

Accepted Manuscript

Transporters knowledge towards pre-slaughter logistic chain and occupational risks in Mexico: An integrative view with implications on sheep welfare

Miguel A. Pulido, Laura X. Estévez-Moreno, Morris Villarroel, María A. Mariezcurrena-Berasain, Genaro C. Miranda-de la Lama



PII: S1558-7878(19)30081-4

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2019.07.001>

Reference: JVEB 1257

To appear in: *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*

Received Date: 19 April 2019

Revised Date: 13 June 2019

Accepted Date: 3 July 2019

Please cite this article as: Pulido, M.A., Estévez-Moreno, L.X., Villarroel, M., Mariezcurrena-Berasain, M.A., Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., Transporters knowledge towards pre-slaughter logistic chain and occupational risks in Mexico: An integrative view with implications on sheep welfare, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2019.07.001>.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 Transporters knowledge towards pre-slaughter logistic chain and occupational
2 risks in Mexico: An integrative view with implications on sheep welfare
3

4 Miguel A. Pulido ^a, Laura X. Estévez-Moreno ^b, Morris Villarroel ^c, María A. Mariezcurrena-
5 Berasain ^a, Genaro C. Miranda-de la Lama ^{b, d 1}
6

7 ^a Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Husbandry, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico
8 UAEM, Toluca, Mexico.

9 ^b Department of Animal Production and Food Science, Agrifood Institute of Aragon (IA2), University of
10 Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain.

11 ^c Department of Animal Science, E.T.S.I.A. Polytechnic University of Madrid, Spain,

12 ^d Department of Food Science, Metropolitan Autonomous University, Lerma Campus, UAM, State of México,
13 México.

14
15 **Abstract**

16 Using a survey, we aimed to investigate Mexican transporter knowledge towards pre-slaughter
17 logistic chain and occupational risks and secondly, to quantify how transport can affect sheep
18 welfare. We used univariate and multivariate statistics based on cluster analysis. According to a
19 cluster analysis, the incidence of risks varied with the association between transport, pre-
20 slaughter logistic operations and journey distance. Cluster 1 included long distance journeys
21 (LDJ), cluster 2 medium distance journeys (MDJ) and cluster 3 short distance journeys (SDJ). In
22 MDJ the collection points were quite varied compared to the LDJ and SDJ groups, which were
23 always in the north or central regions, respectively. The LDJ group used pot-belly trailers or 10
24 ton (t) to 16 t lorries, the MDJ group preferably used 10 t to 16 t lorries and group SDJ used 3.5
25 lorries or pick-ups. Most of the accidents were grouped in SDJ, which also included transporters
26 who smoked most and drank coffee as a countermeasure for sleepiness. The MDJ group loaded
27 more animals at the farm, while the other two groups mostly collected animals at assembly
28 centres or auction markets. Results suggest the existence of three types of journey distances,
29 most of the road accidents were grouped in long distance journeys. It is critical for everyone
30 engaged in welfare promotion along the pre-slaughter logistic chain to recognize the links
31 between human well-being, animal welfare, and the environment, and to know that the way
32 sheep are transported can have broader One-Welfare implications.

¹ Address for reprint requests and correspondence:

María Antonia Mariezcurrena-Berasain: maria.mariezcurrena@yahoo.com.mx

Genaro C. Miranda-de la Lama: g.miranda@correo.ler.uam.mx

33 **Keywords:** One-Welfare; Sheep transporters', Logistic chain, occupational risks, Mexico

34 **1. Introduction**

35 In recent years, the interest in health and safety in the workplace has increased (Cecchini et al.,
36 2018). Animal production represents a high-risk occupation, responsible for several thousand
37 worker injuries and fatalities worldwide per year (Irwin and Poots, 2015). The main occupational
38 hazards which can have an impact on transporters safety are relatively well known, including;
39 interaction with animals, driving, sleeplessness and physical effort. In this context, a
40 multidisciplinary approach is essential to understand the complex relationships between people
41 and animals during livestock transport. One-Welfare is an integrative concept that asks us to
42 confront the most contentious and important questions of ethics, science, production, health,
43 economics, and politics (Colonius and Earley, 2013). This concept also recognises the
44 interconnections between human wellbeing, animal welfare and environment balance (Pinillos et
45 al., 2016), although it does not directly refer to the well-being of stock-people, transporters and
46 operators. In this article we make an extension to the definition of One Welfare as standards that
47 promote the welfare of farm animals, prevent or reducing occupational hazards that may affect
48 livestock workers (farmers, stock-people, transporters and abattoir operators), promote
49 sustainability in animal production and generate an integrative vision of the human-animal
50 relationship (Miranda-de La Lama, 2018).

51
52 Transportation is generally regarded as an exceptionally stressful period in the life of an animal,
53 and there is an increasing public interest in and concern for the welfare of transported livestock
54 (Padalino et al., 2015). During transport, animals are exposed to a range of potential stressors
55 such as handling and human contact, loading and lairage, different or unfamiliar environments,
56 food and water deprivation, alterations in weather conditions, noise and environmental
57 pollutants, and also changes in social structure through separation, mixing and crowding
58 (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2014). Sheep production is one of the fastest growing food-
59 producing sectors in Mexico. This is mostly motivated by a higher demand for lamb meat in the
60 central states of Mexico, where they consume the traditional sheep dishes. Additionally, in recent
61 years, the number of sheep abattoirs has decreased and become more centralized, increasing
62 transport times. As a result, the pre-slaughter logistic chain for sheep production in Mexico is

63 now longer and possibly more detrimental for transporters and animals, including breeding
64 farms, feedlots, collecting points, markets and abattoirs (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2018).

65

66 Much has been learned about stress during transport, but less attention has been paid to
67 identifying and correcting risk factors from the point of view of interactions between transporters
68 and animals, partly because they vary widely both nationally and internationally (Marahrens et
69 al., 2011). Consequently, animal welfare during transport can depend on the attitudes and
70 training of handlers and transporters and on the availability of appropriate facilities (Burnard et
71 al., 2015). Notwithstanding the fact that livestock drivers play an essential role in protecting
72 animal welfare throughout the pre-slaughter logistic chain, and can be held legally responsible,
73 there is limited information about this group of transporters in the scientific literature (Miranda-
74 de La Lama et al., 2010). Studies on risk perception of transporters are often referred to as
75 specific risk factors as traumatic accidents, but the risk perception plays an important role in
76 preventing every kind of accident, occupational disease and the welfare of transported animals.
77 Little is known of the occupational exposures, risk factors and their associated adverse health
78 outcomes among sheep transporters, particularly from emergent countries. Therefore, we aimed
79 to investigate Mexican transporter knowledge regarding transport and pre-slaughter logistic
80 operations, and secondly, to quantify how journey distance affects occupational risks of
81 transporters and animal welfare.

82

83 **2. Material and methods**

84 The survey was carried out in the municipality of *Capulhuac* (19°12'N 99°28'W; 2700 m.a.s.l.)
85 in the State of Mexico (central plateau of Mexico). The survey period was from May to
86 September 2016. The first article in this series study the transporters perceptions and attitudes
87 towards animal welfare and their influence in logistics practices in sheep transport (see Pulido et
88 al., 2018), and this article integrates the knowledge of transporters about Mexican pre-slaughter
89 logistic chain and occupational risks and its impact on sheep welfare. In Mexico, sheep are
90 slaughtered, and meat is processed in the central area of the country, mostly because of the high
91 demand in Hidalgo and Mexico City where sheep meat is consumed as a traditional dish called
92 “*barbacoa*”. The *Capulhuac* municipality is the largest sheep producer with approximately
93 400,000 head slaughtered per year, 600 small-scale slaughterhouses, 300 sheep meat retailers

94 and 115 professional transporters. There are eight specialized abattoirs, while 60% of the animals
95 are slaughtered in small abattoirs and even at homes. We obtained written informed consent from
96 every transporter participant in the survey, and all of them were informed that they could quit at
97 any time, without explanation. The questionnaire was anonymous, and all information obtained
98 in the study was kept confidential and used only for our study.

99

100 *2.1. Study Description and Questionnaire*

101 Fifty-seven male transporters (53% of the national census of professional sheep transporters)
102 aged between 18 and 62 years old were recruited through the Sheep Dealers and Transporters
103 Association of *Capulhuac* (State of Mexico). No women were found working as sheep
104 transporters. Only transporters with at least one year of experience driving livestock trucks were
105 chosen. The transporters had participated in other studies related to the same sector due to their
106 willingness to provide information and the credibility of their testimonials. To minimize
107 selection biases, we ensured that the participant transporters were blind to the main objectives of
108 the study. The interested transporters were informed that “participation was voluntary, that the
109 information collected was confidential, and if they did not participate or wanted to desist during
110 the interview, their future employment conditions would not be affected”. Participation was
111 anonymous and there were no financial incentives. All respondents had permits to drive heavy
112 lorries and were working as professional transporters transporting sheep. The interviews were
113 conducted individually at the assembly centres, classification centres or transporter offices (with
114 a work context) and took 30 minutes to complete.

115

116 To validate the questionnaire, ten preliminary surveys were carried out in May 2016 using draft
117 questions with the participation of 10 sheep transporters (who were excluded from subsequent
118 analyses). Using those results we designed the final questionnaire, which was divided into three
119 sections. The first section was related to socio-demographics such as age, education, driving
120 experience, vehicle type and work status (owner or employee). The second section was related to
121 operational risks, including personal health, occupational risks on the road and accidents. The
122 final section dealt with operational and logistic practices during transport, transporters were
123 questioned about most common routes or journeys and transport procedures. This allowed us to
124 obtain numerical data on loading capacity, journey distance, transport time, loading/unloading

125 time, transportation cost per sheep, weight loss, percentage of animals injured and mortality. In
126 the same section, the participants were asked about logistic issues such as the farms or collecting
127 points of origin (north, northwest-centre, centre and southeast of the Mexican Republic), and
128 animal handling during loading and unloading. Finally, respondents were asked two questions:
129 “Do you think that stress during animal production and transport could affect meat quality” and
130 “What parts of the pre-slaughter logistics most jeopardize the welfare of sheep in Mexico?”

131

132 2.2. Specifications of the Model

133 We used univariate and multivariate statistics based on cluster analysis. All statistical analyses
134 were carried out using the software Package SPSS, Version 21.0. Descriptive statistics included
135 percentages and means. Prior to that, univariate analyses were carried out on all the variables
136 included in the study to observe their individual behaviour and to detect outliers. A cluster
137 analysis was carried out in order to typify the geographical origins of the journeys in accordance
138 with transporters knowledge regarding transport and pre-slaughter logistic operations. The
139 conglomeration method was the two-step method due to the nature of the data (categorical
140 variables). Unlike hierarchical and non-hierarchical methods, this method was used in order to
141 take maximum advantage of the benefits offered by both methods (Morris et al., 2017). The two-
142 step method has been used previously to examine animal transport and farm external biosecurity
143 (Bottoms et al., 2013). The distance measurement was the maximum likelihood, calculated using
144 the variables relating to four possible geographical origins of the journeys (north, northwest-
145 central, central and south-central), and the number of conglomerates was identified
146 automatically. The log-likelihood distance measure was applied for clustering and the Schwarz's
147 Bayesian Criterion (BIC) was to select the optimal number of clusters. Having defined the
148 clusters, they were then characterized based on their orientation towards vehicle type, sheep
149 collection method, production system at origin, commercial category of the animals (lambs,
150 sheep's and goats), route matters (stop at animal health checkpoints, number of toll booths of the
151 route, journey distance, journey time, transport costs per animal per journey, number of animals
152 per journey), occupational hazards, animal loss, loading and unloading schedules, and animal
153 handling procedures. In order to identify the variables that discriminated between clusters, the
154 contingency tables were employed with their respective Chi-square tests and Kruskal–Wallis
155 tests to compare ranges of independent samples (Sepúlveda et al., 2010).

156

157 **3. Results**

158 The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The mean age of respondents was 40
159 years old (SD= 10.7), while the mean driving experience was 7.7 (± 3) years. Most transporters
160 (80.8%) had at least a junior high-school education. The great majority (72%) were taught to
161 drive sheep vehicles by a relative, while 28% learned by being an assistant to a transporter. Most
162 of the transporters interviewed owned 10 ton (t) to 16 t lorries with two to three axles (40%), pot-
163 bellies (28%), 3 t lorries (15.8%) or pick-ups (14%). About 65% were owners and 35%
164 employees. The transported animals come from different places in northern Mexico, via long
165 journeys of more than 8 hours (from states of *Chihuahua*, *San Luis Potosí*, *Zacatecas*, *Coahuila*
166 and *Durango*), from northwest-central Mexico (4 to 8 hour journeys from states of
167 *Aguascalientes*, *Jalisco*, *Queretaro*, and *Guanajuato*) and central Mexico (less than 4 hour
168 journeys from states of *Mexico*, *Morelos* and *Michoacan*) and southeast Mexico with medium
169 journeys (4 to 8 h journeys from states of *Guerrero* and *Oaxaca*).

170

171 *3.1. Univariate Analysis*

172 Regarding the participation of transporters in the transport process, 70% bought animals,
173 loaded/unloaded and drove, 13.9 % only drove and loaded/unloaded, 11.1% bought animals and
174 drove and 5 % only drove. Only 13.3% of carriers reported having some form of chronic disease.
175 The most common health complications were diabetes (50%), chronic back pain (37.5%), and
176 high cholesterol (12.5%). Regarding occupational risks on the road, the most important problems
177 were assault while on the road (49.4%), road accidents (43%), and kidnappings (7.6%). All the
178 accidents only involved the livestock vehicle and in 50% of the cases the vehicle was empty (no
179 animal mortality). In approximately 56% of the accidents the vehicle overturned, 40% were
180 collisions and 4% mechanical failures. In most accidents involving animals, 63.6% were re-
181 transported to the destination, while 36.4% were abandoned (alive, injured or dead) on the
182 motorway. Most accidents (68%) occurred at night (32% during the day).

183

184 Regarding logistics, all together the transporters interviewed transported approximately 40,000
185 sheep per month, making up 70% of all the animals slaughtered per month in Capulhuac. The
186 average transport distance of loaded vehicles was 604.63 ± 309.7 km (maximum 1,300 km).

187 Loading time took about 2.2 h on average and journeys lasted 12 ± 6 h (maximum 24 h). Some
188 journeys included goats (7%) since Mexican sheep farmers traditionally keep some goats with
189 their sheep. Animals were always loaded in groups and the average loading time was 2.20 h
190 (± 2.0), with widespread use of sticks or electric prods. Most transporters (73.2%) mentioned that
191 before loading they normally separated sheep by commercial category, presence of horns or
192 breed, to then place them in specific compartments on the truck. Most loading was performed in
193 the afternoon from 13 to 19 pm (58%), followed by the morning (37.5% between 6 am to 12 pm)
194 and 3.6% at night (8 pm- 5 am). Unloading was faster (1.1 ± 1.4 h) up to maximum of 2 h, and
195 mostly performed in the morning (65%), followed by the afternoon-night (35%). Transporters
196 stated that the most common difficulties during loading/unloading were lack of personnel
197 (19.9%), poor infrastructure for weighing (17.5%), poor weather conditions (16.7%), too long
198 distance between pre-loading pens and loading ramp (16.7%), lack of ramps (13.3%), lack of
199 ramps and personnel (10%), and little space to move (6.6%). In reference to the supply of water
200 or feed for the animals at the destination, 87.7% provided water-feed, 8.8% nothing and 3.5%
201 only water.

202

203 Most (56.4%) of the transporters stated that the welfare of the animals could be under risk during
204 transport, where the most important problems are related to fatigue (60.8%), bruises (26.1%) and
205 fractures (13.1%). Regarding mortality, only 31.6% of the transporters reported at least one
206 mortality per journey. They also consider that weight loss per animal shipped was 4.0 (± 1.9) kg
207 (maximum 11 kg). The transporters believe that mortality and morbidity were higher in winter
208 (36.8%) and summer (24.6%), while some mentioned there were more problems in spring (5.3%)
209 and fall (1.8%). The remaining 31.7% of transporters found no relation between mortality and
210 season of the year. The cost of transport per animal was approximately 2.98 (± 1.3) US dollars,
211 up to \$ 6.23 US dollars. The lairage and slaughter at the abattoir (32.1%) and road accidents
212 (24.5%) were mentioned as the two main welfare critical points, followed by transport (20.8%),
213 markets and collecting points (11.3%), and living conditions on the farm (5.7%). In 6th place
214 were clinical and husbandry procedures (5.6%). Finally, 79% of the transporters considered that
215 stress during animal production and transport could affect meat quality.

216

217 *3.2. Multivariate Analysis*

218 The two-step cluster analysis separated three clusters or typical routes that explained the
219 association between transport and pre-slaughter logistic operations and journey distance (Table
220 2). Cluster 1 included long distance journeys (LDJ), cluster 2 medium distance journeys (MDJ)
221 and cluster 3 short distance journeys (SDJ). The majority (86%) of the respondents were evenly
222 distributed in clusters 1 (LDJ) and 2 (MDJ), and only 14% in cluster 3 (SDJ). In MDJ the
223 collection points were quite varied compared to the LDJ and SDJ groups, which were always in
224 the north or central regions, respectively. The LDJ group used pot-belly trailers or 10 t to 16 t
225 lorries, the MDJ group preferably used 10 t to 16 t lorries and group SDJ used 3.5 t lorries or
226 pick-ups. Most of the accidents were grouped in LDJ, which also included transporters who
227 smoked most and drank coffee as a countermeasure for sleepiness. The MDJ group loaded more
228 animals at the farm, while the other two groups mostly collected animals at assembly centres or
229 auction markets. The animals transported in LDJ and SDJ groups came mostly from mixed
230 production systems (grazing and finishing with concentrate in stables), while MDJ animals were
231 mostly stabled.

232
233 Lambs were the most transported commercial category, especially in LDJ and MDJ groups. The
234 SDJ group mostly included cull ewes. The three groups transported goats, although sheep was
235 always the main species. The LDJ group always stopped at animal health checkpoints run by
236 governmental authorities, passing through more than three toll-booths and having the longest
237 journeys (above 700 km and 13 h). They also transported the largest number of animals per trip
238 at the highest cost. Surprisingly, the highest mortality was concentrated in medium-distance
239 journeys, followed by long journeys. Weight loss was directly related to journey distance, with
240 LDJ animals losing the most weight, followed by those of medium distance. Loading always
241 took place during the day for long and short distance journeys. In the case of MDJ, loading
242 usually occurred during the day but occasionally at night. That group also had longer loading
243 times. The highest unloading time corresponded to LDJ. Shouting and aggressive handling were
244 common in all three groups. Finally, separation or selection of sheep during the pre-loading
245 period was common practice in LDJ and MDJ groups.

246

247 **4. Discussion**

248 Transportation is a stressful experience for animals and sheep are no exception (Miranda-de La
249 Lama et al., 2010). Safe and humane livestock transportation carries important public and trade
250 concerns worldwide due to its potential negative consequences on economics, animal health and
251 welfare, food quality and safety (González et al., 2012). Transporters play a crucial role in
252 delivering live and healthy animals to their destinations on time, despite long journeys and
253 irregular driving schedules (Pulido et al., 2018). Surprisingly we know little about how
254 transporters influence animal welfare. Our study is one of the first to consider how transporters
255 perceive and influence pre-slaughter transport and logistics in terms of One-Welfare.

256

257 *4.1. Univariate Analysis*

258 More than half of the transporters we interviewed were over 39 years old, with a secondary
259 education and more than 10 years of experience driving cattle trucks. Most of those trucks were
260 large (>10 t) and owned by the transporters, who have a particular interest in profiting from the
261 purchase and sale of live animals. Morbidity and mortality are economic losses for the meat
262 industry, regardless of the pain and suffering caused to animals. Increasing the number of trained
263 personnel would help to promote positive attitudes towards welfare issues (Hemsworth et al.,
264 2011). Sheep transport in Mexico mostly involves vehicles from 10 t to 16 t, followed by pot-
265 belly's. The use of large vehicles reflects the industrial scale of the supply chain and the need to
266 move a greater number of animals at a lower price. Providing appropriate vehicles for livestock
267 transport that are built and equipped according to the specifications of the sheep category of the
268 animals transported is an unquestionable principle for the protection of animals during transport
269 (Gallo et al., 2018).

270

271 Typically, commercial transporters had irregular work schedules and sleep hours, in addition to
272 little physical activity, poor eating habits and nutrition, and mental and physical stress, all of
273 which may aggravate health problems, including obesity, cardiovascular issues and metabolic
274 disorders (Mabry et al., 2016). Although only 13% of the transporters stated that they had a
275 chronic disease, one of the main problems was diabetes. That could be due to the work schedules
276 that do not provide enough time to follow an adequate diet, partly due to the difficulty of finding
277 healthy foods en route and the perception that diets that are rich in carbohydrates, fat and sugar
278 stave off hunger, which predisposes transporters to obesity and eventually diabetes (Vayro et al.,

279 2016). That would also help explain the problems with sore backs and high cholesterol, which
280 can be the result of obesogenic process and be connected to cardiovascular and metabolic
281 disorders (Leyton et al., 2012). In addition, journeys include risks such as armed robbery and
282 accidents. Safety is a relatively recent topic in studies on logistics and supply chains. The type of
283 goods affects the risk of theft, especially in Mexico (De la Torre et al., 2015). In that context, the
284 high incidence of thefts could be related to several factors including the high value of sheep meat
285 (compared with other farm species), small size of sheep, numerous loading sites, poor
286 traceability and decreasing national road security levels.

287
288 Road accidents involving loaded livestock vehicles can be a serious problem, leading to
289 economic, animal, and even human loss. In addition, accidents have an important impact in the
290 media and affect the image of the industry for consumers (Valadez-Noriega et al., 2018). Our
291 results indicate that a little less than half the transporters had at least one accident on the job, and
292 half of those accidents were with an empty load. The rate of accidents is related to a series of
293 factors determined by journey time/distance, as mentioned below in section 4.2. We also found a
294 similar tendency for accidents reported in Spain (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2011). One of the
295 main causes of accidents appears to be driver fatigue, which may be the result of intense
296 workdays, poorly designed route plans, or high levels of pressure from companies (Valadez-
297 Noriega et al., 2018). Most accidents occurred at night with an empty load since loading and
298 journey with live animals tend to occur during the day. When there are accidents with animals
299 on-board, there was a high rate of re-transport (sent to the slaughterhouse for emergency
300 slaughter) compared to reports from Spain (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2011) and the USA
301 (Woods and Grandin, 2008). The high rate and cost of accidents involving sheep lorries
302 demonstrate the need for continued efforts to increase the safety of trucking operations in
303 Mexico and other countries.

304
305 The data confirm that the number of animals transported and slaughtered in this region of
306 Mexico is the highest in the country (Mondragón-Ancelmo et al., 2018) and possibly the highest
307 in Latin America. That may partly be explained by culinary traditions, migration of consumers
308 from the countryside to the city and to a view that lamb meat is tied with modern food traditions.
309 Although it is clear that the production chain is young, certain stages of transport and logistics

310 are deficient and require more governmental control. The legal requisites related to transport and
311 slaughter are known as the Official Mexican Regulations (NOM-024-ZOO-1995 and NOM-051-
312 ZOO-1995). These legal provisions regulate the maximum journey time that in the case of small
313 ruminants is 18 hours (without access to water and feed). Although in practice these regulations
314 are not usually met by sheep transporters. The cattle, pig and poultry industries appear to obey
315 those regulations, possibly since the production techniques are more modern than for sheep.
316 Those norms may be relaxed for animals that are produced, slaughtered and consumed in a
317 traditional manner. However, mass consumption of sheep meat in Mexico may mean that the
318 industry will have to comply with current and future regulations. In addition, a recent study has
319 confirmed that Mexican consumers demand high quality meat and systems of transport and
320 slaughter that take into account animal welfare as the main pillar of operational quality in the
321 system (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2019).

322
323 The survey we developed helped to identify a series of practices that represent risks to the health
324 and welfare of sheep. Many journeys were long (the average was 12 h), which may be a problem
325 in a country without legal limits on sheep journey times. Longer journey times increase the risk
326 of unnecessary suffering for animals and have negative effects on the health of transporters.
327 Thus, journey distance is of vital interest in terms of animal welfare and product quality but also
328 within the framework of the One-Welfare concept. Although not demanded by Mexican
329 regulations, most transporters provide feed and water to sheep upon arrival at the slaughterhouse
330 or in small collection centres near the slaughterhouse, especially during medium to long hauls.
331 The main reason is to compensate for weight loss, even when the animals will be slaughtered in
332 the following 72 hours. This practice may pose a risk in terms of food, according to Pointon et al.
333 (2012), the significance of withholding feed for long period before slaughter is twofold. Firstly,
334 it leads to an increase in rumen pH, due to a reduction in volatile fatty acids, which in turn
335 favours the multiplication and growth of undesirable enteric bacteria as *Salmonella* and
336 *Escherichia coli*. This causes an increase in microbial hazard prevalence and counts in both
337 rumen contents and faeces as the time without feed increases. Secondly, withholding feed
338 reduces the visible contamination of the surface of the animals and facilitates hygienic dressing
339 (Pointon et al., 2012). Non-compliance with certain legal provisions regarding safety and animal

340 welfare is related to the traditional character of the consumption of sheep meat in the country.
341 Unlike pork and beef that are usually exported, and these industries are highly regulated.

342

343 The work of the transporter requires specific driving abilities, but many transporters also partake
344 in the loading/unloading of animals, select animals for loading and distribute animals on the
345 truck according to their weight or commercial category. The use of electric prods (very popular
346 device among transporters in North America) and other instruments to handle the animals is
347 more common during the loading and unloading of large vehicles, since it is done by
348 compartment and conditions are often less than adequate. Those problems lead to long loading
349 (2-4 hours) and unloading times (1-2 hours). Rough handling during the pre-slaughter period has
350 been related to fatigue and increased bruising in sheep, particularly under poor transport
351 conditions (Tarumán and Gallo, 2008). Poorly defined abnormalities in the mobility of pigs and
352 recently in cattle at abattoirs have garnered considerable interest from the beef industry and
353 media (Thomson et al., 2015). Fatigue is a multifactorial syndrome in which affected animals
354 become non-ambulatory without obvious injury, trauma, or disease, and refuse to walk (Schuetze
355 et al., 2017). Although there are no clinical reports about this syndrome in sheep, Mexican
356 transporters perceive fatigue as the main risk during to transport. Some of them referred to
357 clinical signs that are similar to other species (personal observations outside the questionnaire),
358 so it would be necessary to investigate the clinical significance of this phenomenon.

359

360 Loss in live weight is an inevitable consequence of transport, although its impact depends on the
361 breed, sex, health status, body condition, handling and individual susceptibility to stress
362 (Cernicchiaro et al., 2008). Our results indicate that weight loss averages 3.5 kg per animal,
363 independently of the journey distance. The initial decrease is due to dehydration and loss of urine
364 and feces, that represent 5 -15 % of the total live weight. During long, stressful journeys (where
365 sheep release high levels of glucocorticoids), fat tissue may also be lost, which affects carcass fat
366 deposition (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2018). In many of those cases, the high levels of physical
367 stress increase mortality (31% of long journeys had at least one mortality), which most
368 transporters believe is higher in winter and summer months.

369

370 According to Mexican consumers, the greatest risk to animal welfare is during transport to
371 slaughter, followed by handling immediately before slaughter and during slaughter itself
372 (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2019). Nonetheless, for transporters, the greatest risk to animal
373 welfare is right before and during slaughter. That discrepancy may be explained by a
374 phenomenon already described for workers with strategic responsibilities, where they do not tend
375 to accept their degree of responsibility in the final quality of a product (Del Campo et al., 2014).
376 In the future, training programs could focus on this problem by raising awareness about the
377 importance of transporters throughout pre-slaughter logistics. Finally, 79% of the transporters
378 considered that stress on the farm and during transport could affect meat quality. This is a good
379 sign and it may make it easier to train them in gentle handling, although adequate handling
380 facilities are also required (Soysal et al., 2014).

381

382

383

384 *4.2. Multivariate Analysis*

385 In the generic meat logistics chain, livestock is moved to slaughterhouses via farms, feedlots and
386 logistic centres. Each slaughterhouse can also be supplied by more than one production region
387 (Soysal et al., 2014). Throughout the chain, we found a clear effect of the route (determined by
388 the points of loading/collecting animals), vehicle type, occupational risks, collecting points,
389 production systems, commercial categories of sheep, journey distance and cost, animal mortality
390 and handling of the animals at loading and unloading. Given those associations we identified
391 three main journey types; long, medium and short journeys. The long journeys begin in the north
392 where goats are traditionally produced, and sheep production is gaining momentum to feed the
393 demands of the larger cities in the centre of the country (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2018). This
394 has resulted in the creation of collecting sites (both public and private) in the north where
395 livestock is quite heterogeneous in terms of genetics, production system (grazing, stabled or
396 mixed) and commercial categories. Typically, animals at collecting sites will have undergone a
397 previous transport, which has a cumulative effect and may increase mortality during the long
398 journeys as well as loss in live weight. Long journeys are also more risky for transporters in
399 terms of traffic accidents, and are correlated with higher tobacco consumption. Typically, the
400 trade route crosses desert areas in a straight line for hundreds of kilometres, which can increase

401 the incidence of falling asleep at the wheel. Thus, many accidents involve empty, heavy vehicles
402 travelling at night (to be able to load the animals in the morning). Long journeys are also subject
403 to sanitary inspection and must go through toll stops (toll-highways).

404
405 Medium distance journeys typically involve collecting sheep at farms with more intensive
406 production. Each delivery is contracted so as to provide homogenous lambs directed to a specific
407 market (i.e. cuts). These journeys have the highest mortality and losses in live weight. A possible
408 explanation for this phenomenon could be that the cluster of medium distance journeys also
409 includes 23% long and short journeys, which could alter logistical practices and handling.
410 Accidents are not a typical problem, but transporters consume high levels of coffee and tobacco,
411 which places them as the highest risk group for the development of chronic diseases. From these
412 results and the dynamics of sheep production in Mexico (also for Latin America), we can suggest
413 that the risk of road accidents increases as the journey distance increases. Increasing journey
414 time (and distance) also tend to increase weight loss, immunosuppression and negative effects on
415 meat quality (Miranda-de la Lama et al., 2018). For this reason, there is an international tendency
416 to decrease long journeys. Nonetheless, the negative effects of journey distance can be
417 aggravated if performed under poor conditions, such as in an extreme climate, using a poorly
418 designed vehicle or by placing animals of different sizes and commercial categories in the same
419 compartment. In our study, short journeys were similar to long ones in terms of heterogeneity of
420 animal sizes since both begin at collecting centres or livestock markets. The shorter trips are
421 under less governmental control, however, and use secondary vehicles and transport fewer
422 animals than the other two typologies. Accidents are rare, and the use of tobacco and coffee is
423 lower, implying less stress for the animals and the transporters.

424

425 **5. Conclusions**

426 An integrative approach is essential to understand the relationships between transporters and
427 animals during pre-slaughter logistic chain. Our results show a sheep collection system with
428 three types of journey distances, implying a specialization of the drivers and trucks used in each
429 type of journey. The journey type influences certain risks to which transporters and animals are
430 exposed. Smoking and consuming coffee is related to journeys of more than 4 hours and should
431 be considered in future occupational health programs. Journeys greater than 8 hours imply a

432 greater probability of suffering an accident on the road. The crisis in public security in Mexico
433 are also a major stress factor in drivers that must be taken into account. In terms of sheep
434 welfare, it seems that the medium-distance journeys of lambs from stable systems concentrate a
435 greater mortality during the journey, even compared with long distance animals. Additionally,
436 night journeys, aversive and violent handling (shouting and the use of electric prod), loading
437 times greater than 2.5 hours can also increase live weight losses and mortality rates. Finally, our
438 results highlight the importance of developing new regulations and guidelines for transport in
439 Mexico and Latin America in terms of transport time and transporting conditions, with a long-
440 term view to obtain improvements in the conditions of the thousands of sheep's that travel,
441 avoiding suffering and preventing losses for the industry.

442

443 **Acknowledgements**

444 This work was supported by PROMEP grants 103.5/13/8925 UAMPTC- 417 of G.C. Miranda-de
445 la Lama. Many thanks to the CONACyT, for Scholarship PhD Program for Miguel Pulido. The
446 authors also want to acknowledge Aragonese Agency for Research and Development (ARAID)
447 and Aragon Government for funding Miranda-de la Lama's incorporation to the IA2.

448

449 **Conflict of interests**

450 The authors declared that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship and/or
451 the publication of this article.

452

453 **Ethical considerations**

454 This study was conducted in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the Declaration of
455 Helsinki and all procedures involving human subjects were approved by the Ethics Committee of
456 Veterinary Faculty (CICUAL-DISP) from the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico-
457 UAEM (Protocol ID 4117/2016E, approved in October 2016).

458

459 **References**

460 Bottoms, K., Poljak, Z., Dewey, C., Deardon, R., Holtkamp, D., Friendship, R., 2013. Evaluation
461 of external biosecurity practices on southern Ontario sow farms. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 109, 58-
462 68.

- 463 Burnard, C.L., Pitchford, W.S., Edwards, J.H., Hazel, S.J., 2015. Facilities, breed and experience
464 affect ease of sheep handling: The livestock transporter's perspective. *Animal* 9, 1379-
465 1385.
- 466 Cecchini, M., Bedini, R., Mosetti, D., Marino, S., Stasi, S., 2018. Safety knowledge and
467 changing behavior in agricultural workers: an assessment model applied in central Italy.
468 *Saf. Health Work* 9(2), 164-171.
- 469 Cernicchiaro, N., White, B.J., Renter, D.G., Babcock, A.H., Kelly, L., Slattery, R., 2012. Effects
470 of body weight loss during transit from sale barns to commercial feedlots on health and
471 performance in feeder cattle cohorts arriving to feedlots from 2000 to 2008. *J. Anim. Sci.*
472 90, 1940-1947.
- 473 Colonius, T. J., Earley, R.W., 2013. One welfare: a call to develop a broader framework of
474 thought and action. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.* 242(3), 309.
- 475 De la Torre, E., Martner, C., Moreno Quintero, E., Martínez, J. L., Olivares Benítez, E., 2015.
476 Herramienta para la evaluación del riesgo de robo en el autotransporte de carga. *Nova*
477 *Scientia*, 7, 438-469.
- 478 Del Campo, M., Brito, G., Montossi, F., de Lima, J.S., San Julián, R., 2014. Animal welfare and
479 meat quality: the perspective of Uruguay, a "small" exporter country. *Meat Sci.* 98(3), 470-
480 476.
- 481 Gallo, C., Tarumán, J., Larrondo, C., 2018. Main factors affecting animal welfare and meat
482 quality in lambs for slaughter in Chile. *Animals* 8(10), 165.
- 483 González, L.A., Schwartzkopf-Genswein, K.S., Bryan, M., Silasi, R., Brown, F., 2012.
484 Benchmarking study of industry practices during commercial long haul transport of cattle
485 in Alberta, Canada. *J. Anim. Sci.* 90, 3606-3617.
- 486 Hemsworth, P.H., Rice, M., Karlen, M.G., Calleja, L., Barnett, J.L., Nash, J., Coleman, G.J.,
487 2011. Human-animal interactions at abattoirs: Relationships between handling and animal
488 stress in sheep and cattle. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 135, 24-33.
- 489 Irwin, A., Poots, J., 2015. The human factor in agriculture: An interview study to identify
490 farmers' non-technical skills. *Saf. Sci.* 74, 114-121.
- 491 Leyton, V., Sinagawa, D.M., Oliveira, K.C.B.G., Schmitz, W., Andreuccetti, G., De Martinis,
492 B.S., Yonamine, M., Munoz, D.R., 2012. Amphetamine, cocaine and cannabinoids use

- 493 among truck drivers on the roads in the State of Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 215,
494 25-27.
- 495 Mabry, J.E., Hosig, K., Hanowski, R., Zedalis, D., Gregg, J., Herbert, W.G., 2016. Prevalence of
496 metabolic syndrome in commercial truck drivers: A review. *J. Transp. Health*, 3, 413-421.
- 497 Marahrens, M., Kleinschmidt, N., Di Nardo, A., Velarde, A., Fuentes, C., Truar, A., Dalla Villa,
498 P., 2011. Risk assessment in animal welfare: Especially referring to animal transport. *Prev.*
499 *Vet. Med.* 102, 157-163.
- 500 Miranda-de La Lama, G.C. 2018. *Transporte y Bienestar Animal: Un enfoque integrador.*
501 Editorial Servet, Grupo Asís Biomedía S.L., Zaragoza España. 160 pp.
- 502 Miranda-de La Lama, G.C., Villarroel, M., Liste, G., Escós, J., María, G.A. 2010. Critical points
503 in the pre-slaughter logistic chain of lambs in Spain that may compromise the animal's
504 welfare. *Small Rumin. Res.* 90, 174-178.
- 505 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., Sepulveda, W.S., Villarroel, M., Maria, G.A., 2011. Livestock
506 vehicle accidents in Spain: causes, consequences, and effects on animal welfare. *J. Appl.*
507 *Anim. Welf. Sci.* 14, 109–123.
- 508 Miranda-de la Lama, G. C., Villarroel, M., María, G.A., 2014. Livestock transport from the
509 perspective of the pre-slaughter logistic chain: A review. *Meat Sci.* 98, 9–20.
- 510 Miranda-de la Lama, G. C., Rodríguez-Palomares, M., Cruz-Monterrosa, R. G., Rayas-Amor, A.
511 A., Pinheiro, R. S. B., Galindo, F. M., Villarroel, M., 2018. Long-distance transport of hair
512 lambs: effect of location in pot-belly trailers on thermo-physiology, welfare and meat
513 quality. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.* 50(2), 327-336.
- 514 Miranda-de la Lama, G. C., Estévez-Moreno, L. X., Villarroel, M., Rayas-Amor, A. A., María,
515 G. A., Sepúlveda, W.S., 2019. Consumer Attitudes Toward Animal Welfare-Friendly
516 Products and Willingness to Pay: Exploration of Mexican Market Segments. *J. Appl.*
517 *Anim. Welf. Sci.* 1-13.
- 518 Mondragón-Ancelmo, J., García-Hernández, P., Rojas-Sandoval, L.A., Vara, I.A.D., Gómez-
519 Tenorio, G., Rebollar, S.R. 2018. Caracterización de consumidores agroindustriales de
520 carne de pequeños rumiantes en el Estado de México. *Invest. Cienc.* 26(74), 17-24.
- 521 Morris, W., Henley, A., Dowell, D., 2017. Farm diversification, entrepreneurship and technology
522 adoption: Analysis of upland farmers in Wales. *J. Rural Stud.* 53, 132-143.

- 523 Padalino, B., 2015. Effects of the different transport phases on equine health status, behavior,
524 and welfare: A review. *J. Vet. Behav.* 10(3), 272-282.
- 525 Pinillos, R. G., Appleby, M., Manteca, X., Scott-Park, F., Smith, C., Velarde, A., 2016. One
526 Welfare—a platform for improving human and animal welfare. *Vet. Rec.* 179 (16), 412-413.
- 527 Pointon, A., Kiermeier, A. Fegan, N., 2012. Review of the impact of pre-slaughter feed curfews
528 of cattle, sheep and goats on food safety and carcass hygiene in Australia. *Food Control*
529 26(2), 313-321.
- 530 Pulido, M. A., Mariezcurrena-Berasain, M. A., Sepúlveda, W., Rayas-Amor, A. A., Salem, A. Z.,
531 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., 2018. Hauliers' perceptions and attitudes towards farm animal
532 welfare could influence the operational and logistics practices in sheep transport. *J. Vet.*
533 *Behav.* 23, 25-32.
- 534 Schuetze, S.J., Schwandt, E.F., Maghirang, R.G., Thomson, D.U., 2017. Transportation of
535 commercial finished cattle and animal welfare considerations. *Prof. Anim. Sci.* 33(5), 509-
536 519.
- 537 Sepúlveda, W.S., Maza, M. T., Pardos, L., Fantova, E., Mantecón, Á.R., 2010. Farmers' attitudes
538 towards lamb meat production under a Protected Geographical Indication. *Small Rumin.*
539 *Res.* 94, 90-97.
- 540 Soysal, M., Bloemhof-Ruwaard, J.M., Van der Vorst, J.G.A.J., 2014. Modelling food logistics
541 networks with emission considerations: The case of an international beef supply chain.
542 *International J. Prod. Econ.* 152, 57-70.
- 543 Tarumán, J.A., Gallo, C.B., 2008. Contusiones en canales ovinas y su relación con el transporte.
544 *Arch. Med. Vet.* 40(3), 275-279.
- 545 Thomson, D.U., Loneragan, G.H., Henningson, J.N., Ensley, S., Bawa, B., 2015. Description of
546 a novel fatigue syndrome of finished feedlot cattle following transportation. *J. Am. Vet.*
547 *Med. Assoc.* 247(1), 66-72.
- 548 Valadez-Noriega, M., Estévez-Moreno, L.X., Rayas-Amor, A.A., Rubio-Lozano, M.S., Galindo,
549 F., Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., 2018. Livestock hauliers' attitudes, knowledge and current
550 practices towards animal welfare, occupational wellbeing and transport risk factors: A
551 Mexican survey. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 160, 76-84.
- 552 Vayro, C., Hamilton, K., 2016. Using three-phase theory-based formative research to explore
553 healthy eating in Australian truck drivers. *Appetite* 98, 41-48.

- 554 Woods, J., Grandin, T., 2008. Fatigue: A major cause of commercial livestock truck accidents.
555 Vet. Ital. 44, 259–262.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT