

1     **EFFECT OF YEAR OF CALVING ON THE REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF**  
2     **HOLSTEIN FRIESIAN COWS IN VOM PLATEAU STATE NIGERIA**

3  
4     **ABSTRACT**

5     The study was carried out to estimate the effect of year of calving on reproductive  
6     performance traits of Holstein Friesian cows that calved between 2006 – 2017. Five  
7     hundred and thirteen (513) calving records obtained from Integrated Dairy Farm  
8     Vom were collated for the study. Data were analyzed using the general linear models  
9     of SAS 2001 (version 8.0). Results revealed that the overall mean of Age at First  
10    Calving (AFC), Calving Interval (CI) and Days Open (DO) were  $30.36 \pm 0.23$  months,  
11     $379.70 \pm 13.34$  days and  $93.67 \pm 9.74$  days respectively. All the reproductive traits in  
12    the study have significant effect (P < .05) on year of birth of dam. The first then  
13    fourth and fifth calving interval has significant effect (P < .05) on year of birth while  
14    the second and sixth calving interval had no significant influence (P > 0.05) on year of  
15    birth. The observed reproductive performance of Holstein Friesian cattle under Vom  
16    condition was generally commendable. This may be attributed to improved  
17    management practices (such as high quality feed), maternal gene effect, accurate  
18    heat detection, timely insemination and adaptation of Holstein Friesian breed to the  
19    climatic condition of the study area (due to lower temperature).

20  
21    **INTRODUCTION**

22         In the tropics, despite the large and diverse animal genetic resources, the  
23    productivity of many livestock especially the indigenous dairy cattle remains low. The  
24    increasing demand for milk and dairy products in Nigeria due to increasing  
25    population and improved standard of living may worsen if the bulk of multipurpose  
26    indigenous cows are with generically low productive potentials (Alphonsus *et al.*,  
27    2014). This is because milk production depends on the reproductive efficiency of the  
28    cow, with the best cows being those that calve at early age with little number of  
29    services per conception and with minimum calving interval; thereafter (Ngodigha *et*  
30    *al.*, 2009).

31         Kiwuwa *et al.* (1983) reported that the reproductive performance of the  
32    breeding female is probably the single most important factor that is a prerequisite  
33    for sustainable dairy production system and influencing the productivity. The size of  
34    the calf crop is all important for her replacement and the production of milk depends  
35    heavily on the cow reproductive activity. The overall productivity and adaptive

36 efficiency of cattle depends largely on their reproductive performance in a given  
37 environment (Wondossen et al., 2018). Any genetic improvement in dairy cattle  
38 requires information reproductive performance in a given population (Wondossen et  
39 al., 2018). Reproductive performance is biologically crucial phenomenon and vital  
40 measurement for the profitability of many animal production systems. Especially, the  
41 economics of diary enterprise is based on an efficient reproductive performance of  
42 dairy animals (Negussie et al., 1998). It is sometimes used interchangeably with  
43 fertility (Massawe Heriel, 2011).

44 According to Abdel Rahman and Aleman (2008) the Holstein-Friesian breed is  
45 known for high milk productivity under the temperate climate. The high productivity  
46 of Holstein-Friesian in temperate climates raises the question of how much of this  
47 superiority in production is maintained when the animals are transferred to tropical  
48 environment. Therefore, the objective of this study was to estimate the non-genetic  
49 and environment factors on the reproductive performance of Hosltein-Friesan cows  
50 in integrated Dairy Form, Vom.

## 51 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 52 **Description of Study Area**

53 The study was conducted in Integrated Dairy Farm (IDF) Ltd, a private  
54 commercial dairy enterprise located at Vom, Plateau State, Nigeria. Vom is situated  
55 on the Jos Plateau 29km south West of Jos city. The town lies between latitudes  
56 9°43 60" N and longitudes 8° 46' 60" E and has an altitude of 1222M above sea  
57 level, with mean annual rainfall of 1400mm (55 inches). The area is defined by two  
58 seasons; rainy season (May to October) and dry season (November to April). The  
59 temperature ranges for 15–25oC, but from mid November to late January, night  
60 temperature drops as low as 11°C.

61

62

### 63 **Herd Description and Animal Management**

64 The Holstein Friesian cattle were maintained under intensive management  
65 throughout the year. They were grazed on sown pasture in fenced padlocks  
66 containing grasses and legumes in the morning and evening after which they were  
67 turned to the stall (pen). In the dry season mixture of concentrates and silage/hay  
68 were used to feed the cattle twice in a day. Steaming up was practiced at later stage  
69 of pregnancy (2-3 months before calving). The cows were milked twice daily  
70 (morning and evening) in the milking parlour using the milking machine. Calves were  
71 weighed 24 hours of life (after birth) and weekly thereafter. The animals were  
72 vaccinated against prevalent diseases and ecto parasites were also controlled using  
73 spray. Routine deworming was also carried out.

#### 74 **Mating System**

75 Artificial insemination was the main breeding method in the diary farm.

#### 76 **Experimental Design**

77 The experimental design used was the completely Randomized Design (CRD).

#### 78 **Data Collection**

79 Five hundred and thirteen (513) calving records of Holstein Friesian cows were  
80 collected from 2006 – 2017 for analysis. Data on Age at First Calving (AFC), Days  
81 Open (DD) and Calving Interval (CI) were obtained as measures of reproductive  
82 performance.

#### 83 **Statistical Analysis**

84 Data obtained was subjected to analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using the General  
85 linear models (GLM) procedure of Statistical Analysis System (SAS, 2001 version).  
86 Where there is significant difference, means was separated using Duncan's New  
87 Multiple Range Test (DNMRT).

88

89

#### 90 **RESULTS**

91 **Age at First Calving (AFC)**

92 The result showed that year of birth had significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) effect on Aged at First  
 93 Calving of Holstein Friesian cows at Integrated Dairy Farm Vom. The overall mean  
 94 for AFC was  $30.36 \pm 0.23$  months. The result also indicated that high AFC (32.94  
 95 months) was recorded in 2011 and heifers born in 2013 had the lowest mean AFC  
 96 (26.94 months).

97 **Table 1: Least Square Means (LSM) for Effect of Year of Birth. On Age at**  
 98 **First Calving of Holstein Friesian Cows at Integrated Dairy Farm**  
 99 **Vom**

Year of Birth	N	Age at First Calving (Months) LSM $\pm$ SE
	365	*
2006	37	31.87 $\pm$ 0.75 <sup>ab</sup>
2007	41	31.82 $\pm$ 0.57 <sup>ab</sup>
2008	39	30.75 $\pm$ 0.56 <sup>b</sup>
2009	32	32.89 $\pm$ 0.69 <sup>a</sup>
2010	31	31.68 $\pm$ 0.65 <sup>ab</sup>
2011	36	32.94 $\pm$ 0.67 <sup>a</sup>
2012	42	28.86 $\pm$ 0.69 <sup>c</sup>
2013	57	26.94 $\pm$ 0.42 <sup>d</sup>
2014	50	28.61 $\pm$ 0.52 <sup>c</sup>
Overall Mean		30.36 $\pm$ 0.23

100 **Note:** <sup>abcd</sup> LS mean with different superscript in the same column are significantly  
 101 different ( $P < 0.05$ ); \* =  $P < 0.05$ ; N = Number of observation.

102

103 **Days Open (DO)**

104 The result showed that year of birth had significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) effect on Days open of  
 105 Holstein Friesian cows in Integrated Dairy Farm Vom. The overall mean for DO was  
 106  $93.67 \pm 9.74$  days. The result indicated highest level of DO in 2011 ( $118.10 \pm 30.40$ )  
 107 days and lowest DO in 2013 ( $83.85 \pm 7.30$  days).

108 **Table 2: Least Square Means of Effect of Year of Birth. On Days open of**  
 109 **Holstein Friesian Cows at Integrated Dairy Farm Vom**

Year of Birth	N	Days Open (Days) LSM±SE
	226	*
2006	28	87.54±5.88 <sup>ab</sup>
2007	26	86.19±6.44 <sup>ab</sup>
2008	22	95.86±4.35 <sup>ab</sup>
2009	32	91.44±5.07 <sup>ab</sup>
2010	26	91.85±6.47 <sup>ab</sup>
2011	27	118.10±30.40 <sup>a</sup>
2012	26	90.62±6.59 <sup>ab</sup>
2013	34	83.85±7.30 <sup>b</sup>
2014	5	97.60±15.20 <sup>ab</sup>
Overall Mean		93.67±9.74

110

111 **Note:** <sup>ab</sup> LS Mean with different superscript in the same column are significantly  
 112 different (P<0.05); \* = P<0.05); \* P<0.05; N = Number of observation.

113

#### 114 **Calving Interval (CI)**

115 The result showed that year of birth had significant (P<0.05) effect on calving  
 116 interval of Holstein Friesian cows in Integrated Dairy Farm, Vom. The overall mean  
 117 for Calving Interval (CI) was 379.70±13.34 days. The highest calving interval was  
 118 in 2008 (453.20±31.00 days) while the lowest was in 2014 (345.20±35.90 days)  
 119 indicative of improved management.

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128  
129

**Table 3: Least Square Means of Effect of Year of Birth on Calving Interval of Holstein Friesian Cows at Integrated Dairy Farm Vom**

Year of Birth	N	Calving Interval (CI) LSM±SE (Days)
	215	*
2006	26	388.88±8.64 <sup>bc</sup>
2007	26	389.80±16.20 <sup>b</sup>
2008	19	453.20±31.00 <sup>a</sup>
2009	29	384.76±8.20 <sup>bc</sup>
2010	25	375.20±14.00 <sup>bc</sup>
2011	26	354.04±6.17 <sup>c</sup>
2012	25	367.24±5.53 <sup>bc</sup>
2013	34	358.97±7.77 <sup>bc</sup>
2014	5	345.20±35.90 <sup>c</sup>
Overall Mean		379.70±13.34

130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144

**Note:** <sup>abc</sup> LS Mean with different superscript in the same column are significantly different (P<0.05); \* = P<0.05; N = Number of observation.

145 **Table 4: Least Square Means for Effect of Year of Birth on First to Sixth**  
 146 **Calving Interval of Holstein Friesian Cows at Integrated Diary**  
 147 **Farm Vom**

Year of Birth	First CI (days) LSM±SE	Second CI (days) LSM±SE	Third CI (days) LSM±SE	Fourth CI (days) LSM±SE	Fifth CI (days) LSM±SE	Sixth CI (days) LSM±SE
	*	ns	*	*	*	ns
2006	388.88±8.64 <sup>bc</sup> (26)	367.80±15.40 (19)	381.60±15.7 <sup>b</sup> (13)	346.30±14.2 <sup>b</sup> (12)	359.6±8.16.4 <sup>b</sup> (7)	372.4±18.9 (7)
2007	389.8±16.20 <sup>b</sup> (26)	386.8±18.50 (13)	404.80±31.6 <sup>ab</sup> (6)	424.01±23.0 <sup>a</sup> (4)	434.0±21.4 <sup>a</sup> (4)	427.7±20.2 (3)
2008	453.2±31.0 <sup>a</sup> (19)	393.60±15.40 (19)	437.90±20.6 <sup>a</sup> (17)	373.7±16.7 <sup>ab</sup> (10)	413.2±22.4 <sup>ab</sup> (6)	
2009	384.76±8.20 <sup>bc</sup> (29)	380.10±10.80 (21)	376.60±13.3 <sup>b</sup> (18)	334.0±14.6 <sup>b</sup> (12)	366.0±25.2 <sup>ab</sup> (3)	
2010	375.20±14.0 <sup>bc</sup> (25)	361.80±15.20 (24)	383.0±13.0 <sup>b</sup> (14)	375.3±33.5a <sup>b</sup> (4)		
2011	354.04 ±6.17 <sup>c</sup> (26)	375.00±11.90 (15)	346.5±28.4 <sup>b</sup> (6)			
2012	367.24±5.53 <sup>bc</sup> (25)	361.20±19.20 (11)	339.0±00 <sup>ab</sup> (2)			
2013	358.97±7.77 <sup>bc</sup> (34)	344.90±15.3 (7)				
2014	345.20±35.90 <sup>bc</sup> (5)					
N	215	129	75	42	20	10

149 **Note:** <sup>abc</sup>LSMean with different superscript in the same column are significantly  
 150 different (P<0.05); ns = Not significant; \* = P<0.05; n = Total number of  
 151 Observation in each factor; CI = Calving Interval; ( ) = Values in parenthesis are  
 152 number of observations.

## 154 DISCUSSION

155 Accurate estimation of reproductive performance of Holstein Friesian is very  
 156 important for improving the management practices and profitability of dairy farms  
 157 (Wondossen *et al.*, 2008).the reproductive parameters discussed include:

### 158 Age at First Calving (AFC)

159 AFC has a great economic importance in the efficiency of dairy cattle production as it  
 160 affects productive life of a cow (Wondossen *et al.*, 2018). The overall mean in this  
 161 study (30.36 months) was higher than the recommended AFC of 23-25 months for  
 162 heifers to calve, but was similar to the work of Gwaza *et al.*(2007) and Ajili *et*  
 163 *al.*(2007) who reported AFC values of 30.9 and 29.28 months respectively. It was

164 however shorter than 42.16, 39.4, 36.48, 33.73, 39.2 and 33.27 months reported by  
165 Fekadu *et al.*(2011), Wondossen *et al.*(2018), Kebede (2015), Zelalem *et al.* (2015),  
166 Tadesse et al. (2010) and Kollalpitiya et al. (2012) respectively. The AFC in this  
167 study agrees with the average AFC in many tropical countries and if indicated  
168 improve management practice in the farm such as good nutrition.

169 In the present study, AFC was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) influenced by year of birth. The  
170 AFC was found to be shorter in the latter years especially cows born in 2012, 2013  
171 and 2014 (28.86, 26.94 and 28.61 months respectively) compared to the ones born  
172 in previous or former years (2006 – 2011) with longer AFC. This could be attributed  
173 to change in herd management in the latter years such as improved feeding, health  
174 and reproductive health. Therefore, decreasing AFC implies a progressive  
175 improvement in management practices of heifers and improved reproductive health.  
176 This work agrees with earlier findings by Haile (2014) and Habfamu *et al.* (2010)  
177 who reported that changes in feeding management environmental conditions which  
178 varied from year to year as well as differences between year in the quality and  
179 quantity of forage available.

### 180 **Days Open (DO)**

181 The overall mean for Days Open (DO) was 93.67 days. This falls within the desired  
182 optimum value of 85 – 115 days and 75 – 90 days reported by Hammoud *et al.*  
183 (2010) and Fernando *et al.* (2016) respectively required for improve herd  
184 management. Days open is part of calving that can be reduced by improving herd  
185 management. The value obtained in this study can be attributed to normal calving to  
186 service period, regular oestrus and good management such as proper feeding.

187 The study showed that year of birth had significant ( $P<0.05$ ) effect on Days open.  
188 This agrees with the finding of Haile (2014) who reported significant effect for years  
189 of calving on Days open.

190 The value obtained in this study is shorter than 208, 179.9 and 156.44 days reported  
191 by Haile (2014), Wondossen *et al.* (2018) and Fernando et al. (2016) respectively.  
192 Long DO may affect the overall economic revenues of the dairy herd. Delayed  
193 resumption of ovarian activity after calving and management factors such as



194 inadequate heat detection, decisions of breeding after parturition, nutrition and  
195 diseases are some of the causes of higher length of DO.

### 196 **Calving Interval (CI)**

197 The study showed that years of birth significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) affected the calving  
198 interval. This agrees with the work of Haile (2014) and Tadesse *et al.* (2010) who  
199 reported significant effect of CI on year of birth for Holstein Friesian cows.

200 The overall mean calving interval of 379.70 days (12.5 months) in this study falls  
201 under the optimum recommended level of 12-13 months as reported by Fernando *et*  
202 *al.* (2016) and Hammoud *et al.* (2010) for a well managed farm. This also agrees  
203 with previous reports of Ogundipe and Adeoye (2013), Hunduma (2012) and Sena *et*  
204 *al.* (2014) who reported 374 days, 12.4 months and 13.06 months respectively. The  
205 value may be as a result of normal calving to service period, environmental factors  
206 and good reproductive managements such as accurate heat detection, timely  
207 insemination and efficiency of AI technicians and also adequate and high quality  
208 feed supply. Many researchers in the tropics reported higher level of CI such as  
209 469.2 days, 14.64 months, 436 days and 431.41 days reported by Kebede (2015),  
210 Wondossen *et al.* (2018), Zelalem *et al.* (2014), Ogundipe and Adeoye (2013) and  
211 Fernando *et al.* (2016) respectively.

212 The study also showed significant decline of CI as the calving year advanced from  
213 2008 (453.20 days) to 2014 (345.20 days). The marked decrease observed shows  
214 an improvement in the levels of management such as supplementation of lactating  
215 cows, better oestrus detection, better ratification insemination services and improved  
216 regular follow up of breeding cows.

217 Table 4 in the current study showed year of birth had significant ( $P<0.05$ ) effect on  
218 the first, third, fourth and fifth calving interval but showed non significant ( $P>0.05$ )  
219 effect on the second and sixth calving interval. The variation in all the calving  
220 intervals from year to year indicated a progressive improvement in management,  
221 maternal gene effect, accurate heat detection and timely insemination.

222

223 **CONCLUSION**

224 The reproductive performance assessed in the present study showed that year of  
225 calving had significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) affected virtually all the factors (Age at first calving,  
226 days open and calving interval). The ultimate goal of a breeder is to lower the age at  
227 first calving, Days open and calving interval.

228 In the study both Days open and calving intervals overall mean were within the  
229 optimum standard recommended to maintain reproductive efficiency. This means  
230 normal number of calves was produced during the productive life of the cows.  
231 However, overall mean for Age and at first calving was slightly above the optimum  
232 standard which could be attributed to changes in feeding management and  
233 environmental conditions at the early stage of growth, but this performance was  
234 better than the overall means of AFC in the tropics.

235 The Holstein Friesian (HF) cattle can be bred and maintained in tropical  
236 environments, although performing a little lower than those maintained in temperate  
237 climates, but the observed performance of Holstein Friesian in Vom, Nigeria was  
238 commendable compared to other tropical conditions. This could be attributed to  
239 progressive improvement in management practices such as high quality feed,  
240 adaptation to climatic condition due to lower temperature, accurate heat detection  
241 and timely insemination.

242 Based on the above conclusion, the following recommendations were forwarded.

- 243 ❖ Further studies should be carried out on the effect of season and parity on  
244 reproductive performance in the same farm.
- 245 ❖ Better management practices, improved nutrition and use of new  
246 reproductive technology can help improve the reproductive performance of  
247 the HF cows in Vom to perform similar to the temperate ones.
- 248 ❖ Setting up of more farms in Vom area by private individuals, investors, multi-  
249 nationals and Federal Government of Nigerian can help reduce the incessant  
250 herders/farmers crisis that always led to loss of lives and properties in Nigeria.
- 251 ❖ Climatic records such as temperature, relative humidity and rainfall should be  
252 kept in the farm to distinguish the variations across the years.

## REFERENCES

- 254 Abdel Rahman, I.M.K. and Alemam, T.A.(2008).Reproductive and Productive  
255 Performance of Holstein-Friesian Cattle under Tropical conditions with special  
256 Reference to Sudan – A Review. *Agric. Rev.* 29(1): 68-73.
- 257 Ajili, N. Rekik, B., Gara, A.B. and Bouraoui (2007). Relationships among Milk  
258 Production, Reproductive Traits and Herd Life for Tunisian Holstein-Friesian  
259 Cows. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.*, 2(2): 47-51.
- 260 Alphonsus, C., Akpa, G.N., Barje, P.P., Nwogu, B.I. and Orunmuyi, M. (2014).  
261 Evaluation of Fertility Traits of Friesian & Bunaji Dairy Cows. *Animal Research*  
262 *International*.11(1): 1851-1862.
- 263 Fekadu, A., Kassa, T. and Belehu, K.(2011). Study on Reproductive Performance of  
264 Holstein-Friesian Dairy Cows at Alage Dairy Farm, Riff Valley of Ethiopian  
265 *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.*, 43:581-586.
- 266 Fernando, P.R.P., Sinniah, J and Thatchaneshkanth, S. (2016). Productive and  
267 Reproductive performance of Jersey Cattle in the Hill Country of Sri Lanka.  
268 *Global Veterinaria*, 17(14): 392-400.
- 269 Gwaza, D.S., Okwori, A.I., Abu, A.H. and Fombah, E.M. (2007).A Retrospective  
270 Study on Reproductive and Dairy Performance of Holstein Friesian on Zero  
271 Grazing in the Western highland region of Cameroon. *Livestock Research for*  
272 *Rural Development*, 19(4): 36-40.
- 273 Habtamu, L., Kelay, B. and Desie, S. (2010). Study on the Reproductive Performance  
274 of Jersey Cows at Wolaifa Sodo dairy Farm, southern Ethiopia. *Ethiop. Vet.*  
275 *J.*, 14(1): 53-70.
- 276 Haile, B. (2014). Evaluation of Reproductive Performance of Holstein Friesian Dairy  
277 Cows at Alage Agricultural Technical Vocational Educational Training College  
278 Dairy Farm, South Western. Ethiopia. M.Sc thesis presented to the school of  
279 graduate studies, School of Animal and Range Sciences Haramaya University,  
280 99pp.
- 281 Hammoud, M.H., Elzarkouny, S.Z. and Oudah, E.Z.M.(2010). Effect of Sire, Age at  
282 First Calving, Season, year of Calving and Parity on Reproductive  
283 Performance of Friesian Cows under Semi-arid Conditions in Egypt. *Archiva*  
284 *Zootechnica*, 13(1):60-82.
- 285 Hunduma, D. (2012). Reproductive Performance of Crossbred Dairy Cows under  
286 small holder condition in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock*  
287 *Production*. 3(3):25-28.

- 288 Kebede, H. (2015).productive and Reproductive performance of Holstein Friesian  
289 Cows under Farmer's Management in Hossana town Ethiopia. *International*  
290 *Journal of Dairy Science*, 10(3): 126:133.
- 291 Kiwuwa, G.H., Trail, J.C.M., Kurtu, M.Y., Worku, G. Anderson, F. M. and Durkin, J.I.  
292 (1983).cross bred Dairy Productivity in Arsi Region in Ethiopia. ILCA research  
293 Report Nell ILCA (International Livestock Centre for Africa). Pp 1-29.
- 294 Kollalpitiya, K.M.P., Premaratne, S. and Peiris, B.L. (2012). Reproductive and  
295 Productive performance of Up-country exotic diary Cattle Breeds of Sri  
296 Lanka. *Trop. Agric. Res.*, 23:319-326.
- 297 Massawe, H.F.(2011). Evaluation of Current performance of Dairy Cattle in ASAS and  
298 Kitulo Farms in the Southern highlands of Tanzania. M.Sc thesis presented to  
299 Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.123pp.
- 300 Negussie, E., Brannang, E., Bangaw, K.and Rattman, O.J. (1998). Reproductive  
301 Performance of Dairy Cattle at Asella Livestock Farm, Arsi, Ethiopia. I:  
302 Indigenous Cows. Versus their F<sub>1</sub> crosses. *J. Anim. Breed. Genet.* 115:267-  
303 280.
- 304 Ngodigha, E.M. Etokeren, E. and Mgbere, O.(2009). Evaluation of Age at First  
305 Calving and Number of Service per Conception Traits on Milk Yield Potentials  
306 of Holstein Friesian x Bunaji Crossbred Cows. *Research Journal of Animal*  
307 *Science*, 3(1):6-9.
- 308 Ogundipe, R.I. and Adeoye, A.A. (2013). Evaluation of the Dairy Potential of  
309 Friesian, Wadara and their crossbreds in Bauchi State – A Review. *Scholarly*  
310 *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(6): 223-225.
- 311 Tadesse, M., Thiegtham, J., Pinyopummin, a. and Prasunpanich, S. (2010).  
312 Productive and Reproductive Performance of Holstein Friesian Dairy Cows,  
313 under Tropical Condition of Ethiopia. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.*, 22(2) 2010-  
314 2012.
- 315 Sena, T., Guesch, F., Adugnaw, A., Beletech, J.H. And Workalem, D. (2014).  
316 Department of Animal Science Debre Tabor University, Debre Tabor,  
317 Ethiopia. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Health Care* 4:23-25.
- 318 Wondossen, A., Mohammed, A. and Enyew, Negussie (2018). Reproductive  
319 Performance of Holstein Friesian Dairy Cows in Highland environment. *J. Adv*  
320 *Dairy Res.* 6(2): 1-6.
- 321 Zelalem, A., Biniam, M. and Tilaye D. (2015).Reproductive and Lactation  
322 Performance of Crossbred Dairy Cows in Bishoftu, Ada'a District of East  
323 Show, Eastern Ethiopia. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*,  
324 4(4): 113-119.