

1995

## The effect of implants on gain of heifers grazing native grass

F.K. Brazle

D.L. Cook

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr>

 Part of the [Other Animal Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Brazle, F.K. and Cook, D.L. (1995) "The effect of implants on gain of heifers grazing native grass," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 0: Iss. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.2006>

This report is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. Copyright 1995 Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. Contents of this publication may be freely reproduced for educational purposes. All other rights reserved. Brand names appearing in this publication are for product identification purposes only. No endorsement is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products not mentioned. K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



---

# The effect of implants on gain of heifers grazing native grass

## Abstract

Three hundred-ninety crossbred heifers were allotted randomly to one of three implant treatments: 1) Implus-H®, 2) Synovex-H®, and 3) Ralgro®. The heifers grazed native grass pastures for 122 days, stocked at 4 acres per head. The heifers receiving the Implus-H tended to gain faster ( $P < .12$ ) than the Ralgro heifers. No difference in gain occurred between the Implus-H and Synovex-H heifers.

## Keywords

Cattlemen's Day, 1995; Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station contribution; no. 95-357-S; Report of progress (Kansas State University. Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service); 727; Beef; Implant; Grazing cattle; Native grass

## Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

## **THE EFFECT OF IMPLANTS ON GAIN OF HEIFERS GRAZING NATIVE GRASS <sup>1</sup>**

*F. K. Brazle<sup>2</sup> and D. L. Cook<sup>3</sup>*

### **Summary**

Three hundred-ninety crossbred heifers were allotted randomly to one of three implant treatments: 1) Implus-H®, 2) Synovex-H®, and 3) Ralgro®. The heifers grazed native grass pastures for 122 days, stocked at 4 acres per head. The heifers receiving the Implus-H tended to gain faster ( $P < .12$ ) than the Ralgro heifers. No difference in gain occurred between the Implus-H and Synovex-H heifers.

(Key Words: Implant, Grazing Cattle, Native Grass.)

### **Introduction**

Yearling cattle that graze native bluestem grass may be on pasture longer than the normal implant payout. The normal grazing season on native grass is 125 to 150 days. These cattle may graze in large pastures that are not equipped with catch pens and chutes to reimplant them. Therefore, the object of this study was to compare the effects of three implants on gains of grazing heifers for a 120- to 125-day grazing season on native bluestem grass.

### **Experimental Procedures**

British × Continental crossbred heifer calves were purchased in December and

January and were not implanted until time for native grass in April. The heifers had been selected for uniformity from a larger group and were allotted randomly by assigning every third heifer down the chute to each treatment. The implant treatments were: 1) Implus-H® implant, 2) Synovex-H® implant, and 3) Ralgro® implant injected in mid 1/3 of the ear.

The heifers were weighed individually on April 7 and 8 and August 9 and 10 in the early morning. They grazed burned native bluestem grass pastures and were stocked at 4 acres per head. The heifers had access to a free-choice salt-mineral mixture containing chlortetracycline (350 mg/animal/day).

### **Results and Discussion**

Results of implant effects on gains of heifers are shown in Table 1. Heifers implanted with Implus-H showed a trend ( $P < .12$ ) toward improved ADG for 122 days compared to heifers implanted with Ralgro. This trend in results most likely was a function of the length of time that the implants were at a desired payout level. Ralgro implants have an expected payout period of 90 days, whereas the payout period for the other two implants is longer. No difference in ADG occurred between Implus-H and Synovex-H implanted heifers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mike Collinge, Hamilton, Kansas for providing cattle and facilities and to Ivy Laboratories, Overland Park, Kansas for financial support.

<sup>2</sup>Extension Livestock Specialist, Southeast Kansas.

<sup>3</sup>Ivy Laboratories, Inc., Overland Park, Kansas.

**Table 1. The Effect of Implants on Gain of Heifers Grazing Native Grass Pastures**

Item	Implus-H	Synovex-H	Ralgro
No. heifers	128	128	129
Starting wt. ,lb	486	487	487
ADG, lb	1.78 <sup>b</sup>	1.77 <sup>ab</sup>	1.72 <sup>a</sup>
Days	122	122	122

<sup>a,b</sup>Means in the same row with unlike superscripts are different (P < .12).

Shown below are a listing of implants, their approved use, their active ingredients, and their expected payout.

Brand	Sex	Phase <sup>1</sup>	Active Ingrid. <sup>2</sup>	Payout, Days
Ralgro	Both	SGF	36 Zeronal	70-90
Synovax-C	Both	S	10 Est + 100 Prog	90-110
Calf-oid	Both	S	10 Est + 100 Prog	90-110
Synovex-S	Steers	GF	20 Est + 200 Prog	90-100
Implus-S	Steers	GF	20 Est + 200 Prog	90-100
Synovex-H	Heifers	GF	20 Est + 200 Test	90-100
Implus-H	Heifers	GF	20 Est + 200 Test	90-100
Compudose	Steers	SGF	24 Est	150-180
Compudose	Heifers	F	24 Est	150-180
Finaplix-S	Steers	GF	140 TBA	60-90
Finaplix-H	Heifers	GF	200 TBA	60-90
Revalor-S	Steers	F	120 TBA + 24 Est	100-120
Revalor-H	Heifers	F	140 TBA + 14 Est	100-120

<sup>1</sup>S = Suckling, G = Growing, F = Finishing  
<sup>2</sup>Est = Estradiol, Prog = Progesterone, TBA = Trenbolone Acetate, in mg