

Table 1. Mean Values in Implant Trials to Date<sup>a</sup>

Year	Treatment				Days on Feed	ADG	Daily Feed Intake	Feed Efficiency	Slaughter		USDA Grade		Choice or Better	
	0	60	120	180					Weight	HCW	Yield	Quality		
1999-2000	Ral	Ral	Syn S	Rev S	291	3.49	20.2	5.80	1,334	800	3.05	4.35	52.8%	
	Syn C		Syn S	Rev s	291	3.38	19.8	5.90	1,303	782	2.94	4.06	26.5%	
	Syn C		Rev IS	Rev S	291	3.42	19.9	5.80	1,313	790	2.87	4.26	38.9%	
	Rev G		Rev IS	Rev S	291	3.55	20.6	5.80	1,352	809	3.02	4.17	51.4%	
	Nonimplanted Control					291	2.99	18.5	6.20	1,189	705	3.01	4.62	57.1%
	<b>Average</b>					<b>291</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>5.90</b>	<b>1,298</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>45.3%</b>
2000-2001	Ral	Rev IS		Rev S	288	3.25	20	6.15	1,292	758	2.81	4.05	40.5%	
		Rev IS		Rev S	288	3.18	19.03	6.00	1,254	743	2.49	3.75	27.0%	
		Ral	Ral	Rev S	288	3.13	19.07	6.10	1,242	734	2.51	3.81	31.6%	
			Ral	Rev S	288	3.23	19.07	5.91	1,273	756	2.63	4.09	52.8%	
	Nonimplanted Control					288	2.83	17.67	6.22	1,163	686	2.82	4.36	57.9%
	<b>Average</b>					<b>288</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>1,243</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>42.0%</b>
2001-2002	Ral	Comp ES		Comp TES										
	Encore				276	3.27	20.02	6.13	1,214	729	2.96	5.04	83.9%	
	Encore			Comp TES	276	3.44	20.51	5.96	1,260	760	2.72	4.63	72.9%	
	Nonimplanted Control					276	3.03	18.99	6.27	1,147	693	2.82	4.93	85.2%
<b>Average</b>					<b>276</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>6.10</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	

<sup>a</sup>Implant strategies: Panel Discussion A member Jon Beckett, California Polytechnic State University.

Table 2. Percentage improvement over nonimplanted controls<sup>a</sup>.

Year	Treatment				Days on	Daily Feed	Feed	Slaughter	USDA Grade		Choice or		
	0	60	120	180	Feed	ADG	Intake	Efficiency	Weight	HCW	Yield	Quality	Better
					%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	\$
1999-2000	Ral	Ral	Syn S	Rev S	0	16.7	9.2	6.5	12.2	13.6	1.3	-5.8	-7.5
	Syn C		Syn S	Rev S	0	13.0	7.0	4.8	9.6	11.0	-2.3	-12.1	-53.6
	Syn C		Rev IS	Rev S	0	14.4	7.6	6.5	10.4	12.1	-4.7	-7.8	-31.9
	Rev G		Rev IS	Rev S	0	18.7	11.4	6.5	13.7	14.9	0.3	-9.7	-10.0
	<b>Average</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>-1.3</b>	<b>-8.9</b>
2000-2001	Ral	Rev IS		Rev S	0	14.8	13.2	1.1	10.2	10.5	-0.4	-7.1	-30.1
		Rev IS		Rev S	0	12.4	7.7	3.5	7.8	8.3	-11.7	-14.0	-53.4
		Ral	Ral	Rev S	0	10.6	7.9	1.9	6.8	7.0	-11.0	-12.6	-45.4
			Ral	Rev S	0	14.1	7.9	5.0	9.5	10.3	-6.7	-6.2	-8.8
	<b>Average</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>-7.4</b>	<b>-10.0</b>
2001-2002	Ral	Comp ES		Comp TES	0	14.9	10.5	3.8	10.7	11.6	2.8	-8.9	-21.7
	Encore				0	7.9	5.4	2.2	5.8	5.1	5.0	2.2	-1.5
	Encore			Comp TES	0	13.5	8.0	4.9	9.9	9.6	-3.5	-6.1	-14.4
	<b>Average</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>-4.3</b>

<sup>a</sup>Implant strategies: Panel discussion A member, Jon Beckett, California Polytechnic State University.