

# Impact of dairy calf management practices on the intestinal tract microbiome preweaning.

This is the accepted version of the article, which has now been formally published in final form at the Journal of Medical Microbiology at <https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.001957>.

## 1.1 Author names

*Aisling Carroll<sup>1</sup>, Matt J. Bell<sup>1</sup>, Emma C.L Bleach<sup>2</sup>, Dann Turner<sup>3</sup>, Lisa K. Williams<sup>1</sup>*

## 1.2 Affiliation(s)

<sup>1</sup> Animal and Agriculture Department, Hartpury University, Gloucester, GL19 3BE, UK

<sup>2</sup> Animal Science Research Centre, Harper Adams University, Edgmond, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8NB, UK

<sup>3</sup> University of the West of England, Bristol, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QY, UK

## 1.3 Corresponding author and email address

Aisling Carroll, [aisling.carroll2@hartpury.ac.uk](mailto:aisling.carroll2@hartpury.ac.uk)

## 1.4 Keywords

Dairy calves; microbiome; microbiota; health; husbandry

## 2. Abstract

**Background:** Microbiota in the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) consisting of the rumen and hindgut (the small intestine, cecum, and colon) in dairy calves, plays a vital role in their growth and development. This review discusses the development of dairy calf intestinal microbiomes with an emphasis on the impact that husbandry and rearing management have on microbiome development, health and growth of pre-weaned dairy calves.

**Discussion:** The diversity and composition of the microbes that colonise the lower GIT (small and large intestine) can have a significant impact on growth and development of the calf, through influence on nutrient metabolism, immune modulation, resistance or susceptibility to infection, production outputs and behaviour modification in adult life. The colonisation of the calf intestinal microbiome dynamically changes from birth, increasing in microbial richness and diversity until weaning, where further dynamic and drastic microbiome change occurs. In dairy calves, neonatal microbiome development

34 prior to weaning is influenced by direct and indirect factors, some of which could be considered  
35 stressors, such as maternal interaction, environment, diet, husbandry, and weaning practices. The  
36 specific impact of these can dictate intestinal microbial colonisation, with potential lifelong  
37 consequences.

38 **Conclusion:** Evidence suggests the potential detrimental effect that sudden changes and stress may  
39 have on calf health and growth due to management and husbandry practices, and the importance of  
40 establishing a stable yet diverse intestinal microbiome population at an early age is essential for calf  
41 success. The possibility of improving the health of calves through intestinal microbiome modulation  
42 and using alternative strategies including probiotic use, faecal microbiota transplantation, and novel  
43 approaches of microbiome tracking should be considered to support animal health and sustainability  
44 of dairy production systems.

45

### 46 3. Data summary

47 Not applicable.

48

### 49 4. Introduction

50 Microbiota in the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) consisting of the rumen and hindgut (the small intestine,  
51 cecum, and colon) in calves, plays a vital role in the growth and development, GIT function and  
52 fermentation, immunocompetence and behaviour of the calf (Dias *et al.*, 2018; Amin & Seifert, 2021;  
53 Du *et al.*, 2023). Microbial establishment in the GIT of a newborn calf is influenced by exposure to  
54 microorganisms from the mother, environment, milk and other feeds, and conspecific interactions  
55 (Orihuela & Galina, 2019). The diversity and composition of the bacteria that colonise the rumen and  
56 the small and large intestine influence nutrient metabolism, pathogenic defence, immune modulation,  
57 resistance or susceptibility to infection, production outputs and behaviour in adult life (Diao, Zhang &  
58 Fu, 2019). During the period before weaning, neonatal calves have a developing rumen, and milk  
59 passes through a primarily monogastric digestive system. Hindgut microbial fermentation produces  
60 numerous compounds (e.g. B vitamins and amino acids) that may help support neonatal growth,  
61 development and immunity (Elolimy *et al.*, 2020).

62 The nutritional, metabolic, developmental and environmental changes that a dairy calf faces during  
63 the eight to ten weeks prior to weaning can lead to disruption or change within the GIT (Meale *et al.*,  
64 2017; Mir *et al.*, 2019). Dairy calves during this period undergo husbandry challenges such as changes  
65 in surroundings and groupings (Neave, Weary & Von Keyserlingk, 2018), changes in diet (De La Cruz-  
66 Cruz *et al.*, 2019), and stress events (De Paula Vieira, de Passillé & Weary, 2012; Cantor, Neave & Costa,  
67 2019), such as disbudding (Mir *et al.*, 2019) and weaning (Neamt *et al.*, 2019). Any disruption to the  
68 growth and population of the GIT microbiome can have drastic and permanent effects on calf  
69 development due to reduced weight gain (Costa, 2015), diarrhoea (Xie *et al.*, 2013), contraction of  
70 infection or disease (Gaeta *et al.*, 2017), and potential for mortality (Diao, Zhang & Fu, 2019).

71 Studies of the development of the GIT microbial community to improve cattle health, welfare and  
72 production efficiency have been ongoing for many decades (Celi *et al.*, 2017). High throughput  
73 sequencing technologies allow examination of the structure and function of the bovine GIT microbiota

74 (McCann, Wickersham & Looor, 2014). Factors such as breed, sex, diet and heritable components have  
75 been linked to the composition of the GIT microbiome (Li *et al.*, 2019a; Li *et al.*, 2019b). The mature  
76 GIT microbiome has a great variety of microorganisms, dominated by the phyla Firmicutes and  
77 Bacteroidetes (Fernando *et al.*, 2010; McCann *et al.*, 2016), that display redundancy among niches and  
78 contribute to community resilience (Myer *et al.*, 2017). Consequently, reconstruction of the mature  
79 GIT microbiome is difficult and mature animals primarily act as a donor source for microbial  
80 transplantation in young ruminants (Li, Shi & Na, 2023). This has led to a focus on early life microbiome  
81 development, due to its susceptibility to change at this stage and as a potential target for microbiome  
82 manipulation, that could persist over the productive life of the animal (Yáñez-Ruíz, Abecia & Newbold,  
83 2015). However, the dynamic nature of the GIT microbiome in neonatal calves is not fully understood  
84 (Kim *et al.*, 2021a). Research in this area has largely focused on investigating sources of inoculation or  
85 influence, such as the maternal microbiome (Barden *et al.*, 2020), diet (Dill-McFarland *et al.*, 2019) and  
86 the environment (Zhu *et al.*, 2021). Less is known about how establishment of the bovine GIT  
87 microbiome during early-life may be influenced by wider husbandry practices. An improved  
88 understanding of the temporal dynamics of the GIT microbiome throughout life may facilitate  
89 opportunities to enhance animal health, welfare, growth and development from neonate to maturity.

90 This review focuses on the development of dairy calf intestinal tract microbiomes and the impact that  
91 husbandry and rearing management have on microbiome development, health and performance of  
92 pre-weaning dairy calves.

## 93 **5. Calf Microbiome – Early life colonisation**

94 During the pre-weaning period, calves are considered pre-ruminant or monogastric while their rumen  
95 is developing, dynamic changes in intestinal microbiota occur during this time (Song *et al.*, 2019).  
96 Commensal microbial colonisation of the intestinal tract occurs during and after birth, influenced by  
97 the maternal microbiota, diet, environment, management practices and antibiotic treatment (Fanaro  
98 *et al.*, 2003; Penders *et al.*, 2006; Adlerberth and Wold, 2009). Colonisation is a two-way interaction  
99 between microorganisms and the host (Van den Abbeele *et al.*, 2011). Commensal microorganisms  
100 support intestinal pH, food retention time and immune defence mechanisms (Hold & Hansen, 2019;  
101 Michaudel & Sokol, 2020), while the host supports microbial adhesion, nutrient absorption and can  
102 provide protection to the microbiota via intestinal mucus secretions and antimicrobial peptides  
103 through the immune response (Júnior & Bittar, 2021; Welch *et al.*, 2022). Although initial microbial  
104 communities are facultative anaerobic or aerobic, the intestinal environment transitions to support a  
105 rapid establishment of obligate anaerobes (such as Firmicutes, *Bifidobacterium* and *Bacteroides*) which  
106 play a vital role in host health (Conroy, Shi & Walker, 2009; Jost *et al.*, 2012; Figure 1). Recent findings  
107 identified a foetal GIT microbiome during gestation containing Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes,  
108 Firmicutes and Proteobacteria as the predominate phyla present in meconium during months five to  
109 seven of gestation (Guzman *et al.*, 2020; Table 1). This has dispelled the previous thinking of a sterile  
110 foetus until parturition (Adnane & Chapwanya, 2022). Prior to weaning, Firmicutes are reported to be  
111 the predominant phylum in faecal samples of dairy calves, including families such as *Ruminococcaceae*  
112 and *Lachnospiraceae* (Foditsch *et al.*, 2015; Liu *et al.*, 2019), followed by the phylum Bacteroidetes,  
113 primarily dominated by the family *Prevotellaceae* (Klein-Jöbstl *et al.*, 2014; Liu *et al.*, 2019). Despite  
114 observations of highly individualised microbial communities of the developing calf microbiome, the  
115 pooling of samples has allowed an estimation of community-level microbiome diversity (Ray *et al.*,  
116 2019).

117 During gestation (between five to seven months into foetal development), the abundance of microbial  
118 species across foetal tissues within the rumen and caecum change. Guzman *et al.* (2020) observed  
119 over 500 bacterial species within the calf foetal GIT compartments. The differences observed across  
120 the rumen and caecum indicate location-specific microbial colonisation likely to occur before the fifth  
121 month of gestation. Caecal tissues were dominated by the phylum Actinobacteria, and caecal fluid was  
122 dominated by Firmicutes (order *Lactobacillales*) and Proteobacteria (order *Enterobacteriales* and  
123 *Pseudomonadales*). Although the foetal GIT microbiome shares several bacterial species from the  
124 genera *Lactobacillus*, *Escherichia*, *Shigella* and *Streptococcus* with the mother, the inoculation source  
125 remains unclear. Guzman *et al.* (2020) speculate that bacterial communities might be introduced to  
126 the foetus via translocation from the mothers GIT epithelium.

127 Upon birth, the sections of the intestinal tract can have varying microbiome compositions due to the  
128 specific interactions that take place across them. Phylum and genus level differences have been  
129 reported across the dominant bacteria of the small and large intestine within the calf GIT and the  
130 faecal microbiome (Dias *et al.*, 2018; Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2019). Analysis of commensal microbial  
131 community composition identified the initial establishment of aerobic and facultative anaerobic  
132 bacteria such as *Bifidobacteria* and *Lactobacillus* across the sections of the intestinal tract, which  
133 provide an appropriate anaerobic environment for the gradual colonisation of Actinobacteria,  
134 Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes and Proteobacteria, via the removal of oxygen (Sprockett, Fukami & Relman,  
135 2018). The small intestine (duodenum, jejunum, ileum) and large intestine (cecum, colon, rectum,  
136 anus) have a high relative abundance of Firmicutes at 80% and 81%, respectively. Actinobacteria,  
137 Proteobacteria and Bacteroidetes are also found throughout the small and large intestine in varying  
138 relative abundances from 6 to 13%, 5 to 22% and 1 to 33%, respectively (Myer *et al.*, 2017; Yeoman *et al.*,  
139 2018). In the first week of life, the small intestine of the calf consists of 1 to 4% *Bifidobacterium*, 7  
140 to 11% *Prevotella*, 9 to 27% *Bacteroides* and 17-24% *Lactobacillus* (Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2019). As the  
141 calf ages, these genera decrease in relative abundance, potentially due to increasing diversity across  
142 the intestinal tract (Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2019).

143 *Bifidobacterium* were found to be in higher abundance (60%) in the large intestine of 1-week old  
144 calves. By six weeks of age, *Bifidobacterium* abundance in the large intestine decreases to  
145 approximately 11%. *Bacteroides* maintain a relatively low abundance (4 to 9%) in the large intestine  
146 compared to the small intestine (Song *et al.*, 2018). *Lactobacillus* was found to be a prominent genus  
147 in the large intestine at between 20 to 22%. This genus decreases in relative abundance as the calf  
148 consumes concentrate feed and forage in its diet (Song *et al.*, 2018).

149 The faecal microbiome is the most studied intestinal microbial composition due to the accessibility of  
150 samples. The faecal microbiome can represent microbial activity across the GIT. Studies have shown  
151 they most closely represent the bacterial composition within the large intestine and specifically the  
152 colon (Malmuthuge, Griebel & Guan, 2014). Like the microbial composition of the large intestine of 1-  
153 week old calves, *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus* were found to be more abundant in faeces  
154 compared to other species observed in the first week after birth. These species decreased to weaning  
155 age (Uyeno, Sekiguchi & Kamagata, 2010). *Bacteroides* (16%), *Prevotella* (22%) and *Faecalibacterium*  
156 (10%) increased in relative abundance between weeks one and three of life, before declining in  
157 abundance with increasing age (Malmuthuge, Griebel & Guan, 2014; Amin *et al.*, 2023). As the calf  
158 grows and consumes more forage and concentrate feeds (between weeks five to 12), the faecal  
159 microbiota present is comprised of higher relative abundances of *Bacteroidales*, *Clostridia* and  
160 *Ruminococcaceae* (Figure 1; Uyeno, Sekiguchi & Kamagata, 2010; Amin *et al.*, 2023).

161 Understanding the relative abundance of the microbiota during the pre-weaning period provides  
162 insight into how the microbiome develops while interacting with a range of environmental factors  
163 (diet, environment, conspecifics). The relative abundance of specific species during this time have been  
164 identified as indicators of the health or diarrheic status of the calf. Slanzon *et al.* (2022) identified  
165 *Eggerthella*, *Bifidobacterium*, and *Collinsella* as species associated with calves that did not experience  
166 enteric disease. The presence of *E. coli* species in neonatal calves (up to three weeks of age) had the  
167 highest association with enteric disease prediction (Slanzon *et al.*, 2022). Therefore, understanding  
168 early intestinal colonisation and the factors that influence microbiome establishment could provide  
169 opportunities to design specific interventions to manage calf gut health.

170

171 Figure 1: The progression of commensal intestinal microbiome bacterial orders from foetus to  
172 weaning. Figure constructed from previous studies (Kišac *et al.*, 2011; Meale *et al.*, 2017; Liu *et al.*,  
173 2019; Guzman *et al.*, 2020). Created with BioRender.com.

174

## 175 **5.1 The importance of early microbiota colonisation**

176 Early-life microbial colonisation plays an important role in neonatal growth, development and  
177 immunity (Elolimy *et al.*, 2020). The development and differentiation of the intestine, immune system,  
178 and further regulation of enteric innate and adaptive immune processes are supported by the  
179 establishment of microbiota (Liang *et al.*, 2014; Liang *et al.*, 2016). Through the establishment of a  
180 stable microbiome, the community structures act as a biological barrier that inhibits pathogenic  
181 bacteria from colonising and contributes to maintaining calf health (Taschuk & Griebel *et al.*, 2012;  
182 Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2019).

183 The role and importance of intestinal microbial colonisation has been assessed across a variety of  
184 germ-free (GF) animal models, including mice, rats, guinea pigs, dogs, pigs, sheep, goats, and chickens  
185 (Al-Asmakh & Zadjali, 2015). Aspects such as cell proliferation and intestinal mucosal layers were  
186 observed to be of poorer functionality in GF mice compared to conventional mice (Nowacki *et al.*,  
187 1993; Petersson *et al.*, 2011). Gnotobiotic mice inoculated with whole mice microbiota resulted in an  
188 increase in T helper cell responses, with *Clostridia*-related species possibly influencing the maturation  
189 of T cell responses (Gaboriau-Routhiau *et al.*, 2009). Similarly, the presence of Bacteroidetes have been  
190 shown to support the activation of regulatory T cells (Luu, Steinhoff & Visekruna, 2017). These T cells  
191 enhance epithelial repair, promote tolerance to commensal microorganisms and regulate intestinal  
192 immune processes in response to bacterial or self-antigens (Webb *et al.*, 2016; Lyons *et al.*, 2020).  
193 Moreover, the development of gut-associated lymphoid tissues including Peyer's patches and  
194 mesenteric lymph nodes, have been seen to be stimulated by postnatal microbial colonisation (Renz,  
195 Brandtzæg & Hornef, 2012). Increasingly, the intestinal microbiota is recognised to play an important  
196 role in maintaining intestinal function and immune defence (Li, Shi & Na, 2023).

197 Intestinal bacteria are also responsible for supporting feed utilisation and efficiency in the calf,  
198 supporting the transition from liquid products (such as milk or colostrum) to solid feed (such as calf  
199 concentrate pellets) (Elolimy *et al.*, 2020), determining the ability of the animal to utilise energy from  
200 the diet (Turnbaugh and Gordon, 2009; Yeoman and White, 2014). Increases in the relative abundance  
201 of Bacteroidetes in the small intestine produce the enzyme glycoside hydrolase which is needed for  
202 the degradation of glycan (Patrascu *et al.*, 2017; Lyons *et al.*, 2020). This enzyme is necessary to support

203 the weaning process when the calf is transitioning from milk to solid feed and forage. A recent study  
204 examined feed efficiency and its correlation to different sections of the GIT microbiome (the rumen,  
205 caecum, and faeces) in cattle. In caecal and faecal samples, several species including *Ruminococcaceae*  
206 ( $r = -0.674$  and  $r = -0.725$  respectively) and *Mogibacteriaceae* ( $r = -0.647$  and  $r = -0.494$  respectively)  
207 were negatively correlated with feed efficiency. Whereas *Succinivibrionaceae* in the caecum and  
208 *Bifidobacteriaceae* in faeces were positively correlated with feed efficiency ( $r = 0.445$  and  $r = 0.478$   
209 respectively; Welch *et al.*, 2020). Previous studies primarily focused on rumen fermentation as the  
210 centre of microbial feed digestion processes (Dias *et al.*, 2018; Hao *et al.*, 2021). However, Welch *et al.*  
211 (2020) provided evidence that in addition to the ruminal microbiome, the hindgut microbial  
212 populations have a significant impact on feed efficiency and thus are an essential component to growth  
213 and health, particularly in the pre-ruminant calf.

214

## 215 **6. Factors influencing colonisation**

216 A wide range of factors influence intestinal microbial colonisation and the stability of those  
217 communities throughout the pre-weaning period. These include direct influences such as maternal  
218 microbiomes, colostrum or milk/milk-replacer feeding, weaning, and the housed environment (Breen  
219 *et al.*, 2023); while indirect influences include aspects such as disbudding and weaning readiness,  
220 where husbandry practices that elicit a possible stress response may cause adverse consequences to  
221 intestinal microbial community establishment and/or stability (Mir *et al.*, 2019).

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232 Table 1: Microorganism sources associated with management events during the pre-weaning period.

Event	Source of microorganisms	Direct/Indirect Source	Microorganisms from or influenced by source	Impact on calf microbiome development	Reference
Birth	Gestation - Communities suggested to be sourced from maternal placenta epithelium.	Direct	Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes, Proteobacteria.	Bacterial communities in GIT foetal samples at five, six & seven months of gestation.	Guzman <i>et al.</i> , 2020
	Vaginal		Proteobacteria, Firmicutes, Fusobacteria, Tenericutes.	Maternal faecal, oral & vaginal, microbiomes were significant predictors of calf faecal microbiome. Dam faecal & oral microbiomes have the largest correlation to the calf faecal microbiome.	Owens <i>et al.</i> , 2021
	Faecal		Fusobacteria, Firmicutes.		
	Oral		Proteobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes.		
	Maternal Heat Stress	Indirect	Firmicutes, Proteobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Epsilonbacteraeota, Actinobacteria, Fusobacteria	Maternal heat stress alters intestinal microbiome $\beta$ -diversity & composition in sows & their piglets.	He <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Prewaning diet	Colostrum	Direct	<i>Lactobacilli</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , reduced presence of Coliforms and <i>Enterococci</i> .	Better quality colostrum (>1.070 g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) promotes the intestinal microbiome development & daily liveweight gain.	Puppel <i>et al.</i> , 2020
	Milk replacer		<i>Ruminococcaceae</i> , <i>Lachnospiraceae</i> ,	Higher milk replacer intakes in calves increased faecal bacterial diversity. Increased abundances of beneficial	Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2021b

			<i>Bacteroides</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , <i>Faecalibacterium</i> , Peptococcus, Blautia	bacteria such as <i>Faecalibacterium</i> , were observed, which may contribute to development & growth.	
Housing	Conventional/Single pen	Direct & Indirect	<i>Enterococcaceae</i> , <i>Lactobacillus</i>	<i>Enterococcaceae</i> & <i>Lactobacillus</i> was more abundant in the faecal samples of conventionally housed pigs.	Wen <i>et al.</i> , 2021
	Enriched		<i>Prevotella</i> , Christensenellaceae, Ruminococcus gauvreauii, Ruminiclostridium, Phascolarctobacterium, Peptostreptococcaceae	<i>Enterococcus</i> decreased & relative abundance of a variety of faecal bacteria increased in enriched housed pigs - these bacteria are known to support degradation of plant materials, the production of short-chain fatty acids. Suggesting enriched housing accelerated the maturation of early-life faecal microbiota composition.	Wen <i>et al.</i> , 2021
Disbudding	Body Weight - Light	Indirect	Higher abundance in lightweight calves: <i>Verrucomicrobiacea</i> , <i>Erysipelotrichaceae</i>	Lightweight calves had higher relative abundance of families like <i>Erysipelotrichaceae</i> & <i>Verrucomicrobiaceae</i> at Day 3 after disbudding. Procedure was conducted at 10 weeks of age when the faecal microbiome is still maturing & therefore could mask the effects/impact of the process.	Mir <i>et al.</i> , 2019
	Body Weight - Heavy		Higher abundance in heavy-weight calves: <i>Elusimicrobiaceae</i> , <i>Turicibacteraceae</i>	Heavy-weight calves had higher relative abundance of <i>Elusimicrobiaceae</i> and <i>Turibacteriaceae</i> , at Day 3 after disbudding. Procedure was conducted when faecal microbiome is still maturing & therefore could mask the effects/impact of the process.	Mir <i>et al.</i> , 2019



Weaning	Calf Starter	Direct	<i>Prevotella, Succinivibrio, Anaerovibrio Sharpea, Acidaminococcus, Megasphaera, Mitsuoakella, Lactobacillus</i>	Inclusion of concentrate decreased Shannon, Simpson & Fisher's alpha diversity index in faecal samples. Promoting the abundance of possible starch degraders & reduced the presence of key species associated with fibre degradation.	Hartinger <i>et al.</i> , 2022
	Forage		<i>Ruminococcaceae Akkermansia, Lachnoclostridium</i>	No significant effect in faecal microbial diversity was found regarding hay quality (medium or high quality). Fewer changes in bacterial abundances in response to forage were observed at genus level.	Hartinger <i>et al.</i> , 2022
	Weaning readiness	Indirect	<i>Bacteroides, ParaBacteroides, Blautia</i>	Weaning at 17 weeks of age had a higher growth rate due to late weaning & a quick adaptability of the faecal microbiota to dietary changes during day 112. This suggests an age-dependent maturation of the intestinal microbiome supporting liquid to solid diet transition.	Amin <i>et al.</i> , 2023

## 234 6.1 Birth and Maternal Influence

235 Studies have identified that the microbiota within meconium at birth are representative of faecal  
236 community structures at 24 hours after birth, although changes are observed with increased microbial  
237 diversity and relative abundance in this time period (Alipour *et al.*, 2018; Klein-Jöbstl *et al.*, 2019;  
238 Wilczyńska, Skarżyńska & Lisowska-Myjak, 2019; Guzman *et al.*, 2020). The sources influencing this  
239 development dictate initial microbiome functions in early life (Dias *et al.*, 2018). Owens *et al.* (2021)  
240 found the maternal microbiota within samples from oral, placental, vaginal, faecal and colostrum  
241 sources to be significant predictors of the calf faecal microbiome during pre-weaning (Table 1).  
242 Interestingly, most of the abundant genera within meconium (*Ruminococcaceae*, *Acinetobacter*, *5-*  
243 *7N15*) were closely related to genera within dam placental and faecal samples (Owen *et al.*, 2021). In  
244 addition to direct influences from maternal sources, maternal stress during gestation and birth has a  
245 direct effect on the calf (Kovács *et al.*, 2021). Cortisol, a glucocorticoid hormone, increases within the  
246 dam and calf leading up to parturition in preparation for birth. The production of glucocorticoids  
247 supports gestational and neonatal functions in the calf (Fischer *et al.*, 2014; Arfuso *et al.*, 2023).  
248 Intestinal health and function are directly influenced by glucocorticoids due to their role in stimulating  
249 tight junction formation and mucosal production (Fishman *et al.*, 2014; Tena-Garitaonandia *et al.*,  
250 2022). In addition, glucocorticoids influence intestinal maturation via receptor activation that regulates  
251 gene transcription controlling intestinal development (maturation of intestinal epithelium), supporting  
252 the production of enzymes such as peptidase (Nanthakumar, Meng & Newbury, 2013), and supporting  
253 the immune response (Lu *et al.*, 2006; Ahmed, Schmidt & Brunner, 2019). Difficult births have been  
254 shown to result in a significant increase in the levels of glucocorticoids, specifically cortisol, in the  
255 newborn calf up to 48 hours after birth compared to normal births (Kovács *et al.*, 2021; Arfuso *et al.*,  
256 2023). Kovács *et al.* (2021) suggest that high cortisol concentrations at birth could increase  
257 susceptibility to bacterial infection in calves. In other species, such as humans, stress exposure in  
258 preterm infants has been observed to significantly affect the presence and relative abundance of  
259 *Proteus* and *Veillonella* in the intestinal tract, with higher stress exposure increasing abundance of both  
260 families (D'Agata *et al.*, 2019).

261 The gestational environment can influence the success of the newborn calf in its development and  
262 growth, affecting intestinal maturation (Abuelo, 2020). Human research has examined the impact  
263 maternal stress, anxiety and depression has on the faecal microbiome in infants (Galley *et al.*, 2023).  
264 Infants of mothers who reported higher anxiety and stress had a reduced alpha diversity and  
265 reductions in beneficial bacteria essential for health and intestinal modulation (such as  
266 *Bifidobacterium*, *Lactobacillus* and *Streptococcus*) in the faecal microbiome (Galley *et al.*, 2023). Within  
267 cattle, heat stress has been the primary focus of maternal physiological stress on new-born  
268 development. Dado-Senn *et al.* (2020), examined the long-term effects of late gestation prenatal heat  
269 stress on growth and productivity in the dairy calf. Prenatal cooling was found to increase birth weight  
270 and average daily liveweight gain compared to prenatal heat-stressed calves. Postnatal cooled calves  
271 were found to have reduced fever and infection, with less medication events compared to postnatal  
272 heat-stressed calves (Dado-Senn *et al.*, 2020). These findings suggest that providing a cool  
273 environment for dams and calves pre- and post-birth might support the development of intestinal  
274 maturation, which could lead to greater nutrition utilisation and supporting immunity, potentially  
275 through the adequate development of intestinal microbiota. Although these results provide a  
276 promising insight into strategies supporting newborn calf health and development, further exploration  
277 is needed to assess the extent of these effects on postnatal intestinal maturation and function.

278

## 279 6.2 Prewaning diet

280 In pre-weaned calves on a milk-based diet, the small and large intestines are critical for digestion  
281 (Castro *et al.*, 2016). Concurrent with physiological adaptations and changes within the forestomach  
282 system during early life, the development of microbial compositions in the intestine of pre-weaned  
283 calves is driven by rearing factors such as age, diet and environment (Malmuthuge & Guan, 2017;  
284 O'Hara *et al.*, 2020). Typically, a gradual change from a liquid diet (milk or milk replacer) to solid feed  
285 (concentrate and forage) occurs within eight weeks of life (Khan *et al.*, 2016). This shift in nutritional  
286 sources also results in prominent effects on the calf intestinal microbiome. Due to the relative ease of  
287 dietary manipulation, several studies have examined the influence of liquid and solid diets of varying  
288 nutritional sources on the intestinal bacterial community composition in the neonatal calf. These have  
289 included assessments of whole (Fouladgar *et al.*, 2016), waste (Deng *et al.*, 2017) or pasteurised milk  
290 (Bach *et al.*, 2017), milk replacer (Amado *et al.*, 2019), calf concentrate and forage quality (Aragona *et al.*,  
291 *et al.*, 2020; Hartinger *et al.*, 2022).

292 Feeding colostrum is essential soon after birth to establish immune protection within the calf via  
293 colostrum-associated immunoglobulins (Mann *et al.*, 2020). Feeding colostrum supports the  
294 development and function of the intestinal tract (Hammon *et al.*, 2020), promotes beneficial microbial  
295 colonisation (Fischer *et al.*, 2018) and inhibits the growth of pathogens, ensuring a reduced risk of  
296 diarrhoea and supporting calf health (Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2015; Hammon *et al.*, 2020). In humans, a  
297 high abundance of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* in infants resulted in increased protection against  
298 enteric infection (Menchetti *et al.*, 2016). Due to calves being immunodeficient at birth, the  
299 appropriate management of colostrum to ensure minimal microbial contamination is important (Barry  
300 *et al.*, 2019). Heat-treated colostrum has been shown to inhibit pathogenic *Escherichia coli* and  
301 *Shigella*, while increasing the growth of beneficial microorganisms such as *Bifidobacterium* (Fischer *et al.*,  
302 *et al.*, 2018; Song *et al.*, 2019). Colostrum is a key microbiome inoculation source, as it shares abundant  
303 bacteria with calf faeces within the first 24 hours of life (Cunningham *et al.*, 2018), contributing to  
304 bacterial colonisation of the intestinal tract. Using quantitative real time-PCR, Malmuthuge *et al.*  
305 (2015) found calves that did not receive colostrum had a reduced bacterial density within the jejunum  
306 and ileum of the small intestine after 12 hours post-birth in comparison to calves that received  
307 colostrum after birth ( $10^8$  16S rRNA genes/g and  $10^{10}$  16S rRNA genes/g respectively).

308 Proteobacteria are a dominant phylum of the faecal microbiome within the first few days of life while  
309 calves are being fed colostrum (Klein-Jöbstl *et al.*, 2019). Shifting the diet from colostrum to milk or  
310 milk replacer increases the abundance of lactose-utilising bacteria such as *Lactobacillus* and  
311 *Bacteroides* across the small and large intestine (Ma *et al.*, 2019; Song *et al.*, 2021). Furthermore, as  
312 the calf continues to consume milk, from two weeks of age *Ruminococcus* increases in relative  
313 abundance in the faeces of calves (Meale *et al.*, 2016; Malmuthuge *et al.*, 2019), which suggests  
314 cellulolytic bacterium use milk (specifically volatile fatty acids) as a substrate while calves transition to  
315 consumption of solid feed through to weaning (Wei *et al.*, 2023). Similarly, high numbers of *Prevotella*  
316 and *Faecalibacterium* groups were found in faecal samples from one to three-week-old calves fed milk  
317 replacer, with feeding strategy (milk replacer allowances of 10%, 20% or *ad libitum*) resulting in  
318 increased bacterial diversity as milk replacer intake increased (Alipour *et al.*, 2018; Kumar *et al.*,  
319 2021b). Collectively, this demonstrates that both feed and feeding strategies in early life influence  
320 microbiome composition in pre-weaned calves by providing different nutritional sources for bacterial  
321 growth.

322 Water intake has also been observed to impact the intestinal microbial composition. Calves that had  
323 access to drinking water immediately after birth demonstrated an increase of *Faecalibacterium*,  
324 *Bacteroides* and *Bifidobacterium* in faecal samples (Wickramasinghe *et al.*, 2020). Calves consuming

325 water demonstrated greater feed efficiency, specifically fibre digestibility, and increased daily  
326 liveweight gain compared to calves that consumed water after two weeks of age (Wickramasinghe,  
327 Kramer & Appuhamy, 2019).

328 As the calf consumes more solid feed after birth, the abundance of proteobacteria in the faecal  
329 microbiome decreases while the abundance of Bacteroidetes increases (Kim *et al.*, 2021a). In the lower  
330 gut microbiome (jejunum, caecum and colon), *Lactobacillus* and *Faecalibacterium* decreases, and  
331 there is an increase in the relative abundance of amylolytic and fibrolytic bacteria such as  
332 *Prevotellaceae* during this time (Guzman *et al.*, 2015; Dill-Mcfarland, Beaker & Suen, 2017; Dias *et al.*,  
333 2018). Hartinger *et al.* (2022), identified that carbohydrate composition in the form of calf concentrate  
334 was the most influential dietary inclusion on the establishment of distinct niche-specific ruminal and  
335 faecal microbial communities. The findings revealed two faecal enterotypes that were diet-dependent:  
336 *Prevotella*, *Succinivibrio* and *Anaerovibrio* were associated with concentrate-supplemented animals;  
337 whereas animals without concentrate were dominated by fibrolytic *Ruminococcaceae*. An important  
338 factor to consider is the health implications of these dynamic changes. For example, higher prevalence  
339 of *Prevotella* and *Ruminococcaceae* have been associated with calf faecal microbiome profiles from  
340 apparently healthy animals for the prevention of calf diarrhoea (Ma *et al.*, 2020; Chen *et al.*, 2022).  
341 However, the exact health impact these enterotypes may have remains unclear.

342

### 343 6.3 Housing

344 The selection and implementation of different calf housing systems have been seen to influence calf  
345 health and growth (Brown *et al.*, 2021). Weaning stress was reduced as a consequence of grouping  
346 calves early in life, from five days of age (Vieira, Von Keyserlingk & Weary, 2010; Bolt *et al.*, 2017), and  
347 those grouped or paired consumed greater intakes of calf concentrate feed (Overvest, 2018; Liu *et al.*,  
348 2019) with increased growth rates due to social mimicry (Costa *et al.*, 2015; Liu *et al.*, 2019). Group  
349 size also appears to influence calf health. According to Svensson & Liberg (2006), calves in pens of 12  
350 to 18 animals had a higher incidence of respiratory illness which impacted growth compared to calves  
351 housed in groups of six to nine animals. These results were observed under an automatic milk-feeding  
352 system, where close contact via shared feeding equipment likely played a role in transmission of  
353 infection (Salem *et al.*, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2020). However, evidence suggests that groups of less than  
354 10 calves gives the greatest opportunity to support calf health (Svensson & Liberg, 2006; Liu *et al.*,  
355 2019).

356 From the perspective of intestinal microbiome development, it remains unclear the specific influence  
357 individual, paired and group housing environments have on calf intestinal microbiome development  
358 due to the lack of studies examining calf housing environments outside of calf-dam interaction  
359 (Malmuthuge & Guan, 2017; Owen *et al.*, 2021). Zhu *et al.* (2021) reported homogeneity in the faecal  
360 microbiota of calves and dams grouped together, whereas Beaver *et al.* (2021) demonstrated only  
361 marginal similarities in the faecal microbiome of grouped calves that received maternal contact. In  
362 other mammalian species such as humans (Guthrie *et al.*, 2022), chimpanzees (Moeller *et al.*, 2016)  
363 and dogs (Song *et al.*, 2013), transmission of intestinal microbiota between individuals has been  
364 evidenced. Transition modes influencing intestinal microbiome development are not well understood,  
365 but it is hypothesised that shared environments would elicit homogenising effects (Beaver *et al.*, 2021).  
366 However, Barden *et al.* (2020) identified no evincible difference in faecal microbiome development  
367 between maternally reared and grouped beef calves with dairy calves that were housed individually

368 before being group housed, in groups of six until weaning. Research with broiler chickens found that  
369 housing conditions affected the caecal microbiota composition and functionality more than diet  
370 intervention (Kers *et al.*, 2019; Ramírez *et al.*, 2020a). The extent to which the environment influences  
371 the intestinal microbiota in calves still remains unclear.

372

#### 373 **6.4 Husbandry practices as potential stress events**

374 Early life stress, such as from environment exposure, can lead to potentially long-lasting health  
375 problems (Laporta *et al.*, 2020). While some stressors during life may support adaptation, others may  
376 become biologically embedded, potentially altering the future health of the individual (D'Agata *et al.*,  
377 2019). Stress in animals can lead to decreased immune function, altered metabolism (reduced growth  
378 and production), altered behaviour, or a combination of these (Endris & Feki, 2021; Niu *et al.*, 2022).  
379 All these affect animal health, welfare, and productivity with a concurrent detrimental impact on the  
380 livestock industry (Aich *et al.*, 2007; Chen *et al.*, 2015). Dairy calf production systems have several  
381 events that have the potential to cause stress, including birth (Nagel, Aurich & Aurich., 2019; Kovács  
382 *et al.*, 2021), housing and grouping (Bolt *et al.*, 2017), disbudding practices (Mir *et al.*, 2019), and  
383 changing diets through weaning (Meale *et al.*, 2016; Meale *et al.*, 2017; Dill-McFarland *et al.*, 2019).

384 Acute stress experiences can alter eating habits, reducing dry matter intake, and changing the rate of  
385 carbohydrate metabolism, which potentially results in hypoglycemia and increased glucose disposal  
386 rates (Fisher *et al.*, 2001; Baumgard *et al.*, 2011). The effects of acute stress on the intestinal microbiota  
387 can be due to these behavioural and dietary changes (Rajoka *et al.*, 2017; Kraïmi *et al.*, 2019).  
388 Therefore, stress and factors such as diet, current intestinal microbiome structure, host genotype, and  
389 environment can influence the composition of the microbiota resulting in adverse effects on nutrient  
390 acquisition, metabolism, host immunity and disease resistance (Deng *et al.*, 2017; Chen *et al.*, 2018;  
391 Rea, Dinan & Cryan, 2019; Liu *et al.*, 2021).

##### 392 **6.4.1 Disbudding**

393 Dairy calves in the UK, Europe, America, and other developed countries are disbudded or dehorned as  
394 horned animals pose a risk to human and animal health and safety, and to ease management (Kling-  
395 Eveillard *et al.*, 2015). For example, cattle with horns have an increased risk of causing injury to  
396 handlers and herd mates either through accidental interactions or because of aggressive behaviour  
397 (Kling-Eveillard *et al.*, 2015; Knierim, Irrgang & Roth, 2015). Disbudding involves the removal of horn  
398 germinal tissue in young calves to prevent horn growth, while dehorning involves the amputation of  
399 the horn. Disbudding or dehorning can be performed using either chemical action (sodium or calcium  
400 hydroxide), amputation (guillotine or scoop) or hot iron (cauterisation) (Marquette, Ronan & Earley,  
401 2023). The age at which this procedure is conducted and whether local anaesthetic is provided will  
402 influence the amount of pain and discomfort the animal experiences (Costa *et al.*, 2019; Steagall *et al.*,  
403 2021). In the UK, under the Protection of Animals (Anaesthetics) Act 1954, it is an offense to disbud a  
404 calf or dehorn a cow without anaesthetic unless performing chemical cauterisation within the first  
405 week of life. The pain associated with disbudding when calves receive no form of pain relief, was  
406 observed to have a negative impact on growth rates in three to six-week-old calves (Bates *et al.*, 2016).  
407 Although pain relief was not administered to these animals during the study, there is a clear link  
408 between pain and this management experience, with growth and development (Marti *et al.*, 2017).

409 Mir *et al.* (2019) identified that disbudding stress reduced microbial diversity of the intestinal  
410 microbiota, using the assessment of faecal samples. Lighter-weight calves (those that weighed less  
411 than 68kg at the time of disbudding) were found to display a more pronounced microbiota reduction  
412 and had a more significant reduction in their Firmicute to Bacteroidete ratio when exposed to stress  
413 (Mir *et al.* 2019; Table 1). These bacteria have previously been reported to indicate dysbiosis of the  
414 intestinal microbiome (Auffret *et al.*, 2017). Although a reduction in Firmicute to Bacteroidete ratio  
415 was also observed in heavy-weight calves, the reduction was significantly more pronounced in the  
416 lighter-weight calves (Mir *et al.*, 2019). Furthermore, light-weight calves had higher relative  
417 abundances of faecal bacterial families such as *Erysipelotrichaceae* and *Verrucomicrobiaceae*, while  
418 heavyweight calves had a higher relative abundance of *Elucimicrobiaceae* and *Turibacteriaceae* (Mir  
419 *et al.*, 2019). The specific role of these within the intestinal microbiome remains unclear, but members  
420 of the *Erysipelotrichaceae* family are thought to be highly immunogenic, potentially having an  
421 influence on immune function within the intestinal tract (Matthews *et al.*, 2023). This highlights the  
422 need to understand the impact management events and procedures have on calf health and intestinal  
423 microbiome development (Malmuthuge & Guan, 2017).

424

#### 425 **6.4.3 Weaning**

426 Weaning strategy and weaning age can influence the success of dietary changes in a calf. Abrupt  
427 weaning practices can reduce solid feed intake and average daily weight gain (Schwarzkopf *et al.*, 2019;  
428 Scoley, Gordon & Morrison, 2019). However, the influence of either an abrupt or a gradual weaning  
429 strategy on intestinal microbial communities showed no significant effect (Meale *et al.*, 2016; Li *et al.*,  
430 2018). Thus, the age at which weaning takes place is likely more influential in ensuring calf readiness  
431 for the transition than the strategy itself (Amin *et al.*, 2023). Weaning calves after eight weeks of age  
432 improved average daily gains (Mao *et al.*, 2017) and rumen enzyme activity due to an increase in solid  
433 feed intake, compared to those weaning more naturally but later in life at 34 weeks (Mao *et al.*, 2017;  
434 Hao *et al.*, 2021). When calves were weaned at six weeks of age, a sudden change in  $\beta$ -diversity and  
435 evenness of their faecal microbiota from a pre- to post-weaned state was observed, which was not  
436 observed in calves weaning at a later age of eight weeks. Coupled with observed reductions in growth  
437 rates (Eckert *et al.*, 2015; Meale *et al.*, 2016; Li *et al.*, 2018), suggesting pre-mature intestinal  
438 development at the time of weaning. Weaning encourages the increased consumption of concentrate  
439 feed and forage by the calf, which alters the microbial composition of the intestinal tract. The faecal  
440 microbiome transitions to an increased number of Bacteroidetes, with a decrease in Firmicutes which  
441 up until weaning were a dominant phylum (Amin *et al.*, 2023).

442 In the faecal microbiome, *Prevotella* was positively correlated with concentrate intake, and the  
443 abundance of species such as *Prevotella*, *Ruminococcus* and *Blautia* were positively correlated with  
444 average daily gain in calves weaned at 17 weeks of age (Meale *et al.*, 2017; Amin *et al.*, 2023). The  
445 likely increase of *Prevotella* and *Ruminococcus* species is due to their cellulolytic capabilities, which is  
446 reflective of activity identified within the maturing intestinal microbiome (Meale *et al.*, 2016; Wang *et al.*  
447 *et al.*, 2019). Faecal microbiome changes are likely due to the transition from intestinal to rumen  
448 fermentation post-weaning (Meale *et al.*, 2017) and demonstrates how solid feed intake alters the  
449 intestinal microbiome to resemble that of the mature animal.

450

451 The behaviour and stress response at weaning may influence calf immunity because of intestinal  
452 microbiome disruption (Upadhaya & Kim, 2021; Welch *et al.*, 2022). Generally, the calf's readiness for  
453 weaning is not measured by its consumption of concentrate feed or intestinal microbiome  
454 development, but instead by its age and/or its body weight (Welk, Neave & Jensen, 2024). Age has  
455 been shown to be a predictor of successful weaning transition, with weaning at a later age (after eight  
456 weeks) demonstrating beneficial effects on the microbiota that can quickly adapt to dietary changes  
457 (Amin *et al.*, 2023; Welk, Neave & Jensen, 2024; Table 1). A review by Whalin, Weary & Von Keyserlingk  
458 (2021), identified that gradual or late weaning mimicked the natural behaviour of a calf as it ages,  
459 culminating when the calf is seven to 14 months old. The practical application of this timeframe within  
460 dairy calf rearing systems is challenging, but it should provide some consideration for age of weaning  
461 to ensure calf preparedness to reduce drastic community shifts in the intestinal microbiome (Guo *et*  
462 *al.*, 2021). Weaning practices are likely to present different experiences and severity of stressors for  
463 individual calves, as well as for those being weaned from milk or milk replacer feeding systems or from  
464 their dams (Hulbert & Moisé, 2016).

465

## 466 **7.0 Potential strategies to support dairy calf microbiome development**

467 Livestock species are often subject to management and environmental stressors that can result in an  
468 imbalance in GIT microbiota homeostasis (O'Callaghan *et al.*, 2016). If dysbiosis occurs at a young age,  
469 changes in key commensal and health conferring intestinal bacteria such as *Lactobacillus* (Fan *et al.*,  
470 2021), *Faecalibacterium* (Oikonomou *et al.*, 2013) and *Bifidobacteria* (Vlková, Trojanová & Rada, 2006)  
471 impact calf health and growth. An awareness of the possibility of this disruption occurring because of  
472 management interactions as part of the calf rearing system is essential to provide the opportunity to  
473 apply interventions prior to these experiences to support calf health.

474

### 475 **7.1 Probiotic supplementation**

476 A common additive to calf milk replacer that would provide some buffering towards intestinal  
477 microbiome community disruptions are probiotics (Stefańska *et al.*, 2021). Probiotics are live  
478 organisms that can provide the host with health benefits via supporting digestive processes and  
479 pathogen defence, if administered in adequate amounts (O'Callaghan *et al.*, 2016; JinQiang *et al.*,  
480 2018). Probiotics have been identified as an alternative treatment to maintain and support GIT  
481 homeostasis (Fan *et al.*, 2021). Within the UK, probiotic products aimed at young ruminants primarily  
482 contain bacterial species such as *Bifidobacterium*, *Lactobacillus* and *Enterococcus faecium* or live yeast  
483 strains like *Saccharomyces*, which have all been shown to have some conferring health benefits to the  
484 calf (Zábranský *et al.*, 2022; Maâmouri & Salem, 2022).

485 Initially, probiotics were investigated as alternatives to some antibiotic usage in livestock, particularly  
486 in place of growth promoters (Cheng *et al.*, 2014; Grant, Gay & Lillehoj, 2018). In the past 10-15 years,  
487 growth promoter use has been restricted or banned in the UK (but still in use in many nations) due to  
488 concerns of increasing antibiotic resistance and food safety (O'Callaghan *et al.*, 2016). As a result of  
489 changing antibiotic regulation and increased understanding of the influence of probiotic  
490 supplementation, there has been a marked increase in probiotic use in farm and domestic animals in  
491 the past 20 years (Chaucheyras-Durand & Durand, 2010; Yeoman & White, 2014). The use of probiotics  
492 to support ruminant health during the pre-weaning period and stressful experiences have

493 demonstrated some beneficial effects, through the stimulation of beneficial microbiota, supporting  
494 mucosal immunity, preventing enteric pathogens from colonising, controlling pH, and increasing  
495 digestion (Uyeno, Shigemori & Shimosato, 2015).

496 Calf diarrhoea as a health challenge in young ruminants can be caused by a variety of infectious and  
497 non-infectious factors (Whon *et al.*, 2021). Due to this, the administration of antibiotics is used as a  
498 treatment option to control the potential pathogen proliferation that may be occurring within the calf  
499 intestinal tract. The effectiveness of this treatment method is questionable (Kim *et al.*, 2021a) due to  
500 the variety of causative agents and the likely use of broad-spectrum antibiotics. Eibl *et al.* (2021) found  
501 farmers and veterinarians from Scotland (as a representative country of the UK) and Portugal, used  
502 antibiotics for the treatment of neonatal calf diarrhoea significantly more frequently (always: 46%, n =  
503 78; in some situations: 54%, n = 92) compared to other European countries (Austria and Belgium;  
504 always: 20%, n = 46; in some situations: 80%, n = 188). The more frequent use of antibiotics could be  
505 a result of untargeted approaches toward the treatment of calf diarrhoea and would negatively affect  
506 the intestinal microbiome composition, impacting beneficial bacterial populations and potentially  
507 increasing antibiotic resistance (Ramírez *et al.*, 2020b; Ali *et al.*, 2021).

508 Studies have examined probiotic usage to reduce diarrhoea in calves (Renaud *et al.*, 2019; Kayasaki  
509 *et al.*, 2021). One of the most common probiotics administered to ruminants includes live yeasts,  
510 particularly those containing *S. cerevisiae*. Several beneficial effects have been seen in animals  
511 supplemented with live yeast, these include increased performance markers such as growth, dry  
512 matter intake and milk production in beef and dairy cattle (Maâmourî & Salem, 2022; Zhang *et al.*,  
513 2022). A reduction in diarrhoea was observed in calves fed milk containing *S. cerevisiae* NCD49 or *L.*  
514 *acidophilus-15* (Renaud *et al.*, 2019; Kumar *et al.*, 2021a). Similarly, a marked improvement in the  
515 severity (and prevention) of diarrhoea was observed in neonatal calves administered *E. coli* Nissle 1917  
516 (Von Buenau *et al.*, 2005).

517

## 518 **7.2 Faecal microbiota transplantation**

519 A novel strategy for supporting and promoting intestinal microbiome development towards that of an  
520 adult community structure is faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT). This method requires the  
521 transfer of faecal material from a healthy donor into the GIT of a recipient to inoculate the intestinal  
522 area with suitable commensal microorganisms (Rosa *et al.*, 2021). Recently, the efficacy of FMT for the  
523 treatment of calf diarrhoea has been confirmed (Kim *et al.*, 2021b). Studies have shown a decrease in  
524 the occurrence of diarrhoea for calves that have undergone FMT treatment, with an observed  
525 intestinal shift from an imbalanced microbiome to a symbiotic state (Kim *et al.*, 2021b; Islam *et al.*,  
526 2022; Li *et al.*, 2023). The resulting intestinal community composition resembles that of the healthy  
527 donor after FMT treatment (Kim *et al.*, 2021b).

528 Although the findings in this area are promising in supporting microbiome establishment and calf  
529 health, the effects of FMT as a treatment for potential intestinal microbiome dysbiosis remains a  
530 challenge due to the inappropriate selection of donors and corresponding recipients. For FMT to be  
531 successful, intestinal microbiota compositions of donor and recipient need to have a degree of  
532 similarity. The intestinal microbiome structures vary even within healthy populations as a result of  
533 factors such as farm management, environmental conditions, and calf age (Gómez *et al.*, 2017). These  
534 aspects may increase the failure of FMT and impact the repeatability of research in practice.



535

### 536 **7.3 Microbiome tracking**

537 Similar to production measurements routinely collected such as feed intake and body weight tracking  
538 to assess the health and development of the calf, routine intestinal microbiome community measures  
539 could be a novel and potentially powerful tool in supporting calf health and welfare in a more  
540 individualised and targeted manner. According to a review conducted by Allaband *et al.* (2019), this is  
541 a strategy of interest for clinicians in human medicine due to the understanding of the importance of  
542 the intestinal microbiome in human health and disease. Additionally, intestinal microbial profiling has  
543 been identified to be paramount in monitoring livestock health to allow the appropriate  
544 implementation of interventions or treatments to support intestinal microbiome health and prevent  
545 the establishment of pathogens (Valerio *et al.*, 2019; Chen *et al.*, 2021).

546 Production systems could identify those individuals with intestinal microbiome communities that  
547 confer resilience and contain a wide diversity of commensal beneficial bacterial populations (Weimer,  
548 2015; Forcina *et al.*, 2022). These characteristics could be tracked across the herd and within genetic  
549 lineages to assess the influence of these factors and how the microbiome community composition  
550 relates to production, health and reproductive success (Welch *et al.*, 2022). Faecal samples would  
551 provide an efficient and non-invasive means of analysing these aspects, which could be collected  
552 individually or pooled to provide an overview of intestinal microbiota within different cohorts of calves  
553 (Mott *et al.*, 2022; Monteiro *et al.*, 2022). The results could be compared to other production measures  
554 already tracked on farm (e.g. feed, body weight, health) to provide a much more detailed picture of  
555 calf development, suitability of management and husbandry practices, and likely success of the calf in  
556 production as a future milk producing cow.

557 If this strategy was implemented on a national or international scale, the data provided along with  
558 measures already tracked on farm would propel ruminant livestock microbiome research and the  
559 applications to industry far beyond any other animal group. It would demonstrate the livestock  
560 industry as pioneers in the advancement of animal health and welfare as well as financially benefit the  
561 farming community through targeted management practices. The microbiome measures utilised to  
562 assess health, and welfare could also provide greater detail and insight into the suitability of farm  
563 management standards to inform food standard assessment initiatives.

564 This strategy is not without its challenges. Within ruminant microbiome research, there are still  
565 considerable gaps in the knowledge. This is partly due to the large number of published studies that  
566 contain small sample sizes (Owens *et al.*, 2021; Slanzon *et al.*, 2022), resulting in challenges in  
567 generalising these results to the wider population of dairy cows and large-scale livestock production  
568 systems; where differences in aspects such as genetic diversity, management, and husbandry would  
569 need to be considered. Intestinal microbiome tracking as a strategy to support dairy cattle health  
570 would only be possible if a coordinated effort was made across large-scale livestock producers for  
571 nationwide monitoring of microbiome data alongside other production measures where this data  
572 might be extracted and analysed to create guidance on its use.

573

## 574 **8. Conclusion**

575 The colonisation of the intestinal microbiota in calves in early life has attracted much attention due to  
576 a growing body of evidence of its impact on calf health, development and influence on health and  
577 welfare throughout the animal's lifetime. The composition and diversity of the intestinal microbiota  
578 vary with age, diet, environment, and husbandry practices that may elicit a stress response. The  
579 evidence provided within published work establishes the potential detrimental effect that sudden  
580 changes and stress may have on calf health and growth due to management and husbandry practices,  
581 and the importance of establishing a stable yet diverse intestinal microbiome population at an early  
582 age is essential for calf success. However, the specific relationship that developmental markers such as  
583 rearing systems and husbandry practices have with calf intestinal microbiome development linked to  
584 the health, growth and performance of the animal in production remains unclear.

585 Research should focus on tracking microbiome development from birth through to the weaning  
586 period, with consideration of the main variables that are included within the calf-rearing system  
587 (individual/group housing, disbudding, weaning etc.) and should factor in calf development with other  
588 measures of health and performance (feed intake and daily live-weight gain). This would provide a  
589 holistic approach to calf rearing, supporting targeted neonatal interventions and informed calf  
590 management practices.

591 Ensuring the application of this informed approach within the dairy industry will require an  
592 understanding of how calf intestinal microbiome development influences the composition of the adult  
593 microbial community and the effects of these outcomes on health, reproduction, and milk production  
594 parameters within dairy production systems. A longitudinal approach to the tracking of intestinal  
595 microbiome development would ensure research can be used to provide the opportunity for an  
596 informed and targeted approach to calf health and welfare interventions to support the success of  
597 dairy cows throughout their productive life. Such an approach has the potential to be of considerable  
598 economic value to this livestock production industry.

599

## 600 **9. Author statements**

### 601 **9.1 Author contributions**

602 A.C & L.W conceived the review, A.C led its drafting, and managed the editing of the document. All  
603 authors contributed to the drafting of the review and approved the final manuscript.

604

### 605 **9.2 Conflicts of interest**

606 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

607

### 608 **9.3 Funding information**

609 This work was funded by Hartpury University.

610

## 611 10. References

- 612 Abuelo, A. (2020). Symposium review: Late-gestation maternal factors affecting the health and  
613 development of dairy calves. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(4), 3882-3893.  
614 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17278>
- 615 Adlerberth, I., & Wold, A. E. (2009). Establishment of the gut microbiota in Western infants. *Acta*  
616 *Paediatrica*, 98(2), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2008.01060.x>
- 617 Adnane, M., & Chapwanya, A. (2022). Role of genital tract bacteria in promoting endometrial health in  
618 cattle. *Microorganisms*, 10(11), 2238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms1011>
- 619 Ahmed, A., Schmidt, C., & Brunner, T. (2019). Extra-Adrenal glucocorticoid synthesis in the intestinal  
620 mucosa: between immune homeostasis and immune escape. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 10.  
621 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2019.01438>
- 622 Aich, P., Jalal, S., Czuba, C., Schatte, G., Herzog, K. R., Olson, D., Ross, A. R. S., Potter, A., Babiuk, L. A.,  
623 & Griebel, P. (2007). Comparative approaches to the investigation of responses to stress and viral  
624 infection in cattle. *Omics a Journal of Integrative Biology*, 11(4), 413–434.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.1089/omi.2007.0023>
- 626 Al-Asmakh, M., & Zadjali, F. (2015). Use of Germ-Free animal models in Microbiota-Related research.  
627 *Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 25(10), 1583–1588.  
628 <https://doi.org/10.4014/jmb.1501.01039>
- 629 Ali, A., Liaqat, S., Tariq, H., Abbas, S., Arshad, M., Li, W., & Ahmed, I. (2021). Neonatal calf diarrhea: A  
630 potent reservoir of multi-drug resistant bacteria, environmental contamination and public health  
631 hazard in Pakistan. *Science of the Total Environment*, 799, 149450.  
632 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149450>
- 633 Alipour, M., Jalanka, J., Pessa-Morikawa, T., Kokkonen, T., Satokari, R., Hynönen, U., Iivanainen, A., &  
634 Niku, M. (2018). The composition of the perinatal intestinal microbiota in cattle. *Scientific Reports*,  
635 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-28733-y>
- 636 Allaband, C., McDonald, D., Vázquez-Baeza, Y., Minich, J. J., Tripathi, A., Brenner, D. A., Loomba, R.,  
637 Smarr, L., Sandborn, W. J., Schnabl, B., Dorrestein, P. C., Zarrinpar, A., & Knight, R. (2019). Microbiome  
638 101: Studying, analyzing, and interpreting gut microbiome data for clinicians. *Clinical Gastroenterology*  
639 *and Hepatology*, 17(2), 218–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2018.09.017>
- 640 Amado, L., Berends, H., Leal, L., Wilms, J., Van Laar, H., Gerrits, W., & Martín-Tereso, J. (2019). Effect of  
641 energy source in calf milk replacer on performance, digestibility, and gut permeability in rearing calves.  
642 *Journal of Dairy Science*, 102(5), 3994–4001. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15847>
- 643 Amin, N., & Seifert, J. (2021). Dynamic progression of the calf's microbiome and its influence on host  
644 health. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 19, 989–1001.  
645 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2021.01.035>
- 646 Amin, N., Schwarzkopf, S., Tröscher-Mußotter, J., Camarinha-Silva, A., Dänicke, S., Huber, K., Frahm, J.,  
647 & Seifert, J. (2023). Host metabolome and faecal microbiome shows potential interactions impacted

648 by age and weaning times in calves. *Animal Microbiome*, 5(1). [https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-023-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-023-00233-z)  
649 [00233-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-023-00233-z)

650 Aragona, K., Suarez-Mena, F., Dennis, T., Quigley, J., Hu, W., Hill, T., & Schlotterbeck, R. (2020). Effect of  
651 starter form, starch concentration, and amount of forage fed on Holstein calf growth from 2 to 4  
652 months of age. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(3), 2324–2332. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17474>

653 Arfuso, F., Minuti, A., Liotta, L., Giannetto, C., Trevisi, E., Piccione, G., & Lopreiato, V. (2023). Stress and  
654 inflammatory response of cows and their calves during peripartum and early neonatal period.  
655 *Theriogenology*, 196, 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.Theriogenology.2022.11.019>

656 Auffret, M., Dewhurst, R. J., Duthie, C., Rooke, J. A., Wallace, R. J., Freeman, T. C., Stewart, R. D.,  
657 Watson, M., & Roehe, R. (2017). The rumen microbiome as a reservoir of antimicrobial resistance and  
658 pathogenicity genes is directly affected by diet in beef cattle. *Microbiome*, 5(1).  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-017-0378-z>

660 Bach, À., Arís, A., De Fátima Vidal, M., Fábregas, F., & Terré, M. (2017). Influence of milk processing  
661 temperature on growth performance, nitrogen retention, and hindgut's inflammatory status and  
662 bacterial populations in a calf model. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 84(3), 355–359.  
663 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022029917000401>

664 Barden, M., Richards-Rios, P., Ganda, E., Lenzi, L., Eccles, R., Neary, J. M., Oultram, J., & Oikonomou, G.  
665 (2020). Maternal influences on oral and faecal microbiota maturation in neonatal calves in beef and  
666 dairy production systems. *Animal Microbiome*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-020-00049-1>

667 Barry, J., Bokkers, E., Berry, D., De Boer, I., McClure, J. T., & Kennedy, E. (2019). Associations between  
668 colostrum management, passive immunity, calf-related hygiene practices, and rates of mortality in  
669 preweaning dairy calves. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 102(11), 10266–10276.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-16815>

671 Bates, A., Laven, R., Chapple, F., & Weeks, D. S. (2016). The effect of different combinations of local  
672 anaesthesia, sedative and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs on daily growth rates of dairy calves  
673 after disbudding. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*, 64(5), 282–287.  
674 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00480169.2016.1196626>

675 Baumgard, L. H., Jb, W., Sanders, S. R., Moore, C., Green, H., Waldron, & Rhoads, R. P. (2011).  
676 Postabsorptive carbohydrate adaptations to heat stress and monensin supplementation in lactating  
677 Holstein cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 94(11), 5620–5633. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4462>

678 Beaver, A., Petersen, C., Weary, D. M., Finlay, B. B., & Von Keyserlingk, M. A. G. (2021). Differences in  
679 the fecal microbiota of dairy calves reared with differing sources of milk and levels of maternal contact.  
680 *JDS Communications*, 2(4), 200–206. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jdsc.2020-0059>

681 Bolt, S., Boyland, N., Mlynski, D. T., James, R., & Croft, D. P. (2017). Pair housing of dairy calves and age  
682 at pairing: Effects on weaning stress, health, production and social networks. *PLOS ONE*, 12(1),  
683 e0166926. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166926>

684 Breen, M. J., Williams, D. R., Abdelfattah, E. M., Karle, B. M., Byrne, B. A., Lehenbauer, T. W., & Aly, S.  
685 S. (2023). Effect of group housing of preweaned dairy calves: Health and fecal commensal antimicrobial  
686 resistance outcomes. *Antibiotics*, 12(6), 1019. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics12061019>

687 Brown, A. J., Scoley, G., O'Connell, N., Robertson, J., Browne, A. E., & Morrison, S. (2021). Pre-Weaned  
688 calf rearing on Northern Irish Dairy Farms: Part 1. A Description of calf management and Housing  
689 design. *Animals*, 11(7), 1954. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11071954>

690 Cantor, M. C., Neave, H. W., & Costa, J. (2019). Current perspectives on the short- and long-term effects  
691 of conventional dairy calf raising systems: a comparison with the natural environment. *Translational*  
692 *Animal Science*, 3(1), 549–563. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tas/txy144>

693 Castro, J., Gómez, A., White, B. A., Loften, J., & Drackley, J. (2016). Changes in the intestinal bacterial  
694 community, short-chain fatty acid profile, and intestinal development of preweaned Holstein calves. 2.  
695 Effects of gastrointestinal site and age. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 99(12), 9703–9715.  
696 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-11007>

697 Celi, P., Cowieson, A. J., Fru-Nji, F., Steinert, R. E., Klünter, A., & Verlhac, V. (2017). Gastrointestinal  
698 functionality in animal nutrition and health: New opportunities for sustainable animal production.  
699 *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 234, 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeeds.2017.09.012>

700 Chaucheyras-Durand, F., & Durand, H. (2010). Probiotics in animal nutrition and health. *Beneficial*  
701 *Microbes*, 1(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.3920/bm2008.1002>

702 Chen, H., Liu, Y., Huang, K., Yang, B., Zhang, Y., Yu, Z., & Wang, J. (2022). Fecal microbiota dynamics and  
703 its relationship to diarrhea and health in dairy calves. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*,  
704 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-022-00758-4>

705 Chen, S., Wang, J., Peng, D., Gan, L., Chen, J., & Gu, X. (2018). Exposure to heat-stress environment  
706 affects the physiology, circulation levels of cytokines, and microbiome in dairy cows. *Scientific Reports*,  
707 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-32886-1>

708 Chen, X., Su, X., Li, J., Yang, Y., Wang, P., Fang, Y., Yao, J., & Wu, S. (2021). Real-time monitoring of  
709 ruminal microbiota reveals their roles in dairy goats during subacute ruminal acidosis. *Npj Biofilms and*  
710 *Microbiomes*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41522-021-00215-6>

711 Chen, Y., Arsenault, R. J., Napper, S., & Griebel, P. (2015). Models and methods to investigate acute  
712 stress responses in cattle. *Animals*, 5(4), 1268–1295. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani5040411>

713 Cheng, G., Hao, H., Xie, S., Wu, X., Dai, M., Huang, L., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Antibiotic alternatives: the  
714 substitution of antibiotics in animal husbandry? *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 5.  
715 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00217>

716 Conroy, M., Shi, H. N., & Walker, W. A. (2009). The long-term health effects of neonatal microbial flora.  
717 *Current Opinion in Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 9(3), 197–201.  
718 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aci.0b013e32832b3f1d>

719 Costa, J., Cantor, M. C., Adderley, N. A., & Neave, H. W. (2019). Key animal welfare issues in  
720 commercially raised dairy calves: social environment, nutrition, and painful procedures. *Canadian*  
721 *Journal of Animal Science*, 99(4), 649–660. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjas-2019-0031>

722 Costa, J., Meagher, R. K., Von Keyserlingk, M., & Weary, D. M. (2015). Early pair housing increases solid  
723 feed intake and weight gains in dairy calves. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 98(9), 6381–6386.  
724 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9395>

- 725 Cunningham, H., Austin, K. J., Powell, S. R., Carpenter, K. T., & Cammack, K. M. (2018). Potential  
726 response of the rumen microbiome to mode of delivery from birth through weaning<sup>1,2</sup>. *Translational*  
727 *Animal Science*, 2(suppl\_1), S35–S38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tas/txy029>
- 728 D'Agata, A., Wu, J., Welandawe, M., Dutra, S. V. O., Kane, B., & Groër, M. (2019). Effects of early life  
729 NICU stress on the developing gut microbiome. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 61(5), 650–660.  
730 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.21826>
- 731 Dado-Senn, B., Acosta, L. V., Rivera, M., Field, S. L., Marrero, M. G., Davidson, B., Tao, S., Fabris, T. F.,  
732 Ortiz-Colón, G., Dahl, G. E., & Laporta, J. (2020). Pre- and postnatal heat stress abatement affects dairy  
733 calf thermoregulation and performance. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(5), 4822–4837.  
734 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17926>
- 735 De La Cruz-Cruz, L. A., Bonilla-Jaime, H., Orozco-Gregorio, H., Tarazona-Morales, A. M., Ballesteros-  
736 Rodea, G., Roldán-Santiago, P., Waytula, M., & Vargas-Romero, J. (2019). Effects of weaning on the  
737 stress responses and productivity of water buffalo in different breeding systems: A review. *Livestock*  
738 *Science*, 226, 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2019.05.020>
- 739 De Paula Vieira, A., De Passillé, A., & Weary, D. (2012). Effects of the early social environment on  
740 behavioral responses of dairy calves to novel events. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 95(9), 5149–5155.  
741 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-5073>
- 742 Deng, Y., Wang, Y. J., Zou, Y., Azarfar, A., Wang, X., Ji, S., Zhang, J., Wu, Z., Wang, S., Dong, S., Xu, Y.,  
743 Shao, D., Xiao, J., Yang, K., Cao, Z., & Li, S. L. (2017). Influence of dairy by-product waste milk on the  
744 microbiomes of different gastrointestinal tract components in pre-weaned dairy calves. *Scientific*  
745 *Reports*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42689>
- 746 Diao, Q., Zhang, R., & Fu, T. (2019). Review of strategies to promote Rumen Development in Calves.  
747 *Animals*, 9(8), 490. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9080490>
- 748 Dias, J., Marcondes, M. I., De Souza, S. M., Da Mata E Silva, B. C., Noronha, M. F., Resende, R. T.,  
749 Machado, F. S., Mantovani, H. C., Dill-McFarland, K. A., & Suen, G. (2018). Bacterial Community  
750 Dynamics across the Gastrointestinal Tracts of Dairy Calves during Prewaning Development. *Applied*  
751 *and Environmental Microbiology*, 84(9). <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02675-17>
- 752 Dill-McFarland, K. A., Breaker, J. D., & Suen, G. (2017). Microbial succession in the gastrointestinal tract  
753 of dairy cows from 2 weeks to first lactation. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1).  
754 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep40864>
- 755 Dill-McFarland, K. A., Weimer, P. J., Breaker, J. D., & Suen, G. (2019). Diet Influences Early Microbiota  
756 Development in Dairy Calves without Long-Term Impacts on Milk Production. *Applied and*  
757 *Environmental Microbiology*, 85(2). <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02141-18>
- 758 Du, Y., Gao, Y., Hu, M., Hou, J., Yang, L., Wang, X., Wang, D., Liu, J., & Xu, Q. (2023). Colonization and  
759 development of the gut microbiome in calves. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*, 14(1).  
760 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-023-00856-x>
- 761 Eckert, E., Brown, H., Leslie, K., DeVries, T., & Steele, M. (2015). Weaning age affects growth, feed  
762 intake, gastrointestinal development, and behavior in Holstein calves fed an elevated plane of nutrition  
763 during the preweaning stage. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 98(9), 6315–6326.  
764 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-9062>

765 Eibl, C., Bexiga, R., Viora, L., Guyot, H., Félix, J. D. S. N., Wilms, J., Tichy, A., & Hund, A. (2021). The  
766 antibiotic treatment of calf diarrhea in four European countries: a survey. *Antibiotics*, 10(8), 910.  
767 <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10080910>

768 Elolimy, A. A., Alharthi, A. S., Zeineldin, M., Parys, C., & Loor, J. J. (2020). Residual feed intake divergence  
769 during the preweaning period is associated with unique hindgut microbiome and metabolome profiles  
770 in neonatal Holstein heifer calves. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*, 11(1).  
771 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-019-0406-x>

772 Endris, M., & Feki, E. (2021). Review on effect of stress on animal productivity and response of animal  
773 to stressors. *J Anim Vet Adv*, 20(1), 1-14.

774 Fan, P., Kim, M., Liu, G., Zhai, Y., Liu, T., Driver, J., & Jeong, K. C. (2021). The gut microbiota of newborn  
775 calves and influence of potential probiotics on reducing diarrheic disease by inhibition of pathogen  
776 colonization. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.772863>

777 Fanaro, S., Chierici, R., Guerrini, P., & Vigi, V. (2003). Intestinal microflora in early infancy: composition  
778 and development. *Acta Paediatrica*, 92(s441), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2003.tb00646.x>

780 Fernando, S. C., Purvis, H. T., Najjar, F. Z., Sukharnikov, L. O., Krehbiel, C. R., Nagaraja, T. G., Roe, B. A.,  
781 & DeSilva, U. (2010). Rumen Microbial Population Dynamics during Adaptation to a High-Grain Diet.  
782 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 76(22), 7482–7490. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.00388-10>

783 Fischer, A. J., Song, Y., He, Z., Haines, D. M., Guan, L. L., & Steele, M. (2018). Effect of delaying colostrum  
784 feeding on passive transfer and intestinal bacterial colonization in neonatal male Holstein calves.  
785 *Journal of Dairy Science*, 101(4), 3099–3109. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13397>

786 Fischer, A., Gluth, M., Weege, F., Pape, U., Wiedenmann, B., Baumgart, D. C., & Theuring, F. (2014).  
787 Glucocorticoids regulate barrier function and claudin expression in intestinal epithelial cells via MKP-  
788 1. *American Journal of Physiology-gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, 306(3), G218–G228.  
789 <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.00095.2013>

790 Fisher, A., Knight, T., Cosgrove, G. P., Death, A. F., Anderson, C. B., Duganzich, D. M., & Lr, M. (2001).  
791 Effects of surgical or banding castration on stress responses and behaviour of bulls. *Australian*  
792 *Veterinary Journal*, 79(4), 279–284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-0813.2001.tb11981.x>

793 Fishman, J. E., Levy, G., Alli, V. V., Zheng, X., Mole, D. J., & Deitch, E. A. (2014). The Intestinal Mucus  
794 Layer is a Critical Component of the Gut Barrier that is Damaged During Acute Pancreatitis. *Shock*,  
795 42(3), 264–270. <https://doi.org/10.1097/shk.000000000000209>

796 Foditsch, C., Van Vleck Pereira, R., Ganda, E., Gomez, M. S., Marques, E., Santín, T., & Bicalho, R. (2015).  
797 Oral Administration of *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* Decreased the Incidence of Severe Diarrhea and  
798 Related Mortality Rate and Increased Weight Gain in Preweaned Dairy Heifers. *PLOS ONE*, 10(12),  
799 e0145485. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0145485>

800 Forcina, A., Pérez-Pardal, L., Carvalheira, J., & Beja-Pereira, A. (2022). Gut microbiome studies in  
801 livestock: Achievements, challenges, and perspectives. *Animals*, 12(23), 3375.  
802 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12233375>

803 Fouladgar, S., Shahraki, A. D. F., Ghalamkari, G., Khani, M., Ahmadi, F., & Erickson, P. S. (2016).  
804 Performance of Holstein calves fed whole milk with or without kefir. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 99(10),  
805 8081–8089. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-10921>

806 Gaboriau-Routhiau, V., Rakotobé, S., Lécuyer, E., Mulder, I., Lan, A., Bridonneau, C., Rochet, V., Pisi, A.,  
807 De Paepe, M., Brandi, G., Eberl, G., Snel, J., Kelly, D., & Cerf-Bensussan, N. (2009). The key role of  
808 segmented filamentous bacteria in the coordinated maturation of gut helper T cell responses.  
809 *Immunity*, 31(4), 677–689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2009.08.020>

810 Gaeta, N. C., Lima, S., Teixeira, A., Ganda, E., Oikonomou, G., Gregory, L., & Bicalho, R. (2017).  
811 Deciphering upper respiratory tract microbiota complexity in healthy calves and calves that develop  
812 respiratory disease using shotgun metagenomics. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 100(2), 1445–1458.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-11522>

814 Galley, J. D., Mashburn-Warren, L., Blalock, L. C., Lauber, C. L., Carroll, J., Ross, K. M., Hobel, C. J.,  
815 Coussons-Read, M., Schetter, C. D., & Gur, T. L. (2023). Maternal anxiety, depression and stress affects  
816 offspring gut microbiome diversity and bifidobacterial abundances. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*,  
817 107, 253–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2022.10.005>

818 Gómez, D. E., Arroyo, L., Costa, M. P., Viel, L., & Weese, J. S. (2017). Characterization of the fecal  
819 bacterial microbiota of healthy and diarrheic dairy calves. *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*,  
820 31(3), 928–939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvim.14695>

821 Grant, A., Gay, C. G., & Lillehoj, H. S. (2018). Bacillus spp. as direct-fed microbial antibiotic alternatives  
822 to enhance growth, immunity, and gut health in poultry. *Avian Pathology*, 47(4), 339–351.  
823 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457.2018.1464117>

824 Guo, W., Van Niekerk, J., Zhou, M., Steele, M., & Guan, L. L. (2021). Longitudinal assessment revealed  
825 the shifts in rumen and colon mucosal-attached microbiota of dairy calves during weaning transition.  
826 *Journal of Dairy Science*, 104(5), 5948–5963. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-1925>

827 Guthrie, L., Spencer, S. P., Perelman, D., Van Treuren, W., Han, S., Yu, F. B., Sonnenburg, E. D., Fischbach,  
828 M. A., Meyer, T. W., & Sonnenburg, J. L. (2022). Impact of a 7-day homogeneous diet on interpersonal  
829 variation in human gut microbiomes and metabolomes. *Cell Host & Microbe*, 30(6), 863–874.e4.  
830 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2022.05.003>

831 Guzman, C. E., Bereza-Malcolm, L., De Groef, B., & Franks, A. E. (2015). Uptake of milk with and without  
832 solid feed during the monogastric phase: Effect on fibrolytic and methanogenic microorganisms in the  
833 gastrointestinal tract of calves. *Animal Science Journal*, 87(3), 378–388.  
834 <https://doi.org/10.1111/asj.12429>

835 Guzman, C. E., Wood, J. L., Egidi, E., White-Monsant, A., Semenec, L., Grommen, S. V., Hill-Yardin, E. L.,  
836 De Groef, B., & Franks, A. E. (2020). A pioneer calf foetus microbiome. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1).  
837 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-74677-7>

838 Hammon, H., Liermann, W., Frieten, D., & Koch, C. (2020). Review: Importance of colostrum supply  
839 and milk feeding intensity on gastrointestinal and systemic development in calves. *Animals*, 14, s133–  
840 s143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1751731119003148>



841 Hao, Y., Guo, C., Gong, Y., Sun, X., Wang, W., Wang, Y., Hu, Y., Cao, Z., & Li, S. (2021). Rumen  
842 Fermentation, Digestive Enzyme Activity, and Bacteria Composition between Pre-Weaning and Post-  
843 Weaning Dairy Calves. *Animals*, 11(9), 2527. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11092527>

844 Hartinger, T., Pacífico, C., Poier, G., Terler, G., Klevenhusen, F., & Zebeli, Q. (2022). Shift of dietary  
845 carbohydrate source from milk to various solid feeds reshapes the rumen and fecal microbiome in  
846 calves. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-16052-2>

847 He, J., Zheng, W., Tao, C., Guo, H., Xue, Y., Zhao, R., & Yao, W. (2020). Heat stress during late gestation  
848 disrupts maternal microbial transmission with altered offspring's gut microbial colonization and serum  
849 metabolites in a pig model. *Environmental Pollution*, 266, 115111.  
850 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115111>

851 Hold, G. L., & Hansen, R. (2019). Impact of the Gastrointestinal Microbiome in Health and Disease: Co-  
852 evolution with the Host Immune System. In *Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology* (pp. 303–  
853 318). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15138-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15138-6_12)

854 Hulbert, L., & Moisés, S. J. (2016). Stress, immunity, and the management of calves. *Journal of Dairy*  
855 *Science*, 99(4), 3199–3216. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-10198>

856 Islam, J., Tanimizu, M., Shimizu, Y., Gotō, Y., Ohtani, N., Sugiyama, K., Tatezaki, E., Sato, M., Makino, E.,  
857 Shimada, T., Ueda, C., Matsuo, A., Suyama, Y., Sakai, Y., Furukawa, M., Usami, K., Yoneyama, H., Aso,  
858 H., Tanaka, H., & Nochi, T. (2022). Development of a rational framework for the therapeutic efficacy of  
859 fecal microbiota transplantation for calf diarrhea treatment. *Microbiome*, 10(1).  
860 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-021-01217-4>

861 JinQiang, X., Li, Y., Yang, Z., Li, C., Hong-Yan, L., Wu, Z., & Pu, W. (2018). Yeast probiotics shape the gut  
862 microbiome and improve the health of Early-Weaned piglets. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 9.  
863 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02011>

864 Jost, T., Lacroix, C., Braegger, C., & Chassard, C. (2012). New insights in gut microbiota establishment  
865 in healthy breast fed neonates. *PLOS ONE*, 7(8), e44595.  
866 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0044595>

867 Júnior, G. F. V., & Bittar, C. M. M. (2021). Microbial colonization of the gastrointestinal tract of dairy  
868 calves – a review of its importance and relationship to health and performance. *Animal Health*  
869 *Research Reviews*, 22(2), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1466252321000062>

870 Kayasaki, F., Okagawa, T., Konnai, S., Kohara, J., Sajiki, Y., Watari, K., Ganbaatar, O., Goto, S., Nakamura,  
871 H., Shimakura, H., Minato, E., Kobayashi, A., Kubota, M., Terasaki, N., Takeda, A., Noda, H., Honma, M.,  
872 Maekawa, N., Shiro, M., & Ohashi, K. (2021). Direct evidence of the preventive effect of milk replacer-  
873 based probiotic feeding in calves against severe diarrhea. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 254, 108976.  
874 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2020.108976>

875 Kers, J. G., Velkers, F. C., Fischer, E., Hermes, G. D. A., Lamot, D., Stegeman, J., & Smidt, H. (2019). Take  
876 care of the environment: housing conditions affect the interplay of nutritional interventions and  
877 intestinal microbiota in broiler chickens. *Animal Microbiome*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-019-0009-z>  
878

879 Khan, M. A., Bach, À., Weary, D. M., & Von Keyserlingk, M. (2016). Invited review: Transitioning from  
880 milk to solid feed in dairy heifers. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 99(2), 885–902.  
881 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9975>

882 Kim, E., Lee, S., Kim, T., Lee, H., Atikur, R. M., Gu, B., Kim, D., Park, B., Son, J., & Kim, M. (2021a). Dynamic  
883 changes in fecal microbial communities of neonatal dairy calves by aging and diarrhea. *Animals*, 11(4),  
884 1113. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11041113>

885 Kim, H. S., Whon, T. W., Sung, H., Jeong, Y., Jung, E. J., Shin, N., Hyun, D., Kim, P. S., Lee, J., Lee, C. H., &  
886 Bae, J. (2021b). Longitudinal evaluation of fecal microbiota transplantation for ameliorating calf  
887 diarrhea and improving growth performance. *Nature Communications*, 12(1).  
888 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20389-5>

889 Kišac, P., Brouček, J., Uhrinčathacek, M., & Hanuš, A. (2011). Effect of weaning calves from mother at  
890 different ages on their growth and milk yield of mothers. *Czech Journal of Animal Science*, 56(6), 261–  
891 268. <https://doi.org/10.17221/1287-cjas>

892 Klein-Jöbstl, D., Quijada, N. M., Dzieciol, M., Feldbacher, B., Wagner, M., Drillich, M., Schmitz-Esser, S.,  
893 & Mann, E. (2019). Microbiota of newborn calves and their mothers reveals possible transfer routes  
894 for newborn calves' gastrointestinal microbiota. *PLOS ONE*, 14(8), e0220554.  
895 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220554>

896 Klein-Jöbstl, D., Schornsteiner, E., Mann, E., Wagner, M., Drillich, M., & Schmitz-Esser, S. (2014).  
897 Pyrosequencing reveals diverse fecal microbiota in Simmental calves during early development.  
898 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00622>

899 Kling-Eveillard, F., Knierim, U., Irrgang, N., Gottardo, F., Ricci, R., & Dockès, A. (2015). Attitudes of  
900 farmers towards cattle dehorning. *Livestock Science*, 179, 12–21.  
901 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.012>

902 Knierim, U., Irrgang, N., & Roth, B. A. (2015). To be or not to be horned—Consequences in cattle.  
903 *Livestock Science*, 179, 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.014>

904 Kovács, L., Kézér, F. L., Bodó, S., Ruff, F., Palme, R., & Szenci, O. (2021). Salivary cortisol as a non-invasive  
905 approach to assess stress in dystocic dairy calves. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1).  
906 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-85666-9>

907 Kraïmi, N., Dawkins, M. S., Gebhardt-Henrich, S. G., Velge, P., Rychlík, I., Volf, J., Créach, P., Smith, A. L.,  
908 Colles, F. M., & Leterrier, C. (2019). Influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior and welfare  
909 in farm animals: A review. *Physiology & Behavior*, 210, 112658.  
910 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.112658>

911 Kumar, M., Kala, A., Chaudhary, L. C., Agarwal, N., & Kochewad, S. (2021a). Microencapsulated and  
912 Lyophilized *Lactobacillus acidophilus* Improved Gut Health and Immune Status of Preruminant Calves.  
913 *Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins*, 14(3), 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12602-021-09821-4>

914 Kumar, S., Khan, M. A., Beijer, E., Liu, J., Lowe, K. K., Young, W., Mills, D. A., & Moon, C. D. (2021b).  
915 Effect of milk replacer allowance on calf faecal bacterial community profiles and fermentation. *Animal*  
916 *Microbiome*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-021-00088-2>

- 917 Laporta, J., Ferreira, F. C., Ouellet, V., Dado-Senn, B., Almeida, A. K., De Vries, A., & Dahl, G. E. (2020).  
918 Late-gestation heat stress impairs daughter and granddaughter lifetime performance. *Journal of Dairy*  
919 *Science*, 103(8), 7555–7568. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-18154>
- 920 Li, F., Li, C., Chen, Y., Liu, J., Zhang, C., Irving, B., Fitzsimmons, C., Plastow, G., & Guan, L. L. (2019a). Host  
921 genetics influence the rumen microbiota and heritable rumen microbial features associate with feed  
922 efficiency in cattle. *Microbiome*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-019-0699-1>
- 923 Li, J., Yousif, M. H., Li, Z., Wu, Z., Li, S., Yang, H., Wang, Y., & Cao, Z. (2019b). Effects of antibiotic residues  
924 in milk on growth, ruminal fermentation, and microbial community of preweaning dairy calves. *Journal*  
925 *of Dairy Science*, 102(3), 2298–2307. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15506>
- 926 Li, K., Shi, B., & Na, R. (2023). The colonization of rumen microbiota and intervention in Pre-Weaned  
927 ruminants. *Animals*, 13(6), 994. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13060994>
- 928 Li, Y., Guo, Y., Wen, Z., Jiang, X., Ma, X., & Han, X. (2018). Weaning stress perturbs gut microbiome and  
929 its metabolic profile in piglets. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-33649-8>
- 930 Li, Y., Li, X., Nie, C., Wu, Y., Luo, R., Chen, C., Niu, J., & Zhang, W. (2023). Effects of two strains of  
931 *Lactobacillus* isolated from the feces of calves after fecal microbiota transplantation on growth  
932 performance, immune capacity, and intestinal barrier function of weaned calves. *Frontiers in*  
933 *Microbiology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1249628>
- 934 Liang, G., Malmuthuge, N., Bao, H., Stothard, P., Griebel, P., & Guan, L. L. (2016). Transcriptome analysis  
935 reveals regional and temporal differences in mucosal immune system development in the small  
936 intestine of neonatal calves. *BMC Genomics*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-2957-y>
- 937 Liang, G., Malmuthuge, N., McFadden, T., Bao, H., Griebel, P., Stothard, P., & Guan, L. L. (2014).  
938 Potential Regulatory Role of MicroRNAs in the Development of Bovine Gastrointestinal Tract during  
939 Early Life. *PLOS ONE*, 9(3), e92592. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092592>
- 940 Liu, K., Zhang, Y., Yu, Z., Xu, Q., Zheng, N., Zhao, S., Huang, G., & Wang, J. (2021). Ruminant microbiota–  
941 host interaction and its effect on nutrient metabolism. *Animal Nutrition*, 7(1), 49–55.  
942 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aninu.2020.12.001>
- 943 Liu, S., Ma, J., Li, J., Alugongo, G. M., Wu, Z., Wang, Y., Li, S., & Cao, Z. (2019). Effects of pair versus  
944 individual housing on performance, health, and behavior of dairy calves. *Animals*, 10(1), 50.  
945 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10010050>
- 946 Lu, N., Wardell, S. E., Burnstein, K. L., DeFranco, D. B., Fuller, P. J., Giguère, V., Hochberg, R. B., McKay,  
947 L. I., Renoir, J. M., Weigel, N. L., Wilson, E. M., McDonnell, D. P., & Cidlowski, J. A. (2006). International  
948 Union of Pharmacology. LXV. The Pharmacology and classification of the nuclear receptor superfamily:  
949 glucocorticoid, mineralocorticoid, progesterone, and androgen receptors. *Pharmacological Reviews*,  
950 58(4), 782–797. <https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.58.4.9>
- 951 Luu, M., Steinhoff, U., & Visekruna, A. (2017). Functional heterogeneity of gut-resident regulatory T  
952 cells. *Clinical & Translational Immunology*, 6(9). <https://doi.org/10.1038/cti.2017.39>
- 953 Lyons, T., Jahns, H., Brady, J., O’Hara, E., Waters, S. M., Kenny, D. A., Doyle, E., & Meade, K. G. (2020).  
954 Integrated analyses of the microbiological, immunological and ontological transitions in the calf ileum  
955 during early life. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-77907-0>

- 956 Ma, T., O'Hara, E., Song, Y., Fischer, A. J., He, Z., Steele, M., & Guan, L. L. (2019). Altered mucosa-  
957 associated microbiota in the ileum and colon of neonatal calves in response to delayed first colostrum  
958 feeding. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 102(8), 7073–7086. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-16130>
- 959 Ma, T., Villot, C., Renaud, D., Skidmore, A., Chevaux, E., Steele, M., & Guan, L. L. (2020). Linking  
960 perturbations to temporal changes in diversity, stability, and compositions of neonatal calf gut  
961 microbiota: prediction of diarrhea. *The ISME Journal*, 14(9), 2223–2235.  
962 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-020-0678-3>
- 963 Maâmouri, O., & Salem, M. B. (2022). The effect of live yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as probiotic  
964 supply on growth performance, feed intake, ruminal pH and fermentation in fattening calves.  
965 *Veterinary Medicine and Science*, 8(1), 398–404. <https://doi.org/10.1002/vms3.631>
- 966 Malmuthuge, N., & Guan, L. L. (2017). Understanding host-microbial interactions in rumen: searching  
967 the best opportunity for microbiota manipulation. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*, 8(1).  
968 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-016-0135-3>
- 969 Malmuthuge, N., Chen, Y., Liang, G., Goonewardene, L. A., & Guan, L. L. (2015). Heat-treated colostrum  
970 feeding promotes beneficial bacteria colonization in the small intestine of neonatal calves. *Journal of*  
971 *Dairy Science*, 98(11), 8044–8053. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9607>
- 972 Malmuthuge, N., Griebel, P., & Guan, L. L. (2014). Taxonomic Identification of Commensal Bacteria  
973 Associated with the Mucosa and Digesta throughout the Gastrointestinal Tracts of Prewaned Calves.  
974 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 80(6), 2021–2028. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.03864-13>
- 975 Malmuthuge, N., Liang, G., Griebel, P., & Guan, L. L. (2019). Taxonomic and functional compositions of  
976 the small intestinal microbiome in neonatal calves provide a framework for understanding early life  
977 gut health. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 85(6). [https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02534-](https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02534-18)  
978 [18hamm](https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02534-18)
- 979 Mann, S., Curone, G., Chandler, T., Sipka, A., Cha, J. P., Bhawal, R., & Zhang, S. (2020). Heat treatment  
980 of bovine colostrum: II. Effects on calf serum immunoglobulin, insulin, and IGF-I concentrations, and  
981 the serum proteome. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(10), 9384–9406. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-18619)  
982 [18619](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-18619)
- 983 Mao, H., Xia, Y., Yan, T., Wang, C., & Diao, Q. (2017). Effects of various weaning times on growth  
984 performance, rumen fermentation and microbial population of yellow cattle calves. *Asian-*  
985 *Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 30(11), 1557–1562. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.16.0981>
- 986 Marquette, G. A., Ronan, S., & Earley, B. (2023). Calf disbudding – animal welfare considerations.  
987 *Journal of Applied Animal Research*, 51(1), 616–623.  
988 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09712119.2023.2264912>
- 989 Marti, S., Meléndez, D. M., Pajor, E. A., Moya, D., Heuston, C. E. M., Gellatly, D., Janzen, E. D., &  
990 Schwartzkopf-Genswein, K. S. (2017). Effect of band and knife castration of beef calves on welfare  
991 indicators of pain at three relevant industry ages: II. Chronic pain. *Journal of Animal Science*, 0(0), 0.  
992 <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2017.1763>
- 993 Matthews, C., Walsh, A. M., Gordon, S. V., Markey, B., Cotter, P. D., & O' Mahony, J. (2023). Differences  
994 in Faecal Microbiome Taxonomy, Diversity and Functional Potential in a Bovine Cohort Experimentally

- 995 Challenged with *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* (MAP). *Animals*, 13(10), 1652.  
996 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13101652>
- 997 McCann, J. C., Luan, S., Cardoso, F., Derakhshani, H., Khafipour, E., & Loor, J. J. (2016). Induction of  
998 subacute ruminal acidosis affects the ruminal microbiome and epithelium. *Frontiers in Microbiology*,  
999 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00701>
- 1000 McCann, J. C., Wickersham, T., & Loor, J. J. (2014). High-throughput Methods Redefine the Rumen  
1001 Microbiome and Its Relationship with Nutrition and Metabolism. *Bioinformatics and Biology Insights*,  
1002 8, BBI.S15389. <https://doi.org/10.4137/bbi.s15389>
- 1003 Meale, S. J., Li, S., Azevedo, P., Derakhshani, H., Plaizier, J., Khafipour, E., & Steele, M. (2016).  
1004 Development of ruminal and fecal microbiomes are affected by weaning but not weaning strategy in  
1005 dairy calves. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00582>
- 1006 Meale, S.J., Chaucheyras-Durand, F., Berends, H., Guan, L.L., & Steele, M.A. (2017). From pre- to  
1007 postweaning: Transformation of the young calf's gastrointestinal tract. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 100(7),  
1008 5984–5995. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-12474>
- 1009 Menchetti, L., Traina, G., Tomasello, G., Casagrande-Proietti, P., Leonardi, L., Barbato, O., & Brecchia,  
1010 G. (2016). Potential benefits of colostrum in gastrointestinal diseases. *Frontiers in Bioscience*, 8(2),  
1011 331–351. <https://doi.org/10.2741/s467>
- 1012 Michaudel, C., & Sokol, H. (2020). The gut microbiota at the service of immunometabolism. *Cell*  
1013 *Metabolism*, 32(4), 514–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2020.09.004>
- 1014 Mir, R. A., Kleinhenz, M. D., Allen, H. K., & Kudva, I. T. (2019). Fecal microbiota changes associated with  
1015 dehorning and castration stress primarily affects light-weight dairy calves. *PLOS ONE*, 14(1), e0210203.  
1016 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210203>
- 1017 Moeller, A. H., Foerster, S., Wilson, M. L., Pusey, A. E., Hahn, B. H., & Ochman, H. (2016). Social behavior  
1018 shapes the chimpanzee pan-microbiome. *Science Advances*, 2(1).  
1019 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500997>
- 1020 Monteiro, H. F., Zhou, Z., Gomes, M. S., Peixoto, P. M. G., Bonsaglia, E. C. R., Canisso, I. F., Weimer, B.  
1021 C., & Lima, F. S. (2022). Rumen and lower gut microbiomes relationship with feed efficiency and  
1022 production traits throughout the lactation of Holstein dairy cows. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1).  
1023 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-08761-5>
- 1024 Mott, A. C., Schneider, D., Hünerberg, M., Hummel, J., & Tetens, J. (2022). Bovine Rumen Microbiome:  
1025 Impact of DNA extraction methods and comparison of Non-Invasive Sampling Sites. *Ruminants*, 2(1),  
1026 112–132. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ruminants2010007>
- 1027 Münger, E., Montiel-Castro, A. J., Langhans, W., & Pacheco-López, G. (2018). Reciprocal interactions  
1028 between gut microbiota and host social behavior. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 12.  
1029 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2018.00021>
- 1030 Myer, P. R., Freetly, H. C., Wells, J. E., Smith, T., & Kuehn, L. A. (2017). Analysis of the gut bacterial  
1031 communities in beef cattle and their association with feed intake, growth, and efficiency. *Journal of*  
1032 *Animal Science*, 95(7), 3215. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas2016.1059>

- 1033 Nagel, C., Aurich, C., & Aurich, J. (2019). Stress effects on the regulation of parturition in different  
1034 domestic animal species. *Animal Reproduction Science*, 207, 153–161.  
1035 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anireprosci.2019.04.011>
- 1036 Nanthakumar, N. N., Meng, D., & Newburg, D. S. (2013). Glucocorticoids and microbiota regulate  
1037 ontogeny of intestinal fucosyltransferase 2 requisite for gut homeostasis. *Glycobiology*, 23(10), 1131–  
1038 1141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwt050>
- 1039 Neamț, R. I., Ilie, D., Enculescu, M., Săplăcan, S., & Ciszter, T. L. (2019). The Weaning Stress Effect on  
1040 Calf Behaviour and Performances. *Research Journal of Biotechnology*, 14(3).costaNeave, H. W., Weary,  
1041 D. M., & Von Keyserlingk, M. (2018). Review: Individual variability in feeding behaviour of domesticated  
1042 ruminants. *Animals*, 12, s419–s430. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1751731118001325>
- 1043 Neave, H. W., Weary, D. M., & Von Keyserlingk, M. (2018). Review: Individual variability in feeding  
1044 behaviour of domesticated ruminants. *Animals*, 12, s419–s430.  
1045 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1751731118001325>
- 1046 Niu, X., Ding, Y., Chen, S., Gooneratne, R., & Ju, X. (2022). Effect of immune stress on growth  
1047 performance and immune functions of livestock: Mechanisms and prevention. *Animals*, 12(7), 909.  
1048 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12070909>
- 1049 Nowacki, M. R. (1993). Cell proliferation in colonic crypts of germ-free and conventional mice--  
1050 preliminary report. *PubMed*, 31(2), 77–81. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8405572>
- 1051 O’Callaghan, T. F., Ross, R. P., Stanton, C., & Clarke, G. (2016). The gut microbiome as a virtual endocrine  
1052 organ with implications for farm and *Domestic Animal Endocrinology*. *Domestic Animal Endocrinology*,  
1053 56, S44–S55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.domaniend.2016.05.003>
- 1054 O’Hara, E., Kenny, D. A., McGovern, E., Byrne, C., McCabe, M. S., Guan, L. L., & Waters, S. M. (2020).  
1055 Investigating temporal microbial dynamics in the rumen of beef calves raised on two farms during early  
1056 life. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 96(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiz203>
- 1057 Oikonomou, G., Teixeira, A., Foditsch, C., Bicalho, M., Machado, V., & Bicalho, R. (2013). Fecal Microbial  
1058 Diversity in Pre-Weaned Dairy Calves as Described by Pyrosequencing of Metagenomic 16S rDNA.  
1059 Associations of Faecalibacterium Species with Health and Growth. *PLOS ONE*, 8(4), e63157.  
1060 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0063157>
- 1061 Orihuela, A., & Galina, C. (2019). Effects of separation of cows and calves on reproductive performance  
1062 and animal welfare in tropical beef cattle. *Animals*, 9(5), 223. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9050223>
- 1063 Overvest, M., Crossley, R., Miller-Cushon, E., & DeVries, T. (2018). Social housing influences the  
1064 behavior and feed intake of dairy calves during weaning. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 101(9), 8123–8134.  
1065 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-14465>
- 1066 Owens, C. E., Huffard, H. G., Nin-Velez, A. I., Duncan, J., Teets, C. L., Daniels, K., Ealy, A. D., James, R. E.,  
1067 Knowlton, K. F., & Cockrum, R. (2021). Microbiomes of various maternal body systems are predictive  
1068 of calf digestive bacterial ecology. *Animals*, 11(8), 2210. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11082210>
- 1069 Patrascu, O., Béguet-Crespel, F., Marinelli, L., Chatelier, E. L., Abraham, A., Leclerc, M., Klopp, C.,  
1070 Terrapon, N., Henrissat, B., Blottière, H. M., Doré, J., & Béra-Maillet, C. (2017). A fibrolytic potential in

- 1071 the human ileum mucosal microbiota revealed by functional metagenomic. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1).  
1072 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep40248>
- 1073 Penders, J., Thijs, C., Vink, C., Stelma, F., Snijders, B. E., Kummeling, I., Van Den Brandt, P. A., &  
1074 Stobberingh, E. E. (2006). Factors influencing the composition of the intestinal microbiota in early  
1075 infancy. *Pediatrics*, 118(2), 511–521. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2005-2824>
- 1076 Petersson, J., Schreiber, O., Hansson, G. C., Gendler, S. J., Velcich, A., Lundberg, J. O., Roos, S., Holm, L.,  
1077 & Phillipson, M. (2011). Importance and regulation of the colonic mucus barrier in a mouse model of  
1078 colitis. *American Journal of Physiology-gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, 300(2), G327–G333.  
1079 <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.00422.2010>
- 1080 Puppel, K., Gołębiewski, M., Konopka, K., Kunowska-Słószarz, M., Słószarz, J., Grodkowski, G., Przysucha,  
1081 T., Balcerak, M., Madras-Majewska, B., & Sakowski, T. (2020). Relationship between the Quality of  
1082 Colostrum and the Formation of Microflora in the Digestive Tract of Calves. *Animals*, 10(8), 1293.  
1083 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10081293>
- 1084 Rajoka, M. S. R., Shi, J., Mehwish, H. M., Zhu, J., Li, Q., Shao, D., Huang, Q., & Yang, H. (2017). Interaction  
1085 between diet composition and gut microbiota and its impact on gastrointestinal tract health. *Food*  
1086 *Science and Human Wellness*, 6(3), 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fshw.2017.07.003>
- 1087 Ramírez, G. A., Richardson, E., Clark, J., Keshri, J., Drechsler, Y., Berrang, M. E., Meinersmann, R. J., Cox,  
1088 N. A., & Oakley, B. B. (2020a). Broiler chickens and early life programming: Microbiome transplant-  
1089 induced cecal community dynamics and phenotypic effects. *PLOS ONE*, 15(11), e0242108.  
1090 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242108>
- 1091 Ramírez, J., Guarner, F., Fernández, L., Maruy, A., Sdepanian, V. L., & Cohen, H. (2020b). Antibiotics as  
1092 major disruptors of gut microbiota. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology*, 10.  
1093 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2020.572912>
- 1094 Ray, K. J., Cotter, S. Y., Arzika, A. M., Kim, J., Boubacar, N., Zhou, Z., Zhong, L., Porco, T. C., Keenan, J. D.,  
1095 Lietman, T. M., & Doan, T. (2019). High-throughput sequencing of pooled samples to determine  
1096 community-level microbiome diversity. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 39, 63–68.  
1097 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2019.09.002>
- 1098 Rea, K., Dinan, T. G., & Cryan, J. F. (2019). Gut Microbiota: a perspective for psychiatrists.  
1099 *Neuropsychobiology*, 79(1), 50–62. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000504495>
- 1100 Renaud, D., Kelton, D., Weese, J. S., Noble, C., & Duffield, T. (2019). Evaluation of a multispecies  
1101 probiotic as a supportive treatment for diarrhea in dairy calves: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of*  
1102 *Dairy Science*, 102(5), 4498–4505. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15793>
- 1103 Renz, H., Brandtzaeg, P., & Hornef, M. W. (2012). The impact of perinatal immune development on  
1104 mucosal homeostasis and chronic inflammation. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, 12(1), 9–23.  
1105 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nri3112>
- 1106 Rosa, F., Michelotti, T. C., St-Pierre, B., Trevisi, E., & Osorio, J. S. (2021). Early Life Fecal Microbiota  
1107 Transplantation in Neonatal Dairy Calves Promotes Growth Performance and Alleviates Inflammation  
1108 and Oxidative Stress during Weaning. *Animals*, 11(9), 2704. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11092704>

- 1109 Salem, E., Hagglund, S., Cassard, H., Corre, T., Näslund, K., Foret, C., Gauthier, D. T., Pinard, A.,  
1110 Delverdier, M., Zohari, S., Valarcher, J. F., Ducatez, M., & Meyer, G. (2019). Pathogenesis, host innate  
1111 immune response, and aerosol transmission of influenza D virus in cattle. *Journal of Virology*, 93(7).  
1112 <https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01853-18>
- 1113 Schwarzkopf, S., Kinoshita, A., Kluess, J., Kersten, S., Meyer, U., Huber, K., Dänicke, S., & Frahm, J.  
1114 (2019). Weaning Holstein Calves at 17 Weeks of Age Enables Smooth Transition from Liquid to Solid  
1115 Feed. *Animals*, 9(12), 1132. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9121132>
- 1116 Scoley, G., Gordon, A., & Morrison, S. (2019). Performance and behavioural responses of group housed  
1117 dairy calves to two different weaning methods. *Animals*, 9(11), 895.  
1118 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9110895>
- 1119 Slanzon, G. S., Ridenhour, B. J., Moore, D. A., Sischo, W. M., Parrish, L. M., Trombetta, S. C., & McConnel,  
1120 C. S. (2022). Fecal microbiome profiles of neonatal dairy calves with varying severities of  
1121 gastrointestinal disease. *PloS One*, 17(1), e0262317. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0262317>
- 1122 Song, S. J., Lauber, C. L., Costello, E. K., Lozupone, C., Humphrey, G., Berg-Lyons, D., Caporaso, J. G.,  
1123 Knights, D., Clemente, J. C., Nakielny, S., Gordon, J. I., Fierer, N., & Knight, R. (2013). Cohabiting family  
1124 members share microbiota with one another and with their dogs. *eLife*, 2.  
1125 <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.00458>
- 1126 Song, Y., Li, F., Fischer-Tlustos, A., Neves, A. C. M. D., He, Z., Steele, M., & Guan, L. L. (2021).  
1127 Metagenomic analysis revealed the individualized shift in ileal microbiome of neonatal calves in  
1128 response to delaying the first colostrum feeding. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 104(8), 8783–8797.  
1129 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-20068>
- 1130 Song, Y., Malmuthuge, N., Li, F., & Guan, L. L. (2019). Colostrum feeding shapes the hindgut microbiota  
1131 of dairy calves during the first 12 h of life. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 95(1).  
1132 <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiy203>
- 1133 Sprockett, D. D., Fukami, T., & Relman, D. A. (2018). Role of priority effects in the early-life assembly of  
1134 the gut microbiota. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 15(4), 197–205.  
1135 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2017.173>
- 1136 Steagall, P. V., Bustamante, H., Johnson, C. B., & Turner, P. V. (2021). Pain management in farm animals:  
1137 focus on cattle, sheep and pigs. *Animals*, 11(6), 1483. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11061483>
- 1138 Stefańska, B., Sroka, J., Katzer, F., Goliński, P., & Nowak, W. (2021). The effect of probiotics, phytobiotics  
1139 and their combination as feed additives in the diet of dairy calves on performance, rumen  
1140 fermentation and blood metabolites during the preweaning period. *Animal Feed Science and  
1141 Technology*, 272, 114738. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2020.114738>
- 1142 Svensson, C., & Liberg, P. (2006). The effect of group size on health and growth rate of Swedish dairy  
1143 calves housed in pens with automatic milk-feeders. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 73(1), 43–53.  
1144 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2005.08.021>
- 1145 Taschuk, R., & Griebel, P. (2012). Commensal microbiome effects on mucosal immune system  
1146 development in the ruminant gastrointestinal tract. *Animal Health Research Reviews*, 13(1), 129–141.  
1147 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1466252312000096>



- 1148 Tena-Garitaonaindia, M., Arredondo-Amador, M., Mascaraque, C., Asensio, M., Marin, J. J. G.,  
1149 Martínez-Augustin, O., & De Medina, F. S. (2022). Modulation of intestinal barrier function by  
1150 glucocorticoids: Lessons from preclinical models. *Pharmacological Research*, 177, 106056.  
1151 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2022.106056>
- 1152 Turnbaugh, P. J., & Gordon, J. I. (2009). The core gut microbiome, energy balance and obesity. *The*  
1153 *Journal of Physiology*, 587(17), 4153–4158. <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2009.174136>
- 1154 Upadhaya, S., & Kim, I. (2021). The impact of weaning stress on gut health and the mechanistic aspects  
1155 of several feed additives contributing to improved gut health function in Weanling Piglets—A review.  
1156 *Animals*, 11(8), 2418. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11082418>
- 1157 Uyeno, Y., Sekiguchi, Y., & Kamagata, Y. (2010). rRNA-based analysis to monitor succession of faecal  
1158 bacterial communities in Holstein calves. *Letters in Applied Microbiology*, 51(5), 570–577.  
1159 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765x.2010.02937.x>
- 1160 Uyeno, Y., Shigemori, S., & Shimosato, T. (2015). Effect of Probiotics/Prebiotics on cattle health and  
1161 productivity. *Microbes and Environments*, 30(2), 126–132. <https://doi.org/10.1264/jsme2.me14176>
- 1162 Valerio, A., Casadei, L., Giuliani, A., & Valerio, M. (2019). Fecal Metabolomics as a novel noninvasive  
1163 method for Short-Term stress monitoring in beef cattle. *Journal of Proteome Research*, 19(2), 845–853.  
1164 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jproteome.9b00655>
- 1165 Van Den Abbeele, P., Van De Wiele, T., Verstraete, W., & Possemiers, S. (2011). The host selects mucosal  
1166 and luminal associations of coevolved gut microorganisms: a novel concept. *FEMS Microbiology*  
1167 *Reviews*, 35(4), 681–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00270.x>
- 1168 Vieira, A.D.P., Von Keyserlingk, M., & Weary, D. M. (2010). Effects of pair versus single housing on  
1169 performance and behavior of dairy calves before and after weaning from milk. *Journal of Dairy Science*,  
1170 93(7), 3079–3085. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2516>
- 1171 Vlková, E., Trojanová, I., & Rada, V. (2006). Distribution of bifidobacteria in the gastrointestinal tract of  
1172 calves. *Folia Microbiologica*, 51(4), 325–328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02931825>
- 1173 Von Buenau, R., Jaekel, L. Z., Schubotz, E., Schwarz, Š., Stroff, T., & Krueger, M. (2005). Escherichia coli  
1174 Strain Nissle 1917: Significant Reduction of Neonatal Calf Diarrhea. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 88(1),  
1175 317–323. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302\(05\)72690-4](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302(05)72690-4)
- 1176 Wang, H., Li, H., Wu, F., Qiu, X., Yu, Z., Niu, W., He, Y., Su, H., & Cao, B. (2019). Effects of dietary energy  
1177 on growth performance, rumen fermentation and bacterial community, and meat quality of Holstein-  
1178 Friesians Bulls slaughtered at different ages. *Animals*, 9(12), 1123.  
1179 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9121123>
- 1180 Webb, C. R., Koboziev, I., Furr, K. L., & Grisham, M. B. (2016). Protective and pro-inflammatory roles of  
1181 intestinal bacteria. *Pathophysiology*, 23(2), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pathophys.2016.02.002>
- 1182 Wei, X., Zou, J., Zhang, Y., Yang, J., Wang, J., Wang, Y., & Wang, C. (2023). Effects of milk, milk replacer,  
1183 and milk replacer plus ethoxyquin on the growth performance, weaning stress, and the fecal  
1184 microbiota of Holstein dairy calves. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 14.  
1185 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.111351>

- 1186 Weimer, P. J. (2015). Redundancy, resilience, and host specificity of the ruminal microbiota:  
1187 implications for engineering improved ruminal fermentations. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6.  
1188 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.00296>
- 1189 Welch, C. B., Lourenço, J. M., Stewart, R. L., Krause, T., Carmichael, M. N., Rothrock, M. J., Pringle, T. D.,  
1190 & Callaway, T. R. (2020). The impact of feed efficiency selection on the ruminal, cecal, and fecal  
1191 microbiomes of Angus steers from a commercial feedlot. *Journal of Animal Science*, 98(7).  
1192 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jas/skaa230>
- 1193 Welch, C. B., Ryman, V. E., Pringle, T. D., & Lourenço, J. M. (2022). Utilizing the Gastrointestinal  
1194 Microbiota to Modulate Cattle Health through the Microbiome-Gut-Organ Axes. *Microorganisms*,  
1195 10(7), 1391. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10071391>
- 1196 Welk, A., Neave, H. W., & Jensen, M. B. (2024). Invited review: The effect of weaning practices on dairy  
1197 calf performance, behavior, and health – a systematic review. *Journal of Dairy Science*.  
1198 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2024-24521>
- 1199 Wen, C., Van Dixhoorn, I., Schokker, D., Woelders, H., Stockhofe-Zurwieden, N., Rebel, J. M., & Smidt,  
1200 H. (2021). Environmentally enriched housing conditions affect pig welfare, immune system and gut  
1201 microbiota in early life. *Animal Microbiome*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42523-021-00115-2>
- 1202 Whalin, L., Weary, D. M., & Von Keyserlingk, M. (2021). Understanding behavioural development of  
1203 calves in natural settings to inform calf management. *Animals*, 11(8), 2446.  
1204 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11082446>
- 1205 Whon, T. W., Kim, H. S., Shin, N., Sung, H., Kim, M., Kim, J. Y., Kang, W., Kim, P. S., Hyun, D., Seong, H.  
1206 J., Sul, W. J., Roh, S. W., & Bae, J. (2021). Calf diarrhea caused by prolonged expansion of autochthonous  
1207 gut enterobacteriaceae and their lytic bacteriophages. *MSystems*, 6(2).  
1208 <https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00816-20>
- 1209 Wickramasinghe, J., Anast, J. M., Schmitz-Esser, S., Serão, N. V. L., & Appuhamy, J. (2020). Beginning to  
1210 offer drinking water at birth increases the species richness and the abundance of *Faecalibacterium* and  
1211 *Bifidobacterium* in the gut of preweaned dairy calves. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103(5), 4262–4274.  
1212 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17258>
- 1213 Wickramasinghe, J., Kramer, A., & Appuhamy, J. (2019). Drinking water intake of newborn dairy calves  
1214 and its effects on feed intake, growth performance, health status, and nutrient digestibility. *Journal of*  
1215 *Dairy Science*, 102(1), 377–387. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15579>
- 1216 Wilczyńska, P., Skarżyńska, E., & Lisowska-Myjak, B. (2019). Meconium microbiome as a new source of  
1217 information about long-term health and disease: questions and answers. *Journal of Maternal-fetal &*  
1218 *Neonatal Medicine*, 32(4), 681–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767058.2017.1387888>
- 1219 Xie, G., Duff, G. C., Hall, L. S., Allen, J. D., Burrows, C. D., Bernal-Rigoli, J. C., Dowd, S. E., Guerriero, V.,  
1220 & Yeoman, C. J. (2013). Alteration of digestive tract microbiome in neonatal Holstein bull calves by  
1221 bacitracin methylene disalicylate treatment and scours1. *Journal of Animal Science*, 91(10), 4984–  
1222 4990. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-6304>
- 1223 Yáñez-Ruíz, D. R., Abecia, L., & Newbold, C. J. (2015). Manipulating rumen microbiome and  
1224 fermentation through interventions during early life: a review. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6.  
1225 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01133>

- 1226 Yeoman, C. J., & White, B. A. (2014). Gastrointestinal tract microbiota and probiotics in production  
1227 animals. *Annual Review of Animal Biosciences*, 2(1), 469–486. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-  
animal-022513-114149](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-<br/>1228 animal-022513-114149)
- 1229 Yeoman, C. J., Ishaq, S. L., Bichi, E., Olivo, S. K., Lowe, J., & Aldridge, B. M. (2018). Biogeographical  
1230 Differences in the Influence of Maternal Microbial Sources on the Early Successional Development of  
1231 the Bovine Neonatal Gastrointestinal tract. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1). [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-  
018-21440-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-<br/>1232 018-21440-8)
- 1233 Zábanský, L., Poborská, A., Gálik, B., Šoch, M., Brož, P., Kantor, M., Kernerová, N., Řezáč, I., Rolinec, M.,  
1234 Hanušovský, O., Strnad, L., & Havrdová, N. (2022). Influence of probiotic strains bifidobacterium,  
1235 lactobacillus, and enterococcus on the health status and weight gain of calves, and the utilization of  
1236 nitrogenous compounds. *Antibiotics*, 11(9), 1273. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics11091273>
- 1237 Zhang, C., Zhang, J., Yu, Z., Zhou, G., & Yao, J. (2022). Effects of supplementation with *Saccharomyces*  
1238 *cerevisiae* products on dairy calves: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 105(9), 7386–7398.  
1239 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2021-21519>
- 1240 Zhang, N., Chen, W., Chan, P. T., Yen, H., Tang, J. W., & Li, Y. (2020). Close contact behavior in indoor  
1241 environment and transmission of respiratory infection. *Indoor Air*, 30(4), 645–661.  
1242 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12673>
- 1243 Zhu, H., Yang, M., Loor, J. J., Elolimy, A. A., Li, L., Xu, C., Wang, W., Yin, S., & Qu, Y. (2021). Analysis of  
1244 Cow-Calf microbiome transfer routes and microbiome diversity in the newborn Holstein Dairy calf  
1245 hindgut. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2021.736270>
- 1246