

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A systematic review of non-productivity-related animal-based indicators of heat stress resilience in dairy cattle

Elena Galán^{1*}, Pol Llonch², Arantxa Villagrà³, Harel Levit⁴, Severino Pinto⁵, Agustín del Prado¹

1 Basque Centre for Climate Change (BC3), Leioa, Spain, **2** Departament of Animal and Food Science, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Bellaterra (UAB), Spain, **3** Centro de Investigación en Tecnología Animal (CITA), Valencian Institute for Agricultura Research (IVIA), Segorbe, Spain, **4** Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Research Organization (ARO)- Volcani Center, Bet Dagan, Israel, **5** Engineering for Livestock Management, Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy (ATB), Potsdam, Germany

* elena.galan@bc3research.org



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Galán E, Llonch P, Villagrà A, Levit H, Pinto S, del Prado A (2018) A systematic review of non-productivity-related animal-based indicators of heat stress resilience in dairy cattle. PLoS ONE 13 (11): e0206520. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206520>

Editor: Juan J. Loor, University of Illinois, UNITED STATES

Received: May 23, 2018

Accepted: October 15, 2018

Published: November 1, 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Galán et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: E.G., H.L. and S.P. were funded by the OPTIBARN Project through the research grant 618105 FACCE Era Net Plus – Food Security, Agriculture, Climate Change ERA-NET plus –JPI). P.L. was funded by the Marie Curie Actions of the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Union (FP7/2007-2013) under the TECNIO Spring programme

Abstract

Introduction

Projected temperature rise in the upcoming years due to climate change has increased interest in studying the effects of heat stress in dairy cows. Environmental indices are commonly used for detecting heat stress, but have been used mainly in studies focused on the productivity-related effects of heat stress. The welfare approach involves identifying physiological and behavioural measurements so as to start heat stress mitigation protocols before the appearance of impending severe health or production issues. Therefore, there is growing interest in studying the effects of heat stress on welfare. This systematic review seeks to summarise the animal-based responses to heat stress (physiological and behavioural, excluding productivity) that have been used in scientific literature.

Methods

Using systematic review guidelines set by PRISMA, research articles were identified, screened and summarised based on inclusion criteria for physiology and behaviour, excluding productivity, for animal-based resilience indicators. 129 published articles were reviewed to determine which animal-based indicators for heat stress were most frequently used in dairy cows.

Results

The articles considered report at least 212 different animal-based indicators that can be aggregated into body temperature, feeding, physiological response, resting, drinking, grazing and pasture-related behaviour, reactions to heat management and others. The most common physiological animal-based indicators are rectal temperature, respiration rate and dry matter intake, while the most common behavioural indicators are time spent lying, standing and feeding.

(TECSPR15-1- 0040) and the Agency for Competitiveness and Business of the Government of Catalonia, ACCIÓ.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Conclusion

Although body temperature and respiration rate are the animal-based indicators most frequently used to assess heat stress in dairy cattle, when choosing an animal-based indicator for detecting heat stress using scientific literature to establish thresholds, characteristics that influence the scale of the response and the definition of heat stress must be taken into account, e.g. breed, lactation stage, milk yield, system type, climate region, bedding type, diet and cooling management strategies.

1. Introduction

There has been growing interest in studying the effects of heat stress in dairy cows as this is a welfare and production problem in temperate latitudes which is expected to increase in the near future. According to recent predictions [1], global temperatures are expected to rise by 1.4–3.0°C by the end of this century, and by 5.0°C in certain temperate areas of the planet. An average temperature rise of 2°C or more is also expected in the upcoming years, along with an increase in the frequency and intensity of extreme heat waves.

Heat stress has an impact on a variety of parameters in dairy production, particularly in terms of reductions in milk production, impaired reproductive performance, higher risk of lameness and mastitis and even death [2]. Numerous studies have focused on the productivity-related effects of heat stress in lactating cows [3], dry cows [4] and calves [5]; and on fertility effects [6,7]. However, interest has recently turned to studying the effects of heat stress on welfare [8–10], which may or may not impact production or reproductive parameters. Some of the welfare effects based on physiological and behavioural changes that result from heat stress may occur in the short term, sometimes with no impact on productivity [10], while others can predict further impacts on productivity and therefore be used to prevent them [11].

The Temperature Humidity Index (THI) is the most widely used environmental indicator of heat stress effects in scientific literature. The heat stress threshold has been set at daily THI values of 68–72 [8,12,13], although lower values have recently been found for temperate areas [14–16]. In addition, in outdoor systems animals are exposed to sunlight, which increases the effects of heat stress [17,18], and to high winds, which decreases them [19]. These parameters are not taken into account in THI. In animal welfare, changes in behaviour or physiology are referred to as animal-based welfare measures, since they reflect the state of an animal in a given environment or challenge. Animal-based indicators (ABI) can be used to recognise heat stress more accurately than environmental indicators as they take into account differences between individuals and differences in farm systems (e.g. pasture or not, outdoor access or not) which can be used to assist in heat stress prevention and mitigation and improve the welfare of dairy cows.

Resilience is the ability of animals to adapt to short-term environmental challenges [20]. In dairy cattle, resilience to heat stress refers to the animals' response to a heat challenge in terms of maintaining thermal balance and recovering homeostasis. This study focuses on the animal-based indicators of resilience to a heat challenge in dairy cattle. Animal-based indicators can be locomotive (e.g. standing to expose more surface area to air flows), physiological (e.g. increased panting rate, sweating, drooling) or feeding behaviour (e.g. reduced feed intake) [21,22]. All these changes share one main common goal: to maintain body temperature by either decreasing metabolic heat production or losing heat by conduction, convection, radiation and water evaporation. The failure of these mechanisms leads to a body temperature rise and the associated heat stress response [10].

The aim of this study is to identify the animal-based indicators of heat stress (excluding productivity-related measures) that have been most widely used in scientific literature for measuring resilience in dairy cows. The outcome of this study will help refine the identification of heat stress in dairy cattle, which may in turn help to mitigate its effects on productivity and welfare.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Search criteria and strategy

Peer-reviewed scientific literature published before 24th February 2017 was systematically reviewed. Searches were performed using the same search items on three search engines: (1) PubMed; (2) ScienceDirect; and (3) Scopus. The search terms used (including titles, abstracts and keywords) were ("heat stress*" OR "heat load" OR "temperature humidity index" OR hyperthermia OR "thermal stress*") AND (cow* OR cattle OR heifer* OR "lactating cow*" OR "dry cow*" OR "bos taurus") AND dairy AND (physiolog* OR behavi*r OR welfare OR health). PubMed does not accept truncation in the middle of words, so behavior OR behaviour was used.

Most studies describing a single average value for an entire warm season did not discriminate between short- and long-term acclimation or include resilience among their keywords, so we designed a broader question excluding keywords such as resilience and acclimation and made our selection in a second step. After filtering by documents written in English, journal articles and proceedings, 672 documents were obtained (108 in (1) PubMed, 118 in (2) ScienceDirect and 446 in (3) Scopus). The number fell to 468 when duplicates were removed. Eleven of the 468 full text papers could not be obtained online access or by contact with the authors. From the information in the abstracts, we know that 4 of the 11 would not meet the study selection criteria below (see Fig 1). The PRISMA checklist is in S1 Table.

2.2 Study selection criteria

We selected experimental studies that related climate variables (e.g. temperature) or indices (THI, BGHI and others such as Adjusted THI [23], Back Globe Humidity Index (BGHI) [18], Heat Load Index (HLI) [24], Comprehensive Climate Index (CCI) [25]) to physiological and behavioural responses associated with thermoregulation. We therefore excluded changes in endocrine status, e.g. growth hormones or glucocorticoid levels [26,27].


Similarly, effects on somatic cell count (SCC) were excluded as they result from seasonal (and thus long-term) warm temperatures among other factors, such as increased exposure to pathogens or vectors [28,29]. In addition, we removed reviews, model-based predictions and articles based on the same experiment. Once all these selection criteria were applied, 129 articles remained. These articles are listed in S1 List.

Apart from quantifying the list of ABIs, we included information on characteristics of the studies that were likely to be relevant to users of the review. These characteristics were defined prior to the literature search [30] and were grouped into characteristics that could influence the definition of heat stress and the scale of the effect. An examination of these characteristics (S2 Table) demonstrated that the studies selected did not all use the same methodology, so we discarded the meta-analysis.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. The database

The database for the systematic review comprises a list of all the animal-based indicators used in the studies to measure heat stress. The last two subsections list those characteristics of the



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit www.prisma-statement.org.

Fig 1. PRISMA 2009 flow diagram.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206520.g001>

studies that may influence the scale of heat stress and the definition of heat stress. These characteristics are listed in [S2 Table](#).

3.1.1. List of the animal-based indicators (ABI) identified for measuring heat stress.

The most frequent animal-based indicators of heat stress are shown in [Table 1](#) and [Fig 2](#). Indicators related to internal temperature (used in 28% of the studies) are the most common group, and rectal temperature is the predominant measure among them, followed by vaginal and milk temperatures respectively. We separated body temperature from other physiological indicators because the latter refer to physiological organic strategies to reduce body temperature. The rectal temperature of dairy cows is normally around 38.5°C and thresholds for fever range from 39.4 to 39.7°C [31]. On average, vaginal temperature is 0.2± 0.3°C higher than rectal temperature [31]. According to Reference [32], the average milk temperature of dairy cows is 0.16°C higher than their rectal temperature.

The second most common group is that of physiological indicators (24% of the studies). In it, the most prominent variables are respiration rate (also panting), heart rate, sweat rate and metabolic heat production. Respiration rate increases as THI increases: for instance a respiration rate higher than 60 breaths per minute is considered an indicator of heat stress in lactating dairy cows [27]. The sweating rate has its own cyclical pattern and does not follow increases in THI linearly, but it is higher in hot, dry conditions than in hot, humid conditions [33]. In heat-stressed lactating cows, water excreted in urine increases and faecal water decreases, but these changes are not confirmed in dry cows [34]. In summer-reared calves, [35] finds more urination and defecating bouts. There is no clear pattern for heart rate: some studies show an increase [36–38] and others a decrease [34,39,40] as a result of heat stress. Adding to these inconclusive results, [10] observe both an increase and a decrease in heart rate as a response to

Table 1. Summary of the most frequent indicators used to assess heat stress in dairy cattle.

Animal based indicator	% over total studies (n = 129)
Body temperature	32.1
Inner temperature	27.6
Surface temperature	6.4
Physiological response	26.2
Feeding	16.8
Feeding behaviour	14.1
Rumination time	3.2
Resting	9.4
Lying-Standing	8.2
Activity behaviour	2.7
Drinking	7.6
Drinking	5.8
Drinking area	1.3
Grazing/Pasture related behaviour	3.2
Reaction to heat management	2.9
Other behaviour	1.8

The rows coincide with the circles in [Fig 2](#). The full list of animal-based indicators is in [S3 Table](#). The percentages of the subcategories may not add up because the same study may include indicators belonging to different subcategories of the same category. In such cases, they count as a single study for the aggregate category to avoid double counting.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206520.t001>




Fig 2. Animal-based indicators (ABIs) of heat stress of dairy cows. Circle packing plot representing showing how many studies use the most widely used ABIs listed in Table 1 and S3 Table. The diameter of the circles is proportional to the number of occurrences of each ABI included in each aggregation level (bold). The darker the circle, the higher the level of aggregation.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206520.g002>

heat stress. Alternatively, [3] states that heat stress initially increases respiration rate and heart rate but that they tend to slow down later on.

Feeding behaviour is used to assess heat stress in 14% of the studies. The most frequent variables are dry matter intake (DMI), feeding time and ruminating time. Reducing feed intake is an adaptive mechanism for cows to reduce metabolic heat production [3,27] and can be detected within two days after the onset of the heat challenge [32,36]. A decrease in feed intake is accompanied by shorter meal duration [39,41,42] and decreased feeding time [35,39,41–46]. The frequency of meals per day increases during heat stress in high-yield or late-gestation cows [41,42] whereas it decreases in those with lower yields [39] and in postpartum cows [41]. In fact, high-yielding dairy cows have higher metabolic heat production and are therefore more sensitive to heat stress [3]. Ruminating time also decreases in the event of heat stress [3,46]; however there is also a lower passage rate, which can increase ruminating time per feed intake [47].

Resting-associated measures appear in 9% of the studies on heat stress considered, with lying time and standing time being the most frequent of them. In general warm temperatures decrease the time spent lying. This behaviour has been explained by the fact that a standing cow exposes more surface area to convection and therefore loses more heat than a lying cow [22,48]. Cows in thermal comfort have been reported to lie for approximately 70 min [48], and to prefer to lie down for about half their time [19,49] or up to 14 h/day for the most productive among them [50]. Standing time does not increase linearly with THI: it peaks at THI 80 to 89

rather than THI 90 to 98 or THI >98. This is probably related to the tiredness caused by the accumulated time spent standing while THI is rising [48].

Drinking-related indicators are studied by 8% of the studies that assess heat stress. Water intake increases by 1.2 kg per °C of increase in minimum ambient temperature [51]. Proximity to the water trough increases when there are no sprinklers or shade available to mitigate heat [52,53]. Heat-stressed cows drink more frequently [35,41,52,54] but take in smaller quantities of water and the total time spent drinking increases [35,44,46,55].

6% of the studies considered measure cow surface temperature, which increases with high ambient temperatures although the amount depends on where on the body it is measured and on whether the area measured is shaved [56]. Shorter hair, e.g. on Holstein cows with slick genes, makes for better inner temperature regulation [57]. In addition, peripheral areas such as the thigh and the leg are more affected by THI than the surface temperature measured on the udder [58]. Skin temperature does not always reflect changes in inner temperature [59]. Thus, inner temperature seems to be a more valuable parameter for assessing heat stress, but it is not easy to measure in a free-range animal [10].

Grazing or pasture-related behaviour is measured in 3% of the studies. Time spent grazing decreases with heat stress [52,55]. For instance, in experiments where cows can choose between being on pasture or indoors, they prefer to stay indoors in events of higher THI or BGHI [60,61], although this trend is not so clear when THI is in the range of thermal comfort [62–65]. When given the choice, cows also prefer to be on pasture at night, thus avoiding diurnal THI peaks [60,64,65]. Finally, winds can help mitigate heat stress in animals on pasture even if the cows are exposed to strong solar radiation [19].

Heat stress abatement strategies other than those already mentioned are covered by 3% of the studies considered. They include time in the shade, time under sprinklers, signs of comfort or discomfort related to water flow, etc. At high temperatures, the use of fans or fans with misters in feeding areas lead cows to spend longer there than if no cooling measure are taken, although total intake might not be affected [43,53,66,67]. The use of shade is also a common strategy for mitigating heat stress, and the higher the solar radiation the more time cows spend in the shade [68]. When given the choice, cows spend more and more time under sprinklers as the ambient temperature rises [69], but they are reluctant to expose their heads to the water [43,53,70]. An example of this is found in [71], where there is evidence that sprinkler treatment reduces the number of expressions of discomfort such as hoof stamps or tail flicks.

Other variables that cannot be classified within the categories listed above are covered in 2% of the studies. These include aggressive behaviour, which increases during heat stress in the absence of shade [52], body positions to increase wind exposure vs “normal” body positions [19], and grooming, which decreases under heat stress [35].

Taking the individual variables from all categories, rectal temperature (12.4%), respiration rate (12.4%), dry matter intake (6.4%), time lying down (3.8%) and vaginal temperature (3.0%) are the indicators most frequently used to assess heat stress in dairy cattle. The full list of indicators reported within each category is shown in [S3 Table](#).

3.1.2 Characteristics that influence the scale of heat stress. Here we provide information on the characteristics that may influence the scale of ABIs. Studies are classified according to production systems (indoor, outdoor and grazing), breed, milk yield (genetic merit) and production stage (e.g. lactating or dry).

11% of the studies do not give enough data to identify the system, but 45.5% have some outdoor access (16% pasture, 29.5% no pasture), 29.5% are indoor and 14% use a thermal chamber).

The studies focus mostly on Holstein breed cows (78%) in lactation (81%), although some studies use dry cows (11%) or calves and heifers (4%). Most of the lactating cows are in mid-

lactation (65–225 days in milk). There is inconsistency between the studies in considering a milk yield average as “low” or “high”. For instance, for the same breed [46] considers a milk production of <20 kg/d as “low” and >25 kg/d as “high”, whereas [39] considers a winter milk yield of 28kg/d as “low” and 33 kg/d as “high”. Therefore, to compare milk yields within the studies, we take all the annual averages reported, calculate the first and third quartiles, i.e. ≤ 22 kg/d and ≥ 34 kg/d, and define them as “low” and “high” respectively. On that basis, we calculate the corresponding “low” and “high” lactation curves using the SIMSdairy model [72] (Fig 3). We plot the yield values in relation to the days in milk reported at the beginning of those studies that do not report annual average production. Under our classification, 18% of the studies work with low yields, 29% with medium, 30% with high and 23% with yields which are either not defined or provide insufficient data for them to be classified. The yield levels are unevenly distributed across the systems, but the system with the highest proportion of low-yielding cows (33%) is the pasture system, and that with the highest proportion of high-yielding cows (34%) in indoors.

According to the Köppen climate classification [73], 57% of the studies considered were conducted in temperate climates (34% in temperate climates with warmest month average $>22^{\circ}\text{C}$ (humid subtropical (Cfb) and Mediterranean (Csa)) and 22% in temperate climates with warmest month average $<22^{\circ}\text{C}$ (oceanic (Cfb), Mediterranean with warm summer (Csb) and highlands (Cwb)). 18% were conducted in arid climates, 14% in continental climates and 10% in tropical climates. The rest are unspecified.

There is no way of knowing whether our studies are representative of current farms, but the studies conducted in arid climates do not include pasture. In temperate climate studies, the systems are evenly distributed between indoor, outdoor without pasture and pasture, but the use of thermal chamber is marginal (8%). By contrast, in arid and continental climates the use of a thermal chamber is more widespread at 26% and 28% respectively. In arid climates the most widely studied treatment for mitigating heat stress is that of cooling systems (48% of all studies in arid climates) installed in barns, while in temperate climates the treatments studied are more diverse: 48% of the studies include treatments (diets, shade, supplements, access to pasture and others) other than cooling systems within barns (which are used exclusively in just 26% of cases). In tropical systems barn cooling systems are marginal (8%) and the focus is on other treatments (46%) or on measuring heat stress effects *per se* (46%).

70% of the studies conducted in tropical climates include breeds other than Holsteins, but in all other climates more than 80% of the studies use only Holsteins.

3.1.3 Characteristics that influence the definition of heat stress. This section addresses the design of experiments for studies to evaluate heat stress. That design influences the definition of heat stress used by each study. The characteristics selected are system type, environment comparison, use of heat mitigation measures, climate indices for measuring heat load and heat stress duration.

The controlled environment of the thermal chamber enables heat stress to be compared with thermo-neutral control conditions (13%), except in a single study that uses air conditioning, enabling the temperature of the barn to be changed [74]. This effect is emulated in the other systems by comparing a cool period with a warm period (13%), for example different seasons. However, most of the studies considered (60%) have a single group exposed to heat stress with no control group (a thermo-neutral environment).

68% of the studies include the study of a heat stress mitigation treatment. 11% of them use a thermo-neutral control environment, 6% use a cooler season as a control group and 73% make their measurements in a warm period or season. By contrast, 31% focus on studying the harmful effects of heat stress with no mitigation measures. Only 17% of them use a thermo-neutral




Fig 3. Classification of yields when DIM are reported. Source: own work from the milk yields and days in milk reported in the studies. From the red line downwards the yields are <22 kg/d using standardised lactations of 305 days. From the green line upwards the yields are >34 kg/d.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206520.g003>

control environment, 29% use a cooler season as a control group and 31% make their measurements in a warm period or season.

In the studies investigating management to mitigate heat stress, the most widely used treatments are cooling systems (29%), a special diet or supplement (29%), shade (11%), pasture restriction or preference (8%) and others (10%), which include bedded pack systems, bedding, feeding method and drinking water temperature.

86% of the studies use the THI (maximum, average, minimum) or temperature and humidity together as a measure of climate, while 13% use temperature without calculating the THI. 36% of the studies also factor in solar radiation, wind speed or other indices that include them (e.g. the Black Globe Humidity Index (BGHI), Heat Load Index (HLI), adjusted THI, Heat Load Index (HLI) or Comprehensive Climate Index (CCI)). These indices are used especially in studies of pasture systems (43%, or 66% if studies that include rainfall are also considered). Studies measuring heat stress effects on behaviour and physiology in pasture find closer correlations with climate parameters if the effect of solar radiation is added, i.e. if black globe temperatures [18,24,75,76] are also used rather than THI only. This is important as shade is one of the cooling strategies most widely studied in pasture systems. For systems other than pasture, the proportion of studies that include additional climate variables or indices other than THI is only 20%, even when cows have access to outdoors (i.e. playground but not pasture) and are therefore exposed to solar radiation or wind.

Duration of heat stress depends on each study's own definition of a heat stress threshold (e.g. days with daily average THI > 72), or in the absence of such a definition on the period when effects of heat stress are detected. If the periods of heat stress correspond to different trials (with different treatments or just replications) we consider a single trial period (or take the average if they have different durations) and not the entire experiment. When studies show a relationship between THI and any ABI but do not show THI measurements, we consider the

number of days of exposure to a hot environment as unknown. We realise that this is a complex categorisation that might be subject to interpretation bias, so we prefer to express this information qualitatively, thinking that readers may be interested in locating studies according to broad guidelines of duration (short, medium or longer) of exposure to heat stress.

In 34% of the studies considered the duration of heat stress is less than one week, and most of these studies are conducted under chamber conditions, as are the 17% that last from one to three weeks. 53% of the studies have periods of heat stress longer than three weeks (>21 days); these are mostly those classed as “other” studies using systems other than climatic chambers.

3.2 Factors that condition the response of animal-based indicators as measures of heat stress

All the responses to ABIs identified can be influenced by a variety of internal (e.g. breed, metabolic status) and external factors (e.g. system type, heat stress duration). In this section we discuss the influence of different factors in the assessment of heat-stress response as result of the systematic review.

3.2.1 Genetic and phenotypic background. Holstein cows tend to have higher internal temperatures under hot conditions [32,52,77,78] than other breeds (e.g. Jersey, Brown Swiss) and crossbreeds.

Holstein cows are usually larger and have thicker coats than other dairy cattle breeds, which hinders heat loss [79]. Some characteristics of other breeds such as short hair, light colour, low body weight, high rate of cutaneous evaporation, low milk production (and therefore low metabolic heat production) benefit the heat stress tolerance of other breeds [78,80].

White cows have also lower skin temperatures than black cows under high solar loads, which compromises the flow of metabolic heat towards the surface to be lost by convection or evaporation. Black cows exposed to solar radiation therefore have a greater risk of thermal discomfort [19,33].

The effects of heat stress are more severe in high-yield dairy cows than low-yield cows, as higher yields are related to higher feed intakes, which in turn is linked to greater metabolic heat [81]. Holstein is the main breed in high-yield dairy cattle, so severe effects of heat stress are more frequent in this breed due to its association with milk yield potential [39,46].

3.2.2 Metabolic status. Heat stress sensitivity can be determined by the metabolic status of cows, as this has an impact on heat production. In cattle, the main metabolic statuses that can alter metabolic heat production are lactation and gestation.

Lactating cows have more heat to dissipate than non-lactating cows and also have greater difficulty dissipating heat during hot, humid conditions [51]. On the other hand, dry cows also suffer from heat stress, which might compromise subsequent lactation, as heat-stressed dry cows in the late stages of pregnancy show lesser development of mammary glands than those in barns with heat abatement structures [4]. As milk yield declines with the stage of lactation, it is reasonable to think that sensitivity to heat stress may also decrease. However, a study by [82] finds that body temperature, respiration rate and milk yield are more severely affected in mid-lactation (80–120 days in milk) cows than in the early or late stages. The reason for this inconsistency could be that in early lactation, milk production is supported by stored tissue mobilisation and less by feed intake, by contrast with the mid-lactation stage, when peak intake occurs. Therefore, early-lactation cows produce less metabolic heat per kg of milk [83].

Despite the fact that heifers are less sensitive to heat stress than lactating cows [84], it is difficult to tell from the articles reviewed whether pregnant cows are more or less sensitive to heat stress than non-pregnant cows. Calves exposed to heat stress *in utero* have higher rectal temperatures and respiration rates and longer lying times [85], but they could be subject to

acclimation in the long run and therefore be less sensitive to heat stress. Once raised, lactating cows from heat-stressed dams have smaller increases in rectal temperature and sweating rate than their peers from cooled dams when exposed to heat stress [86].

3.2.3 Heat challenge duration. Circadian rhythms influence response to heat load, as body temperatures are lower in the morning than in the afternoon [87]. The circadian rhythm affects the lying time of cows, i.e. cows tend to lie more at night [88]. Also, temperature drops at night and night cooling below the traditional 72 THI threshold alleviate the effects of heat stress. However, this threshold is set by using milk yield and mortality risk as indicators [2] and it might be different if other indicators are used. For instance, night cooling (around 67THI or lower) does not affect diurnal respiration and heart rate when cows are exposed to THI above 75 [52] with no shade. When the experiments are conducted in thermal chambers, the adoption of a cyclic pattern of temperatures to simulate night cooling (around 66THI) reduces the severity of heat stress in rectal temperature and milk yield [89].

The duration of heat stress and the acclimation capacity of each cow affects the value of the response. For example, rectal temperature, respiration and heart rates are observed to increase during the early days of exposure but then to drop progressively [11,90,91]. This may be due to the acclimation process, which reduces endogenous heat production and facilitates heat loss [91]. Similarly, the fall in dry matter intake is less severe after three weeks of warm temperatures, suggesting that cows start to acclimate [91,92]. The acclimation process involves changes in endocrine status which lead to homeostasis if exposure to thermal load is prolonged (and not lethal). How long it takes to reach this new equilibrium also varies from breed to breed, e.g. it ranges from 9 days for Angus and Charolais to 14 days for Polled Hereford [26]. Further studies are needed to predict the effects under long-term or cycling heat-stress conditions [11].

3.2.4 System type and management. The term “cooling systems” refers to different designs of fans, sometimes in combination with misters or sprinklers which are installed in barns. However, they have to be adapted to farm needs as they are not always sufficient to alleviate heat stress. For instance, decline in milk yield is found to be at a higher threshold (83.2 THI) with a combination of a shaded pen close to the milking room plus water sprinkling throughout the day than otherwise [45]. The frequency of cooling is also determinant for the effect: for instance, when it is increased from 5 to 8 times per day in an environment of 78.4 THI average for 40 days, cows show lower respiration rates and rectal temperatures and spend more time resting [93].

Orientation of fans and misters is also important for how effective they are. [94] demonstrate that if fans and misters can follow shade as the sun’s angle shifts throughout the day, lower body temperatures and more time lying (80.2 THI during 5 days) are obtained than with a fixed fan and mister system. In grazing systems, if sprinkler treatments are introduced before milking, rectal temperature is lower at a daily average THI for a week of between 73.8 and 77.9 [95]. Although the use of sprinklers gives good results, it has raised environmental and economic concerns because it involves a large increase in water consumption at dairy farms [8]. Diet also has an impact on the response of dairy cows to heat stress: overall its effects on saving metabolic heat production by supplementing saturated fatty acids [96,97], reducing neutral detergent fibre on a dry matter basis [98–100] and increasing the proportion of digestive fibre [101] have been studied. Indeed, replacing low quality NDF in diets by NDF of better quality (low lignin concentrations and high digestibility) modifies the effects of heat stress on performance, body temperature, rumination activity and feeding behaviour [100,102,103]. The above strategies must be applied with caution as they can increase the risk of rumen acidosis in reducing fibre. Reference [104] suggests that these strategies need to be studied further. In addition to diets, several attempts to minimise the effects of heat stress through supplements have been made. These supplements include citrus extract [105], niacin [56,106], conjugated

linoleic acids [107], *Asparagus officinalis* [108] and yeast cultures [109], but most of them have inconsistent effects on the responses of animals to heat stress and further research is needed to understand the real extent of their effects [104].

3.2.5 Underlying factors that affect resting behaviour. There are other factors that affect resting behaviour as an indicator of heat stress. Lying down facilitates body heat loss by convection, so wind speed may affect the convection rate and therefore also affect standing time in heat-stressed cows [19].

A key factor for determining resting behaviour is bedding quality, which affects comfort, including thermal comfort. Some studies investigate how heat stress changes preferences for lying on different bedding substrates. With higher THI cows tend to prefer substrates that dissipate body heat better and allow for evaporation, such as wood shavings and solid manure, rather than ethylene-vinyl acetate (EVA) mats [110] and sand rather than straw bedding [111].

The activities of cows on pasture differ from those of confined cows. Resources such as water and feed might need longer displacements in pasture, so they may spend less time lying down than confined cows [110]. Also, grazing and the fact that bedding on pasture may facilitate the transition from lying to standing so make for longer standing times [60].

Shorter resting time is a reaction to high temperatures, but it is associated with the risk of claw-horn lesions and could be related to the higher number of cows which are lame (or show some degree of lameness) observed at the end of summer [48,112]. In turn, lameness alters preferences and standing-lying behaviour in relation to bedding material, for instance there is no difference between non-lamed cows but lame cows spend more time standing on rubber-crumbs mattress surfaces than on sand bedding. This suggests that they prefer more cushioned surfaces to stand on as they struggle to change position on mattress stalls [113]. Therefore, lying time is also influenced by factors other than thermal comfort, which evidences the need to use this measure in combination with other indicators.

4. Implications for the dairy sector

We have identified 129 papers with 212 different animal-based indicators of heat stress. Those most widely used concern temperature, physiology, feeding and resting behaviour. These indicators can be used to identify animal-based responses to stress from high temperatures and humidity. The advantage of animal-based indicators is that they enable individual sensitivity to heat stress to be estimated with precision. At the same time, using animal-based indicators helps to determine which measures of heat mitigation are most efficient when the predictive value of THI alone is limited, e.g. with direct sunlight or inside barns if the THI measurement is taken outdoors. Body temperature and respiration rate are the indicators in all categories which are most frequently used to assess heat stress in dairy cattle. The most widely used behavioural indicators are time lying, time standing and time eating. In terms of individual variables from all categories, rectal temperature, respiration rate, dry matter intake, time lying and vaginal temperature are the indicators most frequently used to assess heat stress in dairy cattle.

The studies considered in this review have characteristics that must be taken into account in estimating individual heat stress responses. Hence, when choosing an ABI to detect heat stress and using scientific literature to establish thresholds, we recommend taking into account that most ABIs refer to lactating Holstein cows which produce more than 34 kg/d. In addition, the experiments comparing a thermo-neutral environment with a heat stress environment are conducted using thermal chambers. Under other farm environments (indoor, outdoor, pasture) factors may intervene which are different from those found in thermal chambers, but may be similar to real conditions. Those ABIs associated with resting behaviour are influenced by a number of management factors such as bedding type, tiredness and presence of pasture,

among others. The duration of exposure to hot conditions should also be taken into account so as to capture the effects of acclimation.

Moreover, the temperature ranges and environmental indices considered are not standardised across the studies reviewed, so we recommend taking into account the climate of the region, for instance using the Köppen climate classification. Further research is needed to determine the limitations and possibilities of climate change adaptation strategies.

Supporting information

S1 Table. PRISMA 2009 checklist.

(DOC)

S2 Table. Description of the factors of the studies found in the systematic review.

(XLSX)

S3 Table. ABI indicators found in the systematic review.

(XLSX)

S1 List. Systematic review references list.

(DOCX)

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà.

Data curation: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà.

Formal analysis: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà.

Investigation: Elena Galán, Harel Levit, Severino Pinto.

Methodology: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà.

Supervision: Agustín del Prado.

Validation: Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà.

Visualization: Elena Galán.

Writing – original draft: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch.

Writing – review & editing: Elena Galán, Pol Llonch, Arantxa Villagrà, Harel Levit, Severino Pinto, Agustín del Prado.

References

1. IPCC. International Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change 2013: the Physical Science Basis. Working Group 1 Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the International Panel on Climate Change. International Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge, New York. 2013.
2. Nienaber JA, Hahn GL. Livestock production system management responses to thermal challenges. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2007; 52: 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-007-0103-x> PMID: 17530301
3. Kadzere CT, Murphy MR, Silanikove N, Maltz E. Heat stress in lactating dairy cows: a review. *Livest Prod Sci.* 2002; 77: 59–91. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226\(01\)00330-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226(01)00330-X)
4. Tao S, Dahl GE. Invited review: heat stress effects during late gestation on dry cows and their calves. *J Dairy Sci.* 2013; 96: 4079–93. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-6278> PMID: 23664343
5. Roland L, Drillich M, Klein-Jöbstl D, Iwersen M. Invited review: Influence of climatic conditions on the development, performance, and health of calves. *J Dairy Sci.* 2016; 99: 2438–2452. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9901> PMID: 26874416

6. Wolfenson D, Roth Z, Meidan R. Impaired reproduction in heat-stressed cattle: Basic and applied aspects. *Animal Reproduction Science*. 2000. pp. 535–547. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4320\(00\)00102-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4320(00)00102-0) PMID: 10844222
7. Rensis F De, Scaramuzzi RJ. Heat stress and seasonal effects on reproduction in the dairy cow—a review. *Theriogenology*. 2003; 60: 1139–1151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-691X\(03\)00126-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-691X(03)00126-2) PMID: 12935853
8. Polsky L, von Keyserlingk MAG. Invited review: Effects of heat stress on dairy cattle welfare. *J Dairy Sci*. 2017; 100: 8645–8657. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-12651> PMID: 28918147
9. Özkan Ş, Vitali A, Lacetera N, Amon B, Bannink A, Bartley DJ, et al. Challenges and priorities for modelling livestock health and pathogens in the context of climate change. *Environ Res*. 2016; 151: 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.07.033> PMID: 27475053
10. Silanikove N. Effects of heat stress on the welfare of extensively managed domestic ruminants. *Livest Prod Sci*. 2000; 67: 1–18.
11. Spiers DE, Spain JN, Sampson JD, Rhoads RP. Use of physiological parameters to predict milk yield and feed intake in heat-stressed dairy cows. *J Therm Biol*. 2004; 29: 759–764. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtherbio.2004.08.051>
12. Zimbelman RB, Rhoads RP, Rhoads ML, Duff GC, Baumgard LH, Collier RJ. A Re-Evaluation of the Impact of Temperature Humidity Index (THI) and Black Globe Humidity Index (BGHI) on Milk Production in High Producing Dairy Cows. In: Tempe AZ. J R. Collier E, editor. *Proceedings of the Southwest Nutrition and Management Conference, Arizona*. Tucson: The University of Arizona; 2009. pp. 158–168.
13. Collier RJ, Hall LW, Rungruang S, Zimbleman RB. Quantifying heat stress and its impact on metabolism and performance. *Pap 23rd Annu Rumin Nutr Symp Gainesville, Florida*. 2012; 68.
14. Lambertz C, Sanker C, Gaulty M. Climatic effects on milk production traits and somatic cell score in lactating Holstein-Friesian cows in different housing systems. *J Dairy Sci*. 2014; 97: 319–329. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7217> PMID: 24239072
15. Gorniak T., Meyer U., Südekum K-H., Dänicke S. Impact of mild heat stress on dry matter intake, milk yield and milk composition in mid-lactation Holstein dairy cows in a temperate climate. *Arch Anim Nutr*. 2014; 68: 358–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2014.950451> PMID: 25176045
16. Hammami H, Bormann J, M'hamdi N, Montaldo HH, Gengler N. Evaluation of heat stress effects on production traits and somatic cell score of Holsteins in a temperate environment. *J Dairy Sci*. 2013; 96: 1844–1855. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-5947> PMID: 23313002
17. Gaughan JB, Mader TL, Gebremedhin KG. Rethinking Heat Index Tools for Livestock. In: CRJ J.L. and C, editor. *Environmental Physiology of Livestock*. Ames, Iowa: Wiley-Blackwell; 2012. pp. 243–265. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119949091.ch14>
18. Buffington DE, Colloazo-Arocho A, Canton GH, Pitt D, Thatcher WW, Collier RJ. Black Globe Humidity Index (BGHI) as Comfort Equation for Dairy Cows. *Trans ASABE*. 1981; 24: 711–714. <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.34325>
19. Lee CNM, Hillman PE. Thermal responses of Holstein dairy cows on pastures with high solar loads and high winds. *American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers - 6th International Dairy Housing Conference 2007*. 2007. pp. 253–259.
20. Colditz IG, Hine BC. Resilience in farm animals: biology, management, breeding and implications for animal welfare. *Anim Prod Sci*. 2016; 56: 1961. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15297>
21. McGovern RE, Bruce JM. AP—Animal Production Technology. *J Agric Eng Res*. 2000; 77: 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jaer.2000.0560>
22. Berman A. Extending the potential of evaporative cooling for heat-stress relief. *J Dairy Sci*. 2006; 89: 3817–3825. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(06\)72423-7](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(06)72423-7) PMID: 16960056
23. Mader TL, Davis MS, Brown-Brandt T. Environmental factors influencing heat stress in feedlot cattle. *J Anim Sci*. 2006; 84: 712–719. PMID: 16478964
24. Gaughan JB, Mader TL, Holt SM, Lisle A. A new heat load index for feedlot cattle. *J Anim Sci*. 2007; 86: 226–234. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2007-0305> PMID: 17911236
25. Mader TL, Johnson LJ, Gaughan JB. A comprehensive index for assessing environmental stress in animals. *J Anim Sci*. 2010; 88: 2153–2165. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2009-2586> PMID: 20118427
26. Bernabucci U., Lacetera N., Baumgard LH., Rhoads RP., Ronchi B., Nardone A. Metabolic and hormonal acclimation to heat stress in domesticated ruminants. *Animal*. 2010; 4: 1167–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173111000090X> PMID: 22444615
27. Collier RJ, Renquist BJ, Xiao Y. A 100-Year Review: Stress physiology including heat stress. *J Dairy Sci*. 2017; 100: 10367–10380. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13676> PMID: 29153170

28. Bertocchi L, Vitali A, Lacetera N, Nardone A, Varisco G, Bernabucci U. Seasonal variations in the composition of Holstein cow's milk and temperature–humidity index relationship. *animal*. 2014; 8: 667–674. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731114000032> PMID: 24513161
29. Olde Riekerink RGM, Barkema HW, Stryhn H. The Effect of Season on Somatic Cell Count and the Incidence of Clinical Mastitis. *J Dairy Sci*. 2007; 90: 1704–1715. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-567> PMID: 17369210
30. JPT H, S G, (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0* [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011.
31. Burfeind O, Suthar VS, Heuwieser W. Effect of heat stress on body temperature in healthy early postpartum dairy cows. *Theriogenology*. 2012; 78: 2031–2038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.theriogenology.2012.07.024> PMID: 23043945
32. West JW, Mullinix BG, Bernard JK. Effects of hot, humid weather on milk temperature, dry matter intake, and milk yield of lactating dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2003; 86: 232–242. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(03\)73602-9](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(03)73602-9) PMID: 12613867
33. Gebremedhin KG., Lee CN., Hillman PE., Collier RJ. Physiological responses of dairy cows during extended solar exposure. *Trans ASABE*. 2010; 53: 239–247.
34. Khelil-Arfa H, Faverdin P, Boudon A. Effect of ambient temperature and sodium bicarbonate supplementation on water and electrolyte balances in dry and lactating Holstein cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2014; 97: 2305–2318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7079> PMID: 24485695
35. Tripon I, Csiszter L, Bura M, Sossidou E. Effects of seasonal and climate variations on calves' thermal comfort and behaviour. *Int J Biometeorol*. 2014; 58: 1471–1478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-013-0749-5> PMID: 24141562
36. Bouraoui R, Lahmar M, Majdoub A, Djemali M, Belyea R. The relationship of temperature-humidity index with milk production of dairy cows in a Mediterranean climate. *Anim Res*. 2002; 51: 479–491.
37. Dalcin VC, Fischer V, Daltro DS, Alfonzo EPM, Stumpf MT, Kolling GJ, et al. Physiological parameters for thermal stress in dairy cattle. *Rev Bras Zootec*. 2016; 45: 458–465. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-92902016000800006>
38. Neuwirth JG, Norton JK, Rawlings CA, Thompson FN, Ware GO. Physiologic responses of dairy calves to environmental heat stress. *Int J Biometeorol*. 1979; 23: 243–254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01553775> PMID: 536051
39. Boga M, Gorgulu M, Sahin A. Effects of feeding methods, season and production level on lactation performance and feed intake behaviour of dairy cows. *Bulg J Agric Sci*. 2014; 20: 915–923.
40. Lough DS, Beede DL, Wilcox CJ. Effects of Feed Intake and Thermal Stress on Mammary Blood Flow and Other Physiological Measurements in Lactating Dairy Cows 1. *J Dairy Sci*. 1990; 73: 325–332. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(90\)78677-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(90)78677-8) PMID: 2329200
41. Eslamizad M, Lamp O, Derno M, Kuhla B. The control of short-term feed intake by metabolic oxidation in late-pregnant and early lactating dairy cows exposed to high ambient temperatures. *Physiol Behav*. 2015; 145: 64–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.03.044> PMID: 25839094
42. Karimi MT, Ghorbani GR, Kargar S, Drackley JK. Late-gestation heat stress abatement on performance and behavior of Holstein dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2015; 98: 6865–6875. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-9281> PMID: 26233442
43. Chen JM, Schütz KE, Tucker CB. Dairy cows use and prefer feed bunks fitted with sprinklers. *J Dairy Sci*. 2013; 96: 5035–5045. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-6282> PMID: 23769371
44. Cook NB, Mentink RL, Bennett TB, Burgi K. The effect of heat stress and lameness on time budgets of lactating dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2007; 90: 1674–1682. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-634> PMID: 17369207
45. Davison TM, Jonsson NN, Mayer DG, Gaughan JB, Ehrlich WK, McGowan MR. Comparison of the impact of six heat-load management strategies on thermal responses and milk production of feed-pad and pasture fed dairy cows in a subtropical environment. *Int J Biometeorol*. 2016; 60: 1961–1968. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-016-1183-2> PMID: 27174414
46. Tapki I, Şahin A. Comparison of the thermoregulatory behaviours of low and high producing dairy cows in a hot environment. *Appl Anim Behav Sci*. 2006; 99: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2005.10.003>
47. Honig H, Miron J, Lehrer H, Jackoby S, Zachut M, Zinou A, et al. Performance and welfare of high-yielding dairy cows subjected to 5 or 8 cooling sessions daily under hot and humid climate. *J Dairy Sci*. 2012; 95: 3736–3742. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-5054> PMID: 22720930
48. Allen JD, Hall LW, Collier RJ, Smith JF. Effect of core body temperature, time of day, and climate conditions on behavioral patterns of lactating dairy cows experiencing mild to moderate heat stress. *J Dairy Sci*. 2015; 98: 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7704> PMID: 25468707

49. Cook NB, Mentink RL, Bennett TB, Burgi K. The Effect of Heat Stress and Lameness on Time Budgets of Lactating Dairy Cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 2007; 90: 1674–1682. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-634> PMID: 17369207
50. Grant RJ. Incorporating Dairy Cow Behavior into Management Tools. 2006 Penn State Dairy Cattle Nutr Work. 2006; 31–41.
51. West JW. Effects of heat-stress on production in dairy cattle. *J Dairy Sci.* 2003; 86: 2131–2144. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(03\)73803-X](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(03)73803-X) PMID: 12836950
52. Vizzotto E, Fischer V, Thaler Neto A, Abreu A, Stumpf M, Werncke D, et al. Access to shade changes behavioral and physiological attributes of dairy cows during the hot season in the subtropics. *Animal.* 2015; 9: 1559–1566. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731115000877> PMID: 25994200
53. Chen JM, Schütz KE, Tucker CB. Cooling cows efficiently with water spray: Behavioral, physiological, and production responses to sprinklers at the feed bunk. *J Dairy Sci.* 2016; 99: 4607–4618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-10714> PMID: 27060833
54. Pereyra AVG, May VM, Catracchia CG, Herrero MA, Flores MC, Mazzini M. Influence of water temperature and heat stress on drinking water intake in dairy cows [Influencia de la temperatura del agua y el estrés calórico sobre el consumo de agua de bebida en vacas lecheras]. *Chil J Agric Res.* 2010; 70: 328–336.
55. Palacio S, Bergeron R, Lachance S, Vasseur E. The effects of providing portable shade at pasture on dairy cow behavior and physiology. *J Dairy Sci.* 2015; 98: 6085–6093. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8932> PMID: 26162795
56. Zimbelman RB, Baumgard LH, Collier RJ. Effects of encapsulated niacin on evaporative heat loss and body temperature in moderately heat-stressed lactating Holstein cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 2010; 93: 2387–2394. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2557> PMID: 20494147
57. Dikmen S, Alava E, Pontes E., Fear JM, Dikmen BY, Olson TA, et al. Differences in thermoregulatory ability between slick-haired and wild-type lactating Holstein cows in response to acute heat stress. *J Dairy Sci.* 2008; 91: 3395–3402. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1072> PMID: 18765598
58. Zähner M, Schrader L, Hauser R, Keck M, Langhans W, Wechsler B. The influence of climatic conditions on physiological and behavioural parameters in dairy cows kept in open stables. *Anim Sci.* 2004; 78: 139–147.
59. Gebremedhin KG, Lee CN, Larson JE, Davis J. Alternative cooling of dairy cows by udder wetting. American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers Annual International Meeting 2012, ASABE 2012. 2012. pp. 2073–2092.
60. Legrand AL, von Keyserlingk MAG, Weary DM. Preference and usage of pasture versus free-stall housing by lactating dairy cattle. *J Dairy Sci.* 2009; 92: 3651–3658. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1733> PMID: 19620646
61. Ketelaar-de Lauwere CC, Ipema AH, van Ouwkerk ENJ, Hendriks MMW., Metz JHM, Noordhuizen JPT., et al. Voluntary automatic milking in combination with grazing of dairy cows: Milking frequency and effects on behaviour. *Appl Anim Behav Sci.* 1999; 64: 91–109. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(99\)00027-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00027-1)
62. Charlton GL, Rutter SM, East M, Sinclair LA. Effects of providing total mixed rations indoors and on pasture on the behavior of lactating dairy cattle and their preference to be indoors or on pasture. *J Dairy Sci.* 2011; 94: 3875–3884. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4172> PMID: 21787924
63. Charlton GL, Rutter SM, East M, Sinclair LA. Preference of dairy cows: Indoor cubicle housing with access to a total mixed ration vs. access to pasture. *Appl Anim Behav Sci.* 2011; 130: 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2010.11.018>
64. Charlton GL, Rutter SM, East M, Sinclair LA. The motivation of dairy cows for access to pasture. *J Dairy Sci.* 2013; 96: 4387–4396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-6421> PMID: 23664348
65. Falk AC, Weary DM, Winckler C, von Keyserlingk MAG. Preference for pasture versus freestall housing by dairy cattle when stall availability indoors is reduced. *J Dairy Sci.* 2012; 95: 6409–6415. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-5208> PMID: 22959941
66. Matarazzo SV, Silva IJO, Perissinotto M, Moura DJ, Fernandes SAA. Thermal conditioned in resting area of freestall facilities and its consequences on productive and physiological responses in dairy cows. 2005 ASAE Annual International Meeting. 2005.
67. Lin JC, Moss BR, Koon JL, Flood CA, Rowe S, Martin JR, et al. Effect of Sprinkling Over the Feed Area and Misting Free Stalls on Milk Production^{1,2,3}. *Prof Anim Sci.* 1998; 14: 102–107. [http://dx.doi.org/10.15232/S1080-7446\(15\)31802-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.15232/S1080-7446(15)31802-7)
68. Schütz KE, Cox NR, Tucker CB. A field study of the behavioral and physiological effects of varying amounts of shade for lactating cows at pasture. *J Dairy Sci.* 2014; 97: 3599–3605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7649> PMID: 24731637

69. Legrand A, Schütz KE, Tucker CB. Using water to cool cattle: Behavioral and physiological changes associated with voluntary use of cow showers. *J Dairy Sci.* 2011; 94: 3376–3386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2010-3901> PMID: 21700023
70. Kendall PE, Nielsen PP, Webster JR, Verkerk GA, Littlejohn RP, Matthews LR. The effects of providing shade to lactating dairy cows in a temperate climate. *Livest Sci.* 2006; 103: 148–157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2006.02.004>
71. Kendall PE, Verkerk GA, Webster JR, Tucker CB. Sprinklers and Shade Cool Cows and Reduce Insect-Avoidance Behavior in Pasture-Based Dairy Systems. *J Dairy Sci.* 2007; 90: 3671–3680. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-766> PMID: 17638978
72. del Prado A, Misselbrook T, Chadwick D, Hopkins A, Dewhurst RJ, Davison P, et al. SIMSDAIRY: A modelling framework to identify sustainable dairy farms in the UK. Framework description and test for organic systems and N fertiliser optimisation. *Sci Total Environ.* 2011; 409: 3993–4009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.05.050> PMID: 21703662
73. Peel M, Finlayson B, McMahon T. Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci.* 2007; 11: 1633–1644. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-11-1633-2007>
74. Wise ME, Armstrong D V, Huber JT, Hunter R, Wiersma F. Hormonal alterations in the lactating dairy cow in response to thermal stress. *J Dairy Sci.* 1988; 71: 2480–2485. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(88\)79834-3](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(88)79834-3) PMID: 3183143
75. Ketelaar-De Lauwere CC., Ipema AH., Van Ouwerkerk ENJ., Hendriks MMWB., Metz JHM., Noordhuizen JPTM., et al. Voluntary automatic milking in combination with grazing of dairy cows: Milking frequency and effects on behaviour. *Appl Anim Behav Sci.* 1999; 64: 91–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(99\)00027-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00027-1)
76. Valtorta SE, Leva PE, Gallardo MR. Evaluation of different shades to improve dairy cattle well-being in Argentina. *Int J Biometeorol.* 1997; 41: 65–67. PMID: 9429340
77. Lima IA, de Azevedo M, Borges CRA, Ferreira MA, Guim A, de Almeida GLP. Thermoregulation of Girlando cows during summertime, in Pernambuco State, Brazil [Termorregulação de vacas da raça Girolando no período de verão, no Estado de Pernambuco, Brasil]. *Acta Sci—Anim Sci.* 2013; 35: 193–199. <https://doi.org/10.4025/actascianimsci.v35i2.16591>
78. Correa-Calderon A, Armstrong D, Ray D, DeNise S, Enns M, Howison C. Thermoregulatory responses of Holstein and Brown Swiss Heat-Stressed dairy cows to two different cooling systems. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2004; 48: 142–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-003-0194-y> PMID: 14624352
79. Alfonzo EPM, Barbosa da Silva MVG, dos Santos Daltro D, Stumpf MT, Dalcin VC, Kolling G, et al. Relationship between physical attributes and heat stress in dairy cattle from different genetic groups. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2016; 60: 245–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-015-1021-y> PMID: 26062817
80. da Cruz P, Monteiro C, Guimaraes E, Antunes R, Nascimento M. Physiological parameters, hair coat morphological characteristics and temperature gradients in holsteingyr crossbred cows [Parâmetros fisiológicos, características morfológicas do pelame e gradientes térmicos de vacas cruzadas holandês-gir]. *Biosci J.* 2016; 32: 471–477. <https://doi.org/10.14393/BJ-v32n2a2016-29827>
81. Kadzere CT, Murphy MR, Silanikove N, Maltz E. Heat stress in lactating dairy cows: a review. *Livest Prod Sci.* 2002; 77: 59–91.
82. Calamari L., Abeni F. d, Calegari F., Stefanini L. Metabolic conditions of lactating Friesian cows during the hot season in the Po valley. 2. Blood minerals and acid-base chemistry. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2007; 52: 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-007-0097-4> PMID: 17503089
83. Abeni F, Calamari L, Stefanini L. Metabolic conditions of lactating Friesian cows during the hot season in the Po valley. 1. Blood indicators of heat stress. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2007; 52: 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-007-0098-3> PMID: 17487513
84. Sartori R., Sartor-Bergfelt R., Mertens SA., Guenther JN., Parrish JJ., Wiltbank MC. Fertilization and early embryonic development in heifers and lactating cows in summer and lactating and dry cows in winter. *J Dairy Sci.* 2002; 85: 2803–2812. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(02\)74367-1](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(02)74367-1) PMID: 12487447
85. Laporta J, Fabris TF, Skibieli AL, Powell JL, Hayen MJ, Horvath K, et al. In utero exposure to heat stress during late gestation has prolonged effects on the activity patterns and growth of dairy calves. *J Dairy Sci.* 2017; 100: 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-11993>
86. Ahmed BMS, Younas U, Asar TO, Dikmen S, Hansen PJ, Dahl GE. Cows exposed to heat stress during fetal life exhibit improved thermal tolerance. *J Anim Sci.* 2017; 95: 3497–3503. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2016.1298> PMID: 28805919
87. Burfeind O, Suthar VS, Heuwieser W. Effect of heat stress on body temperature in healthy early postpartum dairy cows. *Theriogenology.* 2012; 78: 2031–2038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.theriogenology.2012.07.024> PMID: 23043945

88. Zahner M, Schrader L, Hauser R, Keck M, Langhans W, Wechsler B. The influence of climatic conditions on physiological and behavioural parameters in dairy cows kept in open stables. *Anim Sci J*. 2004; 78: 139–148.
89. Kim KH, Kim DH, Oh YK, Lee SS, Lee HJ, Kim DW, et al. Productivity and energy partition of late lactation dairy cows during heat exposure. *Anim Sci J*. 2010; 81: 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-0929.2009.00711.x> PMID: 20163673
90. Koubková M, Knížková I, Kunc P, Härtlová H, Flusser J, Doležal O. Influence of high environmental temperatures and evaporative cooling on some physiological, hematological and biochemical parameters in high-yielding dairy cows. *Czech J Anim Sci*. 2002; 47: 309–318.
91. Ronchi B, Lacetera N, Bernabucci U, Nardone A, Verini Supplizi A. Distinct and common effects of heat stress and restricted feeding on metabolic status of Holstein heifers. *Zootec e Nutr Anim*. 1999; 25: 11–20.
92. Shwartz G, Rhoads ML, VanBaale MJ, Rhoads RP, Baumgard LH. Effects of a supplemental yeast culture on heat-stressed lactating Holstein cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2009; 92: 935–942. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1496> PMID: 19233786
93. Honig H, Miron J, Lehrer H, Jackoby S, Zachut M, Zinou A, et al. Performance and welfare of high-yielding dairy cows subjected to 5 or 8 cooling sessions daily under hot and humid climate. *J Dairy Sci*. 2012; 95: 3736–3742. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-5054> PMID: 22720930
94. Anderson SD, Bradford BJ, Harner JP, Tucker CB, Choi CY, Allen JD, et al. Effects of adjustable and stationary fans with misters on core body temperature and lying behavior of lactating dairy cows in a semiarid climate. *J Dairy Sci*. 2013; 96: 4738–4750. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-6401> PMID: 23684043
95. Valtorta S, Gallardo M. Evaporative cooling for Holstein dairy cows under grazing conditions. *Int J Biometeorol*. 2004; 48: 213–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-003-0196-9> PMID: 14639473
96. Wang J, Bu D, Wang J, Huo X, Guo T, Wei H, et al. Effect of saturated fatty acid supplementation on production and metabolism indices in heat-stressed mid-lactation dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci*. 2010; 93: 4121–4127. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2635> PMID: 20723687
97. Moallem U, Altmark G, Lehrer H, Arieli A. Performance of high-yielding dairy cows supplemented with fat or concentrate under hot and humid climates. *J Dairy Sci*. 2010; 93: 3192–3202. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2979> PMID: 20630236
98. Adin G, Solomon R, Shoshani E, Flamenbaum I, Nikbachat M, Yosef E, et al. Heat production, eating behavior and milk yield of lactating cows fed two rations differing in roughage content and digestibility under heat load conditions. *Livest Sci*. 2008; 119: 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2008.03.012>
99. Miron J, Adin G, Solomon R, Nikbachat M, Zenou A, Shamay A, et al. Heat production and retained energy in lactating cows held under hot summer conditions with evaporative cooling and fed two rations differing in roughage content and in vitro digestibility. *Animal*. 2008; 2: 843–848. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731108001900> PMID: 22443663
100. Kanjanaputhipong J, Junlapho W, Karnjanasirm K. Feeding and lying behavior of heat-stressed early lactation cows fed low fiber diets containing roughage and nonforage fiber sources. *J Dairy Sci*. 2015; 98: 1110–1118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8154> PMID: 25497805
101. West JW. Nutritional strategies for managing the heat-stressed dairy cow. *J Anim Sci*. 1999; 77: 21. PMID: 15526778
102. Arieli A, Rubinstein A, Moallem U, Aharoni Y, Halachmi I. The effect of fiber characteristics on thermoregulatory responses and feeding behavior of heat stressed cows. *J Therm Biol*. 2004; 29: 749–751. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtherbio.2004.08.050>
103. Soriani N, Panella G, Calamari L. Rumination time during the summer season and its relationships with metabolic conditions and milk production. *J Dairy Sci*. 2013; 96: 5082–5094. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6620> PMID: 23791488
104. Conte G, Ciampolini R, Cassandro M, Lasagna E, Calamari L, Bernabucci U, et al. Feeding and nutrition management of heat-stressed dairy ruminants. *Ital J Anim Sci*. 2018; 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1828051X.2017.1404944>
105. Havlin JM, Robinson PH. Intake, milk production and heat stress of dairy cows fed a citrus extract during summer heat. *Anim Feed Sci Technol*. 2015; 208: 23–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2015.06.022>
106. Lohöfner M, Meyer U, Rauls C, Rehage J, Dänicke S. Effects of niacin supplementation and dietary concentrate proportion on body temperature, ruminal pH and milk performance of primiparous dairy cows. *Arch Anim Nutr*. 2013; 67: 202–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2013.793048> PMID: 23742643

107. Moore CE, Kay JK, Collier RJ, VanBaale MJ, Baumgard LH. Effect of supplemental conjugated linoleic acids on heat-stressed brown Swiss and Holstein cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 2005; 88: 1732–1740. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(05\)72846-0](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(05)72846-0) PMID: 15829665
108. Ominski KH, Wittenberg KM, Kennedy AD, Moshtaghi-Nia SA. Physiological and production responses when feeding *Aspergillus oryzae* to dairy cows during short-term, moderate heat stress. *Anim Sci.* 2003; 77: 485–490.
109. Shwartz G, Rhoads ML, Vanbaale MJ, Rhoads RP, Baumgard LH. Effects of a supplemental yeast culture on heat-stressed lactating Holstein cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 2009; 92: 935–942. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1496> PMID: 19233786
110. De Palo P, Tateo A, Zezza F, Corrente M, Centoducati P. Influence of free-stall flooring on comfort and hygiene of dairy cows during warm climatic conditions. *J Dairy Sci.* 2006; 89: 4583–4595. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(06\)72508-5](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(06)72508-5) PMID: 17106090
111. Calegari F, Calamari L, Frazzi E. Misting and fan cooling of the rest area in a dairy barn. *Int J Biometeorol.* 2012; 56: 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-011-0432-7> PMID: 21494898
112. Cook NB, Mentink RL, Bennett TB, Burgi K. The effect of heat stress and lameness on time budgets of lactating dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 2007; 90: 1674–1682. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-634> PMID: 17369207
113. Cook NB, Bennett TB, Nordlund K V. Effect of free stall surface on daily activity patterns in dairy cows with relevance to lameness prevalence. *J Dairy Sci.* 2004; 87: 2912–2922. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(04\)73422-0](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(04)73422-0) PMID: 15375052