RESEARCH ARTICLE

Study on Housing Practices Followed by Dairy Animal Owners in Anand District of Middle Gujarat Region

PA Patel¹, YG Patel²*, RJ Modi³, MM Trivedi⁴

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was carried out to study dairy animal housing practices followed by dairy animal owners in the Anand district of middle Gujarat region. The data were collected from randomly selected 120 dairy animal owners interviewed personally with a well-prepared questionnaire. The study revealed that all the respondents provided housing shelter with the all-time placement of their animals in the house. Majority of respondents (74.17%) constructed animal sheds nearby their own house followed by 25.83% were at a distance from farmer's house. It was found that 64.17% of animal houses were oriented in east-west while 35.83% respondents had houses in a north-south orientation. The respondents provided pucca floor (63.33%) and galvanized iron sheets as a roofing material (49.17%) in their animal sheds, whereas 34.17% farmers had no provision of the wall in their animal sheds. The vast majority of respondents (85.00%) had the provision of good ventilation in their animal sheds and 72.50% of the respondents had the provision of artificial light in their animal houses. Majority of dairy animal owners (72.50%) kept distance between manure pits and their animal sheds and 66.67% respondents had provision and practice to protect animals from extreme weather. About 1/5th respondents used a curtain to reduce cold and very few owners (5.00%) provided bedding material to their animals. It was concluded that dairy animal owners of Anand district possess better knowledge regarding animal housing management and follow different practices of scientific animal husbandry.

Keywords: Dairy animals, Housing, Management, Practices *Ind J of Vet Sci and Biotech* (2019): 10.21887/ijvsbt.15.2.2

Introduction

nimal husbandry is making a significant contribution to Athe national economy and socioeconomic development in the country. The livestock is the main source of livelihood for the small, marginal and landless farmers (Hegde, 2006) and ensures socioeconomic security of farmers. Dairying is an integral component of the rural economy of Gujarat state. Dairy development has made a quantum jump in the state due to a wide network of the cooperative dairy system. Gujarat is an important state in milk production and marketing in India due to the cooperative dairy system. The most important environmental interventions done in recent days are those that have been done in housing and other attempts to ameliorate the thermal extremes. An environment in which stress is minimized would likely be favorable for efficient production of products derived from domestic farm animals and for helping ensure the well-being of those species. Housing is one of the major contributors to play an important role in the production and health of dairy animals by providing a comfortable and hygienic environment (Reddy and Chakravarthi, 2015). A livestock management practice followed by the farmers is crucial to identify the strengths and poor animal rearing system and to advise appropriate intervention policies. Therefore, it is imperative to ascertain the scientific housing management practices of dairy animals followed by dairy animal owners under village conditions so that need-based extension program may be launched to make them aware to increase

^{1,4}Department of Animal Science, B.A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

^{2,3}Deparment of Livestock Production and Management, Veterinary College, AAU, Anand, Gujarat, India

Corresponding Author: YG Patel, Deparment of Livestock Production and Management, Veterinary College, AAU, Anand, Gujarat, India, e-mail: ygpatel89@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Patel, P.A., Patel, Y.G., Modi, R.J., & Trivedi, M.M. (2019). Study on Housing Practices Followed by Dairy Animal Owners in Anand District of Middle Gujarat Region. Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech, 15(2): 6-9.

Source of support: Nil
Conflict of interest: None

Submitted: 14/07/2019 Accepted: 09/08/2019 Published: 25/11/2019

their knowledge and the adoption of scientific housing management practices for dairy animals.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in the Anand district of middle Gujarat state which is a seat of dairy development and white revolution. Geographically, Anand district is located in Middle Gujarat at 72.15–73.18 East (Longitude) to 22.07–23.29 North (Latitude) at an elevation of 45 meters above the mean sea level with a sub-tropical climate. Two talukas (Anand and Petlad) of Anand district were selected purposively because of their good animal husbandry practices. Five villages were selected from each taluka which are geographically located

[©] The Author(s). 2019 Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons. org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and non-commercial reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

apart and truly represented the animal husbandry practices of the taluka. The random samples of 120 dairy animal owners were made. The selected respondents were interviewed and the desired information was collected in the questionnaire developed for the purpose. While selecting farmers due care was taken to ensure that selected farmers were evenly distributed in villages. After collection, all the data were compiled and tabulated and analyzed as per standard statistical tools like frequency and percentage to draw the meaningful inference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data regarding dairy animal housing practices followed by dairy animal owners have been presented in Table 1. It was observed that almost all the respondents (100%) provided shelter through a conventional type of housing to their animals with all-time placement in sheds. In the current study, 74.17 % of animal sheds were a nearby house of farmers followed by 25.83% animal sheds away from farmer's house. The farmers can give proper attention to their animals which help in better management and that may be the reason farmers preferred their animal houses in the close vicinity of their houses. The animal houses nearby human dwelling provided good management and easy transport of milk (Rangamma et al., 2013; Vranda et al., 2017; Himani et al., 2018).

It was found that 64.17% farmers had east-west orientation, whereas 35.83% respondents had a north-south orientation of their animal houses. In tropical country like India where temperature raises high, direction of house plays an important role in hot climate to reduce heat stress on animal during summer season, to maintain good sanitation and to increase the productivity of dairy animals (Kumar and Mishra, 2011; Sabapara, et al., 2015; Sinha, et al., 2009). Majority of respondents (63.33%) constructed the pucca floor, whereas 34.17 and 2.50% respondents had earthen and rubber mat floor in their animal sheds, respectively. The pucca floor was non-slippery, easy to clean and maintain better sanitary condition of the shed. The respondents under this study showed awareness about these problems and preferred pucca floor in their animal sheds. The respondents who provided the earthen floor believed that animal feels comfortable and ease during sitting and standing (Dhaliwal and Dhillon, 2017; Patbandha et al., 2018). However, results are contradictory to the results found by Patel et al. (2018) and Pilaniya et al. (2018).

Data in Table 1 revealed that 49.17, 29.17 and 21.66% of the respondents used galvanized sheets, thatched materials, and renal cell carcinoma (RCC) (pucca) roofing as a roof for their animal sheds, respectively. Prevailing climatic condition and economic status of the farmers might have played a significant role in the selection of roofing materials (Himani et al., 2018; Pilaniya et al., 2018). The majority of respondents did not construct wall (34.17%) in their animal sheds, which

Table 1: Existing dairy animal housing practices followed by the dairy animal owners (n = 120)

No. Particulars Frequency Percent 1 Yes 120 100.00 2 Loose 0 0 2 Conventional 120 100.00 3 All-time 120 100.00 4 Placement in housing All-time 120 100.00 5 During night 0 0 6 Extreme weather 0 0 7 At 17 At a distance from farmer's house 89 74.17 5 East-West 77 64.17 6 Feast-West 77 64.17 7 North-South 43 35.83 7 Fucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 7 Fucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 7 Fucca rowspan="2" 49.17 17		animal owners (n =	= 120)				
Yes	No.			Percent			
No		Providing hous	ing shelter				
Type of housing	1	Yes	120	100.00			
Loose		No	0	0			
Conventional 120 100.00		Type of housing					
Placement in housing	2	Loose	0	0			
All-time				100.00			
Bouring night 0 0 Extreme weather 0 0 Location of shed Nearby house of the farmer 89 74.17 At a distance from farmer's house 31 25.83 Direction of shed Fast-West 77 64.17 North-South 43 35.83 Type of floor Pucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall							
Extreme weather 0 0	3						
Location of shed Nearby house of the farmer 89 74.17 At a distance from farmer's 31 25.83 25.83							
Nearby house of the farmer At a distance from farmer's house							
At a distance from farmer's house Direction of shed East-West 77 64.17 North-South 43 35.83 Type of floor Pucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger Drainage	4			74.17			
Direction of shed	4						
East-West 77 64.17 North-South 43 35.83 Type of floor Pucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 Poor 10 8.33 R							
North-South	5			64 17			
Type of floor	Э						
Pucca 76 63.33 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
6 Earthen floor 41 34.17 Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.3 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>62.22</td>				62.22			
Rubber mate 3 2.50 Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	6						
Type of roof provided Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house							
Galvanized iron sheet 59 49.17 Thatched roof 35 29.17 Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
Thatched roof				40.17			
Pucca roof (cement) 26 21.66 Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	7						
Wall of house One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
One side 19 15.83 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				21.66			
8 Double side 27 22.50 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				45.02			
8 Triple side 6 5.00 All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
All side 27 22.50 No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	8						
No wall 41 34.17 Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00		·					
Provision of manger 9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
9 Yes 120 100.00 No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				34.17			
No 0 0 Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
Type of manger 10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	9						
10 Kutcha (wooden assisted) 37 30.83 Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 **Drainage facility** 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 **Ventilation** Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				0			
Pucca (cement) 83 69.17 Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00							
Drainage facility 11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	10						
11 Yes 77 64.17 No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				69.17			
No 43 35.83 Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00	11						
Ventilation Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00			77				
Poor 10 8.33 12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00				35.83			
12 Fairly good 8 6.67 Good 102 85.00		Ventilat	ion				
Good 102 85.00	12	Poor	10	8.33			
		Fairly good	8	6.67			
No provision of ventilation 0 0		Good	102	85.00			
		No provision of ventilation	0	0			

Contd...

10	n	+	_			
	, ,		u	١.	_	ı

	Location of mo	anure pit		
13	Adjacent	33	27.50	
	Distant	87	72.50	
	No	0	0	
	Cleanliness o	f house		
	Very dirty	16	13.33	
14	Moderate dirty	49	40.83	
	Slight dirty	43	35.84	
	Clean	12	10.00	
	Summer management			
15	Splashing of water	15	12.50	
15	Fan	59	49.17	
	No any measure	46	38.33	
16	Winter management			
	Providing bedding material	06	5.00	
	Closing shed with curtain	24	20.00	
	No any measure	90	75.00	

might be due to better provision of ventilation and cost-effective construction of the animal sheds (Singh *et al.*, 2016). However, 22.50, 22.50, 15.83 and 5.00% respondents had all side, double side, one side and triple sidewall in their animal houses, respectively. Data revealed that 69.17 and 30.83% farmers had pucca and wooden assisted temporary manger to fed their animals, respectively. This might be due to the awareness of dairy farmers regarding better utilization and to avoid wastage of feeds and fodder (Pilaniya *et al.*, 2018; Rathore *et al.*, 2010).

The farmers with the provision of the pucca floor had the facility of pucca drainage of urine (64.17%) in their animal shed while remaining respondents (35.83%) had no drainage, so urine soaked in the earthen floor lead to dampness and unsanitary condition of their animal houses. The proper drainage system helps to maintain cleanliness in animal houses and also improves the hygienic condition and thereby reduction in the occurrence of disease in animals (Rao et al., 2015). However, the results are contrary to the results reported by some of the researchers (Sreedhar et al., 2017; Vranda et al., 2017). Majority of respondents (85.00%) had the provision of good ventilation, whereas only 8.33 and 6.67 % had a poor and fairly good type of ventilation in their animal sheds. The provision of good ventilation indicates farmers' awareness of the importance of ventilation to live animals. Proper ventilation is beneficial for the health and production of dairy animals (Sabapara et al., 2015). About 72.50% of respondents constructed manure pit away from their animal sheds, while 27.50 % of the respondents kept manure pits adjacent to their animal sheds for disposal of solid waste. This might be due to the awareness of dairy farmers regarding disposal of livestock waste and to maintain hygienic condition around the animal as well as human dwellings (Patbandha et al., 2018).

Regarding the cleanliness of the animal shed in our study, it was observed that 40.83% of the dairy farmers had moderate dirty animal houses followed by 35.84, 13.33 and 10.00% of the respondents had slight dirty, very dirty and clean animal houses, respectively. The study revealed that respondents used fans (49.17%) and splashing of water (12.50%) in summer season to protect their animals from heat stress. However, 38.33% of respondents adopted no measure to protect their animals from heat stress. Similarly, the majority of 75.00% respondents had no provision, whereas 20.00% of respondents used curtain and 5.00% respondents used bedding material to protect their animals in the winter season. It might be due to the awareness of the dairy farmers regarding ill effects of heat stress on the health and productivity of the dairy animals (Sabapara et al., 2015). However, the severity of winter is less in the region may be the reason for lacking in the protection of dairy animals in the winter season.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, it was revealed that dairy farmers of Anand district keep their dairy animals in a conventional type of house near to their dwelling, with pucca manger and floor, with different types of roof in their animal houses. Irrespective of taluka, different aspects of housing was observed. Impact of the cooperative system was observed in improved dairy housing system for welfare and production of animals.

REFERENCES

Dhaliwal, A.P.S. and Dhillon, G.S. (2017). Management practices followed by dairy farmers in rural and urban areas of Bathinda district in Punjab. J. Krishi Vigyan, 6(1): 124-127.

Hegde, N.G. (2006). Livestock development for sustainable livelihood of small farmers. 48th National symposium on energizing rural India - A challenge to livestock industry, held at Manesar, Haryana, 26 August, pp: 50-63.

Himani, T., Sanjay, K., Rajashree, R. and Kalpna, T. (2018). Existing housing and breeding management practices adopted by dairy farmers in Tarai region of Uttarakhand, India. Indian J. Anim. Res., 52(3): 449-453.

Kumar, S. and Mishra, B.K. (2011). Existing feeding and housing management practices followed by dairy producers in Tehri Garhwal district of Uttarakhand. Indian J. Anim. Prod. Mgmt., 27(3-4): 159-162.

Meena, H.R., Ram, H., Sahoo, A. and Rasool, T.J. (2008). Livestock husbandry scenario at high altitude Kumaon Himalaya, Indian J. Anim. Sci., 78(8): 882-886.

Patbandha, T.K., Garg, D.D., Chavda, M.R., Parikh, S.S., Savaliya, B.D. and Gamit, V.V. (2018). Housing management of dairy bovines: A comparative study in south and north Saurashtra sub-agro-climatic zones of Gujarat. Intl. J. Pure and Appl. Biosci., 6(1): 889-893.

Patel, N.B., Patel, J.B., Rao, T.K.S., Singh, R.R. and Modi, R.J. (2013). Housing management practices of dairy animal in Patan district of North Gujarat region. Indo-Am. J. Agril. Vet. Sci., 1: 31-37.



- Pilaniya Praveen, Desai, P.M. and Mordia Anil (2018). Existing housing management practices followed by rural dairy animal owners in Sabar dairy milk shed of Gujarat, India. Intl. J. Curr. Microbiol. and Appl. Sci., 7(08): 1642-1649.
- Rangamma, B., Jadeswararao, S., Prasad, R.M.V. and Ragavarao, E. (2013). Managemental practices adopted by buffalo milk producers in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh. Indian J. Anim. Prod. Mgmt., 29(1-2): 61-68.
- Rao, T.K.S., Patel, N.B. and Tyagi, K.K. (2015). Ecofriendly housing and feeding management of diary animals in tribal area of high rain coastal India. Res. Environ. & Life Sci., 8(1): 75-80.
- Rathore, R.S., Rajbir, S. and Abha, T. (2010). Studies on various existing managemental practices followed by the crossbred cattle owners. Indian J. Anim. Prod. Mgmt., 26(1/2): 85-88.
- Reddy, Y.R. and Chakravarthi, M.K. (2015). Housing of dairy animals under Indian conditions. Dairy Year Book (2014-15): 117-121.
- Sabapara, G.P., Fulsoundar, A.B. and Kharadi, V.B. (2015). Existing housing management practices followed by rural dairy

- animal owners in Surat district of Gujarat. Intl. J. Farm Sci., 5(4): 299-308.
- Singh, R., Kumar, P., Khandi, S.A. and Bhadwal, M.S. (2016). Animal welfare practices followed by dairy farmers of Kathua district of Jammu and Kashmir state. J. Anim. Res., 6(3): 479.
- Sinha, R.K., Dutt, T., Singh, R.R., Bhushan, B., Singh, M. and Kumar, S. (2009). Feeding and housing management practices of dairy animals in Bareilly district of UP. Indian J. Anim. Sci., 80(10): 1022–1027.
- Sreedhar, S., Nagarjuna Reddy, A., Sudhakar, B.V. and Ramesh Babu, P. (2017). Housing and other managemental practices adopted by different categories of dairy farmers in Kadapa district of Andhra Pradesh. Intl. J. Livestock Res., 7(11): 191-199.
- Vranda, R., Satyanarayan, K., Jagadeeswary, V., Veeranna, K.C., Rajeshwari, Y.B., Sudha, G. and Shree, J.S. (2017). A study on different housing practices of buffaloes in Bidar district of Karnataka. Intl. J. Sci. Environ. & Tech., 6(1): 295-302.