

MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

BJMSR VOL 7 NO 1 (2023) P-ISSN 2687-850X E-ISSN 2687-8518

Available online at <https://www.cribfb.com>  
 Journal homepage: <https://www.cribfb.com/journal/index.php/BJMSR>  
 Published by CRIBFB, USA

A REVIEW ON EFFICIENCY OF ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION IN CATTLE BREEDING IN ETHIOPIA



Teweldemedhn Mekonnen <sup>(a)1</sup> Selam Meseret <sup>(b)</sup>

<sup>(a)</sup> Tigray Agricultural Research Institute-Humera Begait Animals Research Center, Tigray, Ethiopia; E-mail: [teweldem2004@gmail.com](mailto:teweldem2004@gmail.com)

<sup>(b)</sup> International Livestock Research Institute, Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; E-mail: [S.Meseret@cgiar.org](mailto:S.Meseret@cgiar.org)

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023  
 Revised: 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023  
 Accepted: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2023  
 Published: 10<sup>th</sup> November 2023

Keywords:

Artificial Insemination, Efficiency, Cattle, Conception Rate, Calving Rate, Breeding

ABSTRACT

Ethiopia has large cattle population in Africa. The output of decades of crossbreeding programme in Ethiopia through AI service was quite insignificant because the exotic breeds and their crossbreds of the country accounted for about 1.44%. The objective of this review is to present the efficiency of Artificial Insemination (AI) service in cattle breeding in Ethiopia. The optimum recommended mean number of services per conception (NSC) for profitable dairy cow is about 1.4. However, conventional cattle AI breeding indicated that the mean NSC of different studies ranged from 1.14 in local cows up to 2.47 in different genotypes of cows kept under different management systems and conception rate at first insemination (CR<sup>1</sup>) ranged from 7.14% to 75.5% in different genotypes of dairy cows kept under extensive and intensive management systems. Estrus synchronization followed AI breeding indicated that CR<sup>1</sup> ranged from 24.69% to 70.6% in Zebu cows kept under semi-intensive management system. Calving rate (CR) is the most appropriate measure of fertility of dairy cows which is defined as the number of calves born per 100 services. The poor efficiency of the country cattle AI service is a huge biological economic loss in cattle production and managerial monetary losses. Strategic interventions on cattle AI service efficiency improvement options should be identified and practiced considering breed type, production system and agro-ecology.

© 2023 by the authors. Licensee CRIBFB, U.S.A. This open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Livestock production provided approximately 35 to 49% of the total agricultural GDP and 16 to 17% of national foreign currency earnings of Ethiopia (Metaferia *et al.*, 2011). The output of decades of crossbreeding programme in Ethiopia through Artificial Insemination (AI) was quite insignificant because the total number of exotic and crossbred female cattle are few (CSA, 2013). About 98.56% of the total Ethiopian cattle populations are indigenous Zebu (*Bos indicus*) cattle while exotic breeds and their crossbreds account for about 1.44% (CSA, 2016). However, crossbreeding of indigenous cattle with highly productive exotic cattle have been considered a realistic solution to improve the low productivity of indigenous cattle (Tadesse, 2002). For example, the types of exotic cattle breeds used for crossbreeding through the use of AI in Tigray region, Ethiopia comprised of Holstein Friesian (HF) and Jersey, and 50% crossbred of HF and the indigenous Begait cattle (Ashebir *et al.*, 2016).

AI is one of the most important techniques ever devised for the genetic improvement of farm animals (Bearden *et al.*, 2004). The greatest advantage of AI is maximum use of superior sires whilst the use of one bull is limited to less than 100 mating per year. The use of AI enabled one dairy sire to provide semen for more than 60,000 services in one year (Webb, 2003). AI service enables maximum use of outstanding males, rapid dissemination of superior genetic material, improve the rate and efficiency of genetic selection, introduction of new genetic material by import of semen rather than live animals (Verma *et al.*, 2012). The critical factors in artificial reproductive management are estrus detection and insemination of the cow at the correct time in the estrus cycle. Estrus detection and conception rates are the main determinants of reproductive efficiency (Bekana *et al.*, 2005).

Reproductive failure is a major source of economic loss in dairy and beef industry (Perry, 2005). The application of reproductive technologies accelerates genetic progress and enhance the reproductive performance of farm animal genetic resources (Gizaw *et al.*, 2016). AI has a good potential to improve cattle productivity in Ethiopia. However, its use is limited

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9655-4096

© 2023 by the authors. Hosting by CRIBFB. Peer review under the responsibility of CRIBFB, U.S.A. <https://doi.org/10.46281/bjmsr.v7i1.2115>

due to the challenges related to infrastructure and the availability and skills of AI technicians (Ndambi *et al.*, 2017). Infrastructure, managerial and financial constraints, poor heat detection, improper timing of insemination and embryonic death were the factors which resulted in very low level efficiency of the AI service in Ethiopia (Shiferaw *et al.*, 2003).

Although the use of cattle AI service is increasing in Ethiopia, oestrus detection is difficult in Zebu breeds due to their poorly expressed estrus (Bekuma & Ketema, 2019). Failure to accurately detect estrus is the major factor limiting optimum reproductive performance on many farms (Graves, 2012). Reproductive management tools such as estrus synchronization involves induction of estrous in a group of females to breed relatively in around the same time (Schaffer *et al.*, 2007; Rick, 2013). Estrus synchronization (ES) and AI are influential technologies for cattle producers in terms of genetic improvement, reproductive management and performance (Jinks *et al.*, 2013). Mean number of services per conception (NSC), conception rate at first insemination (CR<sup>1</sup>) and calving rate (CR) are essential parameters which enable breeders to determine the efficiency of AI service. Therefore, the objective of this review is to present the efficiency of AI service in cattle breeding in Ethiopia.

## DISCUSSIONS

The major determinants of efficiency of AI in cattle breeding in Ethiopia are presented below (Table 1). The mean NSC, CR<sup>1</sup> and CR mainly determine fertility and efficiency of dairy cattle.

### Number of services per conception (NSC)

NSC as an indicator of reproductive efficiency has been defined as the number of services required for a successful conception (Albero, 1993; Haile Mariam *et al.*, 1993; Negussie *et al.*, 1998; Shiferaw *et al.*, 2003). The optimum recommended NSC for profitable dairy cow ranges from 1-1.7 (Evelyn, 2001). The NSC under conventional cattle AI breeding ranged from 1.14 in local dairy cows kept under mixed crop-livestock production up to 2.47 in different genotypes kept under mixed crop livestock and Urban dairying whilst under fixed time AI breeding the NSC ranged from 1.44 in crossbred cows kept under extensive production system up to 2.36 in local cows kept under extensive production system (Table 1). The differences in NSC could be due to intrinsic (genotype, age, parity, body condition score, semen quality) and extrinsic (ecology, production system, heat detection, time of insemination, skill of inseminator, type of insemination, semen handling procedures) factors.

### Conception rate at first insemination (CR<sup>1</sup>)

In most African countries, poor semen quality, poor semen handling procedure, inadequate insemination skill, poor estrus detection and wrong time of insemination resulted in low CR<sup>1</sup> (Tegegne *et al.*, 1995).

The CR<sup>1</sup> under conventional cattle AI breeding ranged from 7.14% in different genotypes of cows kept under mixed crop livestock and Urban dairying up to 75.5% in crossbred dairy cows kept under extensive and intensive production systems whilst under timed AI breeding the CR<sup>1</sup> ranged from 24.69% in Zebu cows kept under unknown production system up to 70.6% in Boran cows kept under semi-intensive production system (Table 1). The differences in CR<sup>1</sup> could be due to ecology, genotype, parity, body condition score, skill of inseminator, insemination time, production system and semen quality.

### Calving Rate (CR)

The most appropriate measure of fertility is CR which is defined as the number of calves born per 100 services (Mohamed, 2004). The CR under conventional cattle AI breeding ranged from 22.0% in local dairy cows kept under mixed crop-livestock production system up to 54.8% in HF x Zebu crossbred cows kept under Urban and Peri-urban production system whilst under fixed time AI breeding the CR ranged from 10.67% in dairy cows kept under extensive production system up to 13.58% in Zebu cows kept under unknown production system (Table 1). The differences in CR could be due to prevalence of reproductive diseases, production system and number of services provided per cow.

Therefore, as per the reviewed publications, average NSC is the same in conventional cattle AI breeding (1.74) and fixed time AI breeding (1.74) whilst the average CR in conventional cattle AI breeding (38.4%) and fixed time AI breeding (12.1 %) are not comparable which reveal poor AI efficiency.

Table 1. Efficiency of Artificial Insemination in different parts of Ethiopia

| AI type         | Cattle breed group   | Management system               | NSC (mean) | CR <sup>1</sup> (%) | CR (%) | Author(s)                    |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------|---------------------|--------|------------------------------|
| Conventional AI | Local dairy cows     | Extensive and intensive systems | -          | 72.9                | -      | Befkadu <i>et al.</i> , 2019 |
|                 | Crossbred dairy cows | Extensive and intensive systems | -          | 75.5                | -      | Befkadu <i>et al.</i> , 2019 |
|                 | Local dairy cow      | Extensive and intensive systems | -          | 53.5                | -      | Hamid <i>et al.</i> , 2021   |
|                 | Crossbred cows       | Extensive and intensive systems | -          | 69.1                | -      | Hamid <i>et al.</i> , 2021   |
|                 | Local Zebu cows      | Extensive system                | -          | 48.9                | -      | Abdula and Bilal, 2022       |
|                 | Local Zebu cows      | Extensive system                | -          | 37.4                | -      | Abdula and Bilal, 2022       |
|                 | Zebu cows            | Extensive system                | -          | 24                  | -      | Hamid, 2012                  |

|   |   |                  |             |             |                                    |                            |
|---|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| HF x Zebu crossbred cows                | Extensive system                                | -                | 60          | -           | Hamid, 2012                        |                            |
| Zebu x Holstein-Friesian                | Farmer's management system                      | 1.8              | -           | -           | Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2017         |                            |
| HF x Zebu, Jersey x Zebu cows           | Intensive system                                | -                | 62.5        | -           | Abdula and Bilal, 2022             |                            |
| HF x Zebu, Jersey x Zebu cows           | Intensive system                                | -                | 41.5        | -           | Abdula and Bilal, 2022             |                            |
| Not specified                           | Mixed crop livestock                            | 1.78             | 34.29       | -           | Gebreegiabiher, 2008               |                            |
| Not specified                           | Mixed crop livestock, Urban dairying            | 1.91             | 33.33       | -           | Gebreegiabiher, 2008               |                            |
| Not specified                           | Mixed crop livestock, Urban dairying            | 2.47             | 7.14        | -           | Gebreegiabiher, 2008               |                            |
| Not specified                           | Mixed crop livestock, Urban dairying            | 1.55             | 20.31       | -           | Gebreegiabiher, 2008               |                            |
| Local cows                              | Mixed crop-livestock production                 | 1.14             | -           | -           | Tadesse <i>et al.</i> , 2022       |                            |
| Crossbred cows                          | Mixed crop-livestock production                 | 1.15             | -           | -           | Tadesse <i>et al.</i> , 2022       |                            |
| Local and crossbred cows                | Mixed crop-livestock production                 | -                | 51.03       | -           | Tadesse <i>et al.</i> , 2022       |                            |
| Indigenous cattle                       | Mixed crop-livestock production system          | -                | 23.36       | 22          | Bayew, 2019                        |                            |
| 82.3% crossbred dairy cows              | Not specified                                   | -                | 64.8        | -           | Yehalaw <i>et al.</i> , 2018       |                            |
| Fogera x Holstein Friesian              | Not specified                                   | 1.56             | -           | -           | Sena <i>et al.</i> 2014            |                            |
| >80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows | Not specified                                   | -                | 17.64       | -           | Ashebir <i>et al.</i> , 2016       |                            |
| >80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows | Not specified                                   | -                | 30.12       | -           | Ashebir <i>et al.</i> , 2016       |                            |
| >80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows | Not specified                                   | -                | 48.47       | -           | Ashebir <i>et al.</i> , 2016       |                            |
| HF x Zebu crossbred                     | Urban and Peri-urban                            | 1.67             | 64.6        | 54.8        | Birhanemeskel <i>et al.</i> , 2017 |                            |
| Dairy cows                              | Urban dairy farming                             | 1.6              | 48.1        | -           | Engidawork, 2018                   |                            |
| Not specified                           | Urban dairying                                  | 1.7              | 40.23       | -           | Gebreegiabiher, 2008               |                            |
| Local and crossbred cows                | Extensive and intensive system                  | -                | 47.8        | -           | Woldu <i>et al.</i> , 2011         |                            |
| Local and crossbred cows                | Extensive system                                | 1.95             | 49.3        | -           | Jemal <i>et al.</i> , 2016         |                            |
| local cows                              | 65% Mixed crop-livestock system                 | 2.15             | -           | -           | Yousuf, 2022                       |                            |
| F <sub>1</sub> crossbred                | 65% Mixed crop-livestock system                 | 2.0              | -           | -           | Yousuf, 2022                       |                            |
| F <sub>2</sub> crossbred                | 65% Mixed crop-livestock system                 | 1.6              | -           | -           | Yousuf, 2022                       |                            |
| <b>Average</b>                          |   | <b>1.74</b>      | <b>45.0</b> | <b>38.4</b> |                                    |                            |
| <b>Fixed time AI</b>                    | Local cows                                      | Extensive system | -           | 45          | -                                  | Abiyot and Eyob, 2019      |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Extensive system | -           | 50.2        | -                                  | Abiyot and Eyob, 2019      |
|   | Local cows                                      | Extensive system | 1.85        | 54          | -                                  | Belay <i>et al.</i> , 2016 |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Extensive system | 1.44        | 69.6        | -                                  | Belay <i>et al.</i> , 2016 |
|   | Dairy cattle                                    | Extensive system | -           | 34.61       | 10.67                              | Zewude, 2018               |
|   | Local dairy cow                                 | Extensive system | 1.7         | 59          | -                                  | Duro, 2022                 |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Extensive system | 1.5         | 67          | -                                  | Duro, 2022                 |
|   | Zebu cows                                       | Extensive system | -           | 48.4        | -                                  | Hamid, 2012                |
|   | HF x Zebu crossbred cows                        | Extensive system | -           | 46.7        | -                                  | Hamid, 2012                |
|   | Boran cows                                      | Intensive system | -           | 28.6        | -                                  | Demisse, 2018              |
|   | HF x Boran crossbred cows                       | Intensive system | -           | 31.3        | -                                  | Demisse, 2018              |
|   | Local cows                                      | Not specified    | 1.71        | 58.49       | -                                  | Worku, 2015                |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Not specified    | 1.78        | 56.1        | -                                  | Worku, 2015                |
|   | Zebu (95.8%), Sheko (2.8%) and crossbred (1.4%) | Not specified    | -           | 24.69       | 13.58                              | Fantahun, and Admasu, 2017 |
|   | Local cows                                      | Not specified    | 1.7         | 59.5        | -                                  | Shanku, 2022.              |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Not specified    | 1.5         | 65.0        | -                                  | Shanku, 2022               |
|   | Local cows                                      | Not specified    | -           | 40.8        | -                                  | Haile <i>et al.</i> , 2023 |
|   | Crossbred cows                                  | Not specified    | -           | 64.8        | -                                  | Haile <i>et al.</i> , 2023 |
|   | Boran cows                                      | Semi-intensive   | -           | 70.6        | -                                  | Tilahun, 2018              |

|                       |                  |             |             |             |                           |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Zebu x Holstein cross | Semi-intensive   | -           | 50          | -           | Tilahun, 2018             |
| Local cows            | Extensive system | 2.2         | 45.7        | -           | Amanuel and Amanuel, 2023 |
| Crossbred cows        | Extensive system | 1.4         | 70.5        | -           | Amanuel and Amanuel, 2023 |
| Local cows            | Extensive system | 2.36        | 42.3        | -           | Amanuel and Amanuel, 2023 |
| Crossbred cows        | Extensive system | 1.7         | 60.2        | -           | Amanuel and Amanuel, 2023 |
| <b>Average</b>        |                  | <b>1.74</b> | <b>51.8</b> | <b>12.1</b> |                           |

NSC=Number of Services per Conception, CR<sup>1</sup>=Conception Rate at first insemination, CR=Calving Rate

## CONCLUSIONS

Cattle AI service was widely practiced in Ethiopia, however, the efficiency of cattle AI service in Ethiopia was extremely poor due to different intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Mean number of services per conception (NSC), conception rate at first insemination (CR<sup>1</sup>) and calving rate (CR) under both conventional cattle AI breeding and fixed time AI breeding indicated poor efficiency of AI service. The poor efficiency of the country cattle AI service is a biological economic loss in cattle production and managerial monetary losses. Strategic interventions on cattle AI service efficiency improvement should be identified and practiced.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, T.M.; Data Curation, N/A.; Methodology, N/A.; Validation, N/A.; Visualization, N/A.; Formal Analysis, T.M. and S.M.; Investigation, T.M. and S.M.; Resources, T.M.; Writing - Original Draft, T.M.; Writing - Review & Editing, T.M. and S.M.; Supervision, T.M.; Software, N/A.; Project Administration, T.M.; Funding Acquisition, N/A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Ethical review and approval were waived for this study because the research does not deal with vulnerable groups or sensitive issues.

**Funding:** The authors received no direct funding for this research.

**Acknowledgement:** The authors would like to thank to the researchers who involved in studying the efficiency of AI in cattle breeding in Ethiopia.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to restrictions.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

- Abdula, A. M., & Bilal, Z. M. (2022). Effect of breed and risk factors affecting conception rate to artificial insemination in dairy cows of Tullo District Western Haraghe, Ethiopia. *Vet Med Open J.*, 7(1), 16-21. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17140/VMOJ-7-163>.
- Abiyot, H., & Eyob, E. (2019). Evaluation on the Efficiency of Artificial Insemination Following Estrus Synchronization of Dairy Cattle: In the Case of Sodo Zuria District, Ethiopia. *EC Veterinary Science*, 4, 226-233.
- Alberro, M. (1983). Comparative performance of F<sub>1</sub> Friesian× Zebu heifers in Ethiopia. *Animal Science*, 37(2), 247-252.
- Amanuel, D., & Amanuel, E. (2023). Effectiveness of Artificial Insemination after Estrus Synchronization in Dairy Cattle Breeding in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Research Square*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3442060/v1>
- Ashebir, G., Birhanu, A., & Gugsa, T. (2016). Status of artificial insemination in Tigray Regional State, "Constraints and acceptability under field condition". *J Dairy Vet Anim Res*, 3(3), 00078. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15406/jdvar.2016.03.00078>.
- Birhanemeskel, A., Kide, W., & Mekasha, Y. (2017). Reproductive efficiency of crossbred (HF x Zebu) dairy cows under artificial insemination service in Eastern Zone of Tigray, Northern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Biology*, 4(3), 160-163.
- Bearden, H. J., Fuquay, J. W., & Willard, S. (2004). Applied Animal Reproduction, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. *Mississippi State University, USA*, p. 427.
- Bekana, M., Gizachew, A., & Regassa, F. (2005). Reproductive Performance of Fogera Heifers Treated with Prostaglandin F<sub>2</sub> [alpha] for Synchronization of Oestrus. *Tropical animal health and production*, 37(5), 373-379.
- Bekuma, A. & Ketema, H. (2019). Estrus Synchronization in Ethiopian Dairy Cattle: Principle, Purpose and Influencing Factors. *J Anim Husb Sci Technol*. 2019; 1:101.
- Belay, D. L., Tera, A., Tegeng, A., & Hawassa, E. (2016). Evaluating the efficiency of artificial insemination following estrus synchronization of dairy cattle in southern region, Ethiopia: The Case of Dale District. *Journal of Natural Sciences*, 6(5), 22-27.
- Tadesse, B., Reda, A. A., Kassaw, N. T., & Tadege, W. (2022). Success rate of artificial insemination, reproductive performance and economic impact of failure of first service insemination: a retrospective study. Tadesse *et al. BMC Veterinary Research*, 18, 226. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-022-03325-1>
- Bayew, K. (2019). The problem of Artificial Insemination (Study in Janamora Wereda) in North Gondar, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agriculture and Agribusiness*, 3(1), 8-14.
- Befkadu, Y., Tadesse, B., & Hamid, M. (2019). Efficiency of Artificial Insemination in Dairy Cows in and around Kombolcha Town, South Wollo, Ethiopia. *Dairy Vet Sci J*, 13(5), 555875.
- CSA. (Central Statistical Authority) (2013). Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Agricultural Sample Survey. Livestock and Livestock Characteristics Bulletin, Volume II, Central Statistical Authority, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- CSA. (2016). Agricultural sample survey 2015/16. Vol. II. Report on livestock and livestock characteristics. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- Duro, E. S. (2022). Cattle Breeding Practice of the Community and Evaluation of Artificial Insemination (AI) after estrus Synchronization in Wondo Genet District, Sidama National Regional State, Southern, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 12(9), 1–15.
- Demisse, E. (2018). Effect of Breed, Parity and Body Condition on Efficacy of Double and Single PGF2 $\alpha$  Bovine Estrus Synchronization Protocol in Boran and Crossbreed Dairy Cattle in Bishoftu, Ethiopia. M.V.Sc. Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Engidawork, B. (2018). Artificial Insemination Service Efficiency and Constraints of Artificial Insemination Service in Selected Districts of Harari National Regional State, Ethiopia. *Open Journal of Animal Sciences*, 8, 239–251. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojas.2018.83018>.
- Evelyn, C. G. (2001). “Reproductive performance of crossbred cattle developed for milk production in the semi-arid tropics and the effect of feed supplementation”, PhD Thesis, University of Zimbabwe, pp.165.
- Fantahun, T., & Admasu, Z. (2017). Evaluation of oestrus synchronization and mass artificial insemination service of dairy cattle in Mizan Aman area, Bench Maji zone, South West Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 8(1), 1-4.
- Gebreeggiabiher, D. G. (2008). Assessment of Problems/Constraints Associated with Artificial Insemination Service in Ethiopia. M.Sc. Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Gizaw, S., Tesfaye, Y., Mekuriaw, Z., Tadesse, M., Hoekstra, D., Gebremedhin, B., & Tegegne, A. (2016). Oestrus synchronization for accelerated delivery of improved dairy genetics in Ethiopia: results from action research and development interventions. LIVES Working Paper 12. Nairobi: International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).
- Graves, W. M. (2012). Dairy Herd Synchronization Programs. The University of Georgia and Ft. Valley State University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and counties of the state cooperating.
- Haile-Mariam, M., Banjaw, K., Gebre-Meskel, T., & Ketema, H. (1993). Productivity of Boran cattle and their Friesian crosses at Abernossa Ranch, Rift Valley of Ethiopia. I. Reproductive performance and pre-weaning mortality. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 25(4), 239-248.
- Haile, S. M., Abebe, B. K., & Tesfa, T. W. (2023). Efficiency evaluation of two estrus synchronization protocols in estrus response and conception rate of dairy cows in the Dalocha district, Ethiopia. *Heliyon*, 9(1), e12781.
- Hamid, M., Abduraman, S., & Tadesse, B. (2021). Risk Factors for the Efficiency of Artificial Insemination in Dairy Cows and Economic Impact of Failure of First Service Insemination in and around Haramaya Town, Oromia Region, Eastern Ethiopia. *Veterinary Medicine International*, 2021, 6622487-6622487. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6622487>
- Hamid, J. (2012). Study on Factors Affecting the Success of Artificial Insemination Program in Cattle, Siltie Zone, Ethiopia. M.Sc. Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Jemal, H., Lemma, A., & Bekana, M. (2016). Assessment of the reproductive performance of dairy cows in smallholder dairy farms using artificial insemination. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 28(5) 2016.
- Jinks, E. M., Smith, M. F., Atkins, J. A., Pohler, K. G., Perry, G. A., MacNeil, M. D., ... & Geary, T. W. (2013). Preovulatory estradiol and the establishment and maintenance of pregnancy in suckled beef cows. *Journal of Animal Science*, 91(3), 1176–1185.
- Kumar, N., Gebrekidan, B., Abebe, N., & Kebede, E. (2017). Performance of crossbred dairy cows under farmers’ management in and around Debre Zeit, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Veterinary Science and Animal Production (EJVSAP)*, 1(1), 66-72.
- Metaferia, F., Cherenet, T. G., Abnet, F., Tesfay, A., Abdi, J., & Gulilat, W. (2011). Review to Improve Estimation of Livestock Contribution to the National GDP. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development and Ministry of Agriculture. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Mohamed, A. (2004). Estimation of genetic parameters of birth weight, age at first calving and milk production trait in Holstein Friesian dairy herds kept in three state farms, Ethiopia. M.Sc. Thesis, Alemaya University, Ethiopia.
- Ndambi, A., van der Lee, J., Ulfina, G. G., Berhanu, T., & Andeweg, K. (2017). Improving private AI services to dairy farmers through AI technician refresher training: lessons from Ethiopia. Practice Brief Dairy BISS project. *Wageningen Livestock Research*, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen
- Negussie, E., Brännäng, E., Banjaw, K., & Rottmann, O. J. (1998). Reproductive performance of dairy cattle at Asella livestock farm, Arsi, Ethiopia. I: Indigenous cows versus their F1 crosses. *Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics*, 115(1-6), 267-280.
- Perry, G. A. (2005). Comparison of the efficiency and accuracy of three estrous detection methods to indicate ovulation in beef cattle. South Dakota State University Beef Report Pp. 122–127.
- Rick, R. (2013). Synchronizing Estrus in Beef Cattle. University of Nebraska-Lincoln | Lincoln, NE 68588 | 402-472.
- Schafer, D. W., Brinks, J. S., & LeFever, D. G. (2007). Increased calf weaning weight and weight via estrus synchronization. *Beef Program Report. Colorado State University*, 115-124.
- Sena, T., Guesh, F., Adugnaw, A., Beletech, H., & Workalem, D. (2014). Assessment of productive and reproductive performances of crossbreed dairy cows in Debre Tabor town. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, 4(23), 112-114.
- Shanku, E. (2022). Evaluation of artificial insemination (AI) after estrus synchronization of dairy cattle in Wondo Genet District, Sidama regional state of southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Biological Sciences*, 9, 109-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2022.09.06.011>
- Shiferaw, Y., Tenhagen, B. A., Bekana, M., & Kassa, T. (2003). Reproductive performance of crossbred dairy cows in different production systems in the central highlands of Ethiopia. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 35,

551-561.

- Tadesse, B. (2002). Calf sex ratios in artificial insemination and natural mated female cross breed daily herd. In *Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the Ethiopia Society of animal production, Addis Ababa Ethiopia* (Vol. 227).
- Tegegne, A., Lahlou-Kassi, A., & Mukassa-Mugrwa, E. (1995). Biotechnology in animal production. Development Opportunities in Livestock Agriculture. *Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the Ethiopian Society of Animal Production*, 26-27 May, 1993, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 1995; 49-80.
- Tilahun, A. (2018). Effect of Breed, Parity and Body Condition on Ovarian Response and Conception Rate of Boran and Zebu-Holstein Crossbred Dairy Cows Subjected to Ovsynch or Co-Synch Protocol. MVSc Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Bishoftu, Ethiopia.
- Verma, O. P., Kumar, R., Kumar, A., & Chand, S. (2012). Assisted Reproductive Techniques in Farm Animal-From Artificial Insemination to Nanobiotechnology. *Veterinary World*, 5(5), 301–310.
- Webb, D. W. (2003). Artificial Insemination in Cattle. University of Florida, Gainesville. IFAS Extension, DS 58. Pp. 1–4.
- Woldu, T., Giorgis, Y. T., & Haile, A. (2011). Factors affecting conception rate in artificially inseminated cattle under farmers' condition in Ethiopia. *Journal of cell and animal biology*, 5(16), 334-338.
- Worku, B. (2015). Assessment of Breeding Practices and Evaluation of Estrus Synchronization and Mass Insemination Technique in Dairy Cattle in West Shoa Zone, Ethiopia. MSc. Thesis, Haramaya University, Ethiopia.
- Yehalaw, B., Jemberu, A., Asnake, A., Wube, A., & Hirpa, A. (2018). Factors affecting the efficiency of artificial insemination in dairy cows in and around Bishoftu (Debre Zeite), Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. *J Reprod Infer*, 9(2), 28-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5829/idosi.jri.2018.28.35>
- Yousuf, M. (2022). Effect of Artificial Insemination on production performance of dairy cattle in Case of Sayo District West Wollega Zone, Ethiopia. *Research Horizon*, 2(1), 262-269. Retrieved from <http://journal.publindoakademika.com/index.php/RH>
- Zewude, D. B. (2018). Evaluation of Estrous Synchronization and Mass Artificial Insemination Service of Dairy Cattle in East Wollega Selected Districts, Western Ethiopia. *Journal of Reproduction and Infertility*, 9(3), 63-66, <https://dx.doi.org/10.5829/idosi.jri.2018.63.66>

**Publisher's Note:** CRIBFB stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2023 by the authors. Licensee CRIBFB, U.S.A. This open-access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

*Bangladesh Journal of Multidisciplinary Scientific Research* (P-ISSN 2687-850X E-ISSN 2687-8518) by CRIBFB is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.