

Research Reflection

Cite this article: Hillerton JE and Berry EA (2022). A retrospective on claims regarding clinical mastitis in the subsequent lactation, after use of an internal teat sealant in the dry period. *Journal of Dairy Research* **89**, 173–177. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022029922000401>

Received: 6 October 2021
Revised: 17 February 2022
Accepted: 7 March 2022
First published online: 17 May 2022

Keywords:

mastitis; intramammary infection; dry cow; antibiotic; teat sealant

Author for correspondence:

J Eric Hillerton,
Email: hillerton@outlook.com

A retrospective on claims regarding clinical mastitis in the subsequent lactation, after use of an internal teat sealant in the dry period

J Eric Hillerton¹ and Elizabeth A Berry²

¹Massey University, Palmerston North, 4442, New Zealand and ²Ross-on-Wye, UK

Abstract

Infusion of an internal teat sealant into the mammary gland of the dairy cow at drying off has been claimed to reduce the incidence of clinical mastitis over many months in the subsequent lactation, despite the absence of any ingredient of the sealant remaining for that long. However, these claims have been poorly substantiated, often by lack of identification on when the infection occurred in the period from calving to disease, if the infection was present at post calving sampling and if the pathogen causing the disease was that causing an earlier infection. Moreover, no hypothesis on how any effect on clinical mastitis might occur has been advanced in any of the publications claiming the effect. That the effect might occur is only reported in a minority of publications, and the possibility that this is relatively specific to Gram-negative pathogens is reviewed.

The issue

A considerable number of studies have reported that use of an internal teat sealant introduced into each teat of the dairy cow at the end of lactation, sometimes in combination with a dry cow antimicrobial infusion, successfully prevents clinical mastitis in early lactation. Adoption of this technology on dairy farms has proven highly successful in controlling clinical mastitis (CM) in early lactation and in reducing the use of antimicrobial agents. Several of the studies report the effect may last up to 150 d after calving, but none have proposed a hypothesis as to how this protection can happen long after any introduced ingredient should have disappeared.

Background

Neave *et al.* (1950) showed that 50% of intramammary infections (IMI) present at calving of dairy cows persisted for at least 14 d after calving with half developing to CM. Most CM was from infections newly arisen in the dry period, mostly caused by streptococci. Further, cows with a history of infection were those most likely to suffer a new IMI or another IMI in another quarter. However, nearly 30% of IMI detected at calving resolved within 14 d. Later, Smith *et al.* (1966, 1967b) reported that more cows were infected at calving than were infected at drying off with ~30% of new IMI in a lactation occurring in the dry period. This recognition of the importance of the dry period (DP) in the risk of new IMI led to various attempts to control infection in this period. Neave *et al.* (1951) tried the recently available penicillin, as did Pearson (1951) to manage pyogenic CM (summer mastitis) in the DP. However, useful success with antimicrobial treatment in the DP required the development of long-acting formulations, the first being cloxacillin (Smith *et al.*, 1966, 1967b).

Adoption of whole herd treatment at drying off, comprising dry cow antimicrobial infusion (DCAI) into each quarter of each cow, became one of the pillars of the five-point mastitis control plan (Hillerton and Booth, 2018). The ability to enhance protection of the mammary gland from infection and disease around the DP has been enhanced by the development of an infused internal teat sealant (ITS, usually containing bismuth subnitrate; Meaney, 1976, 1977). Successful deployment often uses ITS in addition to DCAI, a combination approach (Combo), first described by Woolford *et al.* (1998). The DCAI is usually applied first, followed by the ITS.

Here we present a retrospective examination of the evidence that DP prophylaxis affects the occurrence of CM relatively late in the subsequent lactation. We have used 21 published studies, 13 as used by Rabie and Lean (2013) and a later eight (Table 1).

Infections and clinical mastitis

An IMI is defined as the presence of pathogenic bacteria, known to cause an inflammatory response in mammary gland tissue, likely to be sustained in the mammary gland, at least

Table 1. Publications comparing various combinations of a negative control, dry cow antimicrobial infusion, an internal teat sealant and a combination of dry cow antimicrobial infusion followed by an internal teat sealant in field trials

Reference	Animals	Treatments tested				Samples at calving (DIM)	Udder health at calving relative to CM	Time period for CM (DIM)	Effect
		Neg. control	DCAI	ITS	Combo				
Berry <i>et al.</i> (1997)	Cows	X	X			0	NR	0–150	No effect of DCAI on CM
Berry and Hillerton (2002a)	Cow	X	X			≤1, 7–14	X	0–90	Less CM with DCAI vs. neg. control
Berry and Hillerton (2002b)	Cows	X		X		0, 4–10	X	0–100	Less CM with ITS vs. neg. control
Berry and Hillerton (2007)	Cows		X		X	0, 4–10	Infected Uninfected	0–100	Less CM with Combo vs. neg. control No diff. Combo vs. neg. control
Bhutto <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Cows	X	X	X		0	NR	0–100	Less CM with ITS vs. neg. control
Bradley <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Cows		X	X	X	≤10	NR	0–100	Less CM with Combo vs. DCAI or ITS
Bradley <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Cows			X	X	≤7	NR	0–100	Less CM with Combo vs. DCAI
Cameron <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Cows		BvS			3–4, 5–18	NR	0–120	No diff. BvS
Compton <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Cows and heifers	X		X		0–4, 3–6	NR	0–30	Less CM with ITS vs. neg. control to 30 DIM
Godden <i>et al.</i> (2003)	Cows		X		X	1–3, 6–8	NR	0–60	Less CM with Combo vs. DCAI for DO to 60DIM
Huxley <i>et al.</i> (2002)	Cows		X	X		≤1	NR	0–100	No diff. DCAI vs. ITS
Klocke <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Cows	X		X		NR	NR	0–100	Less CM with ITS vs. neg. control
Lacy-Hulbert <i>et al.</i> (2022)	Cows	X	X	X	X	0, 2–4	X	0–30	Less CM with Its or DCAI vs. neg. control, Less CM with Combo vs. ITS or DCAi
Laven and Lawrence (2008)	Cows and heifers	X		X X	X	–	NR	0–77	Less CM with ITS
Bichalo (2018)	Heifers	X	Lactating cow AI	X	X	4–10, some animals	NR	0–270	Less CM with Combo. No diff. Neg. control vs. DCAI vs. ITS
Mütze <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Cows			X	X	6–14	NR	0–100	Less CM with Combo + ITS vs. DCAI
Newton <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Cows		X		X	4, 8–11	NR	0–100	Less CM with Combo vs. DCAI
Parker <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Heifers	X		X		≤4	NR	0–14	Less CM with ITS vs. neg. control
Rowe <i>et al.</i> (2020)	Cows		BvS			1–13	NR	0–120	No diff. BvS
Runciman <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Cows		X		X	–	NR	0–150	Less CM with Combo vs. DCAI
Woolford <i>et al.</i> (1998)	Cows	X	X	X	X	≤1	NR	0–150	Less CM with all treatments

DIM, days in milk; CM, clinical mastitis; Neg. control, untreated control group; DCAI, dry cow antimicrobial infusion; ITS, internal teat sealant; Combo, dry cow antimicrobial infusion followed by internal teat sealant; X, used/reported; NR, not reported; BvS blanket vs. selective DCAI.

temporarily. A new DP IMI is the identification of pathogenic bacteria in one or more milk samples taken soon after calving from a quarter known to be free of that pathogen at drying off.

Thus, a quarter can be defined as infected or uninfected at calving. The time when a sample is taken post calving affects the determination of infected vs. uninfected quarters as an IMI may

be eliminated or a new infection arise at any time following calving.

Clinical mastitis is defined as the observation of abnormalities in the appearance (the presence of clots and/or discolouration) of milk or udder tissue (swelling, tenderness and elevated temperature).

Dry period management to control new intramammary infections

Numerous trials have described the efficacy of DCAI or ITS or Combo in preventing new DP IMI, generally showing a trend that ITS is at least equal to DCAI in preventing a new DP IMI in uninfected quarters and that Combo is superior to either DCAI or ITS (see meta-analysis of results from 12 studies, Rabie and Lean, 2013). Results are based on the bacteriology of quarter samples taken at or soon after calving. Errors are likely in these data, varying between trials, according to when the samples were taken and if confirmatory results were obtained from duplicate samples or subsequent samples. Of the 21 studies considered here, 17 used sampling within a very few days of calving but only eight of those added any confirmatory data from other sampling (Table 1). Without results from both of separate samplings, it cannot be known conclusively when a new IMI occurred and whether it was real and sustained or simply transitory. In some studies, the single 'calving' sample was not taken until 10 or more days after calving (days in milk, DIM) so any IMI may have been acquired after calving rather than during the dry period. See Table 1 for details.

Dry period management to control new clinical mastitis

Rabie and Lean (2013) suggested, using 21 sub trials, that the overall evidence is that DCAI or ITS or Combo treatment over the DP reduces the incidence of CM, relative to no treatment, in the period 2–100 d post calving. The time varies between reports, and as much as 150 DIM has been claimed in later studies not considered in the 2013 review. However, the relationship of timing of new IMI, whether it occurs in the DP or soon post calving, has not been considered in any of the published studies. This leaves an important question, namely, were the CM cases in quarters infected or uninfected at calving?

When considering quarters identified as infected at calving, Berry and Hillerton (2002a) found fewer CM in DCAI treated cows vs. untreated cows in the first three months post calving, and Berry and Hillerton (2002b) found fewer CM in ITS treated cows vs. untreated cows in the first 100 d post calving. Similarly, Berry and Hillerton (2007) found fewer CM in Combo treated cows vs. DCAI treated quarters in the first 100 d post calving, again in those quarters identified as infected at calving. Berry and Hillerton (2002a and 2002b) had both earlier found a slightly higher proportion of coliform CM post calving in ITS treated cows vs. either untreated or DCAI treated cows.

Godden *et al.* (2003) reported fewer CM cases up to 60 DIM in Combo treated cows opposed to DCAI treated cows, but no effect on Gram-negative infections. Runciman *et al.* (2010) found less CM in Combo treated cows than in DCAI treated cows, principally for up to 21 DIM but the effect continued for more than 100 DIM, most notably against Gram-negative pathogens.

Bradley *et al.* (2010) also observed fewer CM in Combo vs. DCAI, this time in high milk cell count (SCC) cows. Overall, they found no difference in low SCC cows. The Combo treated

high SCC cows were less likely to incur an enterobacterial CM, whereas the low SCC cows were more likely to suffer an enterobacterial CM. However, they did not differentiate if the CM occurred in the DP or subsequently in the 100 DIM post calving. Bradley *et al.* (2011) also reported fewer CM in Combo vs. DCAI treated cows, mostly in the first 21 DIM with the prevalence of coliform IMI in DCAI treated cows twice that in Combo treated cows. Again, they gave no indication when the CM occurred. They notably reported that Combo was equivalent to use of cefquinome (a fourth-generation cephalosporin) DCAI, an antimicrobial with Gram-negative bacteria activity unlike the products more commonly used in DCAI. Cefquinome has been designated a Veterinary Critically Important Antimicrobial, which should not be used as a first line treatment, by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE, 2015).

None of the published studies have offered any explanation for this protection against CM many days and weeks after the treatment. Further, many do not consider if the CM was related to an infection detected at calving or arising at any later time in the lactation. Indeed, seventeen of the 21 published studies reviewed (Table 1) either give no timing for the occurrence of CM in the lactation or do not differentiate if the CM occurred in the DP or the subsequent lactation, nor if the quarters that showed CM later in the lactation were infected at calving or not.

If CM is to be used as a proxy for, or another measure of, successful prevention of a new IMI and hence a benefit of any prophylaxis, it is incumbent to identify an IMI at calving. The alternative is to advance a hypothesis of how DCAI or ITS can have an effect that prevents a new IMI in the subsequent lactation, especially by a Gram-negative pathogen, at some time after 4 DIM. At this time, milk is usually considered acceptable for human consumption, meaning that it is free of introduced antimicrobial substances or a teat sealant, or below maximum permitted levels (EMEA, 1998).

The issue: How can dry period prophylaxis prevent new clinical mastitis in the next lactation?

Smith *et al.* (1967a) reported that the activity of dry period antibiotics is limited to three or four weeks after infusion, ie, about half the length of a normal dry period. More extended-life formulations may have a milk withhold of up to 58 d post infusion. Thus, milk at 4 d after calving is free of detectable antimicrobial effects (EMEA, 1998; Hillerton *et al.*, 1999). That any long-term effect does not appear to occur for DCAI treated cows suggests the absence of any active ingredient. Importantly, the vast majority of antimicrobials, and those most common in international use, are active against Gram-positive pathogens and rarely or poorly against Gram-negative pathogens.

The various studies of Berry and Hillerton, Bradley *et al.*, and Runciman *et al.*, suggest that a real protection against CM long after any DCAI or ITS activity could be present. What might induce or prevent an IMI developing to CM has not, apparently, been considered. A clue to what may occur is that this is not simply a generic protection against a new IMI and subsequent CM, but that it depends on the timing of infection and the pathogen type involved. Bradley *et al.* (2010) said use of pathogen-free status at calving is the most relevant criterion to assess efficacy. Kabera *et al.* (2018) reported that ITS particles persisted up to an average 4.5 d after calving even though no sealing was evident as the animals were being milked successfully. ITS are composed principally of bismuth salts which have long been known to have

some antimicrobial properties, hence their use to treat peptic and gastric ulcers involving Gram-negative *Helicobacter* spp. in humans (Domenico *et al.*, 1997). Notcovich *et al.* (2020) reported some in vitro antimicrobial inhibition by bismuth salts against some strains of mastitis pathogens, including *Escherichia coli*. Potentially, bismuth salts, the largest ingredient of teat sealants, may not be inactive as initially proposed. That they are active, mostly against Gram-negative bacteria, long after any ITS is absent from the mammary gland is, however, a tenuous claim. The effect of ITS may not simply be as a barrier to entry of pathogens, but no definitive hypothesis has been proposed for an effect when no residue of the supposed active ingredient should still be present.

Research opportunities

Potentially a long-term effect of ITS may occur for CM caused by coliform bacteria, although the field trial results are not unanimous. Indeed, the current state of knowledge is insufficient to substantiate the claims made for protection against CM. The aetiology of IMI and CM in the subsequent lactation requires further study. If the effect is specific to certain pathogen types, then the farm system becomes important. Studies on pastured cows and many loose-housed systems with straw bedding will be less useful as the aetiology is predominantly Gram-positive pathogens, mostly streptococci. A J5 vaccine, applied over the dry period, shows benefits in reduction of Gram-negative mastitis in the subsequent lactation (Hogan *et al.*, 1992). No published studies have been found that examine any interaction with ITS treatment, another gap that could be filled.

References

- Berry EA and Hillerton JE (2002a) The effect of selective dry cow treatment on new intramammary infections. *Journal of Dairy Science* **85**, 112–121.
- Berry EA and Hillerton JE (2002b) The effect of an intra mammary teat seal on new intra mammary infections. *Journal of Dairy Science* **85**, 2512–2520.
- Berry EA and Hillerton JE (2007) The effect of an intramammary teat seal and dry cow antibiotic in relation to dry period length on post partum mastitis. *Journal of Dairy Science* **90**, 760–765.
- Berry SL, Maas J, Kirk JH, Reynolds JP, Gardner IA and Ahmadi A (1997) Effects of antimicrobial treatment at the end of lactation on milk yield, somatic cell count, and incidence of clinical mastitis during the subsequent lactation in a dairy herd with a low prevalence of contagious mastitis. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medicine Association* **211**, 207–211.
- Bhutto AL, Murray RD and Woldehiwet Z (2011) The effect of dry cow therapy and internal teat-sealant on intramammary infections during the subsequent lactation. *Research in Veterinary Science* **90**, 316–320.
- Bichalo RC (2018) Prepartum application of internal teat sealant or intramammary amoxicillin on dairy heifers: Effect on udder health, survival, and performance. *Journal of Dairy Science* **101**, 1388–1402.
- Bradley AJ, Breen JE, Payne B, Williams P and Green MJ (2010) The use of a cephalonium dry cow therapy and an internal teat sealant, both alone and in combination. *Journal of Dairy Science* **93**, 1566–1577.
- Bradley AJ, Breen JE, Payne B, Williams P and Green MJ (2011) A comparison of broad-spectrum and narrow-spectrum dry cow therapy used alone and in combination with a teat sealant. *Journal of Dairy Science* **94**, 692–704.
- Cameron M, McKenna SL, MacDonald KA, Dohoo IR, Roy JP and Keefe GP (2014) Evaluation of selective dry cow treatment following on-farm culture: risk of postcalving intramammary infection and clinical mastitis in the subsequent lactation. *Journal of Dairy Science* **97**, 270–284.
- Compton CWR, Emslie FR and McDougall S (2014) Randomised controlled trials demonstrate efficacy of a novel internal teat sealant to prevent new intramammary infections in dairy cows and heifers. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal* **62**, 258–266.
- Domenico P, Salo RJ, Novick SG, Schoch PE, van Horn K and Cunha BA (1997) Enhancement of bismuth antibacterial activity with lipophilic thiol chelators. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* **41**, 1697–1703.
- EMEA (1998) Note for guidance for the determination of withdrawal period for milk. *European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products*, EMEA/CVMP/473/98-FINAL, pp26.
- Godden S, Rapnicki P, Stewart S, Fetrow J, Johnson A, Bey R and Farnsworth R (2003) Effectiveness of an internal teat sealant in the prevention of new intramammary infections during the dry and early-lactation periods in dairy cows when using a dry cow intramammary antibiotic. *Journal of Dairy Science* **86**, 3899–3911.
- Hillerton JE and Booth JM (2018) The Five-Point Mastitis Control Plan – A Revisory Tutorial! In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the National Mastitis Council, Tucson AZ, p3-19.
- Hillerton JE, Halley BI, Neaves P and Rose MD (1999) Detection of antimicrobial substances in individual cow and quarter milk samples using Delvotest microbial inhibitor tests. *Journal of Dairy Science* **82**, 704–711.
- Hogan JS, Smith KL, Todhunter DA and Schoenberger PS (1992) Field trial to determine efficacy of an *Escherichia coli* J5 mastitis vaccine. *Journal of Dairy Science* **75**, 78–84.
- Huxley JN, Green MJ, Green LE and Bradley AJ (2002) Evaluation of the efficacy of an internal teat sealer during the dry period. *Journal of Dairy Science* **85**, 551–561.
- Kabera F, Dufour S, Keefe G and Roy J-P (2018) An observational cohort study on persistency of internal teat sealant residue in milk after calving in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* **101**, 6399–6412.
- Klocke P, Ivemeyer S, Butler G, Maeschli A and Heil F (2010) A randomized controlled trial of homeopathy and internal teat sealers for the prevention of mastitis in organically farmed dairy cows during the dry period and 10 d postcalving. *Homeopathy* **99**, 90–98.
- Lacy-Hulbert SJ, Williamson JH, Kuhn-Sherlock B, Taylor K, Hea S, Bryan M and Hillerton JE (2022) Efficacy of a dry cow antimicrobial infusion alone and in combination with an internal teat sealant in managing intramammary infections in dairy cows during winter conditions in Southland, New Zealand. (In Preparation).
- Laven R and Lawrence KE (2008) Efficacy of blanket treatment of cows and heifers with an internal teat sealant in reducing the risk of mastitis in dairy cattle calving on pasture. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal* **56**, 171–178.
- Meaney WJ (1976) Dry period teat seal. *Veterinary Record* **99**, 30.
- Meaney WJ (1977) Effect of dry period sealant on bovine udder infections. *Irish Journal of Agricultural Research* **16**, 293–299.
- Mütze K, Wolter W, Failing K, Kloppert B, Bernhardt H and Zschöck M (2012) The effect of dry cow antibiotic with and without an internal teat sealant on udder health during the first 100 d of lactation: a field study with matched pairs. *Journal of Dairy Research* **79**, 477–484.
- Neave FK, Dodd FH and Henriques E (1950) Udder infections in the dry period. *Journal of Dairy Research* **17**, 37–49.
- Neave FK, Lee JM and Dodd FH (1951) Report of the National Institute for Research in Dairying, p62.
- Newton HT, Green MJ, Benchaoui H, Cracknell V, Rowan T and Bradley AJ (2008) Comparison of the efficacy of cloxacillin alone and cloxacillin combined with an internal teat sealant for dry-cow therapy. *Veterinary Record* **162**, 678–684.
- Notcovich S, Williamson NB, Flint S, Yapura J, Schukken YH and Heuer C (2020) Effect of bismuth subnitrate on in vitro growth of major mastitis pathogens. *Journal of Dairy Science* **103**, 7249–7259.
- OIE (2015) OIE list of antimicrobial agents of veterinary importance. Available at <https://www.oie.int/app/uploads/2021/03/eng-oie-list-antimicrobials-may2015.pdf>.
- Parker KI, Compton C, Annis FM, Weir A, Heuer C and McDougall S (2007) Subclinical and clinical mastitis in heifers following the use of a teat sealant precalving. *Journal of Dairy Science* **90**, 207–218.
- Pearson JKL (1951) Further experiments in the use of penicillin in the prevention of *C. pyogenes*-infection of the non-lactating bovine udder. *Veterinary Record* **68**, 215–220.
- Rabie AR and Lean IJ (2013) The effect of internal teat sealant products (Teatseal and Orbeseal) on intramammary infection, clinical mastitis, and

- somatic cell counts in lactating cows: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy Science* **96**, 6915–6544.
- Rowe SM, Godden SM, Nydam DV, Gorden PJ, Lago A, Vasquez AK, Royster E, Timmerman J and Thomas MJ** (2020) Randomized controlled trial investigating the effect of 2 selective dry-cow therapy protocols on udder health and performance in the subsequent lactation. *Journal of Dairy Science* **103**, 6493–6503.
- Runciman DJ, Malmo J and Deighton M** (2010) The use of an internal teat sealant in combination with cloxacillin dry cow therapy for the prevention of clinical and subclinical mastitis in seasonal calving dairy herds. *Journal of Dairy Science* **93**, 4582–4591.
- Smith A, Neave FK, Dodd FH and Brander G** (1966) Methods of reducing the incidence of udder infection in dry cow. *Veterinary Record* **79**, 233–236.
- Smith A, Neave FK, Dodd FH, Jones A and Gore DN** (1967a) The persistence of cloxacillin in the mammary gland when infused immediately after the last milking of lactation. *Journal of Dairy Research* **34**, 47–57.
- Smith A, Westgarth DR, Jones MR, Neave FK, Dodd FH and Brander G** (1967b) Methods of reducing the incidence of udder infection in dry cows. *Veterinary Record* **81**, 504–510.
- Woolford MW, Williamson JH, Day AM and Copeman PJA** (1998) The prophylactic effect of a teat sealer on bovine mastitis during the dry period and the following lactation. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal* **46**, 12–19.