

1 **The effects of crossbreeding with Norwegian Red dairy cattle on common**
2 **postpartum diseases, fertility and body condition score**

3 E. Rinell ¹ and B. Heringstad ¹

4 ¹ *Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of Life*
5 *Sciences, NO-1432 Ås, Norway.*

6 Corresponding author: Ellen Rinell, email: ellen.rinell@nmbu.no

7 Short title: Health and fertility of Norwegian Red crossbreds

8

9 **Abstract**

10 Norwegian Red bulls, selected in Norway, have been used for crossbreeding with Israeli
11 Holstein on commercial farms. The aim of this project was to investigate Norwegian Red
12 x Israeli Holstein (NRX) performance to see how the daughters perform in a different
13 environment than the one their sires were selected in. This was done by comparing health
14 and fertility of NRX with their Israeli Holstein (HO) counterparts. The data consisted of 71
15 911 HO records and 10 595 NRX records from 33 855 cows in 23 Israeli dairy herds.
16 Calving events took place between 2006 and 2016. Five postpartum disorders (mean
17 frequency in HO vs NRX, %) recorded by veterinarians were analyzed: anestrus (37.4 vs.
18 41.2), metritis (40.1 vs. 28.6), ketosis (11.9 vs 7.1), lameness (7.1 vs. 3.1) and retained
19 placenta (6.2 vs. 4.0). The incidence of abortions was also analyzed; HO had a mean
20 frequency of 9.9% and NRX 8.2%. These traits were defined as binary traits, with “1”
21 indicating that the disorder was present and a treatment took place at least once, or “0” if
22 the cow did not show signs of that disorder. Days open (i.e. the number of days from

23 calving to conception), body condition score (BCS) recorded on a 1-5 scale and changes
24 in BCS from calving to peak lactation were also analyzed. A logistic model was used for
25 the health traits, while days open and BCS were analyzed with linear models. The model
26 included breed group, herd-year of calving, birth year and parity as fixed effects. There
27 was a significantly higher risk (odds ratio for HO vs. NRX in parentheses) of ketosis (1.46),
28 metritis (1.78), lameness (2.07), retained placenta (1.41), and abortion (1.13) in HO
29 compared with NRX. Israeli Holstein heifers and cows in parity 3-6 had fewer cases of
30 anestrus than NRX but no differences were found between the groups in parities 1 and 2.
31 Body condition score was higher for NRX than HO and there was less change in BCS
32 from calving to peak lactation in NRX compared to HO. Likewise, NRX had fewer days
33 open than HO. Results indicate that crossbreeding can produce cows with better fertility
34 that are less susceptible to postpartum disorders.

35 **Key words.** Dairy crossbreeding, Holstein, health, reproduction, lameness

36

37 **Implications**

38 Using Norwegian Red bulls for crossbreeding with Israeli Holstein dams produced cows
39 with a lower risk of postpartum diseases like metritis, ketosis and retained placenta. The
40 crossbreds also had a decreased incidence of lameness, better body condition scores
41 and fewer days open compared to their Israeli Holstein counterparts. Although Norwegian
42 Red crossbreds usually produce less milk than Holsteins, improving health and fertility by
43 crossbreeding may result in better animal welfare and a higher income for the farmer
44 because the cows require fewer treatments and less labor.

45

46 **Introduction**

47 In response to the effects of inbreeding and decades of effective selection for increased
48 milk yield which has resulted in unfavorable correlated responses for health and fertility in
49 the Holstein (**HO**) breed (Pryce et al., 2014), crossbreeding has grown in popularity over
50 the last two decades. Crossbreeding can provide a fast solution to the decline in health
51 and fertility through both heterosis and breed complementarity. While the NR breeding
52 goal has focused on fertility and health along with milk production since the 1970s,
53 breeding goals for HO have mainly focused on milk production (Miglior *et al.*, 2005).
54 Semen from Norwegian Red (**NR**) has been exported to over 20 countries and is used for
55 crossbreeding with HO. Although they produce about 5% less milk per lactation,
56 Norwegian Red-Holstein crossbreds (**NRX**) and NR have outperformed their HO
57 herdmates in terms of fertility, lower incidence of mastitis, lower SCS, and better survival
58 (Heins *et al.*, 2006, Heins and Hansen, 2012; Walsh *et al.*, 2008; Begley *et al.*, 2009;
59 Cartwright *et al.*, 2011).

60 Although many countries began shifting emphasis away from milk yield to more functional
61 traits in the last 10 years, milk production was weighted at 80% of the breeding goal in
62 Israel in 2005, and at 100% only a few years prior to that (Miglior *et al.*, 2005). Dairy
63 production in Israel has become of international interest because Israeli dairy cows, on
64 average, produce the most milk per lactation of any country – first parity Holstein cows
65 had an average 305-d yield of 438 kg fat and 388 kg protein in 2015 (Ezra *et al.*, 2016). A
66 veterinarian from the farmer-owned cooperative, Hachaklait, examines all cows weekly

67 after calving and therefore extensive health records are available on dairy cows in Israel
68 including unique postpartum traits (Flamenbaum and Galon, 2010).

69 There are approximately 125 000 dairy cattle on two types of farms in Israel. “Kibbutz” are
70 large, communally owned farms with an average of 350 cows per herd and “moshav” are
71 smaller, cooperative family farms with an average of 60 cows per herd (personal
72 communication, David Dror). Israel has a warm climate, subtropical on the coast and hot
73 and dry in the desert, and is often affected by drought. Consequently, it is a challenging
74 environment for dairy production as cows’ milk yield, health and fertility suffer when
75 temperatures exceed 25°C (Klinedinst *et al.*, 1993). The Israeli HO originated from
76 crossbreds between Damascus cows and European HO bulls, and the development of
77 the breed continued using HO bulls from America and England until the mid-1960s
78 (personal communication, David Dror). Since then, Israeli HO bulls have been exclusively
79 used as sires. In 2005, the first NRX calf was born in Israel and crossbreeding has
80 continued since, as both 2-way crossbreds (NR x HO) and 3-way crossbreds (NR x HO x
81 Montbeliarde). The combination of intensive production and warm climate makes it
82 interesting to investigate effects of crossbreeding in Israel, as many other countries have
83 a similar production system and climate but do not have the thorough health records that
84 are available in Israel.

85 Only one study has been published on NRX in Israel. Ezra *et al.* (2006), which included
86 fewer NRX cows and analyzed fewer postpartum diseases compared to the present study,
87 reported that crossbreeding with NR was beneficial because it resulted in fewer cases of
88 metritis. They found no differences between NRX and HO for incidence of ketosis, milk
89 fever, and displaced abomasum. Holsteins had approximately 5% higher fat and protein

90 yields in parities 1-3 but NRX had higher fat and protein percentages (Ezra *et al.*, 2016).
91 While several studies in the USA, Ireland and Canada have compared NRX with HO for
92 production and fertility, few have evaluated direct health traits. Many studies on NRX
93 performance have analyzed SCS as an indication of health and immune response (Walsh
94 *et al.*, 2007 and Heins *et al.*, 2012). Begley *et al.* (2009) and Cartwright *et al.* (2011) found
95 better immune responses in NRX calves compared to HO calves. Only one study has
96 compared the incidence of clinical mastitis in HO, NR, and NRX and reported a
97 significantly lower incidence of mastitis in NR (6%) compared to NRX (10.4%) and HO
98 (11.9%) (Begley *et al.*, 2009). Other indicators of health have not been examined in NRX
99 cows, mostly due to lack of direct health records. Crossbreeding with NRX has also been
100 found to improve fertility. Walsh *et al.*, 2008 reported that NR had 4.5 fewer days open
101 compared to HO and Heins *et al.*, 2012 found that Scandinavian Red crosses had 12
102 fewer days open compared to HO.

103 In this study, we compared NRX and HO in order to evaluate the effect of crossbreeding
104 on incidence of postpartum disease, lameness, fertility, body condition score (**BCS**) and
105 changes in BCS. A greater number of direct health traits were analyzed than in any other
106 study comparing NRX and HO. Although the data is from Israel, we expect the results to
107 be relevant in many other countries that have similar intensive milk production systems
108 and/or warm climates.

109 **Materials and methods**

110 The data was provided by David Dror (Qualified Gene, Tel Aviv, Israel) and consisted of
111 records on health and fertility from 23 herds with an average of 2855 records per herd
112 with calving events taking place from 2006 to 2016. Records from heifers for some traits

113 (anestrus, lameness and abortion) and parity 1-6 for all traits were included. The farmers
114 own the data and have given permission for its use in this study. Records are kept by
115 farmers and veterinarians using the Israeli Dairy Herd Management Program (NOA),
116 developed by the Israeli Cattle Breeder's Association. Veterinarians recorded the body
117 condition scores and all of the health traits. Cows were examined by a veterinarian at 6-
118 12 days after calving. If they have any postpartum disorders at that time, they are treated
119 and then checked weekly until they were considered "clean."

120 The breed group termed NRX was composed of F1 crossbreds, all with NR sires and HO
121 dams. There were not enough crossbreds of other breed compositions to include
122 additional groups in the analysis. The cows in the HO group were 100% HO. The data
123 consisted of one dataset with health records from routine weekly veterinarian
124 examinations postpartum, body condition scores and days open, and the other file
125 consisted of abortion records. The number of records per parity and breed group are given
126 in Table 1. Herd-years having less than three NRX or HO observations each were
127 removed from the dataset (Table 2). Parities 3-6 were combined into one group called
128 "parity 3+".

129 In the health records dataset, each cow had one record per parity, where each of 5
130 diseases (defined in Table 3) were scored with either 1 or 0, 1 signifying that the disease
131 or event was present or occurred at least once, and 0 signifying there was no sign of the
132 disease. The diseases in the health dataset included ketosis, metritis, retained placenta,
133 lameness and anestrus. Records on milk fever, displaced abomasum, uterine prolapse
134 and udder edema were also obtained, but frequencies were so low that they were not
135 included in this study. For the postpartum diseases, the time period in which the scoring

136 took place was between day 6-12 after calving. In the abortion dataset, there were two
137 records per lactation scored as 1 or 0. In the present study, abortion refers to the loss of
138 pregnancy between 40 days of gestation and the beginning of the dry-off period. For the
139 trait anestrus, two health events were combined: inactive ovaries and persistent corpus
140 luteum (**CL**). Only 14% of positive anestrus cases were classified as persistent CL while
141 86% were due to inactive ovaries. There was only one fertility trait available in the dataset,
142 days open, which was the number of days from calving to the start of the subsequent
143 pregnancy. Body condition score was recorded three times per lactation by the
144 veterinarian: two weeks after dry-off, within two weeks after calving and at peak milk
145 production. In Israel, a scale of 1-5 with increments of 0.25 is used, 1 meaning thin and 5
146 meaning obese. The trait change in BCS was the difference between BCS after calving
147 and BCS at peak lactation. The overall means for each trait are listed in Table 4.

148 *Model*

149 Data edits and statistical analyses were performed in SAS 9.4 (version 9.4, SAS Institute,
150 2013). Days open and BCS were analyzed with linear models using the GLM procedure.
151 All other traits were binary and analyzed using a logistic model.

152 The following model was used for postpartum traits:

$$153 Y_{ijkl} = \mu + \text{Breed}_i + \text{HY}_j + \text{Parity}_k + \text{Birthyear}_l + e_{ijkl},$$

154 where Y_{ijkl} is the observed value of the trait; μ is the overall mean; Breed_i was the fixed
155 effect of i^{th} breed group (2 classes, HO or NRX); HY_j the fixed effect of herd-year (Table
156 2), which was made up of herd and year of calving except for the trait abortion, where HY
157 included the year of conception instead of calving. Parity_k was the fixed effect of the k^{th}

158 lactation (3 classes, 1, 2, and 3+), birthyear_l was the fixed effect of the cow's birth year,
159 and e_{ijkl} was the residual error.

160 The following model was used for traits relevant for heifers (anestrus and lameness):

$$161 \quad Y_{ijkl} = \mu + \text{Breed}_i + H_j + \text{Parity}_k + \text{Birthyear}_l + e_{ijkl},$$

162 where H_j the fixed effect of herd. Parity_k was the fixed effect of the k^{th} lactation (4 classes;
163 0, 1, 2, and 3+), and other effects were as defined above.

164 Effects were included in the models if they were significant at $P < 0.1$. The final model for
165 lameness did not include birth year as it was not significant. The effect of season (defined
166 as winter, from November to January, spring, from February to April, summer, from May
167 to July, and fall, August to October) was not significant for any of the traits, and therefore
168 not included in the final models. For each trait, each parity was also analyzed separately,
169 using the same model without the effect of parity.

170 *Odds ratio*

171 Odds ratio (**OR**) was calculated and used to evaluate differences in health traits between
172 the two breed groups. The OR describes how much higher odds one breed group has of
173 getting a disease compared to the other group. In the present study, an odds ratio >1
174 means that HO has higher odds of getting the disease compared to NRX, while an OR <1
175 signifies the opposite. If the OR for HO vs. NRX was 1, there was no significant difference
176 between breed groups. The 95% confidence interval shows the range of OR that 95% of
177 all observations in the true population fall into. The width of the confidence interval
178 signifies how precise the estimate is. If this range includes one, there is not a significant

179 difference between breed groups. The p-values also indicate the significance level of the
180 difference between the breed groups.

181 **Results**

182 *Postpartum diseases*

183 Odds ratios for HO vs. NRX for the health traits ranged from 0.87 to 2.07 (Table 5). Here,
184 OR >1 indicates a higher risk of the disease in the HO group, while OR <1 indicates a
185 higher risk of the disease in the crossbred group. The highest OR (2.07) was found for
186 lameness, i.e. the odds of lameness were higher in HO than NRX. Norwegian Red
187 crossbreds had significantly fewer cases of ketosis, metritis, retained placenta, abortion,
188 and lameness than HO (Table 5).

189 The mean frequency of anestrus decreased, while frequencies of ketosis and lameness
190 increased with higher parities (Table 6). Odds ratios for each parity (Table 6) demonstrate
191 that breed differences vary over parities for these traits. The incidence of ketosis increased
192 in later lactations (Table 6), but difference between breeds decreased. The biggest
193 difference between breed groups for ketosis was after the first calving, when odds for HO
194 primiparous cows were 2.71 times as high compared to NRX (Table 6). Table 6 only
195 includes the health traits that show a trend in odds ratio from one parity to the next.

196 Israeli HO had two times higher odds of becoming lame compared to their NRX herdmates
197 (Table 5). The biggest difference was observed in first-parity HO, which were 2.75 times
198 higher odds of developing a case of lameness than first-parity NRX (Table 6). In later
199 parities, the difference became slightly smaller between breed groups, but still significant
200 at $P < 0.001$.

201 *Anestrus*

202 The OR for HO vs. NRX for anestrus was 0.87 indicating that NRX were at a slightly higher
203 risk for anestrus compared to HO (Table 5). NRX heifers had a significantly higher risk of
204 anestrus than HO heifers (Table 6). No significant breed difference for anestrus was found
205 for cows during the first and second parities, but anestrus was more likely to be observed
206 in NRX during parities 3-6 (Table 6).

207 *Abortions*

208 Abortion was the fourth most common health event in this study (Table 5). Norwegian Red
209 crossbreds had a lower frequency of abortions than HO, significant at $P < 0.05$ (Table 5).
210 Israeli HO had 1.13 times higher odds of having an abortion compared to NRX. We did
211 not observe any trend with increasing parity number in the differences between breed
212 groups.

213 *Days open and body condition score*

214 There were significantly more days open for HO compared to NRX ($P < 0.001$). Least
215 squares means (standard error) were 135 (0.4) and 123 (1.1), respectively (Table 7).
216 There was no noticeable trend with increasing parity number and the difference between
217 breeds was significant in each parity. Norwegian Red crossbreds had significantly higher
218 BCS before calving, after calving and at peak lactation ($P < 0.001$). The change in BCS
219 from after calving to peak lactation was also lower for NRX ($P < 0.001$). Least square
220 means and standard errors are given in Table 7.

221

222 **Discussion**

223 *Disease frequencies*

224 The frequency of some of the diseases and fertility problems were high in Israel compared
225 to other countries. The frequent veterinary examinations in Israel allow for a high detection
226 rate of postpartum diseases, and may explain the relatively high frequencies, especially
227 for the traits metritis and ketosis. In the present study, 40.1% of HO and 28.6% of NRX
228 had metritis, while the incidence of metritis in Norway was less than 1% (Hauggaard and
229 Heringstad, 2015). In a review, Pryce *et al.* (2016) reported a median incidence rate for
230 ketosis of 3.3% over several countries in Europe and North America. This is much lower
231 than the present study where means for NRX and HO were 7.1% and 11.9%, respectively
232 (Table 4). The lower incidence rate in the other studies could be due to the recording
233 system rather than a lower incidence of the disease.

234 The high incidence of anestrus (nearly 50% of cows had at least one case) found in both
235 breed groups in the present study is probably reflective of the tradeoff between production
236 and reproduction experienced by the modern dairy cow and could be due to different
237 management practices. Incidence of reproductive problems was much lower in other
238 countries: 6.3% in Canada (Koeck *et al.*, 2010) and 2.4 - 3.8% in Norway (Hauggaard *et*
239 *al.*, 2015) for anestrus and silent heat, respectively.

240 *Differences in breeding goals*

241 Differences between breed groups is due to a combination of additive genetic value of
242 each of the parent breeds and heterosis effects. The latter could not be estimated in the
243 present study because there are no purebred NR in Israel. Different genetic level for health
244 and fertility in NR and HO is expected because of the differences in their breeding goals.

245 Although HO in Israel have been a closed population for many decades, they have had a
246 similar breeding goal to other Holstein populations, with the highest weight on milk
247 production out of all the Interbull member countries. They have only recently included
248 fertility in the breeding index, PD07 (Glick *et al.*, 2012) while Norwegian Red has been
249 selected for a broad breeding goal with emphasis on health and fertility since the 1970s.
250 Genetic improvement has been obtained for low-heritability traits like mastitis, ketosis
251 (Heringstad *et al.*, 2007), and female fertility (A. Ranberg *et al.*, 2003). Some of the traits
252 included in the present study have not been directly included in NR breeding goal (e.g.
253 abortion, lameness) or have been added only recently (e.g. metritis, anestrus). However,
254 positive genetic correlation to other health traits (Heringstad *et al.*, 2005) and antagonistic
255 genetic correlation between health traits and milk yield (Koeck *et al.*, 2010; Pryce *et al.*,
256 2016) may have resulted in indirect selection responses and genetic differences between
257 breeds.

258 *Metabolic disorders*

259 The inclusion of ketosis in each country's breeding goal is reflected in the results. As
260 ketosis is a metabolic disorder, the level of milk yield and, in turn, negative energy balance
261 influences the prevalence. High milk production in the previous lactation can be a risk
262 factor for ketosis (Fleischer *et al.*, 2001). Ketosis caused a decrease in milk yield from 126
263 to 534 kg depending on parity (Rajala-Schultz *et al.*, 1999) and can lead to a loss in body
264 condition (Gillund *et al.*, 2001). The latter could be one of the causes of poor fertility
265 identified in ketotic cows (Gillund *et al.*, 2001).

266 *Lameness*

267 The health event with the most substantial difference between breed groups in this study
268 was lameness, as HO had double the odds of becoming lame compared with their NRX
269 counterparts. The difference between breeds decreased in later lactations, which could
270 be due to the culling of lame cows. Because the HO breeding index has put much more
271 weight on milk production than NR's breeding index, we expect that hoof problems would
272 be more prevalent in HO. König *et al.* (2008) found positive but unfavorable genetic
273 correlations ranging from 0.11-0.44 between milk yield and claw health. No previous
274 studies on NRX and HO have compared incidence of lameness.

275 *Reproductive disorders*

276 Higher risk of metritis in HO compared to NRX was in agreement with Ezra *et al.* (2016).
277 Another study that compared Montbéliarde x HO crossbred cows with HO found a much
278 lower incidence of uterine disorders in the crossbred cows (Mendonça *et al.* 2014). Metritis
279 was added to the NR total merit index in 2015 (Geno Global, 2016) while genetically
280 correlated traits such as mastitis and retained placenta have been included since 1978
281 and could have improved resistance to metritis. Two studies have shown that NRX have
282 a better immune response than HO (Begley *et al.* 2009; Cartwright *et al.* 2011). This could
283 be an explanation of why NRX had a lower incidence of metritis and other disorders.

284 The genetic correlation between metritis and retained placenta is moderate-high and has
285 been estimated from 0.55 to 0.74 (Heringstad, 2010; Jamrozik *et al.*, 2016). The results
286 of the present study were consistent with this study, as a higher incidence of retained
287 placenta was observed in HO. Retained placenta can be a result of difficult calvings, which
288 have been reported as more common in HO than in Scandinavian Red crosses (NRX and
289 Swedish Red X Holstein crosses) and NR (Heins *et al.*, 2006; Ferris *et al.*, 2014).

290 Reducing the incidence of retained placenta and metritis by crossbreeding could also
291 prevent fertility problems as there have been moderate genetic correlations (0.5) reported
292 between retained placenta and anestrus/silent heat in HO (Koeck *et al.*, 2010). However,
293 this disagrees with Heringstad (2010) who found no genetic correlation between the traits
294 in NR.

295 The results for anestrus in the present study differ from our expectations based on
296 previous studies comparing Holsteins with NRX. In all fertility-related traits, the NRX and
297 NR have performed better than Holsteins in the same environment, including having a
298 higher non-return rate and fewer services per conception (Schaeffer, 2011, unpublished
299 results), a higher conception rate (Walsh *et al.*, 2008, Ferris *et al.*, 2014) and a higher first-
300 service conception rate and pregnancy rate (Heins *et al.*, 2012). However, none of these
301 studies looked into heifer fertility or fertility disorder traits like anestrus.

302 Anestrus has several different definitions, but in the present study, this health trait
303 comprises two of the types of anestrus as defined by Peter *et al.* (2009). The first and
304 most prevalent, inactive ovaries, is referred to as Type I. Type I anestrus occurs when
305 there is no deviation of follicles or establishment of a dominant follicle (Peter *et al.*, 2009).
306 The other type of anestrus included in the present study, type IV, was due to a persistent
307 CL, which can be caused by dystocia, heat stress or postpartum diseases (Opsomer *et*
308 *al.*, 2000).

309 Anestrus can be affected by many different events. Climate differs between regions in
310 Israel; a warm Mediterranean climate dominates in the northern valley where most dairy
311 farms in the present study are located. The winters are generally mild, 15-20°C being the
312 mean temperature, but summer temperatures typically reach 35°C. In the present study,

313 there was not enough information on the time of anestrus diagnosis so we could not make
314 a conclusion about the influence of summer or winter. There was no effect of season of
315 calving, which could be due to the effective cooling systems in many barns in Israel
316 involving the use of spraying and fans to prevent overheating (Flamenbaum and Galon,
317 2010).

318 *Abortions*

319 The ability to maintain pregnancy is associated with the cow's energy balance. A change
320 in BCS of one unit from prior to calving to 30 d postpartum increased the likelihood of fetal
321 loss by 2.4 (López-Gatius *et al.*, 2002); likewise, Silke *et al.* (2002) reported that a higher
322 frequency of fetal loss was associated with a change in BCS during the second month of
323 pregnancy. Frequency of abortion has been found to be higher in high-yielding than low-
324 yielding cows (Grimard *et al.*, 2006) so this could explain why we see a higher incidence
325 in HO vs. NRX. The results of the present study favored NRX over HO only marginally (P
326 < 0.05), however, each abortion results in an economic loss of \$550 (De Vries, 2006) so
327 even a small decrease in abortions is noteworthy in terms of farm profit.

328 *Days open*

329 Days open is often used as a measure of fertility in dairy cattle. The results from the
330 present study were consistent with previous studies on NRX vs. HO, which found that
331 there were significantly fewer days open among NRX cows compared to HO (Walsh *et al.*
332 2008; Heins *et al.* 2012). One reason for the difference between breed groups in days
333 open could be due to the NR's history of including fertility in the total merit index. However,
334 many factors can affect days open. If a cow requires many inseminations to become

335 pregnant, or if she is not showing estrus, breeding will be delayed. Management decisions,
336 like choosing to postpone breeding and have longer lactations, affect the number of days
337 open. Metritis and other postpartum diseases can also affect days open. Toni et al. (2015)
338 reported that metritis, retained placenta and lameness decreased first service conception
339 rate and increased days open. It would have been preferred to use other measures of
340 fertility in the present study as days open is biased because it only includes cows with a
341 subsequent lactation. Unfortunately, days open was the only one available in the data we
342 received.

343 *Body condition score*

344 Many of the metabolic diseases are associated with negative energy balance in early
345 lactation. BCS is a subjective measure of an animal's body reserves, and changes in BCS
346 can be used to quantify mobilization of body reserves. The results of the present study
347 were similar with two previous studies on Norwegian Red crossbreds in which NRX also
348 had higher BCS than HO. In both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, purebred
349 NR had a higher lactation average BCS than HO (Walsh *et al.*, 2008; Ferris *et al.*, 2014).
350 Body condition scores are especially of interest because of the genetic correlation ($r_g = -$
351 0.27 to -0.62) with reproductive performance (De Haas *et al.*, 2007). Poor body condition
352 can make it more difficult for cows to become pregnant, leading to more days open and
353 requiring several inseminations. A lack in body condition can also increase the risk of
354 postpartum diseases such as lameness, metritis, ketosis and retained placenta
355 (Hoedemaker *et al.*, 2009; Jamrozik *et al.*, 2016). Hoedemaker *et al.* (2009) also observed
356 that cows with a change in BCS >0.25 from calving to four weeks after calving had a
357 higher risk of developing lameness. In the present study, both breeds had a change in

358 BCS >0.25 with the change in HO significantly higher than NRX, so that could partially
359 explain the increase in lame cows. However, it is more logical that lameness results in a
360 low BCS due to a decrease in feed intake rather than vice-versa.

361 *Implications*

362 The relatively high incidence of some of the diseases in the present study can be attributed
363 to the high milk yield, challenging environment, as well as the high detection rate in Israeli
364 dairy herds. Most of these diseases are favorably genetically correlated with one another,
365 so selection for resistance against one disease can result in a correlated selection
366 response and a decrease in other diseases (Heringstad, 2010, Jamrozik et al., 2016).
367 Although the present study used data only from Israel, the aforementioned genetic
368 correlations are present in many different populations (Pryce *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, we
369 surmise that the effect of crossbreeding with NR would be similar in other countries with
370 production systems that are also intensive and/or face the challenges of warm climates.
371 It would be interesting to look at genotype by environment interactions between NRX in
372 Israel and NRX in different production systems, but there is minimal data available on
373 similar postpartum disease traits outside of Israel.

374 Heins *et al.* (2012) has shown that crossing Holstein with Scandinavian Red breeds can
375 result in 44% higher lifetime profit per cow due to a longer herd-life and 5-8% higher profit
376 per day than pure Holstein. Their study did not consider veterinary expenses in the profit
377 calculations. Therefore, it would be interesting to acquire and analyze veterinary
378 treatments and the costs associated with them in order to determine the economic benefits
379 of crossbreeding due to improved health. Lameness, for example, results in a substantial
380 cost to the farmer due to a loss in milk production, increase of fertility problems and

381 treatment of the disease, which has been estimated at \$120 to \$216 USD per case
382 depending on the type of lameness (Cha *et al.*, 2010).

383 Despite the small loss in milk production observed in NRX (Heins *et al.*, 2012),
384 crossbreeding could be economically beneficial due to less money spent on treatments
385 and fewer days open. The higher BCS and less change over time in the crossbreds could
386 help prevent diseases and reproductive problems. According to Koeck *et al.* (2010),
387 selecting cows for disease resistance could increase longevity. Improving health and
388 fertility, and in turn, creating more robust animals, is the main purpose of crossbreeding,
389 but in order to quantify this improvement and to do further studies we will need more
390 records on direct health traits.

391

392 **Conclusions**

393 Crossbreeding HO and NR can result in cows that are less susceptible to postpartum
394 diseases; NRX were less likely to be diagnosed with metritis, ketosis, and lameness than
395 their HO herdmates. They also had lower risk of having a retained placenta and abortions.
396 NRX heifers and older cows had a higher risk of anestrus, but NRX cows had significantly
397 less days open in all parities. They also had a higher BCS than HO and maintained more
398 body condition from calving to peak lactation. The results from Israel show the same trend
399 as previous studies on Norwegian Red crossbreds which indicates that the crossbreds
400 are durable enough to thrive in warm climates while maintaining a high level of production.
401 The challenge of intensive production in warm climates is not unique to Israel, and these
402 results provide insight on how NRX would perform in other countries with similar

403 environments. However, more crossbred animals are needed for future studies in order to
404 demonstrate a significant difference between the breed groups for less frequent diseases
405 and to be able to divide the crossbreds into groups to compare varying breed
406 compositions.

407

408 **Acknowledgements**

409 We would like to thank David Dror for assisting us in the data collection, the dairy
410 farmers in Israel for their willingness to share their data, the Norwegian University of Life
411 Sciences and Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences for funding the PhD
412 project and the Mina and Samson Berges Research Grant for funding needed to acquire
413 the data.

414

415 **Declaration of Interest**

416 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

417 **Ethics statement**

418 This study does not require ethical approval as data were collected for herd
419 management purposes only.

420 **Software and data repository resources**

421 Data are not deposited in an official repository.

422

423 **References**

424 A-Ranberg IM, Heringstad B, Klemetsdal G, Svendsen M, and Steine T 2003. Heifer fertility in
425 Norwegian Dairy Cattle: Variance components and genetic change. *Journal of Dairy Science* 86,
426 2706-2714.

427 Begley N, Evans R, Pierce K and Buckley F 2009. Breed and heterosis estimates for milk
428 production, udder health and fertility traits among Holstein and Norwegian Red Dairy Cattle. *in*
429 *Proc. 60th Annual Meeting of the European Association for Animal Production*, Barcelona, Spain,
430 206.

431 Cartwright SL, Begley N, Schaeffer LR, Burnside EB and Mallard BA 2011. Antibody and cell-
432 mediated immune responses and survival between Holstein and Norwegian Red × Holstein
433 Canadian calves. *Journal of Dairy Science* 94, 1576-1585.

434 Cha E, Hertl JA, Bar D and Gröhn YT 2010. The cost of different types of lameness in dairy cows
435 calculated by dynamic programming. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 97, 1-8.

436 De Haas Y, Janss L and Kadarmideen H 2007. Genetic correlations between body condition
437 scores and fertility in dairy cattle using bivariate random regression models. *Journal of Animal*
438 *Breeding and Genetics* 124, 277-285.

439 De Vries A 2006. Economic value of pregnancy in dairy cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science* 89, 3876-
440 3885.

441 Ezra E, Van Straten M and Weller JI 2016. Comparison of pure Holsteins to crossbred Holsteins
442 with Norwegian Red cattle in first and second generations. *Animal* 10, 1254-1262.

443 Ferris CP, Patterson DC, Gordon FJ, Watson S and Kilpatrick DJ 2014. Calving traits, milk
444 production, body condition, fertility, and survival of Holstein-Friesian and Norwegian Red dairy
445 cattle on commercial dairy farms over 5 lactations. *Journal of Dairy Science* 97, 5206-5218.

446 Flamenbaum I and Galon N 2010. Management of heat stress to improve fertility in dairy cows in
447 Israel. *Journal of Reproduction and Development* 56, 36-41.

448 Fleischer P, Metzner M, Beyerbach M, Hoedemaker M and Klee W 2001. The relationship
449 between milk yield and the incidence of some diseases in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*
450 84, 2025-2035.

451 Geno Global 2016. Total Merit Index. Retrieved on 16 November 2016 from
452 [http://www.genoglobal.com/Start/Norwegian-Red/about-norwegian-red/Norwegian-Red-Total-](http://www.genoglobal.com/Start/Norwegian-Red/about-norwegian-red/Norwegian-Red-Total-Merit-Index/)
453 [Merit-Index/](http://www.genoglobal.com/Start/Norwegian-Red/about-norwegian-red/Norwegian-Red-Total-Merit-Index/)

454 Gillund P, Reksen O, Gröhn YT, and Karlberg K 2001. Body Condition Related to Ketosis and
455 Reproductive Performance in Norwegian Dairy Cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 84, 1390-1396.

456 Glick G, Shirak A, Uliel S, Zeron Y, Ezra E, Seroussi E, Ron M and Weller JI. 2012. Signatures of
457 contemporary selection in the Israeli Holstein dairy cattle. *Animal Genetics*. 43, 45-55.

458 Grimard B, Freret S, Chevallier A, Pinto A, Ponsart C and Humblot P 2006. Genetic and
459 environmental factors influencing first service conception rate and late embryonic/foetal mortality
460 in low fertility dairy herds. *Animal Reproduction Science* 91, 31-44.

461 Haugaard K and Heringstad B 2015. Short communication: Genetic parameters for fertility-related
462 disorders in Norwegian Red. *Journal of Dairy Science* 98, 1321-1324.

463 Heins BJ and Hansen LB 2012. Short communication: Fertility, somatic cell score, and production
464 of Normande × Holstein, Montbéliarde × Holstein, and Scandinavian Red × Holstein crossbreds
465 versus pure Holsteins during their first 5 lactations. *Journal of Dairy Science* 95, 918-924.

466 Heins BJ, Hansen LB and Seykora AJ 2006. Fertility and survival of pure Holsteins versus
467 crossbreds of Holstein with Normande, Montbeliarde, and Scandinavian Red. *Journal of Dairy*
468 *Science* 89, 4944-4951.

469 Heringstad B 2010. Genetic analysis of fertility-related diseases and disorders in Norwegian Red
470 cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 93, 2751-2756.

471 Heringstad B, Chang YM, Gianola D and Klemetsdal G 2005. Genetic analysis of clinical mastitis,
472 milk fever, ketosis, and retained placenta in three lactations of Norwegian Red cows. *Journal of*
473 *Dairy Science* 88, 3273-3281.

474 Heringstad B, Klemetsdal G and Steine T 2007. Selection responses for disease resistance in two
475 selection experiments with Norwegian Red cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 90, 2419-2426.

476 Hoedemaker M, Prange D and Gundelach Y 2009. Body condition change ante- and postpartum,
477 health and reproductive performance in German Holstein cows. *Reproduction in Domestic*
478 *Animals* 44, 167-173.

479 Jamrozik J, Koeck A, Kistemaker GJ and Miglior F 2016. Multiple-trait estimates of genetic
480 parameters for metabolic disease traits, fertility disorders, and their predictors in Canadian
481 Holsteins. *Journal of Dairy Science* 99, 1990-1998.

482 Klinedinst PL, Wilhite DA, Hahn GL and Hubbard KG 1993. The potential effects of climate change
483 on summer season dairy cattle milk production and reproduction. *Climate Change* 23, 21-36.

484 Koeck A., Egger-Danner C, Fuerst C, Obritzhauser W and Fuerst-Waltl B 2010. Genetic analysis
485 of reproductive disorders and their relationship to fertility and milk yield in Austrian Fleckvieh dual-
486 purpose cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 93, 2185-2194.

487 König S, Wu XL, Gianola D, Heringstad B and Simianer H 2008. Exploration of relationships
488 between claw disorders and milk yield in Holstein cows via recursive linear and threshold models.
489 *Journal of Dairy Science* 91, 395-406.

490 López-Gatius F, Santolaria P, Yániz J, Rutllant J and López-Béjar M 2002. Factors affecting
491 pregnancy loss from gestation day 38 to 90 in lactating dairy cows from a single herd.
492 *Theriogenology* 57, 1251-1261.

493 Mendonça LGD, Abade CC, da Silva EM, Litherland NB, Hansen LB, Hansen WP and Chebel
494 RC. Comparison of peripartum metabolic status and postpartum health of Holstein and
495 Montbeliarde-sired crossbred dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 97, 805-818.

496 Miglior F, Muir BL and Van Doormaal BJ 2005. Selection indices in Holstein cattle of various
497 countries. *Journal of Dairy Science* 88, 1255-1263.

498 Opsomer G, Gröhn YT, Hertl J, Coryn M, Deluyker H and de Kruif A 2000. Risk factors for post
499 partum ovarian dysfunction in high producing dairy cows in Belgium: A field study. *Theriogenology*
500 53(4):841-857.

501 Peter AT, Vos PLAM and Ambrose DJ 2009. Postpartum anestrus in dairy cattle. *Theriogenology*
502 71, 1333-1342.

503 Pryce JE, Parker Gaddis KL, Koeck A, Bastin C, Abdelsayed M, Gengler N, Miglior F, Heringstad
504 B, Egger-Danner C, Stock KF, Bradley AJ and Cole JB 2016. Invited review: Opportunities for
505 genetic improvement of metabolic diseases. *Journal of Dairy Sciences* 99, 6855-6873.

506 Pryce JE, Woolaston R, Berry DP, Wall E, Winters M, Butler R, Shaffer M 2014. World trends in
507 dairy cow fertility. In *Proceedings, 10th World Congress of Genetics Applied to Livestock*
508 *Production* 680.

509 Rajala-Schultz PJ, Gröhn YT and McCulloch CE 1999. Effects of milk fever, ketosis, and lameness
510 on milk yield in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 82, 288-294.

511 SAS Institute. 2013. Version 9.4. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina, USA.

512 Silke V, Diskin MG, Kenny DA, Boland MP, Dillon P, Mee JF and Sreenan JM 2002. Extent, pattern
513 and factors associated with late embryonic loss in dairy cows. *Animal Reproduction Science* 71,
514 1-12.

515 Toni F, Vincenti L, Ricci A and Schukken YH. 2015. Postpartum uterine diseases and their impacts
516 on conception and days open in dairy herds in Italy. *Theriogenology* 84, 1206-1214.

517 Walsh S, Buckley F, Berry DP, Rath M, Pierce K, Byrne N and Dillon P 2007. Effects of breed,
518 feeding system, and parity on udder health and milking characteristics. *Journal of Dairy Science*
519 90, 5767-5779.

520 Walsh S, Buckley F, Pierce K, Byrne N, Patton J and Dillon P 2008. Effects of breed and feeding
521 system on milk production, body weight, body condition score, reproductive performance, and
522 postpartum ovarian function. *Journal of Dairy Science* 91, 4401-4413.

523

524

TABLES

525 **Table 1** *Number of records (one record per cow per parity) in the health and abortion datasets for*
526 *each breed group, Israeli Holstein (HO) and Norwegian Red x Israeli Holstein crossbreeds (NRX),*
527 *and parity¹.*

Breed group	Dataset	Heifers	Parity 1	Parity 2	Parity 3+	Total no of observations
HO	Health	17 697	13 255	10 436	17 497	58 885
	Abortion	11 353	8 935	6 703	9 972	36 963
NRX	Health	2 682	1 743	1 153	1 199	6 777
	Abortion	1 779	1 248	786	688	4 501

528 ¹ Parity 3+ included parities 3-6.

529

530 **Table 2** *Number of Israeli Holstein (HO) and Norwegian Red x Israeli Holstein crossbreds (NRX)*
 531 *per herd-year (HY) in each dataset.*

Breed group	Dataset	no. of HY ¹	no. of cows per HY		
			Mean	Min	Max
HO	Health	194	305	4	1 340
	Abortion	155	240	6	1 019
NRX	Health	194	35	4	147
	Abortion	155	29	3	120

532 ¹ number of herd-year levels in each dataset

533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550

551

552 **Table 3** *Definitions of health traits*

Event	Definition
Anestrus	No growth of follicles and/or no sign of estrus
Metritis	Infection of the uterus resulting from contamination during parturition
Ketosis	Mobilization of fat tissue and a high glucose demand at peak lactation causes anorexia and depression
Abortion	loss of embryo/fetus from 40 days gestation to start of dry period
Lameness	Any abnormality in the hooves or legs that affects the locomotion of the cow
Retained placenta	Failure to expel fetal membranes within 24h of parturition

553

554

555 **Table 4** Mean frequency¹ of disease (% lactations with at least one case of disease) and mean
 556 days open and body condition score (BCS)² in Israeli Holstein (HO) and Norwegian Red x Israeli
 557 Holstein crossbreds (NRX).

Event	HO	NRX
Anestrus (%)	37.4	41.2
Metritis (%)	40.1	28.6
Ketosis (%)	11.9	7.1
Abortion (%)	9.1	8.1
Lameness (%)	7.1	3.1
Retained placenta (%)	6.2	4.0
Days open	136	122
BCS before calving	3.16	3.41
BCS after calving	3.33	3.58
BCS peak lactation	2.65	2.96
Change in BCS ³	0.71	0.61

558 ¹ Each disease was scored as 0 or 1 based on routine veterinary examinations. Postpartum diseases were
 559 recorded between d 6-12 after calving.

560 ² BCS scored in a scale from 1 to 5, in increments of 0.25, where 1=thin and 5=obese.

561 ³ Difference between BCS after calving and BCS at peak lactation.

562

563

564 **Table 5** Odds ratio (OR)¹ for Israeli Holstein (HO) vs. Norwegian Red crossbreeds (NRX) with 95%
 565 confidence intervals for each disease diagnosis.

Event	OR	95% confidence interval	Significance level ²
Anestrus	0.87	0.82 – 0.91	$P < 0.001$
Metritis	1.78	1.66 – 1.92	$P < 0.001$
Ketosis	1.46	1.28 – 1.66	$P < 0.001$
Abortion	1.13	1.01 – 1.27	$P < 0.05$
Lameness	2.07	1.79 – 2.39	$P < 0.001$
Retained placenta	1.41	1.19 – 1.67	$P < 0.001$

566 ¹ Odds ratio (HO vs. NRX), if OR > 1 HO is more likely to have the disease; if OR < 1 NRX is more likely to
 567 have the disease.

568 ² Significance level tested if odds ratio was different from one.

569

570 **Table 6** Mean frequency and odds ratio (OR)² of the diseases with a trend in breed differences over parities ¹ for Holstein (HO) and
 571 Norwegian Red crossbreds (NRX).

Event	Heifers			Parity 1			Parity 2			Parity 3-6		
	HO	NRX	OR	HO	NRX	OR	HO	NRX	OR	HO	NRX	OR
Anestrus	45.84	44.88	0.89**	41.73	40.69	1.02	34.92	33.84	1.00	29.06	30.77	0.82**
Ketosis	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.41	2.83	2.71***	9.18	6.65	1.69***	15.85	14.59	1.11
Lameness	1.95	0.86	2.12	8.22	4.19	2.75***	7.38	3.91	2.50***	9.50	6.10	1.79***

572 ¹ Table includes only diseases which vary from one parity to the next.

573 ²Odds ratio (HO vs. NRX): if OR > 1, HO is more likely to have the disease; if OR<1, NRX is more likely to have the disease.

574 **odds ratio is significantly different from 1 at $P < 0.01$

575 ***odds ratio is significantly different from 1 at $P < 0.001$

576

577

578

579

580

581

582 **Table 7** Least squares means with standard error (SE) for days open¹ and body condition score
 583 (BCS)² for Israeli Holstein (HO) and Norwegian Red x HO crossbreds (NRX).

584

Trait	HO	NRX	Root MSE	Significance ⁴
BCS before calving	3.16 (0.003)	3.41 (0.009)	0.43	$P < 0.001$
BCS after calving	3.32 (0.004)	3.58 (0.014)	0.49	$P < 0.001$
BCS peak lactation	2.65 (0.003)	2.92 (0.009)	0.46	$P < 0.001$
Change in BCS ³	0.71 (0.004)	0.67 (0.014)	0.50	$P < 0.01$
Days open	135 (0.4)	123 (1.1)	60.5	$P < 0.001$

585 ¹ Days open is the number of days from calving to the start of the next pregnancy.

586 ² BCS scored in a scale from 1 to 5, in increments of 0.25, where 1=thin and 5=obese.

587 ³ Change in BCS from after calving to peak lactation.

588 ⁴ Significance level of the difference in LS means different from 0 between the two breed groups.

589