

## **Effect of Two Types of Housing and Levels of Feeding on Voluntary Feed and Water Intakes, and Associated Changes in Body Weight and Body Measurements of Crossbred Female Calves in Winter Season\***

Yibrah Yacob<sup>1</sup> ♦, S.S. Grewal<sup>2</sup> and R S Yadav<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Werer Agricultural Research Center, EARO, P.O.Box 2003 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; E-mail: warc@telecom.net.et

<sup>2</sup>Department of Livestock Production and Management, College of Animal Sciences, CCS, Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar- 125004, India

### **Abstract**

The effect of two housing systems (loose house vs. conventional barn) and two levels of protein feeding (80 vs. 100% NRC, 1988) on feed and water intake and, associated changes in body weight and body measurements of twenty crossbred female calves that had an average body weight of about 85.6±2.18 kg and age of 6-10 months was studied in 2x2 factorial experiment over a period of 98 days in the winter season. The average daily dry matter intake per head and intake per unit of metabolic body weight were significantly ( $p<0.001$ ) affected by level of protein. The differences in these parameters between housing systems were not significant. Average voluntary water intake per head and intake per kg dry matter consumed and per kg  $w^{0.75}$  were not significant. Housing system and level of protein did not significantly influence average final body weight and daily body weight gain. The average monthly increases in body measurements (body length, height, heart girth, abdominal girth and hip width) were not significantly influenced by housing system. Abdominal girth was however, significantly ( $p<0.001$ ) affected by level of protein. It was higher for the 100% than 80% level of feeding.

Keywords: Body weight, crossbred calves, feed intake, water intake, housing system

---

♣ The paper is based on the MSc Thesis of Yibrah Yacob (2002) on Effect of Housing and Level of Feeding on Performance of Crossbred Female Calves in Winter Season. CCS, Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India

♦ Corresponding author

## Introduction

Exotic breeds of dairy cattle have been introduced in many tropical and subtropical countries to meet growing demand of milk and milk products. As a result, a large number of crossbred populations have become available with the farmers. A farmer expects his cows to produce more milk and calve early with minimum inputs. Unfortunately, the above-mentioned targets are not realized in view of a number of constraints such as poor nutrition, disease and climatic stress. It has been well recognized that feed and climate affects the growth, production and reproduction at large.

Feed shortages, low nutritive value of existing feed resources and nutritional imbalance limit animal production and retard the onset of puberty. Provision of adequate nutrients in the diet of ruminants is of primary importance for the expression of their full genetic potential for growth and reproduction. On the other hand, adverse climate is another constraint for efficient livestock production systems. High or extremely low temperatures; high humidity and high solar radiation that characterized tropical environments are associated with lower livestock performance. These factors have led livestock owners in many parts of the tropics and sub-tropics to provide shelter for their animals. The purpose of housing dairy cattle like other farm animals is to reduce climatic stress on the animals that hinder production, reproduction and proper growth and development. Results of several trials conducted under a variety of conditions suggest that shelter is more beneficial in winter than in summer (Curtis, 1983). Winters are severe enough in most of the tropics and young calves are more susceptible to cold stress due to less adaptation ability to environmental stress. Severe cold weather not only reduces the feed efficiency but also causes to decrease resistance and suppresses growth and future development of the animal (Hahn, 1981 and Collier *et al*, 1982). This effect is more pronounced in crossbred cattle as compare to native breeds.

As indicated earlier, adverse climate make the raising of crossbred calves and maintenance of dairy cattle a difficult task under prevailing feed shortages (Jain *et al*, 1996). Although a number of studies have been conducted to reduce the deleterious effect of climate and feed on growth and production of different species (Dattilo and Congiu, 1979; Charles, 1994; Singh and Singh, 1994; Chauhan *et al*, 1999; Poudel, 2001), no comprehensive study appears to have been conducted to study the

associative effect of housing and level of feeding on performance of growing crossbred female calves. Hence, the present investigation has been planned to study the effect of two housing systems and two levels of protein feeding on dry matter and water intakes, body weight gain and body measurements of crossbred female calves in winter season.

## Materials and Methods

### Study area

The study was conducted at the dairy farm of the College of Animal Sciences, Chaudhary Charan Singh (CCS) Haryana Agricultural University in Hisar, India for 98 days (from December 1, 2000 to March 10, 2001) during winter season. Hisar is located at 29° to 10' North latitude and 75° to 45' East longitude. The maximum daily temperature during the summer (hot season) varies between 40 and 46 degree Celsius. During winter (cold season) it ranges from 1.5 degree to 4 degree Celsius.

### Allocation of treatments

Twenty crossbred female calves of 6 to 10 months of age that had an average body weight of about  $85.6 \pm 2.18$  kg that varies from 68 to 100 kg were selected from the cattle herd. The crossbred female calves were of Indian zebu × European dairy breeds. All calves were treated against internal and external parasites. After a preliminary adjustment period of 10 days, all the calves were divided into four groups of five animals each according to age and body weight. Animals in each group were randomly assigned to one of the following housing and feeding treatments: Loose housing system +80% feeding as per NRC (1988) recommendations (T<sub>1</sub>); Loose housing system +100% feeding as per NRC (1988) recommendations (T<sub>2</sub>); Conventional barn system + 80% feeding as per NRC (1988) recommendations (T<sub>3</sub>) and Conventional barn system + 100% feeding as per NRC (1988) recommendations (T<sub>4</sub>).

### Management of animals

Two types of housing systems were used to house the calves as described by Heizer *et al.* (1953). Calves in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> were sheltered in loose house that employed an open lot free-stall system that permits freedom of movement. The open lot has a shelter (partially protected shed) on one side where animals can retire during time of excessive heat, cold or rain. The other two groups of calves (T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>) were housed in a conventional barn that is also known as closed barn or tie barn or stanchion barn. In this system animals are confined by stanchions or tie stalls on a lightly bedded hard surface floor. The barn is

completely roofed and the wall is also complete with windows and ventilators located at suitable places. During the experimental period the average daily internal house temperature ranged from 12.4 to 20.4 °C in the loose house and 14 to 22.3 °C in the conventional barn. The overall mean values of maximum and minimum temperatures recorded in both the housing systems were 25 and

8.0 °C in loose house and 22.3 and 12.7 °C in conventional barn respectively. The maximum temperatures in loose house and conventional barn varied from 17.3 to 30.4 °C and 16.8 to 28.7 respectively, while the minimum temperature varied from 5.3 to 11.4 °C in loose house and 9.5 to 15.9 °C in conventional barn respectively. The calves in both house types were fed and treated individually. Both shelters were cleaned daily and fresh drinking water was continuously available in each shed.

Percent ingredient composition of the concentrate mixture fed to the experimental calves is given in Table 1. The amount of concentrate offered to the calves in each treatment group was fixed in such a way that T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> received 20 per cent below the normal NRC (1988) recommended level while T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> were fed on normal NRC (1988) recommended level of crude protein per head per day. An equal and weighed amount of seasonally available green fodder was fed to all the calves daily and its crude protein content was taken into consideration while fixing the allowance of concentrate feed for each group. Calves in each group were offered wheat straw *ad libitum*. The ration of each calf was adjusted in proportion to its body weight change in each fortnight.

Table 1. Ingredient composition (%) of concentrate mixture fed to experimental

<b>Feed ingredients</b>	<b>Proportion of mixture</b>
Maize	13
Wheat	19
Barley	14
Rice polish	20
Mustard cake	15
Groundnut cake	16
Common salt	01
Mineral mixture	02

The feed intake during the experimental period was determined on the basis of weighing the concentrate, green fodder and wheat straw offered and left over in a fortnight. Representative samples of concentrate mixture, wheat

straw, maize and mustard green chops were taken and were kept in hot air-oven for determination of dry matter content. These samples were then analyzed for proximate principles according to AOAC (1980). Calves were weighed at the beginning of the experiment and fortnightly then after. The weights were recorded in the morning before providing water and feed. Body measurements such as body length, height, heart girth, abdominal girth and hip width were taken at the beginning and monthly then after. The water intake of individual calves was recorded for three consecutive days in a fortnight during the experimental period and the mean was taken for calculation. A measured quantity of fresh water was offered ad libitum individually to each calf by placing a graduated bucket full of water in front of the calves twice a day. The leftover was also measured to find out the actual voluntary water intake.

### Statistical analyses

Data on dry matter and water intakes, body weight and body measurements were analyzed based on housing and feeding effects in a 2 x 2 factorial arrangement as per the standard statistical procedure recommended by Snedecor and Cochran (1980). The Least significant difference (LSD) was used to locate treatment means that were significantly different

## Results and Discussion

### Dry matter intake

The proximate composition of feeds and fodder on dry matter basis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Proximate composition (%) of feeds

Feed components	DM	Expressed as percent of dry matter				
		CP	CF	NFE	EE	Ash
Concentrate	90.00	20.00	8.96	62.73	4.24	5.65
Maize green	12.35	8.94	25.11	52.93	1.26	11.75
Mustard green	12.83	8.50	19.94	56.41	3.24	9.90
Wheat straw	90.08	3.53	31.13	53.04	1.81	10.47

The data for daily dry matter intake and intake per kg metabolic body weight are presented in Table 3. On an average the daily dry matter intake and intake per kg metabolic body weight in the two housing systems were  $2.89 \pm 0.086$ ,  $2.96 \pm 0.092$  kg and  $84 \pm 0.002$  and  $85 \pm 0.002$ g in loose house and conventional barn respectively. These differences were not statistically

significant ( $p>0.05$ ). This supported the earlier findings by researchers (Martin, 1971; chakrabarti, 1991; Fiems *et al*, 1998; Chauhan et al, 1999 and Poudel, 2001) on cattle and buffalo calves in winter under similar housing conditions.

Table 3. Average daily dry matter intake of crossbred calves

Variables	Number of animal	Average DM Intake (kg) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Dry matter intake / kg Metabolic body weight (g) (Mean $\pm$ SE)
Overall mean	20	2.93 $\pm$ 0.06	85 $\pm$ 0.001
A. Housing			
<i>Loose House (LH)</i>	10	2.89 $\pm$ 0.09	84 $\pm$ 0.002
<i>Conventional Barn (CB)</i>	10	2.96 $\pm$ 0.09	85 $\pm$ 0.002
B. Level of feeding			
1. 80% NRC (F <sub>1</sub> )	10	2.71 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.08	79 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.002
2. 100 % NRC (F <sub>2</sub> )	10	3.14 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.09	90 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.002
C. House x Feed			
1. LH x F <sub>1</sub>	5	2.71 $\pm$ 0.12	80 $\pm$ 0.003
2. LH x F <sub>2</sub>	5	3.07 $\pm$ 0.12	88 $\pm$ 0.002
3. CB x F <sub>1</sub>	5	2.71 $\pm$ 0.12	79 $\pm$ 0.002
4. CB x F <sub>2</sub>	5	3.20 $\pm$ 0.13	91 $\pm$ 0.002

Within variables means in the same column without a common superscript differ significantly ( $p<0.001$ )

The average values for daily dry matter intake and intake per kg metabolic body weight under two levels of proteins were 2.71 $\pm$ 0.084, 3.14  $\pm$ 0.087 kg and 79  $\pm$ 0.002 and 90  $\pm$ 0.002 g in 80 and 100% NRC levels of protein feeding respectively. These differences were statistically significant ( $P<0.001$ ). It was higher for the 100% than the 80% level. This may be due to the 20% additional concentrate intake by calves of this group than calves of other group fed on 80% level. Similarly Taparia *et al.* (1983), Mai and Kurar (1990b), Singh *et al.* (1991) and Shenu (2000) reported that there was significant increase in feed intake in crossbred calves that were fed higher levels of crude protein. On the contrary, Gupta and Saba (1983), Krishna and Ranjhan (1985) and Sampath *et al.* (1983) did not find significant effect on dry matter intake in crossbred calves reared on different levels of protein. The interaction between housing systems and level of feeding was not significant.

Table 4. Average daily voluntary water intake of crossbred calves

Variables	Number of animals	Voluntary water intake/ h/d(Liters) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Voluntary water intake / kg DM consumed (Liters) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Voluntary water intake/ kg metabolic body weight (ml) (Mean $\pm$ SE)
<b>Overall mean</b>	20	6.00 $\pm$ 0.16	2.13 $\pm$ 0.069	174 $\pm$ 0.004
<b>A. Housing</b>				
1. Loose House (LH)	10	5.70 $\pm$ 0.22	2.07 $\pm$ 0.11	166 $\pm$ 0.006
2. Conventional Barn (CB)	10	6.30 $\pm$ 0.24	2.18 $\pm$ 0.09	181 $\pm$ 0.006
<b>B. Level of feeding</b>				
1. 80% NRC (F <sub>1</sub> )	10	5.74 $\pm$ 0.22	2.25 $\pm$ 0.12	168 $\pm$ 0.006
2. 100 % NRC (F <sub>2</sub> )	10	6.26 $\pm$ 0.24	2.01 $\pm$ 0.07	179 $\pm$ 0.006
<b>C. House x Feed</b>				
1. LH x F <sub>1</sub>	5	5.63 $\pm$ 0.31	2.23 $\pm$ 0.18	166 $\pm$ 0.008
2. LH x F <sub>2</sub>	5	5.77 $\pm$ 0.32	1.92 $\pm$ 0.10	165 $\pm$ 0.007
3. CB x F <sub>1</sub>	5	5.85 $\pm$ 0.30	2.27 $\pm$ 0.14	170 $\pm$ 0.008
4. CB x F <sub>2</sub>	5	6.74 $\pm$ 0.35	2.09 $\pm$ 0.11	192 $\pm$ 0.008

### Voluntary water intake

The data for daily voluntary water intake and intake per kg metabolic body size by experimental animals are presented in Table 4. The daily voluntary water intake and ratio of water to dry matter intake were 5.70  $\pm$  0.22, 6.30  $\pm$

0.24 liter and 2.07 $\pm$  0.11 and 2.18 $\pm$  0.09 liter in loose house and conventional barn respectively and intake per kg metabolic body weight were 166  $\pm$ 0.006 and 181  $\pm$ 0.006 ml in loose house & conventional barn respectively. These differences were not statistically significant ( $p>0.05$ ). However the trend was clearly in favor of the conventionally housed group. This may be due to the higher internal temperature observed in the conventional barn, (17.5 vs. 16.5

$^{\circ}$ C) which initiated the calves of this house group to consume more water than the calves in loose house. Chakrabarti (1991) and Poudel (2001) reported similar findings on buffalo calves under similar housing systems in winter.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference in voluntary water intake between the two levels of protein, which is in agreement with earlier reports. For instance, Mudgal and Sivaiah (1982) and Sivaiah and Mudgal (1984) observed non-significant difference in voluntary water intake per unit of dry matter consumed between different levels of feeding. Shenu (2000) reported non-significant difference in voluntary water intake at 100

and 125% level of feeding and Poudel (2001) observed non-significant difference in voluntary water intake per kg dry matter consumed and intake per kg metabolic body weight at 80 and 100 % levels of protein. The interaction between housing system and level of protein feeding was not significant.

### **Body weight changes**

The data for body weight changes of calves under the two housing and two levels of protein feeding are presented in table 5. Average daily body weight gain under two housing systems and two levels of protein feeding was 535  $\pm$ 0.03 and 540  $\pm$ 0.04 g and 525  $\pm$ 0.03 and 553  $\pm$ 0.03g in loose house, conventional barn, 80 and 100% NRC feeding respectively. The analysis of variance revealed that housing system and level of protein of the diet and the interact between housing system and level of protein had no significant influence ( $p>0.05$ ) on final body weight, total weight gain and daily body weight gain of crossbred females calves. The results indicated that for a dry land environment like Hisar during a cold winter season housing of crossbred female calves in a conventional barn had no advantage in respect to growth of the calves over the loose house. Murely and Calvahouse (1958) reported no significant variation in growth of calves between conventional barn open shed or portable pens. Similarly, significant difference was not reported in body weight gain of beef cattle due to closed building and open front pole barn during winter (Hillickson *et al*, 1972). Chakrabarti (1991) observed better growth in conventional barn housed calves than the calves hosed in the other housing systems. On the contrary Saseendranath *et al.* (1983) and Poudel (2001) reported significantly higher weight gains in crossbred and buffalo calves housed in conventional barn as compared to loose house in winter.

Values for the level of feeding were slightly higher in 100% than the 80% level. This trend was clearly in favor of the 100% level however, the higher dry matter recorded by calves fed on 100% NRC level was not reflected in their body weight gain. This may be due to the fact that the difference in protein level between the two levels may not be large enough to detect a significant difference in body weight gain of crossbred calves. This could also be due to the facts that diet containing 80% protein might be optimum for crossbred calves to attain their maximum genetic potential for growth. Similar findings were reported earlier by many workers (Rathee and



Yadava, 1970, Krishna and Ranjhan, 1982, Singh *et al*, 1991, Sampath *et al.* 1993, Loerch and Fluharty, 1998 and Shenu 2000) who observed similar body weight gain ( $p>0.05$ ) between different levels of feeding on crossbred and buffalo calves. However, on the contrary Hassan *et al.*, (1991), Song *et al.*, (1998) and Poudel (2001) reported significant difference in growth rates of calves between different protein levels.

Table 5. Average body weight changes of crossbred calves during the experimental period

Source of variation	Number of animals	Average initial body weight (Kg) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Average final body weight (Kg) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Average total weight gain (kg) (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Average daily weight gain (g) (Mean $\pm$ SE)
<b>Overall mean</b>	20	85.60 $\pm$ 2.18	138.30 $\pm$ 5.10	52.7 $\pm$ 1.07	539 $\pm$ 0.024
<b>A. Housing</b>					
1. Loose House (LH)	10	85.30 $\pm$ 2.89	137.60 $\pm$ 5.09	52.30 $\pm$ 1.05	535 $\pm$ 0.031
2. Conventional Barn (CB)	10	85.90 $\pm$ 3.38	139.00 $\pm$ 5.69	53.10 $\pm$ 1.10	540 $\pm$ 0.037
<b>B. Level of feeding</b>					
1. 80% NRC (F <sub>1</sub> )	10	85.50 $\pm$ 3.29	134.30 $\pm$ 4.44	51.30 $\pm$ 0.05	525 $\pm$ 0.033
2. 100 % NRC (F <sub>2</sub> )	10	85.70 $\pm$ 3.008	139.80 $\pm$ 6.09	54.10 $\pm$ 0.10	553 $\pm$ 0.036
<b>C. House x Feed</b>					
1. LH x F <sub>1</sub>	5	85.20 $\pm$ 3.75	136.20 $\pm$ 4.09	51.00 $\pm$ 1.22	520 $\pm$ 0.041
2. LH x F <sub>2</sub>	5	85.40 $\pm$ 4.68	139.00 $\pm$ 9.43	53.60 $\pm$ 1.27	550 $\pm$ 0.048
3. CB x F <sub>1</sub>	5	85.80 $\pm$ 5.72	137.40 $\pm$ 8.20	51.60 $\pm$ 1.08	530 $\pm$ 0.051
4. CB x F <sub>2</sub>	5	86.00 $\pm$ 4.34	140.60 $\pm$ 8.80	54.60 $\pm$ 1.14	557 $\pm$ 0.053

### Body measurements

The monthly changes in average body length and average body height during the experimental period were 245  $\pm$ 0.025 and 200  $\pm$ 0.019 mm, respectively, in loose house and 256  $\pm$ 0.022 and 185  $\pm$ 0.013 in the conventional barn, respectively. The corresponding values for the other body measurements for the two housing systems were 209  $\pm$ 0.026 and 189  $\pm$ 0.012 mm for heart girth 210  $\pm$ 0.027 and 225  $\pm$  0.016 mm for abdominal girth, and 100  $\pm$ 0.006 and 115 $\pm$ 0.008 mm for hip width, respectively. The corresponding values between the two housing systems were not statistically different. Similar results reported earlier by Erb and Murdock (1951), Jorgenson *et al.* (1970), Macualay *et al.* (1995) and Poudel (2001) were in line with the findings in the present investigation.

The monthly average increases in body measurements (mm) of calves under the two levels of protein feeding were 253  $\pm$ 0.022 and 249  $\pm$ 0.025 (length), 185  $\pm$ 0.014 and 200  $\pm$ 0.017 (height) in 80 and 100% feeding levels respectively. The values for heart girth, abdominal girth and hip width were 175  $\pm$ 0.011 and 223  $\pm$ 0.026 mm, 179  $\pm$ 0.016 and 256  $\pm$ 0.025 mm, 104  $\pm$ 0.008 and 112  $\pm$ 0.007 mm in both protein levels respectively. Statistical analysis revealed no significant differences in body length, height, heart girth and hip width between the two levels of feeding. Though Significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) higher value of abdominal girth was observed in calves fed higher level of protein. This may be due to more concentrate intake observed by calves of this group. The findings of Mudgal and Ray (1965) and Sreenivasa *et al.* (1986) who reported no significant difference in heart girth, body height and body length and a significant difference in abdominal girth of calves between different levels of feeding on protein support the present results. However, Awate *et al.* (1975) observed significant differences in chest girth, posterior girth and height at withers of calves due to different levels of feeding, while Sarma (1991), Shenu (2000) and Poudel (2001) did not observe significant differences in body length, height, heart girth abdominal girth and hip width of calves between different levels of feeding on protein. The interaction between housing systems and level of feeding in the present study was not significant.

#### **Feed conversion efficiency**

The data for dry matter intake per kg body weight gain of crossbred calves are presented in Table 6. The average dry matter intakes per kg body weight gains under the two housing systems were 8.19 $\pm$ 0.097 and 8.99  $\pm$ 1.17 kg in loose house and conventional barn respectively. Statistical analysis indicated that dry matter intake per kg body weight gain was not significantly ( $P > 0.05$ ) influenced by housing systems. Chakrabarti (1991) also did not observe significant effect on DM intake due to housing systems. However, Poudel (2001) reported significantly higher values in DM intake per kg body weight gain in calves housed in conventional barn as compared to calves in loose house.

The values for DM intake per kg body weight gain under two levels of protein feeding were 8.75  $\pm$ 1.14 and 8.43  $\pm$ 0.01kg in 80% and 100% respectively. Level of feeding did not influence ( $p > 0.05$ ) dry matter intake per kg body weight gain. The present results are in agreement with those of

earlier workers who also did not observe any significant difference in DM intake per kg body weight gain on crossbred and buffalo calves fed different levels of protein (Shenu, 2000 and Poudel, 2001). On the contrary Mai and kurar (1990a) observed a significant difference in DM intake per kg body weight gain in crossbred calves fed different protein and energy levels. The interaction between housing systems and levels of protein was not significant ( $P>0.05$ ).

Table 6. Daily Average dry matter intake (kg) per kg body weight gain of crossbred calves

	Level of feeding		Mean
	80% NRC	100%NRC	
<b>Housing system:</b>			
<i>Loose house</i>	8.18 ± 1.33	8.20 ± 1.43	8.19 ± 0.97
<i>Conventional barn</i>	9.33 ± 1.86	8.65 ± 1.43	8.99 ± 1.17
Mean	8.75 ± 1.14	8.43 ± 1.01	

### Conclusion

Findings of the present study confirmed that type of housing and level of protein in a diet had no significant influence in body weight, body measurements, water intake and dry matter intake per kg body weight gain of crossbred females calves in winter. However the significant effect of level of protein observed on dry matter intake of the calves was not reflected in their body weight gain. Thus these results suggest that in cold winter season crossbred females calves can be economically reared in loose house with 80% NRC protein feedings.

### References

- AOAC. 1980. Official Methods of Analysis. 13th ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington D.C.
- Awate, P.R., Rotte, S.O. and Bonde, H.S. 1975. Effect of different protein and energy fractions on the growth rate of weaned Doeni calves. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.* 28: 29-35.
- Chakrabarti, A. 1991. Effect of winter management systems on growth performance of female Murrah buffalo calves. M.V.Sc, Thesis, Department of Livestock Production and Management, Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India.
- Charles, D.R. 1994. Sheep housing. In: Livestock housing. Slade, C.F.R.; Stubbing, S.L. and Wathes, C.M. (Eds.). pp. 359-378.

Chauhan, T.R., Dahiya, S.S., Gupta, R., Hooda, O.K., Bhardwaj, A. and Punia, B.S. 1999. Effect of extreme cold on voluntary dry matter intake, nutrient utilization, some biochemical and physiological parameters in growing buffalo calves. *Buffalo J.* **15**(2): 133-141.

Collier, R.D.K., Beede, W.W., Thatcher, L. and Wilcox, C.J. 1982. Influence of environment and its modification on dairy animal health and production. *J. Dairy Sci.* **65**: 2213.

Curtis, Stanley E. 1983. Environmental management in animal agriculture. The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, USA.

Dattilo, M. and Congiu, F. 1979. Effects of feeding and housing on milk yield of sheep and goats. *Rivista-di-Zootecnia-e-Veterinaria.* **4**: 274-281.

Erb, R.E. and Murdock, F.R. 1951. Open shed versus conventional housing for dairy calves. *J. Dairy Sci. Abstr.* **34**(1-6): 503.

Fiems, L., Campeneere, S. de, Cottyn, B. and Boufue, C. 1998. Effect of housing on the performance of double muscled rearing calves. *Annals de Zootechnie* **47**(3) 207-214.

Gupta, B.N. and Saba, R.C. 1983. Effect of various levels of protein intake on nutrients utilization by crossbred calves in hot humid climate. *Indian J. Nutr.* **20**: 394-400.

Hahn, G.L. 1981. Housing and management to reduce climatic impacts on livestock. *J. Anim. Sci.* **51**(1): 175-186.

Hassan, H.A., El-Feel, F.M.R., Morsy, N.H.A. and Fahney, S.T.M. 1995. Effect of feeding level, season of calving and body weight on performance and carcass, traits of Friesian x Native calves. *Intl. J. Anim. Sci.* **10**(1): 85-93.

Heizer, E.E., Vearl Smith, R. and Zehner, C.E. 1953. A summary of study comparing stanchion and loose housing barns. *J. Dairy Sci.* **36**: 281-292.

Hillickson, M.A., Winter, W.B. and Barringer, R. 1972. Comparison of selected Environmental conditions and beef cattle performance in pole type of closed environment. *Trans. Amr. Soc. Ag. Enggrs.* **15**: 536-538.

Jain, D.K., Sharma, K.N.S., Walli, T.K. and Rai, S.N. 1996. Estimates of nutrient requirement & availability for bovine population across major states in India. NDRI pub. No. 281. NDRI Karnal.

Jorgenson, L.J., Jorgensen, N.A., Schingoethe, D.J. and Owens, M.J. 1970. Indoor versus outdoor calf rearing at three weaning ages. *J. Dairy Sci.* **53**(6): 813- 816.

Krishna Mohan D.V.G and Ranjhan, S.K. 1982. Growth, nitrogen balance and nutrient intake in Crossbred heifer calves fed different levels of energy and protein. *Indian J. anim. Sci.* 638-642.

Krishna Mohan, D.V.G. and Ranjhan, S.K. 1985. Effect of different levels of energy and protein on nutrient and energy utilization in crossbred heifer calves. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* **55** (6): 450-453.

Loerch, S.C. and Fluharty, F.L. 1998. Effect of corn processing, dietary roughage level and timing of roughage inclusion on performance of feedlot steers. *J. Anim. Sci. (USA)* **76**(3): 681-685.

Macaulay, A.S., Hahn, G.L., Clark, D.H. and Sisson, D.V. 1995. Comparison of calf housing types and tympanic temperature rhythms in Holstein calves. *J. Dairy Sci.* **78**(4): 856-862.

Mai, N.T. and Kurar, C.K. 1990a. Effect of different planes of nutrition on growth and cost of raising crossbred male calves. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* **60**(3): 387-380.

Mai, N.T. and Kurar, C.K. 1990b. Protein requirement for maintenance and growth in crossbred male calves. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.* **43**(2): 164-167.

Martin, H. 1971. Milk yield and food consumption and utilization by dairy cows in tie-up cow shades and loose housing. *Dairy Sci. Abstr.* **33**: 2739.

Mudgal, V.D. and Sivaiah, K. 1982. Effect of feeding different levels of protein and energy on feed utilization and growth of buffalo calves. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.* **35**(2): 138-144.

Mudgal, V.D. and Ray, S.N. 1965. Studies on the nutrient required for growth. I. Effect of feeding different levels of protein on the growth of Sahiwal calves. *Indian J. Dairy sci.* **18**: 21-30.

Murley, W.R and Culvahouse, E.W. 1958. Open shed and portable pens versus conventional housing for young dairy calves. *J. Dairy Sci.* **41**(7-12): 977-981.

NRC. 1988. Nutrient requirements of dairy cattle. 6<sup>th</sup> revised edition. National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

Poudel, R.P. 2001. Effect of management systems on growth performance of buffalo calves in winter season. M.Sc. Thesis, CCS Haryana Agricultural University Hisar, India.

Rathee, C.S. and Yadava, I.S. 1970. Effect of different protein levels on the performance of Haryana calves. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.* **23**: 95-99.

Sampath, K.T., Prasad, C.S. and Shivaramaiah, M.T. 1993. Effect of feeding two levels of rumen degradable protein at higher level of energy on growth and nutrient utilization in crossbred female calves. *Indian J. Anim. Nutr.* 10(2): 89-93.

Sarma, N.K. 1991. Effect of management regimes on growth performance of female Murrah buffalo calves. Ph.D. Thesis, Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India.

Saseendranath, M.R, Thomas, C.K. and Geevarghese, P.I. 1983. Effect of two type of housing and two concentrate feeds on growth of crossbred calves. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* 53(6): 591-595.

Shenu, T. 2000. Effects of management regimes on growth performance of crossbred calves. M.Sc. Thesis, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India.

Singh, U.B.; Mehra, U.R., Sinha, A.P. and Srivastava, U.S. 1991. Effect of different planes of nutrition on nutrient utilization and growth in crossbred calves. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.* 44(5): 305-208.

Singh, L.S.K. and Singh, N. 1994. Effect of housing and roughage to concentrate ratios on growth performance of buffalo heifers. *J. Vet. Physiol. & Allied Sci.* 13 (1): 7-11.

Singh, L.S.K. and Singh, N. 1994. Effect of housing and roughage to concentrate ratios on growth performance of buffalo heifers. *J. Vet. Physiol. & Allied Sci.* 13 (1): 7-11.

Sivaiah, K. and Mudgal, V.D. 1984. Effect of feeding different energy to protein ratio on growth rate and feed efficiency in buffalo calves. *Indian Vet. J.* 61: 1070-1076.

Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. 1980. *Statistical Methods*. 7th ed. Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, USA, 507 pp.

Song, M.K., Kim, N.S., Chung, C.S., Choi, Y.I., Won, Y.S., Chung, J.K. and Choi, S.H. 1998. Effect of feeding level of concentrate on growth performance and fatty acid composition of adipose tissue at various locations in Hanwoo, bulls. *Korean J. Anim. Sci.* 40(5): 485-498.

Sreenivasa, T. Mohan, Narasaiah, K.N., Krishna, N. and Anjneya, D. P. 1986. Effect of level of protein on growth rate and nutrient utilization of Ongole x Jersey crossbred heifers. *Dairy Sci.* 39: 351-353.

Taparia, A.L., Khambalkar, V.J. and Sharma, V.V. 1983. Response to supplementary levels of protein and energy in growing crossbred heifers. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* 53(5): 465-469.