Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants (VIII):
IRON METABOLISM AND REQUIREMENTS IN RUMINANTS

A.M. van den Top

CVB Documentation report nr. 40
November 2005

Centraal Veevoederbureau
© Centraal Veevoederbureau 2005

All rights are explicitly reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed and/or published by any means (including but not limited to printing, photocopying, microfilming, scanning, electronic copying or distribution) in whatever manner, without the prior written consent of the Centraal Veevoederbureau.

Although this publication has been compiled with great care, the Centraal Veevoederbureau cannot be held liable in any way for the consequences of any use of the information contained in this publication.
Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants (VIII):
IRON METABOLISM AND REQUIREMENTS IN RUMINANTS

A.M. van den Top
Adviesbureau VOER-RAAD
Groenekan, The Netherlands

CVB Documentation report nr. 40
November 2005

Centraal Veevoederbureau
Postbus 2176
8203 AD Lelystad
Telefoon 0320 – 29 32 11
Telefax 0320 – 29 35 38
E-mail cvb@pdv.nl
Internet www.cvb.pdv.nl
PREFACE

In the Netherlands the ‘Handleiding Mineralenonderzoek bij rundvee in de praktijk’\(^1\) is a well-known publication that has been used already for decades as a guide to trace and treat mineral disorders in cattle. The fifth edition of this guidebook was published in 1996. The content of this publication was largely identical to that of the fourth edition (1990). Therefore the (independent) committee that is responsible for the contents of the guidebook (the ‘Commissie Onderzoek Minerale Voeding’\(^2\), COMV) decided in 2000 that a thorough revision was desired.

The committee was of the opinion that, if possible, the available scientific literature should be summarized and evaluated once again. Furthermore, attention should be paid to the mineral provision of categories of cattle other than dairy cattle, as well as to that of sheep and goats. Finally, the basic principles for the calculation of the mineral requirements should be described in a transparent way.

The intended revision was made possible as the Dutch ‘Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuur en Voedselkwaliteit’ (LNV), the ‘Productschap Diervoeder’ and the ‘Productschap Zuivel’\(^3\) were willing to subsidize this extensive and ambitious project.

The COMV decided to execute the project as follows.

- External experts, invited by the COMV, should summarize and evaluate the relevant literature in a so-called ‘basal document’ (with two exceptions to be written in English).
- Subsequently, these documents should be critically evaluated by the COMV.
- These basal documents should then be used to write and arrange the several chapters of the revised ‘Handleiding’.

The revised ‘Handleiding’ is available (in the Dutch language) since October 2005, under the title ‘Handleiding mineralenvoorziening rundvee, schapen en geiten’\(^4\). This book is published by the ‘Centraal Veevoederbureau’ (CVB; Central Bureau for Livestock Feeding) in Lelystad, as was also the case for the previous edition.

The COMV was of the opinion that the valuable basal documents, that became available during the course of this project, should be published too. By doing so everyone has the possibility to trace the basis for the text of the revised ‘Handleiding’. The CVB was gladly willing to issue these documents as CVB Documentation reports. In connection with this the authors and the members of the COMV have disclaimed all rights and have assigned them to the Productschap Diervoeder, of which the CVB is one of the services.

For an overview of the CVB Documentation Reports that will appear in this context, you are referred to an Annex in the back of this report.

For the preparation of the present report on the Iron provision in ruminants the COMV expresses its gratitude to the author, dr. A.M. van den Top.

Utrecht/Lelystad, November 2005.

Professor dr. ir. A.C. Beynen  Dr. M.C. Blok
Chair of the COMV  Secretary of the COMV and Head of the CVB

The author, Dr. A.M. van den Top, expresses his thanks to the COMV, especially prof. dr. A. Th. van ’t Klooster and dr. M.C. Blok, for critically reading the manuscript and their advice.

---

1. Guidebook on mineral research for cattle in practice.
2. Committee for research on mineral nutrition
3. The Ministry for Agriculture, Nature and Food quality, the Product Board Animal Feed and the Dutch Dairy Board, respectively.
4. Guidebook mineral provision cattle, sheep and goats.
MEMBERS OF THE ‘COMMISSIE ONDERZOEK MINERALE VOEDING’ (COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH ON MINERAL
NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. Ir. A. C. Beynen</td>
<td>Afdeling Voeding, Faculteit Diergeneeskunde, Universiteit Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Department Nutrition, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M. C. Blok</td>
<td>Veevoederbureau, Productschap Diervoeder (Bureau for Livestock Feeding, Product Board Animal Feed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelystad / Den Haag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir. D. J. den Boer</td>
<td>Nutriënt Management Instituut (NMI) (Nutrient Management Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wageningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir. G. van Duinkerken</td>
<td>Divisie Veehouderij, Animal Sciences Group van WUR (Division Animal Husbandry, Animal Sciences Group of Wageningen University and Research Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelystad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ir. A. W. Jongbloed</td>
<td>Divisie Veehouderij, Animal Sciences Group van WUR (Division Animal Husbandry, Animal Sciences Group of Wageningen University and Research Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelystad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. A. Th. Van ‘t Klooster</td>
<td>Adviseur van de COMV (Advisor of the COMV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ir. W. M. van Straalen</td>
<td>Schothorst Feed Research (Animal Health Service Ltd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelystad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ir. H. Valk</td>
<td>Divisie Veehouderij, Animal Sciences Group van WUR (Division Animal Husbandry, Animal Sciences Group of Wageningen University and Research Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelystad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Veling</td>
<td>Gezondheidsdienst voor Dieren b.v. (Animal Health Service Ltd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deventer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content

Preface......................................................................................................................... 1
Members of the ‘Commissie Onderzoek Minerale Voeding’ (Committee for research on
mineral nutrition)........................................................................................................... 2
List of abbreviations .................................................................................................... 4
1 Functions of iron in the body ...................................................................................... 5
2 Distribution of iron in the body and iron kinetics ......................................................... 5
3 Iron metabolism ........................................................................................................ 7
  3.1 Iron absorption from different sources ................................................................. 7
  3.1.1 Cattle .................................................................................................................. 7
  3.1.2 Sheep .................................................................................................................. 7
  3.1.3 Goats ................................................................................................................... 8
  3.1.4 Iron from drinking water ..................................................................................... 8
  3.1.5 Discussion and conclusions ............................................................................. 8
3.2 Interactions influencing iron absorption ................................................................. 9
  3.2.1 Iron and cadmium ............................................................................................. 9
  3.2.2 Iron and zinc ...................................................................................................... 9
  3.2.3 Iron and lead ...................................................................................................... 10
  3.2.4 Iron and either nickel, aluminium, calcium and/or phosphorus ....................... 10
  3.2.5 Iron and copper ............................................................................................... 12
  3.2.6 Iron and manganese ......................................................................................... 13
3.3 Recycling ................................................................................................................ 14
3.4 Excretion ................................................................................................................ 14
4 Iron requirements ....................................................................................................... 15
  4.1 Cattle .................................................................................................................... 15
  4.1.1 Dairy cattle ........................................................................................................ 15
  4.1.2 Beef cattle ....................................................................................................... 15
  4.2 Sheep .................................................................................................................... 15
  4.3 Goats .................................................................................................................... 16
  4.4 Conclusion ............................................................................................................ 16
5 Allowances ............................................................................................................... 17
6 Criteria to judge iron status ...................................................................................... 19
  6.1 Criteria to judge iron status .................................................................................. 19
  6.1.1 Blood parameters of iron status ....................................................................... 19
  6.2 Conclusions ......................................................................................................... 19
7 Deficiency .................................................................................................................. 21
  7.1 Direct measures in deficiency cases ..................................................................... 21
  7.1.1 Direct continuous supplementation .................................................................. 21
  7.1.2 Direct discontinuous supplementation ............................................................. 21
  7.1.3 Slow release oral supplementation and indirect supply via fertilization ........ 21
8 Toxicity ..................................................................................................................... 22
  8.1 Direct measures in toxicity cases .......................................................................... 22
9 Prevention .................................................................................................................. 23
Reference List .............................................................................................................. 25
ANNEX: Overview of the series of CVB documentation reports ‘Reviews on the mineral
provision in ruminants’.................................................................................................. 31
### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>Body weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>Dry matter intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ht</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean cell volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean corpuscular haemoglobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean corpuscular haemoglobin concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Packed cell volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total iron binding capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbound iron binding capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 FUNCTIONS OF IRON IN THE BODY

The main importance of Fe is related to its role as a component of heme, which is present in haemoglobin (Hb) and myoglobin. Both Hb and myoglobin are essential for O₂ transport from the lungs to the (muscle) tissues. Haemoglobin is packaged in the erythrocytes, whereas myoglobin is found in muscle tissue. As myoglobin has a higher affinity for O₂ than does Hb, the result is an efficient transport of O₂ from the blood into the cells. Moreover, Fe is necessary for proper function of enzymes of the electron transport chain, cytochrome oxidase, ferredoxin, myeloperoxidase, catalase, succinate dehydrogenase, and the cytochrome P-450 enzymes. Thus, Fe is involved at all stages of energy metabolism in all tissues [54;66].

2 DISTRIBUTION OF IRON IN THE BODY AND IRON KINETICS

Approximately 60% of body Fe is present as Hb [66]. The duodenum and jejunum are the primary sites of Fe absorption, where absorption is rapid. Besides this, a slow uptake occurs in the ileum [1]. Iron uptake by the intestinal cells is regulated by the Fe status of the mucosa. In rats, upregulation of Fe absorption to the maximal level took only 24 hours. Iron is more readily absorbed as Fe²⁺ (ferrous form) than as Fe³⁺ ions (ferric form) [41]. However, Fe³⁺ ions can be partly reduced to Fe²⁺ ions in the abomasum. During digestion, Fe²⁺ is usually bound to chelators such as histidine, mucine or fructose. After uptake by the mucosal cells, Fe can be transported to the basolateral membrane and bound to transferrin in the blood. If the Fe status of the body is adequate, Fe is instead bound to ferritin in the mucosal cell and excreted from the body after the death of the enterocyte. The mechanism underlying this regulation remains to be revealed.

In the blood, Fe is bound to transferrin. The TIBC represents the total capacity of the plasma to bind Fe, whereas the UIBC represents the degree of unsaturation of the plasma with Fe. Both the Cu containing ceruloplasmin and the Mo-containing xanthine dehydrogenase play a role in the transport and release of Fe, but the mechanism remains unclear.

Under normal circumstances, ferritin is the main Fe storage compound in the body. If Fe status is high, hemosiderin is the main storage form [54;66]. In the bone marrow, Fe is incorporated into protoporphyrins during the synthesis of heme in reticulocytes.
3 IRON METABOLISM

3.1 Iron absorption from different sources

3.1.1 Cattle
Bull calves (40 kg BW) fed a milk substitute ration supplemented with 30 µg Fe/g dry milk substitute powder from either FeSO₄, ferric citrate, Fe-EDTA or Fe phytate for 11 weeks did not show any differences in Fe or Hb metabolism between the first three sources, whereas Hb concentration and packed cell volume at the end of the experiment were lower in the phytate group [13]. Red blood cell number and mean corpuscular volume were not different between the groups. In another experiment, 53 newborn calves (33 kg BW) were given colostrum supplemented with 20 mg Fe from either FeSO₄ or Fe-saturated lactoferrin [40]. The calves receiving the FeSO₄ treatment showed significant increases in Hb concentrations from the start of the treatment until 10 days post partum, whereas these values remained more or less constant in the lactoferrin-treated calves. At 10 days of age, blood Hb concentrations were ± 12.5 and 11.5 g/dL for FeSO₄- and lactoferrin-treated groups, respectively. In calves (90 kg BW, 4 animals/group) fed a maize/soybean meal ration supplemented with 1000 ppm Fe from either FeSO₄·H₂O or FeCO₃ for 28 days and dosed with ⁵⁹Fe, significantly higher stable Fe concentrations were found in the small intestine of the FeSO₄-treated group, whereas Fe concentrations in many tissues (e.g. liver, spleen, pancreas) tended to be higher in the FeSO₄-treated group as compared with the FeCO₃ treated group [44]. Small intestine Fe concentrations were 583 and 230 ppm (DM) for FeSO₄- and FeCO₃-treated groups, respectively. Concentrations of ⁵⁹Fe were lower in several tissues (e.g. liver, kidney, heart, pancreas and muscle) of the FeSO₄ treated group as compared with the FeCO₃ treated group. Performance, Hb, serum Fe, serum and tissue Cu concentrations, PCV and TIBC were not significantly different between the groups. In two experiments with calves (± 200 days of age; ± 100 kg BW) on a maize/grass hay ration (72 ppm Fe (DM)) were dosed with ⁵⁹Fe (70-73 mg stable Fe/animal) from either ferric chloride or ferric oxide (3 animals/Fe source) [6]. In one experiment, no ⁵⁹Fe deposition in any tissue of the ferric oxide group could be detected, whereas in the second experiment the radioactivity levels in liver, spleen, kidney, heart and rib tissues from the ferric oxide group were significantly (3-5 x) lower than those in the ferric chloride group.

3.1.2 Sheep
In wether lambs (34 kg BW), no differences in Ht and Hb concentrations between groups fed 1600 ppm supplemental Fe from either Fe sulphate or Fe citrate could be demonstrated [60]. The Fe content of the unsupplemented maize/grass hay/soybean meal ration was not given. Iron concentrations in the liver tended to be higher and those in the spleen were significantly lower in the citrate vs. the sulphate group, respectively. Iron concentrations in kidney, heart and muscle were not different between the groups. In an experiment with wethers (39 kg BW) the relative absorption of ferrous sulphate, ferrous carbonate (30 mg Fe each), ferric chloride (70 mg Fe) and ferric oxide (77 mg Fe) was determined (6 animals/group) [6]. The single oral Fe doses contained 150 µCi ⁵⁹Fe. The ration consisted of maize, cottonseed meal and grass hay. Based on tissue ⁵⁹Fe deposition, ferrous sulphate, ferrous carbonate and ferric chloride tended to rank in decreasing order of absorption. However, in the animals receiving ferric oxide very low Fe tissue levels were detected, which were significantly lower than those in the other groups. Selected data are given in Table 1.
Table 1  Selected data from an experiment with wethers fed different Fe sources [6]. Values are expressed as % x 10⁻⁶ of the oral dose per g of fresh tissue.⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forms of Fe</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe₂O₃</td>
<td>FeCO₃</td>
<td>FeCl₃</td>
<td>FeSO₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spleen</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ all levels of the Fe₂O₃ group were lower than the corresponding values of the other groups

3.1.3 Goats
No data are available on differences in Fe absorption from different sources by goats.

3.1.4 Iron from drinking water
No suitable data are available on the bio-availability and the significance of Fe in drinking water. However, as Fe in drinking water is more or less dissolved, the availability is assumed to be high [54].

As explained in CVB Documentation report Nr. 41, the Fe intake from drinking water by lactating cows can be assessed to be up to ± 300 mg/day (at Fe concentrations up to 2.5 mg/L), whereas the intake from feeds will be ± 7000 mg/day. Under normal conditions, the contribution of Fe from drinking water will therefore be relatively minor. On Fe-rich (sandy) soils the Fe content of ground water can be as high as 3-8 mg/L. As such high concentrations hamper proper functioning of water pipes, taps etc., the Fe has to be removed from the water by chemical treatments. This results in Fe concentrations below the Dutch maximum tolerable level of 2.5 mg/L (G. Counotte, Animal Health Service, personal communication).

3.1.5 Discussion and conclusions
The scarce data reported do not reveal one most suitable Fe source for use in ruminants, although – if any - FeSO₄ seems to be the source of first choice [53]. Higher tissue Fe deposition could be associated with lower dietary Cu concentrations (paragraph 3.2.5), which, in turn, could be associated with higher dietary sulphate levels (CVB Documentation report Nr. 41). As the use of FeSO₄ as an Fe source simultaneously increases the dietary sulphate content, the effect of FeSO₄ on tissue Fe levels could theoretically be interrelated with Cu metabolism. As to what extent this interrelationship exists remains unclear.

Iron phytate and Fe-saturated lactoferrin seem to be unsuitable Fe sources for non-ruminating calves. In ruminating animals, the specific disadvantage mentioned for Fe phytate may be irrelevant (breakdown of phytate by ruminal phytase), whereas Fe₂O₃ is an unsuitable Fe source. As Fe³⁺ ions need to be reduced to Fe²⁺ ions prior to uptake by the intestinal mucosa [70], this could be related to the poor availability of Fe₂O₃. However, as FeCl₃ (also containing Fe³⁺) has been demonstrated to be well available, the insolubility of Fe₂O₃ [68] is the most important feature underlying its unsuitability as an Fe source for ruminants.

In raw materials used in concentrates, extra Fe originating from wastage of processing equipment can be present. Essentially, Fe will be present as metallic Fe or rust (Fe (hydr)oxides). Although no data are available on the availability of metallic Fe or rust for ruminants, the insolubility (metallic Fe) or very poor solubility (Fe (hydr)oxides) [68] of these sources in water most likely will make them unavailable. Thus, the extra amount of Fe added to the ration of ruminants in this way can be ignored.
3.2 Interactions influencing iron absorption

3.2.1 Iron and cadmium

3.2.1.1 Cattle
No experimental data are available on the influence of dietary Cd on Fe metabolism in cattle.

3.2.1.2 Sheep
In lambs on a diet (cottonseed hulls, maize, soybean meal, molasses) supplemented with graded levels of Cd, Fe concentrations in ileum and liver were significantly depressed in most of the Cd-treated groups when compared with control animals not receiving extra Cd [17]. Iron concentrations in rumen, abomasum, heart, spleen, lungs, testicles and kidneys were not affected. Selected results are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Selected results of dietary Cd addition on Fe metabolism of lambs [17].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ration (ppm)</th>
<th>Fe (ppm (DM))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basal Fe</td>
<td>Basal Cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>86 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>81 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>76 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = significantly different from lowest control group receiving no additional Cd

3.2.1.3 Goats
Although dietary Cd supplements are reported to influence Fe metabolism in goats [8], no suitable data on this interaction are available.

3.2.1.4 Conclusion
In non-polluted areas, Cd levels in herbage are 0.1-0.8 ppm (DM), whereas Cd levels in polluted areas are 1-21 ppm (DM)[49]. Therefore, the results of the sheep experiment mentioned [17] are applicable in practice, which means that Fe metabolism of sheep in Cd-polluted areas might be impaired. However, due to scarcity of data quantification of the interaction is precluded.

3.2.2 Iron and zinc

3.2.2.1 Cattle
In bull calves (5-11 months of age) on a ration of hay, groundnut cake and maize, the addition of Zn (from ZnSO₄) gradually depressed Fe retention [11]. Retention data were 677, 529, 445 and 255 mg/day for 0, 20, 40 and 60 ppm additional Zn. On the other hand, in lactating cows on a grass silage/concentrate ration supplemented with Zn (from ZnO) to contain either 44, 372, 692 or 1279 ppm Zn (DM) Hb concentrations (10.9-11.9 g/100 mL) and PCV (39.3-41.2%) were of similar magnitude in all groups [48]. Unfortunately, for none of the two experiments statistical data were given, thereby precluding judgement of the data.

In an experiment with lactating dairy cows (mean milk yield 15 kg) fed a Zn deficient, semi-synthetic diet (6 ppm Zn (DM)) for 6 weeks [38], the Fe content of the milk was 0.51 mg/kg milk. After 10 weeks Zn repletion (108-436 ppm Zn (DM)), the Fe content of the milk was slightly increased to 0.57 mg/kg milk. Corresponding serum Fe concentrations were 47 and 52 µM, respectively [38].
3.2.2.2 Sheep

In sheep (1 year of age) fed a grain/hay ration supplemented with 2667 (first 4 weeks) - 4000 ppm Zn (4-14 weeks), animals with histological kidney lesions had significantly higher kidney and pancreas Fe concentrations when compared with control animals not receiving extra Zn [5]. Iron concentrations were 14.4 vs. 5.0 µmol/g DM (kidney) and 2.0 vs. 1.5 µmol/g DM (pancreas) in Zn-supplemented and control groups, respectively.

3.2.2.3 Goats

No data are available on the influence of dietary Zn on Fe metabolism in goats.

3.2.2.4 Conclusion

As the dietary Zn concentrations mentioned to influence Fe metabolism in cattle (108-436 ppm (DM)) substantially exceed the highest recommendations for cattle (23-63 ppm Zn (DM)) [54] and probably maximum allowable concentrations (120 ppm (DM) (dairy cattle) and 100 ppm (DM) (other cattle) according to EU legislation [34]) and, nevertheless, produce only slight alterations of Fe metabolism, under practical circumstances the influence of Zn on Fe metabolism in cattle seems irrelevant. Probably the same is the case for sheep and goats, but as no suitable data are available this cannot be judged.

3.2.3 Iron and lead

Although Pb has been shown to significantly depress Hb concentrations (11.08 vs. 13.94 g/100 mL) in blood of calves after 28 days feeding of 7.5 mg Pb/kg BW (from Pb acetate) [55], no direct evidence of the influence of Pb on Fe metabolism in ruminants (if any) has been reported.

3.2.4 Iron and either nickel, aluminium, calcium and/or phosphorus

3.2.4.1 Cattle

In bull calves (50 days of age, 74 kg BW), no effect of the addition of 5 ppm Ni (from NiCl₂.6H₂O) to a maize/cottonseed hulls/meal ration on Fe concentrations in liver, kidney, spleen, lung, heart or muscle has been demonstrated [59]. The experiment lasted for 140 days. The same is the fact for the addition of 300, 600 or 1200 ppm Al (from AlCl₃.6H₂O) to the ration of steers (226 kg BW) [67]. The unsupplemented maize/soybean meal/cottonseed seed hulls ration contained 210 ppm Al and 3.5 g P/kg and the experiment lasted for 84 days. Iron concentrations in liver, kidney, muscle and brain were unaffected by Al treatment. Increasing the P content of a grass hay/maize/soybean meal ration from 2.3 to 4.6 g/kg (extra P from NaH₂PO₄) during 77 days significantly decreased the Fe concentrations in liver and kidney of steers (± 200 kg BW), whereas those in spleen, heart and muscle tissue were not significantly influenced [61]. The Ca content of the ration was doubled together with the P content from 2.6 to 5.2 g/kg to maintain similar Ca:P ratios. The relative effect of increasing the P content of the ration on liver Fe content was larger when the ration contained 1000 instead of 100 ppm Fe (Fe x P interaction). Increasing the P content of the ration did not significantly influence apparent Fe absorption. Selected results are given in Table 3.

In lactating cows (mean milk yield 17.5 kg), increasing the Ca and/or P content of a maize silage/hay/concentrate ration for 12 months did not significantly influence liver Fe content [27]. Calcium was added as CaCO₃, whereas the combined Ca+P treatment originated from tricalcium phosphate. Selected results are given in Table 3.
Table 3. Selected results of experiments on the influence of Ca and/or P on Fe metabolism in cattle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ration</th>
<th>Fe (ppm)</th>
<th>Ca (g/kg)</th>
<th>P (g/kg)</th>
<th>Liver</th>
<th>Kidney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[61]</td>
<td>Steer calves</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>Lactating cows</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>140 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>180 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = significantly different from lowest P level within Fe level; a = values assessed from a graph

3.2.4.2 Sheep

In wether lambs (6 months of age, 31 kg BW), the influence of dietary additions of either 2.5 g P/kg, 1450 ppm Al and/or 760 ppm Fe to a basal ration (maize (starch)/cottonseed hulls; 1.7 g P/kg, 40 ppm Fe, 168 ppm Al) was investigated [58]. The duration of the experiment was 76 days. Phosphorus was added as NaH$_2$PO$_4$, Fe was added as ferric citrate and Al was added as AlCl$_3$.6H$_2$O. Selected results are given in Table 4. Significant P, Al and Fe effects, as well as P x Fe, P x Al, Fe x Al and P x Fe x Al interactions were observed. Iron concentrations in kidney, muscle, heart and spleen, as well as Hb concentrations and haematocrits were not influenced by Al or P supplements.

Table 4 Selected results of an experiment on the influence of dietary P, Al and Fe additions on liver Fe concentrations in sheep [58].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Fe (ppm)</th>
<th>Al (ppm)</th>
<th>Liver Fe (ppm (DM))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>3652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant P, Al and Fe effects, as well as P x Fe, P x Al, Fe x Al and P x Fe x Al interactions.

3.2.4.3 Goats

No data are available on any influences of dietary Ni, Al, Ca and/or P on Fe metabolism in goats.

3.2.4.4 Conclusions

Due to scarcity of data, neither Ni, Al, Ca nor P effects on Fe metabolism in ruminants can be adequately judged or quantified.

Both in cattle and sheep P effects on liver Fe concentrations depend on dietary Fe concentrations. When dietary Fe concentrations are low (40-117 ppm), increasing the P content of the ration has hardly any effect. At higher dietary Fe concentrations (800-1000 ppm), however, increasing the P content of the ration depresses the Fe content of the liver. As the Fe content of grass silage can easily attain or exceed 800 ppm Fe (both intrinsic Fe and Fe from rain soil splash (CVB Documentation report Nr. 41)) the influence of higher dietary P concentrations on Fe metabolism should be taken into account. However, Fe requirements are in the order of magnitude not influenced by P additions, whereas high P
3.2.5 Iron and copper

3.2.5.1 Cattle

In three experiments with bull calves (37-40 kg BW) [12;13;31] on a milk substitute ration, the influence of Cu additions (from CuSO₄) on Fe metabolism was investigated. Selected results are given in Table 5. The addition of ± 11.4 ppm Cu during 4 weeks decreased the liver non-heme Fe concentrations and transiently increased plasma Fe concentrations, whereas liver total Fe, kidney, spleen and muscle Fe concentrations were not different [13]. In a similar experiment by the same authors [12] the addition of 5 ppm Cu (DM) to the ration of calves significantly lowered Fe concentrations in spleen and heart tissues, whereas parameters of Hb (Hb, MCV, MCH, MCHC) and Fe metabolism (plasma Fe, transferrin saturation, liver (non-heme) Fe, liver ferritin, liver hemosiderin) were not influenced. In the third experiment [31], the addition of either 10 or 1000 ppm Cu (DM) significantly increased liver Fe concentrations. Within the hepatocytes, the increases were mainly due to Fe loading of the nuclei.

Table 5 Selected results of experiments on the influence of Cu on Fe metabolism in calves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Ration</th>
<th>Fe ppm in milk powder</th>
<th>Cu ppm (DM)</th>
<th>liver</th>
<th>liver (non-heme)</th>
<th>spleen</th>
<th>heart</th>
<th>liver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[31]</td>
<td>109 (DM)</td>
<td>10 (DM)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 (DM)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = significant Cu effect.

In calves fed whole and skim milk containing either 2 or 10 ppm Cu (DM), no difference could be observed in performance or meat colour [18]. In lactating dairy cows on a ration (maize silage and -meal, lucerne hay, cottonseed) with or without additional Cu (0, 15 or 30 ppm Cu (DM)) from either CuSO₄ or Cu-Lysine no effect of Cu addition on liver Fe concentrations could be observed [15].

3.2.5.2 Sheep

In sheep (11 kg BW) on a ration (maize, rice bran, groundnut cake, palm kernel meal) significant influences of Cu addition (5 ppm) on Fe metabolism could be observed [2]. Iron was added as FeSO₄.7H₂O and Cu as CuSO₄.5H₂O. Selected results are given in Table 6.
Table 6  Selected results of an experiment on the influence of Cu on Fe metabolism in sheep [2].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ration</th>
<th>Plasma</th>
<th>Liver</th>
<th>Heart</th>
<th>Ht</th>
<th>Hb</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe ppm</td>
<td>Cu µM</td>
<td>Fe ppm (DM)</td>
<td>Cu ppm</td>
<td>Fe %</td>
<td>g/dL</td>
<td>IU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.8 D</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>248 D</td>
<td>36.8 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.8 D</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>248 D</td>
<td>36.8 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ht = haematocrit; Hb = haemoglobin concentration; CP = caeruloplasmin activity; D = significant Cu effect within Fe treatment.

3.2.5.3  Goats
As yet, no data are available on the influence of dietary Cu on Fe metabolism in goats.

3.2.5.4  Conclusion
Regarding the high dietary Cu levels employed in the third calf experiment [31], these Cu effects may be rather pharmacological than physiological. Thus, results of this experiment have been ignored. Although dietary Cu supplementation in cattle seems to decrease tissue Fe concentrations in favor of plasma Fe concentrations, the evidence is not identical. In sheep, the only experiment available demonstrates this phenomenon more clearly. However, due to scarcity of data quantification of the relationship is difficult.

3.2.6  Iron and manganese

3.2.6.1  Sheep
In milk-fed lambs the influence of increasing amounts of Mn on Fe metabolism was investigated [24]. During the experimental period of 35 weeks, lambs were fed either 0, 15-2500 or 45-5000 ppm Mn. Serum Fe and Hb concentrations were significantly lower in the highest Mn group compared to in the other groups. Final liver, kidney and heart Fe concentrations were not significantly different between the unsupplemented and the highest Mn-supplemented group, whereas spleen Fe concentrations were significantly lower in the highest Mn-supplemented group (204 ppm (DM)) than in the unsupplemented group (841 ppm (DM)). In a second experiment, lambs were fed a soybean hay/glucose/casein/cottonseed oil diet either not supplemented with Mn or supplemented with 1000 or 2000 ppm Mn. Both Mn-supplements resulted in significantly lower Hb and serum Fe concentrations.

3.2.6.2  Cattle and goats
No data are available on any interaction of Mn with Fe in cattle or goats.

3.2.6.3  Conclusion
As adverse effects on Fe metabolism were observed in the lambs from the 45-5000 ppm Mn group, which is well beyond Mn requirements (20 ppm (DM)) or even exceeds the recommended maximum tolerable level [52], practical value of the results mentioned is very limited. Within practical dietary Mn levels, no adverse effect of Mn on Fe metabolism should be expected.
3.3 Recycling

The Fe of senescent or defective red cells is broken down and taken up by transferrin or ceruloplasmin or stored as ferritin [1]. No data are available on enterohepatic recycling of Fe in ruminants.

3.4 Excretion

When compared with faecal Fe excretion (281-485 ppm), urinary Fe excretion (0.72-1.52 µg/mL) in calves is negligible [11]. This was also demonstrated in another experiment with young calves, where 84.5% of daily Fe intake was excreted via the faeces, whereas only 0.3% was excreted via the urine [35]. The same is the case in sheep, as within 7 days after dosing $^{59}$Fe ± 90% of dose was excreted via the faeces, whereas only 0.05-0.09% of dose was excreted via the urine [6]. In another experiment with sheep, urinary Fe excretion was 1.0% of total daily Fe excretion [39]. However, in an experiment with goat kids, urinary Fe excretion was relatively high (11.5% of daily intake), while 45.2% was excreted via the faeces [35].

In calves on a hay/concentrate ration, Fe intake was 655 mg/day [65]. Corresponding daily biliary Fe excretion was 2.4 mg (0.4% of intake). Biliary Fe excretion increased substantially (285-993 µmol/day) after infection with Fasciola hepatica. In sheep, biliary Fe excretion did not respond to intravenous administration of tetrathiomolybdate (TM) (0.36 vs. 0.28 mg/day for groups receiving 0 and 100 mg TM, respectively [22]. No data are available on Fe losses via integument and sweat in ruminants.
4  IRON REQUIREMENTS

4.1  Cattle

Iron requirements depend on the criterion of adequacy used. Only very few data are available on true Fe absorption in ruminants. In calves fed a liquid diet, the true Fe availability decreases from 40 to 15% as the Fe content of the diet raised from 40 to 100 mg/kg [9]. In pregnant ewes, a true availability of 21% has been reported, whereas for adult ruminants a value of 10% has been suggested [54]. In this report, for calculation of Fe requirements of adult animals a value of 10%, and for milk-fed, growing animals a mean value of 28% was used.

4.1.1  Dairy cattle

Due to very effective recovery of Fe incorporated in tissues, maintenance requirements for Fe are negligible [54].

Iron content of growing tissues is reported to be 28-34 [9] (mean 31) or 18-34 mg/kg growth [54] (mean 26) and declines with age [66]. However, 13-18 mg/kg have been demonstrated to be associated with growth retardation [9]. On the other hand, a higher estimate of 55 mg/kg growth, allowing for tissue Fe storage, has been made [64]. To calculate minimum requirements, the latter value has been ignored and the average of 26 and 31, i.e. a value of 28.5 mg Fe/kg growth is assumed.

In veal calves intended to produce white meat, Fe supply is critical. At birth, the Fe status of the calves is very variable [47], thereby influencing Fe absorption. Usually, a higher Fe level (60-150 mg Fe/kg) is fed during the first 7 weeks of the fattening period, whereas 8-17 mg Fe/kg is fed until the end of the fattening period at 26-28 weeks of age to produce the desired pale meat colour. No differences in Hb concentrations at slaughter between groups fed 60, 100 of 150 mg Fe/kg of milk replacer during the first 7 weeks could be observed, as all calves became anaemic. An extra Fe supply in the middle of the fattening period might be more effective [50].

In pregnant cows consuming a ration containing 261 ppm Fe (DM), the gravid uterus accumulates approximately 18.0 mg of Fe/day [26] or 27.3 mg Fe/day [20] from 190 days of gestation until calving. No more data are available on Fe requirements during other stages of pregnancy. The average of these two values, i.e. 23 mg, has been used for factorial estimation.

The Fe content of mature milk is assessed to be 0.2 [30], 0.30 [3;33], 0.5 [37;66], 0.515 [57], 0.51-0.57 [38], 1 [54] or 1-2 mg/kg [42]. Arbitrarily, a value of 0.5 mg/kg milk has been chosen for all ruminants. An abberating high value of 2.84 mg/kg [43] has been ignored.

4.1.2  Beef cattle

No separate calculations are recommended for the Fe requirements of beef cattle as compared to dairy cattle [53].

4.2  Sheep

Calculation of the Fe requirements of sheep is essentially similar to that of cattle. Endogenous loss is similar to that of cattle. For Fe accumulation into the gravid uterus, the value for cows related to metabolic body weight (kg$^{0.75}$) is used. Thus, for a 75 kg ewe (25 kg$^{0.75}$) instead of a 650 kg cow (128 kg$^{0.75}$) the Fe accretion in the gravid uterus should be 3.6 mg/day. For ewes carrying 2 foetuses instead of 1 foetus, this value is multiplied by the same factor as for the energy need (1.7 [19]). For twin pregnancy, the Fe accretion should be 6.1
mg/day. Unless proven otherwise, for the remaining parameters the values for cattle are used.
Sheep milk is reported to contain (mg/kg) 0.38-0.40 (no differences between parities) \cite{14} or 0.75 mg Fe/kg.
No data are available on Fe requirements for gestation or wool production in sheep.

4.3 Goats

For goats, data on Fe content of the gravid uterus, growing tissues and hair are lacking. Unless proven otherwise, the values for sheep are used.
Mature goat milk contains (mg/kg) 0.30 \cite{16}, 0.45 \cite{46}, 0.520 \cite{57} or 0.55. An abberating high value of 6.28 mg/kg \cite{43} has been ignored.

4.4 Conclusion

The following equation can be used to calculate the required Fe-concentration of ruminant rations:

\[
C = \frac{100 \times ((kg \text{ milk} \times 0.5) + (kg \text{ growth} \times 28.5) + a)}{A_{Fe} \times DMI}
\]

in which

- \( C \) = required dietary Fe concentration (ppm (DM))
- \( A_{Fe} \) = true Fe absorption (%); for calculation of requirements, a value of 10% (adult) and 28% (milk-fed, growing animals) is assumed
- \( DMI \) = dry matter intake (kg/day)
- \( a \) = amount of Fe needed for gestation (23 mg/day for cattle during the last trimester); for sheep and goats, the amount of Fe needed for gestation is roughly estimated to be 3.6 or 6.1 mg/day for 1 vs. 2 foetuses, respectively (see text).

Note: endogenous Fe loss is considered to be negligible
5 ALLOWANCES

Using the equation mentioned (paragraph 4.4), some examples of dietary Fe requirements and allowances have been tabulated (Table 7). These allowances include a safety margin of 50%.

Table 7 Examples of calculated Fe requirements and allowances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DMI (kg)</th>
<th>Requirement (mg/day)</th>
<th>Allowance mg/day</th>
<th>Allowance Ppm (DM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing female cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months, 850 g growth/day, 130 kg BW</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months, 700 g growth/day, 250 kg BW</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 months, 625 g growth/day, 400 kg BW</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cattle (650 kg BW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow, dry, pregnant (last trimester)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow, lactating, 20 kg of milk</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow, lactating, 40 kg of milk</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle, intermediate type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 g growth/day, 100 kg BW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 g growth/day, 250 kg BW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 g growth/day, 500 kg BW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150 g growth/day, 150 kg BW</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 g growth/day, 275 kg BW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep (75 kg BW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing lamb, 0.3 kg growth/day, 40 kg BW</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep, pregnant, last trimester</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep, lactating, 3 kg of milk, nursing 2 lambs</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats (70 kg BW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat, pregnant, last trimester</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat, lactating, 4 kg of milk</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allowances calculated here are in part substantially lower than most other recommendations. For preruminant calves, growing cattle (>150 kg BW) and sheep the IDWP recommends 30 ppm (DM), and for weaned calves, pregnant and lactating cattle 40 ppm (DM) [29]. In beef cattle, 40-50 ppm Fe is considered adequate to support growth (no data given) and to prevent anaemia. For calves <150 kg BW and for pregnant cattle, the ARC recommends 40 ppm (DM) [9]. The NRC recommends 50 ppm Fe for beef cattle [53]. For sheep, recommendations are 40 ppm (25 ppm being not sufficient to support maximum growth of lambs) [54] or 30 ppm (DM) [9], whereas (without specific results for goats) 30-40 ppm (DM) Fe is supposed sufficient for this animal species [4;36]. As most references do not supply any data on the calculation of their recommendations, proper comparison is precluded.

For young, growing animals, Fe requirements are relatively high (i.a. due to Fe needs for Hb synthesis). The ARC calculates an Fe requirement of 100 ppm (DM) for calves <150 kg BW, as 40 ppm (DM) is considered adequate for growth and 100 ppm (DM) is considered adequate for both growth, Hb and myoglobin synthesis. Moreover, the NRC calculates a Fe requirement of 150 ppm (DM) for a 6-week calf. These recommendations are more or less similar to those calculated above. For young dairy calves and veal calves, IDWP recommendations may not be fully adequate.
6 CRITERIA TO JUDGE IRON STATUS

6.1 Criteria to judge iron status

6.1.1 Blood parameters of iron status

When Fe deficiency is suspected, Fe status is initially assessed by determining blood Hb concentrations and Ht (PCV) values. Under normal circumstances, these parameters are highly correlated. Normal values for Hb concentrations and Ht are given in Table 8. However, individual variation is considerable and low values are not always associated with Fe deficiency. By dividing the Hb reading by the PCV, the mean cell haemoglobin concentration (MCHC) can be calculated. In cases of Fe deficiency anaemia, the MCHC is lowered due to the release of small, new erythrocytes containing less than normal Hb. Meanwhile, TIBC and UIBC increase due to an increased capacity of the blood to bind Fe (TIBC), which cannot be satisfied (UIBC). The diagnostic value of serum ferritin is limited because concentrations become minimal before anaemia develops [66].

More detailed surveys giving normal values (TIBC, UIBC) or marginal bands (indicating for deficient or excessive Fe supply; liver and kidney Fe concentrations, serum ferritin concentrations) have been given in reference [56] and [66] (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 8 Normal values for Hb and Fe concentrations and Ht values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Hb (g/L)</th>
<th>Serum Fe (µM)</th>
<th>Serum Fe marginal bands (µM)</th>
<th>Ht (%)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excess (E)/toxicity (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>90-140</td>
<td>17.9-35.7</td>
<td>2.7-23.2</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>[56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-120</td>
<td>17.4 ± 5.2</td>
<td>8.9-17.9</td>
<td>[66]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-150</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7-32.2 (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td>80-100 (^a)</td>
<td>24-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>5.0-8.0 (^b)</td>
<td>27-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>27-36</td>
<td>[63]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>80-160</td>
<td>29.6-39.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-48</td>
<td>[56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-110</td>
<td>34.6 ± 1.3</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>&gt;39 (E)</td>
<td>[66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90-140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>80-140</td>
<td>8.9-17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>[56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
<td>22-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7-7.6 (^c)</td>
<td>19-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[63]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) the lower limit to be used for individual calves and the upper limit as a group mean value;
\(^b\) values expressed as mM;
\(^c\) Kessels, Utrecht University, personal communication

6.2 Conclusions

Both Hb and Ht are cheap, convenient methods to determine Fe status in most cases, although low values are not always indicative for Fe deficiency. Especially in young animals, one should be aware of (parasitic) infections causing low Fe status not related to a deficient dietary Fe supply. For use in ruminants, regarding the rare occurrence of Fe deficiency and the usually abundant Fe supply, the use of more refined methods to discriminate between the different causes of anaemia will be rarely useful. On the other hand, Fe overload can be manifested as Cu deficiency symptoms, especially when Mo concentrations of the ration are low (CVB Documentation report Nr. 41).
7  DEFICIENCY

The most striking feature of Fe deficiency is hypochromic microcytic anaemia due to insufficient Hb production. In veal calves, anaemia and a light meat colour (low myoglobin levels) is elicited by restricted Fe feeding. Moreover, poor appetite and growth, as well as an increased disease incidence due to impairment of immune function may occur. This feature can be observed before effects on red blood cell volume are detectable [54]. In veal calf production, the occurrence of anaemia does not preclude rapid growth, demonstrating the tolerance of these animals to Fe-induced anaemia. In case of twins, anaemia is more likely to occur due to the competition of the two foetuses for the limited Fe supply by the dam [66].

In adult animals, Fe deficiency is very rare due to efficient adaptation of Fe metabolism in case of an insufficient Fe intake and to the ubiquitous occurrence of Fe in the environment (e.g. soil) [54]. However, anaemia due to bloodsucking parasites is possible both in growing and adult animals [66]. Dietary Fe concentrations below 40 [56], 40-60 (cattle) or 30-50 ppm (DM) (sheep) are considered to indicate for a deficient Fe supply [66] (Table 2). However, it is not clear if this applies only to young, growing animals or also to adult ones.

7.1  Direct measures in deficiency cases

7.1.1  Direct continuous supplementation
Daily oral supplementation of the ration with 30-60 mg Fe/day or 40 mg Fe/kg DM (e.g. from FeSO₄) has been shown to be effective to treat Fe deficiency in newborn calves [66].

7.1.2  Direct discontinuous supplementation
Both in the neonatal lamb (200 mg Fe) and calf (500 mg Fe) iron dextran can be applied intramuscularly to treat Fe deficiency [66].

7.1.3  Slow release oral supplementation and indirect supply via fertilization
Because of the rare occurrence of Fe deficiency in adult cattle and the fact that Fe occurs ubiquitously in the environment, both slow release oral supplementation and indirect Fe supply via fertilization of the pasture are irrelevant [54].
8 TOXICITY

Free Fe is cytotoxic because of its ability to generate free oxygen radicals, which can cause e.g. membrane damage. Therefore, the extent to which tissues are affected depends on the animal’s antioxidant status (vitamin A and E, carotene, Se, Cu, Zn). Moreover, a high intake of polyunsaturated fatty acids (spring grass) from Fe-rich soils may present a hazard. Finally, plants such as lupines and brassicas may increase the hepatic Fe content [54;66].

Veal calves have been demonstrated to be very tolerant for excess Fe in their milk replacer [32]. Three-day-old calves were fed a milk substitute ration supplemented with Fe (from FeSO$_4$.7H$_2$O) for 6 weeks. Total Fe concentrations were either 100, 500, 1000, 2000 or 5000 ppm (DM). The animals tolerated all except the 5000 ppm level. At this level, DMI (0.85 vs. 0.96-1.02 kg/day) and growth rate (0.51 vs. 0.62-0.69 kg/day) were significantly reduced when compared with the other groups. No more clinical abnormalities or gross post mortem changes were observed. Similar clinical observations were made in steers receiving Fe from FeSO$_4$ (either 100 or 1000 ppm total dietary Fe [61] or either 77, 477 or 1677 ppm Fe [62]). However, growth rate was already significantly reduced at the 1000 ppm level when compared with the 100 ppm level [61]. Similarly, the 1677 ppm as compared with the 477 ppm Fe treatment diminished DMI and growth rate, whereas the feed/gain ratio was higher [62]. A similar treatment using 3277 ppm total Fe had to be interrupted due to continuous weight loss. As these experiments were carried out using ruminating animals, the influence of S from the sulphate reducing Cu status (significantly lower liver and kidney Cu concentrations) may have contributed to the observed growth depression. However, in an experiment with calves (90 kg BW, 12 weeks of age), no effect on performance or Hb metabolism of 1000 ppm Fe from either ferrous carbonate or ferrous sulphate could be observed [44].

In summary, although symptoms of Fe toxicity are relatively mild, dietary Fe concentrations within those occurring in practical forages (2000-4000 ppm (DM) [28]) have been demonstrated to impair animal performance. For dairy cattle feeds, maximum tolerable levels of 1000 [54] or even 1000-4000 ppm Fe (DM) [56;66] have been recommended. For beef cattle, a level of 1000 ppm Fe [53], and for sheep levels of 500 [52] or 600-1200 ppm Fe [66] have been recommended.

8.1 Direct measures in toxicity cases

There is no measure reported to be effective in curing Fe toxicosis. The body has only limited possibilities to remove excess Fe [45].
9 PREVENTION

As free Fe is very reactive and generates free radicals [54;66], improving the antioxidant status of the animal (e.g. vitamin E, Se) may be helpful in overcoming Fe toxicosis. No specific measure is known to prevent Fe toxicosis.

Table 9 Inventory of Fe allowances for cattle, sheep and goats as used in some foreign countries (ppm (DM)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Goat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (mature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAa,b</td>
<td>[53;54]</td>
<td>150 (6-week calf)</td>
<td>[52]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>[51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (lactation, gestation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (beef cattle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Allowances for cattle are expressed in mg/kg feed as fed; as DM contents of the feeds are not given, allowances cannot be calculated in ppm (DM).

a minimum requirements.
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ANNEX: OVERVIEW OF THE SERIES OF CVB DOCUMENTATION REPORTS ‘REVIEWS ON THE MINERAL PROVISION IN RUMINANTS’

- CVB Documentation report Nr. 33: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants I: Calcium metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 34: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants II: Phosphorous metabolism and requirements in ruminants (H. Valk)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 35: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants III: Magnesium metabolism and requirements in ruminants (J.Th. Schonewille and A.C. Beynen)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 36: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants IV: Sodium metabolism and requirements in ruminants (J.Th. Schonewille and A.C. Beynen)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 37: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants V: Potassium metabolism and requirements in ruminants (J.Th. Schonewille and A.C. Beynen)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 38: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants VI: Chlorine metabolism and requirements in ruminants (J.Th. Schonewille and A.C. Beynen)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 39: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants VII: Cation Anion Difference in Dairy Cows (J.Th. Schonewille and A.C. Beynen)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 40: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants VIII: Iron metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 41: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants IX: Copper metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 42: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants X: Cobalt metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 43: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XI: Iodine metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 44: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XII: Zinc metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 45: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XIII: Manganese metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 46: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XIV: Selenium metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 47: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XV: Fluorine, chromium, nickel and molybdenum metabolism and requirements in ruminants (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 48: Reviews on the mineral provision in ruminants XVI: Contaminants: Cadmium, lead, mercury, arsenic and radio nuclides (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 49 (in Dutch): Literatuurstudie over de mineralenvoorziening van herkauwers XVII: Nitraat en nitriet (A.M. van den Top)
- CVB Documentation report Nr. 50 (in Dutch): Literatuurstudie over de mineralenvoorziening van herkauwers XVIII: Kwaliteit van drinkwater (A.M. van den Top)