A REVIEW OF RECENT RESEARCH OUTCOMES ON THE HOUSING OF FARMED DOMESTIC RABBITS: REPRODUCING DOES
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Abstract: The housing of farmed animals is increasingly scrutinised by society and thereby subject to a change towards more animal-friendly systems. For rabbits, also kept as pets, there are no EC regulations regarding their housing under farming conditions. In many countries, studies have been carried out to improve their welfare and health under current and alternative housing systems. This paper reviews and integrates the research efforts made since the EFSA report in 2005 on reproducing rabbit does and provides some conclusions, where possible, with special emphasis on animal welfare according to the principles stated by the Welfare Quality® project, i.e. good housing, good health and appropriate behaviour. The use of an elevated platform provides greater opportunities for does and their kits to move, jumping up and down. Management and housing systems (especially flooring) must guarantee good hygienic conditions (all-in, all-out) and separation of the rabbits from their excreta for proper resting places, hygiene and health. Plastic floors and footrests and environmental enrichments (e.g. gnawing material) are also recommended. Continuous group housing systems for reproducing females have been definitively proven to challenge animal welfare by increased aggression and injuries among does and to kits. Part-time group housing systems have proven to have potential, but cannot yet be recommended in farms until major problems of aggression and injuries among animals are solved.
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rabbits which, compared to other farmed animals, are more likely to provoke strong emotional arguments in the public opinion because they are also widely used as pets.

In the absence of EU directives, some member countries have drafted their own legislation or recommendations on the housing of farmed rabbits (The Netherlands, 2006; Hungary, 2009; Hoy, 2012; Belgium, 2014; Germany, 2014). Some countries have already opted for the abolition of cage housing systems (with small group sizes) and a gradual transition is sustained towards rearing systems with larger groups of animals kept in open-top elevated pens, also called park systems, with platforms and slatted floors (Maertens, 2017). Others (Italy) have issued guidelines to guarantee welfare of rabbits kept for farming purposes (Italian Ministry of Health, 2014). Finally, in March 2017, the European Parliament approved a resolution aimed at promoting the change from conventional cage systems to alternative housing systems respectful of animal welfare (European Parliament, 2017).

However, in order to ensure the rational development of rabbit farms and the adoption of alternative animal-friendly production systems, common management practices as well as minimum standards for the housing of rabbit does and their kits during the entire reproduction and production cycle must be developed in accordance with available scientific results.

In 2005, an independent EFSA scientific opinion on the current impact of housing and husbandry on health and welfare was published, based on the latest available scientific data and literature (EFSA, 2005). Based on this detailed and multi-faceted report, EFSA recommendations for housing, management and future research were drawn up. Since then, several studies have been performed and reviews on this topic published (Trocino and Xiccato, 2006; Hoy and Verga, 2007; Szendrő and Dalle Zotte, 2011; Szendrő and McNitt, 2012; Hoy and Matics, 2016; Szendrő et al., 2016a; Turner et al., 2017). However, the research results available were obtained under a great variety of farming and management conditions (farm organisation, housing systems and dimensions, animal genetics, reproductive rhythms, slaughter age and weight, etc.). Nevertheless, as for other farmed species, the farm sizes are increasing and alternatives to current housing systems should be evaluated in a production context consistent with the economic sustainability of farmers.

Thus, this review integrates literature already available at the time of the first EFSA opinion (2005) with research subsequently published at scientific congresses and journals concerning the housing of rabbit does being reared in farms for meat production. Special attention has been given to factors related to the housing systems (in terms of enclosures, equipment, and individual/collective housing) which could affect animal welfare with special emphasis on good housing, good health and appropriate behaviour (consistently with three out of the four principles stated by the Welfare Quality® project; good feeding was not considered, being deemed not at risk under standard production conditions). The aim is to use available results to draw conclusions, when possible, regarding plausible alternatives beyond dispute for improving housing and management systems.

**HOUSING AND EQUIPMENT**

**Current housing**

In commercial farms, reproducing does are exclusively housed in wire cages together with their offspring until the age of weaning. In a large majority of specialised farms, cages are predominantly “dual purpose”, i.e. for reproducing does and for fattening after weaning, which permits the all-in, all-out approach, as well as cleaning and disinfection for the following incoming reproduction cycle. These cages are equipped with a feeder, a nipple drinker and a nest area.

More recently, an increasing number of new or renovated farms have been using the so-called “WRSA cages”, i.e. enriched cages equipped with elevated platforms and plastic footrests, sometimes provided with environmental enrichment (gnawing material). They also have a higher height than standard cages (Hoy and Matics, 2016).

Restocking does, but not pregnant does, are usually housed in small cages for a brief period before entering the batch production management system. Standard cages for reproducing does have the shortest side at 38 cm, a height of 30 cm and a minimum total surface of about 3000 cm² (EFSA, 2005). In some countries, cages with a width of 46 cm are also used as standard. Enriched cages and pen/park systems have a total available surface ranging from about 4400 to 6400 cm² per doe. An overview of dimensions for the different housing systems is presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Overview of the dimensions of the most common housing systems used in Europe for rearing of young females or lactating does with litter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing System</th>
<th>Width (cm)</th>
<th>Length (cm)</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Total available surface (cm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young or non-pregnant female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1710-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactating doe: basic standard models</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87-102</td>
<td>32-35</td>
<td>3300-3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactating doe: wider versions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95-102</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4370-4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactating doe: enriched cages with wire-mesh platform</td>
<td>38-46</td>
<td>95-102</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>4370-5600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactating doe: enriched cages with plastic-mesh platform</td>
<td>46-52.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65-80</td>
<td>5600-6400*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen/Park systems (4 does) with plastic-mesh platform</td>
<td>180-200</td>
<td>95-102</td>
<td>Open-top</td>
<td>Total: 21600-25400c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per doe: 5400-6350c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Oldest models may be 75 cm in length.

bThe nest area is included.

cThe platform surface is included.

Cage dimensions

Regarding cage size for reproducing does, the 3 dimensions may affect animal welfare differently in terms of the possibility of providing good housing for movement and resting. Length and width firstly determine the available surface for rabbit movement and resting, whereas height may affect general movement possibilities and some specific behaviours of rabbits, like rearing up on their hind legs. Indeed, limitation in surface available for movement may cause mental distress such as boredom, frustration and stereotypical behaviour (Verga et al., 2007), as well as developmental and skeletal abnormalities.

Initial studies on housing of reproducing does showed that housing in small and low-height cages was associated with deformation of the vertebral column in reproducing does (Drescher, 1996). In this study, according to the authors, the low height of conventional cages (<32 cm) forced the animals to adopt a prolonged flat-sitting position and was likely to provoke a systemic hypoplasia of bone tissues, as well as a caudal dislocation of the body gravity centre due to the weight of the pregnant uterus. In fact, Buijs et al. (2014) found no effect of dimensions of the housing system on spinal deformations occurrence in does kept in systems with little/no limitation in height, i.e. individual cages (3952 cm²/doe, maximum roof height 63 cm) vs. semi-group housing system (5000 cm²/doe, roofless). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, no welfare problem in terms of pain or decreased mobility associated with the occurrence and degree of spinal deformities has been reported in literature on farmed rabbits.

On the other hand, higher faecal corticosterone levels were measured in reproducing does kept in standard cages compared to those kept in double-size cages (83×38×32 cm vs. 113×46×46 cm), which could be related to differences in the stress level (Prola et al., 2013). However, the results of this study cannot be conclusive regarding the effect of cage size on rabbit stress, as the large cages were also equipped with plastic foot mats, whose presence is known to increase doe health and welfare by decreasing the occurrence of ulcerative sore hocks (Rosell and de la Fuente, 2009b; Buijs et al., 2014).

Few studies have investigated the budget time of reproducing does under housing systems with different available space. Effects on animal behavioural pattern, especially movement and resting, are often confounded due to other experimental factors, such as individual vs. group housing or physiological state or time of recording (Bignon et al., 2012; Alfonso-Carrilho et al., 2014; Buijs et al., 2015). Moreover, to our knowledge, no studies on characterization of the locomotion activities of reproducing does are available which could be useful to design housing systems.

Indeed, rabbit does spend most of their time in stationary behaviours (Alfonso-Carrilho et al., 2014; Rommers et al., 2014; Buijs et al., 2015) and have been observed to hop or run for a very low amount of time both in smaller individual systems (0.11 to 0.25% of total observation time; Buijs et al., 2015) and in larger semi-group systems (0.17 to 1.41% of total observation time at 12 d after group formation, Buijs et al., 2015; 2% of total observation time at 4 d after group formation, Rommers et al., 2014). Nevertheless, in the case of young does (from 11 wk of age until weaning of their first litter), their activity (including standing, sitting, and moving) significantly increased...
(8.3 vs. 12.2% and 15.9%; $P<0.001$) and lying time decreased (63.8 vs. 57.5% and 52.0%; $P<0.05$) from standard cages (25×46×28.5 cm) to wider cages (intermediate size, 33×68.5×40 cm or large size: 38×90×60 cm with a platform of 35×25 cm at 30 cm height) (Bignon et al., 2012). Locomotion also increases (until 5% of observation time) in a part-time system on the first day of group formation because of behaviour related to installation of the hierarchy among the does (Buijs et al., 2015).

In wider cages, does also increased the time spent resting with the body completely extended, whereas in higher cages they were able to stand upright (Rommers and Meijerhof, 1998).

Negretti et al. (2010) observed that the most frequent postures adopted by adult rabbits do not require more than 40 cm height: animals stood below this height in 99.5% of observations (45000 recordings over 10 animals during 1 wk). Standing up on the hind legs is the only behaviour requiring no limitation in height, but it is an exploratory or alert behaviour. In fact, rabbits display rearing when placed in a novel environment, such as when moved from a standard cage to a flux chamber (Olivas et al., 2013) or when submitted to the open field test (Meijesser et al., 1989). The motivation for standing up under farming conditions may be related to an alert behaviour due to any visual stimulus (e.g. human presence) or noise.

Finally, previous research also showed that doe performance is not affected by cage size (Rommers and Meijerhof, 1998; Mirabito et al., 1999).

**Nest box**

A nest box or nesting area in the cage should be provided for reproducing rabbit does. Most does nurse their kits only once a day during 3-4 min (Hoy et al., 2000) and therefore the nest box has to be primarily comfortable for survival of the young. To our knowledge, there is no published literature concerning the optimal dimensions of the nest box or nesting area, but farm data confirm that in practice good results are obtained with standard commercial nests measuring minimal 25×35 cm.

At birth, kits are hairless and huddle together in the fur-lined nest for thermoregulation. The optimal temperatures determined in the nest are around 38°C at birth and 30°C at 14 d of age (Hull et al., 1986). Proper and abundant nesting material is first required for their comfort, as the nest quality plays an important role on the survival of kits (Hamilton et al., 1997). The lack of a proper nest increases mortality rates in both wild and domestic rabbits (Canali et al., 1991).

Wild rabbits collect dried straw and other plant material and pluck hair from their body for nest building (Hudson et al., 2000). In rabbit farms, wood shavings, hay and straw are commonly used according to the farmer’s convenience and habits (Blumetto et al., 2010). Based on the existing literature, all these materials comply with the health and welfare of does and kits. In fact, several nest materials have been tested (wood shavings, barley, wheat and rice straw, meadow and Tifton hay, chopped newspaper) without effects on kit mortality in most experiments (Mahmoud and Tulip, 2004; Blumetto et al., 2010; Oliveira et al., 2014; Farkas et al., 2017). However, in preference tests, does showed preferences between the different nesting materials: straw > hay > wood shavings (Farkas et al., 2018), which also deserves further investigation in terms of litter comfort, mortality and performance.

Nest boxes are usually equipped with a door (full closure) for controlled nursing (i.e. once-a-day nursing) during the first part of lactation. In fact, during the first 12 d of their life, kits only suckle and sleep (Hudson and Distel, 1982). Does may disturb their sleep when entering the nest box more frequently; moreover, a frightened doe jumping into the nest may scatter or even trample her kits, causing considerable harm. Thus, controlled nursing allows us to overcome these problems: does have access to the nest box only once a day for some minutes in the morning hours, while the remainder of the day the nest boxes are closed (Szendró et al., 1999).

Controlled nursing is not contrary to doe rabbit natural behaviour, as the large majority of wild and domesticated does nurse their kits only once a day and the nursing time is very short (Hoy et al., 2000, EFSA, 2005; González-Mariscal et al., 2007).

In practice, free or controlled nursing is applied in the different rabbit farms according to farmer habits, whereas controversial results about its effects on kits are available in the literature. Pizzi and Crimella (1985) found no
significant differences between the 2 systems, while Costantini et al. (1986) observed higher mortality of kits under controlled nursing. According to Coureaud et al. (1998), the controlled nursing was more favourable during the first 3-5 d after parturition, whereas free nursing was advantageous later on. On the contrary, Szendrő et al. (1999) found that free nursing was advantageous in the first 7 d of lactation.

**Flooring**

Under farming conditions, rabbits have been kept until now almost exclusively on wire-mesh flooring, which guarantees good hygienic conditions due to the separation from their droppings. Nevertheless, on wire floors, and in contrast with fattening rabbits, sore hocks (pododermatitis) are frequently observed in does (Rosell and de la Fuente, 2013). Because of the does’ weight and the long-time living in cages or pens on wire-mesh floor, sore hocks could be very frequent (De Jong et al., 2008; Rosell and de la Fuente, 2009b). Ulcerative pododermatitis causes chronic pain and suffering (Rosell and de la Fuente, 2013) as well as doe culling (Rosell and de la Fuente, 2009a).

The use of a plastic footrest (25×40 cm) on wire-mesh floor significantly decreases the incidence of ulcerative sore hocks in reproducing does (De Jong et al., 2008; Rosell and de la Fuente, 2009b; Rommers and De Jong, 2011; Mikó et al., 2014). Similarly, the presence of plastic platforms and/or plastic-slatted flooring decreases sore hock problems and improves doe welfare conditions (Rosell and de la Fuente, 2009b; Buijs et al., 2014; Mikó et al., 2014) (Table 2). In contrast, under alternative systems based on collective housing in parks with litter on the floor or on plastic slats combined with plastic platforms, 25% of does have ulcerative pododermatitis on at least one hind leg (Ruchti et al., 2018). Both flooring materials could provoke unhygienic or more humid conditions which favour the development of sore hocks.

**Table 2: Prevalence of ulcerative pododermatitis in reproducing does kept under housing systems with different flooring.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Prevalence (% of does)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosell et al. (2000)</td>
<td>1986-1996</td>
<td>103,968 does in commercial farms</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis: 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,987 bucks in commercial farms</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis: 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosell and de la Fuente (2013)</td>
<td>2001-2012</td>
<td>105,009 does in commercial farms</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.87±0.26 (with footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.71±0.32 (without footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rommers and De Jong (2011)</td>
<td>at 5th kindling</td>
<td>250 does in 5 commercial farms (50 per farm)</td>
<td>non-ulcerative and ulcerative pododermatitis: 18.7% (with footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.7% (without footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosell and De la Fuente (2009b)</td>
<td>until 5th kindling</td>
<td>224 does in 1 commercial farm</td>
<td>accumulated incidence of ulcerative pododermatitis: 15.1% (with footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5% (without footrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>curative effect of footrest in 81.3% of affected does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikó et al. (2014)</td>
<td>at 5th kindling</td>
<td>108 does</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis: 48% in wire cages without footrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% in wire cages with footrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% in pens with wire-mesh platform and footrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% in pens with plastic platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buijs et al. (2014)</td>
<td>at 5th kindling</td>
<td>72 does</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis: 0% in all groups small (28.6% of all does) and large (11.4%) hyperkeratosis area and cracked callus (1.4%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65% in wire pens with plastic mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% in plastic-slatted pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68% in wire floor cages with plastic mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruchti et al. (2018)</td>
<td>June-September 2016</td>
<td>1090 does (=30% of total Switzerland group housed does) in 17 farms that used floor pens with litter</td>
<td>ulcerative pododermatitis: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hyperkeratosis and scaling: 68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As regards behaviour, Buijs et al. (2015) found no differences in the behaviour and aggression of reproducing does kept in collective pens with different flooring (wire-net with plastic mats vs. plastic-slatted). Differently, Zomeño et al. (2018) observed lower aggression with plastic-slatted floor than with wire-net floors covered with plastic mats, which was difficult to explain, as floor type did not exert any effect on does’ performance and health. Similarly, other studies showed no effects of floor type on performance of does kept in individual cages or in part-time collective systems across multiple reproductive cycles, when comparing wire-net with plastic mats vs. plastic-slatted floor (Maertens and Buijs, 2013, 2016a) or wire-net vs. plastic-mesh platforms (Mikó et al., 2014).

Undoubtedly, the flooring design is a key factor for rabbit comfort and cage hygiene. Petersen et al. (2000) observed that on a slatted floor with a large distance between slats (16 mm) rabbit does avoided orientation parallel to the slat position and preferred to position themselves crosswise to the slats, and squatted significantly more frequently than when slat distance was small (10 mm).

**Environmental enrichments**

Environmental enrichments serve both to enrich the barren environment and to fulfil species-specific behaviours like exploring, hiding, hopping and gnawing in the case of rabbits (EFSA, 2005; Trocino and Xiccato, 2006), as well as to reduce aggression in case of animals housed collectively (Verga et al., 2007; van de Weerd and Day, 2009). In this regard, compared to breeder does kept for farming purposes, more studies have researched the effect of different types of enrichment in adult rabbits housed under laboratory conditions, as well as in growing rabbits under farming conditions; these results could provide useful information.

Domestic rabbits kept in individual laboratory cages did not appear motivated to use enrichment elements allowing hiding, e.g. boxes, as they spent most of the time (more than 800 min during 1 d) above rather than inside the box (less than 20 min) (Hansen and Berthelsen, 2000). On the other hand, the presence of hiding places (such as plastic tubes or platforms) hardly reduced the frequency of severe injuries in the case of reproducing does kept in part-time collective systems (Rommers et al., 2014a).

**Platforms or second level**

Compared to other types of enrichment, platforms in rabbit housing systems have been tested more extensively and deserve special attention. Under laboratory conditions, rabbits are motivated to gain access to a platform or any second level (Lidford, 1997; Seaman et al., 2008). Under farming conditions, the inclusion of elevated platforms in high or open-top cages/pens for rabbit does increases space availability (±25%) compared to flat-deck cages, but both advantages and disadvantages are claimed.

Undoubtedly, among advantages, the platform provides more opportunities for movement and exercise (jumping up and off) due to the increased functional area (Maertens et al., 2011). The rabbits can freely choose between staying on, under (safety part) or in front of the platform (highest part of the cage). It also offers mothers the possibility of escaping from their kits once they leave the nest box (Mirabito et al., 1999). Nevertheless, some authors found that does spend more time on the platform when kits begin to leave the nest box (14-16 d of age), but then does spend more time on the bottom level when kits are 3 wk old and start to jump up onto the platform (Mirabito et al., 1999, 2004; Mikó et al., 2014).

Regarding disadvantages, daily health checking may be more difficult because animals are less visible below the platform and catching them might require more time. Moreover, according to Cervera et al. (2018a), in individual cages, the presence of a wire-net platform significantly impaired cage hygiene (dirty does) and animal health (higher rate of does affected by dermatophytoses and footpad injuries) compared to conventional cages. The impairment of hygiene conditions and sanitary status was confirmed by the same research group when comparing standard individual cages with part-time collective housing systems where does used the upper side of the nest box as a platform (Cervera et al., 2018b). The authors reported that faeces accumulated on this type of platform, which increased animal dirtiness. These observations confirm the importance of the correct location and design of the elevated platform.
On the other hand, no effects (Mirabito, 2002, 2003; Cervera et al., 2018a) or limited advantages (Barge et al., 2008; Mikó et al., 2014) of platform inclusion have been described on doe and kits performance. Finally, Mikó et al. (2014) observed that does preferred a plastic-mesh platform over a wire-mesh platform (56.9% chose plastic, 31.7% chose wire). The same trend was measured in kits at 28 d of age: more kits (33.2%) used a plastic-mesh platform than a wire-mesh platform (5.2%).

Other types of enrichments

As regards environmental enrichments allowing gnawing behaviour, once again, many studies have been performed in fatteners, whereas less information is available in adult rabbits. Generally speaking, the early research works have not clearly proven the animal preference for a particular object (straw, cans, wooden objects), nor a real improvement of animal welfare (López et al., 2004; Carrilho et al., 2005; María et al., 2005).

However, more recently, Maertens et al. (2013) tested three different gnawing blocks (wood mash, wood mash+chicory pulp and wood mash+inulin syrup) as cage enrichment and feed supplement for reproducing does kept in individual cages. The presence of gnawing blocks did not affect cage manipulations such as biting on the wire walls, but significantly increased does’ active behaviours (locomotion and intake) and decreased the number of visits into the nest box, which was positively considered. The block use and consumption did not decrease over time, which indicated that the blocks fulfil an animal behavioural requirement, i.e. gnawing. Wood mash blocks were more used and consumed than the other blocks. However, because of some negative effects on doe and litter performance, chicory pulp blocks should be preferred to wood mash ones.

Likewise, Rommers et al. (2014b) did not find significant differences in normal or abnormal behaviours when comparing rabbit does kept in barren cages or in cages enriched with different sticks (pinewood stick, straw in a plastic bin, compressed wooden block, combination of straw and pinewood stick). The does used straw and wooden blocks for gnawing and chewing, whereas they showed little interest for the pine stick (0.1% of observed time, perhaps due to its resin content).

GROUP HOUSING SYSTEMS

Group living in wild rabbits

European wild rabbits live in groups in a burrow system (Cowan, 1987) in order to reduce predation risk (many eyes, alarm signals with hind legs, running in zigzag, cooperative construction of warrens) (Cowan, 1987; Szendrő and McNitt, 2012) and this fact determines their social needs. Predation threat favours group living (König, 1997; Ebensperger and Wallern, 2002) and the group formation in rabbits has been related to defence (Villafuerte and Moreno, 1997). Nevertheless, wild rabbits have been described both as solitary and gregarious (Wheeler et al., 1981; Cowan, 1987) and, in this latter case, the group size depends on how the field is covered by scrub and the extent of the predation risk (Villafuerte and Moreno, 1997). Moreover, does living in groups with more than one female have a shorter lifetime and less reproductive success than those that live with males only (Cowan, 1987). In fact, aggressive behaviour and fighting among wild rabbits are well-known (Mykytowycz, 1958; von Holst et al., 1999); double kindling in the same nest and infanticides, high stress hormone levels and low productivity have been reported as a consequence (von Holst et al., 2002; Rödel et al., 2004, 2008).

Continuous group-housing in farms

Many studies have been performed on the housing of rabbit does in a continuous group-housing system. The so-called Stauffacher system (Stauffacher, 1992) used eight females together with a male. The results of this small scale experiment were promising, but were never confirmed either in experiments or in the field. Studies of continuous group-housing systems showed several problems and no acceptable results were obtained with respect to either welfare of does and kits or productive performance. The main reasons for the failure of this housing system are the very high rates of aggression among females and injured does and competition for nesting space (Andrist et al.,...
Moreover, such a housing system is not compatible with the current batch management system, which is widely used in farmed rabbits (Maertens et al., 2011; Hoy and Matics, 2016).

In collective systems, reproductive performance decreases due to high rates of pseudopregnancy (Rommers et al., 2006; Mugnai et al., 2009; Andrist et al., 2013). Moreover, kit mortality is very high because of competition among does for nests, aggressions towards kits and kindling of 2 or 3 does in the same nest box (Mirabito et al., 2005; Hoy and Matics, 2016; Szendrő et al., 2016b; Hoy et al., 2017). Likewise, a very high number of attacks (Szendrő et al., 2016) and mating attempts between does (Gerencsér et al., 2016) have been observed. Decreased sanitary status, higher culling and shorter lifespan have also been reported (Andrist et al., 2013; Szendrő et al., 2013) Table 3).

To tackle these problems, Ruis (2006) used a special individual electronic nest box recognition system, allowing a doe to have access only to her own nest box. Although survival rate of young was improved, the pseudopregnancy rate was still high, kindling rate and weaning weight remained low, and very high rates of aggression and injured does were reported (Rommers et al., 2006). Buhl et al. (2015) tested a system which consisted of four single areas and

Table 3: Comparison of some welfare indicators of single-caged and group housed rabbit does.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group characteristics</th>
<th>Individually housed females</th>
<th>Group housed females</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate of does</td>
<td>4 does and 1 buck/pen, after 200 d</td>
<td>71-81%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive interactions</td>
<td>4 does and 1 buck/pen, during the 1st month</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>3.6-5.1/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does/pen regrouped 8 d before kindling</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27.5 during 12 h of observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does/pen regrouped 2 d after kindling</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>66.9 during 12 h of observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured does</td>
<td>4 does/pen, during rearing</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 does/pen</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>16.8-21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swiss farms with different systems (generally 8 does/group)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>33% (9% severe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does/pen regrouped 18 d after kindling</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>91.7 and 75.0% of does in pens with plastic floor and wire-net, respectively, at the 4th cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does/pen regrouped 2 d after kindling</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>34, 47, 13, 13% and 10% at 3, 10, 17, 24 and 32 d after regrouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 does/pen regrouped 23 d after kindling</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>34 and 53% at 4 d after regrouping and at weaning, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress hormones level</td>
<td>4 does and 1 buck/pen, corticosterone in faeces, nmol/g</td>
<td>54-61</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 does/pen, progesterone concentration (0.7 ng/mL)</td>
<td>100% low</td>
<td>23.9% high (5.7 ng/mL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 doe kindled into the same nest box</td>
<td>4 does/pen</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>31.3% (2 does) 6.3% (3 does)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does and 1 buck/pen</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.7% (2 does)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality of kits</td>
<td>4 does/pen</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 does/pen, natural mating</td>
<td>5.2-8.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 does/pen, AI</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does and 1 buck/pen</td>
<td>14.0-15.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 does/pen, combination of individual cage with common area</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a.: not available.
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Farkas et al. (2017) observed non-pregnant does housed in 1.83×2.00 m open-top pen containing 4 individual modules (0.5×0.91 m), which were connected to a common area (1.83×1.00 m) through a 0.25 m-long and 0.20 m-wide lockable corridor. At the beginning of the experiment, the does were placed individually in the closed modules (4 does/pen) for 3 d, to get used to their own site. After the adaptation period, the cage doors were opened to allow the does to move freely. The experiment lasted for 14 d. The frequency of mutual mating attempts was high until the end of the experiment. High frequencies of injured rabbits were also observed in the whole experimental period and in consequence this alternative group housing system failed to overcome the aforementioned problems.

Semi-group (part-time) housing in farms

More recently, semi-group (part-time) housing systems have been proposed (Maertens et al., 2011) and are currently under study in different countries. In these systems, does are housed in small groups, usually from around 18 d of lactation till weaning (i.e. 3 wk of collective housing), and individually from a few days before the following kindling till around day 18 of lactation (i.e. 3 wk of individual housing). Moreover, in contrast with continuous group-housing systems, females are artificially inseminated on the same day using a batch management system (Maertens and Buijs, 2013, 2015, 2016b; Buijs et al., 2014; Hoy and Matics, 2016; Cervera et al., 2017; Zomeño et al., 2017).

The few available studies show that under these systems the reproductive performance of does may be comparable with those under individual housing, even if litter and kit performance may be negatively affected (Maertens and Buijs, 2013, 2015, 2016b, 2016c; Maertens and Debie, 2017). Cervera et al. (2017) also reported lower litter size and weight at weaning in a part-time group housing system compared to individual cage housing, whereas Machado et al. (2016) observed an opposite trend.

Nevertheless, aggression, fighting and injured rabbits after each regrouping remain an unsolved problem. Although agonistic interactions decreased very rapidly after grouping (4 does with kits) at day 18 post parturition, Buijs et al. (2015) observed skin lesions in many does (58% showed slight lesions and 20% more severe lesions) on the 4th day after grouping. The loss of kits was much lower than in continuous group housing systems, whereas no loss of females was observed (Maertens and Buijs, 2016b, 2016c).

Different strategies (platform, plastic pipe, hiding place, straw, territory, dark corridor, group stability, regrouped into home or new pen, sprayed odours) have been tested without great success in reducing aggression at regrouping and consequent injuries which may affect up to 60% of does (Graf et al., 2011; Rommers et al., 2011, 2013, 2014a; Andrist et al., 2012, 2013, 2014; Buijs et al., 2015). A combined system with four individual modules and a common area has also been tested by Gerencsér et al. (2018): 18 d after kindling, the entrances of the individual modules were opened and a 21-d group-housing started. The ratio of injured rabbits was higher than 50%. It reached the highest peak on day 2, but remained high for many days in some pens. Indeed, aggressive interactions decreased on some days (Rommers et al., 2011; Andrist et al., 2012) or even a few hours after group formation (Maertens and Buijs, 2016b; Zomeño et al., 2017). In fact, also in other farmed animal species, the establishing of hierarchy in a group is always a critical point (sow: Mount and Seabrook, 1993; Hoy and Bauer 2005; Elmore et al., 2010; Hemsworth et al., 2013; laying hen: Gvaryahu et al., 1994; D’Eath and Keeling, 2003; Johansson et al., 2015).

The time of group formation (first days after kindling, early or late lactation) has a great influence on the aggression level among does (Zomeño et al., 2017, 2018). In the case of late lactation, does may be less stressed because more time has passed since kindling and the presence of the kits out of nest boxes may positively modulate female to female aggression (Zomeño et al., 2017). Nevertheless, Rommers and De Greef (2018) found that the percentage of injured does in a part-time system with 5 does increased from 34% measured 4 d after group formation (23 d of lactation) to 53% at litter weaning (36 d) (Table 3).

The little information concerning the group size that is available also shows a significant negative effect of the increase of female group size on aggressiveness (Buijs et al., 2016; Zomeño et al., 2017).
CONCLUSIONS

The above literature review summarises the main scientific knowledge on the impact of housing systems on health and welfare of reproducing rabbit does in order to design reliable and feasible alternatives.

Regarding cage height, the rearing of does for their entire reproductive life in cages lower than 40 cm may challenge their skeletal development and is not advisable. Higher or roofless cages would permit does to freely stand up on hind legs, even if under standard and controlled farming conditions the motivation to display this behaviour is very low.

Plastic flooring with proper design or wire flooring partially covered with a plastic footrest or platform should be preferred to cages/pens with exclusively wire-net flooring or with full floors covered with litter.

Platforms have beneficial effects offering animals more options for movement. However, their materials (wire or plastic) and design (wire-net size and plastic slats dimensions; platform height and position inside the cage) require careful evaluation before adoption in farms on a large scale to tackle disadvantages linked to animal coat soiling and to guarantee safe hygienic conditions. Because of rabbit interest in gnawing, the presence of wooden sticks or blocks is also recommended, provided that enrichments do not deteriorate hygienic conditions within the housing system.

Research findings concerning continuous group housing of reproducing does definitively show that levels of aggression and injuries associated with continuous group housing dramatically decrease welfare and performance of does and kits. This system thus cannot be recommended under commercial conditions.

Part-time group housing systems have shown some potential, but their adoption under farming conditions cannot yet be recommended due to the aggression level and, consequently, the rate of injured does measured after each regrouping, which severely challenges animal welfare and health. Before any change can be proposed, robust research is necessary to determine the optimal strategies and management techniques, as well as pen design and equipment for a safe establishment and maintenance of hierarchies, in order to limit harmful and painful behaviours among does reared collectively in a closed environment such as a cage or pen.

European collaboration in research is urgently needed to design, jointly and based on different expertise and competences, both housing and management systems which could improve animal welfare and health of rabbits kept under farming conditions.
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