

Common Questions on the Better Chicken Commitment (BCC)

Updated April 2021

Are the components of the [Better Chicken Commitment](#) (BCC) rooted in science?

Absolutely. Each element of the broiler welfare improvement ask reflects the most recent peer-reviewed published research in animal welfare science. Below, we have summarized the main scientific findings that ground each aspect of the ask. A comprehensive list of references can be found at the end of this document.

- **Higher welfare breeds:** It is well established in the scientific literature that selective breeding for performance traits, such as faster growth rates, greater breast meat yields, and lower feed conversion, are responsible for the majority of the health and welfare issues experienced by industry-standard broiler chickens. Specifically, these issues include higher mortality rates,^{1,2} a greater incidence of cardiovascular disorders (*i.e.*, ascites and sudden death syndrome (SDS)),³ as well as more leg weakness and a higher incidence of breast blisters and skin lesions.⁴⁻⁶ Additionally, breeding solely for greater white meat yields and weight gain has resulted in the appearance of serious degenerative conditions in the breast muscles, or breast meat myopathies (BBM), which includes wooden (woody) breast, white striping, and spaghetti meat.⁷ These conditions not only represent downgrades in meat quality, but research indicates birds with wooden breast have chronic tissue inflammation from the first week of age – along with poorer walking abilities, impaired wing movement, and a higher incidence of pulmonary disease and mortality.⁸⁻¹⁰

Fast growth rates are often singled out as the single cause of poorer welfare outcomes in broiler breeding. However, the potential for higher welfare is not only related to a reduced growth rate, but also to meaningful improvements in several important physical and behavioral animal-based welfare outcomes. These outcomes include better leg health, proportional organ and skeletal development, improved robustness to immune and thermal challenges, and the ability to remain active and express normal behavioral patterns throughout their lives. Therefore, genetic selection that focuses on higher welfare, rather than primarily production goals, must be prioritized. (Further information is available in our resource, [Choosing Breeds with Higher Welfare Outcomes](#))

Broilers bred for higher health and welfare outcomes have been observed to engage in more highly-motivated natural behaviors, including perching, walking, foraging, and ground scratching.^{1,11,12} When grown to 9 weeks of age, chickens with slow-to-intermediate growth rates continue to spend ~40% of their daily time perching. In

contrast, the time spent perching by industry-standard broiler strains has been shown to decline to roughly 10% around six weeks of age.¹¹⁻¹³ Studies have shown that broilers selected for improved physical and behavioral outcomes are more active (35-55% of total observation time),^{1,12} spending more time walking¹¹ and less time resting on the litter throughout their lives. Alternatively, fast-growing broilers may spend as little as 7% of their time actively moving (*i.e.*, walking, running, or foraging).¹ Higher welfare chickens also exhibit more comfort behaviors (*e.g.*, dust-bathing, preening, leg and wing stretching) indicative of a more positive welfare status.¹

In the past year, several new research studies have added further evidence demonstrating the current industry-standard breeds suffer from worse health and behavioral expression than strains bred for higher welfare outcomes. An independent study funded by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) '[Eat. Sit. Suffer. Repeat. The Life of a Typical Meat Chicken](#)' compared the scheme's slow-growing control breed (JA757) with the three most commercially-prevalent fast-growing breeds (Cobb 500, Ross 308, and Hubbard Flex).¹⁴ RSPCA In comparison to the JA757, the industry-standard breeds had much higher mortalities and cull rates for lameness, poorer walking abilities, more painful hock lesions, a greater incidence of BMMs, and much lower activity levels with very little expression of perching or comfort behaviors.

Soon after, the highly-anticipated initial findings of the '[In Pursuit of a Better Broiler](#)' project from the University of Guelph, funded by Global Animal Partnership (G.A.P.), was released in Fall 2020.¹⁵ This research compared 16 currently-available chicken strains at similar weights and ages. Breeds were categorized as industry-standard (conventional), fast, moderate, or slow-growing based on their daily growth rates. The extensive physical and behavioral testing showed the conventional breeds had a significantly higher incidence of BMMs, higher levels of biochemical markers indicating muscle damage, lower activity levels, used enrichments less, and showed poorer mobility due to physical incapability, in contrast to the breeds with slower growth rates. The conventional strains also had a greater incidence of painful lesions to their foot pads – even when lighter on average and two weeks younger than the slower-growing breeds.

Additionally in 2020, the results from a large-scale commercial study¹⁶ were released comparing the welfare outcomes of three broiler breeds: a commonly-used fast, an intermediate, and a slow-growing strain, in barns of approx. 12,000 birds under different final stocking densities. Like the RSPCA and University of Guelph studies, this research showed that the current industry-standard strains also suffer poorer welfare in commercial settings. Unlike the slower growing breeds, the industry-standard strain had significantly higher mortality rates, greater carcass rejections at slaughter, worse leg health, and spent considerably less time ground scratching, playing, and sitting on top of the straw bale enrichment. More detailed analysis and further highlights from these three studies can be found in our [2020 ChickenTrack report](#).

Businesses that commit to the BCC should select broiler strains based on their

comprehensive performance on several health and behavioral parameters in order to achieve balanced selection for breeds that truly demonstrate higher welfare outcomes. In addition to breeds approved by the RSPCA Broiler Breed Welfare Assessment Protocol, G.A.P. will release of a list of approved breeds for the BCC based on the findings of the University of Guelph's large-scale breed assessment study. In addition, G.A.P. will be establishing a set protocol of key welfare outcomes for future breed acceptance to the G.A.P. program and the BCC using input from a technical working group of experts. Updates on this work can be found at <https://globalanimalpartnership.org/better-chicken-project>

- **Stocking density** (*maximum 6 lb/ft²*): This requirement is based on extensive research documenting the effects of higher stocking densities on welfare and production outcomes. Among relevant findings, higher stocking densities result in higher daily mortalities; a higher incidence of leg health problems, contact dermatitis, and carcass bruising;^{4,17} more disturbances to broiler resting behavior;¹⁸ and decreased locomotion, ground pecking, preening,¹⁹ perching,²⁰ foraging, and play behavior.^{21–24} Similar studies have reported a decline in body weight, reduction in feed consumption, and increased foot pad lesions and skin scratches at densities **above** 6 lb/ft².^{25–27} Stocking chickens at high densities also inhibits their ability to effectively dissipate metabolic heat, which can lead to cellular damage to the liver²⁸ and gut resulting in poorer nutrient absorption²⁹ and reduced resilience to infection.³⁰
- **Enriched environments** (*including adequate behavioral enrichment, litter, and lighting*): The welfare of broiler chickens is improved by housing them in enriched environments with opportunities for the expression of important species-specific behavior, including foraging, scratching, exercise, dust-bathing, perching, and undisturbed resting. The addition of enrichment items, such as dust-baths and pecking objects, have been shown to increase bird activity, which improves leg health by strengthening the muscle and bones of growing broilers.^{31–33} Raised platforms and perches allow chickens to move off the floor leading to better foot pad condition, allowing birds to escape more dominant chickens, and for chickens to have longer undisturbed resting periods.^{33–35}

Besides a lack of enrichment, broiler chickens are typically housed indoors in barns with poor quality, compacted litter, and a near-constant, low intensity of artificial daytime lighting with very short periods of continuous darkness. Poor **litter** management, including thin, wet, capped, and less friable litter, has been demonstrated to have multiple negative effects on broiler flocks, including reductions in weight gain and feed conversion ratios. Litter that is too wet will result in air quality issues causing irritation to the eyes and respiratory tracts of chickens due to increased ammonia production. Most prominently for bird welfare, research has repeatedly shown that poor litter quality leads to a higher incidence of painful contact dermatitis lesions to the hocks, breast, and/or foot pads, which can impair their walking ability.^{22,36–43}

When **good litter conditions** are maintained, the moisture from the drinking and defecation of the flock can be absorbed to provide a comfortable, insulating bedding for broilers and ensure their breasts and legs remain healthy throughout rearing. A minimum depth of **3 inches** and regularly removing caked litter (**≤10% caked**) to take out large deposits of wet litter and manure allows the litter flooring to remain dry and friable overall.^{37,42-44} Research has shown the incidence of hock burn decreases incrementally with increasing litter depth with more litter moisture, ammonia emissions, and lesions to the hocks and foot pads for broilers reared on less and thinner litter (*e.g.*, <2 inches) than deeper (*e.g.*, ≥3 inches) litter.^{37,40,45-47} Broilers housed on floors **fully covered** in deep, non-toxic, friable litter also express higher levels of foraging, ground pecking, scratching, and dust-bathing behavior.^{48,49} Given dust-bathing is a socially-facilitated activity, full floor coverage ensures all the broilers within a flock have access to loose litter to perform this natural comfort behavior.

Suitable **lighting** conditions are important for chickens to maintain their circadian rhythm of physiological processes and behavioral patterns. Poultry also rely on their vision as their primary sense to engage with their environment and socially interact.⁵⁰⁻⁵⁵ Natural light provides the optimal lighting conditions for broiler chicken welfare and retrofitting existing barns with windows is becoming increasingly more common in the US.^{56,57} However, good artificial lighting systems can still meet the biological needs of broilers by providing suitable intensities and lengths for the daily light and dark periods, while also ensuring the lighting source provides a full spectrum of light (*e.g.*, UV wavelengths).⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰ In standard US production, broilers are typically kept under a near-constant low light intensity (<10 lux) during daylight hours providing no distinction between light and dark periods of the day.⁴³ Research has shown low intensities during the light period negatively impacts the physical health of broilers, flock synchronicity, and disrupts their normal diurnal behavioral rhythms. Broilers kept in continuously low light show little variation in behavior throughout the entire day spending a considerable proportion of time sleeping.^{51,52,61-63} For instance, broilers reared on 5 lux during the daylight hours (16hours Light: 8h Dark) were significantly less active and expressed less foraging and preening, highly-motivated behaviors associated with positive welfare, than chickens housed in 50 or 200 lux lighting (all treatments 1 lux during dark period).^{51,53,64} Broilers reared under ≤5 lux daylight also suffer higher rates of mortality and are more likely develop painful foot pad lesions and larger, heavier eyes, which may cause impaired vision.^{53,54,61,65,66} Furthermore, studies have demonstrated chickens maintain the preference to feed and drink at higher light intensities throughout their lives.^{63,67}

Chickens require a sufficiently long continuous dark period each day (**minimum 6 hours**) to obtain the undisturbed rest needed to support good eye and leg musculoskeletal health with research showing flock gait scores and foot pad conditions improve as the length of the daily dark period increases.^{4,38,40,65-67} The expressions of normal behaviors signifying a good level of welfare (*e.g.*, moving, litter pecking, preening, dust-bathing) also

disappear, birds are more fearful of humans, and mortality increases when chickens are raised without adequate lengths of daily darkness.^{38,71-73} A significant contrast between the dark (<1 lux) and light periods (**minimum 50 lux**) is necessary to support normal immune function, melatonin release, and synchronize the diurnal patterns of rest and activity in broiler flocks.^{51,52,54,69,73}

Artificial lighting systems that only provide lighting sources over a single area of the house (*e.g.*, over the feeding lines) often fail to provide enough well-lit space for all birds within a flock to engage in light-stimulated active behaviors besides feeding. In these systems, the consumption of feed is prioritized over the expression of other highly-motivated natural behaviors (*e.g.*, movement, foraging, play, preening) important for broiler welfare. Without adequate daytime lighting levels throughout the house, broilers are also unable to engage with enrichments that require the use of visual acuity, *e.g.*, perches/platforms, scattered grain, straw bales. The majority of birds in these systems are in near-constant darkness (<5 lux) in the predominantly unlit floor space causing the same disruptions to their normal diurnal physiological and behavioral rhythms as broilers reared under uniform low intensity lighting. Severe contrasts in light intensities across the house may also lead to an unequal distribution of broilers with higher bird occupancy and activity within small areas of significantly brighter light, adversely affecting the localized litter quality. Regardless of the type and location of the lighting sources, all lighting programs must guarantee the majority of the useable floor area is adequately illuminated (minimum 50 lux) during daylight hours. This will ensure the entire flock has the necessary lighting contrast between the daily light and dark periods to maintain a high level of broiler welfare in artificially-lit houses.

- **Controlled atmosphere stunning (CAS):** Controlled atmosphere stunning, when properly executed, offers many welfare advantages compared to electric water-bath stunning and other common industry methods. Electrical water-bath stunning at slaughter facilities often uses uniform electrical parameters, so variation in the body size and electrical resistance between individual broilers means some chickens may be ineffectively stunned and recover consciousness prior to bleeding.⁷⁴ In contrast, CAS operates to irreversibly stun chickens so these birds do not regain consciousness and are killed in the system prior to being bled.

One of the greatest advantages of CAS is that it avoids the dumping, handling, inversion, and shackling of live birds. With CAS, crated chickens go directly into the controlled atmosphere chamber, and therefore are not subject to pain and distress from being shackled by their legs or the weight of their organs shifting onto their heart and lungs while conscious prior to stunning. The pre-stun handling required for electrical water-bath stunning also significantly increases bird stress levels, exposes them to greater risk of injury, and can affect final meat quality.^{75,76} Although multi-step CAS processing is a requirement of the BCC, it currently falls outside the scope of the G.A.P. program. A

detailed description of the benefits of CAS and commercially available CAS systems is provided in our [‘Controlled Atmosphere Systems for Broiler Chickens’](#) resource.

It must be considered that any animal welfare or potential financial benefits of shifting to a higher welfare broiler production system will only be achieved through the full adoption of the BCC. More specifically, any environmental improvements must be accompanied by a switch to strains of broiler chickens with better health and behavioral capacities. Some may argue the welfare of the current commercial breeds only declines at heavy final body weights, but research has repeatedly demonstrated that these strains experience poor welfare even at younger ages and lighter weights. In the last year, studies have shown the ‘conventional’ breeds are unable to perch or get on top of straw bales (in commercial barns) at two weeks of age and experience a high incidence of foot pad and breast meat lesions (BMMs) even when only four weeks old.^{14–16} The high metabolic demands and poor physical condition of industry-standard breeds can also put these strains at risk of heat stress and injury when these broilers become more active when provided with enrichment, such as perches, pecking substrates, or outdoor ranges.^{6,77,78}

Why is the adoption of higher welfare breeds dated for 2026 while the other BCC criteria are required by 2024?

In late 2019, the BCC was updated to include an optional timeline extension for the breed criteria to 2026. This shift is primarily due to the delay in the original timeline for the delivery of the findings from the breed evaluation research at the University of Guelph (completed Spring 2020). Based on conversations with producers and genetics companies about the timeline to scale flocks, this accommodation was made to ensure that it is viable for food companies to achieve their commitments on time. The delivery date for the other BCC criteria remains 2024 because producers have already begun to scale production in these areas and continue to demonstrate that it is possible to achieve all other criteria by 2024.

Aren’t industry practices rooted in science as well?

A vast majority of the practices and technologies used in industrial agriculture are indeed rooted in scientific knowledge intended to maximize yields and profits, minimize the use of resources, and manage food safety risks. However, the welfare of animals has remained a low priority. When welfare is considered, the focus lies only on the physical health of animals, rather than on comprehensive improvement to overall broiler chicken welfare, which also includes mental well-being and the satisfaction of highly-motivated, natural behavioral needs.

Are the National Chicken Council (NCC) standards for broilers sufficient?

We do not consider the NCC standards to be sufficient, as they do not align with many of the scientific findings discussed above. For example, the NCC recommends stocking densities ranging from 6.5 lb/ft² for light broilers to 9 lb/ft² for roasters or heavy birds.⁷⁹ As for lighting, the NCC standards do not set a minimum light intensity for daylight hours and only requires four hours of darkness per each 24-hour period. However, it is not required that the four hours be provided continuously. Li et al (2000) found that normal ocular development in a growing broiler requires a minimum of four hours of darkness per day, provided at the same time of day, without

interruption.⁴¹ These results are supported by Olanrewaju et al (2006), who states that “an absolute minimum uninterrupted dark period of four hours should be given, but the requirements for sleep may be higher at certain points of the growing period.”⁵⁰ The NCC guidelines also fail to make any recommendations regarding the use of environmental enrichment or breed.

Isn't it the role of the USDA and other government agencies to ensure that broiler chickens have good welfare?

The USDA oversees the food safety aspects of poultry processing but does not regulate welfare at the farm level for industry-standard broiler production.* Poultry are specifically excluded from the USDA Animal Welfare Act. Similarly, other government regulatory agencies have no jurisdiction over poultry welfare.

What about the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) guidelines?

The AVMA has produced a series of useful policies that apply to commercial poultry production, such as general guidelines and protocols on euthanasia and pain management, as well as more specific documents on the transport and slaughter of poultry. While we consider these to be meaningful guidelines based on robust research, they do not cover the wider range of issues addressed by third-party animal welfare certifiers. Furthermore, these guidelines are not meant to be regulatory instruments, but rather scientific opinions. The AVMA has no obligation to oversee or enforce their use in commercial production, except as pertains to individual veterinary practitioners.

Why do we advocate for third-party certification?

As stated above, third-party animal welfare certification is important because it provides a way to impartially guide *and* enforce best practices for animal welfare. We advocate for the G.A.P. standard as a model, as it comprehensively covers the issues that we believe to be central to the on-farm welfare of broiler chickens, based on scientific research. Furthermore, G.A.P. uses third-party auditing and certification to preserve the integrity of the program, which ensures a higher level of impartiality and transparency. As a result of careful assessment of the available standards, we believe that the G.A.P. standard is one of the strongest and most comprehensive; therefore, we recommend certification by this standard to meet the welfare criteria addressed in the BCC.

How does G.A.P. develop their standards?

The G.A.P. 5-Step™ Animal Welfare Rating Standards are fully transparent, allowing for public and scientific scrutiny. The G.A.P. standards are developed in consultation with their Scientific Advisory Committee, composed of highly-trained animal welfare scientists with specific expertise on the welfare and behavior of the covered farm species. The scientific committee also meets regularly to ensure the standards reflect the most current and relevant scientific research. The G.A.P. standards go through multiple rounds of review - including input from multi-stakeholder technical working groups and are open for public comment during the approval process. A unique aspect of the G.A.P. program is their 5-step tiered structure, which allows producers to enter the

program at the level that best fits with their business. More information on how G.A.P. develops their standards can be found [here](#).

Are there environmental trade-offs related to the higher welfare broiler commitment?

While we acknowledge that higher welfare systems require increased amounts of certain inputs to achieve the same output quantity, we think it is important to consider these challenges within a broader context of environmental sustainability, the benefits to these changes, and potential changes in current production methods (*e.g.*, feed composition) which can help mitigate environmental impacts. A more comprehensive view should simultaneously include considerations of environmental, social, and economic sustainability.

For example, the environmental benefits of including alternative feed ingredients, such as rotational small grains, in poultry diets is improved soil health and reduced fertilizer inputs by shifting away from the current reliance on monoculture crops (*i.e.*, soy and corn) for animal feed. Higher welfare strains typically require less protein and metabolizable energy in their daily rations to support their growth than industry-standard broiler breeds, so these strains could cope with being fed more varied diets that are less reliant on nutrient-dense ingredients, such as soy and corn. Therefore, the use of rotational small grains for broiler feed could be used to offset the environmental impact of the adoption of higher welfare, slower-growing breeds, which can require more feed to achieve market weights.

Research on the relationship between higher welfare systems and environmental impacts have also found areas in which there can be improvements for both animal welfare and environmental outcomes.⁸⁰ Sustainability analyses that only focus on the increase in inputs (such as land, feed, and water) required in higher welfare systems fail to account for the expected gains of cutting losses related to poor welfare. According to Dawkins (2017), higher welfare systems can actually result in long-term financial benefits from reduced mortality rates, improved health, improved product quality, improved disease resistance, reduced medication, lower risk of zoonoses and foodborne diseases, increased farmer job satisfaction, and positive consumer response to increased corporate social responsibility.⁸¹ For example, the increased prevalence of white striping and wooden breast are conservatively estimated to cost the US broiler industry up to \$200 million each year.⁸² In addition, roughly five percent of flock mortalities may be attributed to cardiovascular disorders (*e.g.*, ascites and SDS)^{83,84} due to selection focused on greater feed-to-body weight conversion over bird welfare. This could account for more than \$2 billion dollars in annual losses from reduced meat output and lost costs of production for the US broiler industry.⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷

As established by scientific research and public opinion, improving animal welfare is critically important. Studies on consumer perception of animal welfare consistently indicate growing consumer concern.⁸⁸ If the industry does not respond accordingly, economic losses are to be expected. To do so in a way that aligns with the broader goals of sustainability is part of the work that follows. A 2017 economics review of animal welfare highlighted that “[animal welfare] is likely to be of interest for the long term, as there is a clear correlation between income levels and demand for animal welfare as well as other sustainability concerns”.⁸⁹

Why do we ask for corporate positions to be made publicly available?

Transparency is one of the most important components of any animal welfare program, and as such, we believe that this information should be publicly available. According to a 2018 NCC consumer report, over 50% of US respondents were very to extremely concerned about how chickens are raised, housed, and bred to optimize the meat they produce.⁸⁸

Transparency around animal welfare policies also paves the way for accountability, both internally and to external stakeholders, such as other companies, NGOs, and investors. In September 2019, we released our inaugural [ChickenTrack](#) report, which included a broiler market overview, a review of the BCC science, and profiles of two producers who have begun to invest in systems which meet the BCC. The [2020 ChickenTrack report](#) provided an overview of the impacts of COVID-19 on the market and broiler welfare; highlighted the findings from three recent studies, all of which reinforce the understanding that industry-standard breeds have poor welfare outcomes compared to their slower-growing counterparts; and outlined a framework through which companies can begin making and reporting BCC progress. In future years, our ChickenTrack reports will begin using publicly available information to track the annual progress of food businesses transitioning their supply chains to chicken that meets the BCC. The [Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare \(BBFAW\)](#), an investor-facing report that ranks food companies based on risk management associated with farm animal welfare practices, also assesses companies using only publicly-disclosed data. BBFAW provides stakeholders interested in understanding the relative performance of food companies with an independent, impartial, and reliable assessment on their commitments to improving farm animal welfare.

*The USDA oversees broiler chicken production systems under the USDA Organic program, which is verified by a USDA-accredited certifying agent before products can be labeled USDA organic. The only welfare provision under the USDA organic program is that certified producers must provide chickens with year-round outdoor access with shade, shelter, and exercise areas. Although the animals cannot be continuously confined, no minimum length of time is specified for outdoor access.

References

1. Castellini, C. *et al.* Adaptation to organic rearing system of eight different chicken genotypes: Behaviour, welfare and performance. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* **15**, 37–46 (2016).
2. Yngvesson, J. *et al.* Let me sleep! Welfare of broilers (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) with disrupted resting behaviour. *Acta Agric. Scand. A Anim. Sci.* **67**, 123–133 (2017).
3. Olkowski, A. A. Pathophysiology of Heart Failure in Broiler Chickens: Structural, Biochemical, and Molecular Characteristics 1. *Poult. Sci.* **86**, 999–1005 (2007).
4. Knowles, T. G. *et al.* Leg disorders in broiler chickens: Prevalence, risk factors and prevention. *PLoS One* **3**, (2008).
5. Shim, M. Y., Karnuah, A. B., Anthony, N. B., Pesti, G. M. & Aggrey, S. E. The effects of broiler chicken growth rate on valgus, varus, and tibial dyschondroplasia. *Poult. Sci.* **91**, 62–65 (2012).
6. Wilhelmsson, S., Yngvesson, J., Jönsson, L., Gunnarsson, S. & Wallenbeck, A. Welfare Quality® assessment of a fast-growing and a slower-growing broiler hybrid, reared until 10 weeks and fed a low-protein, high-

- protein or mussel-meal diet. *Livest. Sci.* **219**, 71–79 (2019).
7. Petracci, M. *et al.* Wooden-Breast, White Striping, and Spaghetti Meat: Causes, Consequences and Consumer Perception of Emerging Broiler Meat Abnormalities. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety* vol. 18 565–583 (2019).
 8. Papah, M. B., Brannick, E. M., Schmidt, C. J. & Abasht, B. Evidence and role of phlebitis and lipid infiltration in the onset and pathogenesis of Wooden Breast Disease in modern broiler chickens. *Avian Pathol.* **46**, 623–643 (2017).
 9. Gall, S. *et al.* Wooden Breast in Commercial Broilers Associated with Mortality, Dorsal Recumbency, and Pulmonary Disease. *Avian Dis.* **63**, 514 (2019).
 10. Norring, M. *et al.* Wooden breast myopathy links with poorer gait in broiler chickens. *animal* **13**, 1690–1695 (2019).
 11. Bokkers, E. A. M. & Koene, P. Behaviour of fast-and slow growing broilers to 12 weeks of age and the physical consequences. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **81**, 59–72 (2003).
 12. Wallenbeck, A., Wilhelmsson, S., Jönsson, L., Gunnarsson, S. & Yngvesson, J. Behaviour in one fast-growing and one slower-growing broiler (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) hybrid fed a high- or low-protein diet during a 10-week rearing period. *Acta Agric. Scand. A Anim. Sci.* **66**, 168–176 (2016).
 13. Malchow, J., Berk, J., Puppe, B. & Schrader, L. Perches or grids? What do rearing chickens differing in growth performance prefer for roosting? *Poult. Sci.* **98**, 29–38 (2019).
 14. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). *Eat. Sit. Suffer. Repeat. The Life of a Typical Meat Chicken*. <https://www.compassioninfoodbusiness.com/media/7439270/rspca-broiler-breed-report-eat-sit-suffer-repeat.pdf> (2020).
 15. Torrey, S. *et al.* *Final Research Results Report Prepared for Global Animal Partnership*. https://globalanimalpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Better_Chicken_Project_Summary_Report_Global_Animal_Partnership.pdf (2020).
 16. Rayner, A. C., Newberry, R. C., Vas, J. & Mullan, S. Slow-growing broilers are healthier and express more behavioural indicators of positive welfare. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, (2020).
 17. Bailie, C. L., Ijichi, C. & O'Connell, N. E. Effects of stocking density and string provision on welfare-related measures in commercial broiler chickens in windowed houses. *Poult. Sci.* **97**, 1503–1510 (2018).
 18. Febrer, K., Jones, T. A., Donnelly, C. A. & Dawkins, M. S. Forced to crowd or choosing to cluster? Spatial distribution indicates social attraction in broiler chickens. *Anim. Behav.* **72**, 1291–1300 (2006).
 19. Buijs, S. *et al.* Resting or hiding? Why broiler chickens stay near walls and how density affects this. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **124**, 97–103 (2010).
 20. Ventura, B. A., Siewerdt, F. & Estevez, I. Access to barrier perches improves behavior repertoire in broilers. *PLoS One* **7**, (2012).
 21. Hall, A. L. The Effect of Stocking Density on the Welfare and Behaviour of Broiler Chickens Reared Commercially. *Anim. Welf.* **10**, 23–40 (2001).
 22. Dawkins, M. S., Donnelly, C. A. & Jones, T. A. Chicken welfare is influenced more by housing conditions than by stocking density. *Nature* **427**, 342–344 (2004).
 23. Petek, M., Üstüner, H. & Yeşilbağ, D. Effects of stocking density and litter type on litter quality and growth performance of broiler chickens. *Kafkas Univ. Vet. Fak. Derg.* **20**, 743–748 (2014).
 24. Baxter, M., Bailie, C. L. & O'Connell, N. E. Play behaviour, fear responses and activity levels in commercial broiler chickens provided with preferred environmental enrichments. *Animal* **13**, 171–179 (2018).
 25. Dozier, W. A. *et al.* Stocking Density Effects on Growth Performance and Processing Yields of Heavy Broilers 1. *Poult. Sci.* **84**, 1332–1338 (2005).
 26. Estevez, I. Density Allowances for Broilers: Where to Set the Limits? *Poult. Sci.* **86**, 1265–1272 (2007).
 27. Guardia, S. *et al.* Effects of stocking density on the growth performance and digestive microbiota of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* **90**, 1878–1889 (2011).
 28. Abudabos, A. M., Samara, E. M., Hussein, E. O. S., Al-Ghadi, M. Q. & Al-Atiyat, R. M. Impacts of stocking density on the performance and welfare of broiler chickens. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* **12**, 66–71 (2013).
 29. Chegini, S., Kiani, A., Parizadian Kavan, B. & Rokni, H. Effects of propolis and stocking density on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, and immune system of heat-stressed broilers. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* **18**, 868–876 (2019).

30. Tsiouris, V. *et al.* High stocking density as a predisposing factor for necrotic enteritis in broiler chicks. *Avian Pathol.* **44**, 59–66 (2015).
31. Reiter, K. & Bessei, W. Effect of locomotor activity on bone development and leg disorders in broilers. *Arch. fuer Gefluegelkd.* **122**, 10–16 (2009).
32. Bailie, C. L. & O’Connell, N. E. The influence of providing perches and string on activity levels, fearfulness and leg health in commercial broiler chickens. *Animal* **9**, 660–668 (2015).
33. Baxter, M., Bailie, C. L. & O’Connell, N. E. Evaluation of a dustbathing substrate and straw bales as environmental enrichments in commercial broiler housing. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **200**, 78–85 (2018).
34. Ventura, B. A., Siewerdt, F. & Estevez, I. Effects of barrier perches and density on broiler leg health, fear, and performance. *Poult. Sci.* **89**, 1574–1583 (2010).
35. Kiyama, Z., Küçükyılmaz, K. & Orojpour, A. Effects of perch availability on performance, carcass characteristics, and footpad lesions in broilers. *Arch. Anim. Breed.* **59**, 19–25 (2016).
36. De Jong, I. C., Gunnink, H. & Van Harn, J. Wet litter not only induces footpad dermatitis but also reduces overall welfare, technical performance, and carcass yield in broiler chickens. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* **23**, 51–58 (2014).
37. Shepherd, E. M., Fairchild, B. D. & Ritz, C. W. Alternative bedding materials and litter depth impact litter moisture and footpad dermatitis. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* **26**, 518–528 (2017).
38. Bassler, A. W. *et al.* Potential risk factors associated with contact dermatitis, lameness, negative emotional state, and fear of humans in broiler chicken flocks. *Poult. Sci.* **92**, 2811–2826 (2013).
39. Kyvsgaard, N. C., Jensen, H. B., Ambrosen, T. & Toft, N. Temporal changes and risk factors for foot-pad dermatitis in danish broilers. *Poult. Sci.* **92**, 26–32 (2013).
40. Meluzzi, A., Fabbri, C., Folegatti, E. & Sirri, F. Effect of less intensive rearing conditions on litter characteristics, growth performance, carcass injuries and meat quality of broilers. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **49**, 509–515 (2008).
41. Taira, K., Nagai, T., Obi, T. & Takase, K. Effect of litter moisture on the development of footpad dermatitis in broiler chickens. *J. Vet. Med. Sci.* **76**, 583–586 (2014).
42. Bilgili, S. F. *et al.* Influence of bedding material on footpad dermatitis in broiler chickens. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* **18**, 583–589 (2009).
43. United States Department of Agriculture. *Poultry Industry Manual National Animal Health Emergency Management System FAD PReP*. http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/ (2013).
44. Dunlop, M. W. *et al.* The multidimensional causal factors of ‘wet litter’ in chicken-meat production. *Science of the Total Environment* vol. 562 766–776 (2016).
45. Haslam, S. M. *et al.* Factors affecting the prevalence of foot pad dermatitis, hock burn and breast burn in broiler chicken. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **48**, 264–275 (2007).
46. Shepherd, E. M. & Fairchild, B. D. Footpad dermatitis in poultry. *Poult. Sci.* **89**, 2043–2051 (2010).
47. Tucker, S. A. & Walker, A. . Hock Burn in Broilers. in *Recent Developments in Poultry Nutrition 2* (eds. Wiseman, J. & Garnsworthy, P. C.) 107–122 (Nottingham University Press, 1999).
48. Robins, A. & Phillips, C. J. C. International approaches to the welfare of meat chickens. *Worlds. Poult. Sci. J.* **67**, 351–369 (2011).
49. Baxter, M., Bailie, C. L. & O’Connell, N. E. An evaluation of potential dustbathing substrates for commercial broiler chickens. *Animal* **12**, 1933–1941 (2018).
50. Olanrewaju, H. A. *et al.* A Review of Lighting Programs for Broiler Production. *Int. J. Poult. Sci.* **5**, 301–308 (2006).
51. Alvino, G. M., Archer, G. S. & Mench, J. A. Behavioural time budgets of broiler chickens reared in varying light intensities. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **118**, 54–61 (2009).
52. Alvino, G. M., Blatchford, R. A., Archer, G. S. & Mench, J. A. Light intensity during rearing affects the behavioural synchrony and resting patterns of broiler chickens. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **50**, 275–283 (2009).
53. Blatchford, R. A. *et al.* The effect of light intensity on the behavior, eye and leg health, and immune function of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* **88**, 20–28 (2009).
54. Blatchford, R. A., Archer, G. S. & Mench, J. A. Contrast in light intensity, rather than day length, influences the behavior and health of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* **91**, 1768–1774 (2012).
55. Kristensen, H. H., White, R. P. & Wathes, C. M. Light intensity and social communication between hens. *Br.*

- Poult. Sci.* **50**, 649–656 (2009).
56. Bailie, C. L., Ball, M. E. E. & O'Connell, N. E. Influence of the provision of natural light and straw bales on activity levels and leg health in commercial broiler chickens. *Animal* **7**, 618–626 (2013).
 57. Compassion in World Farming USA. *ChickenTrack Annual Report 2019*. <https://www.ciwf.com/media/7437445/2019-chickentrack-report.pdf> (2019).
 58. House, G. M., Sobotik, E. B., Nelson, J. R. & Archer, G. S. Effect of the addition of ultraviolet light on broiler growth, fear, and stress response. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* **29**, 402–408 (2020).
 59. James, C., Asher, L., Herborn, K. & Wiseman, J. The effect of supplementary ultraviolet wavelengths on broiler chicken welfare indicators. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **209**, 55–64 (2018).
 60. James, C., Wiseman, J. & Asher, L. The effect of supplementary ultraviolet wavelengths on the performance of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* **99**, 5517–5525 (2020).
 61. Newberry, R. C., Hunt, J. R. & Gardiner, E. E. Influence of light intensity on behavior and performance of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* **67**, 1020–1025 (1988).
 62. Deep, A., Schwan-Lardner, K., Crowe, T. G., Fancher, B. I. & Classen, H. L. Effect of light intensity on broiler behaviour and diurnal rhythms. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **136**, 50–56 (2012).
 63. Davis, N. J., Prescott, N. B., Savory, C. J. & Wathes, C. M. Preferences of growing fowls for different light intensities in relation to age, strain and behaviour. *Anim. Welf.* **8**, 193–203 (1999).
 64. Alvino, G. M., Blatchford, R. A., Archer, G. S. & Mench, J. A. Light intensity during rearing affects the behavioural synchrony and resting patterns of broiler chickens. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **50**, 275–283 (2009).
 65. Deep, A., Schwan-Lardner, K., Crowe, T. G., Fancher, B. I. & Classen, H. L. Effect of light intensity on broiler production, processing characteristics, and welfare. *Poult. Sci.* **89**, 2326–33 (2010).
 66. Deep, A., Raginski, C., Schwan-Lardner, K., Fancher, B. I. & Classen, H. L. Minimum light intensity threshold to prevent negative effects on broiler production and welfare. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **54**, 686–694 (2013).
 67. Frost, M. R. *Effect of Light Intensity on Production Parameters and Feeding Behavior of Broilers*. <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etdhttp://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/1854> (2016).
 68. Li, T., Howland, H. C. & Troilo, D. Diurnal illumination patterns affect the development of the chick eye. *Vision Res.* **40**, 2387–2393 (2000).
 69. Schwan-Lardner, K. *et al.* Effect of day length on cause of mortality, leg health, and ocular health in broilers. *Poult. Sci.* **92**, 1–11 (2013).
 70. Karaarslan, S. & Nazlıgül, A. Effects of lighting, stocking density, and access to perches on leg health variables as welfare indicators in broiler chickens. *Livest. Sci.* **218**, 31–36 (2018).
 71. Rozenboim, I., Robinzon, B. & Rosenstrauch, A. Effect of light source and regimen on growing broilers. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **40**, 452–457 (1999).
 72. Schwan-Lardner, K., Fancher, B. I. & Classen, H. L. Impact of daylength on behavioural output in commercial broilers. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **137**, 43–52 (2012).
 73. Schwan-Lardner, K., Fancher, B. I., Laarveld, B. & Classen, H. L. Effect of day length on flock behavioural patterns and melatonin rhythms in broilers. *Br. Poult. Sci.* **55**, 21–30 (2014).
 74. Hindle, V. A., Lambooi, E., Reimert, H. G. M., Workel, L. D. & Gerritzen, M. A. Animal welfare concerns during the use of the water bath for stunning broilers, hens, and ducks. *Poult. Sci.* **89**, 401–412 (2010).
 75. Bedanova, I. *et al.* Stress in broilers resulting from shackling. *Poult. Sci.* **86**, 1065–1069 (2007).
 76. Berg, C. & Raj, M. A review of different stunning methods for Poultry—animal welfare aspects (stunning methods for poultry). *Animals* **5**, 1207–1219 (2015).
 77. Nielsen, B. L. Effects of ambient temperature and early open-field response on the behaviour, feed intake and growth of fast- and slow-growing broiler strains. *Animal* **6**, 1460–1468 (2012).
 78. Mattioli, S. *et al.* Adaptive response to exercise of fast-growing and slow-growing chicken strains: Blood oxidative status and non-enzymatic antioxidant defense. *Poult. Sci.* **96**, 4096–4102 (2017).
 79. National Chicken Council. *National Chicken Council Animal Welfare Guidelines and Audit Checklist for Broilers*. https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/NCC-Animal-Welfare-Guidelines_Broilers_Sept2020.pdf (2020).
 80. Place, S. E. & Mitloehner, F. M. The nexus of environmental quality and livestock welfare. *Annu. Rev. Anim. Biosci.* **2**, 555–569 (2014).
 81. Dawkins, M. S. Animal welfare and efficient farming: Is conflict inevitable? *Anim. Prod. Sci.* **57**, 201–2088 (2017).

82. Kuttappan, V. A., Hargis, B. M. & Owens, C. M. White striping and woody breast myopathies in the modern poultry industry: A review. *Poult. Sci.* **95**, 2724–2733 (2016).
83. Tarrant, K. Elucidating the genetic cause to ascites syndrome in broiler chickens utilizing multi-generational genome wide association studies. *Theses Diss.* (2016).
84. Esmail, S. H. PoultryWorld - Feed restriction in broiler production. *Poultry World*
<https://www.poultryworld.net/Nutrition/Articles/2018/3/Feed-restriction-in-broiler-production-262439E/> (2018).
85. United States Department of Agriculture. USDA Economic Research Service - Retail prices for beef, pork, poultry cuts, eggs, and dairy products. United States Department of Agriculture. 1
<https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/meat-price-spreads/> (2019).
86. Lusk, J. L., Thompson, N. M. & Weimer, S. L. *The Cost and Market Impacts of Slow Growth Broilers.* (2018)
doi:10.22004/ag.econ.292330.
87. United States Department of Agriculture. Broiler production and value – states and United States Total: 2018. Poultry production and value 2018 summary. *National Agricultural Statistics Service*
[https://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_Subject/result.php?BF68DE46-2798-3F59-9408A9B2AF11349B§or=ANIMALS %26 PRODUCTS&group=POULTRY&comm=CHICKENS](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_Subject/result.php?BF68DE46-2798-3F59-9408A9B2AF11349B§or=ANIMALS%26PRODUCTS&group=POULTRY&comm=CHICKENS) (2018).
88. National Chicken Council. Survey Shows US Chicken Consumption Remains Strong.
<https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/survey-shows-us-chicken-consumption-remains-strong/> (2018).
89. Grethe, H. The Economics of Farm Animal Welfare. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.* **9**, 75–94 (2017).