Table S1 Overview of research conducted on body condition scoring in elephants

| Albi (1971)               | Investigating 240 carcasses of African elephants during cullings in Zambia, this researcher detected a linear negative correlation between the kidney-fat index and the depth of the lumbar depression. Although conducting several morphometric measurements, lumbar depression with the adjoining ridge of the wing of the ilium was the only body region correlating with an elephant's physical condition. During dry season elephants showed a poorer condition compared to the wet season. No universal body condition score index was defined.   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Poole (1989)              | Used a simple visual method focused on the shoulder blade, the pelvic bone and the backbone to determine changes during musth. No universal body condition score index was defined.   |
| Godagama et al.<br>(1998) | Applied a previous version of the index subsequently published by Wemmer et al. (2006) in 140 (68 females, 72 males) captive elephants in Sri Lanka. These elephants were private owned or temple elephants and covered all age categories (3-75 years). The authors reported a significant difference in BCS between females and males with higher scores in females. No significant correlations of BCS with age or husbandry circumstances were detected.  |
| Foley et al. (2001)       | Evaluating effects of stress in free-ranging African elephants, body condition was categorized from 1 (emaciated) to 5 (no bony structures visible). According to the findings from Albl (1971) scoring was based mainly on the lumbar region. A correlation pattern between body condition and season was demonstrated with lower values during the dry season. Lowest scores occurred in late dry season. Foley et al. (2001) explain this pattern with seasonal variation of diet quality and availability.  |
| Wemmer et al.<br>(2006)   | Worked out a method to assess body condition in Asian elephants, deriving a numerical index by separate visual assessment of six different body regions (head, scapula, thoracic region, flank area, lumbar vertebrae, pelvic bone). Thus a total score between 0 and 11 can be obtained and interpreted. She tried to correlate the measured body condition scores with morphometrically determined variables for the amount of subcutaneous fat, but could not find any location that closely parallels the numerical index. Application of the scoring system on a sample of 119 juvenile and young adult Asian elephants in Forest camps in countries of origin. No significant correlations between body condition score and age or sex of the elephants were detectable.  |
| Harris et al. (2008)      | Investigated, during the report on the welfare of zoo elephants in the United Kingdom, beside numerous other variables, the body condition. They did so without former protocol and based their interpretation on comparisons with photographs from the wild and experience of the examiner. Thereby they focused on the rear view of the elephant and chose the spinal protrusion, hip visibility, roundness of the body and the thighs as expressive features. Scores from 1-5 were assigned to pictures, considering a value of 3 to be normal. Doing so, only 6 of the 70 scored individuals were found in desirable condition. Subsequently the group tried to correlate body condition scores with species, sex, age, origin, management system and measured cortisol metabolites. Only management system showed a significant correlation with lowest scores in free contact and highest ones in no contact systems. The authors do not formulate any explanation for this correlation. Any other variable seemed to be independent from body condition. |

| Thitaram et al.<br>(2008)    | Evaluated the body condition of 22 female Asian elephants in two Elephant camps in<br>Thailand during their study on estrous cycle lengths. They used the protocol<br>formulated by Wemmer et al. (2006) and found scores ranging from 6.5 to 10.<br>Thitaram et al. (2008) found no markedly different body condition of normal and<br>irregularly cycling elephants. They report the absence of an estrous cycle in the<br>elephant cow with the lowest BCS (6.5) of the studied population.  |
|------------------------------|---|
| Velthuizen (2008)            | Applied Wemmers method in the investigation of body condition changes in seven<br>African elephants kept in a training facility in South Africa. The investigation led to no<br>reliable results, which is due to a suboptimal study design according to the<br>researcher.   |
| De Klerk (2009)              | Used Poole's (1989) method during her study on free-ranging populations in the Eastern Cape Region, South Africa to show correlations with resource qualities. In doing so, lower body condition scores in populations with limited dieatry resources, during seasons with lower primary productivity, and in lactating females were demonstrated.  |
| Fernando et al.<br>(2009)    | Used a simplified version of Wemmer et al.'s (2006) index in order to assess the body condition of free-ranging Asian elephants involved in the human-elephant-conflict. The researchers took 5 reference photographs of free-ranging individuals representing almost the entire spectrum of body conditions. They assigned the scores 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 to the pictures. In that way the scale can be extended by 0 and 10 if necessary and conditions localized between the given photographs will be evaluated with 2, 4, 6 or 8. Considering its simplicity and the inevitable subjectivity in assessing, they found a comparatively small error in the application of the method.  |
| Pinter-Wollman et al. (2009) | In order to monitor physiology of translocated elephants in Tsavo East National Park, Kenia, a modified protocol of Wemmer's index was applied. Scores of 544 adult individuals revealed significantly higher values for local compared to translocated elephants. Females showed a significantly lower condition than males. During wet season BCS's were significantly higher than during dry season.   |
| Ramesh et al.<br>(2011)      | Used Wemmer et al.'s (2006) body condition score index as basis, modifying and combining it with the technique described for ungulates in general by Riney (1960). In doing so, they added a seventh body region to Wemmer et al.'s (2006) index and determined a total score range from 1-14. With this protocol they assessed the body condition of 1622 free-ranging elephants in Mudumalai Tiger Reserve, Western Ghats, India. The results show a significant correlation between the assigned values and the season, with higher scores during the wet and decreased ones in the dry season. As cause for this phenomenon the changes in availability of food resources for the elephants ar mentioned. The authors conclude that body condition scores may be useful as sensitive health indicators in elephants and encourage such studies over larger populations to develop reference values. |
| Treiber et al.<br>(2012)     | Took the correlation between body condition and several diseases for granted and<br>used a 9-point scale for her evaluations on Asian elephants. Their index<br>corresponds well with the previously published indices, although trying to enhance<br>details. Moreover they correlate body condition scores to and validate them with<br>ultrasonic rump fat measures.   |

| Morfeld et al.<br>(2014)     | Published the development of a new visual body condition scoring index for the assessment of body fat and condition in female African elephants. Compared to Wemmer et al.'s (2006) method, they reduced the observed body regions from 6 to 3, which they chose by their correlation with the local ultrasonic subcutaneous fat thickness. These areas are the backbone, the pelvic bone and the ribs. The developed method was subsequently applied in a comparison of body condition scores assigned to photographs from samples of female zoo elephants and their free-ranging counterparts. The comparison revealed significant lower values in the free-ranging elephants. Following previous studies, the authors expected a relationship between high body condition scores and the poor reproductive activity in zoo elephants (Clubb et al., 2009; Dow et al., 2011; Freeman et al., 2009; Taylor and Poole, 1998). They recommend the use of body condition scores in the medical management and optimization of husbandry practices in zoo elephants, potentially leading to a more healthy and sustainable population. |
|------------------------------|---|
| Kumar et al. (2014)          | Ascribed a BCS to the 12 (4 males, 8 females) zoo-kept Asian elephants investigated during their endocrinological study in southern India. Using the index from Wemmer et al. (2006), they report values ranging from 4 to 9. They could not find any significant correlation between the body condition and any of the measured faecal hormones. Moreover they could not find any significant variation of the body condition with the age or facility of the individual elephants.  |
| Romain et al.<br>(2014)      | Used the index described by Fernando et al. (2009) to measure the body condition of captive Asian elephants in Thailand, but laying their study emphasis on the diet composition and food intake, the body condition score values were of minor interest.   |
| Wijeyamohan et al.<br>(2015) | Took the indices from Wemmer et al. (2006) and Fernando et al. (2009) as basis for<br>the development of a visual system for Body Condition Scoring of Asian elephants.<br>They demonstrated the applicability of this system in free-ranging as well as in<br>captive elephants and provided an exemplary photograph for every score. Moreover<br>they proved the significant correlation between BCS values and morphometric<br>estimates of body fatness. According to this publication, the developed system<br>facilitates the reliable assessment of Asian elephants independent of age and sex.<br>Investigating captive elephants in the USA and a Sri Lankan population, they found<br>on average a two point higher BCS in the American population.   |
| Morfeld et al.<br>(2016)     | Being part of the project "Using science to understand zoo elephant welfare", body condition of 240 elephants in North American zoos was assessed. Before applying the established 5-point score for the African elephant in the Asian species, biological validation was performed by measuring serum triglyceride levels. Results found 34% of the assessed zoo elephants in the highest score (=5) and 40% with a BCS of 4. This means that 74% of zoo elephants showed a physical condition considered as overweight or obese. Increased diversity in feeding methods and being female occurred as risk factors for an elevated score. In contrast, an unpredictable feeding schedule and staff-directed walking for more than 14 hours per week were associated with a decreased risk for elevated scores.   |
| Schiffmann et al.<br>(2017)  | This study reviewed existing visual body condition score protocols for elephants.<br>Additionally a test based on pictorial documents compared different scoring<br>approaches. Results led to the conclusion that body condition scoring in elephants<br>may be best completed using overview and/or algorithm methods.  |

| Pokharel<br>(2017) | et | al. | Investigation of 653 free-ranging Asian elephants in India revealed a correlation of BCS and season with higher scores during the wet season. In females BCS was negatively correlated with feacal glucocorticoid metabolites. BCS development of nine adult females was observed over the course of seven years with the detection of distinct annual changes.   |
|--------------------|----|-----|---|
| Chusyd<br>(2018)   | et | al. | This research group investigated the relationship between adiposity and reproductive cycling in 20 female African elephants living in North American zoos. They checked for patterns of BCS as well and found positive correlations with age, body mass and fat mass. No significant influence on cycling could be found.   |
| Ranjeewa<br>(2018) | et | al. | Body condition of adult female (N=218) and sub-adult and adult male (N=329) elephants in the Udawalawe National Park were assessed by a protocol modified from Wemmer et al. (2006). A mean score in the middle of the range was determined (7.68 $\pm$ 3.04). Scores of females and males showed a significant difference with higher values in males. Considering various age-size classes of the latter, mature-adult males had the lowest scores and young-adult males the highest with sub-adult males ranking between them. The authors demonstrate a significant inverse correlation of elephant body condition with reservoir water level. They explain this phenomenon by the lush grass growing on the banks of the reservoir in times of low water levels. |

**Table S2** Overview of research conducted on body condition scoring in elephants and reported correlation with further parameters(Table modified and extended from Schiffmann et al. (2017))

| Living<br>conditions | Applied Index<br>(scoring range)  | Ν  | Average score   | Standardized<br>average score<br>(average<br>score/scoring<br>range) | Correlating<br>parameters                 | Kind of correlation  | Remarks  | Reference                    |
|----------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| Free-ranging         |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |                              |
| free-ranging         | kidney-fat index,<br>depth of lumbar<br>depression,<br>(good, fair, poor) | 240  | -   | -  | season                                    | lower condition during dry season  | especially well<br>developed fat<br>reserves in<br>pregnant cows | Albl (1971)                  |
| free-ranging         | new developed (1-<br>6)   | 22   | -   | -  | stage of musth                            | body condition<br>decreases during<br>musth phase                        | exclusively males in<br>musth considered                         | Poole (1989)                 |
| free-ranging         | concavity around<br>lumbar depression<br>and scapula (1-5)                | not<br>indicated                                     | mean: 2.8-4.01  | 0.56-0.80 (mean)   | season                                    | lower body condition<br>during dry season                                | sample size and<br>composition not<br>indicated                  | Foley et al. (2001)          |
| free-ranging         | extended the<br>index from Poole<br>(1989) (1-8)                          | 4-107<br>(depending<br>on season<br>and<br>category) | mean: 3.2-5.6<br>(depending on<br>season and<br>category) | 0.40-0.70 (mean)   | season                                    | lower scores during<br>seasons with<br>decreased primary<br>productivity | -  | De Klerk (2009)              |
|                      |   | outogory   |   |  | limitation of<br>nutritional<br>resources | lower scores in<br>population with limited<br>resources                  | -  |                              |
|                      |   |  |   |  | lactation                                 | lower scores in lactating females  | -  |                              |
| free-ranging         | modified from<br>Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-2)                            | 544  | -   | -  | season                                    | lower scores during the dry season                                       | only adults considered   | Pinter-Wollman et al. (2009) |
|                      | (2000) (0-2)  |  |   |  | sex                                       | lower scores in<br>females   | only adults considered   |                              |
|                      |   |  |   |  | history of<br>translocation               | lower scores in<br>translocated<br>elephants                             | only adults<br>considered  |                              |
| free-ranging         | new developed (1-   | 57   | 3 (1-5)   | 0.60 (median)  | captive vs.                               | significantly higher in  | investigation on   | Morfeld et al. (2014)        |

| 5) | free-ranging | captive elephants | female elephants |  |
|----|--------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
|    |              |                   | only             |  |

| Semicaptive a            | •  |                  |                          |                               |  |  |   |   |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| semicaptive <sub>a</sub> | Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-11) and<br>a digital index (not<br>published) | 7                | mean and<br>median: 10   | 0.83 (mean and<br>median)     | -  | -  | suboptimal study<br>design lead to no<br>reliable results         | Velthuizen (2008)                             |
| captive <sub>b</sub>     | own index (5-1)  | not<br>indicated | mean: 2.0                | 0.60 (mean)                   | handling<br>method                           | significantly thinner<br>when managed in free<br>contact compared to<br>no contact | -   | Harris et al. (2008)                          |
| captivec                 | new developed (1-<br>5)  | 50               | median: 4 (2-5)          | 0.80 (median)                 | captive vs.<br>free-ranging                  | significantly higher in captive elephants  | investigation on<br>female elephants<br>only                      | Morfeld et al. (2014)                         |
| captive <sub>c</sub>     | Morfeld et al.<br>(2014) (1-5)   | 132              | median: 4; mean:<br>4.00 | 0.80 (mean and<br>median)     | sex<br>staff-directed<br>walking<br>exercise | higher scores in<br>females<br>decreased risk for<br>higher scores                 | -<br>only significant if<br>exercise exceeds<br>14 hours per week | Morfeld et al. (2016)                         |
|                          |  |                  |                          |                               | unpredictable<br>feeding<br>schedule         | decreased risk for<br>higher scores  | -   | Morfeld et al. (2016)Morfeld<br>et al. (2016) |
|                          |  |                  |                          |                               | diversity in<br>feeding<br>methods           | increased risk for<br>higher scores  | -   |   |
| captivec                 | Morfeld et al.<br>(2014) (1-5)   | 20               | median: 4; mean:<br>3.85 | 0.77 (mean), 0.80<br>(median) | age  | positive   | females only  | Chusyd et al. (2018)                          |
|                          |  |                  | 0.00                     |                               | body mass                                    | positive   |   |   |
|                          |  |                  |                          |                               | fat mass                                     | positive   |   |   |

| I in due of          | Americant   | aximus)   | A                      | Oten den litte   | O a superior till                                 |   | Deres ender  | Defenses                  |
|----------------------|---|---|------------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| Living<br>conditions | Applied Index<br>(scoring range)  | Ν   | Average score          | Standardized<br>average score<br>(average<br>score/scoring<br>range) | Correlating<br>parameters                         | Kind of correlation   | Remarks  | Reference                 |
| Free-ranging         |   |   |                        |  |   |   |  |                           |
| free-ranging         | new developed (0-<br>10)  | -   | -                      | -  | -   | -   | -  | Fernando et al. (2009)    |
| free-ranging         | combined indices<br>from Wemmer et<br>al. (2006) and<br>Riney (1960) (14-<br>1) | 1622  | -                      | -  | season  | decrease in body<br>condition during dry<br>season          | significant<br>differences between<br>age-classes                      | Ramesh et al. (2011)      |
|                      |   |   |                        |  | sex   | higher body condition in males                              | demonstrated for adult elephants only                                  |                           |
| free-ranging         | new developed (1-<br>10)  | 27  | 6 (median and<br>mean) | 0.60 (median and<br>mean)  | captive vs.<br>free-ranging                       | higher in captive<br>elephants                              | application of index<br>recommended<br>independently of<br>age and sex | Wijeyamohan et al. (2015) |
| free-ranging         | Morfeld et al.<br>(2014) (1-5)  | 653   | •                      | ÷  | season  | lower scores more<br>frequent during dry<br>season          | ÷  | Pokharel et al. (2017)    |
|                      |   |   |                        |  | faecal<br>glucocorticoid<br>metabolites<br>(fGCM) | fGCM levels highest in<br>individuals with lowest<br>BCS    |  |                           |
| free-ranging         | modified from<br>Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-14)                                 | 3175<br>(containing<br>526<br>individual<br>elephants<br>at different<br>points of<br>time) | mean: 7.68             | 0.51 (mean)  | reservoir water<br>level                          | higher condition<br>during season with<br>lower water level | only adult and sub-<br>adult elephants<br>considered                   | Ranjeewa et al. (2018)    |
|                      |   |   |                        |  | sex   | higher scores in males                                      | only adult and sub-<br>adult elephants<br>considered                   |                           |
| Semicaptive a        | and captive   |   |                        |  |   |   |  |                           |
|                      | previous version  | 140   | Median: 7; mean:       | 0.58 (mean and   | sex   | higher body condition                                       | -  | Godagama et al. (1998)    |

|   | of the index by<br>Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-11) |  | 6.95  | median)  |                                       | in females   |  |                           |
|---|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| semicaptivee                                      | new developed (0-<br>11)                          | 119  | mean: 7.3                                       | 0.61 (mean)  | -                                     | -  | no correlation with<br>further parameters<br>detected  | Wemmer et al. (2006)      |
| captive <sup>,</sup> and semicaptive <sup>,</sup> | own index (5-1)                                   | semicaptiv<br>e: 42;<br>captive:<br>not<br>indicated | semicaptive<br>mean: 3.25;<br>captive mean: 2.1 | semicaptive: 0.35<br>(mean); captive:<br>0.58 (mean) | captive:<br>handling<br>method        | captive: significantly<br>thinner when<br>managed in free<br>contact compared to<br>no contact | -  | Harris et al. (2008)      |
| semicaptiveg                                      | Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-11)                    | 22   | median: 8.75;<br>mean: 8.70                     | 0.73 (mean and<br>median)                            | -                                     | -  | mature females<br>only; the female<br>with lowest score<br>(6.5) was the only<br>one not cycling | Thitaram et al. (2008)    |
| captivec  | new developed (1-<br>9)                           | 12   | median: 6.25                                    | 0.69 (median)  | rump fat<br>thickness                 | positive linear  | fat thickness<br>measured by<br>ultrasound   | Treiber et al. (2012)     |
| captive <sub>h</sub>                              | Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-11)                    | 12   | median: 8; mean:<br>7.25                        | 0.60 (mean); 0.67<br>(median)                        | -                                     | -  | -  | Kumar et al. (2014)       |
| captivei  | (2009) (0-11)<br>Fernando et al.<br>(2009) (0-10) | 10   | median: 6; mean:<br>6.3                         | 0.57 (mean); 0.55<br>(median)                        | -                                     | -  | -  | Romain et al. (2014)      |
| captive <sub>c</sub>                              | new developed (1-<br>10)                          | 31   | 8 (median and mean)                             | 0.80 (mean and median)                               | captive vs.<br>free-ranging           | higher in captive<br>elephants   | application of index<br>recommended<br>independently of<br>age and sex                           | Wijeyamohan et al. (2015) |
| captivec  | new developed (1-<br>5)                           | 108  | median: 4; mean:<br>4.05                        | 0.81 (mean); 0.80<br>(median)                        | sex                                   | higher scores in<br>females  | -  | Morfeld et al. (2016)     |
|   | ,   |  |   | <b>、</b> ,   | staff-directed<br>walking<br>exercise | decreased risk for<br>higher scores  | only significant if<br>exercise exceeds<br>14 hours per week                                     |                           |
|   |   |  |   |  | unpredictable<br>feeding<br>schedule  | decreased risk for<br>higher scores  | -  |                           |
|   |   |  |   |  | diversity in<br>feeding               | increased risk for<br>higher scores  | -  |                           |
| semicaptive <sub>g</sub>                          | Wemmer et al.<br>(2006) (0-11)                    | 5  | median: 8; mean:<br>7.6                         | 0.63 (mean); 0.75<br>(median)                        | methods<br>-                          | -  | exclusively males<br>considered , no<br>effect of GnRH-<br>vaccination on BCS<br>detected        | Somgird et al. (2016a)    |
| semicaptive <sub>j</sub>                          | Wemmer et al.                                     | 9  | median: 8; mean:                                | 0.69 (mean); 0.75                                    | duration of                           | Positive   | exclusively males  | Somgird et al. (2016b)    |

| (2006) (0-11) | 8.33 | (median) | musth phase |                  | considered        |  |
|---------------|------|----------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|--|
|               |      |          | age         | positive but not | exclusively males |  |
|               |      |          |             | significant      | considered        |  |

c: investigated animals live in captivity, sc: investigated animals live in semi-captive conditions in countries of origin, f: free-ranging individuals were investigated a: Elephant training facility in South Africa; b: UK zoos; c: North American zoos; d: Private owned and temple elephants in Sri Lanka, e: Forest camps in India, Nepal and Myanmar; f: Indian working camp and Wildlife rehabilitation centre; g: Elephant camps in Thailand; h: South Indian zoos; i: Zoos in Thailand; j: Elephant conservation center in Thailand

## References

- Albl P. 1971. Studies on assessment of physical condition in African elephants. Biological Conservation 3:134-140.
- Chusyd DE, Brown JL, Hambly C, Johnson MS, Morfeld KA, Patki A, Speakman JR, Allison DB, Nagy TR. 2018. Adiposity and reproductive cycling status in zoo African elephants. Obesity 26:103-110.
- Clubb R, Rowcliffe M, Lee PC, Mar KU, Moss CJ. 2009. Fecundity and population viability in female zoo elephants: problems and possible solutions. Animal Welfare 18:237-247.
- De Klerk C. 2009. Detecting changes in elephant body condition in relation to resource quality. South Africa: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.
- Dow TL, Holásková I, Brown JL. 2011. Results of the third reproductive assessment survey of the North American Asian (*Elephas maximus*) and African (*Loxodonta africana*) female elephants. Zoo Biology 30:699-711.
- Fernando P, Janaka HK, Ekanayaka SKK, Nishantha HG, Pastorini J. 2009. A simple method for assessing elephant body condition. Gajah 31:29-31.
- Foley CAH, Papageorge S, Wasser SK. 2001. Noninvasive stress and reproductive measures of social and ecological pressures in free-ranging African elephants. Conservation Biology 15:1134-1142.
- Freeman EW, Guagnano G, Olson D, Keele M, Brown JL. 2009. Social factors influence ovarian acyclicity in captive African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*). Zoo Biology 28:1-15.
- Godagama WK, Wemmer C, Ratnasooriya WD. 1998. The body condition of Sri Lankan domesticated elephants (*Elephas maximus maximus*). Ceylon Journal of Science 26:1-6.
- Harris M, Sherwin C, Harris S. 2008. The welfare, housing and husbandry of elephants in UK zoos. Bristol, UK: University of Bristol.
- Kumar V, Reddy VP, Kokkiligadda A, Shivaji S, Umapathy G. 2014. Non-invasive assessment of reproductive status and stress in captive Asian elephants in three south Indian zoos. General and Comparative Endocrinology 201:37-44.
- Morfeld KA, Lehnhardt J, Alligood C, Bolling J, Brown JL. 2014. Development of a body condition scoring index for female African elephants validated by ultrasound measurements of subcutaneous fat. PLoS ONE 9: e93802.
- Morfeld KA, Meehan CL, Hogan JN, Brown JL. 2016. Assessment of body condition in African (*Loxodonta africana*) and Asian (*Elephas maximus*) elephants in North American zoos and management practices associated with high body condition scores. PLoS ONE 11: 0155146.
- Pinter-Wollman N, Isbell LA, Hart LA. 2009. Assessing translocation outcome: Comparing behavioral and physiological aspects of translocated and resident African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*). Biological Conservation 142:1116-1124.
- Pokharel SS, Seshagiri PB, Sukumar R. 2017. Assessment of season-dependent body condition scores in relation to feacal glucocorticoid metabolites in free-ranging Asian elephants. Conservation Physiology 5:1-14.
- Poole J. 1989. Announcing intent: the aggressive state of musth in African elephants. Animal Behaviour 37:140-152.
- Ramesh T, Sankar K, Qureshi Q, Kalle R. 2011. Assessment of wild Asiatic elephant (*Elephas maximus*) body condition by simple scoring method in a tropical deciduous forest of Western Ghats, Southern India. Wildlife Biology Practice 7:47-54.
- Ranjeewa ADG, Pastorini J, Isler K, Weerakoon DK, Kottage HD, Fernando P. 2018. Decreasing reservoir water levels improve habitat quality for Asian elephants. Mammalian Biology 88:130-137.
- Riney T. 1960. A field technique for assessing physical condition of some ungulates. Journal of Wildlife Management 24:92-94.
- Romain S, Angkawanish T, Bampenpol P, Pongsopawijit P, Sombatphuthorn P, Nomsiri R, Silva-Fletcher A. 2014. Diet composition, food intake, apparent digestibility, and body condition score of the

captive Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*): A pilot study in two collections in Thailand. Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine 45:1-14.

- Schiffmann C, Clauss M, Hoby S, Hatt JM. 2017. Visual body condition scoring in zoo animals composite, algorithm and overview approaches in captive Asian and African elephants. Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research 5:1-10.
- Somgird C, Homkong P, Sripiboon S, Brown JL, Stout TAE, Colenbrander B, Mahasawangkul S, Thitaram C. 2016a. Potential of a gonadotropin-releasing hormone vaccine to suppress musth in captive male Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Animal Reproduction Science 164:111-120.
- Somgird C, Sripiboon S, Mahasawangkul S, Boonprasert K, Brown JL, Stout TAE, Colenbrander B, Thitaram C. 2016b. Differential testosterone response to GnRH-induced LH release before and after musth in adult Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) bulls. Theriogenology 85:1225-1232.
- Taylor VJ, Poole TB. 1998. Captive breeding and infant mortality in Asian elephants: A comparison between twenty western zoos and three eastern elephant centers. Zoo Biology 17:311-332.
- Thitaram C, Brown JL, Pongsopawijit P, Chansitthiwet S, Wongkalasin W, Daram P, Roongsri R, Kalmapijit A, Mahasawangkul S, Rojansthien S, Colenbrander B, van der Weijden GC, Eerdenburg FJCM.
   2008. Seasonal effets on the endocrine pattern of semi-captive female Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*): Timing of the anovulatory luteinizing hormone surge determines the length of the estrous cycle. Theriogenology 69:237-244.
- Treiber K, Reppert A, Ward A. Transcutaneous rump ultrasound of Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*): Body fat, body condition and body weight; 2012; Raleigh, NC. p 1-6.
- Velthuizen J. 2008. Relationship between diet, body condition, behavior, and faecal glucocorticoid concentrations in African elephants. South Africa: Mooketsi University
- Wemmer C, Krishnamurthy V, Shrestha S, Hayek LA, Thant M, Nanjappa KA. 2006. Assessment of body condition in Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Zoo Biology 25:187-200.
- Wijeyamohan S, Treiber K, Schmitt D, Santiapillai C. 2015. A visual system for scoring body condition of Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Zoo Biology 34:53-59.