Validation of the Lifecorder Plus device for accurate recording of the grazing time of dairy goats

Marjolaine Lemoine, Marine Piriou, Alexia Charpentier, Remy Delagarde

▶ **To cite this version:**

Marjolaine Lemoine, Marine Piriou, Alexia Charpentier, Remy Delagarde. Validation of the Lifecorder Plus device for accurate recording of the grazing time of dairy goats. Small Ruminant Research, 2021, 202, pp.106469. 10.1016/j.smallrumres.2021.106469 . hal-03334434

HAL Id: hal-03334434
https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03334434

Submitted on 2 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial| 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921448821001462
Manuscript_8e5e432435e574d3023fb0c3ce50b1a4

Validation of the Lifecorder Plus device for accurate recording of the grazing time of dairy goats

Marjolaine Lemoine, Marine Piriou, Alexia Charpentier, Rémy Delagarde[a]

PEGASE, INRAE, Institut Agro, 16 Le Clos, F-35590 Saint-Gilles, France

[a]Corresponding author. E-mail address: remy.delagarde@inrae.fr

Abstract

Few portable devices that record grazing time have been tested on goats. The Lifecorder Plus is a commercial device, based on a single-axis accelerometer, that calculates and stores in memory the average activity level (range: 0-9) every 2 min. Previous studies determined that activity levels greater than or equal to 0.5 were specific to grazing, while those less than 0.5 could be considered as other activities. The aims of the present study were to determine the threshold value that minimised the prediction error and to validate the ability of the Lifecorder Plus device to record goat grazing time at vegetative temperate pasture under rotational grazing management. Twenty goats (5 in 2015 and 15 in 2017) were fitted with the Lifecorder Plus on their neck and had access to pasture for 8-12 h/d. The device was evaluated by comparing 2-min visual observations of trained observers to the activity level recorded at the same time by the device, resulting in a total of 187 h of observations. Two analysis methods were used to assess the device's accuracy: a confusion matrix and the mean squared prediction error. Lifecorder Plus recorded grazing time with 93% accuracy, 95% precision, 97% sensitivity and 73% specificity. Relative prediction errors calculated at the hour and day scales were low, averaging 0.09 and 0.05 of actual grazing time, respectively. Overall, there

© 2021 published by Elsevier. This manuscript is made available under the CC BY NC user license
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

was no confusion between grazing and other goat activities. Lifecorder Plus overestimated grazing time by 3%, probably due to other activities of goats (lack of specificity). Placing an additional Lifecorder Plus on a leg may help identify non-grazing activities (e.g. long-duration walking, running) and thus reduce this slight overestimation. No bias due to sward height was detected. In conclusion, for rotationally grazed vegetative temperate pastures, Lifecorder Plus detects grazing activities of goats with high accuracy and precision and is suitable for studying variations in grazing time, particularly at the day scale in small paddocks.

Keywords: Grazing time, Dairy goat, Accelerometer, Lifecorder Plus, Behaviour

1. Introduction

In Western Europe, increasing grazing in dairy goat production systems can improve feed self-sufficiency and reduce the influence of feed prices on profit (Ruiz et al., 2009; Brocard et al., 2016). However, grazing raises issues, in particular for grazing-management practices and animal performance, health and welfare, such as parasitic infestations in small ruminants (Hoste et al., 2002). To achieve high pasture intake, either per goat or per ha, it is important to know the ability of dairy goats to adapt to grazing and feeding conditions, such as sward height, daily pasture allowance, daily access time to pasture and supplementation level (Charpentier and Delagarde, 2018; Charpentier et al., 2019). Simultaneously recording individual pasture intake using animal-based techniques (Penning, 1991; Delagarde et al., 2018a) and grazing time using portable devices allows an average pasture intake rate to be estimated. This information improves understanding of how behavioural constraints regulate the intake of grazing dairy goats.

49 Portable electronic devices that record animal activities have become increasingly available
50 over time. Many devices based on accelerometers are used to assess animal activities at
51 pasture, either for research or for animal production, and most of them have been developed
52 for cattle and sheep (Andriamandroso et al., 2016). Few devices have been tested on grazing
53 dairy goats (Moreau et al., 2009; Sakai et al., 2019).
54 The Lifecorder Plus is a commercially available device based on a single-axis accelerometer
55 that is designed to measure human activity (LCP, Suzuken Co. Ltd., Nagoya, Japan). Ten
56 years ago, Ueda et al. (2011) and Yoshitoshi et al. (2013) suggested that the Lifecorder device
57 could be useful for recording the grazing behaviour of dairy cows at pasture. Basically, the
58 sensor samples acceleration at 32 Hz, and the acceleration signal is filtered through an
59 analogue band-pass filter and digitised (Kumahara et al., 2004). The device takes the
60 maximum pulse over 4 s as the acceleration signal and uses proprietary algorithms to process
61 the raw signal into an activity level in the range of 0.0 (no activity) to 9.0 (constant activity).
62 The algorithms and methods used to process the raw signal have not been published. Before
63 each use of the Lifecorder Plus, the user must initiate the device with the Physical Activity
64 Analysis Software Lifestyle Coach v1.2 (Kenz, Suzuken Co. Ltd., Nagoya, Japan). The user
65 must choose one of two recording options: the mode or the average activity level of each 2-
66 min period, considering the 30 values recorded every 4 s. Preliminary tests showed that only
67 the average activity level was useful for recording grazing time. Consequently, we chose this
68 option in the present study, as we had for dairy cows (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015). In
69 this previous study, the Lifecorder Plus was validated for grazing dairy cows with 250 h of
70 visual observations and showed high accuracy and a low mean prediction error (MPE) of ca.
71 0.05 at the day scale. The device was placed in a box attached to a collar around the cow's

neck, and grazing activities were detected mainly from head acceleration. Cows were considered to be grazing when the activity level was greater than or equal to 0.5 (scale: 0-9). At the beginning of the present study, several full 24-h days were recorded, including indoor housing at night and grazing during the daytime, with short (8 h/d) to long (14 h/d) daily access to pasture (Figure 1). We observed in this and previous grazing goat studies (Charpentier and Delagarde, 2018; Delagarde et al., 2018b; Charpentier et al., 2019) that the signal recorded on goats was similar to that recorded on cows (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015), with a baseline signal close to zero. Thus, we defined grazing periods of goats as periods with an activity level greater than a given threshold. In our previous studies, we used the same threshold (0.5) for goats as for cows after preliminary comparison of actual and recorded grazing time. The objectives of the present study were to determine (1) the ability of the Lifecorder Plus to detect grazing activities, in order to estimate daily grazing time of dairy goats rotationally grazing vegetative temperate grasslands, and (2) the threshold value that minimised the MPE of the grazing time estimate.

{Insert Figure 1 approximately here}

2. Materials and methods

21. Experimental site, goats and management

This validation study was performed in spring 2015 and spring 2017 at the Institut National de la Recherche pour l'Agriculture, l'Alimentation et l'Environnement (INRAE) experimental dairy farm of Méjusseaume (1.71°W, 48.11°N, Le Rheu, Brittany, France). The study used 20 focal animals, all Alpine dairy goats in mid-lactation. The focal animals were chosen at random from herds of 12-60 goats, depending on the period. The herds were rotationally

96 grazed on multispecies pastures composed of sown perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.),
97 tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea* Schreb.), lucerne (*Medigo sativa* L.), white clover (*Trifolium*
98 *repens* L.) and chicory (*Cichorium intybus* L.), as well as unsown dandelion (*Taraxacum*
99 *officinale* L.). Goats were milked twice daily, from 07:00 to 08:00 in the morning and 16:30
100 to 17:30 in the evening. They had access to pastures between morning and evening milkings,
101 and sometimes for 3-4 hours after the evening milking before nightfall. The front electric
102 fence was moved once every 1-2 days in 6000 m² paddocks to provide fresh pasture regularly
103 (Charpentier and Delagarde, 2018). The focal goats were permanently fitted with the
104 Lifecorder Plus during the study. The device was placed in a small waterproof plastic box (90
105 mm × 60 mm × 55 mm) attached to a plastic collar that was placed around the goat's neck.
106 The device was oriented in the box to lie in a standard horizontal position when the goat was
107 in a head-up position in order to record head movements better when the goats grazed in a
108 head-down position. Any head movement that creates acceleration during grazing will be
109 translated into activity, but the most frequent movements that create the most activity are
110 vertical and/or horizontal head-jerks while biting. The collar was cinched loosely to allow the
111 box to move freely and to maximise sensor recording (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015). Each
112 visual observation period, hereafter called a "sequence", entailed continuous tracking of a
113 goat by a trained observer. There were two trained observers in total, one in 2015 and one in
114 2017. Independent of these visual observations used to validate the Lifecorder Plus, in 2017,
115 six additional goats were each fitted with three Lifecorder Plus in different locations: neck,
116 fore leg and hind leg. The aim of these additional observations was to highlight differences in
117 the signals recorded at the neck and legs in order to analyse sources of bias of the Lifecorder
118 Plus that may have been related to other activities. During these additional observations, the
119 observer sometimes forced the goats into active movement (e.g. walking, running) for a few

minutes. The observer recorded all active movements in addition to grazing and rumination. These additional observations were not included in the dataset used to validate the device because the observer had disturbed the goats.

22. Measurements

The focal goats' activities were recorded manually and divided into three categories: "Grazing", "Rumination" and "Other activities". Goats were considered to be grazing when they were biting head down, walking slowly in a head-down position (searching) with or without chewing, or chewing head up after a biting period. Rumination, defined as a period of mastication of boluses, was identified by chewing without grazing and regular regurgitation of boluses. "Other activities" corresponded to all other goat activities (i.e. drinking, walking without grazing, running, resting and social interactions). The dominant activity of each minute of observation was manually recorded at the end of the minute. For example, if a goat walked, ran or drank for 20 sec during a minute of grazing, these activities were included in the "Grazing" activity. In 2017 only, the compressed sward height was measured using a rising plate meter (30 × 30 cm, 4.5 kg/m², Aurea Agrosciences, Blanquefort, France), with 30 measurements made at the start of each observation sequence. The observer always remained quiet and sufficiently close (i.e. within a few meters) to the observed goat to record its activities accurately, and never disturbed natural animal behaviour. For a given observation day (n = 24, Table 1), observations were performed in the morning, in the afternoon or both. The validation dataset comprised 187 h of visual observations, which were divided among 69 sequences, 20 goats, 24 observation days (dates) and 12 Lifecorder Plus devices (Table 1).

{Insert Table 1 approximately here}

144

145 Once the recordings were made, the device was removed from the box and connected to a
146 computer to transfer data via a USB cable. The data were downloaded using the Physical
147 Activity Analysis Software Lifestyle Coach v1.2. The mean activity level for each 2-min
148 period was stored in a CSV file.

149

150 ***23. Calculations***

151 To compare Lifecorder Plus data (2-min frequency) to visual observation data (1-min
152 frequency) at the same temporal scale, all 2-min observation periods with at least 1 min of
153 "grazing" activity were considered to be "grazing" activity (i.e. grazing was the dominant
154 activity). Observations were performed only at pasture, as no activity could be detected
155 indoors due to a lack of clear and regular head movements, which indicated that the device
156 cannot determine eating time indoors. Analyses of the recorded data clearly showed that the
157 activity level was close to zero when goats were ruminating or engaged in other activities.
158 Grazing activities were thus characterised and defined by an activity level greater than or
159 equal to a given threshold, as defined for dairy cows (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015) and in
160 the preliminary study of dairy goats (Charpentier and Delagarde, 2018). To choose the
161 threshold value that minimised prediction error, two statistical methods were applied for
162 threshold values ranging from 0.0-1.2.

163

164 ***24. Statistical analyses***

165 The two statistical methods used to assess the accuracy of the Lifecorder Plus were a
166 confusion matrix (Mansbridge et al., 2018; Alvarenga et al., 2020) and the mean squared
167 prediction error (MSPE) (Bibby and Toutenburg, 1977).

168

169 ***- Confusion matrix (method 1)***

170 The confusion matrix was generated from predicted (Lifecorder Plus) and actual
171 (observations) values (grazing or non-grazing). The four classification options for each 2-min
172 validation period were True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Positive (FP) and False
173 Negative (FN). The TP and FN are the number of instances in which the actual periods of
174 grazing activities are classified correctly (e.g. as grazing) or incorrectly (e.g. as non-grazing),
175 respectively. In contrast, TN and FP are the number of instances in which the actual periods
176 of non-grazing activities are classified correctly (e.g. as non-grazing) or incorrectly (e.g. as
177 grazing), respectively (Mansbridge et al., 2018; Alvarenga et al., 2020). From this
178 classification, sensitivity, specificity, precision, accuracy and the F1 score were calculated
179 using the following equations:

180 $$\text{Sensitivity (\%)} = (TP/(TP+FN)) \times 100$$

181 $$\text{Specificity (\%)} = (TN/(TN+FP)) \times 100$$

182 $$\text{Precision (\%)} = (TP/(TP+FP)) \times 100$$

183 $$\text{Accuracy (\%)} = ((TN + TP)/(TN+TP+FN+FP)) \times 100$$

184 $$\text{F1 score} = 2 \times ((\text{Precision} \times \text{Sensitivity})/(\text{Precision} + \text{Sensitivity}))$$

185

186 Sensitivity describes the percentage of actual grazing periods that the device correctly
187 identified. Specificity describes the percentage of actual non-grazing periods that the device
188 correctly identified. Precision describes the percentage of total predicted grazing time that is
189 actual grazing time (Nielsen, 2013). Accuracy describes the percentage of correct
190 classification across both activities (Mansbridge et al., 2018). The F1 score indicates

191 performance of the device as a harmonic mean of the sensitivity and precision (Sakai et al.,
192 2019; Saranya et al., 2020).
193
194 ***- Mean squared prediction error (method 2)***
195 The MSPE and relative contributions of mean bias, line bias and random variation to it were
196 calculated for predicted (Lifecorder Plus) and actual (observations) values according to Bibby
197 and Toutenburg (1977). Mean bias is the mean difference between predicted and actual
198 values. A positive (or negative) mean bias indicates that the device overestimates (or
199 underestimates) the actual values. The line bias is the deviation of the slope of the regression
200 line between actual vs. predicted values from that of the 1:1 line. A large line bias indicates
201 mainly an inadequate model structure, with MSPE changing as a function of the actual value.
202 The random variation is the percentage of the MSPE not related to the mean or line biases.
203 The MPE is the square root of the MSPE, while relative prediction error (RPE) is the MPE
204 divided by the mean actual grazing time. A low RPE and low contributions of both mean bias
205 and line bias to the MSPE indicate high accuracy (Rook et al., 1990). The RPE may depend
206 on the temporal scale of validation. At the day scale, the device could be considered
207 moderately accurate, accurate or very accurate when RPE was 0.10-0.15, 0.05-0.10 or less
208 than 0.05, respectively (Rook et al., 1990). Accuracy was analysed at five time scales by
209 summing (before the analyses) the actual and predicted values of grazing time per hour
210 (n=187), per sequence (n=69), per date (n=24), per standardised day of 8 h (n=24), per goat
211 (n=20) and per Lifecorder Plus device (n=12). As the duration of the sequences differed
212 depending on the day of observation, and because an average “grazing day” is 8 h/d in most
213 goat grazing systems (i.e. indoors at night), observations from every 8 h period were summed
214 to create standardised days.

215

216 ***3. Results***

217 The duration of validation sequences averaged 162 min (range: 62-242 min) for a total of 69
218 observation sequences (total of 11,186 min or 5593 2-min periods). Recording time in the
219 morning equalled that in the afternoon. On average, per hour of observation, the goats spent
220 49 min grazing, 2 min ruminating and 9 min in other activities, which represents 82%, 3%
221 and 15% of their time spent grazing, ruminating and in other activities, respectively (Table 2).
222 For the entire dataset, the frequency distribution of activity level recorded by the Lifecorder
223 Plus during actual grazing periods differed completely from that observed during actual non-
224 grazing periods (Figure 2). For example, the percentage of activity levels greater than 0.9, 0.7,
225 0.5, 0.3 and 0.1 were 91%, 95%, 97%, 98% and 100%, respectively, during actual grazing
226 periods, but only 13%, 18%, 23%, 32% and 47%, respectively, during actual non-grazing
227 periods. These frequency distributions suggested that a threshold in the range of 0.3-0.7 could
228 distinguish grazing and non-grazing periods (Figure 2).

229

230 *{Insert Figure 2 approximately here}*

231

232 Sensitivity, specificity, precision, accuracy and MPE at the hour and sequence scales varied
233 for threshold values ranging from 0.0-1.2 (Figure 3). By definition, for a threshold value of
234 0.0 (all activities considered to be grazing), sensitivity and specificity were 100% and 0%,
235 respectively. Precision, the percentage of time the goats spent grazing during the observation
236 periods, was 82% (Table 2). When the threshold increased from 0.0 to 1.2, sensitivity
237 decreased from 100% to 85%, specificity increased from 0% to 90%, and precision increased
238 from 82% to 98%. Accuracy was lowest at the extremes and peaked at 93% for the thresholds

239 of 0.4 and 0.5. The RPE were largest at the extremes (> 0.20) and smallest at the threshold of
240 0.5 (0.091 and 0.074 at the hour and sequence scales, respectively). Consequently, the
241 threshold was set at 0.5 for the rest of the present study.
242
243 *{Insert Figure 3 approximately here}*
244 *{Insert Table 2 approximately here}*
245
246 ***- Confusion matrix (method 1)***
247 The Lifecorder Plus had a mean accuracy of 93% (Table 3). It correctly recognised 97% of
248 the actual grazing 2-min periods (sensitivity), but only 73% of the non-grazing (rumination
249 and other activities) periods (specificity). It correctly identified 95% of grazing time as
250 grazing time (precision). The F1 score was nearly 96%.
251
252 *{Insert Table 3 approximately here}*
253
254 ***- Mean squared prediction error (method 2)***
255 At each scale of validation, the total grazing time observed was similar to that recorded by the
256 Lifecorder Plus (Figure 4, Table 4). Slopes of the relationship between predicted and actual
257 grazing time ranged from 0.94-0.98, with coefficients of determination of the regressions
258 ranging from 0.89-0.99, depending on the scale. The RPE ranged from 0.04-0.09, depending
259 on the scale (Table 4). At the hour scale, the RPE was 0.09, indicating an error of 4.5 min,
260 with 92% of MSPE due to random variation. At the day scale, the RPE was only 0.05 (19 min
261 of error per standardised day), with 72% and 23% of MSPE due to random variation and

262 mean bias, respectively. The actual grazing time was overestimated by 2.6% (i.e. 10 min) per
263 standardised day (Table 4).
264
265 *{Insert Figure 4 approximately here}*
266 *{Insert Table 4 approximately here}*
267
268 An hour seems an appropriate scale for detecting problems in recorded grazing activities and
269 for visualising the results. It represents the sum of thirty 2-min periods, thus decreasing the
270 influence of any short-term random errors. Moreover, in a given hour, goats may engage
271 exclusively in grazing activities or non-grazing activities, which enables sources of bias to be
272 detected easily. At this finest scale of validation, no source of variation in the mean bias
273 between Lifecorder Plus times and actual grazing times was identified. This bias was not
274 strongly correlated with the time of actual grazing, ruminating or other activities, or with
275 sward height (Figure 5). The contribution of line bias to the MSPE was extremely low (1%) at
276 the hour and sequence scales. Actual grazing periods generally coincided well with the
277 periods of high activity that the Lifecorder Plus recorded at the neck. In contrast, activity
278 levels recorded at the legs were often low during most grazing periods (Figure 6). As the
279 activity levels recorded at the fore and hind legs were similar and followed the same pattern,
280 the two signals were averaged to compare them to the signal recorded at the neck (Figure 6).
281 Other active behaviours (e.g. running, long walking times) generated high activity levels for
282 all three locations of the Lifecorder Plus (neck, fore leg, hind leg).
283
284 *{Insert Figure 5 approximately here}*
285 *{Insert Figure 6 approximately here}*

286

287 ***4. Discussion***

288 The accelerometer values stored by the Lifecorder Plus device make it possible to distinguish
289 grazing activities from non-grazing activities at a 2-min resolution with 93% accuracy. It
290 accurately recorded the time that goats spent grazing, regardless of the scale of validation. As
291 the percentage of MSPE due to line bias was low, the MSPE does not depend on the actual
292 grazing time recorded, which indicates that the device detects grazing activities well. The
293 longer the validation time, the greater the accuracy of the Lifecorder Plus, because the MSPE
294 is due mainly to random error. The longer the period, the more random errors cancel each
295 other out. Consistent with our observations, the random error may have been due mainly to
296 differences in the position of the box, which sometimes moved to the side of the neck for a
297 few minutes. This probably decreased the acceleration and amplitude of the activity level, as
298 the collar was cinched loosely to maximise box movement. The RPEs of 0.09 and 0.05 at the
299 hour and day scales, respectively, are low and similar to those reported for dairy cows
300 (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015). This RPE was not highly sensitive to the threshold value
301 of 0.5, as thresholds of 0.4 and 0.6 also had low RPE, and thresholds of 0.3 and 0.7 had RPE
302 only slightly higher. This shows the robustness of the simple definition of grazing chosen in
303 this study and the clear distinction of grazing vs. non-grazing activities based on the activity
304 level recorded by the Lifecorder.

305 Comparing the accuracy of several devices is difficult due to large differences in validation
306 methods, including the statistical approach and scale(s) of validation (as in our study), the
307 frequency of recording actual behaviour and of comparing actual and predicted behaviour
308 (from 5 sec to 15 min: Nielsen, 2013; González et al., 2015; Werner et al., 2019) and the
309 number of behaviours studied (from 1-5: Nielsen, 2013; Gonzalez et al., 2015; Delagarde and

310 Lamberton, 2015). For example, when the recording frequency used to evaluate a 3D activity
311 sensor was changed from 5 s to 10 min, Nielsen (2013) observed that precision increased
312 from 75% to 84%, specificity increased from 80% to 92%, but sensitivity decreased from
313 84% to 59%.
314 When used under the conditions of this study, the Lifecorder Plus can be clearly considered as
315 precise (95%) and sensitive (97%) for recording grazing time. In comparison, a 3-axis
316 accelerometer previously tested on goats correctly classified grazing with 85% precision
317 (Moreau et al., 2009). For dairy cows, the precision was nearly 98% for the CSIRO collar
318 (González et al., 2015), 91% for an ear tag (Pereira et al., 2020) and 86% for the 3D activity
319 sensor (Nielsen, 2013). The accuracy of the Lifecorder Plus (93%) can also be considered as
320 high compared to the 90% accuracy of the RumiWatch device tested on cows (Steinmetz et
321 al., 2020). The F1 score of the Lifecorder Plus (96%) indicates high performance when
322 compared to a 9-axis multi-sensor accelerometer tested on goats (Sakai et al., 2019). The
323 Lifecorder Plus showed lack of specificity (73%), however, like other devices, such as the 3-
324 axis activity sensor tested on dairy cows (80%, Nielsen, 2013). To our knowledge, the
325 specificity of devices used to record the grazing time of dairy goats has not been reported
326 previously.
327 This lack of specificity means that the device detects some non-grazing activities as grazing
328 activities. To study this confusion, several Lifecorder Plus devices were placed
329 simultaneously in different locations on goats, and the signals from the neck and the legs (fore
330 and hind) differed. Combining three Lifecorder Plus signals from the neck and the fore and
331 hind legs would identify grazing periods better, because grazing seems to be defined mainly
332 by head acceleration with little or no leg acceleration. One can assume that when Lifecorders
333 on the neck and the legs have almost the same activity level, the goat is not grazing but

334 probably walking or running. Placing even one additional Lifecorder Plus on one leg would
335 thus increase the specificity by avoiding the confusion that occurs when the goat is walking or
336 running for a long time outside of meals, which the Lifecorder Plus on the neck often
337 identified as grazing (Figure 3). Goats can be active even when they are not grazing, unlike
338 cows, which have clearly identifiable resting times (Delagarde and Lamberton, 2015). Goats
339 are known for their dynamic behaviour, which differs from that of sheep (Miranda-de la Lama
340 and Mattiello, 2010) or cows. Overall, goats are more reactive because they have more
341 exploratory behaviours (Miranda-de la Lama and Mattiello, 2010). The Lifecorder Plus had
342 high accuracy in this study probably because goats had access to small paddocks under
343 rotational grazing management, and only during the daytime, which limited their walking
344 time and other activities while at pasture. One can assume that a Lifecorder Plus on the neck
345 would be less accurate when goats graze both day and night on large areas such as rangeland,
346 desert or silvopastoral systems, particularly due to the long distances travelled each day
347 (Vieira Costa et al., 2015; Paez Lama et al., 2021).
348 Under the conditions of this study, the Lifecorder Plus recorded the grazing time of goats
349 correctly regardless of the individual goat, Lifecorder Plus device or sward height (in the
350 typical range for vegetative pastures on farms), as no bias due to these parameters was
351 identified. This result indicates a true utility for grazing research because it can measure
352 grazing time accurately under a wide range of conditions. The goats must accelerate their
353 head for the device to record grazing activities optimally, as indicated by differences in
354 signals from the neck and the leg. Several observation periods during which goats grazed tall
355 pasture at earing stage in a head-up position without accelerating their head clearly showed
356 that the Lifecorder Plus did not detect grazing periods well in this situation. Similarly, the

Lifecorder Plus is probably not recommended in rangeland or agroforestry systems, where woody species prompt goats to browse in a head-up position.

5. Conclusion

The Lifecorder Plus can record the grazing time of dairy goats with high sensitivity, accuracy and precision in rotationally grazed vegetative temperate grasslands, with a low RPE of only 0.05. It overestimates actual grazing time slightly (< 3%), perhaps due to other active activities (e.g. running, walking, social activities) that it partly identifies as grazing. This small overestimate explains the device's lack of specificity. Nevertheless, it is sufficiently accurate to use in research on rotational grazing of goats under vegetative pasture conditions.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This study was partly funded by the French CASDAR project CAPHERB (no. 5546, Ministry of Agriculture and Food). The authors thank all staff of the Méjusseaume farm (PEGASE, INRAE, Institut Agro, 35750 Le Rheu, France) for milking, feeding and caring for the goats.

*Reference*s

Alvarenga, F.A.P., Borges, I., Oddy, V.H., Dobos, R.C., 2020. Discrimination of biting and chewing behaviour in sheep using a tri-axial accelerometer. Comput. Electron. Agric. 168, 105051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2019.105051.

380 Andriamandroso, A., Bindelle, J., Mercatoris, B., Lebeau, F., 2016. A review on the use of
381 sensors to monitor cattle jaw movements and behavior when grazing. Biotechnol. Agron.
382 Soc. Environ. 20(S1), 273-286. https://doi.org/10.25518/1780-4507.13058.
383 Bibby, J. Toutenburg, H., 1977. Prediction and Improved Estimation in Linear Models, J.
384 Wiley & Sons, London.
385 Brocard, V., Jost, J., Rouillé, B., Caillaud, D., Caillat, H., Bossis, N., others, 2016. Feeding
386 self-sufficiency levels in dairy cow and goat farms in Western France: current situation and
387 ways of improvement. In: Trondheim, Norway. Grassland Science in Europe. The Multiple
388 Roles of Grassland in the European Bioeconomy. Proceedings of the 26th General Meeting
389 of the European Grassland Federation, vol. 21. pp 53–55.
390 Charpentier, A., Delagarde, R., 2018. Milk production and grazing behaviour responses of
391 Alpine dairy goats to daily access time to pasture or to daily pasture allowance on
392 temperate pastures in spring. Small Rumin. Res. 162, 48-56.
393 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2018.03.004.
394 Charpentier, A., Caillat, H., Gastal, F., Delagarde, R., 2019. Intake, milk production and
395 grazing behaviour responses of strip-grazing dairy goats to daily access time to pasture and
396 to dehydrated lucerne supplementation. Livest. Sci. 229, 90-97.
397 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2019.09.019.
398 Delagarde, R., Lamberton, P., 2015. Daily grazing time of dairy cows is recorded accurately
399 using the Lifecorder Plus device. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 165, 25–32.
400 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.01.014.
401 Delagarde, R., Belarbre, N., Charpentier, A., 2018a. Accuracy of the ytterbium-faecal index
402 method for estimating intake of pasture-fed dairy goats. In: Cork, Ireland. Grassland

403 Science in Europe. Sustainable meat and milk production from grasslands, vol. 23, pp 419-
404 421.
405 Delagarde, R., Piriou, M., Charpentier, A., 2018b. The recording of grazing time of dairy
406 goats is accurate by using the Lifecorder Plus device, in: Baumont, R., Silberberg, M.,
407 Cassar-Malek, I. (Eds.), Herbivore Nutrition Supporting Sustainable Intensification and
408 Agro-Ecological Approaches, Advances in Animal Biosciences 9, 417. Proceedings of the
409 10th International Symposium on the Nutrition of Herbivores, Clermont-Ferrand, France.
410 González, L.A., Bishop-Hurley, G.J., Handcock, R.N., Crossman, C. 2015. Behavioral
411 classification of data from collars containing motion sensors in grazing cattle. Comp.
412 Electron. Agric. 110, 91-102. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2014.10.018.
413 Hoste, H., Chartier, C., Le Frileux, Y. 2002. Control of gastrointestinal parasitism with
414 nematodes in dairy goats by treating the host category at risk. Vet. Res. 33, 531-545.
415 Kumahara, H., Schutz, Y., Ayabe, M., Yoshioka, M., Yoshitake, Y., Shindo, M., Ishii, K.,
416 Tanaka, H. 2004. The use of uniaxial accelerometry for the assessment of physical-
417 activity-related energy expenditure: a validation study against whole-body indirect
418 calorimetry. Br. J. Nutr. 91, 235-243. https://doi.org/10.1079/BJN20031033.
419 Mansbridge, N., Mitsh, J., Bollard, N., Ellis, K., Miguel-Pacheco, G., Dottorini, T., Kaler, J.
420 2018. Feature selection and comparison of machine learning algorithms in classification of
421 grazing and rumination behaviour in sheep. Sensors 18, 3532.
422 https://doi.org/10.3390/s18103532.
423 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., Mattiello, S., 2010. The importance of social behaviour for goat
424 welfare in livestock farming. Small Rumin. Res. 90, 1-10.
425 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2010.01.006.

426 Moreau, M., Siebert, S., Buerkert, A., Schlecht, E., 2009. Use of a tri-axial accelerometer for
427 automated recording and classification of goats' grazing behaviour. Appl. Anim. Behav.
428 Sci. 119, 158-170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2009.04.008.
429 Nielsen, P.P., 2013. Automatic registration of grazing behaviour in dairy cows using 3D
430 activity loggers. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 148, 179-184.
431 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2013.09.001.
432 Paez Lama, S., Gonzalez, R., Catania, C., Sbriglio, L., Allegretti, L., 2021. Monitoring
433 behavior and its related energy expenditure of a desert goat through inertial and herat rate
434 sensors. Anim. Sci. Papers Reports 39, 61-74.
435 Penning, P.D., 2004. Animal-based techniques for estimating herbage intake. In: P.D.
436 Penning (Ed.) Herbage Intake Handbook, pp. 53-93. British Grassland Society, Reading,
437 UK.
438 Pereira, G.M., Heins, B.J., O'Brien, B., McDonagh, A., Lidauer, L., Kickinger, F., 2020.
439 Validation of an ear tag-based accelerometer system for detecting grazing behavior of
440 dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 103, 3529-3544. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17269.
441 Rook, A.J., Dhanoa, M.S., Gill, M., 1990. Prediction of the voluntary intake of grass silages
442 by beef cattle. Anim. Prod. 50, 455-466. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003356100004931.
443 Ruiz, F.A., Mena, Y., Castel, J.M., Guinamard, C., Bossis, N., Caramelle-Holtz, E., Contu,
444 M., Sitzia, M., Fois, N., 2009. Dairy goat grazing systems in Mediterranean regions: A
445 comparative analysis in Spain, France and Italy. Small Rumin. Res. 85, 42-49.
446 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2009.07.003.
447 Sakai, K., Oishi, K., Miwa, M., Kumagai, H., Hirooka, H., 2019. Behavior classification of
448 goats using 9-axis multi sensor: The effect imbalanced datasets on classification

449 performance. Comput. Electron. Agric. 166, 105027.
450 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2019.105027.
451 Saranya, T., Sridevi, S., Deisy, C., Tran Duc Chung, Ahamed Khan, M.K.A., 2020.
452 Performance Analysis of Machine Learning Algorithms in Intrusion Detection System: a
453 review. Procedia Comput. Sci. 171, 1251-1260.
454 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.04.133.
455 Steinmetz, M., von Soosten, D., Hummel, J., Meyer, U., Dänicke, S., 2020. Validation of the
456 RumiWatch Converter V0.7.4.5 classification accuracy for the automatic monitoring of
457 behavioural characteristics in dairy cows, Archives Anim. Nutr. 74, 164-172.
458 https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2020.1721260.
459 Vieira Costa, J., Oliveira, M.E., de Andrade da Silva Moura, R.M., da Costa Junior, M.J.N.,
460 Rodrigues, M.M., 2015. Grazing behavior and ingestive goats in silvopastoral system
461 (Abstract in English). Revista Ciência Agronômica 46, 865-872.
462 https://doi.org/10.5935/1806-6690.20150075.
463 Werner, J., Umstatter, C., Leso, L., Kennedy, E., Geoghegan, A., Shalloo, L., Schick, M.,
464 O'Brien, B. 2019. Evaluation and application potential of an accelerometer-based collar
465 device for measuring grazing behavior of dairy cows. Animal 13, 2070-2079.
466 doi:10.1017/S1751731118003658.
467 Ueda, Y., Akiyama, F., Asakuma, S., Watanabe, N., 2011. The use of a physical activity
468 monitor to estimate the eating time of cows in pasture. J. Dairy Sci. 94, 3498-3503.
469 https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2010-4033.
470 Yoshitoshi, R., Watanabe, N., Kawamura, K., Sakanoue, S., Mizoguchi, R., Lee, H.J.,
471 Kurokawa, Y., 2013. Distinguishing cattle foraging activities using an accelerometry-based

activity monitor. Rangeland Ecol. Manag. 66, 382-386. https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-11-00027.1.

475 ## Figure captions

476

477 **Fig. 1**. Examples of activity level recorded by the Lifecorder Plus device placed on the neck of goats
478 at pasture (black horizontal lines) for 24-h periods. The goats were housed when not at pasture. The
479 access time to pasture was 14, 11 and 8 h/d for a), b) and c), respectively.

480

481 **Fig. 2**. Frequency of activity level recorded during actual 2-min periods of grazing (●, n = 4629) or
482 non-grazing (○, n = 964).

483

484 **Fig. 3**. Influence of the threshold value used to distinguish grazing activities (values greater than or
485 equal to the threshold) and non-grazing activities (values lower than the threshold) on sensitivity (●),
486 specificity (■), precision (□), accuracy (○) and relative prediction error (RPE) calculated at the scale of
487 the hour (▲) or of the sequence (▼).

488

489 **Fig. 4**. Relationship between actual grazing time recorded visually by trained observers and grazing
490 time recorded by the Lifecorder Plus device at each validation scale. The solid black line represents
491 the 1:1 line (x = y).

492

493 **Fig. 5**. Relationship between the hourly bias in grazing time and the times of actual grazing,
494 rumination, and other activities of dairy goats at pasture (187 h), and sward height (171 h).

495

496 **Fig. 6**. Activity level recorded by the Lifecorder Plus placed on the neck and the fore and hind legs for
497 two additional recording sequences of two goats at pasture (two days independent of the validation
498 dataset). The legs curve is the average between fore and hind legs curves because the signals were
499 similar. For actual activities, only active behaviours (grazing, rumination, and other activities such as

500 walking, running or social interactions) are reported. The “blank” periods are resting time (no activity,
501 no movement).
502

503 **Table 1.**

504 Distribution of experimental data used to validate the Lifecorder Plus device for grazing dairy goats.

Year	2015	2017	Total
Hour	16	171	187
Sequence	8	61	69
Date[a]	3	21	24
Day[b]	2	22	24
Goat	5	15	20
Lifecorder	4	9	12[c]

505 [a] Date: Number of calendar dates on which the observations were made
506 [b] Day: Standardised day of 8 h of recording
507 [c] One of the 12 Lifecorders was used in both 2015 and 2017
508
509
510 **Table 2.**

511 Mean and standard deviation of the duration of actual goat activities at each validation scale during the

512 study (n = 11,186 min).

Validation scale	n	Average duration (min)	Grazing (min)	Rumination (min)	Other activities (min)
Hour	187	60	49 ± 13	2 ± 4	9 ± 12
Sequence	69	162	134 ± 58	5 ± 8	23 ± 25
Date	24	466	386 ± 172	14 ± 18	66 ± 54
Day	24	466	386 ± 81	14 ± 16	66 ± 52
Goat	20	559	463 ± 397	16 ± 18	80 ± 77
Lifecorder	12	932	772 ± 504	27 ± 19	133 ± 93

513
514

515 **Table 3.** Confusion matrix for the actual class (Observations) and predicted class (Lifecorder Plus),

516 based on the number of 2-min periods (method 1).

	Observations		Total
Lifecorder Plus	Grazing	No grazing[1]	Lifecorder Plus
Grazing	4481 (True Positives)	260 (False Positives)	4741
Non-grazing[1]	149 (False Negatives)	704 (True Negatives)	852
Total Observations	4629	964	5593

517 [1] Non-grazing: Rumination + Other activities

518

519

520 **Table 4.** Accuracy of the Lifecorder Plus device for recording the grazing time of dairy goats at

521 pasture at different scales of validation (method 2).

Validation scale	A[1]	P[2]	Regression of A on P				Bias[3]	MSPE[4]	Percentage of MSPE			MPE[5]	RPE[6]
			Origin	Slope	SD	R^2			Bias	Line	Random		
Hour	49.5	50.7	0.27	0.97	4.34	0.89	1.2	20.1	7	1	92	4.5	0.09
Sequence	134	137	-0.5	0.98	9.4	0.97	3.2	97.7	11	1	88	9.9	0.07
Date	385	395	6.1	0.96	18.8	0.99	9.3	458	19	10	71	21.4	0.06
Day	385	395	12.7	0.94	17.3	0.96	9.3	382	23	5	72	19.5	0.05
Goat	462	474	10	0.95	21.3	0.99	11.2	874	14	39	47	29.6	0.06
Lifecorder	771	790	3	0.97	25.3	0.99	18.7	1080	32	19	49	32.9	0.04

522 [1] A: Actual grazing time (min, observations)
523 [2] P: Predicted grazing time (min, Lifecorder Plus)
524 [3] Bias: (P-A)
525 [4] MSPE: Mean squared prediction error
526 [5] MPE: Mean prediction error (min)
527 [6] RPE: Relative prediction error
528

Validation of the Lifecorder Plus device for accurate recording of the grazing time of dairy goats

Marjolaine Lemoine, Marine Piriou, Alexia Charpentier, Rémy Delagarde



Fig. 1.


○ : Non grazing periods
● : Grazing periods
Frequency (%)
Activity level
42
41
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.5
6.0

Fig. 2.


Sensitivity, Specificity,
Precision, Accuracy (%)
RPE (%)
Threshold value
100
80
60
40
20
0
50
40
30
20
10
0
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0 1.1 1.2

Fig. 3.


n = 187 hours
n = 69 sequences
n = 24 days
n = 24 dates
n = 20 goats
n = 12 Lifecorders
Actual grazing time (min)
Lifecorder grazing time (min)

Fig. 4.


Lifecorder minus actual grazing time (min)
Actual grazing time (min)
Actual rumination time (min)
Actual other activities time (min)
Sward height (cm, plate meter)

Fig. 5.


Activity level
Neck
Legs
Activity level
13:40
13:56
14:12
14:28
14:44
15:00
15:16
15:32
15:48
16:04
16:20
16:36
Time (h)
Actual grazing time
Actual rumination time
Actual active other activities

Fig. 6.