

Scotland's Rural College

## **Blowfly strike in sheep: self-help surveillance for shepherds is unsustainable**

Tongue, SC; Duncan, A; Vipond, J; Stocker, P; Gunn, GJ

*Published in:*  
Veterinary Record

*DOI:*  
[10.1136/vr.104011](https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104011)

First published: 24/01/2017

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Tongue, SC., Duncan, A., Vipond, J., Stocker, P., & Gunn, GJ. (2017). Blowfly strike in sheep: self-help surveillance for shepherds is unsustainable. *Veterinary Record*, 180(11). <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104011>

### **General rights**

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

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

### **Take down policy**

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

**Blowfly strike in sheep: self-help surveillance for shepherds is unsustainable**

Journal:	<i>Veterinary Record</i>
Manuscript ID	vetrec-2016-104011.R2
Article Type:	Short communication
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Tongue, Sue; SRUC (Inverness Campus), Epidemiology Research Unit; SRUC (Inverness Campus), Epidemiology Research Unit Duncan, Andrew; Inverness College, University of the Highlands and Islands, Vipond, John; SRUC, Farm Rural Business Services Stocker, Phil; National Sheep Association Gunn, George; SRUC, Epidemiology Research Unit
Abstract:	<p>Flystrike in sheep, mostly caused by <i>Lucilia sericata</i> (Diptera: Calliphoridae) has been consistently identified as one of the most important sheep diseases, from both a financial and welfare perspective (Bennett and others, 1999; Bennett, 2003; Bennett and Ijpelaar, 2005; Boyne and others, 2006). Infestation levels vary greatly depending on a wide range of factors related to the composition of the parasite fauna, the host, animal husbandry and control practices, climate and geography. However, it has been predicted that the season for flystrike will change (Wall and others, 2011), which, anecdotally, appears to be the case (Anon., 2012). Variation in the occurrence of flystrike in sheep, from year to year and area to area (Bisdorff and others, 2006), means that traditional preventative programmes are often not as effective as they used to be. A report in 2013, commissioned by the pharmaceutical industry (Wall and others, 2013) identified three key issues experienced by farmers: unpredictable weather patterns that make the timing of blowfly treatment difficult; increased risk of treatment resistance and the problem of treating parasites too late in the season. Early use of appropriate compounds for the prevention of flystrike aids effective control (Walters and Wall, 2012). With the aim to help farmers tailor their flystrike control programmes a simple website was developed (<a href="http://www.flystrikealert.co.uk/">http://www.flystrikealert.co.uk/</a>). The objective was for British farmers to be able to anonymously report when they encountered cases of flystrike in their flock.</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Confidential: For Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Title: Blowfly strike in sheep: self-help surveillance for shepherds is unsustainable

7  
8 Authors: S. C. Tongue<sup>1</sup>, A. J. Duncan<sup>1&2</sup>, J. Vipond<sup>3</sup>, P. Stocker<sup>4</sup>, G. J. Gunn<sup>1</sup>

9  
10 Author details:

11  
12 <sup>1</sup>Epidemiology Research Unit (Inverness), SRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG

13  
14 <sup>2</sup>Inverness College UHI, 1 Inverness Campus, Inverness, IV2 5NA, UK

15  
16 <sup>3</sup>SAC Consulting, SRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG

17  
18 <sup>4</sup>National Sheep Association (NSA), The Sheep Centre, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR13 6PH

19  
20 Corresponding author: sue.tongue@sruc.ac.uk tel: 01463 246064

21  
22 **Abstract**

23  
24 Flystrike in sheep is a welfare issue with economic consequences. Changes in patterns of  
25 occurrence are challenging the effective prevention of this condition by flock-owners. A web-  
26 based surveillance tool was developed for the anonymized real-time reporting and mapping of  
27 cases. It generated some interest but the 'tipping-point' where sufficient reports are received to  
28 generate a viable, useful, tool was not achieved. This was consistent with opinions expressed in  
29 a small, potentially biased, survey on the attitudes and intentions of flock-owners, if presented  
30 with such a tool. Other methods for ovine endemic disease surveillance will need to be  
31 explored.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Short communication

Flystrike in sheep, mostly caused by *Lucilia sericata* (Diptera: Calliphoridae) has been consistently identified as one of the most important sheep diseases, from both a financial and welfare perspective (Bennett and others, 1999; Bennett, 2003; Bennett and Ijpelaar, 2005; Boyne and others, 2006). Infestation levels vary greatly depending on a wide range of factors related to the composition of the parasite fauna, the host, animal husbandry and control practices, climate and geography. However, it has been predicted that the season for flystrike will change (Wall and others, 2011), which, anecdotally, appears to be the case (Anon., 2012). Variation in the occurrence of flystrike in sheep, from year to year and area to area (Bisdorff and others, 2006), means that traditional preventative programmes are often not as effective as they used to be. A report in 2013, commissioned by the pharmaceutical industry (Wall and others, 2013) identified three key issues experienced by farmers: unpredictable weather patterns that make the timing of blowfly treatment difficult; increased risk of treatment resistance and the problem of treating parasites too late in the season. Early use of appropriate compounds for the prevention of flystrike aids effective control (Walters and Wall, 2012). With the aim to help farmers tailor their flystrike control programmes a simple website was developed (<http://www.flystrikealert.co.uk/>). The objective was for British farmers to be able to anonymously report when they encountered cases of flystrike in their flock.

The basic details to be submitted are: date of detection; location to postcode district level (first four characters); age group (lamb i.e. < 1 year lamb; mature sheep > 1 year) and severity level (minor <25% of flock; major > 25% flock). To avoid spurious usage, the CPH (County, Parish, Holding) number has to be entered for a record to be validated, although this information is not retained. The GPS location data is mapped online using Google maps API (<https://developers.google.com/maps/web/>) and can be viewed on the same website. The maps of reports can be filtered by date. The intention was that such self-reporting by shepherds could be used, in conjunction with parasite forecasts (Anon., 2016) and would help to inform others of when there was a problem in their area, facilitating treatment decisions and, eventually, to provide year-on-year information. However, the success of this potential tool for surveillance of an endemic health and welfare problem would depend entirely on the willingness of the industry to participate. If it became viable then additional functionality could be added. The website was launched with accompanying press and industry releases in May 2013 (Anon. 2013 a & b, Alderton 2013). It was later publicised by the authors at numerous farmers meetings across the country and at other research-to-industry interface events.

Since launch, to April 2016, a total of 40 records have been entered. The majority of these were in 2013 (n=35), with 13 being for lambs and 20 for mature sheep. Detection dates for lambs ranged from the third week in May to the first week in October and from the second week in May to the last week of July for mature sheep. Two records had a detection date of the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013. It is known that early season strike in ewes is reduced after shearing and that is reflected here. The records in 2014 and 2015 (two and three, respectively) were for mature sheep with the 2014 cases being detected in June and the 2015 cases from the second week in April to the second week in July. Most records came from England (south of the Peak District), with some

1  
2  
3 from south, south east Wales, plus two from Scotland (in 2013 & 2015). All but one of the  
4 records (a mature sheep report in early June 2013) were minor in nature.

5  
6 The response to the provision of this self-help surveillance tool for flystrike for shepherds was  
7 not entirely unexpected. In 2012, one of the authors (Tongue) led a small qualitative survey in  
8 which a convenience sample of Scottish sheep farmers from across Scotland were interviewed  
9 to investigate farmers' and veterinarians' perceptions of their role in monitoring sheep health  
10 and their attitudes towards surveillance for animal disease. One question asked about a specific  
11 example: web-based mapping of the occurrence of flystrike cases that would rely on sheep  
12 farmers entering details of the location and timing of cases to produce a map of the approximate  
13 geographical location of cases. Almost two thirds (65%; n=13) said they would not be interested  
14 in visiting a website to see the approximate geographical location of recently reported flystrike  
15 cases in sheep. The main reasons given for their lack of interest were: they had never had a  
16 strike problem; they could judge themselves when there is going to be a problem on their farm,  
17 or they had a prevention plan in place that worked. However, approximately half said that they  
18 would, in principle, be prepared to report cases. Barriers to reporting included time and  
19 technological issues (such as reluctance to use a computer), a perceived lack of utility, and  
20 accessibility of their information to the general public. Where possible, these barriers were  
21 considered when developing this website. The sheep farmers interviewed were not a random  
22 sample; they were identified by selected vets in five areas across Scotland. This could have  
23 introduced bias; however, one might hypothesise that these would be sheep farmers that are, at  
24 least, interested in the treatment and prevention of disease. This may have contributed to the  
25 apparent satisfaction with current measures taken to deal with flystrike. In addition, only two  
26 flocks were classified as Lowland flocks with the majority of the rest designating themselves as  
27 Upland (one Hill/Upland; one not stated). Thus, they may not have been representative of the  
28 types of flocks that routinely experience problems with flystrike.

29  
30 Any system that relies on voluntary reporting will always provide an under-estimate of the  
31 occurrence of the events reported. In order to make a self-reporting tool such as this website  
32 work, and ensure that it provides useful feedback and information for those that might seek it,  
33 engagement is required from a substantial proportion of the potentially affected population. This  
34 was not achieved, despite the perceived importance of this disease to the health and welfare of  
35 the national sheep flock. This limited uptake is a disappointment, given the independence of this  
36 website from any commercial interest. It is possible that wider and repeated promotion may  
37 enhance uptake to the tipping point where such a self-help tool becomes self-sustaining; it may  
38 not. Other barriers and constraints may contribute to the lack of engagement. Some of these  
39 may relate to the hardware, some to the software and some to the population of interest.  
40 Jespersen and others (2013) identified six overarching barriers to the use of information and  
41 communication technology (ICT) in agriculture. These were: limited use of social media for  
42 innovation in the agricultural sector; insufficient internet connections; lack of access to hardware  
43 tools; cultural barriers and lack of engagement in the use of social media; overload of farmers  
44 with information and mis-information and the lack of long-term solutions beyond the research  
45 project period. Insufficient mobile phone and internet connection is a major problem in rural  
46 areas of the United Kingdom (UK), as evidenced by the low score for UK farms, in terms of both  
47 internet access and handheld phones (Holster and others, 2012). Although the UK scores

1  
2  
3 relatively highly for internet speed and access within the European Union (ITU, 2011), these  
4 values will be skewed by urban densities, whereas sheep producers are located in the more  
5 remote areas (AHDB Beef and Lamb, 2016; Scottish Government, 2016). This has been  
6 highlighted as an issue for some time; one that has led to a “digital divide” between the relatively  
7 extensive, smaller, more rurally based cattle and sheep producers and the larger-scale intensive  
8 arable and dairy sectors (Warren, 2002 & 2004). Cultural barriers may include the older age of  
9 the average farmer (Matthews, 2012; Sharma and others, 2011) at 59 years old (Defra, 2015),  
10 decision-making styles (Jørgenson and others, 2007), and preferences for more traditional  
11 methods of information provision (Kaler & Green, 2013). However, perhaps one of the most  
12 pertinent factors may be the view that sheep farmers hold: the view that sheep farming is  
13 complex; they are the experts with unique understanding and insights - particularly into the  
14 management of their own flock - to which any outsider can make only a limited contribution  
15 (Kaler & Green, 2013). This view would limit their engagement with co-operative technologies  
16 such as this website.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Further research into potential barriers and how to overcome them, additional long-term support  
23 with adaptation of the tool in response to user requirements (Douthwaite and others, 2001)  
24 and/or further promotion would all require additional resources to be made available. While  
25 Ballantyne and others (2010) felt that researchers could benefit from sourcing data from farmers  
26 through mobile ICT, there is little appetite for the provision of funding for endemic disease  
27 surveillance and little benefit, in terms of Research Excellence Framework output, from the  
28 academic stand point. It may be that the necessary resource input is only economically viable  
29 for those who can benefit directly e.g. through increased product sales. If this is the case then it  
30 is no longer purely a self-help surveillance tool for the industry. Alternatively, with technological  
31 advances, improvements in infrastructure, a change in the demographics of the farming  
32 population, further shifts towards digital approaches and increasing awareness of the value of  
33 citizen science, the possibility of achieving a positive outcome may improve. However, at this  
34 point in time, other methods will need to be explored for the surveillance of ovine endemic  
35 diseases.  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 **Acknowledgements,**

41  
42 Dr Tongue, Prof. Gunn & Dr Duncan were supported by the Scottish Government's Rural and  
43 Environment Science and Analytical Services (RESAS) Strategic Research Programme 2011-  
44 2016 Work Package 6.1 Measurement and monitoring to enhance livestock health in Scotland.  
45 The authors would also like to acknowledge the link between Inverness College UHI and the  
46 SRUC. The input of the vets, flock owners and interviewers who participated in the survey and  
47 all those who reported to the website is gratefully acknowledged.  
48  
49

#### 50 **References**

51  
52 BENNETT, R., CHRISTIANSEN, K., & CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. (1999) Preliminary estimates of  
53 the direct costs associated with endemic diseases of livestock in Great Britain. *Preventive*  
54 *Veterinary Medicine* **39**, 155-171  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59



1  
2  
3 BENNETT, R. (2003), The 'Direct Costs' of Livestock Disease: The Development of a System of  
4 Models for the Analysis of 30 Endemic Livestock Diseases in Great Britain. *Journal of*  
5 *Agricultural Economics* **54**, 55–71. doi: [10.1111/j.1477-9552.2003.tb00048.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-9552.2003.tb00048.x)  
6

7  
8 BENNETT, R., & IJPELAAR, J. (2005) Updated estimates of the costs associated with thirty four  
9 endemic livestock diseases in Great Britain: a note. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **56**, 135–  
10 144. doi: [10.1111/j.1477-9552.2005.tb00126.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-9552.2005.tb00126.x)  
11

12  
13 BOYNE, S., STOTT, A. W., & GUNN, G. J. (2006) SAC Report "Disease Priority - Survey to  
14 Establish priorities for cattle and sheep disease modelling and cost-benefit studies."  
15

16 WALL, R., ROSE, H., ELLSE, L., & MORGAN, E. (2011) Livestock ectoparasites: Integrated  
17 management in a changing climate. *Veterinary Parasitology* **180**, 82-89 doi:  
18 10.1016/j.vetpar.2011.05.030  
19

20 ANON (2012) Blowfly strike in sheep. <http://www.scops.org.uk/ectoparasites-sheep-blowfly.html>  
21 Last accessed 19/04/2016  
22

23  
24 BILDORFF, B., MILNES, A., & WALL, R. (2006) Prevalence and regional distribution of scab,  
25 lice and blowfly strike in Great Britain. *Veterinary Record* **158**, 749-752 doi:  
26 10.1136/vr.158.22.749  
27

28 WALL, R., LOVATT, F.L., HENRY, J. & BATES, P. (2013) Protecting the Future of Your Flock:  
29 Blowfly strike in the spotlight.  
30

31  
32 WALTERS, M., & WALL, R. (2012) Evaluation of dicyclanil (CLIKZiN®) treatment for the early-  
33 season protection of ewes. *Veterinary Parasitology* **188**, 200-202 doi:  
34 10.1016/j.vetpar.2012.03.016  
35

36 ANON. (2016) [www.nadis.org.uk/parasite-forecast.aspx](http://www.nadis.org.uk/parasite-forecast.aspx) Last accessed 19/04/2016  
37

38 ANON. (2013a) [http://www.sruc.ac.uk/news/article/398/forecasting\\_flystrike\\_online\\_-](http://www.sruc.ac.uk/news/article/398/forecasting_flystrike_online_-_farmers_asked_to_help)  
39 [\\_farmers\\_asked\\_to\\_help](http://www.sruc.ac.uk/news/article/398/forecasting_flystrike_online_-_farmers_asked_to_help) Last accessed 19/04/2016  
40

41 ANON. (2013b) NSA urges farmers to use new online tool in battle against fly strike  
42 [http://www.nationalsheep.org.uk/news/1237/nsa-urges-farmers-to-use-new-online-tool-in-battle-](http://www.nationalsheep.org.uk/news/1237/nsa-urges-farmers-to-use-new-online-tool-in-battle-against-fly-strike/)  
43 [against-fly-strike/](http://www.nationalsheep.org.uk/news/1237/nsa-urges-farmers-to-use-new-online-tool-in-battle-against-fly-strike/) Last accessed 19/04/2016  
44  
45

46 ALDERTON, S. (2013) Farmers urged to report flystrike via on-line tool  
47 <http://www.fwi.co.uk/livestock/farmers-urged-to-report-fly-strike-via-online-tool.htm> Last  
48 accessed 19/04/2016  
49

50  
51 JESPERSON, L. M., HANSEN, J.P., BRUNORI, G., JENSEN, A. L., HOLST, K., MATHIESON,  
52 C., HALBERG, N., & RASMUSSEN, I.A., (2013) ICT and social media as drivers of multi-actor  
53 innovation in agriculture – barriers, recommendations and potentials  
54 [http://www.icrof.org/pdf/2013%20SCAR\\_CWG\\_AKIS\\_SocialMediaICTandInnovationProcesses](http://www.icrof.org/pdf/2013%20SCAR_CWG_AKIS_SocialMediaICTandInnovationProcesses%20report%2031%2005%202013.pdf)  
55 [%20report%2031%2005%202013.pdf](http://www.icrof.org/pdf/2013%20SCAR_CWG_AKIS_SocialMediaICTandInnovationProcesses%20report%2031%2005%202013.pdf) Last accessed 14/12/16  
56  
57  
58



1  
2  
3 HOLSTER, H. HORAKOVA, S. IPEMA, B. FUSAI, B. GIANNERINI, G. TEYE, F. MARTINI, D.  
4 SHALLOO, L. & SCHMID, O. (2012) Current situation on data exchange in agriculture in the  
5 EU27 and Switzerland, AgriXchange project, network for data exchange in agriculture.  
6 <http://edepot.wur.nl/206268> Last accessed 14/12/16  
7

8  
9 ITU (2011): The World in 2011: ITC Facts and Figures. International Telecommunications  
10 Unions (ITU), Geneva, 2011.  
11 <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/facts/2011/material/ICTFactsFigures2011.pdf> Last accessed  
12 14/12/16  
13

14  
15 AHDB Beef and Lamb (2016) UK Yearbook 2016 Sheep  
16 [http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UK-Yearbook-2016-Sheep-](http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UK-Yearbook-2016-Sheep-050716.pdf)  
17 [050716.pdf](http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UK-Yearbook-2016-Sheep-050716.pdf)  
18

19  
20 SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2016) [http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Agriculture-](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Agriculture-Fisheries/agritopics/Sheep)  
21 [Fisheries/agritopics/Sheep](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Agriculture-Fisheries/agritopics/Sheep) Last accessed 14/12/16  
22

23  
24 WARREN, M. (2002) Digital divides and the adoption of information and communication  
25 technologies in the UK farm sector. *International Journal of Information Technology and*  
26 *Management* **1** (4) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJITM.2002.001207>  
27

28  
29 WARREN, M. (2004) Farmers online: drivers and impediments in adoption of Internet in UK  
30 agricultural businesses, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, **11** (3), 371 –  
31 381 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626000410551627>  
32

33  
34 MATTHEWS, A. (2012): The greying of Europe's farmers. CAPreform.eu blog post of 30 April  
35 2013 <http://capreform.eu/the-greying-of-european-farmers/>  
36

37  
38 SHARMA, A., BAILEY, A., & FRASER, I. (2011) Technology Adoption and Pest Control  
39 Strategies Among UK Cereal Farmers: Evidence from Parametric and Nonparametric Count  
40 Data Models *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **62** (1) 73-92  
41 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-9552.2010.00272.x/full>  
42

43  
44 DEFRA (2015) Agriculture in the United Kingdom  
45 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/agriculture-in-the-united-kingdom-2015> Last accessed  
46 14/12/16

47  
48 JØRGENSEN, L.N., NOE, E., LANGVAD, A.M., JENSEN, J.E., ØRUM, J.E., RYDAHL, P.(2007)  
49 Decision support systems: Barriers and farmers' need for support. *EPPO Bulletin* **37** (2) 374-  
50 377 DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2338.2007.01145x  
51

52  
53 KALER, J. & GREEN, L.E. (2013) Sheep farmer opinions on the current and future role of  
54 veterinarians in flock health management on sheep farms: a qualitative study. *Preventive*  
55 *Veterinary Medicine* **112**, 370-377  
56  
57  
58

1  
2  
3 DOUTHWAITE, B., KEATINGE, J.D.H. & PARK, J.R. (2001) Why promising technologies fail:  
4 the neglected role of user innovation during adoption *Research Policy* **30** (5) 819-836  
5 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(00\)00124-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(00)00124-4)  
6

7  
8 BALLANTYNE, P., MARU, A. & PORCARI, E.M. (2010): Information and communication  
9 technologies – opportunities to mobilize agricultural science for development. *Crop Science* **50**  
10 (Supplement 1), (60-69).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60