



HAL
open science

Automatic brushes induce positive emotions and foster positive social interactions in group-housed horses

Léa Lansade, Julie Lemarchand, Fabrice Reigner, Cécile Arnould, Aline Bertin

► To cite this version:

Léa Lansade, Julie Lemarchand, Fabrice Reigner, Cécile Arnould, Aline Bertin. Automatic brushes induce positive emotions and foster positive social interactions in group-housed horses. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 2022, 246, pp.1-6. 10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105538 . hal-03744235

HAL Id: hal-03744235

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03744235>

Submitted on 8 Jan 2024

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

1 **Automatic brushes induce positive emotions and foster positive social interactions in**
2 **group-housed horses**

3

4 Léa Lansade^{1*}, Julie Lemarchand¹, Fabrice Reigner², Cécile Arnould¹, Aline Bertin¹

5 ¹ CNRS, IFCE, INRAE, Université de Tours, PRC, F-37380, Nouzilly, France

6 ² UEPAO, INRAE F-37380, Nouzilly, France

7 *Corresponding author

8

9 mail: lea.lansade@inrae.fr

10 phone number: 0033 247 427 279

11 **Abstract**

12 In mammals, positive tactile contact is recognized as an effective tool for triggering positive
13 affective states. In this study, we investigated the benefits of providing automatic rotative
14 brushes for group-housed horses. Our three aims were: i. to determine whether horses used
15 automatic brushes and if so how they used them; ii. to investigate whether the presence of these
16 brushes induced positive social behaviours (allogrooming), or aggressiveness, as can be
17 observed when there is competition for a desired resource; iii to provide a preliminary
18 explanation of the role of the positive facial expression displayed by some horses while being
19 groomed.

20 Two brushes were installed in a large stable with free access to a paddock in which 40 horses
21 were housed 7h30/day. For four days, video-cameras placed above the brushes continuously
22 filmed the horses. First, analysis of the video footage demonstrated that brushes were used by
23 almost 90% of the horses, mainly on areas that are not easily accessible to another horse during
24 allogrooming, such as the head. Secondly, it revealed that among the horses that used the brush,
25 25.7% expressed positive social behaviour (allogrooming) at the same time, while none
26 expressed aggressive behaviours. The brush thus seems to act as a catalyst for affiliative
27 behaviours rather than competition for a desired resource. Thirdly, we observed their facial
28 expression, especially a positive one, described when the horse are groomed (neck moderately
29 raised, eyes open or half-closed, upper lip extended, ears turned backwards almost in line with
30 the nose). More than half of the horses displayed this while using the brushes. Interestingly,
31 when a horse expressed this face, it had a six times greater chance to subsequently start
32 allogrooming with a conspecific. Several possible explanations are discussed, including a social
33 function. Further research is needed to validate other criteria to help qualify whether or not this
34 positive facial expression is a signal of intentional communication. From a practical point of
35 view, the results show that the brushes provide both a direct benefit to the horses enabling them

36 to conduct self-grooming, and also in all likelihood, an indirect benefit by facilitating positive
37 social interactions. This study encourages the installation of automatic brushes in places where
38 horses are kept to improve their welfare and provide comfort.

39 **Key Words:** Equus caballus, positive affect, facial expression, emotional indicators, welfare,
40 environmental enrichment

41 **Highlights**

- 42 - Automatic rotative brushes are used by almost 90% of horses observed
- 43 - They trigger positive behaviour (allogrooming) and no aggressiveness
- 44 - Allogrooming is more frequent if the horse previously displayed a positive facial expression
- 45 - This suggests a social function of this facial expression
- 46 - This study encourages the installation of automatic brushes to improve horse welfare

1. Introduction

In mammals, positive tactile contact is recognized as an effective tool for triggering positive affective states (Burgdorf and Panksepp, 2006). These positive effects of tactile contacts can be evaluated through changes in behaviour such as the expression of specific vocalizations, specific facial expressions, contact seeking, allogrooming (grooming between conspecifics) or a relaxed state in various species such as rodents (Burgdorf and Panksepp, 2006; Finlayson et al., 2016), sheep (Reefmann et al., 2009; Westerath et al., 2014; Tamioso et al., 2017), cattle (Schmied et al., 2008; Westerath et al., 2014), heifers (Bertenshaw and Rowlinson, 2008), dogs (Rehn et al., 2014) or horses (Feh and De Mazières, 1993; McBride et al., 2004; Mullard et al., 2017). Positive tactile contact also has physiological correlates in horses. It induces changes in parameters such as heart rate (Feh and De Mazières, 1993) or hormone levels, such as the basal oxytocin level (Lansade et al., 2018), for a review (VanDierendonck and Spruijt, 2012).

With the aim of improving welfare by promoting positive affective states, different ways of providing tactile contact have been studied in horses: allowing allogrooming with partners (Snorrason et al., 2003), a handler scratching them with their hands (Feh and De Mazières, 1993; Lansade et al., 2018), or by making different devices available, such as fixed brushes (Lansade et al., 2014). On cattle farms, automatically rotating brushes are also often provided and animals use them extensively (DeVries et al., 2007; Moncada et al., 2020) with positive results reported, such as a reduction in time spent inactive (Velasquez-Munoz et al., 2019) or an increase in self-grooming (Horvath and Miller-Cushon, 2019). To date, the influence of an automatic brush on the behaviour of group-housed horses has not been studied. Thus, the present study on horses aimed to investigate this.

Moreover, we recently showed in horses that positive tactile contacts trigger a positive affective state associated with a specific facial expression (called “positive facial expression” hereafter).

72 Indeed, when scratched by humans, horses express a facial expressions with the following
73 characteristics: neck moderately raised, eyes opened or half closed, upper lip extended and
74 either immobile or twitching and ears turned backwards almost in line with the nose (Lansade
75 et al., 2018; Trösch et al., 2020). Facial expressions may have a double function: expressing
76 passive emotion and/or an intention to engage in specific activities with the receiver (Waller et
77 al., 2017; Camerlink et al., 2018). The communication of intention is thought to regulate social
78 interactions within groups, such as lipsmacks in chimpanzees that enable allogrooming to be
79 coordinated and prolonged, and facilitate social cooperation. According to Townsend et al.
80 (2017), to determine whether facial expressions are intentional at least two criteria should be
81 used to evaluate them: the signal is only produced in the presence of the recipient (audience
82 effect) and it is contingent on the behaviour of the recipient, which means that the behaviour
83 follows the facial expression and -de facto- ends it (audience behaviour). The intentional use of
84 facial expressions in social communication remains highly debated (Waller et al., 2017) and to
85 date has not been explored in horses.

86 This study had three aims. The first was to determine whether or not horses used automatic
87 brushes, on what parts of their body, at what frequency, and how they triggered them. The
88 second aim was to investigate whether the presence of these brushes induced positive social
89 behaviours assessed by the expression of allogrooming behavior, or instead negative behaviours
90 such as threats and aggressiveness, as can be observed when there is competition for a desired
91 resource. The third aim was to provide a preliminary description of the role of facial expressions
92 in horses, by determining whether the positive facial expression described when horses are
93 groomed by humans was also expressed when they used the brush, and whether it played a
94 social role or not. To this end, we investigated whether there was an audience effect when the
95 positive face was expressed (i.e. if a conspecific was nearby when the signal was produced) and
96 audience behaviour in response (with a contingent signal to the recipient's behaviour). We

97 expected that the positive facial expression would be expressed while brushing but
98 preferentially when another horse was nearby and that this facial expression would promote
99 allogrooming.

100

101 **2. Material and Method**

102

103 **2.1. Welfare statement**

104 This study was non-invasive: we filmed the animals in their normal living condition without
105 particular intervention. No permission from the Animal Ethics Committee was needed.

106

107 **2.2. Animals, housing and characteristics of the brushes**

108 The study was conducted on 40 female Welsh ponies, with an average age of 7.56 ± 0.42
109 (mean \pm sem) years old and height at withers of 1m to 1.20m, reared at the Animal Physiology
110 Experimental Unit PAO, INRAE (DOI: 10.15454/1.5573896321728955E12). The herd was
111 established four weeks before the beginning of the observations. From then on, they lived in a
112 group at pasture and every day from 08:00 to 15:30 they were brought into a large straw-covered
113 stabling area (11x35m) with free access to an adjoining paddock (10x35m). Hay and water were
114 available ad libitum in the stabling area.

115 Two brushes were present in the middle of the stabling area 10m apart. The brushes were those
116 usually used for goats and which start rotating when touched by an animal (Mini rotating brush
117 for goats and calves, MSB DeLaval). Each brush was attached to a mobile axis, enabling it to
118 move from a vertical to a horizontal position and thus reach different parts of the pony's body
119 (Fig.1). The top of the brush was at a height of 120cm, corresponding approximately to the

120 pony's' withers. The dimensions of each brush were 72x30 cm and the rotation speed was 25.5
121 rotations/min.

122

123 **2.3. Behavioural observations**

124 After 4 weeks of familiarization to the presence of the brushes in the stabling area, a camera
125 was fixed above each brush to film the horses using it. Four periods from 08:00 to 15:30 were
126 recorded, two in week 5 (14, 15 May) and two in week 6 (22, 23 May), for a total of 30 hours
127 of observation. The film footage was subsequently viewed by an experienced observer (JL) to
128 record the following behaviours which were divided into three categories according to the
129 different aims.

130 To characterize the use of the automatic brushes (aim 1), we recorded: the number of sequences
131 when a horse activated the brush, and identified the animal; the time the brush was used for
132 each sequence (i.e. the time the brush was in contact with the horse); the part of the body that
133 activated the brush (head, forehead or hindquarters, Fig.3) or if it was already activated when
134 the horse arrived. The percentage of time spent brushing each of these areas (time on one area
135 of the body/ total time of use*100) was also calculated.

136 Then, we determined what type of behaviour was performed during the brushing (aim 2). For
137 each sequence, we recorded whether at the same time as the horse used the brush it
138 demonstrated an affiliative behaviour such as allogrooming (*the horse is top to tail with a*
139 *conspecific and both mutually nibbling different parts of each other's bodies*) or an aggressive
140 behaviour such as threatening to bite and biting (*ears are backward, neck and head are*
141 *stretched toward the opponent and accompanied by a quick movement toward it, without the*
142 *teeth touching the opponent - biting is similar, but the teeth touch the opponent*), threatening to
143 kick and kicking (*the ears are backward, the croup is toward the opponent and the horse raises*
144 *one or both hind limbs or kicks out the hind limbs - kicking is similar, but the limbs touch the*

145 *opponent*), chasing or attacking. For each sequence, this was recorded as a binary response:
146 Yes/No.

147 For each sequence, we also evaluated the facial expressions of the horses while they used the
148 brush (aim 3): a positive facial expression (first described during grooming by a person, see
149 Lansade et al., 2018), a negative facial expression, or neither of them (see Fig.2 for a description
150 of each expression). The negative facial expression differs from the threatening behaviors as
151 the former is not explicitly directed toward a conspecific (the head and neck are not stretched
152 toward a specific opponent and it is not accompanied by a quick movement toward it; the horse
153 does not raise or kick out its hind limbs). When the four zones used to describe the facial
154 expressions were not entirely visible (neck, ears, eyes and lips) the sequence was excluded from
155 the analyses. Only one of these facial expressions was ever observed in any one sequence of
156 brush use, never both of them. Finally we noted whether the positive facial expressions were
157 expressed when there was another horse within 2m (Yes/No) and whether it was followed by
158 allogrooming that *de facto* ended the facial expression (Yes/No). Initially, we had planned to
159 do this kind of analysis for the negative facial expression to determine whether it was also
160 followed by the aggressive behaviours, but since aggressive behaviours were not expressed,
161 this was not possible.

162

163 **2.4. Statistical Analysis**

164 Two-proportion z tests using the Monte Carlo Method (5000 simulations, Fleiss et al., 2003;
165 Vose, 2008) were conducted to compare the proportion of affiliative behaviours vs aggressive
166 behaviours; to compare the proportion of positive vs negative facial expressions; and to test
167 whether positive facial expressions were associated with affiliative behaviours (allogrooming).

168 For the latter, we compared the proportion of allogrooming after a positive facial expression vs
169 that without a positive facial expression.

170 We observed 139 sequences during which a horse used the brush. Of the 139 times the brushes
171 were used, it was possible to determine 132 times when allogrooming took place or not, 111
172 times when there was a positive facial expression or not and 131 times when there was a
173 negative facial expression or not. These numbers differed since it was not always possible to
174 validate all the criteria presented in Fig. 2. For instance, sometimes it was not possible to see
175 all the criteria required to validate the presence of a positive facial expression, because for
176 example the lips were not visible on the video, and therefore their position was unclear. In that
177 case, a positive facial expression could not be validated and we considered the data as missing.
178 The two variables ‘allogrooming’ and ‘positive facial expression’ could be matched for 105
179 sessions of brush use. The statistical analyses presented in the results section were conducted
180 on these respective numbers of sequences.

181

182 **3. Results**

183

184 **3.1. Descriptive analysis of the use of the automatic brushes**

185 Over the four 08:00 to 15:30 periods, 35 of the 40 horses used a brush (i.e. 87.5%) and the
186 brushes were activated 139 times. The mean \pm sem for each horse was 3.97 ± 2.93 times, with a
187 minimum of once and a maximum of 11 times per horse. The mean \pm sem duration of use was
188 55.28 ± 4.125 s. Of the 139 times the brush was activated, the majority were triggered by the
189 horse’s head, followed by the forehead and then the hindquarters. In a quarter of the cases the
190 brush was already activated when the horse arrived (Fig.3a). The horses mainly scratched their
191 heads, followed by their hindquarters and then their forehead (Fig.3b).

192

193 **3.2. Aggressive and affiliative behaviours resulting from the use of the brushes**

194 There were no cases of aggressive behaviour when horses used the brush. By contrast, affiliative
195 behaviour (allogrooming) was expressed in 7.57% of the sequences, by nine different horses -
196 one horse allogroomed twice (comparison between the proportion of aggressive behaviour and
197 affiliative behaviour: 0/139 vs 10/132 sequences, two-proportion z test using the Monte Carlo
198 Method, diff=0.076, p= 0.001).

199

200 **3.3. Facial expressions observed while the horse used the brush and the social context**
201 **in which they appeared**

202 There were only 3.82% of sequences with a negative facial expression (5/131 sequences, from
203 5 different horses), but 39.94% with a positive facial expression (41/111 sequences, from 22
204 different horses, two-proportion z test using the Monte Carlo Method, diff=0.33, p<0.0001,
205 Fig.4).

206 Regarding the ‘audience effect’ hypothesis, there was always at least one other horse present
207 less than 2 m from the horse being brushed with the exception of one case (and in that case, the
208 horse did not produce a specific facial expression), thus it was not possible to test this
209 hypothesis.

210 Regarding the ‘audience behaviour’ hypothesis, among the 105 sequences for which the
211 variables “allogrooming” and “positive facial expression” matched, horses displayed a facial
212 expression in 37 sequences and did not in 68 sequences. Interestingly, when the horse expressed
213 a positive facial expression during a sequence there was 18.91% chance that an allogrooming
214 event with another horse would take place immediately after it (7/37 sequences, for 7 different
215 horses). This was 6.4 times less if the horse had not previously made a positive facial expression

216 (2.94%: 2/68 sequences, for 2 different horses). These proportions are significantly different
217 (two-proportion z test using the Monte Carlo Method, $\text{diff}=-0.16$, $p=0.008$, Fig. 5). The 9 (7+2)
218 sequences of allogrooming involved nine different horses being brushed. We can also notice
219 that allogrooming was never observed after a horse had expressed a negative facial expression
220 ($n=5$).

221

222 **4. Discussion**

223

224 This study first demonstrates that automatic rotating brushes were used by a large proportion
225 of horses living in a group. It also revealed that when horses used these brushes more positive
226 social behaviours (allogrooming) than aggressive behaviours were expressed. Finally, if a horse
227 expressed a positive facial expression during a sequence, it had a six times greater chance to
228 subsequently start allogrooming with a conspecific than if it did not.

229

230 **4.1. Description of brush use**

231 Like cows (e.g. DeVries et al., 2007; Horvath and Miller-Cushon, 2019; Velasquez-Munoz et
232 al., 2019; Moncada et al., 2020), horses spontaneously use automatic brushes, as 87% of the
233 horses in this study used them during the four 7h30 observation periods. The duration of each
234 use was generally short being less than a minute, but this corresponds to the durations described
235 in other species, for instance, bout duration in calves was 18 s (Zobel et al., 2017). The number
236 of visits to the brushes (4 visits per animal over 30h, i.e. 3.2 visits / 24h) is also on the same
237 scale as that observed in adult cows : 4.5 visits / 24h in Mandel et al. (2013) or 7.7 visits / 24h
238 in DeVries et al. (2007). This figure is also similar to that described in Icelandic horses for
239 allogrooming sequences (Snorrason et al., 2003).

240 Regarding the areas brushed the most, we might have expected to find the base of the neck or
241 the withers, which according to a study on Camargue horses corresponds to the area of the body
242 that horses mutually scratch during allogrooming (Feh and De Mazières, 1993). However, this
243 was not the case in our study, as the horses spent more time scratching their head and
244 hindquarters than the base of the neck which was nevertheless an area easily accessible to the
245 automatic brush. In particular, the head is not an area that horses mutually groom probably
246 because it is not so easy for them, but it was the area brushed the most by the automatic brush.
247 The brushes thus appear to supplement the allogrooming horses carry out. That could be
248 particularly true in spring and summer, when potential itching due to flies might explain why
249 horses use the brushes more on areas not typically associated with allogrooming (the present
250 observations were made in May). The time spent using the brush could also reflect a tendency
251 to play with them, although this hypothesis cannot be verified.

252 To activate the brush, horses mainly used their head and their forehead. However, it should be
253 noted that in a quarter of the cases they used brushes that had already been activated by another
254 horse. It is possible that this was based on a process of social facilitation (“when the behaviour
255 of a conspecific changes the motivation of the observer, resulting in the tendency of individual
256 animals to do what other individuals are doing”) or local enhancement (“when the behaviour of
257 the demonstrator results in an increase in the salience of a particular stimulus, and the observer’s
258 motivation to investigate that stimulus may be increased”), processes previously described in
259 the horse (Rørvang et al., 2018). The horses could thus have used the brush because a
260 conspecific had just previously used it. This raises the question of the role these brushes could
261 play in social cohesion.

262

263 **4.2. Induction of affiliative behaviours**

264 The most striking result of this study is that the brushes induced more affiliative than aggressive
265 behaviours. This is noteworthy as we could have expected the contrary regarding a limited
266 resource with only two brushes for 40 horses. Indeed, there could have been a form of
267 competition to access this resource, with aggressive behaviours of a threatening or biting type,
268 as can be observed regarding a vital and rare source, such as at a watering place (Rutberg and
269 Greenberg, 1990). No such behaviour was observed. On the contrary, we were surprised to note
270 that while horses were being brushed by the automatic brush they simultaneously started
271 allogrooming. The brush thus seems to act as a catalyst for affiliative behaviour. To confirm
272 this, in a future study it would be interesting to count the total number of these affiliative
273 behaviours in the group of horses that can access the brushes compared to groups of horses that
274 cannot. In any case, our finding suggests that the presence of brushes directly improved horse
275 welfare by providing them with comfort, as evidenced by the presence of positive facial
276 expression in almost half of the brushing sequences, but also indirectly, by fostering positive
277 social relations between the horses, which is essential to maintain social cohesion (review:
278 VanDierendonck and Spruijt, 2012).

279

280 **4.3. Social context of expressing the positive facial expression**

281 Finally, this study provides initial leads into understanding the social role of horses facial
282 expressions, and in particular the positive facial expression observed when horses are groomed
283 (Lansade et al., 2018). First, we aimed to investigate whether there was an audience effect (if a
284 conspecific was nearby when the facial expression was produced). However, this effect could
285 not be tested because in all sequences except one, there was a horse less than 2m from the
286 brushed horse. Second, our aim was to investigate whether there was audience behaviour in
287 response. Results show that if a horse expressed this face during the brushing sequence (half of
288 the horses were observed doing this), it had a six times greater chance to subsequently start

289 allogrooming with a conspecific than if it had not expressed that face. There are at least three
290 possible explanations of this result.

291 The first corresponds to the audience behaviour hypothesis: the positive facial expression could
292 promote allogrooming and could be used intentionally to communicate. However, to confirm
293 this explanation further studies are necessary to identify supplementary criteria. Among the
294 criteria put forward by Townsend et al. (2017), there is the “Manipulation of the attentional
295 state of the recipient”. To investigate this, we could determine whether “attention-getting
296 behaviours were directed towards a recipient” before the facial expression was expressed
297 (Liebal et al., 2004). We could also check whether there was an exchange of gazes between the
298 signaler and the recipient, given that in horses, gaze alternations to manipulate the attention of
299 the recipient have already been described in another context (Malavasi and Huber, 2016). In
300 our study, there were too many horses in front of the brushed horse to be able to distinguish
301 clearly this type of behaviour. Moreover, as it is known that horses preferentially display
302 allogrooming with certain privileged partners (review: VanDierendonck and Spruijt, 2012), it
303 could also be interesting to determine the composition of the audience, and investigate whether
304 this potential signal was only produced in the presence of certain recipients.

305 A second explanation is related to a phenomenon of emotional contagion. In a previous
306 experiment, we showed that horses tended to engage in allogrooming toward an experimenter
307 simply by watching video footage of another horse expressing this positive facial expression
308 while it was scratched by a handler (Trösch et al., 2020). This behaviour was interpreted as a
309 phenomenon of positive emotional contagion. To discriminate between intentional
310 communication and emotional contagion, we could try to determine whether the positive facial
311 expression of horses using the brush specifically promotes allogrooming between these
312 particular horses and privileged partners, or also allogrooming between two third-party horses
313 (who are not using the brushes).

314 Finally, a third explanation is that the animals who displayed the positive facial expression
315 could be those which appreciated being scratched by the brush the most, and which were the
316 most motivated to be groomed whether with a brush or by a conspecific. In this case they could
317 also be the most motivated to subsequently start allogrooming with another horse.
318 In any case, our result shows that the brush could act as a catalyst for positive emotions and
319 affiliation behaviours within the group.

320

321 **5. Conclusions**

322

323 This study shows that 87.5% of the horses observed used the brushes. The automatic brushes
324 provide both a direct benefit to the horses enabling them to conduct self-grooming, and also in
325 all likelihood, an indirect benefit by facilitating positive social interactions (allogrooming).
326 They do not trigger aggressiveness, as can be sometimes observed when there is competition
327 for a desired resource. The brush thus would appear to act as a catalyst for affiliative behaviours.
328 These results promote the installation of automatic brushes in places where horses are kept to
329 improve their welfare and provide comfort. Our results also show that more than half of the
330 horse expressed a positive facial expression while using the brush. When they displayed this
331 facial expression, they had a six times greater chance to subsequently start allogrooming with
332 a conspecific than if they did not. For a clearer interpretation of this result further research is
333 needed to validate other criteria to qualify whether or not this positive face is a signal of
334 intentional communication.

335

336 **References**

337 Bertenshaw, C.E., Rowlinson, P., 2008. Exploring heifers' perception of 'positive' treatment through
338 their motivation to pursue a retreated human. *Anim. Welfare* 17, 313-319.

339 Burgdorf, J., Panksepp, J., 2006. The neurobiology of positive emotions. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 30,
340 173-187. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2005.06.001>

341 Camerlink, I., Coulange, E., Farish, M., Baxter, E.M., Turner, S.P., 2018. Facial expression as a potential
342 measure of both intent and emotion. *Sci Rep* 8, 17602. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-35905-3

343 DeVries, T.J., Vankova, M., Veira, D.M., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., 2007. Short communication: Usage
344 of mechanical brushes by lactating dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90, 2241-2245. doi:10.3168/jds.2006-648

345 Feh, C., De Mazières, J., 1993. Grooming at a preferred site reduces heart rate in horses. *Anim.*
346 *Behav.* 46, 1191-1194.

347 Finlayson, K., Lampe, J.F., Hintze, S., Wurbel, H., Melotti, L., 2016. Facial Indicators of Positive
348 Emotions in Rats. *PLoS ONE* 11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166446

349 Fleiss, J. L., Bruce, L., Myunghee, C.P., 2003. *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*. Third
350 Edition ed. John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/0471445428

351 Horvath, K.C., Miller-Cushon, E.K., 2019. Characterizing grooming behavior patterns and the influence
352 of brush access on the behavior of group-housed dairy calves. *J. Dairy Sci.* 102, 3421-3430.
353 doi:10.3168/jds.2018-15460

354 Lansade, L., Nowak, R., Lainé, A.-L., Leterrier, C., Bonneau, C., Parias, C., Bertin, A., 2018. Facial
355 expression and oxytocin as possible markers of positive emotions in horses. *Sci Rep* 8, 14680.
356 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-32993-z

357 Lansade, L., Valençon, M., Foury, A., Neveux, C., Cole, S.W., Laye, S., Cardinaud, B., Levy, F., Moisan,
358 M.-P., 2014. Behavioral and Transcriptomic Fingerprints of an Enriched Environment in Horses (*Equus*
359 *caballus*). *PLoS ONE* 9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0114384

360 Liebal, K., Call, J., Tomasello, M., 2004. Use of gesture sequences in chimpanzees. *Am. J. Primatol.* 64,
361 377-396. doi:10.1002/ajp.20087

362 Malavasi, R., Huber, L., 2016. Evidence of heterospecific referential communication from domestic
363 horses (*Equus caballus*) to humans. *Anim Cogn* 19, 899-909. doi:10.1007/s10071-016-0987-0

364 Mandel, R., Whay, H.R., Nicol, C.J., Klement, E., 2013. The effect of food location, heat load, and
365 intrusive medical procedures on brushing activity in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 96, 6506-6513.
366 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6941>

367 McBride, S.D., Hemmings, A., Robinson, K., 2004. A preliminary study on the effect of massage to
368 reduce stress in the horse. *J Equine Vet Sci* 24, 76-81. doi:10.1016/j.jevs.2004.01.005

369 Moncada, A.C., Neave, H.W., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2020. Use of a mechanical brush
370 by dairy cows with chorioptic mange. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 223, 104925.
371 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2019.104925>

372 Mullard, J., Berger, J.M., Ellis, A.D., Dyson, S., 2017. Development of an ethogram to describe facial
373 expressions in ridden horses (FEReq). *Journal of Veterinary Behavior-Clinical Applications and*
374 *Research* 18, 7-12. doi:10.1016/j.jveb.2016.11.005

375 Reefmann, N., Wechsler, B., Gygas, L., 2009. Behavioural and physiological assessment of positive
376 and negative emotion in sheep. *Anim. Behav.* 78, 651-659.
377 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.06.015>

378 Rehn, T., Handlin, L., Uvnas-Moberg, K., Keeling, L.J., 2014. Dogs' endocrine and behavioural
379 responses at reunion are affected by how the human initiates contact. *Physiol. Behav.* 124, 45-53.
380 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2013.10.009

381 Rørvang, M.V., Christensen, J.W., Ladewig, J., McLean, A., 2018. Social Learning in Horses—Fact or
382 Fiction? *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 5. doi:10.3389/fvets.2018.00212

383 Rutberg, A.T., Greenberg, S.A., 1990. Dominance, aggression frequencies and modes of aggressive
384 competition in feral pony mares. *Anim. Behav.* 40, 322-331. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80927-3)
385 [3472\(05\)80927-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80927-3)

386 Schmied, C., Waiblinger, S., Scharl, T., Leisch, F., Boivin, X., 2008. Stroking of different body regions by
387 a human: Effects on behaviour and heart rate of dairy cows. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 109, 25-38.
388 doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2007.01.013

389 Snorrason, S., Sigurjónsdóttir, H., Thórhallsdóttir, A., van Dierendonck, M., 2003. Social relationships
390 in a group of horses without a mature stallion. *Behaviour* 140, 783-804.
391 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1163/156853903322370670>

392 Tamioso, P.R., Rucinque, D.S., Taconeli, C.A., da Silva, G.P., Molento, C.F.M., 2017. Behavior and body
393 surface temperature as welfare indicators in selected sheep regularly brushed by a familiar observer.
394 *J Vet Beh* 19, 27-34. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2017.01.004>

395 Townsend, S.W., Koski, S.E., Byrne, R.W., Slocombe, K.E., Bickel, B., Boeckle, M., Braga Goncalves, I.,
396 Burkart, J.M., Flower, T., Gaunet, F., Glock, H.J., Gruber, T., Jansen, D.A.W.A.M., Liebal, K., Linke, A.,
397 Miklósi, Á., Moore, R., van Schaik, C.P., Stoll, S., Vail, A., Waller, B.M., Wild, M., Zuberbühler, K.,
398 Manser, M.B., 2017. Exorcising Grice's ghost: an empirical approach to studying intentional
399 communication in animals. *Biological Reviews* 92, 1427-1433. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12289>

400 Trösch, M., Pellon, S., Cuzol, F., Parias, C., Nowak, R., Calandrea, L., Lansade, L., 2020. Horses feel
401 emotions when they watch positive and negative horse–human interactions in a video and transpose
402 what they saw to real life. *Anim Cogn*. doi:[10.1007/s10071-020-01369-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-020-01369-0)

403 VanDierendonck, M.C., Spruijt, B.M., 2012. Coping in groups of domestic horses – Review from a
404 social and neurobiological perspective. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 138, 194-202.
405 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2012.02.007>

406 Velasquez-Munoz, A., Manriquez, D., Paudyal, S., Solano, G., Han, H., Callan, R., Velez, J., Pinedo, P.,
407 2019. Effect of a mechanical grooming brush on the behavior and health of recently weaned heifer
408 calves. *BMC Vet. Res.* 15. doi:[10.1186/s12917-019-2033-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-019-2033-3)

409 Vose, D., 2008. *Risk Analysis - A Quantitative Guide*. Third Edition ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

410 Waller, B.M., Whitehouse, J., Micheletta, J., 2017. Rethinking primate facial expression: A predictive
411 framework. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 82, 13-21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.09.005>

412 Westerath, H.S., Gyax, L., Hillmann, E., 2014. Are special feed and being brushed judged as positive
413 by calves? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 156, 12-21. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2014.04.003>

414 Zobel, G., Neave, H.W., Henderson, H.V., Webster, J., 2017. Calves Use an Automated Brush and a
415 Hanging Rope When Pair-Housed. *Animals (Basel)* 7, 84. doi:[10.3390/ani7110084](https://doi.org/10.3390/ani7110084)

416 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

417 The authors report no declarations of interest.

418

419 **Acknowledgements**

420 We thank the staff at the Animal Physiology Experimental Unit PAO, INRA (DOI:
421 10.15454/1.5573896321728955E12) for their contribution to this experiment. We would like
422 to thank Estel Blasi for drawing the horse images and Sue Edrich from the translation agency
423 Interconnect for correcting the English manuscript.

424 **Figures captions**

425

426 **Figure 1:** Automatic brush being used by a horse in the study

427

428 **Figure 2.** Behaviour and facial expressions recorded while the horse used the brush

429

430 **Figure 3 a.** Parts of the body used to activate the brush (as a percentage of the 139 activations)
431 and **b.** percentage of time spent brushing each of these different parts.

432

433 **Figure 4.** Affiliative or aggressive behaviours and facial expressions observed while the horse
434 used the brush.


435 *** $p < 0.001$

436 Data are expressed as a percentage of sequences during which the behaviour or the facial
437 expression was observed

438





439 **Figure 5.** Percentage of chance that the horse using the brush simultaneously allogroomed
440 another horse, when there was or not a prior positive facial expression

441 ** $p < 0.01$


442  : presence or absence of a positive facial expression during the sequence

443  : allogrooming during the sequence






Behaviours	Facial expressions
<p>Affiliative behaviour</p>  <p><i>Allogrooming</i></p>	<p>Positive facial expression</p>  <p> <i>Upper lip extended forward Relaxed nostrils (not dilated) Eyes opened to half closed Ears turned backward Neck moderately raised</i> </p>
<p>Agressive behaviour</p>  <p> <i>Threatening to bite Threatening to kick Biting, Kicking Chasing, Attacking</i> </p>	<p>Negative facial expression</p>  <p> <i>Angle head/neck opened Ears pinned back in the mane Eyes wide-open Optional: Mouth open/teeth visible</i> </p>

a. Part of the body used to activate the brusch



b. Body part brushed





% of sequences

