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Summary

Implanting incoming feedlot heifers with Ralgro® or Synovex-H® increased weight gain an average of 9.4%. Reimplanting half way through the 119 day feeding period did not improve gain significantly. There were no differences between Ralgro and Synovex-H when used as the initial or second implant.

Introduction

Research has consistently shown that implanting increases feedlot gains about 10% and feed utilization about 8%. Reimplanting steers midway through the finishing period increases rate of gain and feed efficiency an additional 4 to 5%. This trial was conducted because there is little research on reimplanting finishing heifers.

Experimental Procedure

Two hundred eleven Brahman-cross heifers averaging 600 lbs were randomly allotted to one of the following seven implant treatments: 1) control (no implant); 2) initial Ralgro, no reimplant; 3) initial Ralgro, Ralgro reimplant; 4) initial Ralgro, Synovex-H reimplant; 5) initial Synovex-H, no reimplant; 6) initial Synovex-H, Ralgro reimplant; 7) initial Synovex-H, Synovex-H reimplant. All cattle were fed in the same pen and handled similarly throughout the feeding period. All heifers were individually identified and weighed at the beginning of the 119 day trial. Final weights were calculated from individual hot carcass weights and the average dressing percentage (62.7%) of the entire group. Heifers in the reimplant treatments were given the second implant midway through the feeding period. All data were analyzed by Least Squares Analysis of Covariance to remove the effects of variation in initial weight.

1 Appreciation is expressed to Grant County Feeders, Ulysses, KS for supplying cattle and facilities; Charles Sauerwein and Donald Wiles, Gray and Ford County Extension Agricultural Agents, and Excel Corporation, Dodge City, KS for slaughter and carcass data assistance; and International Minerals and Chemical Corporation and Syntex Agri-Business, Inc. for implants.

2 Southwest Area Extension Livestock Specialist.
Results

The results are presented in Table 30.1. All implant treatments increased (P<.01) daily gain over the controls except for the single Ralgro implant (P=.08). There were no significant differences between any of the groups that received a single implant or that were reimplanted. Daily gain of the heifers receiving a single implant was 2.79 lbs vs. 2.86 lbs for those reimplanted. Heifers reimplanted with Synovex-H gained 2.89 lbs per day vs. 2.83 lbs per day for those reimplanted with Ralgro.

Table 30.1. Effect of Implanting on Performance of Feedlot Heifers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Initial implant</th>
<th>Reimplant</th>
<th>No. heifers</th>
<th>Initial wt., lbs</th>
<th>Least square means, lbs</th>
<th>Daily gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final wt.</td>
<td>Carcass gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ralgro</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ralgro</td>
<td>Ralgro</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ralgro</td>
<td>Synovex-H</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Synovex-H</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Synovex-H</td>
<td>Ralgro</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Synovex-H</td>
<td>Synovex-H</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>abc</sup> Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P<.01).