



Spatial behaviour of sheep during the neonatal period: Preliminary study on the influence of shelter

Pritchard, Charlotte; Williams, Prysor; Davies, Peers; Jones, Dewi; Smith, Andy

Animal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.animal.2021.100252](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.animal.2021.100252)

Published: 01/07/2021

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Pritchard, C., Williams, P., Davies, P., Jones, D., & Smith, A. (2021). Spatial behaviour of sheep during the neonatal period: Preliminary study on the influence of shelter. *Animal*, 15(7), Article 100252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.animal.2021.100252>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Spatial behaviour of sheep during the neonatal period: Preliminary study on**
2 **the influence of shelter**

3 C.E. Pritchard¹, A.P. Williams¹, P. Davies², D. Jones³, A.R. Smith¹

4

5 *¹School of Natural Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2DG, UK*

6 *²Department of Epidemiology & Population Health, University of Liverpool, Neston*

7 *CH64 7TE, UK*

8 *³Innovis Ltd., Capel Dewi, Aberystwyth, SY23 3HU, UK*

9

10 Corresponding Author: Prysor Williams. E-mail: prysor.williams@bangor.ac.uk

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Effective shelter has been demonstrated to reduce neonatal lamb mortality rates during
14 periods of inclement weather. Periods of high wind speed and rainfall have been shown
15 to influence shelter usage, however, it is not yet known how ewe factors such as breed,
16 age and body condition score influence shelter-seeking behaviour. This study,
17 conducted on a working upland farm in the UK, examined impact of artificial shelter on
18 the biological and climatic factors that influence peri-parturient ewe behaviour.
19 Pregnant ewes (n=147) were randomly allocated between two adjacent fields which
20 were selected for their similarity in size, topography, pasture management, orientation
21 to the prevailing wind and available natural shelter. In one field, three additional artificial
22 shelters were installed to increase the available shelter for ewes, this field was
23 designated the *Test* field; no additional artificial shelter was provided in the second
24 field which was used as the *Control* field. Individual ewes were observed every 2 hours
25 between 0800-1600 for 14 continuous days to monitor their location relative to shelter.
26 Ewe breed (Aberfield and Highlander), age (2 to 8 years) and body condition score
27 were considered as explanatory variables to explain flock and individual variance in
28 shelter-seeking behaviour and the prevalence of issues which required the intervention
29 of the shepherd, termed 'shepherding problems'. Any ewe observed with dystocia, a
30 dead or poor vigour lamb or who exhibited mismothering behaviour was recorded as a
31 shepherding problem. The prevalence of these shepherding problems which
32 necessitate human intervention represents arguably the most critical limiting factor for
33 the successful management of commercial sheep flocks in outdoor lambing systems.
34 Overall, ewes in the *Test* field with access to additional artificial shelter experienced
35 fewer shepherding problems than those in the *Control* field ($P < 0.05$). A significant
36 breed effect was also observed, with Highlander ewes more likely to seek shelter than

37 Aberfield ewes ($P < 0.001$), and experiencing significantly fewer shepherding
38 interventions ($P < 0.05$). These findings demonstrate the substantial and significant
39 benefits to animal welfare and productivity that can be achieved through the provision
40 of artificial shelter in commercial, upland, outdoor lambing systems in the UK.

41

42 **Keywords:** exposure, lamb survival, production, welfare, wind chill

43

44 **Implications**

45 Ewe behaviour around shelter is an important factor in successful outdoor lambing
46 systems. The provision of artificial shelter in this trial resulted in a significant reduction
47 in peri-parturient health and welfare problems; specifically, the cumulative incidence of
48 mortality, dystocia, mismothering and poor lamb vigour. These benefits were observed
49 despite the comparatively mild, stable weather conditions measured over the trial
50 period. The effects observed may have been more pronounced under more severe
51 weather conditions. Breed was an important variable when comparing the spatial
52 behaviour of ewes around shelter. This research demonstrates that both shelter
53 provision and breed choice are important variables when attempting to reduce
54 shepherding workload and improve neonatal outcomes.

55

56 **Introduction**

57 UK lamb mortality between mid-pregnancy and sale is quoted as ranging from 10 to
58 25% (Mellor and Stafford, 2004) and has been reported anecdotally as being as high
59 as 30–40% on individual farms (Gascoigne *et al.*, 2017). The majority of lamb losses
60 occur in the neonatal period (first 7 days of life), with the first 48 hours being the highest
61 risk period (Mellor and Stafford, 2004). Hypothermia and other exposure-related

62 conditions are the major contributors to neonatal mortality in outdoor-lambing systems
63 (Dwyer, 2008; Gascoigne *et al.*, 2017). In addition to the economic costs that neonatal
64 mortality causes the industry, exposure is recognised as an important welfare issue for
65 UK flocks (Mellor and Stafford, 2004; Dwyer, 2008).

66 Cold exposure impacts upon the lambs' cognitive functions and their ability to stand
67 and suckle at birth, resulting in poor lamb vigour and death due to hypothermia and
68 starvation (Dwyer, 2008). Cold-starvation syndrome has been cited as accounting for
69 30-58% of neonatal mortality cases (Huffman *et al.*, 1985; Olsen *et al.*, 1987).

70 The impact of wind speed and evaporation, of rain or amniotic fluid, are additive as the
71 lamb rapidly loses heat through radiation and conduction (Pollard, 2006). Lamb
72 mortality rates can exceed 70% in wet conditions where wind speed exceeds 5 m/s
73 (Obst and Ellis, 1977). Donnelly (1984) created a model with various climatic
74 parameters that predicted effective shelter could reduce lamb mortality rates up to 50%
75 during inclement weather. Shelter modifies the microclimate by funnelling the wind
76 over the top and around the edges of a structure, creating a shelter zone underneath
77 (Gregory, 1995). The shelter zone is predominantly on the leeward side and
78 encompasses a distance of approximately 14 times the height (**H**) of the shelter. Some
79 shelter (about 2 H) is also provided on the windward side (Gregory, 1995). Location,
80 height, and porosity (influenced by density and species of foliage) are stated as the
81 most important factors to consider when looking at the role of shelters in reducing wind
82 speed (Alexander *et al.*, 1979; Gregory, 1995). Shelter placement and the consistency
83 of wind direction are also crucial factors in the efficacy of shelter as variability in wind
84 direction will affect the area protected by the shelter (Wang and Takle, 1996). The
85 utilisation of shelter by lambing ewes is influenced by accessibility, climate, time of day
86 and the duration since the ewes were last shorn (Bird *et al.*, 1984; Gregory, 1995;

87 Pollard *et al.*, 1999). Other factors that might influence behaviour include flock size
88 (Kleemann *et al.*, 2006), stocking density (Alexander, 1984; Broster *et al.*, 2012;
89 Robertson *et al.*, 2012), ewe social interactions (Broster *et al.*, 2010), and visibility to
90 predators. Ewes also have a tendency to separate away from the rest of the flock to
91 lamb (Alexander *et al.*, 1979); which may result in them moving away from sheltered
92 areas if the shelter zone is limited (Gregory, 1995). Alternatively, high-stocking
93 densities around limited shelter might also result in mismothering behaviours
94 (Alexander, 1984).

95 Lynch *et al.* (1980) demonstrated lamb mortality in sheltered paddocks was half that
96 of unsheltered paddocks. The majority of ewes lambed down in the shelter zone and,
97 as expected, the ewes made use of the shelter during the night and day at times of
98 inclement weather. Interestingly, ewes used the shelter for an extended period of time
99 beyond when the shelter provided a physiological benefit, based on published figures
100 for ewe thermoneutral temperatures (Donnelly *et al.*, 1974). It was postulated that the
101 ewes had become accustomed to the shelter and were using it as a 'camp-area'. The
102 sheep from the unsheltered paddocks failed to make use of the shelters when given
103 the opportunity. This finding suggests that ewes should be given time to acclimatise to
104 the shelter prior to the start of lambing. In an earlier behavioural study (Alexander *et*
105 *al.*, 1979), it was observed that ewes with lambs are less likely to seek shelter if it is
106 widely dispersed compared to if it is more clustered and accessible. However, in
107 inclement weather, such behavioural differences were negated as ewes would migrate
108 towards the available shelter. Desertion of neonatal lambs is indeed an observed risk
109 factor when ewes are required to travel long distances to seek shelter (Bird *et al.*,
110 1984).

111 Twins and triplets can be a risk factor for lamb mortality (Huffman *et al.*, 1985). A
112 number of studies show that shelter is more beneficial for multiples than singles
113 (Alexander *et al.*, 1980, Pollard, 2006, Robertson *et al.* 2011). Alexander *et al.* (1980)
114 showed overall shelter increased survival by 10% in singles and 32% in multiples. More
115 recently, Pollard (2006) found that the provision of shelter reduced mortality amongst
116 both singles and twins (3-13% and 14-37% respectively) while Robertson *et al.* (2011)
117 found that there was a 10% increase in survival for twins with shelter, but no effect on
118 singles. It is worth noting that as these shelter-related reductions in mortality were only
119 observed during cold, wet and windy periods, the likelihood of poor weather is an
120 important determinant in the success of the shelter.

121 This study sought to quantify the spatial behaviour of ewes in the presence of natural
122 and artificial shelter and to investigate the climatic and biological factors that might
123 influence shelter-seeking behaviour. The trial aimed to determine whether shelter
124 provision reduced the prevalence of neonatal shepherding problems that impact
125 animal welfare, flock productivity and labour requirement in an upland, outdoor lambing
126 system where the benefits of additional shelter may be the greatest.

127

128 **Material and methods**

129 ***Study site***

130 A randomised control trial was conducted at a commercial sheep farm, Innovis Ltd., in
131 Ceredigion, Wales (52° 27' 26.298" N, 3°57' 55.195" W) during April 2019. No
132 supplementary feeding was provided to the ewes before or during the study period, as
133 the flock is managed in an extensive, low-input manner. The flock was managed no
134 different to usual during the trial, so as not to impact on sheep behaviour and also to
135 simulate commercial management practises.

136 Two adjacent fields were selected for the study site for their similarity in size (3.3 ha
137 and 3.0 ha), topography, pasture management, orientation to the prevailing wind and
138 location and size of available natural shelter. The natural shelter in the first field
139 consisted of a continuous 1.0 – 1.2 m deep ditch (approximately 182 m across) and a
140 partially interrupted band of gorse (*Ulex europaeus*) 8 -10 metres deep. This was much
141 greater quality compared to the natural shelter in the second field that had only a
142 shallow 0.1 – 0.4 m ditch and very isolated patches of gorse growth (Figures 1 and 2).
143 In the first field, three additional artificial shelters were installed to increase the
144 available shelter for the ewes, this field was designated as the *Test* field. The second
145 field served as the *Control* field, with no additional artificial shelter provided. Both fields
146 were south facing, situated between 180 and 230 m above sea level (south to north).

147

148 ***Experimental design***

149 Lambing ewes had historically been observed by the shepherds to lamb at the northern
150 margin of the fields amongst the gorse cover. Two linear artificial shelters built in an
151 elongated ‘S’ shape (Shelters 1 and 3 ; Supplementary Figure S1) and one artificial
152 shelter built in a cross shape (Shelter 2 ; Supplementary Figure S2) were built with
153 tyres approximately 8 m south of the start of the gorse cover in the *Test* field (Figures
154 1 and 2 ; Table 1). The linear artificial shelters were placed parallel to the natural shelter
155 and were perpendicular to the prevailing wind (southerly). The aim was to expand the
156 total shelter available in the *Test* field. The cross shaped shelter was included between
157 the two elongated ‘S’ shaped shelters in order to observe whether the sheep appeared
158 to display a preference between the two shelter designs. Optical porosity was
159 determined by the ratio of gaps to rubber in photos of the shelters (Loeffler et al., 1992).

160 ***Climatic and spatial parameters***

161 Each field was then divided into quadrants and ewes were recorded as either being
162 situated in the *Exposed*, *Natural Shelter*, or *Artificial Sheltered* quadrants. If the ewes
163 were observed within the 5H (3.5 m) perimeter of any of the artificial shelters, they
164 were recorded as using that specific shelter. If the ewes were observed within the area
165 of gorse cover at the top of the field, they were recorded as using the natural shelter.
166 The *Natural Shelter* quadrant was 1.0% of the total area available, the *Artificial Shelter*
167 quadrant area was 0.1% of the total area available and the *Exposed Quadrant* 98.9%.
168 To measure the exposed weather conditions, an automatic weather station (**AWS**;
169 Vantage Pro 2, Davis Instruments, USA) was set up at the northern boundary the
170 periphery between the two fields. The AWS recorded rainfall, relative humidity, air
171 temperature, wind direction and wind speed. The shelter zone for *Artificial Shelter 3*
172 was quantified by placing three 2D WindSonic anemometers (Gill Instruments,
173 Hampshire, UK) connected to a CR1000 data logger (Campbell Scientific Inc, USA) at
174 0.5H and 5H on the leeward side and 5H on the windward side of the shelter (where
175 1H distance = 1 × height of shelter). The two anemometers on the leeward side would
176 have been further sheltered by the gorse bushes in the *Natural Shelter* quadrant,
177 situated a few metres above. The aim of these measurements was to demonstrate a
178 windbreak effect in the *Sheltered* quadrants compared to the exposed weather
179 conditions measured by the AWS. Data was recorded at 30-minute intervals and
180 downloaded from the anemometers and AWS approximately every 24 hours.

181

182 ***Ewe selection and identification***

183 Twin-bearing ewes of body condition score 3.0 and above (of a 1-5 scale; Russel,
184 1984) were selected for the trial to control for litter size and nutritional status as a
185 contributory factor. Two maternal ewe lines were chosen for the study (Highlander

186 (n=66) & Aberfield (n=81)). Both breeds have been developed for their ability to lamb
187 successfully in extensive, outdoor lambing systems. The Highlander ewe is a smaller,
188 hardy ewe that is particularly suited to harsher environments, while the Aberfield is
189 bred to produce larger lambs but from a lower cost grass-based system compared to
190 other commercial hybrids (Innovis Ltd., 2021). The ewes were stratified by breed and
191 age (< 2 years, 2-5 years, and > 5 years) and then randomly allocated between the
192 two fields. In order to be able to identify individuals from a distance, the trial ewes were
193 marked on their back and sides with a unique visual identifier (**ID** ; Supplementary
194 Figure S3) that correlated to their electronic identifier number (**EID**). Lambs were
195 identified to their dam with spray paint markings shortly after birth.

196

197 ***Behavioural and biological parameters***

198 Prior to lambing, ewes displayed similar behaviour and spatial distributions that had
199 been observed during previous lambing seasons. During lambing, the flock was
200 observed for 14 continuous days where lambing occurred at a steady daily rate and
201 approximately 50% of the flock lambed down. Observations were carried out for one-
202 hour at fixed time intervals (starting at 0800 h, 1000 h, 1200 h, 1400 h and 1600 h) for
203 both the *Test* and *Control* fields. For each observation the ewe visual ID, litter size and
204 instantaneous quadrant location were recorded for all individual ewes. Mismothering
205 behaviour and lamb vigour were also recorded for ewes after they had lambed by
206 observing lamb and ewe behaviour from a distance of approximately 20 m over a 7-
207 minute period. Mismothering was categorised as the rejection of the lamb by the ewe,
208 which included abandonment of the lamb or failure to allow the lamb to suckle. Lamb
209 vigour was categorised as 'good' if the lamb was standing, suckling and keeping up
210 with the ewe, and 'poor' if the lamb was unable to stand and suckle. A record was

211 made of any human intervention that was required during the lambing period (including
212 assistance at lambing, and housing). Dead lambs were collected off the field for post-
213 mortem examination (**PME**). The location (field and quadrant), ewe visual ID and litter
214 size were all recorded. Post-mortem examination was carried out to determine the time
215 and cause of death (methodology adapted from Gascoigne *et al.*, 2017).

216

217 **Statistical analysis**

218 A Pearson's *r* correlation was used to investigate correlation between wind speed,
219 rainfall and temperature with the percentage of ewes observed in the *Exposed*
220 quadrant in the *Test* field. Wind speed and ewe location data collected at the same
221 time-points were plotted for both fields and R^2 values determined; R^2 values were
222 interpreted at >0.04 for the correlation to be deemed statistically significant and at
223 >0.25 for a strong correlation to be concluded (Ferguson, 2009).

224 'Shepherding problems' were defined as any additional human intervention an
225 individual ewe or its lamb received during the neonatal period. This was recorded for
226 every shepherding intervention for each ewe and included the presence of lamb
227 mortality, lambs of poor vigour, dystocia and/or mismothering behaviour. Ewes that did
228 not lamb during the trial period were excluded from the shepherding problem dataset
229 ($n=70$). Chi-square tests were used to assess how the proportion of shepherding
230 problems varied between fields, breeds, age categories and ewe body condition score.
231 In order to quantify ewe shelter-seeking behaviour, a preference index (**PI**) (Broster *et*
232 *al.*, 2017) was calculated for each ewe using the following equation (a value > 1
233 indicates a preference for that site):

$$234 \quad \text{PI} = \frac{\text{proportion of time spent in area of interest}}{\text{proportion of area relative to entire area available}}$$

235

236

237 This calculation corrected for the variation in quadrant size. All ewes that started the
238 trial were included in the PI data set (n=147). Following assessment of the PI
239 distribution data, Mood's median and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to assess
240 differences in behaviour between ewes before and after lambing, and between breeds
241 for each field. Subsequently, a Chi-square test was used to determine if group
242 behaviour (i.e., ewes before and after lambing and ewes belonging to each breed) was
243 significantly different from each other by comparing the actual number of ewes with a
244 PI above and below 1 to the expected number of ewes if spatial behaviour was a result
245 of random chance (i.e., would expect a half and half distribution).

246

247

248 **Results**

249 ***Climatic summary and wind break effect***

250 Total cumulative rainfall over the trial period was 27.4 mm. Mean temperature was 6.18
251 (± 2.91) °C. Minimum mean temperature was 5.96 (± 2.88) °C. Wind direction was
252 predominantly south east and east south east (62% of total measurements). The mean
253 wind speeds for each distance from Shelter 3 are shown in Table 2.

254

255 ***Ewe location and climate***

256 For the ewes in the *Test* field, wind speeds were significantly correlated ($P < 0.01$) with
257 increased shelter usage by the ewes, whereas rainfall and air temperature showed no
258 significant correlation.

259 When wind speed and ewe location data collected at the same time-points was plotted
260 for the *Test* field, a negative correlation existed between the number of ewes observed

261 in the *Exposed* quadrant and increasing wind speed ($R^2 > 0.04$). Increasing wind
262 speeds were correlated with the number of ewes seeking out *Natural Shelter*
263 ($R^2 > 0.04$), although no correlation was observed for *Artificial Shelter*. The *Control* field,
264 where the quality of shelter in the *Natural Shelter* quadrant was very limited, showed
265 no correlation between ewe location and wind speed for either the *Exposed* quadrant
266 or the *Natural Shelter* quadrant. This was as expected given the very limited shelter
267 available.

268

269 ***Shepherding problems in Control versus Test fields***

270 A Chi-square test for independence showed that field allocation was significant ($P <$
271 0.05) in influencing the prevalence of shepherding problems. More ewes in the *Control*
272 field ($n=11$) experienced shepherding problems than in the *Test* field ($n=3$).

273

274 ***Shepherding problems and ewe breed, age***

275 A Chi-square test for independence showed that breed was significant ($P < 0.05$) in
276 influencing the prevalence of shepherding problems. Highlander ewes experienced
277 fewer shepherding problems than Aberfield ewes. Age was significant ($P < 0.01$) in
278 contributing to an increased prevalence of shepherding problems in ewes over five
279 years old.

280

281 ***Lamb post-mortem examination results***

282 The cause of death for each lamb from the trial fields that received PME during the 2-
283 week trial period ($n=18$) was compared to a convenience sample of PMEs performed
284 on lambs that had died ($n=54$) from the rest of the 761-ewe flock over the month of
285 April. The flock PMEs included commercial breed lambs, terminal breed lambs and

286 singles. The actual number of lambs born, over the number of lambs expected based
287 on scanning results (if 100% scanning accuracy and 100% survival assumed) was 73%
288 for the *Control* field and 78% for the *Test* field. A Chi-square of PME outcomes between
289 the two treatments was not significant ($P > 0.05$). The actual number of lambs over the
290 expected number of lambs for the rest of the flock was 74%. The Chi-square between
291 the two trial fields and the rest of the flock was not significant. Therefore, the mortality
292 rate for the trial fields was representative of the rest of the flock. The causes of death
293 identified at PME are shown in Figure 3. Note that the category of 'Exposure' includes
294 starvation-mismothering-exposure complex (Haughey, 1991) as death from exposure
295 is often multifactorial. The causes of mortality observed in the trial field also appear
296 representative of the rest of the flock.

297

298 ***Ewe post-lambing preference index for Test versus Control fields***

299 Field allocation was not significant in influencing PI for the *Exposed* or the *Natural*
300 *Shelter* quadrant. Field allocation was therefore not a variable for ewe shelter-seeking
301 behaviour.

302

303 ***Ewe total preference index for Exposed, Natural Shelter and Artificial Shelter***

304 In the *Control* field the mean post-lambing PI for the *Natural Shelter* quadrant (3.27)
305 was 3.8 times greater than the mean post-lambing PI for the *Exposed* quadrant (0.86).
306 Likewise, in the *Test* field the post-lambing PI for the *Natural Shelter* quadrant (4.81)
307 was 5.5 times greater than the post-lambing PI for the *Exposed* quadrant (0.87). Post-
308 lambing PI for the *Artificial Shelter* (1.82) was 2.1 times greater than the mean PI for
309 the *Exposed* quadrant.

310 Figure 4 shows the post-lambing PI distributions for the *Exposed* (interquartile range
311 (IQR) 0.79-1.01) and the *Natural Shelter* (IQR 0.71-3.70) quadrants for the *Control*
312 field. As discussed, there is considerable variance in ewe PI for the *Natural Shelter*
313 quadrant. Post-lambing PI distributions for the *Exposed* (IQR 0.84-1.05), *Natural*
314 *Shelter* (IQR 0.00-6.67) and the *Artificial Shelter* (IQR 0.00-1.32) quadrants for the *Test*
315 field. Again, the impact of outliers can be observed.

316 The PI for each of the artificial shelters is shown in Figure 5. There was a clear
317 preference for *Shelter 1* (IQR 0.00-3.23), with a mean PI value of 4.2, while *Shelter 2*
318 and 3 were rarely used (mean PI of 0.9 and 0.0 respectively).

319

320 ***Ewe preference index pre-lambing versus post-lambing***

321 Ewe behaviour prior to lambing was compared by comparison of pre-lambing PI scores
322 in the *Test* and *Control* groups of ewes. A highly significant difference was observed
323 ($P < 0.001$) between *Test* and *Control* groups.

324 Ewe behaviour before and after lambing was compared within each group (*Test* and
325 *Control*) using the PI for the sheltered quadrant. In the *Control* field, there was a highly
326 significant difference between their PI score pre-lambing compared to post-lambing (P
327 < 0.001). However, in the *Test* field, there was no significant difference in PI between
328 pre- and post-lambing ($P > 0.1$).

329 Figure 6 shows the similar distribution pre-lambing (IQR 0.81-1.00) and post-lambing
330 (IQR 0.84-1.05) for the *Test* field and the significant change of behaviour pre-lambing
331 (IQR 1.01-1.04) compared to post-lambing (IQR 0.79-1.01) in the *Control* field ewes.

332

333 ***Ewe post-lambing preference index and ewe breed***

334 To investigate the influence of breed on behaviour, the PI scores for the exposed
335 quadrant were compared between breeds (Aberfield vs Highlander), within each of the
336 field environments independently. In both the *Test* and *Control* fields, there was a
337 significant difference in the preference of the Highlander for finding shelter ($P < 0.05$
338 (*Test* Field)) & ($P = 0.01$ (*Control* field)). To investigate any potential effect of the 'field'
339 group, preference was compared within each breed between *Test* and *Control* fields
340 and no significant difference observed ($P > 0.1$ Aberfield and $P > 0.1$ Highlander).
341 Figure 7 shows displays this breed difference with a significant difference between
342 Aberfield (*Test* IQR 0.92-1.05, *Control* IQR 0.93-1.01) and Highlander (*Test* IQR 0.77-
343 0.96, *Control* IQR 0.61-0.95) behaviour.

344

345 **Discussion**

346 Effective shelter can provide protection from both exposure and heat-stress, improve
347 lamb growth rates, improve pasture quality and provide drainage (McArthur, 1991).
348 The majority of the literature that examines shelter interventions originates from
349 Australasia and focuses primarily on the effect of natural shelter provision and climate
350 on lamb mortality rates (Alexander *et al.* 1980; Bird *et al.*, 1984; Gregory, 1995; Pollard,
351 2006; Broster *et al.*, 2017). This study aimed to investigate how shelter provision
352 affected the prevalence of shepherding problems including neonatal mortality,
353 dystocia, ewe mismothering behaviours and poor lamb vigour on a commercial sheep
354 farm in the UK. Every shepherding interaction observed over this trial period fell in to
355 one of these four categories and are important factors impacting on animal welfare and
356 lamb survival (Binns *et al.*, 2002, Dwyer, 2008). The cost savings and improved
357 financial sustainability of outdoor lambing systems derives from the reduction in skilled
358 labour required for handling ewes (Carson *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, by using the

359 prevalence of shepherding problems as a measure of shelter effectiveness, we are
360 considering arguably the most critical limiting factor for successful management of
361 outdoor lambing systems. This is the first study that has examined the cumulative
362 prevalence of neonatal shepherding problems as opposed to just the binary outcome
363 of mortality (Alexander *et al.*, 1980; Bird *et al.*, 1984; Broster *et al.*, 2017).

364 The *Test* field experienced significantly fewer shepherding problems than the *Control*
365 field. The size of the *Exposed* quadrant was almost identical for both fields; there may
366 not have been a sufficient difference in shelter provision between the two fields to result
367 in a highly significant difference in the prevalence of shepherding problems.

368 Both breed and age had a significant impact on the prevalence of shepherding
369 problems. Highlander ewes showed a much greater PI for the *Sheltered* quadrants,
370 which may explain the smaller prevalence of shepherding problems compared to the
371 Aberfield ewes. Age was also significant in influencing the prevalence shepherding
372 problems for ewes over 5 years (Olsen *et al.*, 1987); however, it is worth noting that
373 this age group only comprised 10% of the flock. As the ewes were allocated to *Test*
374 and *Control* fields using a stratified randomisation system that accounted for breed and
375 age, these variables are unlikely to confound the difference in the prevalence of
376 shepherding problems observed between the two fields.

377 Wind speed was significant in influencing ewe shelter-seeking behaviour in the *Test*
378 field where substantial shelter was available, which is a well-cited variable in the
379 literature (Pollard *et al.*, 1999). Rainfall and temperature were insignificant but there
380 was likely to have been insufficient variation over the trial period for these factors to
381 have had a detectable influence on ewe behaviour. It would be useful in future studies
382 to consider the impact of weather on mortality rates; this would involve organising the
383 data by birth dates.

384 There did not appear to be significant variation in ewe post-lambing PI between
385 quadrants. However, considering the very limited period of observations compared to
386 the duration of time the ewes had access to the shelter, it was unlikely that any variation
387 would be detectable. The use of PIs to quantify ewe behaviour would have provided
388 greater statistical power if it were possible to monitor ewe movement continuously
389 throughout the day (Broster *et al.*, 2017). It is likely that actual shelter usage was
390 underestimated due to the limited number of observations a day. There were also no
391 observations during the night; when there is usually an increase in shelter-seeking
392 behaviour (Lynch *et al.*, 1980). Interestingly, ewe shelter-seeking behaviour in the *Test*
393 field did not vary substantially pre- and post-lambing, however, there was a significant
394 change in behaviour in the *Control* field. This could indicate that the ewes in the *Test*
395 field were able to exhibit a behavioural preference by virtue of the provision of
396 increased shelter. If the ewes indeed have agency, then the addition of artificial shelter
397 is an effective, cheap and easy modification to result in a positive impact on ewe and
398 lamb welfare, reduce shepherding workload, with no evidence of negative
399 consequences.

400 There was significant ewe shelter-seeking behaviour pre-lambing, however this was
401 not significant post-lambing; contradicting findings from previous studies (Pollard *et al.*,
402 1999). It is possible the study was under-powered for the number of ewes that lambed
403 during the trial period. This change in ewe behaviour may also be confounded by
404 differences in mobility associated with lamb-following behaviours. During periods of
405 inclement weather, ewes tended to congregate around *Shelter 1*, irrespective of
406 whether they had a lamb at foot, leading to high stocking densities unsuitable for
407 lambing ewes, and a potential risk factor for mismothering (Alexander, 1984).

408 The results of this study demonstrate significant variation in the use of shelter between
409 and within breeds of sheep. However, due to the constraints of conducting research in
410 a commercial farm environment it was not possible to include replicates in our
411 experimental design, and thus, our findings should be used with caution until
412 reproducibility has been demonstrated in subsequent research. We believe it is
413 reasonable to assume that other ewe-level variables that were controlled in this study,
414 such as litter size, may also influence shelter-seeking behaviour during the perinatal
415 period. Group level variables may also influence shelter-seeking behaviour, such as
416 the topography, stocking density and weather conditions. These are inevitable
417 limitations of any randomised control trial study design. To understand the extent to
418 which these results can be generalised to commercial sheep farming systems, it would
419 be necessary to replicate the study in a wider range of conditions to understand these
420 complex behavioural, physiological and environmental interactions.

421

422 **Conclusion**

423 The provision of shelter resulted in a significant reduction of shepherding problems in
424 both Aberfield and Highlander breeds. The Highlander breed demonstrated a greater
425 preference for shelter than Aberfield ewes. Even in fairly stable weather conditions,
426 when ewes are given free choice to access shelter, increased shelter utilisation can
427 result in improved welfare, improved lamb survival and a reduction shepherding costs
428 and workload. These benefits may be substantially greater in severe weather
429 conditions. Further research conducted in a multi-farm, multi-year environment with
430 replicate groups within farm would improve the robustness of our findings and is
431 required to fully understand how to optimise shelter design to maximise the benefits
432 for the sheep and the shepherd.

433 **Ethics approval**

434 Not applicable.

435

436 **Data and model availability statement**

437 None of the data were deposited in an official repository. The data that support the
438 study findings are available upon request.

439

440 **Author ORCHIDs**

441 A. P. Williams 0000-0001-6477-7407

442 P. Davies 0000-0001-6085-9763

443 A. R. Smith 0000-0001-8580-278X

444

445 **Author contributions**

446 CP conducted field work, statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript. AS, AW, PD
447 and DJ conceived the project, assisted in design, sampling and analysis. CP, AS, AW
448 and PD contributed to writing the manuscript.

449

450 **Declaration of interest**

451 None.

452

453 **Acknowledgements**

454 This study was conducted as part of an MScRes by Research at Bangor University:
455 Pritchard, C., 2020. Impact of shelter on sheep behaviour during the neonatal period.
456 MScRes thesis, Bangor University, Bangor, UK that was funded by a Knowledge
457 Economy Skills Scholarship (KESS 2) in collaboration with Innovis Ltd. KESS 2 is a

458 pan-Wales higher level skills initiative led by Bangor University on behalf of the Higher
459 Education sector in Wales. It is part-funded by the Welsh Government's European
460 Social Fund convergence programme for West Wales and the Valleys. The authors
461 would personally like to thank the shepherding staff at the study farm for enabling this
462 trial to be conducted on their breeding flock; without their collaboration this project
463 would not have been possible.

464

465 **Financial support statement**

466 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-
467 for-profit section.

468 **References**

469 Alexander, G., 1984. Problems of mismothering and misidentification especially
470 of multiple births. *Wool Technology and Sheep Breeding* 32, 121-124.

471

472 Alexander, G., Lynch, J., Mottershead, B., 1979. Use of shelter and selection of
473 lambing sites by shorn and unshorn ewes in paddocks with closely or widely spaced
474 shelters. *Applied Animal Ethology* 5, 51-69.

475

476 Alexander, G., Lynch, J., Mottershead, B., Donnelly, J., 1980. Reduction in lamb
477 mortality by means of grass wind-breaks - results of a five-year study. *Proceedings of*
478 *the Australian Society of Animal Production* 13, 329-332.

479

480 Binns, S., Cox, I., Rizvi, S. and Green, L., 2002. Risk factors for lamb mortality on UK
481 sheep farms. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 52, 287-303.

482

483 Bird, P., Lynch, J., Obst, J., 1984. Effect of shelter on plant and animal production.
484 *Proceedings of the Australian Society of Animal Production* 15, 270-273.

485

486 Broster, J., Dehaan, R., Swain, D., Friend, M., 2010. Ewe and lamb contact at lambing
487 is influenced by both shelter type and birth number. *Animal* 4, 796-803.

488

489 Broster, J., Rathbone, D., Robertson, S., King, B., Friend, M., 2012. Ewe movement
490 and ewe-lamb contact levels in shelter are greater at higher stocking rates. *Animal*
491 *Production Science* 52, 502-506.

492

493 Broster, J., Dehaan, R., Swain, D., Robertson, S., King, B., Friend, M., 2017. Shelter
494 type and birth number influence the birth and death sites of lambs and ewe movement
495 around lambing time. *Journal of Animal Science* 95, 81-90.

496

497 Carson, A., Dawson, L., Irwin, D., Kilpatrick, D., 2004. The effect of management
498 system at lambing and flock genetics on lamb output and labour requirements on
499 lowland sheep farms. *Journal of Animal Science* 78, 439-450.

500

501 Donnelly, J., 1984. The productivity of breeding ewes grazing on lucerne or grass and
502 clover pastures on the tablelands of southern Australia. III. Lamb mortality and weaning
503 percentage. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research* 35, 709-721.

504

505 Donnelly, J., Lynch, J., Webster, M., 1974. Climatic adaptation in recently shorn Merino
506 sheep. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 18, 233-247.

507

508 Dwyer, C., 2008. The welfare of the neonatal lamb. *Small Ruminant Research* 76, 31-
509 41.

510

511 Ferguson, C., 2009. An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and
512 researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 40, 532-538.

513

514 Gascoigne, E., Bazeley, K., Lovatt, F., 2017. Can farmers reliably perform neonatal
515 lamb post mortems and what are the perceived obstacles to influencing lamb
516 mortality? *Small Ruminant Research* 151, 36-44.

517

518 Google Maps, 2021. Satellite map of field site. Retrieved on 15 March 2021 from
519 <https://www.google.com/maps/@52.4570208,-3.9656357,372m/data=!3m1!1e3>
520

521 Gregory, N., 1995. The role of shelterbelts in protecting livestock: A review. New
522 Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research 38, 423-450.
523

524 Haughey, K., 1991. Perinatal lamb mortality - its investigation, causes and
525 control. Journal of the South African Veterinary Association 62, 78-91.
526

527 Huffman, E., Kirk, J., Pappaioanou, M., 1985. Factors associated with neonatal lamb
528 mortality. Theriogenology 24,163-171.
529

530 Innovis Ltd., 2021. Innovis breeding sheep. Retrieved on 12 January 2021 from
531 <https://www.innovis.org.uk/breeding-sheep/>
532

533 Kleemann, D., Grosser, T., Walker, S., 2006. Fertility in South Australian commercial
534 Merino flocks: aspects of management. Theriogenology 65, 1649-1665.
535

536 Loeffler, A., Gordon, A. and Gillespie, T., 1992. Optical porosity and windspeed
537 reduction by coniferous windbreaks in Southern Ontario. Agroforestry Systems 17,
538 119-133.
539

540 Lynch, J., Mottershead, B., Alexander, G., 1980. Sheltering behaviour and lamb
541 mortality amongst shorn Merino ewes lambing in paddocks with a restricted area of
542 shelter or no shelter. Applied Animal Ethology 6, 163-174.

543

544

545 McArthur, A., 1991. Forestry and shelter for livestock. *Forest Ecology and*
546 *Management* 45, 93-107.

547

548 Mellor, D., Stafford, K., 2004. Animal welfare implications of neonatal mortality and
549 morbidity in farm animals. *The Veterinary Journal* 168, 118-133.

550

551 Obst, J., Ellis, J., 1977. Weather, ewe behaviour and lamb mortality. *Agricultural*
552 *Record* 4, 44-49.

553

554 Olsen, D., Parker, C., LeaMaster, B., Dixon, J., 1987. Responses of pregnant ewes
555 and young lambs to cold exposure. *Canadian Veterinary Journal* 28,181-186.

556

557 Pollard, J., 2006. Shelter for lambing sheep in New Zealand: A review. *New Zealand*
558 *Journal of Agricultural Research* 49, 395-404.

559

560 Pollard, J., Shaw, K., Littlejohn, R., 1999. A note on sheltering behaviour by ewes
561 before and after lambing. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 61, 313-318.

562

563 Robertson, S., Friend, M., Broster, J., King, B., 2011. Survival of twin lambs is
564 increased with shrub belts. *Animal Production Science* 51, 925.

565

566 Robertson, S., King, B., Broster, J., Friend, M., 2012. The survival of lambs in shelter
567 declines at high stocking intensities. *Animal Production Science* 52, 497-501.

568

569 Russel, A., 1984. Body condition scoring of sheep. In Practice 6, 91-93.

570

571 Wang, H., Takle, E., 1996. On shelter efficiency of shelterbelts in oblique

572 wind. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 81, 95-117.

573 **Tables**

574 **Table 1** Description of artificial shelters, shape, physical dimensions, and optical
 575 porosity used to evaluate the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep.

Name	Shape	Height (m)	Length (m)	Breadth (m)	Optical Porosity (%)
Shelter 1	Elongated S	0.7	16.5	5.5	0.05
Shelter 2	Cross	0.7	8.0	7.5	0.05
Shelter 3	Elongated S	0.7	26.5	8.5	0.05

576

577

578 **Table 2** Mean and maximum wind speed measurements taken at fixed distances
 579 from Shelter 3 used to evaluate the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep during study
 580 period.

	Position of anemometer			
	Exposed	Distance from shelter		
		0.5H North ²	5H North	5H South
Wind speed ¹				
Mean (m/s)	3.73 (2.30) ^a	1.62 (1.07)	2.19 (0.88)	2.41 (0.98)
Maximum (m/s)	6.85 (3.35)	3.57 (1.69)	4.30 (1.60)	4.56 (1.74)

581

582 ¹ Mean of half-hourly mean and maximum wind speed readings over the 14 day trial period

583 ² Where H = height of shelter

584 ^a ± SD included in brackets

585

586

587 **Figure captions**

588

589 **Figure 1** Schematic diagram of quadrants for *Test* and *Control* trial fields used to
590 evaluate the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep.

591

592 **Figure 2** Satellite map of *Test* field with artificial shelters and *Control* field used to
593 evaluate the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep (Google Maps, 2021).

594

595 **Figure 3** Cause of lamb death identified on post-mortem examination for trial and
596 flock lambs during an evaluation of the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep (all lambs
597 were sourced from the same company farm).

598

599 **Figure 4** Ewe post-lambing Preference Index (PI) score for the *Exposed* and *Natural*
600 *Shelter* quadrants in the *Control* and *Test* field during an evaluation of the shelter
601 seeking behaviour of sheep (boxplot with median bar, quartiles and standard error).

602

603 **Figure 5** Ewe post-lambing Preference Index (PI) score for the *Artificial Shelter*
604 *quadrant* during an evaluation of the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep (boxplot with
605 median bar, quartiles and standard error).

606

607 **Figure 6** Ewe Preference Index (PI) score for the *Exposed* quadrant pre- and post-
608 lambing during an evaluation of the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep (boxplot with
609 median bar, quartiles and standard error).

610

611 **Figure 7** Breed and ewe post-lambing Preference Index (PI) score for the *Exposed*
612 quadrant during an evaluation of the shelter seeking behaviour of sheep (boxplot with
613 median bar, quartiles and standard error).