Health recording systems: possible new valorizations of events recorded by breeders
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Abstract

A study of 7 computerized health recording systems aimed to analyze the consistency of events recorded by farmers, in order to use them for genetic evaluations or for new management herd tools. From 2007 to 2012, these software were used by 18 303 cattle farmers. The diseases are more or less detailed according to the tools. 4 levels of classifications are proposed, separating (or not) curative and preventive treatments and according to international recommendations. The herds recording events regularly and with information on diversified diseases were selected, assuming that they represent herds recording information exhaustively. 15.6 % of herds meet the requirements on “exhaustivity” criteria; they represent 56.3 % of the events recorded in these tools. The results of annual and monthly prevalence, calculated on 16 types of diseases and on 9 categories of animal are compatible with those previously reported in the literature. For AI bulls with daughters present in at least 2 tools, the proportion of each disease among those recorded for their progeny was compared between tools. Ratios were quite homogeneous, which is a good sign concerning the consistency of the records among tools. These results show that harmonization of health records is possible. The health events could be used to develop new genetic evaluations on health traits or new references used in management tools.
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