

# PRODUCTION PERFORMANCE AND MILK PRODUCING EFFICIENCY IN DIFFERENT FILIAL GROUPS OF H. FRIESIAN × SAHIWAL HALFBREDS

M. Z. Chaudhry<sup>1</sup>, M. J. Tahir and M. Rafique

Livestock Production Research Institute, Bahadurnagar, Okara, Pakistan

## Summary

Six heifers each of  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$  H. Friesian × Sahiwal halfbreds and pure Sahiwal with overall average initial age and live weight of  $315.6 \pm 134.8$  days and  $143.8 \pm 48.5$  kg, respectively were used for this study. The under trial animals were fed according to N.R.C. (1978). The overall average age at maturity, first conception and first calving was  $563.8 \pm 116.8$ ,  $675.8 \pm 135.6$  and  $956.8 \pm 149.8$  days with live weights as  $302.2 \pm 58.6$ ,  $342.6 \pm 41.5$  and  $433.9 \pm 38.1$  kg, respectively. The overall 305 days and total milk yield for 1st lactation was  $2,729.0 \pm 669.3$  and  $2,992.7 \pm 377.5$  litre while the FCM (at 4%) was  $2,934.2 \pm 410.8$  litre. The lactation length was  $336.6 \pm 69.6$  days. The fat and solids not fat contents were  $4.5 \pm 0.2$  and  $8.2 \pm 0.3$  per cent, respectively. The milk production in Sahiwal cows was significantly lower than crossbred cows. The services per conception were  $2.5 \pm 1.3$ . The overall per head per day consumption of DM, TCP and ME was  $10.9 \pm 1.2$  kg,  $1,399 \pm 199$  gm and  $22.6 \pm 2.4$  M.Cal., respectively. The overall milk producing efficiency for the production of one litre of FCM was  $1.12 \pm 0.15$  kg of DM,  $142.2 \pm 17.76$  gm of TCP and  $2.31 \pm 0.27$  M.Cal. of energy while the feeding cost was Rs.  $1.46 \pm 0.22$  per litre of FCM produced. The feeding cost per litre FCM was significantly higher in Sahiwal and  $F_4$  than in other genetic groups.

(Key Words: Crossbred Dairy Cattle, Different Filial Groups, Production and Reproduction Performance)

## Introduction

The cattle crossbreeding program was initiated in Punjab Province in 1973 and the population of crossbred cattle is increasing very rapidly. This study was conducted to compare the production performance and milk producing efficiency of different filial groups of halfbred H. Friesian × Sahiwal and pure Sahiwal cows.

## Materials and Methods

Four genetic groups of Holstein Friesian × Sahiwal (HS) halfbred heifers ( $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$  and  $F_4$ ) alongwith a group of Sahiwal as control group comprising of six heifers in each group were randomly selected for this study. The average initial age and live weight in the various groups was  $315.6 \pm 134.8$  days and  $143.8 \pm 48.5$  kg, respectively; the differences among means being non-significant. These animals were fed individually after calving.

These animals were fed according to the N.R.C. (1978). The data on concentrate feeding was

recorded daily while the data on fodder consumption was recorded for five consecutive days in a fortnight. The proximate analysis of the fodder and concentrate ration fed to these animals was carried out at fortnightly intervals. The fat and solids not fat (SNF) contents were determined at monthly intervals.

The concentrate ration on average contained  $85.29 \pm 4.10$  per cent dry matter (DM),  $15.6 \pm 1.30$  per cent total crude protein (TCP) and  $2.15 \pm 0.35$  M.Cal. of metabolizable energy (ME) per kg. The overall average consumption of DM, TCP and ME from concentrate ration was 40.89, 57.60 and 43.89, per cent respectively before calving and 39.20, 56.08 and 47.66 per cent, respectively during the lactation period.

## Results and Discussion

### Productive and reproductive performance

All the heifers matured and conceived successfully; but only 4, 3, 6, 4 and 4 heifers each of  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$  and Sahiwal successfully calved and completed their first lactation. The productive and reproductive performance of different genetic groups is presented in table 1. The differences in the age and weight at maturity between different genetic groups were non-significant. The difference in age

<sup>1</sup>Address reprint requests to Dr. M. Z. Chaudhry, Livestock Production Research Institute, Bahadurnagar, Okara, Pakistan.

Received December 7, 1993

Accepted April 21, 1994

at fruitful service between the means of groups was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), being lowest ( $528.8 \pm 88.9$  days) in  $F_1$  and highest ( $855.5 \pm 165.2$  days) in Sahiwal. The difference between the means of live weight at fruitful service was non-significant. The age at first calving differed significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) between groups; it was lowest ( $777.8 \pm 93.3$  days) in  $F_1$  and highest ( $1,145.8 \pm 167.2$  days) in Sahiwal but there was non-significant difference between these groups for live weight at first calving (table 1).

The overall 305 days and total milk yield for first lactation was  $2,729.0 \pm 669.3$  and  $2,992.7 \pm 377.5$  litre: it was significantly lowest in Sahiwal as compared to crossbred groups and highest in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  crossbreds. The fat corrected milk

(FCM) at 4 per cent upto 305 days lactation was also significantly lowest in Sahiwal. The overall average days in milk and services per conception for these groups were  $336.6 \pm 69.6$  and  $2.5 \pm 1.3$ . The fat and SNF contents were  $4.5 \pm 0.2$  and  $8.2 \pm 0.3$  per cent, respectively. The difference in the means for services per conception was significant between genetic groups while the differences between the means for days in milk, fat and SNF contents between genetic groups were non-significant (table 1).

The age at maturity in the present study was lower than that observed by Singh and Mishra (1980) and Kaushik (1979) but higher than that observed by Mason (1974). The age at first calving in crossbred and local cows is lower than that

TABLE 1. PRODUCTION PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT FILIAL GROUPS FOR FIRST LACTATION

Traits	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$	$F_4$	Sahiwal	Overall
Age at maturity (days)	463.6 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 115.1$	554.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 115.7$	593.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 51.6$	606.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 92.7$	595.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 170.9$	563.8 $\pm 116.8$
Age at first fruitful service (days)	528.8 <sup>c</sup> $\pm 88.9$	676.3 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 61.6$	655.8 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm 43.2$	702.6 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 106.9$	855.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 165.2$	675.8 $\pm 135.6$
Age at first calving (days)	777.8 <sup>c</sup> $\pm 93.3$	902.7 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm 37.3$	947.5 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 41.0$	996.3 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm 116.9$	1,145.8 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 167.2$	956.8 $\pm 149.8$
Weight at maturity (kg)	291.8 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 65.3$	263.6 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 63.3$	323.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 34.0$	348.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 48.7$	280.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 58.6$	302.2 $\pm 58.6$
Weight at first fruitful service (kg)	327.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 39.3$	323.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 43.9$	341.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 39.4$	364.6 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 57.0$	368.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 17.3$	342.6 $\pm 41.5$
Weight at first calving (kg)	425.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 17.8$	425.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 49.4$	429.7 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 27.5$	447.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 63.4$	442.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 43.7$	433.9 $\pm 38.1$
305 days milk yield (litre)	3,209.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 596.4$	2,436.3 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm 593.8$	2,773.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 464.4$	3,252.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 274.8$	1,915.8 <sup>c</sup> $\pm 491.1$	2,729.0 $\pm 669.3$
305 days FCM (litre)	3,423.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 593.9$	2,635.3 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm 736.2$	2,990.1 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 480.1$	3,464.8 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 460.9$	2,054.4 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 531.4$	2,934.2 $\pm 410.8$
Total milk yield (litre)	3,627.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 1,178.2$	2,566.3 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm 810.1$	3,007.8 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm 656.3$	3,676.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 391.7$	1,971.5 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 586.5$	2,992.7 $\pm 377.5$
Days in milk (litre)	362.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 85.4$	312.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 44.6$	350.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 50.4$	383.8 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 40.4$	262.0 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 75.0$	336.6 $\pm 69.6$
Services per first conception	1.6 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 0.6$	2.2 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 1.3$	2.2 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 1.0$	2.5 <sup>b</sup> $\pm 1.2$	4.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 1.0$	2.5 $\pm 1.3$
Fat content (%)	4.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.4$	4.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.3$	4.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.1$	4.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.3$	4.5 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.2$	4.5 $\pm 0.2$
S.N.F. contents (%)	8.1 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.1$	8.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.2$	8.2 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.4$	8.4 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 0.1$	8.3 <sup>a</sup> $\pm 10.3$	8.2 $\pm 0.3$

Means with similar superscripts are statistically non-significant from each other.

PRODUCTION PERFORMANCE AND MILK PRODUCING EFFICIENCY

reported by McDowell (1985), Cunningham and Syrstad (1987), Pyne et al. (1986), Raheja and Bhat (1982) and Ahmed et al. (1986), however, the age at 1st calving was higher than that reported by Nagarckenkar and Rao (1982). The weight at first calving was higher than that recorded by Raheja and Bhat (1982) and Nagarckenkar and Rao (1982). The milk yield recorded in this study is higher

than reported earlier by Branton et al. (1966), Shafiq (1987), Pyne et al. (1986), Ahmed et al. (1986), Nagarckenkar and Rao (1982) and Biswas et al. (1982).

There was a decrease of 29.24 per cent in total milk yield from F<sub>1</sub> to F<sub>2</sub> crossbreds but there was appreciable improvement in milk yield in F<sub>3</sub> and F<sub>4</sub> crossbreds over F<sub>2</sub> crossbreds. Rao and Nagar-

TABLE 2. FEED CONSUMPTION AND MILK PRODUCING EFFICIENCY IN DIFFERENT FILIAL GROUPS

Traits	F <sub>1</sub>	F <sub>2</sub>	F <sub>3</sub>	F <sub>4</sub>	Sahiwal	Overall
Daily per head feed requirements						
DM (kg)	10.5 + 0.31	10.5 + 0.57	10.3 ± 0.26	10.2 ± 0.48	10.2 ± 0.49	10.4 ± 0.4
TCP (gm)	1,390 ± 160	1,197 ± 135	1,283 ± 127	1,375 ± 88	1,157 ± 71	1,285 ± 141
ME (M.Cal.)	28.0 ± 2.1	25.2 ± 2.4	26.3 + 1.9	27.4 ± 1.5	24.7 ± 1.3	26.4 ± 2.0
Daily per head feed consumption						
Fodder (kg)	29.3 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.8	29.4 <sup>a</sup> + 4.0	28.8 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.7	27.7 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.8	26.7 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.8	28.4 ± 2.7
Concentrate (kg)	5.67 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.83	4.23 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.37	5.06 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.89	5.82 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.83	4.03 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.42	5.01 ± 0.97
DM (kg)	11.8 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.4	11.2 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.1	11.0 <sup>a</sup> + 1.0	11.3 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.5	9.2 <sup>b</sup> + 0.6	10.9 ± 1.2
TCP (gm)	1,488 <sup>a</sup> ± 177	1,240 <sup>a</sup> ± 166	1,427 <sup>a</sup> ± 228	1,543 <sup>a</sup> ± 157	1,241 <sup>a</sup> ± 74	1,399 ± 199
ME (M.Cal.)	24.2 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.6	22.8 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.3	22.9 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.2	23.6 <sup>a</sup> + 1.1	19.5 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.1	22.6 + 2.4
Daily FCM (Litre)	11.23 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.95	8.64 <sup>ab</sup> ± 2.41	9.80 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.57	11.36 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.33	6.74 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.75	9.58 ± 2.31
Milk producing efficiency						
Fodder (kg)	2.67 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.42	3.36 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.37	2.94 <sup>ab</sup> ± 0.38	2.47 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.37	3.28 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.31	2.92 ± 0.47
Concentrate (kg)	0.51 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.05	0.48 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.04	0.51 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.04	0.52 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.06	0.50 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.06	0.50 ± 0.05
DM (kg)	1.11 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.17	1.27 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.17	1.13 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.12	1.00 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.10	1.13 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.16	1.12 ± 0.15
TCP (gm)	134.4 <sup>a</sup> ± 17.6	140.3 <sup>a</sup> ± 14.2	144.0 <sup>a</sup> ± 10.5	137.1 <sup>a</sup> ± 20.2	153.6 <sup>a</sup> ± 25.4	142.2 ± 17.76
ME (M.Cal.)	2.18 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.20	2.60 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.36	2.33 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.20	2.09 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.20	2.40 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.28	2.31 ± 0.27
Feed cost per litre	1.36 <sup>a</sup>	1.45 <sup>b</sup>	1.41 <sup>a</sup>	1.37 <sup>a</sup>	1.74 <sup>b</sup>	1.46
FCM produced (Rs.)	± 0.13	± 0.15	± 0.10	± 0.11	± 0.35	± 0.22

Means carrying same superscript did not differ significantly from one another within a classification.

cenkar (1979) and Bhatnagar et al. (1980) also reported a setback of approximately 700 kg of milk from  $F_1$  to  $F_2$  crossbreds: the latter study, however, suggested a slight improvement in the milk yield of  $F_3$  which is in agreement with the present findings. The decline in milk yield from  $F_1$  to  $F_2$  was also evident in the data of Wijeratne (1970), Buvanendran (1977) and Lobo et al. (1984). In theory, offspring from matings among firstcross progeny ( $F_2$ ) would be expected to average 16-20 per cent below first cross parents in milk yield, less 6 per cent for heterosis, coupled with minus 10-15 per cent because of less opportunity for selection of parent.

#### Feed consumption and milk producing efficiency

According to N. R. C., (1978) the overall per head per day requirements of DM, TCP and ME were  $10.4 \pm 0.4$  kg,  $1,285 \pm 141$  gm and  $26.4 \pm 2.0$  M.Cal., respectively. The consumption of feed during this study was very close to their feed requirements. The overall average per head per day consumption of DM, TCP and ME was  $10.9 \pm 1.2$  kg,  $1,399 \pm 199$  gm and  $22.6 \pm 2.4$  M.Cal., respectively. The Sahiwal cows consumed significantly less DM and ME than the crossbreds; difference between the means for these traits among genetic groups of crossbred cows were non-significant (table 2).

The overall per head per day average production of FCM for 305 days of lactation was  $9.58 \pm 2.31$  litre; the Sahiwal cows produced significantly less milk ( $6.74 \pm 1.75$  litre) than the crossbreds; within crossbred groups  $F_2$  produced significantly less FCM. The overall milk producing efficiency for one litre of FCM on the basis of DM, TCP and ME was  $1.12 \pm 0.15$  kg,  $142.2 \pm 17.76$  gm and  $2.31 \pm 0.27$  M.Cal., respectively. There was non significant difference in the means of these traits of milk producing efficiency among genetic groups. The overall average feeding cost per litre of FCM produced during 305 days of lactation was Rs.  $1.46 \pm 0.22$ ; it was significantly higher in Sahiwal and  $F_2$  than other genetic groups (table 2). These results indicated that the crossbred cows produced significantly more milk than the Sahiwal by consuming the same amount of feed per litre of milk produced.

In a similar study Chaudhry and Shah (1989) found that the crossbreds (1/2, 3/4 and 5/8 HS) consumed significantly larger quantities of concen-

trate and dry matter than the Sahiwal but their feed efficiency per kg FCM produced was significantly better than Sahiwal; among the crossbred groups the differences for feed consumption and feed efficiency were non-significant. Wagen (1971) also observed that in the crossbred cows the feed efficiency for milk production was  $23.18 \pm 1.02$  per cent as compared to  $17.53 \pm 0.90$  per cent in Sahiwal cows under high roughage feeding system. Ram et al. (1979) concluded that various types of crossbreds produced a litre of milk at relatively cheaper cost and required almost only half of the replacement costs than those of exotic and zebu cows. The study of Kumar and Gupta (1968) revealed that the per litre cost of milk production was lowest in the crossbred cows on account of its highest milk yield versus buffaloes and indigenious cattle.

#### Literature Cited

- Ahmad, Z., M. D. Ahmad, G. M. Din and R. A. Gill. 1986. Breeding adapted strains of dairy cattle through crossing Sahiwal, Jersey and Holstein Friesian. In Proc. Nil. Workshop. Dairy Cattle crossbred and maintenance of exotic dairy cattle in Pakistan. July 13-15 NARC, Islamabad.
- Bhatnagar, D. S., R. Nagarckenker, M. Gurnani and R. C. Sharma. 1980. Crossbreeding of zebu cows with Brown swiss. Annual Report, 1980; National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India, p. 134.
- Biswas, J. V., M. M. Saxena, M. Kumar and S. N. Kaushik. 1982. Factors affecting milk yield in Friesian-Haryana halfbred. Indian J. Anim. Sci., 52:123-128.
- Branton, C., R. E. McDowell and M. A. Brown. 1966. Zebu European crossbreeding as a basis of dairy cattle improvement in the U.S.A. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. No. 114. Louisiana Agri. Exp. Sta. Baton Rouge, LA.
- Buvanendran, V. 1977. Production characteristic of Jersey-Sindhi grades in Sri Lanka, Aust. J. Agric. Res., 28:747-757.
- Chaudhry, M. Z. and S. K. Shah. 1989. Study on the production performance and adaptability of cross bred cows under the subtropical environmental conditions of the Punjab. Final Report of PARC Project (1974-87). Livestock Production Research Institute, Bahadurnagar, Okara.
- Cunningham, E. P. and O. Syrstad. 1987. Crossbreeding *Bos indicus* and *Bos taurus* for milk production in the tropics. FAO Anim. Prod. and Hlth. Paper No. 68.
- Kaushik, S. N. 1979. Salient results of Zebu-Taurus crossbreeding (1968-1979). All India coordinated Research Project on cattle. Indian Veterinary research Institute, Izatnagar.

## PRODUCTION PERFORMANCE AND MILK PRODUCING EFFICIENCY

- Kumar, P. and J. N. Gupta. 1968. Comparative cost of milk production from different species of milch animals. A case study of Muzafarnagar District (UP). *Indian J. Dairy Sci.*, 41:411.
- Lobo, R. B., F. A. M. Daurte, A. A. M. Goncalves, J. A. Oliviera and C. J. Wilcox. 1984. Genetic and environmental effect on milk yield of Pitangueiras cattle. *Anim. Prod.*, 39:157-163.
- Mason, I. L. 1974. Maintaining crossbred populations of dairy cattle in the tropics. *Wld. Anim. Rev.*, 11:36-43.
- McDowell, R. E. 1985. Crossbreeding in tropical areas with emphasis on milk, health and fitness. *J. Dairy Sci.*, 68:2418-2435.
- Nagarckenkar, R. and M. K. Rao. 1982. Performance of Tharparkar-Exotic crosses for productive and reproductive traits. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 52:129-138.
- N.R.C. 1978. Nutrient requirements of dairy cattle (Number 3) National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C.
- Pyne, A. K., D. N. Maitra, R. Sinha, R. Dattagupta and S. K. Roy. 1986. Studies on the effect of season of birth of the Jersey-Haryana and Holstein Friesian-Haryana halfbreds on their lactation milk yield in humid tropics. *Indian Vet. J.*, 63:133-136.
- Raheja, K. L. and P. N. Bhat. 1982. Note on the comparative performance of three zebu breeds and their F<sub>1</sub> crosses with Holstein Friesian for certain economic traits. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 52:333-336.
- Ram, K., K. Singh and O. S. Tomar. 1979. Annual Report. 1979. National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India.
- Rao, G. N. and R. Nagarckenkar. 1979. First lactation performance of crossbred and exotic cattle on Indo-Gangetic plains. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.*, 32:355-361.
- Shafiq, M. 1987. Genetic and non-genetic factors affecting first lactation milk yield and reproductive efficiency in Friesian halfbreds. M. Sc Thesis, Univ. Agri. Faisalabad.
- Singh, A. S. and M. Mishra. 1980. Physiological responses of crossbred heifers under different environments. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.*, 33:174-181.
- Wagon, R. A. 1971. National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India. Publication No. 155.
- Wijeratne, W. V. S. 1970. Crossbreeding Sinhala cattle with Jersey and Friesian in Ceylon. *Anim. Prod.*, 12:473-483.