International Journal of Tropical Agriculture
Volume 39, Number (1-2) • 2021 : pp. 139-146
ISSN: 0254-8755

EFFECT OF NON GENETIC FACTORS ON REPRODUCTION TRAITS OF GIR HAIFBRED IN ORGANIZED FARM

S. S. Kamble, M. M. Yadav, S. S. Jadhav and Y. G. Fulpagare
Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairy Science, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri (MS)

Abstarct: The data for the present investigations were collected in organized farm of the history and pedigree sheets maintained at Research Cum Development Project on Cattle, M.P.K.V., Rahuri, (MS), for the period of 40 years (1972 to 2011) on reproduction and production traits of Gir halfbreds and their *Interse*.

The data were classified according to genetic group, season of birth/calving, period of birth/calving and lactation order. In order to overcome non-orthogonality of the data due to unequal subclass frequencies, least squares techniques (Harvey, 1990) was used to estimate the effect of different factors using different Effect of genetic and non-genetic factors . The results obtained in the present investigation of the overall least squares means of AFS in FG and *Interse* of FG were 455.95 $\pm$ 6.91 and 638.99 $\pm$ 8. days, respectively. In *Interse* of FG cows born during period 2004-2009 had lowest AFS which was at par with the period 1980-1982 and significantly differed than rest of the period. The season of birth had non-significant effect on AFS in all genetic groups. The generation had significant ($P<0.01$) effect on AFS. The overall mean AFS as affected by generation was 628.91 ± 6.09 days in FG. The effect of genetic group on AFS was non-significant. However, the FG genetic group had lowest AFS. The overall least squares means of AFFS in F_1 cows of FG and *Interse* of FG was 533.41 ± 6.37 and 743.13 ± 10.72 days, respectively.

Keywords: Reproduction traits, genetic, non-genetic factors.

INTRODUCTION

The economics of dairy Industry is based on productivity of the animals which is govern by several genetic and non-genetic factors. To exploit the genetic potential of the animals it is essential to know the contribution of non-genetic factors to enable them for exploitation. Comparative study is most essential to evaluate the genetic and non-genetic parameters which affect reproduction traits.

The crossbreeding programme is quickest way to bring about the improvement in economic traits of Dairy cattle. The crossing of non-descript indigenous cattle with exotic dairy breeds like Holstein, Jersey and Brown Swiss for high productivity has been the widely adopted policy in India. By crossbreeding, hybrid vigour and additive genetic potential of highly productive exotic breeds are exploited. Thus genetic improvement of livestock by cross breeding is relatively a worldwide accepted concept for enhancing their growth, production and reproduction performance.

Although exotic cattle and their crosses are being used increasingly to raise milk production in hot climate of Indian sub-continent, it is extremely difficult to predict which breed, cross or generation will give highest economic returns over investment, because of the wide variation in performance of crossbreds due to differences of exotic donor breed and adaptability of the crossbred to the divergent climatic conditions of the tropics (Patel and Dave, 1987). Hence, identification and stabilization of the optimum level of exotic inheritance is still moot point in the crossbreeding programme (Dalal *et al.*, 1991). It is very essential to assess the comparative

Article History: Received: 9 March 2021; Revised: 19 March 2021; Accepted: 9 April 2021

performance of crossbreds of various generations under divergent agro climatic environment of formulation and implementation of long term breeding programmes (Prabhukumar *et al*., 1990).

The improvement achieved in crossbred animals can possible be stabilized against the loss of heterosis over the generation. There is increase or decrease in the performance of crossbreds during different generation. This change in performance may be due to the effect of heterosis, segregation and recombination of genes of non-dominant effect. Thus, there is need to assess the comparative performance of these crossbred animals in different generations (Bhagat *et al*., 2006).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The data were collected from the history and pedigree sheets maintained at Research Cum Development Project on Cattle, M.P.K.V., Rahuri, Dist. - Ahmednagar (MS), for the period of 40 years (1972 to 2011) on reproduction traits of Gir halfbreds, and their *Interse*.

The animals were kept under loose housing system with lofing area and covered sheds. All calves were housed in calf pens up to three months of age and thereafter reared separately in loose housing system according to age group. The feeding and management of the cattle was more or less uniform throughout the year. The maintenance, production and growth ration were given as per feeding standards with green and dry fodders.

The data were collected as follows

I. Pre-partum reproduction traits (days)

1. Age at first service (AFS)
2. Age at first fertile service (AFFS)
3. Age at first calving (AFC)

II. Post- partum reproduction traits (days)

1. Open period (OP)
2. Service period (SP)
3. Calving interval (CI)

The data were classified according to genetic group, season of birth/calving, period of birth/calving and lactation order. The following generations were considered for estimation of least square means for production and reproduction traits.

Genetic group	G_1	G_2	G_3	G_4	G_5	G_6	G_7
50 % HF + 50 % Gir	FG	IH	3IH	4IH	5IH	6IH	7IH

As per climatic conditions of the farm the data of each year were divided into three seasons as Rainy, Winter and Summer. The data were divided into different genetic groups according to their period of birth. The parity wise data were collected up to 7th lactation of animal maintained at the farm. In order to overcome non- orthogonality of the data due to unequal subclass frequencies, least squares techniques (Harvey, 1990) was used to estimate the effect of different factors using different models at Department of Statistic, National Dairy Research Institute, (NDRI) Karnal, India.

Effect of genetic and non-genetic factors were estimated by least squares technique suggested by Harvey (1990) using the following model:

Model for estimation of effect of non-genetic factors

$$Y_{ijkl} = \mu + A_i + B_j + C_k + e_{ijkl}$$

Where,

Y_{ijkl} = Performance record of i^{th} period of birth/calving of j^{th} season of birth/calving and k^{th} lactation order

μ = Overall mean

A_i = Effect of i^{th} period of birth/calving

B_j = Effect of j^{th} season of birth/calving

C_k = Effect of k^{th} lactation order

e_{ijkl} = Random error NID (0, 62e)

The period of birth effect was estimated only for the age at first calving.

Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT)

Duncan's multiple range test as modified by Kramer (1957) was used to make pair wise comparison among the least squares means with the use of inverse elements and root mean squares of error.

If the values

$$(Yi - Yj) \times \sqrt{\frac{2}{Cii + Cjj - 2Cij > s^2 e, Z(P, ne}}$$

Yi–Yj = Difference between the two least square means

Cii = Corresponding ith diagonal elements of C matrix

Cjj = Corresponding jth diagonal elements of C matrix

Z(P,ne) = Standardized range value in Duncan's table at the chosen level of probability for ne the error degrees of freedom

P = Number of means involved in the comparison

σ^2e = Root mean squares of error.

Correction of data

The data on reproduction and production traits were corrected for the significant effects of period and season of birth/calving according to the formula suggested by Gacula *et al.* (1968). The corrected data were used to estimate the effect of genetic group and generation, similarly to estimate genetic parameters *viz.*, genetic correlations, phenotypic correlations and heritability.

(b) Model for effect of genetic group and generation

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + A_i + B_j + e_{ijk}$$

Where,

Y_{ijk} = Performance record of ith genetic group of jth generation

μ = Overall mean

A_i = Effect of ith genetic group

B_j = Effect of jth generation

e_{ijk} = error NID (0, σ^2e)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data pertaining to FG (551 records) and Interse of FG (721 records) from year 1972 to 2011 (40 years) are used for analysis. The overall least squares mean of AFS in FG and *Interse* of FG were 455.95 $\pm$ 6.91 and 638.99 $\pm$ 8.31 days, respectively. Similar results have been reported by Gill *et.al.* (1978) in crossbred of Red Danish x Sahiwal cows and Navale (1991) in Brown Swiss crosses. Kale (1984) and Pyne *et.al.* (1987) was reported short AFS in FG, JG, FH and JH crosses, respectively. The period of birth had significant effect on all genetic groups except FG group. The season of birth had non-significant effect on AFS in all genetic groups. Similar result was reported by Ahuja *et.al.* (1961) in Hariana cattle, Luktuke *et.al.* (1961) in Gir cow, Ranjan *et.al.* (1981) in HF, J and Gir crosses.

The generation had significant ($P<0.01$) effect on AFS. There were significant differences in the generation of FG group. The overall mean AFS as affected by generation was 628.91 ± 6.09 days in FG,. Significantly lowest AFS (days) was observed in the Ist generation cows, however, the highest AFS noticed in cows of VIth generation. The cows from generation IIIrd to Vth and VIIth were performance at par with each other. The overall least squares mean of AFFS in FG and *Interse* of FG was 533.41 ± 6.37 and 743.13 ± 10.72 days, respectively. The overall mean for AFFS in FG was 709.61 ± 8.00 days. The effect of generation was significant in FG group. The genetic group wise overall mean AFFS was 709.61 ± 8.00 days. The result indicates that FG genetic group had lowest value of AFFS. In connection with this results Nagarcenkar and Rao (1982) reported AFFS in JT was 548.00 and in FO was 549.00, Sharma *et.al.* (1986) in BO, FO and JO were 616.27, 616.27

The overall least square means of AFC in FG and *Interse* of FG were 820.90 ± 10.03 and 1020.87. ± 11.41 days, respectively.

Significant effect of generation on AFC in all genetic group of Gir crossbred cow. The overall mean for generation of AFC was 997.26 ± 8.48 days in FG group The overall least squares mean of OP in FG and *Interse* of FG was 75.94 ± 1.69 and. 75.13 ± 2.89 days, respectively. The lower AFC days than the present results were reported by Bhoitean and Kale (1996) in JG genetic group (792.70 ± 17.08). However, higher values of AFC days were noticed by Thombre et al.(2002) in HF x D halfbreds (1308.75 ± 76.44), Bhagat et al. (2006) in FG halfbreds (1054.67 ± 12.63) and Jadhav (2011) in FG (834.09 + 12.32),

The period of calving and season of calving had non-significant effect on service period. Similar results were also reported by Kamble

Table 1: Least squares means for AFS (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG

Sources of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Sources of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	FG				*Interse of FG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S.E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S.E.*
µ	**130**	**455.95**	**6.91**	**µ**	**235**	**638.99**	**8.31**
POB				POB			
1972-1973	44	455.52	11.25	1980-1985	64	609.94[a]	13.72
1974-1975	86	456.38	7.90	1986-1991	50	626.11[b]	15.69
				1992-1997	68	699.25[c]	13.30
				1998-2003	38	762.16[d]	17.68
				2004-2009	15	597.48[a]	28.43
SOB				SOB			
S_1(Jun-Sept)	47	457.13	10.83	S_1(Jun-Sept)	78	660.18	13.42
S_2(Oct-Jan)	47	466.98	10.55	S_2(Oct-Jan)	77	659.08	13.51
S_3(Feb-May)	36	443.74	13.05	S_3(Feb-May)	80	657.69	12.67

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed

Table 2: Generation wise least squares means for AFS (days) in Gir crossbred cow

Sources of variation	*Genetic groups*		
	FG		
	N	*Mean*	*S.E.*
µ	**365**	**628.91**	**6.09**
Generation			
G_1	130	457.48 [a]	8.43
G_2	61	675.19 [d]	12.31
G_3	46	620.97 [b]	14.18
G_4	49	661.18 [c]	13.74
G_5	37	674.91 [cd]	15.82
G_6	27	673.59 [cd]	18.51
G_7	15	639.06 [bc]	24.83

Means in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 3: Least squares means for AFFS (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG group

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
µ	130	533.41	6.37	µ	235	743.13	10.72
POB				POB			
1972-73	44	539.78	16.10	1980-1985	64	666.71[a]	17.70
1974-75	86	527.03	11.30	1986-1991	50	692.39[b]	20.24
				1992-1997	68	810.84[c]	17.15
				1998-2003	38	845.02[d]	23.06
				2004-2009	15	700.71[b]	36.68
SOB				SOB			
S_1(Jun-Sept)	47	532.33	15.50	S_1(Jun-Sept)	78	743.74	17.31
S_2(Oct-Jan)	49	540.77	15.10	S_2(Oct-Jan)	77	740.18	17.43
S_3(Feb-May)	34	527.11	18.67	S_3(Feb-May)	80	745.48	16.34

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 5: Generation wise least squares means for AFFS (days) in Gir crossbred cow

Sources of variation	*Genetic groups*		
	FG		
	N	*Mean*	*S.E.*
µ	365	709.61	8.00
Generation			
G_1	130	532.09 [a]	11.06
G_2	61	776.95 [e]	16.15
G_3	46	686.43 [b]	18.60
G_4	49	759.32 [d]	18.02
G_5	37	739.37 [c]	20.74
G_6	27	747.40 [cd]	24.28
G_7	15	725.73 [c]	32.58

Means in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 6: Least squares means for AFC (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG group

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
µ	**130**	**820.98**	10.03	µ	235	1028.87	11.41
POB				POB			
1972-73	44	839.15[b]	16.33	1980-1985	64	957.28[a]	18.84
1974-75	86	802.82[a]	11.46	1986-1991	50	994.26[b]	21.54
				1992-1997	68	1082.55[c]	18.25
				1998-2003	38	1143.28[d]	24.52
				2004-2009	15	966.98[ab]	39.03
SOB				SOB			
S_1(Jun-Sept)	47	824.51	15.73	S_1(Jun-Sept)	78	1012.37	18.42
S_2(Oct-Jan)	49	828.48	15.33	S_2(Oct-Jan)	77	1039.41	18.54
S_3(Feb-May)	34	809.96	18.95	S_3(Feb-May)	80	1034.82	17.39

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 9: Generation wise least squares means for AFC (days) in Gir crossbred cow

Sources of variation	*Genetic groups*		
	FG		
	N	*Mean*	*S.E.*
µ	365	997.26	8.48
Generation			
G_1	130	822.15 [a]	11.73
G_2	61	1059.54[d]	17.13
G_3	46	977.54 [b]	19.79
G_4	49	1032.49 [c]	19.12
G_5	37	1032.05 [c]	22.00
G_6	27	1049.59 [d]	25.78
G_7	15	1007.47 [c]	34.55

Means in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 10: Least squares means for open period (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG group

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
µ	441	75.94	1.69	µ	579	75.13	2.89
POC				POC			
1974-1979	274	80.50	2.51	1982-1987	95	53.27[a]	5.32
1980-1985	167	71.41	2.36	1988-1993	120	78.07[b]	4.37
				1994-1999	192	87.53[c]	3.63
				2000-2005	118	78.11[b]	4.39
				2006- 2011	54	78.67[b]	6.10
SOC				SOC			
S_1(Jun-Sept)	126	73.38	2.80	S_1(Jun-Sep)	179	71.64	3.93
S_2(Oct-Jan)	163	77.60	2.59	S_2(Oct-Jan)	194	80.30	3.79
S_3(Feb-May)	152	76.88	2.54	S_3(Feb-May)	206	73.45	3.86
LO				LO			
L_1	127	74.75	3.07	L_1	238	87.70	2.89
L_2	117	77.42	2.79	L_2	132	80.69	3.89
L_3	84	70.27	3.27	L_3	82	76.18	4.85
L_4	54	74.55	4.05	L_4	56	81.44	5.8
L_5	35	79.87	5.11	L_5	36	66.26	7.30
L_6	24	78.87	6.30	L_6	23	67.99	9.15
				L_7	12	65.66	12.56

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 11: Generation wise least squares means for open period (days) in Gir crossbred cow

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*		
	FG		
	N	*Mean*	*S.E.*
µ	1018	76.88	1.63
Generation			
G_1	441	76.51	1.78
G_2	134	70.85	3.24
G_3	125	76.40	3.36
G_4	144	70.42	3.13
G_5	90	82.63	3.96
G_6	59	81.97	4.88
G_7	25	79.40	7.50

Table 12: Least squares means for service period (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG group

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
µ	441	141.67	4.81	µ	584	138.65	4.76
POC				POC			
1974-1979	274	140.51	7.11	1982-1987	97	132.23	8.74
1980-1985	167	142.82	6.68	1988-1993	121	135.43	7.70
				1994-1999	192	149.56	6.00
				2000-2005	120	142.41	7.20
				2006-2011	54	133.57	10.07
SOC				SOC			
S_1(Jun-Sept)	126	141.87	7.94	S_1(Jun-Sep)	182	129.94	6.46

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
S_2(Oct-Jan)	163	135.32	7.33	S_2(Oct-Jan)	193	143.57	6.24
S_3(Feb-May)	152	147.82	7.20	S_3(Feb-May)	207	142.42	6.37
LO				LO			
L_1	127	136.94	8.69	L_1	239	140.09	4.76
L_2	117	134.49	7.92	L_2	134	143.26	6.38
L_3	84	134.26	9.27	L_3	83	136.54	7.97
L_4	54	158.91	11.49	L_4	57	139.19	9.63
L_5	35	158.14	14.47	L_5	36	153.56	12.06
L_6	24	127.26	17.86	L_6	23	119.47	15.11
				L_7	12	138.41	20.74

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

Table 14: Least squares means for calving interval (days) in FG and *Interse* of FG group

Source of variation	*Genetic groups*			*Source of variation*	*Genetic groups*		
	Interse of FG				*Interse of FJG*		
	N	*Mean*	*S. E.*		*N*	*Mean*	*S. E.*
µ	518	413.20	4.89	µ	694	417.53	4.64
POC				POC			
1974-1979	301	411.09	7.41	1982-1987	101	416.85	9.63
1980-1985	217	419.31	6.18	1988-1993	151	416.20	7.69
				1994-1999	215	429.84	6.35
				2000-2005	152	423.63	7.23
				2006-2011	75	401.11	9.89
SOC				SOC			
S_1(Jun-Sep)	157	405.93	7.51	S_1(Jun-Sep)	218	409.32	6.51
S_2(Oct-Jan)	189	407.34	7.35	S_2(Oct-Jan)	229	422.15	6.45
S_3(Feb-May)	172	432.33	7.23	S_3(Feb-May)	247	421.11	6.44
LO				LO			
L_1	126	413.55	8.90	L_1	234	421.63	5.59
L_2	126	416.34	7.94	L_2	166	416.53	6.58
L_3	100	419.61	8.87	L_3	116	414.08	7.90
L_4	71	431.70	10.45	L_4	74	410.77	9.85
L_5	46	428.24	13.21	L_5	51	430.89	11.90
L_6	30	394.93	16.68	L_6	35	409.23	14.30
L_7	19	402.03	20.71	L_7	18	419.33	19.79

Means under each class in the same column with different superscript differed significantly

(2003) in Gir crossbreds. Lactation order had non-significant effect on service period in all genetic groups. The effect of generation and genetic group was non-significant on service period in all genetic groups. The overall least squares mean of calving interval in FG and *Interse* of FG was 413.20 ± 4.89 and 417.53 ± 4.64 days, respectively. Analysis of variance revealed that period of calving and season of calving had non-significant on calving interval in Gir crossbred cows. Lactation order had non-significant effect on calving interval in all genetic groups. Effect of generation had non-significant effect on calving interval in FG group. The effect of genetic group was non-significant on calving interval in all genetic groups. The results were in consonance with Bhoite (1996) in Gir halfbred and triple crosses, Kanawade (1997) and Bhagat et al. (2006) in Gir crossbred cows and Jadhav (2011) in Gir crossbred.

CONCLUSION

1. Most of the reproduction traits under study were affected by non-genetic factors indicating the importance of feeding and management for enhancing performance.
2. The first generation of FG showed significantly higher performance over their *Interse* because of hybrid vigor, subsequent decline in further generations in FG indicated to restrict the *Interse* mating.

References

Ahuja, L.D., Luktuke, S.N. and Bhattacharya, P. 1961 Certain aspects of physiology of reproduction in Hariana females. Indian J. Vet Sci/31: 13-14.1

Bhagat, R.L., Ulmek, B.R., Gokhale, S.B. and Phadke, N.L. 2006. Generation effect on reproductive traits in non-inbred and inbred crossbred cattle. Indian Vet. J. 83(2): 239-241.

Bhoite, U.Y. 1996. Comparative performance of economic traits of halfbreds, triple crosses of Gir and their interbred cows. Ph.D. Thesis Submitted, M.P.K.V., Rahuri.

Bhoite, U.Y. and Kale, K.M. 1996. Production performance of three breed Gir crosses. Indian Vet. J. 73(4):473-474.

Dalal, D.S., Arora, K.C. and Rathi, S.S. 1991. Evaluation of performance traits in halfbred cattle. Indian J. Dairy Sci. 44(2): 401-405.

Gacula, M.C., Gount, S.N. and Demon, R.A. (Jr.) 1968. Genetic and environmental parameters of milk constituents for five breeds. Effect of herd-year-season and age of cow. J. Dairy Sci. 51(3): 428-437.

Gill , G.S Jain, A.K., Tiwana, M.S. and Pattar, A.S. 1978. Performance of crosses between Red Danish bulls and Sahiwal cows. Indian J. Dairy Sci.31 (4) : 326-329.

Harvey, W.R. 1990. Least squares analysis of data with unequal subclass number. APSH4, U.S.D.A.

Jadhav, P.D. 2011. Generationwise comparative reproduction and production performance of HF x Gir and Phule Triveni synthetic cow. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis submitted to MPKV, Rahuri

Kale, K.M.1984. Growth, reproduction and production performance of Gir cows and its exotic crosses. Ph.D. Thesis Submitted, MPKV, Rahuri.

Kamble, S.S. 2003. Effect of different types of calving on reproduction and productive performance of crossbred cattle. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis Submitted, MPKV, Rahuri.

Kanwade, V.R. 1997. Comparative study on breeding efficiency of halfbreds and its interbred of Gir cattle. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis Submitted, MPKV, Rahuri.

Kramer, C.V. 1957. Extension of multiple range test to group correlated adjusted mean. Biochetrics. 13 : 13-20.

Luktuke, S.N. and Subramanian, P 1961 Studies on certain aspects of oestrus phenomenon in Hariana cattle. Indian J. Report. Pert. 2 (199): 30-213.

Nagarcenkar, R. and Rao, M.K. 1982. Performance of Tharparkar exotic crosses for productive and reproductive traits. Indian J. Anim. Sci. 52 (3) : 129-138.

Navale, P.B. 1991. Comparative performance of reproductive and productive economic traits of triple crosses of Gir cattle and their Interbreds. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis submitted, MPKV, Rahuri.

Patel, J.M. and Dave, A.D. 1987. Body weight changes and growth pattern in Jersey x Kankrej and Holstein x Kankrej F_1 crossbreds. Indian J. Anim. Res. 21(2): 97-101.

Prabhukumar, V., Rao, C.H., Venkatramaian, A. and Naidu, K.M. 1990. Genetic group differences in the performance of the various crosses of angole with Friesian, Brown Swiss and Jersey breeds. Indian J. Dairy. Sci. 43(1): 46-50.

Pyne, A.K., Maitra, D.N., Sinha, R., Dattagupta, R., Mujamdar, S.C., Roy,S.K. and Roy, S.P. 1987. Age at first service and first service period of cross bred cattle as influenced by the season of their birth in humid tropical; conditions. Indian J. Anim. Prod, Mgmt. 3 (2) : 83-85.

Rajan, M.K. Parekhe, H.K.B. and Dave, B.K. 1981. Effect of genetic and non genetic factors on reproductive traits in halfbreds. Indian J. Anim. Sci.51 (12) : 1124-1127.

Sharma, G.P., Krishnaiah, N., Mallikarjuna, Rao, T.K.V.V., Siviah, K. and Murthy, S.R. 1986. Studies on reproductive traits of Ongole cross breeds. Indian J. Dairy Sci. 41(2) : 202-203

Thombre, B.M., Mitkari, B.V., Gujar, B.V. and Padghan, P.V. 2002. Factors affecting reproductive traits in Deoni and Holstein Friesian x Deoni halfbreds (F_1). Indian J. Anim. Res. 36(2): 141-143.