

EXTRACT FROM A PRELIMINARY REPORT FROM
DR. WILLIS
CLUMBER SPANIELS.

H.D. is a condition which is essentially a faulty fit of the ball and socket joint. This is mainly genetic in origin.

In 1978 a scheme was devised for the GSD which involved looking at nine radiographic features of the hip and giving each a score from 0 (ideal) through to 6 (worst) A dog can score from 0 to 54 per/ hip, thus from 0 to 108 on both hips

More than 6,000 dogs have been scored annually.

Registrations for Clumbers was 111 in 1983. Submissions to scheme only 48 by 27.11.85. This report is based on these 48 dogs. This special report is produced to show how serious the situation is for Clumbers, who rank second highest in total score of 36.92. In Gundogs, Clumbers are many points worse than any other Gundog breed.

SEE TABLES 1, 2, 3, 4 Attached.

PROGENY TESTING

Although one can select from better hipped stock and expect to make progress, there is no certainty that a low(ish) scorer will produce good results. Evidence from other breeds suggests that good hip producers are usually themselves good in hip status, but not all good hipped dogs produce well. In a breed with minimal hip information in pedigrees, the predictability of scores in terms of what will be produced is limited. We need to progeny test sires if we are to progress and in this connection we would find that with 10 progeny from random dams in most instances the result will be more useful than the sire's own score. ALAS IN CLUMBERS FEW SIRES HAVE GOT DATA. The number of progeny per sire is seen in Table 7.

Table 7 PROGENY PER SIRE (Clumbers 48 cases)

Progeny per SIRES	Number of sires	Percent of all sires	Number of progeny	Percent of progeny
1	4	21.1.	4	8.3.
2	7	36.8	14	29.2.
3	4	21.1.	12	25.0
4	3	15.9	12	25.0
6	1	5.3	6	12.5.
TOTAL	19	100.0	48	100.0

The sires with ~~more~~ 4 or more progeny scored are ANCHORFIELD ROISTERER (6 same bitch) LEYBEL FLASH IN THE PAN(4 same bitch) MALLADEPTA TALLMAN (4 same bitch) TOLLYLOG ANGUS MOR OR BELCRUM (4 -4 different bitches)

Progeny averages would be meaningless at this stage, but the evidence we have clearly indicates that some Clumber sires would seem to be relatively reasonable prospects while others look less so. I am certain that an organised blitz on hip scores such that as many Clumbers under five as can be scored are assessed, we will find some products that are well worth using more fully and others less so without any major effect upon type and performance.

It is your breed not mine. Either you care about hip status or you do not. If you do not and if you do nothing about hips, then in ten years time the likelihood is that the hip status in the breed will have degenerated and good animals will be few and far between. If you do care, then you have no alternative but to hip score and take that into account in breeding. It rests with you.

Extract. Full document may be obtained if ordered.

M.B. WILLIS. 1985.

M. B. Willis

TABLE 1 PREFIXES SUBMITTED (Clumbers 48 cases)

Prefix Numbers	Prefix
7	Leybel
6	Trevabyn
5	Venaticus
3	Raycroft
2	Anchorfield, Belcram, Cheanwood, Darnacan, Glyncroft, Marshmarks
1	Colland, Davigdor, Deanway, Frastan, Gaylon, Grovewool, Maladetta, Martinross, Scardale, Norriss, Tavirock, Tollylog, Tridast, Wickbourne, No prefix.

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES PER FEATURE

The mean score for right and left hip for each of the 9 radiographic features is shown in Table 2 together with the number of dogs which score 0 on each feature. The number of dogs that could score 0 is 48 in total and the more that do score 0 the more the mean is made up from a limited number of dogs.

TABLE 2 SCORES PER RADIOGRAPHIC FEATURE (Clumbers 48 cases)

Radiographic feature	RIGHT HIP		LEFT HIP		BOTH HIPs ^a	
	Dogs 0	Mean score	Dogs 0	Mean score	Dogs ^a 0	Mean ^b score
1. Norberg angle	6	3.10	5	3.02	3	6.13
2. Subluxation	2	2.92	0	3.19	0	6.10
3. Cranial acetabular edge	2	2.67	0	2.71	0	5.38
4. Dorsal acetabular edge	21	1.67	20	1.71	19	3.38
5. Cranial effec. A. Rim	27	1.73	27	1.67	24	3.40
6. Acetabular fossa	26	1.44	26	1.42	23	2.85
7. Caudal acetabular edge	27	1.19	31	1.04	24	2.23
8. Femoral Head/neck Exostosis	9	2.21	10	2.27	8	4.48
9. Femoral Head recont- ouring	23	1.50	25	1.48	22	2.98
TOTAL	0	18.42	0	18.50	0	36.92

^a Number in this column refers to number that score 0 for the feature on both right and left hip

^b Numbers are rounded to two places of decimals so may not appear to total in some cases.

Clumber spanials appear to score highly on items 1, 2, 3 and 8. Scores in items 1, 2 and 3 can be influenced by X-ray positioning but item 8 is a pathological feature as is 9. These illustrate wear and tear and the reshaping of the hip. As such they indicate secondary effects of hip dysplasia caused by the faulty fitting illustrated in items 1 and 2. The number of dogs with 0 is low in these four items indicating the mean scores represent the breed accurately and are not due to a small number of high scorers. The high levels indicate arthritic problems in the breed and should indicate that several dogs will break down with HD or show problems with it. The overall level is extremely high.

The 48 dogs have been classified for the old system as well as for the new scoring scheme. Table 3 Shows the comparative results.

TABLE 3 Comparison of old BVA/KC with Scoring(Clumbers 48 cases)

Old BVA/KC Class	Number of dogs	% of total	Mean total score
Certificate	0	0	0
Breeders letter	4	8.33	6.50
Failure	44	91.67	39.68
TOTAL	48	100.00	36.92

The unsuitability of the old scheme to this breed is demonstrated with only 4 near normals in 48 dogs. Unless breeders use failures the breed would become extinct but the need to distinguish between failures is obvious and scoring allows this to be done.

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SCORES

The breakdown of the 48 Clumbers by total score is shown in Table 4 with cumulative percentages. Note that class divisions are not equal but are broken down more at the lower(better) end.

TABLE 4 DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SCORES (Clumbers 48 cases)

Score Range	Number of dogs seen	% of total	Cumulative % of total
0 - 5	1	2.08	2.08
6 - 10	5	10.42	12.50
11 - 20	15	31.25	43.75
21 - 30	6	12.50	56.25
31 - 40	4	8.33	64.58
41 - 50	2	4.17	68.75
51 - 60	3	6.25	75.00
61 - 70	4	8.33	83.33
71 - 80	3	6.25	89.58
81 - 90	2	4.17	93.75
91 - 100	2	4.17	97.92
101 - 108	1	2.08	100.00

Given Table 4 a breeder can determine where his scored Clumber is in relation to the breed. We are, of course, assuming the 48 animals to be representative of the breed but in the absence of further data we must assume that. A dog scoring under 20 would be in the best 44%(43.75) of the breed while one scoring over 50 would be in the worst 31.25% of the breed (100-68.75). Clearly few Clumbers score low and a single figure result is in the best eighth of the breed but teen figures are fairly plentiful so that grave though the situation is it is redeemable and more extensive scoring would enable the breed to make real progress in