



ISSN: 2456-2912

VET 2023; SP-8(4): 36-38

© 2023 VET

[www.veterinarypaper.com](http://www.veterinarypaper.com)

Received: 12-05-2023

Accepted: 15-06-2023

**Deepak Kumar**

Ph.D. Research Scholar,  
Department of Animal  
Husbandry and Dairying, C.S.  
Azad University of Ag. & Tech,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Anita Kumari Meena**

Ph.D. Research Scholar,  
Department of Animal  
Production, Maharana Pratap  
University of Agriculture and  
Technology, Udaipur,  
Rajasthan, India

**Ved Prakash**

Professor and Head, Department  
of Animal Husbandry and  
Dairying, C.S. Azad University  
of Ag. & Tech, Kanpur and Dean  
of College of D.T., Etawah,  
Uttar Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author:**

**Deepak Kumar**

Ph.D. Research Scholar,  
Department of Animal  
Husbandry and Dairying, C.S.  
Azad University of Ag. & Tech,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

## Existing health management practices followed by dairy farmers in humid south eastern plain region of Rajasthan

**Deepak Kumar, Anita Kumari Meena and Ved Prakash**

### Abstract

A study on the health care management practices followed by dairy farmers in Rajasthan's humid south eastern plain (Hadoti) region was conducted by gathering data from 225 dairy farmers using a well-structured interview schedule and pretested questionnaire. Studies revealed that overall majority (86.22 %) of respondents were not adopting vaccination against infectious diseases like FMD and HS and 13.78% of respondent adopting. Overall, 51.56 % of respondent were not practicing deworming and 48.44 percent were practicing. Majority (61.78%) of respondents not practices to control ecto-parasite and 33.67 % of respondents practiced. Overall majority (61.33%) of respondent having dirty shed and 33.67 % maintained the sanitation (clean) in shed. According to the findings, the majority (61.78%) of respondents treated sick animals with veterinarian care, while 26.67% used local empirical knowledge and 11.56% called a quack. Overall majority (71.11%) of respondents wash hind quarter after drop of placenta and 28.89 % of respondent not wash. Majority 73.33% of respondents not practiced grooming of their animals and 22.67 % of respondent practiced grooming. The bulk of respondents (82.22%) did not segregate sick animals from healthy animals, whereas only a minority (17.78%) isolated their animals under unfavorable conditions. Overall, it was observed that management practices to ensure health of their Dairy animals was very poor and there is a strong need to conduct awareness program and animal health camp in the study area.

**Keywords:** Health, Rajasthan, management practices, dairy animals, respondents

### Introduction

Over two-thirds of the rural population in India relies on agriculture for their living, which includes animal husbandry. A key part of the Indian economy is livestock. Animals may provide us with a variety of goods, including nutrient-rich food, draught power, organic manures, skin, and fuel for the home, as well as regular sources of income for rural households. Animals can quickly reproduce, giving us the opportunity to generate the desired progeny that is maintained in a living bank and offers insurance against crop loss and natural disasters. The livestock business, which employs around 8.8% of the country's population, produced 16% of the income of small farm households, compared to an average of 14% for all rural households. This industry accounts for 25.6% of total agricultural GDP and 4.11 percent of total GDP. The majority of farmers in the country use mixed farming, also known as integrated farming, which mixes crops and animals such that the output of one operation becomes the input of another, resulting in resource efficiency. The main factors in raising dairy output include livestock management practices such as feeding, housing, breeding, and health care. Sometimes, due to some social and local problems, farmers.

### Materials and Methods

Farmers' adoption patterns for dairy animal housing practices were collected from three districts in Rajasthan's Hadoti area, namely Kota, Bundi, and Baran. Three blocks from each district, five villages from each block, and five dairy farmers from each village were chosen at random for the research, for a total of 225 dairy farmers (75x3). Personal interviews were conducted with the selected respondents using a well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the health care practices of the dairy producers in the research region.

### Vaccination against Infectious diseases FMD and HS

The findings found that 14.67, 9.33, and 17.33 percent of respondents practiced immunization against infectious illnesses FMD and HS, respectively, whereas 85.33, 90.67, and 82.67 percent did not in Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts. The majority of respondents (86.22%) were not adopting immunization against infectious illnesses FMD and HS, with 13.78% adopting in the research region. The findings are consistent with those of Sunil *et al.* (2011) <sup>[11]</sup>, Sinha *et al.* (2010) <sup>[10]</sup>, and Sabapara *et al.* (2015) <sup>[8]</sup>, who found that the majority of dairy farmers in the study region did not practice immunization. Mathur *et al.* (2001) <sup>[4]</sup> also revealed that only 7.78, 7.04 and 6.30 per cent of the farmers vaccinated their animals against FMD, HS and BQ disease in Udaipur tribal area. However, the present results are in contrary with the findings of Varaprasad *et al.* (2013) <sup>[12]</sup> who found that vaccination was practiced by 89.0 per cent respondents for their animals against diseases.

### Deworming

The results showed that 46.67, 48 and 50.67 per cent of respondent practiced deworming whereas 53.33, 52 and 49.33 per cent were not practiced in Kota, Bundi and Baran districts, respectively. Majority (51.56%) of respondent were not practicing deworming followed by 48.44 percent were practicing in study area. These findings are comparable to those of Kumar *et al.* (2014) <sup>[11]</sup>, who discovered that 72.25 percent of farmers did not deworm their animals. These current findings are more positive than those of Choudhary *et al.* (2008) <sup>[5]</sup>, who discovered that 13.0 and 34.0 percent of farmers dewormed their milch cattle on a regular and irregular basis, respectively. Rathore *et al.* (2010) <sup>[7]</sup> discovered that just 14.25 percent of respondents used deworming methods. As a result, the current data suggested a higher degree of knowledge in dairy responders than previously reported.

### Practices for Control Ecto-Parasites

According to Table 1, 33.33, 38.67, and 42.67 percent of respondents practice ecto-parasite control, whereas 66.67, 61.33, and 57.33 percent practice in Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, respectively. The majority of respondents (61.78%) did not practice ecto-parasite control, whereas 33.67% practiced in the research region. These current findings contradict the findings of Kumar *et al.* (2006) <sup>[2]</sup>, who discovered that 80% of farmers used smoke to control flies/mosquitoes.

### Sanitary Condition of Sheds/shelter/standing place

The results indicated that 40, 33.33, and 42.67 percent of farmers in Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, respectively, maintained the hygienic condition (cleaning) of sheds, whereas 60, 66.67, and 57.33 percent of farmers did not pay more attention to the sanitary state of sheds. The majority of respondents (61.33%) had a dirty shed, while 33.67% kept the sanitation (clean) in the shed in the research region. The

current findings contradict the findings of Choudhary *et al.* (2008) <sup>[5]</sup>, who discovered that 89% of respondents cleaned animal shelters whereas 11% of farmers did not pay attention to the hygienic state of animal sheds.

### Treatment of Sick Animal

The result revealed that 24, 30.67 and 25.33 percent of respondents follow local empirical knowledge person for treatment of sick animal whereas 12, 13.33 and 10.67 per cent calling a quack in Kota, Bundi and Baran district, respectively. In the Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, 64, 56, and 65.33 percent of respondents, respectively, followed the treatment of sick animals by veterinary doctors. The majority of respondents (61.78%) treated sick animals using veterinary doctors, followed by (26.67%) using local empirical knowledge people and (11.56%) calling a quack in the research region. These findings were mainly consistent with the findings of Sinha *et al.* (2010) <sup>[10]</sup>, who observed that farmers sought veterinary assistance in urban (77.1%), semi-urban (58.9%), and rural (44.4%) locations in the Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh. Sunil *et al.* (2011) <sup>[11]</sup> also discovered that the majority of farmers sought a veterinary doctor/stockman for sick animal treatment.

### Wash of hind quarters after drop of placenta

In Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, respectively, 69.33, 73.33, and 70.67% of respondents wash their hind quarters after dropping their placentas, whereas 30.67, 26.67, and 29.33% do not. The majority of responders (71.11%) wash the hind region after the placenta is dropped, whereas 28.89% do not wash in the study area.

### Grooming practice of cattle

In Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, it was discovered that 22.67, 17.33, and 24% of respondents engage in grooming practises, whereas the majority of 73.33, 82.67, and 76% of respondents do not. The vast majority (73.33%) of respondents did not practise grooming in the research region, whereas 22.67% did.

### Isolation of Sick Animals

In the Kota, Bundi, and Baran districts, it was discovered that 18.67, 14.67, and 20% of respondents segregate sick animals from healthy animals, respectively, whereas 81.33, 85.33, and 80% of respondents do not isolate. Overall, the majority of respondents (82.22%) did not separate sick from healthy animals, and only 17.78% of respondents isolated in the research region. This might be due to a lack of enough space to separate sick animals and a lack of understanding about disease transmission modes among farmers in the research region. Similar findings were reported by Kumar (2015) <sup>[3]</sup>, who observed that 80% of respondents did not isolate sick animals from healthy animals, and Sabapara *et al.* (2015) <sup>[9]</sup>, who reported that in Surat district of Gujarat, 88.67% of respondents kept diseased animals together with healthy ones, while the remaining 11.33 % kept these two categories of animals separately. In contrast, Rathore and Kachwaha (2009) <sup>[6]</sup> found that the majority of dairy responders separated ill buffalo from healthy animals.

**Table 1:** Health managerial practices of respondents in Kota, Bundi and Baran districts of Rajasthan (n=225)

S. No.	Health care practices	Unit	Kota	Bundi	Baran	Overall
		%	(75)	(75)	(75)	(225)
<b>1.</b>	<b>Vaccination against Infectious diseases FMD and HS</b>					
(a)	Yes	%	14.67(11)	9.33(7)	17.33(13)	13.78(31)
(b)	No	%	85.33(64)	90.67(68)	82.67(62)	86.22(194)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Deworming</b>					
(a)	Practiced	%	46.67(35)	48(36)	50.67(38)	48.44(109)
(b)	Not practiced	%	53.33(40)	52(39)	49.33(37)	51.56(116)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Practices to control ecto-parasites</b>					
(a)	Followed	%	33.33(25)	38.67(29)	42.67(32)	38.22(86)
(b)	Not Followed	%	66.67(50)	61.33(46)	57.33(43)	61.78(139)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Sanitary condition of shed/ standing place</b>					
(a)	Clean (dry)	%	40(30)	33.33(25)	42.67(32)	33.67(87)
(b)	Dirty (wet)	%	60(45)	66.67(50)	57.33(43)	61.33(138)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Treatment of Sick animal by</b>					
(a)	Use of local empirical knowledge	%	24(18)	30.67(23)	25.33(19)	26.67(60)
(b)	Calling a quack	%	12(9)	13.33(10)	10.67(7)	11.56(26)
(c)	Veterinary doctor	%	64(48)	56(42)	65.33(49)	61.78(139)
<b>6.</b>	<b>Wash of hind quarters after drop of placenta</b>					
(a)	Yes	%	69.33(52)	73.33(55)	70.67(53)	71.11(160)
(b)	No	%	30.67(23)	26.67(20)	29.33(22)	28.89(65)
<b>7.</b>	<b>Grooming practice of cattle</b>					
(a)	Yes	%	22.67(20)	17.33(13)	24(18)	22.67(51)
(b)	No	%	77.33(55)	82.67(62)	76(57)	77.33(174)
<b>8.</b>	<b>To isolate the sick animals from healthy animals</b>					
(a)	Yes	%	18.67(14)	14.67(11)	20(15)	17.78(40)
(b)	No	%	81.33(61)	85.33(64)	80(60)	82.22(185)

## References

- Kumar S, Jain A, Gupta AK. Studies on Breeding, Health Care and Milking Management Practices Adopted by the Dairy Owners in Shahdol District of MP, India, International Research Journal of Biological Sciences. 2014;3(10):32-36.
- Kumar U, Mehla RK, Chandra R, Roy B. Studies on manage mental practices followed by the traditional owners of Sahiwal cows in Punjab. Indian Journal of Dairy Science. 2006;59(2):100-105.
- Kumar V. Factors affecting performance of Indian Murrah buffalo. Journal of Buffalo Science. 2015;4(1):1-7.
- Mathur P. Problems and prospects of improved cattle management in arid western plain zone of Rajasthan. Ph.D. Thesis submitted to MPUAT, Udaipur; c2001.
- Meena H, Singh Y. Socio economic status of small ruminant farmers in different agro-climatic zones of Karnataka, India. International Journal of Livestock Research. 2012;2(2):129-136.
- Rathore RS, Kachwaha RN. Studies on existing management practices followed by the buffalo owners in Jhunjhunu district of Rajasthan. Indian Journal of Animal Production and Management. 2009;25:8-12.
- Rathore RS, Singh R, Tiwari A. Studies on existing breeding, feeding and healthcare practices followed by the crossbred cattle keepers. Indian Journal of Animal Production and Management. 2010;26(3-4):194-197.
- Sabapara GP, Fulsoundar AB, Kharadi VB. Existing housing management practices followed by rural dairy animal owners in Surat district of Gujarat. International Journal of Farm Sciences. 2015;5:299-308.
- Sabapara GP, Fulsoundar AB, Kharadi VB. Milking and health care management practices followed by dairy animal owners in rural areas of Surat district. Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences. 2015;2:112-117.
- Sinha RK, Triveni D, Singh RR, Mukesh S, Bharat B. Studies on breeding and health care management practices in rural, semi-urban and urban areas of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Animal Production and Management. 2010;26(1):11-15.
- Sunil K, Mishra BK, Yadav JS, Kumar A. Existing breeding and health management practices followed by dairy farmers in mid hills of Uttarakhand. Indian Journal of Animal Production and Management. 2011;27(1):34-37.
- Varaprasad AR, Raghunandan T, Kumar MK, Prakash MG. Management practices of the farmers rearing Jersey x Sahiwal cows in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. Indian Journal of Animal Production Management. 2013;29(1-2):33-36.
- Yadav. Ph.D. thesis submitted to G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand; c2018.