1 Extensive countrywide field investigation of somatic cell counts and total bacterial counts in bulk

2 tank raw milk in goat herds in Greece

- 3
- 4 Daphne T. Lianou, Charalambia K. Michael, Natalia G.C. Vasileiou, Efthimia Petinaki, Peter J. Cripps,
- 5 Katerina Tsilipounidaki, Angeliki I. Katsafadou, Antonis P. Politis, Nikos G. Kordalis, Katerina S. Ioannidi,
- 6 Dimitris A. Gougoulis, Constantina Trikalinou, Denise C. Orfanou, Ilektra A. Fragkou, Dimitra V. Liagka,
- 7 Athina Tzora, Marzia Albenzio, Vasia S. Mavrogianni, Mariangela C. Caroprese and George C. Fthenakis
- 8
- 9

Supplementary material 1. Location of 119 goat herds around Greece, which were visited for bulk-tank sampling.

- пловдив • Хасково veriore Северна Edirnee Kırklareli Македонија Shqipëria Битола Αποκεντρωμένη Διακηση Tekirdağ Μακεδομίας Korçe Θράκης Yalova Vlorë Αποκεντρωμένη Bursa Διοίκηση Conakkale Ηπείρου Balikesir Δυτικής Μακεδονία Balikesir Αποκεντρωμένη Kütahy Διοίκηση Στερεάς Uşak Monisa Ελλάδας İzmir Ελλάς Αποκεντρωμένη Δισικηση Aydın 0 Αποκεντρωμένη Πελοπ Αθήνα Διοίκηση Denizli, **AUTIK** Αιγαίου Muğla Muğla Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση Κρήτης
- 13 14

- . _
- 15
- 16
- 17

18 **Supplementary material 2.** Details of the data management and analysis performed during the study.

19

20 Data management

During cell counting, total bacterial counting and milk composition measurement, for each bulk-tank milk sample, the results of the two sub-samples from each sample were averaged and then, the two means were again averaged for the final result regarding each bulk-tank milk. During body condition scoring, scores of the 25 goats evaluated in each herd were averaged.

The results of testing for biofilm formation by the staphylococcal strains obtained by each method, were assessed by using the methodology detailed by Vasileiou *et al.* (2018). Subsequently, results of the two methods (culture appearance on Congo Red agar and microplate adhesion) were combined (Vasileiou *et al.*, 2018) and staphylococcal strains were characterised as biofilm-forming or non biofilm-forming.

29 For evaluation of the significance of increased SCC, the 0.75×10⁶ cells mL⁻¹ threshold was used. For evaluation of 30 the significance of increased TBC, the 1500×10³ cfu mL⁻¹ threshold was used.

31 Statistical analysis

Data were entered into Microsoft Excel and analysed using SPSS v. 21 (IBM Analytics, Armonk, USA). Basic descriptive analysis was performed. Exact binomial confidence intervals were obtained, if appropriate. For all statistical analyses, SCC and TBC were transformed to log₁₀ and the log-transformed data were used in the analyses; then, for presentation of the results, the log-transformed findings were back-transformed into 10^{log} data.

In total, 53 or 58 variables (related to infrastructure, animals, production characteristics, health management and human resources in the herd) were evaluated for potential association with, respectively, SCC or TBC in the bulktank milk of these herds (Supplementary material 3); these were either taken directly from the answers of the interview performed at the start of the visit or calculated based on these answers. For each of these variables, categories were created according to the answers of the farmers. Initially, SCC or TBC in the bulk-tank milk from the herds were compared between the categories of each variable by using one-way analysis of variance.

The outcomes of '*increased SCC in bulk-tank milk*' (i.e., with SCC above the threshold of 0.75×10⁶ cells mL⁻¹) and '*increased TBC in bulk-tank milk*' (i.e., with TBC above the threshold of 1500×10³ cfu mL⁻¹) were considered. Exact binomial CI were obtained. Initially, the importance of predictors was assessed by using cross-tabulation with Pearson's chi-square test and with simple logistic regression without random effects.

46 Multivariable models were then created. Initially, all variables which achieved a significance of P < 0.2 in the 47 univariable analyses, were offered to these models (n=9 for increased SCC and n=8 for increased TBC). Variables were 48 removed from the initial model by backwards elimination. The P value of removal of a variable was assessed by the 49 likelihood ratio test, and for those with a P value of > 0.2 the variable with the largest probability was removed. This 50 process was repeated until no variable could be removed with a p value of > 0.2. The final multivariable test for increased 51 SCC required the following variables: (a) availability of straw bedding, (b) annual frequency of check-ups of the system 52 by technician, (c) total milk quantity per goat obtained during the preceding milking period, (d) duration of the dry-53 period. The final multivariable test for increased TBC required the following variables: (a) temperature of cleaning water, 54 (b) use of laboratory diagnostic examinations in samples of milk preventively, (c) use of teat disinfection after milking.

55 The potential association of the mean body condition score or the standard error of the mean (s.e.m.) score in 56 each herd with the SCC or TBC was assessed by using analysis of correlation.

57 The potential association of the content (fat, total protein, lactose, added water) of the bulk-tank milk of these 58 herds with the SCC or TBC was assessed by using analysis of correlation. The potential association of annual per animal 59 milk production during the previous lactation period with the SCC of the bulk-tank milk was also assessed by analysis of 60 correlation. Correlations and correlation coefficients are those of Pearson.

In all analyses, statistical significance was defined at $P \le 0.05$.

- 61
- 62
- 63
- 55
- 64

- 65 Supplementary material 3. Variables evaluated for potential association with somatic cell counts (n=52) or
- total bacterial counts (n=57) in the bulk-tank milk of 119 goat herds in Greece.

Management system applied in the farm (description according to EFSA classification) Month into the lactation period at sampling (month) Availability of milking parlour (yes / no) Availability of a waiting area before the milking parlour (yes / no) Material of the floor of the barn (cement / soil / slatted wood / slatted metal / other) Availability of straw bedding (yes / no) Annual frequency of removal / clean-up of the straw bedding (no. of occasions) Availability of mechanical ventilators (yes / no) Year of initial establishment or of most recent renovation of the milking parlour (year) Volume of the parlour (m³) Material of the floor of the milking parlour (cement / tile / soil / other) Type of milking system (mobile / non-mobile) Type of milking parlour (fishbone / circular / linear parallel / linear one-sided / other) Number of animal positions in the parlour (no.) Number of available milking units per animal position (no.) Provision of feed during milking (yes / no) Availability of facilities for milk yield measurement (yes / no) Availability of milk quality indicators (yes / no) Availability of milk flow indicators (yes / no) System pulsation rate (p. min⁻¹) System pressure (kPa.) System pulsation rate to pressure ratio Type of flow line (low / high) Frequency of check-ups of the system by farmer (no. of occasions) Regular check-up of the system by technicians (yes / no) Annual frequency of check-ups of the system by technicians (no. of occasions) Type of system check-ups performed by technicians (dynamic / static) Water cleaning of parlour after the milking sessions (yes / no) Temperature of cleaning water (°C) Use of detergent for parlour cleaning after the milking sessions (yes / no) Annual frequency of changing teatcups (no. of occasions) Availability of milk tank (yes / no)¹ Availability of mixer in the milk tank (yes / no)¹ Temperature in milk tank (description)¹ Frequency of milk tank cleaning (description)¹ Frequency of milk collection (description)¹ Grazing land by the animals (acres per animal) No. of goats in the farm (no.) Breed of goats (description) Average age of culling goats Month of the start of the kidding season (description) Total milk quantity per goat obtained during the preceding milking period (litres) Total number of kids born per goat (no.) Collaboration with a veterinarian (yes / no) Use of laboratory diagnostic examinations in samples of milk preventively (yes / no) Total visits made annually by veterinarians to the farm during the preceding season (no.)

	Clinical mastitis annual incidence risk in the farm (%)
	Nutritional modifications performed according to the reproductive stage (yes / no)
	Age for kid removal from their dams (days)
	Daily number of milking sessions (no.)
	Vaccination against mastitis (ves / no)
	Administration of 'dry-ewe' treatment at the end of the lactation period (yes / no)
	Use of teat disinfection after milking (yes / no)
	Farmer's age (years)
	Length of animal farming experience (years)
	Education of the farmer (description)
67	Presence of working staff in the farm ¹ parametres evaluated only for potential association with total bacterial counts
07	parametres evaluated only for potential association with total bacterial counts.
68	
69	
70	
71	
72	
73	
74	
75	
76	
77	
78	
79	
80	
81	
82	
83	
84	
85	
86	
87	
88	
89	
90	
91	
92	

93 Supplementary material 4. Distribution of 119 goat herds in Greece in accord with somatic cell counts in

94 bulk-tank milk.



Somatic cell counts ($\times 10^{6}$ cells mL⁻¹)

Supplementary material 5. Isolation of staphylococci from bulk-tank milk of 119 goat herds in Greece and

			Fre	quency of staphylococcal iso	lation				
		Herds	All isolates	S <i>aureus</i> isolates	Coagulase-negative				
		(n)	All isolates	5. dureus isolates	staphylococci				
			Somatic cell	Somatic cell counts					
			All staphylococ	cal isolates					
	$< 0.75 \times 10^{\circ}$ cells mL ⁻¹	42	25 (0.595)	2° (0.048)	23 (0.548)				
	> 0.75×10° cells mL *	//	50 (0.649) Biofilm forming stank	19° (0.247)	31 (0.403)				
	< 0.75 $\times 10^{6}$ cells ml ⁻¹	42	17 (0 405)	1 ^b (0.024)	16 (0 381)				
	$> 0.75 \times 10^6$ cells mL ⁻¹	77	38 (0.494)	16 ^b (0.208)	22 (0.286)				
			Total bacteria	al counts					
			All staphylococ	cal isolates					
	< 1500×10 ³ cfu mL ⁻¹	90	55 (0.611)	14 (0.156)	41 (0.456)				
	> 1500×10 ³ cfu mL ⁻¹	29	20 (0.690)	7 (0.241)	13 (0.448)				
	· · - ² · · · 1		Biofilm-forming staph	ylococcal isolates					
	$< 1500 \times 10^3$ cfu mL ⁻¹	90	39 (0.433)	11 (0.122)	28 (0.311)				
118	$> 1500 \times 10^{\circ}$ Cru IIIL	29 os hotwo	ID (0.552)	0 (0.207)	10 (0.545)				
119		es betwee		e superscripts.					
120									
120									
121									
122									
123									
123									
124									
125									
126									
127									
127									
128									
129									
130									
131									
101									
132									
133									
134									
135									
100									
136									
137									

association with somatic cell counts or total bacterial counts in the milk.

- **Supplementary material 6.** Variables with significant differences between their categories when assessed
- 140 for potential association with somatic cell counts (geometric mean [95% CI] cells mL⁻¹) (n=3 variables) with
- 141 total bacterial counts (geometric mean [95% CI] cells mL⁻¹) (n=2 variables) in the bulk-tank milk of 119

142 goat herds in Greece.

Somatic cell counts								
Provision of feed during milking								
Yes (n=	=58)		No (n=8)					
0.913×10 ⁶ (0.794×	10 ⁶ –1.047×10 ⁶)	0.568×10 ⁶ ((0.339×10 ⁶ –0.933×10 ⁶)	0.020				
	Тур	e of flow line						
High (n=43)	Low	(n=16)	Other (n=7)	Р				
0.888×10 ⁶	0.99	0×10 ⁶	0.522×10 ⁶	0.027				
(0.776×10 ⁶ –1.023×10 ⁶	⁵) (0.692×10 ⁶	–1.175×10 ⁶)	(0.302×10 ⁶ –0.912×10 ⁶)	0.027				
	Daily numb	er of milking sessions						
One (n=4)	Two (n=108)	Three (n=7)	Р				
0.342×10 ⁶	0.88	0×10 ⁶	0.659×10 ⁶	0.002				
(0.162×10 ⁶ –0.741×10 ⁶	⁵) (0.794×10 ⁶)	–0.955×10 ⁶)	(0.525×10 ⁶ –0.832×10 ⁶)	0.002				
	Total I	bacterial counts						
	Туре о	f milking parlour						
Circular (n=4)	Parallel (n=21)	Linear one-sided (n	=41) Other (n=0)	Р				
75×10 ³	788×10 ³	586×10 ³	n/a	0.001				
(5×10 ³ -1288×10 ³)	(427×10 ³ –1479×10 ³)	(372×10 ³ –933×10	D ³)	0.001				
	No. of g	goats in the farm						
Up to 165 (n=56)	166 to 330 (n=37)	331 to 500 (n=13	3) Over 500 (n=13)	Р				
391×10 ³	934×10 ³	480×10 ³	1008×10 ³	0.011				
(257×10 ³ –589×10 ³)	(646×10 ³ –1349×10 ³)	(251×10 ³ –912×10	0 ³) (513×10 ³ –1950×10 ³)	0.011				

Supplementary material 7. Variables (n=50) with no significant differences between their categories when assessed for potential association with somatic cell counts

155 (geometric mean [95% CI] cells mL⁻¹) in the bulk-tank milk of 119 goat herds in Greece.

	Somatic	cell counts		Total bacterial counts			
			Managem	ent system			
Intensive (n=9)	Semi-intensive (n=29)	Semi-extensive (n=61)	Extensive (n=20)	Intensive (n=9)	Semi-intensive (n=29)	Semi-extensive (n=61)	Extensive (n=20)
0.769×10 ⁶	0.816×10 ⁶	0.844×10 ⁶	0.889×10 ⁶	832×10 ³	761×10 ³	501×10 ³	525×10 ³
			Month into the lactat	ion period at sampling			
0-1st (n=8)	2nd-5th (n=60)	6th-9th (n=43)	After 9th (n=8)	0-1st (n=8)	2nd-5th (n=60)	6th-9th (n=43)	After 9th (n=8)
0.895×10 ⁶	0.766×10 ⁶	0.949×10 ⁶	0.813×10 ⁶	382×10 ³	664×10 ³	497×10 ³	758×10 ³
			Availability of	milking parlour			
Yes	(n=66)	No (n=	=53)	Yes	(n=66)	No (n=	=53)
0.86	62×10 ⁶	0.810>	0.810×10 ⁶		9×10 ³	597×10 ³	
		Avail	ability of a waiting area	a before the milking pa	rlour		
Yes	(n=60)	No (n	No (n=6)		Yes (n=60)		=6)
0.86	61×10 ⁶	0.871>	0.871×10 ⁶		592×10 ³		10 ³
			Material of the	floor of the barn			
Soil	(n=105)	Other than s	soil (n=14)	Soil (n=105)	Other than s	soil (n=14)
0.84	44×10 ⁶	0.798>	<10 ⁶	564	4×10 ³	731×	10 ³
			Availability of	straw bedding			
Yes	Yes (n=76)		=43)	Yes	Yes (n=76)		=43)
0.788×10^{6}		0.936>	<10 ⁶	640	0×10 ³	490×	10 ³
		Annual f	frequency of removal /	clean-up of the straw	bedding		
1-4 occasion	ns yearly (n=55)	> 4 occasions y	vearly (n=21)	1-4 occasion	s yearly (n=55)	> 4 occasions y	vearly (n=21)
0.83	12×10 ⁶	0.725>	×10 ⁶	577	7×10 ³	841×	10 ³

	Availability of mechanical ventilators							
Yes (n=8	3)	No	(n=111)	Yes (n	=8)	No (n=111)	
0.817×1	0 ⁶	0.8	40×10 ⁶	662×2	L0 ³	57	6×10 ³	
		Years since init	al establishment or mo	st recent renovation of the	milking parlour			
Up to 10 years (n=50)	11-20 yea	ırs (n=14)	Over 20 years (n=2)	Up to 10 years (n=50	0) 11-20 ye	ars (n=14) (Over 20 years (n=2)	
0.877×10 ⁶	0.793	3×10 ⁶	0.987×10 ⁶	596×10 ³	539	×10 ³	610×10 ³	
			Volume o	f the parlour				
Up to 200 m ³	(n=43)	Over 20	0 m³ (n=23)	Up to 200 n	n³ (n=43)	Over 200	0 m³ (n=23)	
0.898×1	0 ⁶	0.7	98×10 ⁶	539×1	L0 ³	42	8×10 ³	
			Material of the floo	r of the milking parlour				
Concrete (n=35)	Tiles (n=9)	Soil (n=14)	Other (n=8)	Concrete (n=35)	Tiles (n=9)	Soil (n=14)	Other (n=8)	
0.886×10 ⁶	0.869×10 ⁶	0.748×10 ⁶	0.972×10 ⁶	610×10 ³	428×10 ³	491×10 ³	743×10 ³	
			Type of m	ilking system				
Built-in system	n (n=59)	Mobile s	Mobile system (n=7)		Built-in system (n=59)		Mobile system (n=7)	
0.888×1	0 ⁶	0.6	0.671×10 ⁶		611×10 ³		310×10 ³	
			Type of m	ilking parlour				
Circular (n=4)	Parallel (n=21)	One-sided (n=41)	Other (n=0)	Circular (n=4)	Parallel (n=21)	One-sided (n=41)	Other (n=0)	
849×10 ⁶	920×10 ⁶	834×10 ⁶	n/a		Supplement	ary material 6		
			Number of animal	positions in the parlour				
Less than 24 (n=23)	24 (n	=26)	Over 24 (n=17)	Less than 24 (n=23) 24 (n=26)	Over 24 (n=17)	
0.746×10 ⁶	0.488	3×10 ⁶	0.784×10 ⁶	532×10 ³	488	×10 ³	784×10 ³	
		N	umber of available milk	ing units per animal position	on			
< 1 (n=4)	2)	1 (n=24)	< 1 (n=	-42)	1 (n=24)		
0.857×10	0 ⁶	0.8	70×10 ³	457×2	L0 ³	83	3×10 ³	
			Provision of fe	ed during milking				
Yes (n=5	8)	No) (n=8)	Yes (n=	=58)	No	(n=8)	
	Supplementa	ry material 6		603×2	10 ³	37	1×10 ³	

		Availability of facilities fo	r milk yield measurement		
Yes (n=3)		No (n=63)	Yes (n=3)		No (n=63)
0.774×10 ⁶		0.866×10 ⁶	1016×10 ³		553×10 ³
		Availability of mill	c quality indicators		
Yes (n=0)		No (n=66)	Yes (n=0)		No (n=66)
n/a		0.838×10 ⁶	n/a		581×10 ³
		Availability of mi	lk flow indicators		
Yes (n=1)		No (n=65)	Yes (n=1)		No (n=65)
1.369×10 ⁶		0.856×10 ⁶	3571×10 ³		553×10 ³
		System pu	lsation rate		
< 140 p. min ⁻¹ (n=19)	140-150 p. min ⁻¹ (n=37)	> 150 p. min ⁻¹ (n=10)	< 140 p. min ⁻¹ (n=19)	140-150 p. min ⁻¹ (n=37)	> 150 p. min ⁻¹ (n=10)
0.937×10 ⁶	0.809×10 ⁶	0.931×10 ⁶	511×10 ³	605×10 ³	555×10 ³
		System	pressure		
< 38 kPa (n=5)	38-42 kPa (n=55)	> 42 kPa (n=6)	< 38 kPa (n=5)	38-42 kPa (n=55)	> 42 kPa (n=6)
0.927×10 ⁶	0.848×10 ⁶	0.938×10 ⁶	560×10 ³	566×10 ³	602×10 ³
		System pulsation ra	ate to pressure ratio		
< 3.10 (n=15)	3.10-3.79 (n=29)	≥ 3.80 (n=22)	< 3.10 (n=15)	3.10-3.79 (n=29)	≥ 3.80 (n=22)
1.023×10 ⁶	0.828×10 ⁶	0.808×10 ⁶	643×10 ³	612×10 ³	475×10 ³
		Type of	flow line		
High (n=43)	Low (n=16)	Other (n=7)	High (n=43)	Low (n=16)	Other (n=7)
	Supplementary material 6		463×10 ³	1152×10 ³	401×10 ³
		Frequency of check-ups	of the system by farmer		
Daily (n=54)	Less free	quently than daily (n=12)	Daily (n=54)	Less free	quently than daily (n=12)
0.881×10 ⁶		0.779×10 ⁶	659×10 ³		290×10 ³
		Regular check-up of the	e system by technicians		
Yes (n=50)		No (n=16)	Yes (n=50)		No (n=16)
0.846×10 ⁶		0.912×10 ⁶	641×10 ³		553×10 ³

		Annual frequency of check-ups	s of the system by technicians		
1 check-up (n=24)	2 check-ups (n=15)	> 2 check-ups (n=11)	1 check-up (n=24)	2 check-ups (n=15)	> 2 check-ups (n=11)
0.728×10 ⁶	1.054×10 ⁶	0.872×10 ⁶	529×10 ³	411×10 ³	868×10 ³
		Type of system check-ups	performed by technicians		
Full (n=50)		Partial (n=0)	Full (n=50)		Partial (n=0)
0.846×10^{6}		n/a	547×10 ³		n/a
		Water cleaning of parlour	after the milking sessions		
Yes (n=65)		No (n=1)	Yes (n=65)		No (n=1)
0.863×10 ⁶		0.785×10 ⁶	564×10 ³		959×10 ³
		Temperature of	cleaning water		
≤ 65 °C (n=26)		> 65 °C (n=40)	≤ 65 °C (n=26)		> 65 °C (n=40)
0.922×10 ⁶		0.825×10 ⁶	456×10 ³		657×10 ³
		Use of detergent for parlour clea	aning after the milking sessions		
Yes (n=65)		No (n=1)	Yes (n=65)		No (n=1)
0.869×10^{6}		0.485×10 ⁶	587×10 ³		695×10 ³
		Annual frequency of	f changing teatcups		
1 occasion (n=29)	Less frequ	ently than 1 occasion (n=37)	1 occasion (n=29)	Less frequ	ently than 1 occasion (n=37)
0.944×10 ⁶		0.802×10 ⁶	505×10 ³		624×10 ³
		Availability o	of milk tank		
	Not evaluated		Yes (n=103)		No (n=16)
	Notevaluateu		586×10 ³		553×10 ³
		Availability of mixe	er in the milk tank		
	Not avaluated		Yes (n=103)		No (n=16)
	Notevaluateu		586×10 ³		553×10 ³
		Temperature	in milk tank		
	Not avaluated		≤ 3.5 °C (n=54)		> 3.5 °C (n=49)
			562×10 ³		613×10 ³

Frequency of milk tank cleaning								
	Net confusted				Every two	days (n=56) 🛛 🛛 🛛	Every three days (n=3)	
	NOLEV	aluated		483×10 ³	659	×10 ³	1092×10 ³	
			Frequency of r	milk collection				
	Notov	lusted		Daily (n=37)	Every two	days (n=79) 🛛 🛛 🛛	Every three days (n=6)	
	NOLEV	aluated		615×10 ³	543	×10 ³	1035×10 ³	
			Grazing land b	by the animals				
≤ 0.50 ac. per animal	(n=17) 0.51-2.00 ac. pe	er animal (n=31) > 2.00	ac. per animal (n=71)	≤ 0.50 ac. per animal	(n=17) 0.51-2.00 ac. pe	er animal (n=31) > 2	.00 ac. per animal (n=71)	
0.781×10 ⁶	0.87	7×10 ⁶	0.836×10 ⁶	757×10 ³	721	×10 ³	497×10 ³	
			No. of goats	in the farm				
≤ 165 goats (n=56)	166-330 goats (n=37)	331-500 goats (n=13)	> 500 goats (n=13)	≤ 165 goats (n=56)	166-330 goats (n=37)	331-500 goats (n=13	3) > 500 goats (n=13)	
0.763×10 ⁶	0.916×10 ⁶	0.827×10 ⁶	0.996×10 ⁶		Supplementa	ary material 6		
			Breed o	of goats				
Greek breeds (n=	56) Imported br	eeds (n=45) Cr	oss-breeds (n=18)	Greek breeds (n=	56) Imported b	eeds (n=45)	Cross-breeds (n=18)	
0.927×10 ⁶	0.754	4×10 ⁶	0.799×10 ⁶	620×10 ³	694	×10 ³	305×10 ³	
			Average age o	f culling goats				
≤ 6 yea	rs (n=45)	> 6 year	rs (n=74)	≤ 6 years (n=45)		> 6 ye	> 6 years (n=74)	
0.91	7×10 ⁶	0.794	4×10 ⁶	674×10 ³		5	553×10 ³	
			Month of the start o	f the kidding season				
All year (n=8)	Autumn (n=62)	Winter (n=44)	Spring-Summer (n=5)	All year (n=8)	Autumn (n=62)	Winter (n=44)	Spring-Summer (n=5)	
0.517×10 ⁶	0.887×10 ⁶	0.835×10 ⁶	0.947×10 ⁶	615×10 ³	541×10 ³	628×10 ³	651×10 ³	
		Total milk qu	antity per goat obtained	d during the preceding i	milking period			
≤ 200 L (n=73)	201-400	L (n=32)	> 400 L (n=14)	≤ 200 L (n=73)	201-400	L (n=34)	> 400 L (n=12)	
0.793×10 ⁶	0.998	3×10 ⁶	0.719×10 ⁶	599×10 ³	664	×10 ³	365×10 ³	
			Total number of k	ids born per goat				
≤ 1.50	(n=102)	> 1.50	(n=17)	≤ 1.50	(n=102)	> 1.	50 (n=17)	
0.83	9×10 ⁶	0.836	5×10 ⁶	552	2×10 ³	7	87×10 ³	

		Collaboration w	ith a veterinarian		
Yes (n=101)		No (n=18)	Yes (n=101)		No (n=18)
0.838×10 ⁶		0.842×10 ⁶	573×10 ³		628×10 ³
	Use	of laboratory diagnostic examination	ations in samples of milk preventive	ly	
Yes (n=25)		No (n=94)	Yes (n=25)		No (n=94)
0.939×10 ⁶		0.814×10 ⁶	848×10 ³		526×10 ³
	Total visit	s made annually by veterinariar	ns to the farm during the preceding	season	
≤ 4 (n=51)	5-7 (n=25)	> 7 (n=43)	≤4 (n=51)	5-7 (n=25)	> 7 (n=43)
0.919×10 ⁶	0.787×10 ⁶	0.780×10 ⁶	602×10 ³	760×10 ³	476×10 ³
		Clinical mastit	is incidence risk		
≤ 0.50% (n=48)		> 0.50% (n=71)	≤ 0.50% (n=48)		> 0.50% (n=71)
0.750×10 ⁶		0.905×10 ⁶	617×10 ³		558×10 ³
	Nut	ritional modifications performed	d according to the reproductive stag	e	
Yes (n=68) No (n=51) Yes (n=68) > 2			> 2 months (n=51)		
0.909×10 ⁶		0.753×10 ⁶	573×10 ³		592×10 ³
		Age for kid remov	al from their dams		
< 45 (n=34)	45-60 (n=36)	> 60 (n=49)	< 45 (n=34)	45-60 (n=36)	> 60 (n=49)
0.709×10 ⁶	0.888×10 ⁶	0.903×10 ⁶	484×10 ³	629×10 ³	623×10 ³
		Daily number of	f milking sessions		
One (n=4)	Two (n=108)	Three (n=7)	One (n=4)	Two (n=108)	Three (n=7)
Sup	plementary material 6		421×10 ³	600×10 ³	428×10 ³
		Duration of t	he dry-period		
≤ 2 months (n=40)	:	> 2 months (n=79)	≤ 2 months (n=40)		> 2 months (n=79)
0.765×10 ⁶		0.879×10 ⁶	468×10 ³		646×10 ³
		Vaccination a	gainst mastitis		
Yes (n=35)		No (n=84)	Yes (n=35)		No (n=84)
0.919×10 ⁶		0.807 ×10 ⁶	732×10 ³		528 ×10 ³

Administ	ration of 'dry-ewe' treatment at	the end of the lactation period		
N	o (n=104)	Yes (n=15)		No (n=104)
0	.830×10 ⁶	651×10 ³		572×10 ³
	Use of teat disinfection	after milking		
N	o (n=107)	Yes (n=12)		No (n=107)
0	.837×10 ⁶	734×10 ³		566×10 ³
	Farmer's ag	e		
Over 5	0 years (n=46)	Up to 50 years (n=73)		Over 50 years (n=46)
0	.842×10 ⁶	709×10 ³		424×10 ³
	Length of animal farmin	g experience		
29 years (n=39)	> 30 years (n=56)	≤ 5 years (n=24)	6-29 years (n=39)	> 30 years (n=56)
0.876×10 ⁶	0.814×10 ⁶	610×10 ³	583×10 ³	568×10 ³
	Education of the	farmer		
Over se	condary (n=30)	Up to secondary (n=89)		Over secondary (n=30)
0	.751×10 ⁶	643×10 ³		431×10 ³
	Presence of working sta	ff in the farm		
N	lo (n=85)	Yes (n=34)		No (n=85)
0	.832×10 ⁶	640×10 ³		559×10 ³
	Administ N 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 years (n=39) 0.876×10 ⁶ Over se 0 N 0 0 N	Administration of 'dry-ewe' treatment at No (n=104) 0.830×10^6 Use of teat disinfection No (n=107) 0.837×10^6 Farmer's ag Over 50 years (n=46) 0.842×10^6 0.842×10^6 Length of animal farmin 29 years (n=39)> 30 years (n=56) 0.876×10^6 Education of the f Over secondary (n=30) 0.751×10^6 Presence of working sta No (n=85) 0.832×10^6	Administration of 'dry-ewe' treatment at the end of the lactation periodNo (n=104)Yes (n=15) 0.830×10^6 651×10^3 Use of teat disinfection after milkingUse of teat disinfection after milkingNo (n=107)Yes (n=12) 0.837×10^6 734×10^3 0.837×10^6 734×10^3 Over 50 years (n=46)Up to 50 years (n=73) 0.842×10^6 709×10^3 0.842×10^6 709×10^3 29 years (n=39)> 30 years (n=56) ≤ 5 years (n=24) 0.876×10^6 0.814×10^6 610×10^3 Education of the farmerCover secondary (n=30)Up to secondary (n=89) 0.751×10^6 643×10^3 Presence of working staff in the farmNo (n=85)Yes (n=34) 0.832×10^6 640×10^3	Administration of 'dry-ewe' treatment at the end of the lactation periodNo (n=104)Yes (n=15) 0.830×10^6 651×10^3 Use of teat disinfection after milkingUse of teat disinfection after milkingNo (n=107)Yes (n=12) 0.837×10^6 734×10^3 0.837×10^6 734×10^3 Farmer's ageOver 50 years (n=46)Up to 50 years (n=73) 0.842×10^6 709×10^3 Length of animal farming experience29 years (n=39)> 30 years (n=56) ≤ 5 years (n=24) $6-29$ years (n=39) 0.876×10^6 0.814×10^6 610×10^3 583×10^3 Education of the farmerEducation of the farmerPresence of working staff in the farmPresence of working staff in the farmNo (n=85)Yes (n=34) 0.832×10^6 640×10^3 Yes (n=34)

- 161 **Supplementary material 8.** Variables associated with increased somatic cell counts (> 0.75×10⁶ cells mL⁻¹)
- 162 (n=2 variables) or with increased total bacterial counts (> 1500×10^3 cfu mL⁻¹) (n=1 variable) in the bulk-tank
- 163 milk of 119 goat herds in Greece, as found in univariable analysis.

	Proportion of flocks	Odds ratio ²	
Variable	with increased SCC ¹	(95% confidence intervals	Р
Annual frequency of check-ups of			
the system by technicians			0.028
1 check-up (n=24)	0.458	reference	
2 check-ups (n=25)	0.867	7.682 (1.415-41.693)	0.01
>2 check-ups (n=11)	0.727	3.152 (0.668-14.863)	0.14
Daily number of milking sessions			0.024
One (n=4)	0.250	reference	
Two (n=108)	0.685	6.529 (0.655-65.084)	0.11
Three (n=7)	0.286	1.200 (0.073-19.634)	0.89
	Total bacterial co	ounts	
Variable	Proportion of flocks	Odds ratio ²	Р
	with increased TBC ³	(95% confidence intervals	-
Type of flow line			0.00
High line (n=43)	0.163	3.082 (0.158-59.997)	0.45
Low line (n=16)	0.500	15.000 (0.735-306.300)	0.07
Other type (n=7)	0.000	reference	

- 182 **Supplementary material 9.** Variables with *P* < 0.20 in the difference of their categories for increased somatic
- 183 cell counts (i.e., > 0.75×10⁶ cells mL⁻¹) (n=9 variables) or for increased total bacterial counts (i.e., > 1500×10³
- 184 cfu mL⁻¹) (n=8 variables) in the bulk-tank milk of 119 goat herds in Greece, as found in the univariable analysis,
- 185 which were then included in the multivariable analysis.

	Somatic cell counts
	Variables
	Availability of straw bedding
	Provision of feed during milking
	Annual frequency of check-ups of the system by technicians
	Use of detergent for parlour cleaning after the milking sessions
	Month of the start of the kidding season
	Total milk quantity per goat obtained during the preceding milking period
	Total visits made annually by veterinarians to the farm during the preceding season
	Daily number of milking sessions
	Duration of the dry-period
	Total bacterial counts
	Material of the floor of the milking parlour
	Type of milking parlour
	Availability of milk flow indicators
	Type of flow line
	Temperature of cleaning water
	No. of goats in the farm
	Use of table disinfaction ofter milling
106	
100	
187	
188	
100	
189	
190	
191	
101	
192	
193	
194	
195	
106	
107	
197	
198	
199	
200	
201	

- 202 Supplementary material 10. Variables (n=3) which were included in the final multivariable test for evaluation
- 203 for increased somatic cell counts (i.e., $> 0.75 \times 10^6$ cells mL⁻¹) in the bulk-tank milk of 119 goat herds in Greece.

١	Variables	Р
T	Temperature of cleaning water	0.096
ι	Use of laboratory diagnostic examinations in samples of milk preventively	0.20
ι	Use of teat disinfection after milking	0.19
204		

- 205
- 206
- 207