An online survey of equestrian headcollar use and safety

David J. Marlin[1*], Jane M. Williams[2*] and Kirstie J. Pickles[3]

[1]David Marlin Consulting, PO BOX 187, Cambridge, United Kingdom; Cambridge, UK

[2]Department of Equine Science, Hartpury University, Hartpury, Gloucestershire, UK, GL19 3BE. Orcid ID: 0000-0003-4936-6903

[3]School of Veterinary Medicine and Science, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington Campus, Loughborough, LE12 5RD, UK. Orcid ID: 0000-0003-2154-3138

***Corresponding authors: jane.williams@hartpury.ac.uk; dm@davidmarlin.co.uk**

SUMMARY

Background: Headcollars (halters-US) are one of the most commonly used pieces of equestrian "tack". Despite this, there appears to be minimal information on their use or more importantly, risk factors for injury of horses / handlers.

Objective: To explore headcollar use and safety in equestrians.

Study design: Quantitative cross-sectional survey.

Methods: An online survey (19 questions) exploring headcollar use and safety, was disseminated through equestrian social media. Frequency analysis and multivariable modelling identified how headcollar type was linked to use and injury risk.

Results: Most respondents (88%; n=4786) used headcollars multiple times daily but for short time periods (66%, n=3388, <30 minutes). A horse being injured as a result of wearing a headcollar was reported by 1615 (31%) respondents with 15% of incidents also injuring a person. Fractures (horses) occurred in 134 incidents and 167 equine fatalities were reported. Across all headcollar types, the odds of injury risk increased by 1.7 times (confidence intervals (CI): 1.07 – 2.41, p <0.02) using a headcollar when mucking out. During travelling, headcollar use reduced the odds of risk of injury by 0.7 times (CI: 0.43 – 0.98, p < 0.04). The odds of injury risk reduced when using leather (Odds ratio (OR): 0.8, CI: 0.66 –

0.96, $p < 0.01$) or synthetic (OR: 0.8, CI: 0.58 – 0.85, $p < 0.0001$) safety headcollars compared to standard headcollars of the same material. Thematic analysis identified three key themes: 1) need for increased education: fit, safety features, basic horse handling, 2) *'safer'* leather headcollars, and 3) increased safety focus required.

Main limitations: Data were self-reported and may be subject to memory recall errors; online surveys are subject to self-selection bias.

Conclusions: Increased user knowledge of risk factors for headcollar injury, combined with standardised guidance on how to correctly fit and use headcollars would be beneficial to reduce injury risk.

KEYWORDS: horse; handling and restraint; injury; husbandry; tack; welfare

INTRODUCTION

Headcollars (halters, US) are one of the most used pieces of equestrian "tack". Despite this, there appears to be little information on their correct use or injury-related risk factors. Headcollar-related injuries can essentially be divided into two categories: pressure-induced lesions of superficial anatomical structures or traumatic injuries to deeper structures as a result of application of high forces, for example, failure of a headcollar to release. Injuries may occur when the headcollar becomes caught on something. Alternatively, injuries may occur when horses are tied-up (including travelling) or being led. The prevalence of such injuries is unknown as they are rarely reported and are often suspected rather than observed.

Force-related tissue damage can occur over prominent bony areas with little overlying tissue; as such the head is vulnerable. Paresis of the buccal branch of the facial nerve occasionally occurs under general anaesthesia if the headcollar cheek piece of the dependent side is not sufficiently padded. Facial nerve paralysis in a horse has also been reported followed rope recovery from general anaesthesia (del Barrio *et al*, 2018). More severe injuries have been reported following traumatic headcollar accidents including atlas fracture (Volcholrt, 1972), fracture of the paracondylar process of the occiput (Lischer *et al.* 2005) and atlantoaxial subluxation (Nixon and Stashak, 1988). These accidents often involve strangulation-type events when the headcollar becomes caught on an external fixture such as a hook in a stable (Lischer *et al.* 2005). Occasionally these injuries are so severe that the horse is found dead (K Pickles, personal observations).

Horse riding and handling are acknowledged to be dangerous activities for humans (Grossman et al., 1978; Chitnavis et al., 1996; Abu-Zidan and Rao, 2003; Ball et al., 2009). Knowledge of specific risk factors is essential to implement strategies for injury prevention (Ingemarson *et al.*, 1989; Hobbs et al. 1994). Although equestrian falls were the most common reason for emergency department admission in equestrians over a five-year period, 37% (53/142) of these admissions were associated with injuries acquired during horse handling (Hobbs et al. 1994). Additionally, a recent review of injuries in 342 equestrians reported 21.3% of injuries to be associated with scenarios involving headcollar use (Carmargo *et al.* 2018). Unmounted injuries were also reported to be more severe than mounted injuries. A review of horse-related injuries in children found that 9/114 patients

were injured by being dragged, potentially involving headcollar use (Wolyncewicz *et al.*, 2018).

The aim of this study was to investigate equine headcollar use and safety using an online survey.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited online via sharing a link to the survey on selected UK equine-related or discipline-specific social media (Facebook®) groups including, but not limited to, British Dressage, Endurance UK, Eventing UK, Horsepoo (regional). The survey invitation was targeted to include amateur and professional riders competing in either affiliated or unaffiliated competitions in the UK or working professionally in the equine industry e.g. vets, physios, nurses, grooms, etc. Inclusion criteria required participants to be over 18 years of age. The survey was anonymous and no personal data were collected although respondents could optionally provide an email address for entry into a prize draw. To reduce bias, the survey was promoted and disseminated by an independent 3rd party media company (Fox Red Media, Crown House, Loughton IG10 4LF).

Survey Design

The study was designed as an online questionnaire (Survey Monkey®) with 17 closed questions, 1 ranking scale question and 1 open free text question (Supplementary file 1). The questionnaire was split into four major sections: participant demographics; headcollar usage; injuries related to headcollar use; factors associated with headcollar choice. The survey employed routing features in relation to whether or not respondents had experienced horses being injured due to headcollars. The draft survey was tested by 10 experienced equestrian researchers and edited to correct any errors before being fully deployed. The survey was live for 35 days and 65% of the responses were obtained within the first 14 days. Respondents were asked:

Demographic factors: equestrian activities (e.g. breeding, racing, dressage, transporter, vet, physio, etc), competition level and whether professionally involved in the horse industry (defined as either working full-time or the majority of their income coming from the industry).

Headcollar use: how often and how long they used headcollars, reasons for using a headcollar, types of headcollars used and whether a safety device or baler twine was used.

Headcollar injuries: experience of a horse being injured as a result of wearing a headcollar, and if yes, the circumstances of the injury (e.g. location, frequency, how caused, severity), the type of headcollar involved and whether it functioned as expected. Respondents were also asked if they were injured in the incident.

Headcollar choice factors: e.g. material, fit, durability, safety features, etc.

Data analysis

Descriptive analysis

Data were exported from Survey Monkey™ to Microsoft Excel™ Version 2010 (Redmond, WA, USA). Frequency analysis identified the nature of respondents' equestrian activities , competition level, and types of headcollar used. Additionally, frequency of headcollar use and experience of a horse being injured related to headcollar use, including details of how the injury occurred, injury type and severity were collated. Respondents ranked characteristics considered important (from 1: most influential to 8: least influential) when choosing a headcollar and an arithmetic median and interquartile range calculated for each factor.

Data met non-parametric assumptions, therefore Kruskal Wallis followed by Mann Whitney U post-hoc tests were performed to analyse characteristics influencing choice of leather, synthetic and webbing headcollars. Median rankings for individual factors were examined to identify the direction of differences between disciplines; where median values were the same, mean rank differences obtained from post hoc tests differentiated between disciplines. A Mann Whitney U test was used to compare frequency of injuries in professional and non-professional equestrians. Significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

129

130 *Univariable analysis*

131 Univariable analysis using the dependant variable 'headcollar injury: yes vs. no' was
132 performed to establish potential risk across Model A: all headcollar types, Model B: leather
133 headcollars, Model C: synthetic headcollars and Model D: webbing headcollars. A variable
134 with an alpha value of <0.10 was considered eligible for use in building the multivariable
135 models (Bailey *et al.*, 1997). Variables considered to be plausible risk factors that could
136 influence headcollar injury risk were also eligible for inclusion (Parkin *et al.*, 2006).

137

138 *Multivariable analysis*

139 A predictive multivariable logistic regression model was produced, using Statistical Package
140 for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 24, using the dichotomous variable: headcollar injury, yes vs. no
141 across four multivariable models (All headcollar types: Model A; Leather: Model B; Synthetic:
142 Model C; Webbing: Model D). Each model was automatically fitted using a backward
143 elimination stepwise process that excluded variables with a likelihood ratio test significance
144 of $p < 0.05$ (Parkin *et al.*, 2006). For each step in the multivariable model building process the
145 effect of removal of variables was assessed using a likelihood ratio chi-square test of model
146 coefficients ($p < 0.05$) to check that the new model was an improvement over the baseline
147 model. This was done to ensure that variables that had a significant impact on the model were
148 not excluded from further analysis. A Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test ($p > 0.05$) was
149 used to evaluate the fit of the model produced. The predictive ability of the final model was
150 investigated using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis. The risk of a
151 headcollar injury was compared using the odds ratio (OR) and associated 95% confidence
152 intervals (CI).

153 *Thematic analysis*

154 An inductive thematic approach, aligned with a grounded theory methodological framework,
155 was used to analyse responses to the final open question. Inductive content analysis of
156 responses was undertaken utilising tags ('open-coding') to create emergent themes ('focused

157 coding'), using an approach adapted from Lamperd *et al.* (2016) and Braun and Clarke (2006),
158 to ascertain themes related to headcollar design, use or safety.

159

160 **Results**

161 *Respondent profile*

162 A total of 5,615 respondents completed the questionnaire. The majority of these competed
163 in dressage, showjumping and eventing, or were pleasure or leisure riders (Table 1).

164 Table 1: Range of equestrian disciplines or equestrian industries in which >2% respondents
165 participated; respondents could indicate multiple disciplines / industries.

Discipline / Role	Number of respondents	Percentage of sample (n = 5615)
Veterinary surgeon	111	2 %
Veterinary nurse / technician	119	2 %
Racing (Thoroughbred)	166	3 %
Rehabilitation yard	211	4 %
Physiotherapist	223	4 %
Starting/training yard	306	5 %
Driving	322	6 %
Endurance	373	7 %
Trainer / Coach / Instructor	435	8 %
Breeding	487	9 %
Hunting	556	10 %
Showing	902	16 %
Eventing	1223	22 %
Showjumping	1548	28 %
Recreational / leisure riding (did not compete)	2192	39 %
Dressage	2355	42 %

166

Of competitive respondents, 32 % (1799 / 5548) competed at local unaffiliated level, 13 % (702 / 5548) at local affiliated, and a further 21% at regional (11 %, 599 / 5548) and national (10 %, 542 / 5548) affiliated level. Only 3 % (145 / 5548) of respondents competed internationally. The majority of respondents (72 %, 3975 / 5511) were not professionally involved with horses or the equestrian industry. Professional respondents included 435 trainers / coaches / instructors, 223 physiotherapists, 111 veterinary surgeons, 119 veterinary nurses / technicians and 26 horse transporters.

Headcollar use

The majority of respondents (88 %; 4786 / 5444) used a headcollar multiple times daily (Figure 1) for short periods of time (< 30 minutes) (Figure 2) which was compatible with the most commonly cited reasons use: grooming (74 %, 3975 / 5351), tacking up (65 %, 3499 / 5351), leading to and from turnout (95 %, 5085 / 5351), mucking out (14 %, 769 / 5351), and for travelling horses (83 %, 4459 / 5351).

Respondents typically owned more than one headcollar (53 %; 2992 / 5645); median ± IQR: 2±1). Traditional (non-safety) design headcollars were predominately used (80 %, 4248 / 5310), with respondents often owning headcollars of different materials; leather was most popular (57 %, 3002 / 5310) followed by synthetic (41 %, 2169 / 5130) and webbing materials (33 %, 1725 / 5310). Rope headcollars were used by 24 % (1289 / 5310) of respondents; 3 % (165 / 5310) used other types of headcollar with the Dually™ training headcollar being the most popular (Monty Roberts, California, USA). Only 20% (1093 / 5310) of respondents used safety headcollars: 5 % (289 / 5310) leather, 12% (618 / 5310) synthetic, 8 % (429 / 5310) webbing. Baling twine was always used between the lead rope and headcollar ring by 41 % (2074 / 5250) of respondents, whilst 42 % (2103 / 5250) never used baling twine, 8 % (385 / 5250) occasionally, and 9 % usually (456 / 5250) using twine. A commercial safety tie was used by 2466 respondents; of these, 34 % (832 / 2466 Equi-ping (Safety Release Ltd., Newmarket, UK), 15 % (372 / 2466) Safe-T tie (Safe-T-Tie, Australia), 11 % (263 / 2466) Idolo tether tie (Idolo UK, Axminster, UK) and 41 % (999 / 2466) Quick clip (Bitz Equestrian, UK).

Figure 1: Frequency of headcollar use across respondents (n = 5444)

Figure 2: Typical duration of headcollar use across respondents (n = 5444)

196 *Factors which influenced headcollar choice*

197 Approximately half of respondents rarely purchased a new headcollar (49 %, n = 2438), 30 %
198 bought one every 1 - 2 years (n = 1511), 15 % (n = 762) every 6 - 12 months, and 6 % (n = 298)
199 less than every 6 months. Headcollar fit, durability, material and safety features ranked as the
200 most important characteristics when choosing a new headcollar, regardless of headcollar type
201 (Table 2).

202 Table 2: Respondent rating (median ± IQR) of factors that influence headcollar purchase,
203 where 1 was most important and 8 least important.

Headcollar type	Appearance	Brand	Colour	Durability	Fit	Material	Price	Safety features
All	5±3	8±2	6±3	4±3	2±2	4±3	5±3	4±4
Leather	5±3	8±2	6±3	4±3	2±2	3±3	5±3	4±4
Synthetic	5±3	8±2	6±3	4±3	1±2	4±3	4±3	4±4
Webbing	5±3	8±2	6±3	4±2	1±2	4±3	5±3	4±4

204

205 *Headcollar injuries*

206 A horse being injured whilst wearing a headcollar was reported by 31 % (1615 / 5232) of
207 respondents (Figure 3). Those professionally involved in the equine industry were significantly
208 more likely to report an injury than non-professionals ($p = 0.0005$). Increased injuries were
209 reported by horse transporters 62 % (16 / 26), trainers / coaches / instructors 44 % (193 /
210 435), veterinarians 40 % (44 / 111) and physiotherapists 52 % (115 / 223) compared to
211 veterinary nurses / technicians (2%; 2/119). Multiple factors were often related to the injury
212 occurrence. The majority of injuries (71%, 1148 / 1615) occurred whilst horses were tied up:
213 58 % (912 / 1576) outside, 34 % (539 / 1576) in the stable, 32 % (511 / 1576) tied to a trailer
214 or lorry, and 25 % (397 / 1576) when travelling. Furthermore, 23 % (745 / 1615) of injuries
215 occurred in horses wearing headcollars in the field (not tied up) and 6 % (214 / 1615) when
216 horses were being led. Where injuries did occur, 39 % (1027 / 2614) were due to the
217 headcollar getting caught, 39 % (1027 / 2614) were related to the horse pulling backwards,
218 11 % (283 / 2614) were associated with the horse's foot getting trapped in the headcollar,
219 and 11 % (295 / 2614) were related to various 'other' reasons. The top three 'other' reasons

for injury were horses rubbing with the headcollar on (n = 60), the headcollar being left on too long (n = 47) and incorrect headcollar fit resulting in wounds (n = 39). Cuts were the most common type of injury reported (37 %, 1336 / 3576), followed by bruising (31 %, 1096 / 3576) and abrasions (24 %, 843 / 3576), with fewer fractures (4 %, 134 / 3576) and fatalities (5 %, 167 / 3576) (Figure 4). Human injuries occurred in 207 of the headcollar incidents.

Figure 3: Frequency headcollar related injuries occurred, within respondents who had experienced a headcollar related injury (n = 1615)

Figure 4: Frequency (once, twice, three times, four times or more than five times) of reported headcollar related injuries as a percentage of total injuries of that type.

Injuries occurred across all types and designs of headcollar (Figure 5), but were most frequent in traditional design, synthetic headcollars (2.7, 1.8 and 4 times more frequent than leather, webbing and rope headcollars, respectively). The frequency of injuries was reduced in safety headcollars (leather: 1 %, 14 / 1412; synthetic: 2 %, 35 / 1412; webbing: 2 %, 24 / 1412) than in headcollars used alone (leather: 12 %, 163 / 1412; synthetic: 32 %, 451 / 1412; webbing: 18 %, 257 / 2093; rope: 8 %, 116 / 1412) or with baling twine (leather: 6 %, 79 / 1412); synthetic: 13 %, 179 / 1412; webbing: 7 %, 95 / 1412). Respondents reported that generally headcollars involved in injury incidents had behaved as expected e.g. a traditional leather headcollar had broken under pressure and a safety headcollar had opened (leather: 73 % (462 / 637), synthetic: 77 % (813 / 1062), webbing: 73 % (450 / 618), rope: 80 % (150 / 188)).

Figure 5: Frequency of injury within specific headcollar types used by respondents who had experienced a headcollar related injury (n = 1615).

Thematic analysis identified three higher order themes that respondents felt were related to headcollar design, use and safety: increased human education, use of leather headcollars and a core focus on safety (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Researcher derived themes from respondent responses related to headcollar design, use and safety.

Univariable analysis

Univariable analysis identified 16 variables, which were taken forward to multivariable model building (Model A): competitive level, compete or not, frequency of headcollar use, use of headcollar: grooming, tacking up, leading, mucking out, travelling, leather headcollar, synthetic headcollar, webbing headcollar, rope headcollar, multiple headcollars, safety headcollar used, and baling twine used. For Models B to D, variables related to headcollar type: leather, synthetic, webbing and rope were excluded prior to model building.

Multivariable analysis

Model A: Injury across headcollar types (Table S1, Supplementary file 2)

Horses belonging to non-competitive respondents were less likely (OR 0.3, CI: 0.22 – 0.42; p = 0.0001) to have a headcollar related injury than those used competitively. Injuries were more likely (OR 1.7, CI: 1.07 – 2.41; p = 0.021) to occur when mucking out and less likely (OR 0.7 CI: 0.43 – 0.98; p = 0.04) when travelling. There was reduced odds of injury risk when only one headcollar was used compared to using multiple headcollars (OR 0.71, CI: 0.50 – 0.99, p = 0.05). Whilst headcollar material was significantly associated with injury (p = 0.0001), no specific material type increased the odds of injury risk alone, but this variable was retained as it improved model fit. Hosmer Lemeshow goodness of fit statistics confirmed that the model showed a good fit (p = 0.51). The likelihood ratio chi-square test of model coefficients reported a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ at each step. No significant interaction between variables was found. ROC curve analysis indicated that the predictability of the final model to prevent injury was excellent (ROC: 0.97).

Model B: Injury in leather headcollars (Table S2, Supplementary file 2)

Horses wearing leather headcollars competing in affiliated, regional competitions were less likely (OR 0.66, CI: 0.50- 0.86, p = 0.003) to get injured than non-competitive horses, but no

differences were found between horses competing at unaffiliated or affiliated level. However, competitive riders were less likely (OR 0.41, CI: 0.34 – 0.48; p = 0.0001) to have a horse injured than those that did not compete. The use of a leather safety headcollar reduced the odds of injury risk (OR 0.80, CI: 0.66 – 0.96; p = 0.014). Usual use of baling twine increased the odds of injury risk (OR 1.3, CI: 1.08-1.52, p = 0.006) compared to always using it, whilst using it sometimes or rarely reduced the odds of risk of injury (OR 0.69 CI: 0.49-0.53, p = 0.031; OR 0.71 0.53-0.95, p = 0.021, respectively). Hosmer Lemeshow goodness of fit statistics confirmed that the model showed a good fit (p = 0.897). The likelihood ratio chi-square test of model coefficients reported a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ at each step. There was a statistically significant two-way interaction between safety headcollar use and competing (F = 4.4; p = 0.04) and travelling (F = 0.9; p = 0.002), respectively. ROC curve analysis indicated that the predictability of the final model was moderate (ROC: 0.64).

Model C: Injury in synthetic headcollars (Table S3, Supplementary file 2)

Horses which competed were more likely (OR 4.4, CI: 2.80- 6.77, p = 0.0001) to get injured compared to those that did not compete. Using a synthetic safety headcollar reduced the odds of injury risk (OR 0.70, CI: 0.58-0.85, p = 0.0001). Using baling twine usually and sometimes reduced the odds of injury risk (OR 0.66, CI: 0.44-0.99, p = 0.046; OR 0.71, CI: 0.51-0.98, p = 0.036, respectively) compared to always using it. Hosmer Lemeshow goodness of fit statistics confirmed that the model showed a good fit (p = 0.905). The likelihood ratio chi-square test of model coefficients reported a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ at each step. No significant interaction between variables was found. ROC curve analysis indicated that the predictability of the final model was moderate (ROC: 0.64).

Model D: Injury in webbing headcollars (Table S4, Supplementary file 2)

Horses which competed were less likely (OR 0.41, CI: 0.33 – 0.50, p = 0.0001) to get injured compared to those that did not compete. Horses were more likely to get injured when travelling (OR 1.4, CI: 1.08 – 1.90, p = 0.013). Usual use of baling twine increased the odds of injury risk (OR 1.3, CI: 1.04-1.62, p = 0.021); in contrast using it sometimes or rarely reduced the odds of injury risk (OR 0.76, CI: 0.47-1.23, p = 0.019; OR 0.65, CI 0.51-0.98, p = 0.036, respectively). Hosmer Lemeshow goodness of fit statistics confirmed that the model showed

a good fit (p = 0.980). The likelihood ratio chi-square test of model coefficients reported a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ at each step. No significant interaction between variables was found. ROC curve analysis indicated that the predictability of the final model was moderate (ROC: 0.64).

Discussion

Limitations of the present study: although a wide range of factors related to headcollar use were considered, the current study has some limitations. Data were self-reported and no defined timeframe within which headcollar injuries had occurred was stated, therefore it could be argued that respondents' memories of injury occurrence could be vague, lack specific details and be disorganised (Koss *et al.*, 1996). Dual representation theory suggests that there are two memory systems active during traumatic events: verbally accessible memory (VAM: stimulus information and emotional reactions) and situationally accessible memory (SAM: emotional and physiological reactions) (Brewin and Holmes, 2003). SAM related to events are considered able to be accessed after retrospective reflection through the recovery process (Brewin and Holmes, 2003). Therefore, we are reasonably confident that the respondents' ability to recall memories of equine or human injury related to headcollars was reliable and valid. Emotions have been shown to enhance memory recall, therefore respondents that had experienced a traumatic or severe injury incident may have been more likely to recall details accurately than those who had experienced minor incidents (Erk et al., 2003). Whilst our sample was large, it may not be representative of the wider equestrian population. It is also conceivable that we may have encouraged owners with experience of a headcollar related incident using the title "How safe are headcollars" to promote the post online. It should also be noted that options for timeframes related to headcollar use were not all mutually exclusive and therefore some respondents may have had to select a category which did not accurately reflect how they used a headcollar or may have omitted this question.

The frequency of almost a third of respondents reporting an equine headcollar injury is concerning, particularly as injuries whilst the horse was tied-up accounted for 70% of the injuries. A further 24% of injuries occurred whilst horses were wearing a headcollar in the field. These are common husbandry practices used by owners often daily, or multiple times

per day. The fact that only 20% of respondents used a safety headcollar suggests that horse owners perceive the risk of headcollar-related injury to be low. Injuries sustained were primarily cuts, bruising and abrasions, however, 134 horses sustained a fracture and 167 fatalities were reported. Respondents involved in a professional capacity within the equestrian industry reported more injuries than recreational and competitive horse owners. However surprisingly only 8 % (11 / 134), 16 % (21 / 134) and 12 % (16 / 134) of fractures, and 7 % (12 / 167), 14 % (23 / 167) and 6 % (10 / 167) of fatalities were reported by veterinarians, equestrian trainers / coaches / instructors and physiotherapists respectively. Whilst case reports detailing severe headcollar-related incidents have been reported (Lischer et al. 2005; Nixon and Stashak, 1988; Volcholrt, 1972), this is the first study to investigate the occurrence of headcollar-related injuries. Within this sample, 31 headcollar injury events were reported per 100 people surveyed which, at face value, appears high. However, it is important to note that no timeframe for when the injuries occurred was collected and that 81% of respondents used headcollars multiple times daily, therefore the true risk of headcollar injury cannot be determined. Given the frequency and severity of headcollar related injuries reported here, further work is warranted to fully understand human- and horse-related risk factors that contribute to headcollar injury.

Nearly 4 % of respondents had been injured because of a headcollar-related incident; horses were therefore almost 8 times more likely to be injured than the handler/owner in this sample. Only a single question was devoted to human injury and so further interpretation of the circumstances or role of headcollars is not possible. Although falls are widely reported to be the main cause of serious injuries to equestrians (Meredith et al. 2018), Hobbs et al. (1994) reported that 37% of emergency department admissions over a five-year period were related to horses being handled. Similarly, Wolyncewicz et al. (2018) reported that 9/114 paediatric patients were injured by being dragged by a horse.

Whilst many headcollars, devices and practices (e.g. use of baler twine) are promoted as being "safer", to date there is little, if any evidence, to suggest this is true. Interestingly, the use of commercial safety devices and irregular use of baling twine did not lessen the frequency of a horse being injured. Currently, there is no recognised safety standard for headcollars and there appears to be no published information on factors such as breaking force of

conventional headcollars or opening force of safety headcollars or devices. It is also unclear to what specifications manufacturers are producing headcollars. Similarly, there appears to be no industry approved guidelines for headcollar fit, use, life span or safety checks. The frequency of horse injuries was reduced using safety headcollars compared with standard headcollars and therefore it would appear that these are indeed safer. Although baler-twine loops were always used by 40% of respondents, injuries were more common than in safety headcollars. However, fewer injuries were reported using baler-twine compared with standard leather, synthetic, webbing or rope headcollars alone.

Across the equestrian sector there are few standardised industry guidelines for tack and equipment despite the importance of correct fit for both horse and rider welfare and performance (McLean and McGreevy, 2010). The Society of Master Saddlers sets standards and oversees the training of saddle fitters who can advise on saddle and bridle fit (Society of Master Saddlers, 2020) and the International Society of Equitation Science have published guidance on noseband tightness (ISES, 2019). Where evidence-based standards do not exist, it prohibits responsible horse owners and riders from applying them. Our results suggest that horse owners and riders would welcome further guidance on the correct fit and effective use of headcollars. The development of evidence-based, standardised industry guidelines for the use of commonly used tack and equipment, including headcollars, would support horse owner and rider education, and could enhance human and equine welfare by reducing injury.

The incorrect use of equipment, such as headcollars, can result in injury and compromised equine welfare (Jones and McGreevy, 2010). Similarly training flaws within horse-human interactions, such as unsupervised or inappropriate headcollar use, could also result in unintentional equine injuries. Using a headcollar when mucking out increased the injury risk across all headcollar types. This could be related to most respondents not having a professional involvement in the equine sector and not being aware of industry guidance from the British Horse Society to adequately restrain an unfamiliar horse during mucking out, which is standard practice across many equestrian centres. Alternatively, many of the incidents reported here are likely to have occurred when respondents were handling their own horse. Using a safety headcollar reduced injury prevalence, yet despite this and the expressed desire to learn more about safety features, only 20% of respondents currently used one.

Leather is the traditional material for headcollars and was the most commonly used headcollar in the present survey, followed by synthetic and webbing headcollars. Leather is also anecdotally perceived as being safer as it is imagined to break when required (Williams and Tabor, 2017); however, there appears to be no published data of the breaking strength of leather headcollars. Generally, headcollars involved in injury incidents, regardless of material, did behave as designed. However, the impact of repeated wear and tear on the durability and function of headcollars is unknown. Headcollar fit, durability, material and safety features were ranked as the most important characteristics when purchasing a headcollar, regardless of headcollar type. How to fit and use headcollars correctly were also identified as areas where increased horse owner and rider education was required. Further studies evaluating optimal headcollar fit, alongside investigation of durability and functionality, are required to allow evidence-based decisions for their selection and use (Williams and Marlin, 2020).

Conclusion

Headcollars are used multiple times, every day, by most horse owners with an apparently high occurrence of headcollar-related injuries to both horses and handlers and a relatively high number of reported equine fatalities. Based on this sample, safety headcollars appear to reduce the risk of headcollar related injuries to horses or handlers. There is a need for further research relating to headcollar function and industry approved guidelines for headcollar fit and use.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The study was funded by Equilibrium Products Ltd. Equilibrium Products Ltd had no involvement with nor influence over the survey questions, survey dissemination, the data analysis nor the writing of the paper.

References

Abu-Zidan, F.M. and Rao, S., (2003). Factors affecting the severity of horse-related injuries. *Injury*, **34**(12), 897-900.

Bailey, C., Rose, R., Reid, S. and Hodgson, D. (1997). Wastage in the Australian Thoroughbred racing industry: a survey of Sydney trainers. *Aus Vet J*, **75**(1), 64-66.

Ball, J., Ball, C., Mulloy, R., Datta, I. and Kirkpatrick, A. (2009) Ten years of major equestrian injury: are we addressing functional outcomes? *J Trauma Man Outcomes*, **3**, 2.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psych*, **3**, 77–101.

Brewin, C.R. and Holmes, E.A., (2003). Psychological theories of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Clin Psych Review*, **23**(3), 339-376.

Camargo, F., Gombeski Jr, W.R., Barger, P., Jehlik, C., Wiemers, H., Mead, J. and Lawyer, A., (2018). Horse-related injuries: causes, preventability, and where educational efforts should be focused. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, **4**(1), 1432168.

Chitnavis, J.P., Gibbons, C.L., Hirigoyen, M., Lloyd Parry, J. and Simpson, A.H. (1996) Accidents with horses: what has changed in 20 years? *Injury*, **27**, 103-105.

del Barrio, M.C.N., David, F., Hughes, J.L., Clifford, D., Wilderjans, H., Bennett, R. (2018). A retrospective report (2003–2013) of the complications associated with the use of a one-man (head and tail) rope recovery system in horses following general anaesthesia. *Irish Vet J*, **71**(1), 6.

Erk, S., Kiefer, M., Grothe, J., Wunderlich, A.P., Spitzer, M., Walter, H., (2003). Emotional context modulates subsequent memory effect. *Neuroimage*, **18**(2), 439-447.

Grossman, G.A., Kulund, D.N., Miller, C.W., Winn, R., Hodge Jr, R.H. (1978) Equestrian injuries: results of a prospective study JAMA, 240, pp. 1881-1882.

Hobbs, G. D., Yealy, D. M., & Rivas, J. (1994). Equestrian injuries: A five-year review. *J Emer Med*, **12**(2), 143–145.

Ingemarson, H., Grevsten, S., Thoren, L. (1989) Lethal horse-riding injuries. *J Trauma*, **29**(1), 25–30.

International Society for Equitation Science (2019) Position statement on restrictive noseband use. Available at: https://equitationscience.com/equitation/position-statement-on-restrictive-nosebands

Jones, B. and McGreevy, P.D., 2010. Ethical equitation: Applying a cost-benefit approach. *J Vet Behav*, **5**(4), 196-202.

Koss, M.P., Figueredo, A.J., Bell, I., Tharan, M. and Tromp, S., (1996). Traumatic memory characteristics: A cross-validated mediational model of response to rape among employed women. *J Abnorm Psych*, **105**(3), 421.

Lamperd, W., Clarke, D., Wolframm, I., & Williams, J. (2016). What makes an elite equestrian rider? *Comp Exer Physiol*, **12**(3), 105–118.

Lischer, C.J., Walliser, U., Witzmann, P., Wehrli Eser, M., Ohlerth, S. (2005) Fracture of the paracondylar process in four horses: advantages of CT imaging. *Equine Vet J.* **37**(5), 483-7.

McLean, A.N. and McGreevy, P.D. (2010). Ethical equitation: Capping the price horses pay for human glory. Journal of Veterinary Behavior: *Clin Appl Res*, **5(**4), 203-209.

Meredith, L., Ekman, R., Thomson, R. (2018). Horse-related incidents and factors for predicting injuries to the head. *BMJ open sport exer med*, **4**(1), 000398.

Society of Master Saddlers (2020) Available at: https://www.mastersaddlers.co.uk/

Nixon, A.J. and Stashak, T.S. (1988) Laminectomy for relief of atlantoaxial subluxation in four horses. *J Am Vet Med Assoc*, **193**(6), 677-82.

Parkin, T., Clegg, P., French, N., Proudman, C., Riggs, C., Singer, E., Webbon, P. and Morgan, K. (2006). Analysis of horse race videos to identify intra-race risk factors for fatal distal limb fracture. *Prev Vet Med*, **74**(1), 44-55.

Volcholrt W. (1972) [Atlas fracture in a foal following wrong accustoming to halter]. Dtsch Tierarztl Wochenschr, **79**(13), 323.

Williams, J., Marlin, D. (2020). Foreword–Emerging issues in equestrian practice. *Comp Exerc Physiol*, **16**(1).

485 Williams, J. and Tabor, G. (2017). Rider impacts on equitation. Applied Anim Behav Sci, **190**,
486 28-42.

487 Wolyncewicz, G. E. L., Palmer, C. S., Jowett, H. E., Hutson, J. M., King, S. K., & Teague, W. J.
488 (2018). Horse-related injuries in children – unmounted injuries are more severe: A
489 retrospective review. Injury, 49(5), 933–938.

490