# BUSTING THE MYTH:



### **Implants Lead to Salebarn Discounts**

Implants continue to be the most cost effective and proven technology available to producers to improve feed efficiency and gain in cattle, yet only 30 percent of operations are implanting. Why? One of the most common reasons for non-use is the perception that premiums are rewarded at the salebarn for non-implanted or non-hormone treated cattle (NHTC).



#### **FAST FACTS**

- Data indicate that the sale price for implanted calves is not statistically different than non-implanted calves<sup>2,3</sup>
  - Only \$1.72/cwt premium for NHTC<sup>4</sup>



### **IMPLANT VALUE**

- Implants consistently:
- Improve weight gain by 15 to 40 pounds over non-implanted controls<sup>5</sup>
- Increase rate of gain, live weight and value in each phase of beef production<sup>6</sup>
- Increase value on average \$14.25 to \$38.00 per head when used in calves and stocker cattle<sup>†</sup>





# AVERAGE SALE PRICE — IMPLANTED VERSUS NON-IMPLANTED CATTLE 2,3

Year	Implanted, \$/CWT	Non-implanted, \$/CWT
2010	114.99	114.91
2011	141.45	141.28
2012	163.07	162.96
2013	162.05	162.45
2014	232.41	232.35
2015*	227.72	229.12
2016	145.72	145.80
2017	153.36	152.98
2018*	162.36	161.58

When considering a NHTC program, it's critical to ensure your premium earns you more than the pounds gained by implanting. Ask your Elanco sales representative how to evaluate ways implanting can improve your bottom line.



<sup>\*</sup>Statistically different at P=0.05

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Asem-Hiablie, S., Rotz, C. A., Stout, R., Dillon, J., & Stackhouse-Lawson, K. (2015). Management characteristics of cow-calf, stocker, and finishing operations in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Professional Animal Scientist, 31(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.15232/pas.2014-01350

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Rogers, G., King, M., Hill, K., Wittum, T., & Odde, K. (2015). "The effect of growth-promoting implant status on the sale price of beef calves sold through a livestock video auction service from 2010 through 2013." The Professional animal scientists, 31, 443-447. doi: 10.15232/pas.2015-01396

<sup>3</sup>Personal Communication K. Dhuyvetter (25 November 2019)

<sup>&</sup>quot;Odde, K. G.; King, M. E.; McCabe, E. D.; Smith, M. J.; Hill, K. L.; Rogers, G. M.; and Fike, K. E. (2019) "Trends in "Natural" Value-Added Calf Programs at Superior Livestock Video Auction,"

Kansas Aericultural Experiment Station Research Reports: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.7718

<sup>5</sup>kuhl, G. L. 1997. "Abstract: stocker cattle responses to Implants." Oklahoma State University Symposium: Impact of Implants on Performance and Carcass value of Beef Cattle, 51 - 62. "Duckett, S. K. and J. G. Andrae. 2001. "Implant strategies in an integrated beef production system." J. Anim. Sci. 79:E110.

Based on grazing implant data presented by Kuhl and value of gain of \$0.95/lb based on data from 2010-2018 for steers and heifers across multiple states