

1 **Predicting live weight using body volume formula in lactating water buffalo**

2

3 Remedio Ramos-Zapata, Camila Dominguez-Madrigal, Ricardo-A. García-Herrera;
4 Enrique Camacho-Perez; Jesús Manuel Lugo-Quintal, Thobela Louis Tyasi, Antonio
5 Leandro Chaves Gurgel; Luís Carlos Vinhas Ítavo and Alfonso Juventino Chay-Canul

6

7 SUPPLEMENTARY FILE

8

9 **Material and methods**

10 The animals included in the present study were managed in compliance with the ethical
11 guidelines and regulations for animal experimentation of División Académica de Ciencias
12 Agropecuarias at Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco (approval code: UJAT-2012-
13 IA-18).

14 The experiment was conducted in a commercial farm located in Isla (18°01'N
15 94°23'W) in the state of Veracruz, México. The climate of the region is hot-humid with
16 rain in summer and average annual temperature and rainfall of 25 °C and 2750 mm,
17 respectively.

18 Live weight (LW, kg), heart girth (HG, cm), and body length (BL, cm) data were
19 obtained from 165 lactating Murrah buffalo of 3-10 years age. The animals were reared
20 in production systems based on extensive grazing, including native trees, shrubs, grasses,
21 and herbs such as *Paspalum conjugatum* bergius, *Echinochloa polystachya*, *Paspalum*
22 *fasciculatum*, *Oryza perennis* Moench, *Panicum decolorans*, and aquatic
23 plants: *Heliconia latispatha* benth and *Eichhornia crassipes*. The animals were provided
24 water *ad libitum* and none of the animals received supplements. LW was recorded by
25 weighing the animals on a fixed platform scale with a capacity of 2000 kg and precision

26 of 0.5 kg, whereas HG and BL were recorded using a flexible fiberglass tape measure
27 (Truper[®]). Body volume (BV) was estimated using the formula to calculate the volume
28 of a cylinder, by including the measurements of HG and BL in its composition
29 (Paputungan *et al.*, 2015). The calculation was as follows:

30
$$\text{Radius (cm)} = \text{HG} / 2\pi$$

31
$$\text{Body volume (dm}^3\text{)} = (\pi \times r^2 \times \text{BL}) / 1000,$$

32 where r = circumference radius (cm); $\pi = 3.1416$; HG = heart girth (cm); and BL = body
33 length (cm).

34 Additionally, three mathematical models were evaluated to predict the Murrah
35 buffalo LW based on BV, namely:

36 1) Linear equation (Eq. 1): $\text{LW (kg)} = \mu + \beta_1 \times \text{BV}$;

37 2) Quadratic equation (Eq. 2): $\text{LW (kg)} = \mu + \beta_1 \times \text{BV} + \beta_2 \times \text{BV}^2$; and

38 3) Allometric equation (Eq. 2): $\text{LW (kg)} = \mu \times \text{BV}^{\beta_1}$,

39 where LW = live weight (kg); BV = Body volume (dm³), " β_1 " and " β_2 " = model
40 parameters.

41

42 ***Statistical analysis***

43 For the statistical analysis and internal validation of the model, the data were read in the
44 Python environment as follows: descriptive statistics were obtained using the description
45 function of the "pandas" package. The ratio between BV and LW was determined by
46 linear (Eq. 1), quadratic (Eq. 2) and allometric (Eq. 3) equations using the "lmfit"
47 package. The following allometric equation was fitted: $Y = aX^{**} b$, where Y represents
48 LW, X represents BV and a and b are parameters of the model. The models and their
49 residuals were plotted with the "matplotlib" package. The goodness-of-fit of the
50 regression models was evaluated using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the

51 Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), the coefficient of determination (R^2), the mean
52 square error (MSE), and the root MSE (RMSE). The last three parameters were obtained
53 using the “scikit-learn” package.

54 The predictive capacity of the three models for LW was evaluated by cross-
55 validating k -folds ($k = 4$). This approach was undertaken by randomly dividing the set of
56 observation values into non-overlapping k -folds of approximately the same size. The first
57 fold is treated as a validation set, and the model fits the remaining $k-1$ folds (training
58 data). The ability of the fitted model to predict the actual observed values was evaluated
59 using MSE, R^2 , and the mean absolute error (MAE). The mean absolute error is an
60 alternative to the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) that is less sensitive to outliers
61 and is related to the mean absolute difference between observed and predicted results.
62 Lower values of root MSPE and MAE indicate a better fit. The k -folds cross-validation
63 was performed using the “scikit-learn” package, which allowed a comparison of
64 numerous multivariate calibration models.

65

66

67 **Supplementary Table S1.** Descriptive analysis of the live weight (kg), body
68 measurements (cm) and body volume in lactating Murrah buffalo reared in Mexican
69 humid tropical conditions ($n = 165$).

Variable	Mean \pm SD	CV (%)	Minimum	Maximum
LW (kg)	487.17 \pm 89.61	18.39	314.00	722.50
HG (cm)	201.35 \pm 14.99	7.44	166.00	230.00
BL (cm)	102.26 \pm 11.89	11.52	78.00	133.00
BV (dm ³)	333.62 \pm 58.51	17.54	204.68	495.12

70 LW: live weight; BL: body length; HG: heart girth; BV: body volume; SD: standard deviation; CV: coefficient of variation; n : number of animals.

71