5. FEED INTAKE^a BY TRIAL AND TREATMENT^b.

Feeding Period	Treatment							
	1		2		3		4	
	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H
<u>Trial 1</u>								
Day 0-36	8.53	9.60	8.62	9.72	8.67	9.84	9.11	10.12
37-72	9.45	10.34	9.62	10.96	9.61	10.66	9.53	10.81
0-72	8.99	9.97	9.12	10.34	9.14	10.25	9.32	10.46
<u>Trial 2</u>								
Day 0-18	8.08	8.22	8.81	8.71	9.37	9.31	9.78	9.25
19-39	10.12	10.12	10.21	10.21	10.27	10.27	9.86	9.61
40-59	11.84	11.84	12.02	12.02	12.19	12.19	12.37	12.37
0-59	10.08	10.12	10.40	10.37	10.65	10.63	10.69	10.44
<u>Trial 3</u>								
Day 0-18	8.09	8.09	8.39	8.39	8.89	9.37	9.60	9.63
19-30	9.90	9.90	10.00	10.00	10.09	10.09	9.61	10.19
31-51	11.85	11.85	12.03	12.03	12.20	12.20	12.22	12.37
52-59	12.08	12.08	12.20	12.20	12.31	12.31	12.43	12.43
0-59	10.34	10.34	10.53	10.53	10.78	10.92	10.92	11.10

^aAverage daily kg dry matter/cow.

^bL = light-weight and H = heavy-weight replications.

APPENDIX TABLE 6. ENERGY/GAIN (Mcal ME/kg Weight Gain) AND FEED/GAIN (kg dry matter/ kg Weight Gain) RATIOS; TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Source	No. Obs.	Trial 1		Trial 2		Trial 3	
		Energy/ Gain	Feed/ Gain	Energy/ Gain	Feed/ Gain	Energy/ Gain	Feed/ Gain
Mu-Y	48*	44.5	17.8	34.7	13.4	28.5	11.1
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>							
1	12	61.1	27.0	46.9	20.2	28.8	12.5
2	12*	53.6	22.0	29.0	11.5	29.7	11.9
3	12	36.1	13.8	33.1	12.3	29.4	
4	12	39.1	14.1	34.9	12.4	26.4	
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>							
Light	24	39.3	15.6	33.8	13.0	27.8	10.8
Heavy	24*	50.6	20.0	35.5	13.7	29.2	11.4
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>							
1 x Light	6	69.3	30.7	41.6	18.0	26.3	11.4
1 x Heavy	6	55.2	24.4	53.8	23.2	32.0	13.9
2 x Light	6	42.7	17.5	30.7	12.2	27.4	11.0
2 x Heavy	6*	73.5	30.2	27.5	10.9	32.3	13.0
3 x Light	6	32.7	12.5	34.6	12.9	30.4	11.4
3 x Heavy	6	40.0	15.3	31.8	11.8	28.5	10.7
4 x Light	6	32.2	11.6	3.13	11.1	27.1	9.7
4 x Heavy	6	48.5	17.4	39.6	14.1	25.8	9.2

*Trial 1 had one less observation in these means.

APPENDIX TABLE 7. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF WEIGHT, kg; TRIAL 1.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Weight Day 0		Interim Weight Day 36		Final Weight Day 72	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	47	437.0	8.3	452.9	8.1	476.7	8.5
Feed Treatment:							
1	12	444.4	11.8	457.2	13.3	469.8	14.4
2	11	449.5	16.2	460.0	15.6	481.1	14.1
3	12	426.3	20.8	446.9	20.3	476.8	22.2
4	12	429.0	17.2	448.2	15.9	479.4	17.0
Weight Treatment:							
Light	24	391.8 ^a	6.7	409.7 ^a	5.79	434.0 ^a	6.3
Heavy	23	484.3 ^b	6.9	498.0 ^b	7.92	521.2 ^b	9.2
Feed x Weight Interaction:							
1 x Light	6	411.7	7.6	420.2	8.7	432.8	12.7
1 x Heavy	6	477.2	12.0	494.2	12.6	506.7	14.4
2 x Light	6	406.0	9.8	416.0	6.7	443.5	9.9
2 x Heavy	5	501.6	12.1	512.8	10.2	526.2	9.6
3 x Light	6	367.3	14.5	394.2	12.0	420.0	11.8
3 x Heavy	6	485.2	17.3	499.7	23.0	533.5	27.2
4 x Light	6	382.0	14.4	408.3	15.8	439.7	16.0
4 x Heavy	6	476.0	14.5	488.0	15.1	519.2	19.6

^{a,b} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 8. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF WEIGHT, kg; TRIAL 2.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Weight		Interim Weights				Final Weight	
		Day 0		Day 18		Day 39		Day 59	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	48	402.8	5.8	404.5	5.5	433.1	6.3	448.8	6.4
Feed Treatment:									
1	12	399.3	10.0	394.3	10.3	418.3	11.9	428.8	10.9
2	12	399.3	12.3	401.3	11.1	431.8	12.9	452.5	13.3
3	12	410.8	14.4	411.0	14.4	444.5	15.7	461.7	16.2
4	12	401.6	10.1	411.3	8.8	437.7	9.4	452.0	7.8
Weight Treatment:									
Light	24	372.3 ^a	14.1	378.1 ^a	5.2	405.3 ^a	5.7	419.6 ^a	5.9
Heavy	24	433.0 ^b	6.0	430.9 ^b	6.3	460.9 ^b	7.8	477.0 ^b	7.8
Feed x Weight Interaction:									
1 x Light	6	372.0	3.6	369.8	9.0	391.8	9.8	405.2	8.1
1 x Heavy	6	426.7	11.4	418.8	12.3	444.8	15.5	452.5	15.2
2 x Light	6	368.2	5.9	374.2	6.7	402.0	9.6	418.5	10.6
2 x Heavy	6	430.5	15.5	428.3	14.2	461.5	16.9	486.5	14.2
3 x Light	6	377.3	14.8	376.8	13.6	411.7	15.4	426.0	16.2
3 x Heavy	6	444.2	15.8	445.2	16.0	477.3	20.2	497.3	19.7
4 x Light	6	371.7	4.6	391.5	11.6	415.5	10.0	428.7	11.4
4 x Heavy	6	431.5	3.8	431.2	6.6	459.8	9.3	475.3	8.7

^{a,b} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 9. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF WEIGHT, kg; TRIAL 3.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Weight Day 0		Interim Weights						Final Weight Day 59	
		Day 0		Day 18		Day 30		Day 51		Day 59	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	48	402.9	4.6	417.0	5.0	440.9	4.8	458.5	5.2	459.8	5.5
Feed Treatment:											
1	12	404.3	10.4	415.7 ^{ab}	12.0	442.2 ^{ab}	11.9	454.1	12.4	453.1	12.9
2	12	392.7	8.0	403.2 ^b	7.7	421.8 ^b	5.5	442.5	6.6	444.8	7.9
3	12	409.8	9.5	414.7 ^{ab}	9.5	449.3 ^a	9.9	465.9	11.2	467.6	12.1
4	12	404.9	9.0	434.4 ^a	9.9	450.2 ^a	8.8	471.6	10.5	473.8	10.4
Weight Treatment:											
Light	24	379.8 ^a	4.0	393.7 ^a	4.7	421.5 ^a	4.4	438.3 ^a	5.7	433.3 ^a	11.5
Heavy	24	436.0 ^b	4.8	440.3 ^b	6.0	460.3 ^b	6.5	478.8 ^b	6.8	481.8 ^b	7.3
Feed x Weight Interaction:											
1 x Light	6	379.8	7.8	391.3	11.0	420.2	11.3	432.8	12.4	433.3	11.5
1 x Heavy	6	438.8	13.2	440.0	16.6	464.2	17.4	475.3	18.6	472.8	21.1
2 x Light	6	371.0	5.2	383.7	4.3	413.0	4.0	439.5	5.0	427.5	4.3
2 x Heavy	6	414.3	8.1	422.7	9.6	430.7	9.3	455.5	9.8	462.2	11.4
3 x Light	6	390.5	12.0	395.8	12.7	427.8	11.4	445.0	14.9	446.2	16.7
3 x Heavy	6	429.0	10.3	433.5	9.7	470.7	11.0	486.8	12.4	489.0	13.1
4 x Light	6	377.8	5.1	404.0	7.7	424.8	7.8	445.7	12.4	444.5	10.6
4 x Heavy	6	432.0	6.0	464.8	2.8	475.5	5.3	497.5	7.8	503.0	4.9

^{a, b} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 10. DESCRIPTION OF WEATHER CONDITIONS IN TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Feeding Period	Temperature, °C			No. of days -17.8 °C or less	Precipitation, No. of Days			Total No. days cows were wet
	Avg. Max.	Avg. Min.	Mean		<.25 cm	.25 - 1.26 cm.	1.27-2.54 cm	
<u>Trial 1</u>								
Day 0-36	27.1	6.7	16.9	12	24	5	0	29
37-72	48.9	20.1	34.5	2	13	4	0	17
0 - 72	38.0	13.4	25.7	14	37	9	0	46
<u>Trial 2</u>								
Day 0-18	39.3	20.1	29.7	1	6	0	0	6
19-39	41.0	20.6	30.8	2	7	2	0	9
40-59	32.6	10.3	21.5	7	8	1	1	10
0-59	37.6	17.0	27.3	10	21	3	1	25
<u>Trial 3</u>								
Day 0-18	32.8	14.9	23.9	3	7	3	0	10
19-30	43.9	23.4	33.7	0	3	3	0	6
31-51	39.6	21.9	30.8	1	13	2	0	15
52-59	41.1	23.2	32.2	0	3	0	1	4
0-59	39.4	20.9	30.2	4	26	8	1	35

APPENDIX TABLE 11. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF BODY CONDITION SCORE;
TRIAL 1.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Score Day 0		Interim Score Day 36		Final Score Day 72	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	47	4.1	.18	4.8	.16	5.3	.18
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>							
1	12	4.3	.38	4.8	.43	5.5	.40
2	12	4.1	.39	5.0	.29	5.0	.23
3	12	4.0	.32	4.8	.39	5.2	.43
4	12	4.0	.32	4.7	.26	5.7	.32
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>							
Light	24	3.6	.18	4.5	.17	4.9	.19
Heavy	24	4.7	.25	5.2	.25	5.8	.28
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>							
1 x Light	6	3.7	.33	4.2	.33	4.8	.49
1 x Heavy	6	5.0	.57	5.5	.73	6.2	.61
2 x Light	6	3.7	.33	5.0	.24	5.0	.24
2 x Heavy	6	4.6	.76	5.0	.57	5.0	.41
3 x Light	6	3.5	.41	4.3	.33	4.5	.33
3 x Heavy	6	4.5	.41	5.3	.41	5.8	.73
4 x Light	6	3.5	.41	4.5	.41	5.2	.49
4 x Heavy	6	4.5	.41	4.8	.33	6.2	.34

APPENDIX TABLE 12. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF BODY CONDITION SCORES; TRIAL 2.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Score Day 0		Interim Scores				Final Score Day 59	
		Mean	S.E.	Day 18		Day 39		Mean	S.E.
				Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.		
Mu-Y	47	4.8	.13	4.6	.10	5.4	.15	6.0	.15
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>									
1	12	4.7	.32	4.4	.23	4.8 ^a	.23	5.6	.32
2	12	4.7	.23	4.6	.20	6.0 ^c	.29	6.0	.40
3	12	4.8	.20	4.7	.20	5.7 ^{b,c}	.23	6.3	.23
4	12	4.8	.32	4.6	.23	5.3 ^{a,b}	.26	6.0	.17
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>									
Light	24	4.5	.17	4.5	.10	5.5	.16	5.9	.18
Heavy	24	5.0	.19	4.6	.18	5.4	.23	6.1	.23
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>									
1 x Light	6	4.3	.41	4.5	.24	5.0	.24	5.8	.49
1 x Heavy	6	5.0	.45	4.3	.41	4.7	.41	5.3	.41
2 x Light	6	4.3	.33	4.5	.24	5.7	.33	5.3	.41
2 x Heavy	6	5.0	.24	4.7	.33	6.3	.49	6.7	.61
3 x Light	6	4.6	.33	4.5	.24	5.7	.33	6.3	.33
3 x Heavy	6	5.0	.24	4.8	.33	5.7	.33	6.5	.33
4 x Light	6	4.7	.33	4.5	.24	5.7	.33	6.2	.16
4 x Heavy	6	5.0	.57	4.7	.41	4.8	.33	5.9	.33

^{a,b,c} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 13. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF BODY CONDITION SCORE; TRIAL 3.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial Score Day 0		Interim Scores						Final Score Day 59	
		Means	S.E.	Day 18		Day 30		Day 51		Means	S.E.
				Means	S.E.	Means	S.E.	Means	S.E.		
Mu-Y	48	4.0	.12	4.0	.13	4.4	.12	5.8	.14	5.0	.12
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>											
1	12	4.0	.26	4.3	.23	4.3	.23	5.3 ^b	.29	5.7 ^a	.14
2	12	3.8	.23	3.8	.23	4.3	.23	5.8 ^{a,b}	.14	6.2 ^b	.17
3	12	4.0	.26	4.7	.14	4.5	.23	5.9 ^{a,b}	.29	5.8 ^{a,b}	.26
4	12	4.0	.26	3.8	.20	4.3	.20	6.2 ²	.23	6.3 ^b	.29
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>											
Light	24	3.6	.16	3.6	.16	4.2	.16	5.3	.21	5.6 ^a	.13
Heavy	24	4.4	.14	4.5	.15	4.6	.16	6.3	.18	6.4 ^b	.14
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>											
1 x Light	6	3.7	.32	3.5	.20	4.2	.32	5.7	.32	5.7 ^a	.20
1 x Heavy	6	4.5	.32	4.1	.32	4.5	.20	5.6	.37	5.7 ^a	.20
2 x Light	6	3.5	.32	4.1	.32	4.4	.41	5.9	.49	5.8 ^a	.16
2 x Heavy	6	4.2	.32	3.7	.32	4.3	.41	5.5	.61	6.5 ^b	.20
3 x Light	6	3.7	.32	4.7	.20	4.5	.41	6.3	.32	5.2 ^a	.32
3 x Heavy	6	4.3	.32	3.9	.45	4.5	.24	6.1	.45	6.5 ^b	.20
4 x Light	6	3.5	.32	3.3	.41	4.0	.24	5.5	.41	5.7 ^a	.32
4 x Heavy	6	4.5	.20	4.5	.41	4.1	.32	6.8	.32	6.8 ^b	.32

a,b,c Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 14. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF HEIGHT (cm) AND WEIGHT:HEIGHT (kg/cm); TRIAL 1.

Source	No. Obs.	Height		Initial Wt:Ht Day 0		Interim Wt:Ht Day 36		Final Wt:Ht Day 72	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	47	118.7	.61	3.7	.10	3.8	.10	4.0	.10
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>									
1	12	118.2	.98	3.8	.10	3.9	.10	4.0	.10
2	11	119.6	.11	3.8	.12	3.8	.10	4.0	.12
3	12	118.9	1.39	3.6	.14	3.7	.14	4.0	.14
4	12	118.3	1.47	3.6	.12	3.8	.12	4.0	.12
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>									
Light	24	116.1	.57	3.4 ^a	.06	3.5 ^a	.05	3.7 ^a	.05
Heavy	23	121.4	.79	4.0 ^b	.05	4.1 ^b	.05	4.3 ^b	.06
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>									
1 x Light	6	115.9	.94	3.6	.10	3.6	.10	3.7	.12
1 x Heavy	6	120.5	1.14	4.0	.12	4.1	.10	4.2	.10
2 x Light	6	117.3	1.10	3.5	.10	3.5	.10	3.8	.10
2 x Heavy	5	122.4	1.39	4.1	.04	4.2	.04	4.3	.04
3 x Light	6	115.2	1.14	3.2	.12	3.4	.13	3.6	.12
3 x Heavy	6	122.7	1.18	4.0	.12	4.1	.16	4.3	.20
4 x Light	6	116.3	1.51	3.3	.12	3.5	.12	3.8	.12
4 x Heavy	6	120.4	2.33	4.0	.10	4.1	.10	4.3	.10

APPENDIX TABLE 15. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF HEIGHT (cm) AND WEIGHT:HEIGHT (kg/cm); TRIAL 2.

Source	No. Obs.	Height		Initial Wt:Ht Day 0		Interim Wt:Ht				Final Wt:Ht Day 59	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Day 18		Day 39		Mean	S.E.
						Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.		
Mu-Y	48	116.5	.57	3.5	.04	3.5	.04	3.7	.04	3.8	.04
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>											
1	12	115.7	.87	3.4	.06	3.4	.09	3.6	.09	3.7	.09
2	12	116.7	.95	3.4	.09	3.4	.09	3.7	.09	3.9	.09
3	12	116.6	1.30	3.5	.09	3.5	.09	3.8	.12	4.0	.12
4	12	117.2	1.36	3.4	.09	3.5	.06	3.7	.06	3.9	.09
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>											
Light	24	114.3 ^a	.59	3.3 ^a	.04	3.3 ^a	.04	3.5 ^a	.04	3.7 ^a	.05
Heavy	24	118.7 ^b	.69	3.6 ^b	.04	3.6 ^b	.05	3.9 ^b	.06	4.0 ^b	.06
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>											
1 x Light	6	113.5	.82	3.3	.04	3.3	.08	3.5	.08	3.6	.08
1 x Heavy	6	117.8	.69	3.6	.08	3.6	.08	3.8	.12	3.8	.12
2 x Light	6	114.8	1.10	3.2	.04	3.3	.04	3.5	.08	3.6	.08
2 x Heavy	6	118.5	1.22	3.6	.12	3.6	.12	3.9	.12	4.1	.12
3 x Light	6	114.3	1.80	3.3	.12	3.3	.08	3.6	.12	3.7	.12
3 x Heavy	6	118.8	1.43	3.7	.12	3.7	.12	4.0	.16	4.2	.16
4 x Light	6	114.8	1.10	3.7	.08	3.4	.12	3.6	.12	3.7	.12
4 x Heavy	6	119.6	2.12	3.6	.04	3.6	.04	3.9	.08	4.0	.04

^{a,b} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 16. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF HEIGHT (cm) AND WEIGHT:HEIGHT (kg/cm); TRIAL 3.

Source	No. Obs.	Height		Initial Wt:Ht. Day 0		Interim Wt:Ht						Final Wt:Ht Day 59	
		Mean S.E.		Mean S.E.		Day 18		Day 30		Day 51		Day 59	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	48	119.4	.66	3.4	.04	3.5	.04	3.7	.04	3.8	.04	3.9	.03
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>													
1	12	120.3	1.21	3.4	.09	3.5	.04	3.7	.09	3.8	.09	3.8	.06
2	12	117.8	1.47	3.3	.06	3.2	.06	3.5	.06	3.6	.06	3.8	.03
3	12	118.2	1.44	3.5	.12	3.7	.06	3.9	.06	3.9	.09	4.0	.06
4	12	121.4	1.07	3.3	.06	3.4	.06	3.6	.03	3.8	.06	3.9	.06
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>													
Light	24	119.0	.95	3.2 ^a	.05	3.3 ^a	.05	3.5 ^a	.05	3.7 ^a	.06	3.7 ^a	.06
Heavy	24	119.9	.96	3.6 ^b	.03	3.7 ^b	.04	3.8 ^b	.05	4.0 ^b	.05	4.0 ^b	.05
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>													
1 x Light	6	120.5	1.71	3.2	.04	3.3	.04	3.5	.04	3.7	.04	3.6	.04
1 x Heavy	6	120.2	1.96	3.6	.08	3.6	.04	3.6	.08	3.9	.08	3.9	.08
2 x Light	6	117.3	1.55	3.2	.04	3.5	.16	3.8	.16	3.9	.04	3.7	.04
2 x Heavy	6	118.3	2.65	3.5	.04	3.4	.16	3.7	.16	3.8	.20	3.9	.04
3 x Light	6	117.6	2.90	3.3	.16	3.6	.12	4.0	.12	4.1	.12	3.8	.16
3 x Heavy	6	119.1	.90	3.6	.08	3.5	.12	3.7	.08	3.9	.12	4.1	.08
4 x Light	6	120.7	1.18	3.1	.04	3.4	.04	3.0	.04	3.7	.08	3.7	.08
4 x Heavy	6	122.0	1.88	3.5	.04	3.8	.04	3.5	.08	4.0	.08	4.1	.04

^{a,b} Means in same column with different superscript letters are significantly different, $P < .05$.

APPENDIX TABLE 17. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF HEART GIRTH, cm;
TRIAL 1.

Source	No. Obs.	Initial		Interim		Final	
		Heart	Girth	Heart	Girth	Heart	Girth
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	47	180.5	1.49	185.7	1.55	191.7	3.17
<u>Feed Treatment:</u>							
1	12	178.1	3.22	184.7	1.93	185.2	3.51
2	11	184.5	3.05	189.3	4.85	200.3	11.09
3	12	180.9	3.07	184.1	3.15	188.2	2.81
4	12	178.8	2.59	184.8	2.12	193.9	5.55
<u>Weight Treatment:</u>							
Light	24	174.8 ^a	1.31	178.5 ^a	1.04	181.4 ^a	1.70
Heavy	23	186.5 ^b	2.10	193.2 ^b	2.02	202.5 ^b	5.44
<u>Feed x Weight Interaction:</u>							
1 x Light	6	176.8	1.37	179.9	1.24	176.7	4.47
1 x Heavy	6	179.4	6.56	189.7	2.33	193.8	2.19
2 x Light	6	176.6	1.81	179.3	1.38	182.8	2.89
2 x Heavy	5	194.0	2.29	201.4	7.74	221.4	21.50
3 x Light	6	173.0	3.53	176.1	3.18	181.2	2.47
3 x Heavy	6	188.8	1.99	192.1	2.76	195.1	3.09
4 x Light	6	172.6	3.29	178.5	2.20	184.7	3.43
4 x Heavy	6	185.0	1.74	191.0	1.09	203.0	9.50

APPENDIX TABLE 18. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF CARCASS WEIGHT, CARCASS GRADE, AND MARBLING, TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Source	No. obs.	Trial 1						Trial 2						Trial 3					
		CWT ¹		CGRD ²		MSCR ³		CWT ¹		CGRD ²		MSCR ³		CWT ¹		CGRD ²		MSCR ³	
		Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
Mu-Y	48*	250.1	5.26	4.5	.31	4.0	.22	224.1	3.29	6.4	.45	3.8	.16	232.6	3.12	4.5	.19	3.8	.14
Feed Treatment																			
1	12	239.7	10.13	3.8	.55	3.6	.43	212.1	7.01	5.3	.64	3.5	.26	224.5 ^a	7.30	3.9 ^a	.38	3.3	.28
2	12*	257.5	18.14	5.1	.54	4.2	.42	224.6	7.84	6.5	.81	4.1	.40	225.3 ^a	4.47	5.1 ^b	.35	3.9	.35
3	12	250.8	13.55	4.6	.52	4.4	.58	230.4	6.39	6.3	.92	3.8	.27	238.3 ^{ab}	6.38	4.2 ^{ab}	.46	3.8	.38
4	12	253.1	9.80	4.5	.81	3.8	.27	229.4	7.16	7.4	1.09	3.8	.38	242.6 ^b	5.46	5.0 ^{ab}	.25	4.1	.08
Weight Treatment:																			
Light	24	224.8 ^a	4.30	4.5	.49	3.9	.25	210.8 ^a	3.23	7.5 ^a	.72	3.9 ^a	.23	220.8 ^a	3.24	4.5	.26	3.7	.21
Heavy	24*	276.5 ^b	5.99	4.3	.37	4.1	.37	237.5 ^b	5.31	5.4 ^b	.43	3.7 ^b	.24	244.5 ^b	4.22	4.5	.29	3.9	.23
Feed x Weight Interaction:																			
1 x Light	6	216.0	9.95	3.5	.65	3.5	.34	199.8	6.78	6.0	1.27	3.6	.41	211.2	5.96	4.0	.45	3.3	.33
1 x Heavy	6	263.1	11.30	4.0	.90	3.7	.86	224.3	10.49	4.6	.61	3.3	.33	237.8	11.31	3.8	.65	3.3	.49
2 x Light	6	235.5	3.89	5.8	.73	4.5	.65	20.58	3.96	7.5	1.14	4.3	.61	218.7	4.74	5.3	.33	5.3	.49
2 x Heavy	6*	284.3	3.84	4.2	.58	3.8	.49	243.3	10.70	5.6	1.10	3.8	.53	231.8	6.98	4.8	.61	4.8	.57
3 x Light	6	216.8	7.09	4.0	.69	4.2	.49	218.0	6.98	7.3	1.80	3.6	.49	223.3	6.49	4.0	.65	4.0	.61
3 x Heavy	6	284.7	17.22	5.2	.78	4.7	1.10	242.8	8.08	5.3	.33	4.0	.26	253.2	6.90	4.3	.78	4.3	.45
4 x Light	6	231.2	10.82	5.0	1.51	3.5	.49	219.5	5.27	9.0	1.59	4.1	.31	229.8	7.51	4.8	.35	4.8	.00
4 x Heavy	6	275.0	10.69	4.0	.69	4.2	.17	239.3	12.61	5.8	1.18	3.5	.73	255.3	3.14	5.2	.31	5.2	.17

¹CWT = Hot carcass weight; kg.

²CGRD = Carcass quality grade: 3 = low utility, 4 = average utility; 5 = high utility, 6 = low standard, 7 = average standard, 8 = high standard.

³MSCR = Marbling score: 3 = traces, 4 = slight, 5 = small, 6 = modest.

*Trial 1 had one less observation in these means.

APPENDIX TABLE 19. MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF CARCASS FAT, RIB EYE AREA AND PERCENT KIDNEY, PELVIC AND HEART FAT, TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Source	No.	Trial 1						Trial 2				Trial 3							
		FAT ¹		REA ²		KPH ³		FAT ¹		REA ²		KPH ³		FAT ¹		REA ²		KPH ³	
		Obs.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	
Mu-Y	48*	.85	.07	68.0	1.36	--	--	.76	.04	63.4	1.71	.99	.06	.67	.05	65.6	1.11	.99	.06
Feed Treatment:																			
1	12	.71	.16	66.3	2.99	--	--	.78 ^{ab}	.09	53.4 ^a	5.17	1.01	.08	.58	.10	64.4	2.51	.83	.10
2	12*	.82	.11	70.9	2.39	--	--	.61 ^a	.06	64.1 ^b	1.76	.89	.13	.56	.07	63.9	2.54	1.00	.11
3	12	.98	1.73	68.0	2.86	--	--	.70 ^a	.07	68.2 ^b	2.14	1.00	.12	.77	.10	67.1	1.73	.92	.14
4	12	.89	.11	67.1	2.66	--	--	.95 ^b	.11	67.8 ^b	2.74	1.00	.19	.77	.13	66.9	2.19	1.20	.13
Weight Treatment:																			
Light	24	.73	.07	63.5 ^a	1.98	--	--	.65 ^a	.04	61.2	2.97	1.10	.08	.68	.08	63.0	1.35	.96	.08
Heavy	24*	.98	.12	72.8 ^b	1.86	--	--	.87 ^b	.03	65.5	2.01	.90	.10	.65	.07	68.1	1.68	1.00	.09
Feed x weight interaction:																			
1xLight	6	.48	.11	61.7	2.69	--	--	.60 ^a	.00	46.3	9.96	1.10	.08	.58	.12	62.7	2.16	.75	.11
1xHeavy	6	.93	.29	71.0	4.86	--	--	.97 ^{ab}	.16	58.6	2.78	1.00	.13	.57	.16	66.1	4.65	.92	.16
2xLight	6	.78	.12	67.9	2.96	--	--	.67 ^a	.11	62.6	3.10	.93	.18	.58	.12	57.7	2.41	1.10	.20
2xHeavy	6*	.86	.21	74.5	3.53	--	--	.55 ^a	.05	65.6	1.76	.85	.20	.53	.08	70.2	2.69	.92	.08
3xLight	6	.78	.17	61.2	1.64	--	--	.65 ^{ab}	.08	66.5	2.16	1.10	.16	.77	.18	64.7	2.16	.92	.16
3xHeavy	6	1.20	.30	74.8	3.87	--	--	.75 ^{ab}	.11	69.8	3.80	.93	.18	.77	.11	69.5	2.53	.92	.24
4xLight	6	.85	.15	63.2	4.04	--	--	.70 ^{ab}	.11	67.5	1.39	1.30	.21	.78	.20	67.1	2.98	1.10	.16
4xHeavy	6	.93	.17	71.0	2.97	--	--	1.20 ^c	.13	68.2	5.59	.82	.31	.75	.18	66.7	3.51	1.30	.21

¹Fat = Fat thickness at the 12th rib; cm.

²REA = Rib eye area; cm²

³KPH = Percent kidney, pelvic, and heart fat.

*Trial 1 had one less observation in these means.

APPENDIX TABLE 20. AVERAGE WEIGHT CHANGE (kg) BY INITIAL CONDITION SCORES AND CHANGES IN CONDITION, TRIALS 1, 2, AND 3.

Initial Condition Score	Condition Score Change											
	-1		0		1		2		3		4	
	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain, kg.	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain kg.	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain kg.	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain kg.	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain kg.	No. Cows	Avg. Wt. gain kg.
2	-	-	-	-	1	46.0	1	41.0	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	2	-2.7	7	30.6	17	49.1	8	56.9	1	107.0
4	-	-	5	14.8	12	36.0	20	63.0	7	64.3	-	-
5	1	55.0	8	39.7	22	43.2	15	53.0	4	50.5	-	-
6	-	-	3	41.0	4	53.8	1	76.0	-	-	-	-
7	1	68.0	2	38.5	1	26.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-7	2	61.5	20	26.3	47	40.9	54	55.0	19	57.2	1	107.0

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
stks N378.L192@Theses RL
Response of cull cows to different ratio



3 1762 00169412 2


N378
L192
cop. 2