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Summary
In the years 2007-2010 the total sales of antibiotics decreased by 23%. Sample data about the antibiotic use in specific animal species in the Netherlands also indicate a substantial decrease in antibiotic use in four out of five animal production sectors examined in 2010.

Trends in total sales
Sales data reveal that the total amount of antibiotics sold by the pharmaceutical industry (FIDIN members) in the Netherlands for therapeutic veterinary use, has increased by 83% in the period 1999-2007. In the last three years the antibiotic sales in the Dutch animal production decreased by 23%, to a total of 455 tonnes in 2010. This downward trend of veterinary antibiotic sales is in line with the policy objective of 20% reduction in 2011, compared with 2009.
**Trends in exposure**

The figures on exposure to antibiotics in the sample surveys reveal the following tendencies for the years 2005-2010, indicating a substantial decrease in antibiotic use in most animal production sectors in the Netherlands in 2010:

- sow/piglet farms: annual variation, decrease in 2010;
- fattening pig farms: decrease in 2009 and 2010;
- broiler farms: increased usage from 2005 to 2009, decrease in 2010;
- veal calf farms: decreased usage from 2007 to 2010;
- dairy farms: decrease in 2009, increase in 2010.

1 **Introduction**

*Aim*

The objective of this study is to obtain detailed insight into the exposure of farm animals to antibiotics, by monitoring both sales data at the national level and more specifically data per animal species. The results of the study can be used by the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation for policy evaluation. In addition, the usage data might play a role in explaining trends in resistance that have become apparent. Moreover, these data might be used to inform the European Commission.

*Monitoring in the Netherlands*

Monitoring of antibiotic usages in the Netherlands is done in two ways. Since 1998 FIDIN, the federation of the Dutch veterinary pharmaceutical industry, annually reports antibiotic sales figures in the Netherlands (FIDIN, 2011). The sales figures stated in these reports give an impression of the total amount of active substances used in the Netherlands at the level of pharmacotherapeutic groups. LEI, part of Wageningen UR, monitors the antibiotic use on a stratified sample of Dutch farms. This provides information about the true exposure of farm animals to antibiotics, and gives insight into the underlying factors that could explain changes in antibiotic use. In cooperation with the veal calf sector the use in veal calves is monitored in an additional sample.

*Monitoring in Europe*

All EU member states are required to monitor antimicrobial resistance in food producing animals of public health concern (Zoonosis Directive 2003/99/EC). Within this context, monitoring of antibiotic usage is equally important. Therefore the European Medicines Agency (EMA) is carrying out the ESVAC project to establish national systems for the collection of data on sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in Europe, in a standardized way (EMA, 2010). ESVAC stands for European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption. The project was set up in April 2010 to collect information on how antimicrobial medicines are used in animals across the European Union. The EMA started this project following a request from the European Commission for the Agency to develop a harmonised approach for the collection and reporting of data on the use of antimicrobial agents in animals from the EU Member States. EC Directive 2001/82/EC and Regulation 726/2004 form a legal basis for national authorities to request the pharmaceutical industry to provide data on sales of antimicrobial agents. However, member states are not yet obliged to provide data about the use of veterinary antibiotics to the EC.
2 Materials and methods

2.1 Analysis of sales data

FIDIN reports the total number of kilograms of antibiotics (active ingredient) sold in the Netherlands at the level of pharmacotherapeutic groups. The data about use of active substances are based on sales data of members of FIDIN and are estimated to cover about 98% of all sales. Actual use can be different from the amounts sold as a result of stock piling and cross border use. The figures give information about the total sales for all animals, not per individual animal species.

Table 2.1. Trends in livestock in the Netherlands in numbers (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of animals * 1,000</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piglets (less than 20 kg)</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>4,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sows</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattening pigs (of at least 50 kg)</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>5,705</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>6,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pigs</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other poultry</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,714</td>
<td>43,168</td>
<td>44,427</td>
<td>45,800</td>
<td>45,475</td>
<td>45,068</td>
<td>46,976</td>
<td>48,885</td>
<td>48,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (excl. veal calves)</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat 2010
1) Other pigs is a calculated number
2) Poultry 2010 is not yet available; poultry numbers 2009 are used

Table 2.2. Trends in livestock in the Netherlands in live weight (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live weight *1,000 kg</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>831,204</td>
<td>793,152</td>
<td>715,992</td>
<td>699,434</td>
<td>678,786</td>
<td>691,691</td>
<td>685,943</td>
<td>675,876</td>
<td>699,092</td>
<td>703,127</td>
<td>725,258</td>
<td>741,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>8,706</td>
<td>6,672</td>
<td>7,428</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>7,332</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td>8,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other poultry</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>48,714</td>
<td>43,168</td>
<td>44,427</td>
<td>45,800</td>
<td>45,475</td>
<td>45,068</td>
<td>46,976</td>
<td>48,885</td>
<td>48,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td>137,920</td>
<td>130,334</td>
<td>116,542</td>
<td>119,301</td>
<td>129,024</td>
<td>133,610</td>
<td>140,161</td>
<td>142,058</td>
<td>148,264</td>
<td>157,401</td>
<td>152,746</td>
<td>158,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (excl. veal calves)</td>
<td>1,648,500</td>
<td>1,567,000</td>
<td>1,583,000</td>
<td>1,544,000</td>
<td>1,493,150</td>
<td>1,492,000</td>
<td>1,466,500</td>
<td>1,424,500</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>1,541,500</td>
<td>1,556,000</td>
<td>1,519,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>69,120</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>88,560</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>105,300</td>
<td>102,900</td>
<td>92,700</td>
<td>65,460</td>
<td>72,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,744,524</td>
<td>2,623,266</td>
<td>2,548,315</td>
<td>2,498,155</td>
<td>2,439,360</td>
<td>2,471,156</td>
<td>2,449,404</td>
<td>2,400,409</td>
<td>2,482,716</td>
<td>2,549,037</td>
<td>2,556,368</td>
<td>2,492,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To adjust for trends in the size of the animal population the sales of antibiotics in grams per kilogram of live animal weight are determined. For this the annual total sales figures published by FIDIN have been related to the total live weight of animals in the Dutch livestock farming sector (pigs, poultry, veal calves,
other cattle and sheep). For this analysis the following average weights have been used: veal calves 172 kg (i.e. the weighted average of white veal calf 164 kg and rosé veal calf 192 kg), other cattle 500 kg, turkeys 6 kg, other poultry 1 kg, fattening pig 70 kg, sow 220 kg, other pigs 70 kg, piglets (< 20 kg) 10 kg, sheep 60 kg. This yields information about the trend in the sales of antibiotics in grams per kilogram of live animal weight over the years, thus taking yearly fluctuations in the size of the animal population into account.

The yearly average numbers of animals and its conversion into live weight are given in Table 2.1 and 2.2.

2.2 Analysis of sample data

The Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) contains a representative, stratified sample of around 1,500 agricultural and horticultural farms in the Netherlands (Vrolijk et al., 2009). Records are made of the economic data and technical key figures of these farms. Every year a number of farms are replaced by other farms to ensure that the database of the Data Network remains representative for Dutch livestock farming. On these farms all animal-medicine data and veterinary services are recorded. The data for the veal calves originate from an additional random sample of veal calf farms. On these farms detailed data were collected on number of animals present and the amount of antibiotics used.

These data are available on the LEI websites (www.lei.wur.nl and www.maran.wur.nl). Data of 214 pig, broiler and dairy cattle farms in the FADN were used to estimate the antibiotic usage in 2010. Data from veal calf farms were collected in an additional sample. See Table 2.3 for details.

The use of antibiotics is expressed as the number of daily dosages per animal year and about the use in grams of active ingredients per animal year. The aggregated usage data are considered to be representative for the total exposure of Dutch food-producing animals to antibiotics. The 95% confidence intervals (CI) indicate that with 95% certainty, the average antibiotic use per animal on a national level, expressed in the number of daily dosages per animal year, will lie within the upper and lower limits given. The confidence interval also indicates the variation in antibiotic usage amongst farms.
### Table 2.3. Number of sample farms taking part each year and the associated number of animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of holding</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sows / piglets</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>12,155</td>
<td>17,949</td>
<td>18,767</td>
<td>20,806</td>
<td>24,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattening pigs</td>
<td>54,788</td>
<td>55,970</td>
<td>119,922</td>
<td>156,098</td>
<td>159,104</td>
<td>153,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td>2,367,623</td>
<td>2,315,882</td>
<td>2,197,716</td>
<td>2,508,103</td>
<td>2,530,313</td>
<td>2,244,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>124,115</td>
<td>134,437</td>
<td>134,446</td>
<td>124,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cows</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sows / piglets</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattening pigs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cows</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. = no data available

#### 2.3 Daily doses

To provide insight into the true exposure of animals to antibiotics, the use is expressed in the number of daily doses per animal year: ADD (Jensen et al., 2004). Antibiotics vary in their potency and pharmacokinetic properties\(^1\), and this results in different dosages per kilogram of body weight between and within antibiotic classes. Because of these differences the unit “grams per kg live weight”, as calculated from total sales figures, is a less accurate indicator for the use of antibiotics. The unit “daily dosage” is more suitable for calculating the exposure of animals to antibiotics. Adopting this approach offers an opportunity to obtain more insight into the relationship with the occurrence and trends in resistance. Moreover, this unit conforms to international developments in this field and developments in the human health sector. The broader implementation of records of this nature will also improve the feasibility to compare for example the antibiotic use in different EU member states in similar livestock systems.

The number of daily dosages per animal year was determined by calculating the total number of kilograms of animal that can be treated with each active ingredient: the treatable weight. This was then divided by the total weight of the average present livestock on the farm\(^2\). This assumes that the average treatment is administered to animals with an average weight. With this approach the calculation and comparison of the total antibiotic use on farms is possible, even when different active ingredients are involved. Expressing the use per animal year enables comparisons of farms with different vacancy periods. However, especially in some sectors (e.g. veal calves) differences in length of production periods should also be taken into account.

---

\(^1\) Differences in dosage are determined by differences in potency, differences in bioavailability and distribution throughout the body.

\(^2\) This is the average weight of the animals (in kg per animal) multiplied by the average number of animals present on the farm per year. Note that on dairy farms only the weight of the dairy cows has been taken into account.
This information is used to obtain insight into the total antibiotic use for specific animal species and categories of animal species (for example, fattening pigs) on a specific group of farms (for example, all pig farms with fattening pigs). This is expressed in terms of an average number of daily dosages per animal year for fattening pigs. More information about this unit of measurement is given in the following daily dosages box, which also includes an example of a calculation. The use of antibiotics in spray containers is not included.

Animal weights
In general, younger animals are more likely to encounter health problems than older animals, while animals no longer receive antibiotics in the last period before slaughter, primarily because of less health problems and also to ensure that the meat is free of antibiotic residues. The best estimation of the total treatment duration per year would be obtained by calculating the number of daily dosages on the basis of the best possible estimate of the average weight at the time of treatment. However, the information currently available is not sufficient to determine the exact weight of the animals at the time of the administration of the medicine. For this reason the calculations in this report are still based on the average weight per animal during the animals’ presence on the farm. The calculated number of defined daily dosages is therefore expected to be an underestimation of the true exposure, especially for piglets, fattening pigs and veal calves.

In the sample survey the following average weights have been used: dairy cows 600 kg, veal calves 172 kg (i.e. the weighted average of white veal calf 164 kg and rosé veal calf 192 kg), broilers 1 kg, fattening pigs 70 kg, sows 220 kg, maiden gilts 107.5 kg, piglets (<25 kg) 12.5 kg, breeding boars 350 kg (ASG, 2010). On dairy farms the number of daily dosages is based on the weight of the dairy cows only, because this category of the animals gets almost all of the antibiotics. On sow farms the size of the ‘population at risk’ is based on the weight of all present animals (including piglets, gilts, breeding boars). For an illustrative calculation of the number of daily dosages for young calves on dairy farms (from birth to weaning at 56 days of age) the average weight of 56.5 kg has been used.
Daily dosages
The amounts of different active ingredients cannot simply be totalled since the antimicrobial potency and pharmacokinetics (and, consequently, the dosage prescription) varies between active ingredients. However, active ingredients can be compared and totalled once the active ingredient in each antibiotic preparation is expressed in terms of the daily dosage. The daily dosage is a measure of the number of milligrams of a specific active ingredient required to treat one kilogram of animal in one day with that antibiotic preparation, and is based on the recorded average dosage of a medicine for a specific type of animal\(^3\). These daily dosages can be totalled to determine the total exposure to antibiotics. The daily dosages are specific to the type of animal, and have been defined for dairy cattle, veal calves, pigs and poultry. Consequently, antibiotic preparations may have been assigned multiple daily dosages, according to the type of animal the preparations are administered to, i.e. the daily dosage for each type of animal.

\textbf{Example of a calculation of the daily dosage}
For example, a farm with 150 fattening pigs with an average weight of 70.2 kg used 2 litres of antibiotic preparation X during the course of one year (X contains 40\% = 400 mg/ml active ingredient a) and 20 kg of antibiotic preparation Y (Y contains 25\% = 250 mg/g active ingredient b). Antibiotic preparation X: the defined daily dosage of active ingredient a is 10 mg per kg animal weight per day. Antibiotic preparation Y: the defined daily dosage of active ingredient b is 50 mg per kg animal weight per day.

Antibiotic X can be used to treat \((2,000 \times 400)/10 = 80,000\) kg animal weight. Antibiotic Y can be used to treat \((20,000 \times 250)/50 = 100,000\) kg animal weight. Consequently, the farm has used antibiotics for treatment of a total of 180,000 kg animal weight. The farm has an average of 150 fattening pigs per year, with a total weight of 10,530 kg. 180,000 kg were treated in that year, equivalent to \(180,000/10,530 = 17.1\) daily dosages. Consequently, an average fattening pig on the farm in that year was administered a prescribed dosage of antibiotics on 17.1 days. In this example the farm uses 17.1 daily dosages per animal year of antibiotic preparation X plus Y.
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farm size and animal category. The additional sample of veal calf farms is additionally stratified for ‘large integration’ versus ‘small integration or non-contracted farms’.

Since the stratification is disproportional, the results have to be weighted to be representative. For each stratum the average daily dosages per animal year is determined. Then the weighted average for an animal category is calculated, based on the number of farms in the population in each stratum.

In this report the usage data of all sample farms are used to present the findings about the use of antibiotics and also for further statistical analysis about decrease of increase of antibiotic use over a period of two or more years. Comparing means between two years can be done in two ways, either by only using farms that are in the sample for both years\(^5\) or by comparing the means independently, using all sample farms in both years. The first method usually gives better results if the number of sample farms available in both periods is not much smaller that the number of farms in the separate years. This usually is the case in subsequent years. However, if the years of comparison are further apart, the number of sample farms available in both years will be more limited. Additionally, the direction of the change might even be different from the direction in the total sample. In that case, testing for significant differences can better be done by using the means and standard errors of the separate years instead of using a subsample.\(^6\)

3 Trends in antibiotic usage

3.1 Trends in total sales

Figure 3.1 shows the trends in the total sales of therapeutic antibiotics in the Netherlands, also expressed in grams of active substance per kg of live weight. The figure was prepared from total sales figures presented by FIDIN (FIDIN, 2011).

Figure 3.1 reveals that the total amount of antibiotics sold by the pharmaceutical industry (FIDIN members) in the Netherlands for therapeutic veterinary use has increased by 83% in the period 1999-2007 from 322 to 590 tonnes. After that the antibiotic sales in the Dutch animal production decreased by 23%, to a total of 455 tonnes in 2010. Compared with 2009, in 2010 the sales decreased by more than 12%. Because the livestock numbers remained stable, the sales in grams per kg of live weight also decreased by 12%.

\(^5\) See Appendix 3 in Vrolijk et al. (2008) for more detail about the statistics.

\(^6\) If the difference between the two means is larger than twice the square root of the sum of both squares of the standard errors then there is a significant difference.
Discussion

This downward trend of veterinary antibiotic sales is in line with the policy objective of 20% reduction in 2011, compared with 2009. The total sales volume amounted to 455 tonnes in 2010, which is more or less the 2004 level. However, at that time an additional 80 tonnes of antimicrobial growth promoters were used (see Table 3.1). Almost all classes of antibiotics showed a decrease.

Tetracyclines

The sales data show a decrease of tetracyclines from 338 tonnes in 2007 to 232 tonnes in 2010 (-31%), of which 149 tonnes of oxytetracyclines (-40%) and 81 tonnes of doxycyclines (-8%). The true exposure to tetracyclines did not decrease by 31%, but by an estimated 25%, roughly assuming a constant livestock population and an average dosage of 30 mg per kg of animal for oxytetracyclines and 10 mg per kg for doxycyclines.

Fluoroquinolones

In 2010 the fluoroquinolones represented 1.44% of the total veterinary antibiotic sales in the Netherlands, of which 0.38% ‘newer’ fluoroquinolones (danofloxacin, difloxacin, enrofloxacin and marbofloxacin). In the years 2007-2010 the sales of fluoroquinolones decreased substantially, by 30%. The sales of the newer fluoroquinolones showed an increase of 49%.

Cephalosporins

The cephalosporins represented 0.20% of the total sales, of which 0.16% third and fourth generation cephalosporins (ceftoperazon, cefovecin, ceftiquinome, cefitiofur, cefuroxim). In 2007-2010 the sales of third and fourth generation cephalosporins decreased by 22%.
3.2 Trends in exposure

Figure 3.2 shows the trends in exposure to antibiotics in defined daily dosages per average animal present per year (ADD) in the five livestock sectors examined in this study. The outcome of the calculations is indexed, using 2009 as baseline year. The continuous line represents the estimated average use. The 95% confidence intervals are indicated by the dotted lines shown in Figure 3.2. The results are presented from 2005 to 2010, for veal calves as from 2007.

Figure 3.2 shows different trends in exposure to antibiotics in the different animal species. The results indicate a substantial decrease in antibiotic use in most animal production sectors in 2010:
- sow/piglet farms: annual variation, decrease in 2010;
- fattening pig farms: decrease in 2009 and 2010;

Table 3.1. Antibiotic sales from 1999-2010 in tonnes (FIDIN, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penicillins /cephalosporins</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracyclines</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrolides</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminoglycosides</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoroquinolones</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim/Sulfonamides</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total therapeutic sales</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGP)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sales including AGP</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- broiler farms: increased usage from 2005 to 2009, decrease in 2010;
- veal calf farms: decreased usage from 2007 to 2010;
- dairy farms: decrease in 2009, increase in 2010.

For broilers the decrease in 2010 was statistically significant, and also the comparison of the pig farms that participated in the survey in 2009 and in 2010 reveals statistically significant decreases, both in sows and in fattening pigs. Note that the results do not permit a distinct conclusion that the antibiotic usage in the dairy cattle sector in the Netherlands has increased.

4 Antibiotic use per species
In this chapter the usage of the different types of antibiotics per livestock species is addressed into detail.

4.1 Pigs

*Sows and piglets*
In 2010, the average animal on sow/piglet production farms in this survey received approximately 19 daily dosages per year (95% Confidence Interval: 15-24 dd/ay). In 2009 the use was 25 daily dosages per year (95% CI: 21-30 dd/ay). The large confidence intervals are mainly caused by the large variation in use that exists between different farms. 83% of the antibiotics were orally administered, probably predominantly in piglets.

Figure 4.1 provides insight into the trends in the relative use of the various groups of antibiotics on the sample farms.
In 2010 50% of the total antibiotic use in sows/piglets consisted of tetracyclines, 14% of trimethoprim/sulfonamides and another 19% of penicillins. 0.6% of the total usage consisted of 3rd and 4th generation cephalosporins and 0.2% consisted of fluoroquinolones, which are likely to have been administered to young piglets before weaning.

**Discussion**
For sows/piglets in the sample the average use in 2010 was 19 daily dosages per year. However, in practice almost all of the antibiotics are likely used for the treatment of the piglets, and only incidentally for the sows. If it is assumed that 100% of the antibiotics are administered to the piglets, with an average weight of 12.5 kg, this would mean that an average piglet is treated with antibiotics during 19 days in the period from birth to the age of 74 days (at delivering to the fattening farm, at 25 kg).

**Fattening pigs**
The average fattening pig in the sample received 11 daily dosages per year in 2010, of which 95% orally administered (95% Confidence Interval: 7-16 dd/ay). In 2009 the average use was 16 daily dosages per year (CI: 11-20 dd/ay).

Figure 4.2 provides insight into the trends in the relative use of the various groups of antibiotics on the sample farms.
In 2010 66% of the total antibiotic use in fattening pigs originated from the administration of tetracyclines and 18% from macrolides/lincosamides. Cephalosporins and (fluoro)quinolones were not applied.

**Discussion**

The average fattening pig in the sample was treated with antibiotics 11 days per year. Assuming a production period of 117 days, 4 daily dosages (= 11 x (117/365) are administered to each fattening pig during its production period from 25 kg to slaughter weight. This average fattening pig has also received antibiotics at the breeding farm (during 19 days), which brings the total exposure to antibiotics per average fattening pig to approximately 23 days during its whole life from birth to slaughter at the average age of 191 days.

If it is assumed that the average treatment weight of fattening pigs will be 30% lower than their average live weight, since younger animals are more likely to receive antibiotics than older animals, the estimation of the total life time true exposure increases from 23 days to a total of 25 days. Compared to 2009 this is a decrease of 22%.

### 4.2 Broilers

The average boiler chicken in the sample received 23 daily dosages per year in 2010, administered orally, mainly through the drinking water (95% Confidence Interval: 18-28 dd/ay). In 2009 the usage was 37 daily dosages per year (CI: 24-49 dd/ay).
Figure 4.3 provides insight into the trends in the relative use of the various groups of antibiotics on the sample farms.

**Figure 4.3 Antibiotic use in broilers in daily dosages per animal year in 2005-2010**

In 2010 administration of penicillines accounted for 28% of the total antibiotic use on broiler farms, intestinal anti-infectives for 13%, quinolones for 18% and tetracyclines for 23%. Fluoroquinolones use was 2.2% of the total use. The use of intestinal anti-infectives (e.g. orally administered neomycin, colistin) decreased from 6.7 dd/ay in 2009 to 3.0 dd/ay in 2010.

**Discussion**

On the average broiler farm in the sample 23 daily dosages of antibiotics are administered per year. This means that an individual broiler is treated with antibiotics during 3 days (= 23 x 42/365) in the 42 days from day one to slaughter.

Data on the time of prescription reveal that the average weight on which broilers receive treatment equals the average live weight of 1.0 kg. Therefore the calculated exposure of approximately 3 days per broiler can be considered as an adequate estimation of the true exposure (i.e. 2 to 3 treatment days per broiler, considering the 95% confidence interval).
4.3 Veal calves

In 2010 the average veal calf in the sample received 27 daily dosages per animal year, of which more than 90% was orally administered (95% Confidence Interval: 25-30 dd/ay). In 2009 the average use was 30 daily dosages per animal year (CI: 28-31 dd/ay).

Figure 4.4 provides insight into the trends in the relative use of the various groups of antibiotics on the sample farms.

![Figure 4.4 Antibiotic use in veal calves in daily dosages per animal year in 2007-2010](image)

In 2010 47% of the total antibiotic use on the veal calf farms originated from the administration of tetracyclines, 19% from intestinal anti-infectives (e.g. neomycin, colistin) and 11% from trimethoprim/sulfonamides. Fluoroquinolones and 3rd and 4th generation cephalosporin use were respectively 2.0% and 0.5% of the total use.

Discussion

The overall use decreased, mainly as a result of less traditional antibiotic therapy with tetracyclines. On the average veal calf farm in the sample in 2010 27 daily dosages of antibiotics were administered per year. This means that the individual average veal calf was treated with antibiotics during 16.5 days (= 27 x 222/365) in the period from birth to the average slaughter age of 222 days (white and rosé).

If it is assumed that the average treatment weight of veal calves is about 50% lower than the average live weight, since younger animals are more likely to receive antibiotics than older animals, the estimation of the total life time true exposure increases from 16.5 days to a total of 33 days.
4.4 Dairy cows
The average dairy cow in the sample received 6.4 daily dosages per year in 2010, including the use in young stock (95% Confidence Interval: 5.7-7.1 dd/ay). In 2009 the usage was 5.8 daily dosages per year (CI: 5.1-6.5 dd/ay).

Figure 4.5 provides insight into the trends in the relative use of the various groups of antibiotics on the sample farms.

**Figure 4.5** Antibiotic use in dairy cattle in daily dosages per animal year in 2005-2010

In 2010 44% of the total antibiotic use on dairy farms originated from the administration of penicillins and 20% from combinations, which were mainly applications for intramammary treatment. Also 16% third/fourth generation cephalosporins were used. Use of fluoroquinolones in dairy cattle is only 1.3%.

**Discussion**
On the average dairy farm in the sample in 2010 6.4 daily dosages of antibiotics were administered per year, of which 0.2 for oral use. If it is assumed that the oral use is only applied in young calves, an average calf is exposed to antibiotics during 7 days of the 56 day weaning period. Note that part of the antibiotics that are registered for oral treatment may have been used off-label in footbaths for disinfection of cattle feet instead of for treating sick calves.
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