Review Article

Cattle Artificial Insemination Service in Developing Countries: Efficiency, Major Challenges and Economic Loss: A Review

Abstract

This review paper summarizes information on the efficiency, major challenges and economic loss of Artificial Insemination (AI) service in cattle breeding in developing countries.Efficiency of AIservicecan be measured by number of services per conception (NSC), conception rate at first insemination, and calving rate (CR). The optimum recommended NSC for profitable dairy cow ranges from 1-1.7. The NSC varies with animal breeds, animal factor (body condition score, age and parity), semen factor (handling procedure and quality), inseminator factor (knowledge, skill and experience),production systems, management level provided and AI breeding methods. The NSC and calving rate vary with conventional AI and fixed time AI breeding methods. Likewise, calving rate (CR) is influenced by poor semen quality, poor semen handling procedure, inadequate insemination skill, poor oestrus detection and wrong time of insemination. Nevertheless, wide use of AI service can cause cattle biodiversity loss. Dairy producers incur additional costs when cows fail to conceive at their first AI services. Moreover, challenges of AIservicecomprised of feed scarcity, animal diseases, climate change, poor AI infrastructure, poor livestock husbandry practices, weak livestock extension systems and incapability of Artificial Insemination Technicians (AITs). This calls designing suitable interventions to improve the efficiency of AI services. Adequate feed and high level of management should be provided to the breedable cows and heifers.AI service centers should be established as per the recommended number of breedable cows and heifers. AI inputs including AITs should be always available at each AI service center, and proper AI service recordingshould be practiced. Sexed semen should be used to enhance the number ofreplacement heifers, and capacity building should be provided to AITs and community cattle breeders. Radio, television and printed mediasshould be used toenhance theawareness of thecommunity cattle breeders. Due attention is needed in frequent extension support for the success of the AIservice.

Keywords: Calving rate, conventional AI, crossbred cattle, fixed time AI, indigenous cattle, production system, time of insemination

1. Introduction

Dairy farming is vulnerable to global warming and climate change. Likewise, summer months (dry periods) have adverse effects on fertility outcomes, and heat stress results in dairy fertility declinesworsening in tropical climates (Sammad *et al.*, 2020). Livestock production in developing countries is mostly subsistence oriented and fulfills multiple functions that contribute more for food security (Roessler *et al*., 2008; Duguma*et al*., 2010). Cattle farming provides an important food source for the human population. Beef is rich in animal protein which contains 22 grams of protein, 4.5 grams of fat, and 123 kilocalories of energy (Ahmad *et al*., 2018). Ethiopia is one of the developing countries and hosted large cattle population, however, the contribution of Ethiopian cattle to income and nutrition has remained very limited (FAO, 2007). The variety of factors which resulted in low cattle productivity comprised of low genetic capacity of indigenous cattle, the poor genetic potential for productive traits, substandard feeding, poor health care, and poor management practices (Duguma*et al*., 2012; Ulfina*et al*., 2013).

Artificial insemination (AI)was first practiced in dog and the bitch gave birth to three pups by the pioneer scientist Lazzaro Spallanzani(1780) and known as "Father of modern artificial insemination".E.I. Ivanoff a pioneer Russian investigator undertook a successful AI in cattle and sheep in 1922.In some countries, however, AI resulted in indigenouscattle biodiversity loss where 37% of the cattle population in Turkey were crossbreds and 15% of the population were Holstein cattle (Şen *et al*., 2021).

The profitability of dairy cattle herds fundamentally depends on reproductive efficiency (Melese and Wagaye, 2023). Major source of economic loss in dairy and beef industry is reproductive failure (Perry, 2005). Success of dairy cattle farmingdepends on the key element reproductive management, and the lactation always begins with conception followingcalf birth (Singh *et al.*, 2017). Reproductive efficiency has been reported to be the product of successful estrus detection and conception rates. The critical factors in artificial reproductive management are estrus detection and insemination of the cow at the correct time in the estrus cycle (Bekana *et al*. 2005). There are usually faulty oestrus detections and also there are cases of silent oestrus in the zebu cattle (Tsadik *et al*., 2008; Jane *et al*., 2009). Zebu cattle (*Bos indicus*) have short length of estrus behavior with high incidence of estrus occurring during dark hours (Million *et al*., 2006). The quality of frozen semen, breeder knowledge in estrus detection, body condition score of beef cattle and the skills of the inseminator influenceAIservice(Diwyanto,2012).*Percentage of animals detected in standing estrus and inseminated, inseminator efficiency, fertility level of the herd, and fertility level of the semen are determinants of equation of reproduction* (Perry and Smith, 2015).

The genetic progress and reproductive performance of farm animal genetic resources is accelerated through the application of reproductive technologies (Gizaw *et al*., 2016). Robust methods for dairy cattle breeding include AI and selective bull mating which are globally important to enhance productivity and realize rapid genetic gains (Mwanga *et al*., 2019).AI is one of the most important reproductive techniques ever devised for the genetic improvement of farm animals (Bearden *et al*., 2004). Globally, only 5% of beef cows are served by AI as opposed to 75% of dairy cows (Vishwanath, 2003). 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, 55.6% of households in Kenya, 30.1% in Rwanda and 16.4% in Uganda owned crossbred of Holstein-Friesian and was the most widely kept exotic breed (EADD, 2011).Delivery of AI service in developing countries, for example in Ethiopia followed a seasonal pattern (Melesse *et al*., 2020) which is influenced by the availability of feed where the livestock production system in developing countries is predominantly extensive system(Management Entity, 2021).

Widespread use of AI and the use of high quality semen from genetically superior bulls ensure genetic progress in animals (Dixit *et al*., 2016).FAO AI success rate recommendation was 75%(FAO, 2008).AI is widely practiced in developing countries to enhance cattle genetic quality and productivity. About 50% AI success ratewas reported in Bangladesh and Ethiopia which are low income countries of the globe (Uddin *et al*., 2014; Haque *et al*., 2015; Ashebir*et al*., 2016) whilst success rates of less than 50% in Senegal and 70% in Burkina Faso were reported byOuedraogo (2012)which is cited in the work of Cabral (2016).The developingcountries of the globe should practice periodic assessments and reviews of the AI service success rates and adoption rates.Knowledge of the AI service success rates and adoption ratesof a country is paramount important to artificial insemination technicians, animal science experts, agricultural extension experts, breeders and policy makers. Hence,developing countries should first evaluate the efficiency, major challenges and economic loss of AI service in cattle breeding to identify the gaps in breeding policy and strategy, and other technical issues. AI service isa reproductive biotechnology and is one of the genetic improvement optionswhich should be adopted and promotedgreatly including by the smallholder farmers. However, there is scant summarized information on the efficiency of AI service in cattle breeding in developing countries. Therefore, the objective of this review was to present a synthesized information on the efficiency, major challenges and economic loss of AI service in cattle breeding in developing countries.

2. Efficiency of artificial insemination servicein cattle breeding in developingcountries

2.1. Number of services per conception (NSC)

Number of services per conception (NSC) as an indicator of reproductive efficiency has been defined as the number of services required for a successful conception (Shiferaw*et al.*, 2003). The optimum recommended NSC for profitable dairy cow ranges from 1-1.7 (Evelyn, 2001). However,Toelihere (2005) reported that the normal NSC values range from 1.6-2.0. The lower the value of NSC, the higher the fertility of cows and heifers.

The poor mean NSC of different scholars in different areas and breeds of Ethiopia under conventional AI (CoAI) breeding include Niraj*et al*. (2017) report in Zebu x Holstein Friesian (1.8), Desalegn (2008) report in different genotypes (2.47, 1.91, 1.78 and 1.7), Jemal *et al*. (2016) report in dairy cows and heifers (1.95). Manzi *et al*. (2019) reported a two-time period study in Rwanda in different genotypes (Ankole cows, Ankole x HF, Ankole x Jersey, Ankole x Sahiwal, Ankolex Jersey x Sahiwal and Ankole x Sahiwal x Jersey) kept under extensive system indicated an overall optimum NSC of(1.23 for the period 1999-2004 and 1.18 for the period 2014-2017). It was also noted that many authors reported NSC under fixed time AI (FTAI) consisting of Debir *et al*. (2016) report in local cows (1.85), Duro (2022) report in local dairy cow (1.7), Bainesagn (2015) report in local cows (1.71) and crossbred cows (1.78), Edao, (2022) report in local cows (1.7).

2.2. Conception rate at first insemination (CR^1)

Conception rate at first insemination (CR^1) is a very important index that measures the ability of the cow to conceive after the first service of AI or natural service (Ganchou,*et al.*, 2005). Poor semen quality, poor semen handling procedure, inadequate insemination skill, poor oestrus detection and wrong time of insemination could result in low CR^1. Moreover, there is a mutated allele (FXI) in cows, humans and dogs, hence, the mutated allele may lead to repeated breeding syndrome in the cow and cause significant financial losses on dairy farms (Akyuz *et al*., 2012).Müller-Sepúlveda *et al*. (2020) in Chile reported a higher CR^1 (75.6%) in dairy and beef cows. Urzúa*et al*. (2017) in Mexico also reported CR^1 on human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) five-day post-insemination treated group (47.5%) and control group (37.4%) of Holstein cows, and overall CR^1 (48.4%) was reported. There were many actions done to improve the CR^1 of dairy cows in different countries of the globe, for example, Hamid and Kamruzzaman (2017) in Bangladesh reported on gonadotropin releasing hormone (GnRH) of one hour before, during or after AI treated group (71.1%) and control group (55.6%) of Holstein Friesian and local crossbred cows. Therefore, GnRH treated dairy cows revealed higher CR[1] than the control group. Potdar *et al*. (2016) reported in India that cows and heifers breed, sire breed, heat stage, AI number and lactation number affected conception rate. Moreover, Patel *et al*. (2017) reported that conception rate due to AI in India is very low.

Conception rate was greatly affected by cattle breeds which were kept under similar production system (Potdar *et al*., 2016). Many authors reported CR[1] under CoAI breeding; Abdula and Bilal (2022) report in local Zebu cows (37.4%), Hamid (2012) report in Zebu cows (24%), Desalegn (2008) report in different genotypes (34.29%, 33.33%, 7.14% and 20.31%), Kindalem (2019) report in indigenous cows (23.36%), Ashebir*et al*. (2016) report in local and crossbred cows (17.64% and 30.12%), andJemal*et al*. (2016) report in dairy cows and heifers (49.3%). CR[1]under FTAI breeding byEjigayehu (2018) reported in Boran cows (28.6%) and HF x Boran crossbred cows (31.3%), andTegegn and Zelalem (2017) also reported (24.69%) in Zebu cows.

2.3. Calving rate (CR)

The most appropriate measure of fertility is calving rate (CR) which is defined as the number of calves born per 100 services (Mohamed, 2004). The CR is the inseminators success rate which is the percentage of total number of calves born due to first inseminations divided to total number of first inseminations (Sahin *et al*., 2021). It was noted in CoAI breeding a CR of 22% in indigenous cows (Kindalem, 2019). It was also reported that in FTAI breeding a CR of 10.67% in dairy cows (Dereje, 2018) and CR of 13.58% in Zebu cows (Tegegn and Zelalem, 2017). However, the success rate of AI (CR) in intensively managed dairy cows in Turkey was very high (41.36%) and the animals were bred by CoAI(Sahin*et al*., 2021).

Table 1Efficiency of conventional artificial insemination service in cattle breedingin developing countries

Country	**Cattle breed/type**	**Production system**	**NSC**	**CR[1] (%)**	**CR (%)**	**Author(s)**
Bangladesh	Crossbred	Not specified	-	95.6	-	Bahar *et al*., 2024

Bangladesh	Local	Not specified	-	96.2	-	Bahar *et al.*, 2024
Algeria	Brown Swiss	Not specified	-	73.2	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Algeria	Montbeliard	Not specified	-	67.8	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Algeria	Holstein	Not specified	-	63.7	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Algeria	Pie Rouge	Not specified	-	59.6	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Algeria	Fleckvieh	Not specified	-	53.0	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Algeria	Overall	Not specified	1.3	64.0	-	Mouffok *et al.*, 2019
Ethiopia	Simada cows	Extensive system	1.1	-	-	Getie*et al.*, 2015
Ethiopia	HF	Intensive system	2.1	-	-	Alewya, 2014
Ethiopia	F_1 HF x Boran cows	Intensive system	2.1	-	-	Yohannes *et al.*, 2017
Kenya	Dairy cows	Extensive system	1.9	39.0	-	Kinyua, 2016
Zambia	Friesian x Zebu cross (65%)	Extensive (69%) and intensive (8%)	1.8	48.0	-	Mwambilwa*et al.*, 2013
India	Dangi heifers and cows	Semi-intensive	-	49.2	-	Potdar *et al.*, 2016
India	HF crossbred	Semi-intensive	-	41.4	-	Potdar *et al.*, 2016
India	Jersey crossbred	Semi-intensive	-	43.6	-	Potdar *et al.*, 2016
India	Khillar	Semi-intensive	-	46.9	-	Potdar *et al.*, 2016
India	ND cattle	Semi-intensive	-	45.9	-	Potdar *et al.*, 2016
Rwanda	Ankole cows	Extensive system	-	71.0	-	Manzi *et al.*, 2019
Rwanda	Ankole x HF	Extensive system	-	78.0	-	Manzi *et al.*, 2019

Rwanda	Ankole x Jersey	Extensive system	-	73.0	-	Manzi *et al*., 2019
Rwanda	Ankole x Sahiwal	Extensive system	-	67.0	-	Manzi *et al*., 2019
Rwanda	A x Jersy x Sahiwal	Extensive system	-	75.0	-	Manzi *et al*., 2019
Rwanda	Ankole x Sahiwal x Jersey	Extensive system	-	71.0	-	Manzi *et al*., 2019
Bangladesh	50% HF × 50% Local	Not specified	1.3	-	-	Azad *et al*., 2023
Bangladesh	62.5% HF × 37.5 Local	Not specified	1.3	-	-	Azad *et al*., 2023
Bangladesh	75% HF × 25% Local	Not specified	1.4	-	-	Azad *et al*., 2023
Bangladesh	>75% HF × <25% Local	Not specified	1.4	-	-	Azad *et al*., 2023
Manokwari Regency	Beef cattle	Not specified	1.8	-	47.1	Haryanto *et al*., 2019
Indonesia	Beef cattle	Intensive system	1.63	65.15	-	Azizah *et al*., 2022
Bhutan	Dairy cows	Not specified	1.8	-	-	Wangchuk *et al*., 2022
Ethiopia	Dairy cows	Not specified	2.6	62.0	51.0	Melesse *et al*., 2020
Bangladesh	Local cows	Not specified	1.4	73.0	-	Razi *et al*., 2010
Bangladesh	Sahiwal X local cross	Not specified	1.5	65.0	-	Razi *et al*., 2010
Bangladesh	Friesian cross X local	Not specified	1.8	60.0	-	Razi *et al*., 2010
Uganda	Dairy breed	Intensive system	1.7	-	-	Mugisha *et al*., 2014
Uganda	Nondairy breed	Intensive system	1.3	-	-	Mugisha *et al*., 2014
Ethiopia	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive system	1.95	49.3	-	Jemal *et al*., 2016
Ethiopia	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive system	-	47.8	-	Woldu *et al*., 2011

Ethiopia	Local dairy cows	Extensive and intensive systems	-	53.5	-	Muhammed *et al.*, 2021
Ethiopia	Crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive systems	-	69.1	-	Muhammed *et al.*, 2021
Ethiopia	Local Zebu cows	Extensive system	-	48.9	-	Abdula and Bilal, 2022
Ethiopia	Local Zebu cows	Extensive system	-	37.4	-	Abdula and Bilal, 2022
Ethiopia	HF x Zebu, Jersey x Zebu cows	Intensive system	-	62.5	-	Abdula and Bilal, 2022
Ethiopia	HF x Zebu, Jersey x Zebu cows	Intensive system	-	41.5	-	Abdula and Bilal, 2022
Ethiopia	Zebu x Holstein-Friesian	Farmer's management system	1.8	-	-	Niraj*et al.* 2017
Ethiopia	Local cows	Mixed crop-livestock production	1.14	-	-	Tadesse *et al.*, 2022
Ethiopia	Crossbred cows	Mixed crop-livestock production	1.15	-	-	Tadesse *et al.*, 2022
Ethiopia	Local and crossbred cows	Mixed crop-livestock production	-	51.03	-	Tadesse *et al.*, 2022
Ethiopia	Indigenous cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production system		23.36	22	Kindalem, 2019
Ethiopia	82.3% crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	-	64.8	-	Belete*et al.*, 2018
Ethiopia	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	-	**17.64**	-	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Ethiopia	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	-	**30.1**	-	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Ethiopia	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	-	**48.5**	-	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Tanzania	Ayrshire crossbred and Friesian crossbred	Smallholder farms	2.6	43.6	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	Ayrshire crossbred	Smallholder farms	1.1	22.5	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022

Tanzania	Friesian crossbred	Smallholder farms	1.8	77.5	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	Ayrshire, Friesian, Boran, F_1Ayrshire	Large farms	1.4	72.5	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	Ayrshire	Large farms	1.6	61.6	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	Friesian	Large farms	1.5		-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	Boran	Large farms	1.2	81.4	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	F1 Ayrshire x Boran cross	Large farms	1.2	90.3	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Tanzania	F1 Friesian	Large farms	1.4	69.7	-	Mwaipopo and Mbaga, 2022
Bangladesh	Friesian crossbred	Not specified	1.6	57.1	-	Khan *et al*, 2015
Bangladesh	Sahiwal crossbred	Not specified	1.8	52.6	-	Khan *et al*, 2015
Bangladesh	Local (Zebu) cows	Not specified	2.3	63.8	-	Khan *et al*, 2015
Bangladesh	Not specified	Not specified	1.8	56.0	-	Hoque *et al*., 2003
Bangladesh	HF (0.5) X Local (0.5) cows	Intensive system	2.5	63.9	-	Bilkis *et al.*, 2016
Bangladesh	HF (0.75) X Local (0.25) cows	Intensive system	1.9	66.4	-	Bilkis *et al.*, 2016
Bangladesh	HF (0.5) X Sahiwal (0.5) cows	Intensive system	1.8	63.4	-	Bilkis *et al.*, 2016
Bangladesh	HF (0.5) X Sahiwal (0.25) X Local (0.25) cows	Intensive system	1.6	61.6	-	Bilkis *et al.*, 2016
Ethiopia	Begait, Arado and HF crossbred cows	Extensive system	4.8	20.4	20.5	Mekonnen & Berhe, 2023
Bangladesh	Local cows	Not specified	-	73.9	-	Howlader *et al.*, 2019
Bangladesh	Friesian X local cows	Not specified	-	70.0	-	Howlader *et al.*, 2019
Ethiopia	Crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	1.5	-	-	Tafari, 2016

Ethiopia	Dairy cows	Intensive (64.8%) and extensive (35.2%)	1.4	40.9	-	Lemma and Yilma, 2015
Pohuwato Regency	Beef cattle	Not specified	1.4	66.7	-	Mukhtar *et al.*, 2019
Ethiopia	HF	Intensive system	1.9	-	-	Wondossen*et al.*, 2018
Ethiopia	Local dairy cows	Not specified	1.7	-	-	Abera and Ulfina, 2022
Ethiopia	Crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	1.7	-	-	Abera and Ulfina, 2022
Ethiopia	Local cows	Extensive system	2.2	-	-	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021
Ethiopia	F1	Extensive system	2.0	-	-	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021
Ethiopia	F2	Extensive system	1.6	-	-	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021
India	Local cows	Extensive system	-	49.1	-	Bansal *et al.*, 2019
India	HF X Local crossbreds	Extensive system	-	49.6	-	Bansal *et al.*, 2019
India	Jersey X local crossbreds	Extensive system	-	51.9	-	Bansal *et al.*, 2019
India	Non-descript cows	Extensive system	-	51.0	-	Bansal *et al.*, 2019

AI= Artificial Insemination, CoAI=Conventional AI, FTAI=Fixed Time AI, NSC=Number of Services per Conception, CR^1=Conception Rate at first insemination, CR=Calving Rate, Holstein Friesian (HF)

Table 2Efficiency of fixed-time-artificial insemination service in cattle breedingin developing countries

Country	**Cattle breed/type**	**Production system**	**NSC**	**CR^1 (%)**	**CR (%)**	**Author(s)**
Kenya 2016	Dairy cattle	Not specified	-	33.6	-	Mwai*et al.*, 2020
Kenya 2017	Dairy cattle	Not specified	-	43.3	-	Mwai*et al.*, 2020
Kenya 2018	Dairy cattle	Not specified	-	43.8	-	Mwai*et al.*, 2020
Kenya 2019	Dairy cattle	Not specified	-	59.9	-	Mwai*et al.*, 2020

Ethiopia	Dairy cattle	Extensive system	-	34.61	10.67	Dereje, 2018
Ethiopia	Boran cows	Intensive system	-	28.6	-	Ejigayehu, 2018
Ethiopia	HF x Boran crossbred cows	Intensive system	-	31.3	-	Ejigayehu, 2018
Ethiopia	Local cows	Not specified	1.7	59.5	-	Edao, 2022
Ethiopia	Crossbred cows	Not specified	1.5	65.0	-	Edao, 2022
Ethiopia	Local cows	Extensive system	2.2	45.7	-	Desalegn and Eskindir, 2023
Ethiopia	Crossbred cows	Extensive system	1.4	70.5	-	Desalegn and Eskindir, 2023
Ethiopia	Local cows	Extensive system	2.4	42.3	-	Desalegn and Eskindir, 2023
Ethiopia	Crossbred cows	Extensive system	1.7	60.2	-	Desalegn and Eskindir, 2023
Ethiopia	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	1.8	-	-	Hamza, 2023
Sudan	Friesian X Kenana	Intensive system	-	40.0	-	Abdelwahid H.H.*et al.*, 2019
Nigeria	Bunaji Cows	Intensive system	-	12.5	-	Azubuike *et al.*, 2019
Nigeria	Bunaji Cows	Intensive system	-	0	-	Azubuike *et al.*, 2019
Bangladesh	Indigenous heifers	Mixed farming system	1.4	50.3	-	Shankar *et al.*, 2017
Bangladesh	Indigenous cows	Mixed farming system	1.3	76.9	-	Shankar *et al.*, 2017
Malaysia	Brangus cows	Intensive system	-	18.0	-	Malik *et al.*, 2012
Ethiopia	Local and HF crossbred cows	Not specified	2.4	20.5	-	Sharew*et al.*, 2021

AI= Artificial Insemination, CoAI=Conventional AI, FTAI=Fixed Time AI, NSC=Number of Services per Conception, CR^1=Conception Rate at first insemination, CR=Calving Rate

3. Major challenges and economic loss of AI servicein cattle breeding in developing countries

The main objective of AI serviceis to improve the genetic quality by using the semen of superior sire(s). On the contrary, AI servicecan result in livestock biodiversity loss due to wide use of single genotype in different areas for a long period of time (Rege *et al.*, 2006). Persistent drought, livestock diseases and parasites, climate change, inadequate extension service, high transportation costs, shortage of qualified ranch managers, inadequate transport, inadequate staff accommodation, lack of maintenance of fire breaks and perimeter fence at the AI centers, and trekking cows over very long distances to the AI servicecenters were the major challenges of AI service in Botswana (Moreki *et al.*, 2019). Increased days open and decreased conception rates from year to year resulted in declining reproductive performance of dairy cows (Aynalem *et al.*, 2011). A number of technical, financial, infrastructural, managerial and heat detection hindered the success rate of AI in Ethiopia (Shiferaw *et al.*, 2003; Nuraddis*et al.*, 2014). Most artificial insemination technicians (AITs) in Ethiopia did not master the semen thawing process properly which led to some unsuccessful inseminations. The AITs were trained to thaw the semen to 32^{o}C-35^{o}C for a minimum of 40 seconds by immersing the straw in warm water. All of the interviewed AITs confirmed that the thawing level was quite a useful technique to them to follow (Ndambi *et al.* 2017).

Reproductive management tools such as estrus synchronization (ES) involves induction of estrous in a group of females to breed relatively in around the same time (Schafer *et al.*, 2007; Rick, 2013). ES and AI are influential technologies for cattle producers in terms of genetic improvement, reproductive management and performance (Jinks *et al.*, 2013). Pregnancy rate (PR) is the product of heat detection rate and conception rate (CR), and failure of cows to become pregnant and the need for repeated AI services are usually causes of economic losses. A study revealed that a dairy farmer spent an additional cost per cow per day an average of 473.70 ETB in cows that did not conceive by theirfirst AIservice, whereas cows that failed to conceive at their first AI but conceived by second and third service spent extra costs of 21,665.30 ETB for reproductive treatment and other management (Tadesse *et al.*, 2022). Moreover, Muhammed *et al.* (2021) reported that a dairy farmer spent an additional cost per cow per day an average of 440.00 ETB in cows that did not conceive by theirfirst AIservicedue tonutrition, milk loss, and labor until conception.

AI servicewas rejected by some farmers of different parts of Ethiopia due to the birth of dominant number of male calves as compared to females.For example, Kindalem (2019) reported 77.27% of male calf birthsin JanamoraWereda of North Gondar, Ethiopia. Similarly, Merga and Tariku (2015) reported50% of male calf birthsin and around Gondar, Ethiopia. Furthermore, there were no proper recording of AI service in different developing countries including Ethiopia (11.3%), Kenya (72.5%), Uganda (76.0%) and Tanzania (87.5%)which hinder quick genetic improvement (Mwanga *et al*., 2019). There was poor AI service record keeping in Ethiopia as compared to Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.

*Table 3**Major challenges of AI service incattle breeding kept under different management options in Ethiopia***

Challenges	**Prevalence (%)**	**Cattle breed/type**	**Production system**	**Author(s)**
Repeat breeding	20.2	Dairy cows	Intensive and semi-intensive	Regassa and Ashebir, 2016
Inadequate support of concerned bodies	39.6	Dairy cows	Not specified	Tekalign and Amaru, 2019
Unskilled AITs	21.1	Dairy cows	Not specified	Tekalign and Amaru, 2019
Lack of awareness about AI	39.3	Dairy cows	Not specified	Tekalign and Amaru, 2019
Unskilled AITs	14.6	Local and HF crossbred	Not specified	Sharew*et al.*, 2021
Heat detection problems	13.4	Local and HF crossbred	Not specified	Sharew*et al.*, 2021
Long distance travel to AI service center	11.6	Local and HF crossbred	Not specified	Sharew*et al.*, 2021
Long distance travel to AI service center	25.5	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive (20.0%)	Haben *et al.*, 2020
Lack of awareness about AI	20.0	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive (20.0%)	Haben *et al.*, 2020
Time of insemination	28.2	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive	Haben *et al.*, 2020

			(20.0%)	
Heat detection problems	26.4	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive (20.0%)	Haben *et al.*, 2020
Unskilled AITs	21.8	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive (20.0%)	Haben *et al.*, 2020
Management problems	14.5	Local and crossbred	Extensive (5.5%), semi-intensive (74.5%) and intensive (20.0%)	Haben *et al.*, 2020
Time of insemination	20.2	82.3% crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	Belete*et al.*, 2018
Management problems	20	82.3% crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	Belete*et al.*, 2018
Hygiene problems	17.5	82.3% crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	Belete*et al.*, 2018
Heat detection problems	12.2	82.3% crossbred dairy cows	Not specified	Belete*et al.*, 2018
No regular and consistent AI service	98.7	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
No mobile AI service	94.5	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
No AI service on weekends	93	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
Shortage of AI inputs	71.1	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
Inadequacy of AITs	91.7	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
No private AI service	100	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
Lack of training for awareness creation	91.9	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019
Late insemination by farmers	33.3	Dairy cattle	Mixed crop-livestock production	Ephrem, 2019

Lack of awareness about AI	22.2	Dairy cattle	Intensive (9.6% AI failure), Extensive (52.0% AI failure) and Semi-intensive (38.4%)	Mohammed *et al.*, 2015
Time of insemination	21.6	Dairy cattle	Intensive (9.6% AI failure), Extensive (52.0% AI failure) and Semi-intensive (38.4%)	Mohammed *et al.*, 2015
Lack of AIT	18	Dairy cattle	Intensive (9.6% AI failure), Extensive (52.0% AI failure) and Semi-intensive (38.4%)	Mohammed *et al.*, 2015
Management problem	8.4	Dairy cattle	Intensive (9.6% AI failure), Extensive (52.0% AI failure) and Semi-intensive (38.4%)	Mohammed *et al.*, 2015
Heat detection problems	8.7	Dairy cattle	Intensive (9.6% AI failure), Extensive (52.0% AI failure) and Semi-intensive (38.4%)	Mohammed *et al.*, 2015
No AI service on weekends and holiday	46.0	Dairy cattle (local and cross)	Not specified	Zerihun*et al.*, 2013
Shortage of AITs	41.0	Dairy cattle (local and cross)	Not specified	Zerihun*et al.*, 2013
Shortage of AI inputs	34.0	Dairy cattle (local and cross)	Not specified	Zerihun*et al.*, 2013
Long distance travel to AI service center	46.2	Dairy cattle (local and cross)	Not specified	Zerihun*et al.*, 2013
Unskilled AITs	33.4	Dairy cattle (local and cross)	Not specified	Zerihun*et al.*, 2013

No AI service on weekends and holiday	32.2	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Alazar*et al*., 2015
Shortage of AITs	44.8	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Alazar*et al*., 2015
Shortage of AI inputs	25.0	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Alazar*et al*., 2015
No AI service on weekends and holiday	51.2	Dairy cattle	Extensive system	Riyad*et al*., 2017
Shortage of AITs	18.2	Dairy cattle	Extensive system	Riyad*et al*., 2017
Shortage of AI inputs	30.6	Dairy cattle	Extensive system	Riyad*et al*., 2017
No AI service on weekends and holiday	55.3	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Long distance travel to AI service center	42.9	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Long distance travel to AI service center	57.1	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Shortage of AITs	46.3	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Shortage of AITs	53.7	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
High charge of AI service	62.9	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
High charge of AI service	37.9	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Shortage of AI inputs	77.1	Local zebu and HF x	Mixed crop-livestock	Gizaw and Dima,

		Zebu crossbred	system	2016
Shortage of AI inputs	22.9	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Repeat breeding	79.7	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Repeat breeding	69.5	Local zebu and HF x Zebu crossbred	Mixed crop-livestock system	Gizaw and Dima, 2016
Feed shortage	93.3	Dairy cows	Urban dairy farming	Engidawork, 2018
Heat detection problem	81.7	Dairy cows	Urban dairy farming	Engidawork, 2018
High charge of AI service	71.7	Dairy cows	Urban dairy farming	Engidawork, 2018
Long distance travel to AI service center	21.7	Dairy cows	Urban dairy farming	Engidawork, 2018
Husbandry problem	13.3	Dairy cows	Urban dairy farming	Engidawork, 2018
No AI service on weekends and holiday	24.6	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock system	Nuraddis*et al*., 2014
Shortage of AITs	27.0	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock system	Nuraddis*et al*., 2014
Shortage of AI inputs	7.4	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock system	Nuraddis*et al*., 2014
No regular provision of AI	90.4	Dairy cows	Not specified	Bainesagn, 2015
No AI service on weekends and holiday	94.9	Dairy cows	Not specified	Bainesagn, 2015
AI service interruption	53.0	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
No AI service on weekends and holiday	18.8	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018

Long distance travel to AI service center	12.2	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
Shortage of AI inputs	29.8	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
Inadequacy of AITs	10.5	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
Heat detection problem	8.8	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
Inadequate support of concerned bodies	19.3	Dairy cows	Extensive and semi intensive production systems	Yohanis and Tilahun, 2018
Heat detection problem	28.0	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Lack of awareness	18.0	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Lack of infrastructures	16.0	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Management problem	14.0	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016
Lack of incentives	11.0	>80% crossbred cows and <20% local cows	Not specified	Ashebir*et al.*, 2016

Shortage of AI inputs	21.4	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive production systems	Sisay *et al.*, 2017
Inadequacy of AIT	28.6	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive production systems	Sisay *et al.*, 2017
Heat detection problem	7.1	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive production systems	Sisay *et al.*, 2017
Inadequate support of concerned bodies	14.3	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive production systems	Sisay *et al.*, 2017
AI service interruption	15	Local and crossbred cows	Extensive and intensive production systems	Sisay *et al.*, 2017
Heat detection problems	21.1	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	Hamza, 2023
Inadequate support of concerned bodies	15.7	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	Hamza, 2023
Shortage of AI inputs	14.2	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	Hamza, 2023
Shortage of AITs	18.1	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	Hamza, 2023
AI service interruption	55.9	Dairy cows	Mixed crop-livestock	Hamza, 2023
Unskilled AITs	51.7	Local cows and HF x local crossbreds	Urban and Peri-urban systems	Birhanemeskel and Kide, 2018
Shortage of AIT	35.0	Local cows and HF x local crossbreds	Urban and Peri-urban systems	Birhanemeskel and Kide, 2018
No AI service on weekends and holidays	36.7	Local cows and HF x local crossbreds	Urban and Peri-urban systems	Birhanemeskel and Kide, 2018
No training on AI service and heat detection	54.1	Local cows and HF x local crossbreds	Urban and Peri-urban systems	Birhanemeskel and Kide, 2018
Repeat breeding	28.3	Local and crossbred cows	Not specified	Edao, 2022

Heat detection problem	26.7	Local and crossbred cows	Not specified	Edao, 2022
AI service not available on time	23.3	Local and crossbred cows	Not specified	Edao, 2022
Lack of awareness	21.7	Local and crossbred cows	Not specified	Edao, 2022
Lack of awareness in the community	20.6	Indigenous and crossbred cows	Extensive (88.4%), intensive (7.1%) and semi-intensive (4.5%)	Mekonnen and Berhe, 2020
Animal management problem	18.5	Indigenous and crossbred cows	Extensive (88.4%), intensive (7.1%) and semi-intensive (4.5%)	Mekonnen and Berhe, 2020
Unskilled AITs	16.0	Indigenous and crossbred cows	Extensive (88.4%), intensive (7.1%) and semi-intensive (4.5%)	Mekonnen and Berhe, 2020
Inadequacy of AITs	14.7	Indigenous and crossbred cows	Extensive (88.4%), intensive (7.1%) and semi-intensive (4.5%)	Mekonnen and Berhe, 2020
Repeat breeding	13.5	Indigenous and crossbred cows	Extensive system	Jemal *et al.*, 2016
No regular and consistent AI service	91.6	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Shortage of AI inputs	86.7	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Long distance travel to AI service center	83.4	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Inadequacy of AITs	81.6	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Heat detection problem	80.0	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Feed shortage	76.7	Dairy cows	Extensive system	Alilo, 2022
Heat detection problem	38.3	Local and crossbreds	Extensive system	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021
Semen quality problem	23.3	Local and crossbreds	Extensive system	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021

Management problem	15.0	Local and crossbreds	Extensive system	Mohammed and Getachew. 2021

AI= Artificial Insemination, AITs= Artificial Insemination Technicians

Table 4 ***Major challenges of AI service incattle breeding kept under different management options in other developing countries***

Country	**Challenges**	**Prevalence (%)**	**Cattle breed/type**	**Production system**	**Author(s)**
Rwanda	Shortage of AI inputs	95.5	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Uterine infections	95.5	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Animal management problem	76.4	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Feed shortage	73.0	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	High charge of AI service	34.8	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Improper handling of semen (transportation)	33.7	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Dystocia	25.8	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Retained placenta	20.2	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Heat detection problem	60.7	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Lack of infrastructures	25.8	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Inappropriate semen storage	59.6	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Rugwiro *et al*., 2021
Rwanda	Inadequacy of AITs	50.0	Dairy cattle	Intensive, semi-intensive and extensive systems	Eugene *et al*., 2018

Rwanda	Communication to AITs	17.1	Dairy cattle	Intensive, semi-intensive and extensive systems	Eugene *et al*., 2018
Rwanda	Delay of AITs (action)	32.9	Dairy cattle	Intensive, semi-intensive and extensive systems	Eugene *et al*., 2018
Rwanda	Repeat breeding	25.9	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Management Entity. 2022
Rwanda	Poor inseminator visit	24.3	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Management Entity. 2022
Rwanda	Communication to AITs	10.6	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Management Entity. 2022
Rwanda	Inadequacy of AITs	9.5	Dairy cattle	Not specified	Management Entity. 2022

AI= Artificial Insemination, AITs= Artificial Insemination Technicians

4. Conclusion

This scientific review paper summarizes information on the efficiency, major challenges and economic loss of artificial insemination (AI) service in cattle breeding in developing countries.AI selectively increases genetic gain and quality of farm animals. Planned reproductive management is paramount important to the profitability of dairy/beef cattle farming, for example, oestrus and oestrus detection. The reproductive efficiency of breeding cows is influenced by different factors such as number of services per conception (NSC), conception rate at first insemination, and calving rate (CR). The optimum recommended NSC for profitable dairy cow ranges from 1-1.7. The NSC differs under conventional AI (CoAI) and fixed time AI (FTAI) breeding methods. Poor semen quality, poor semen handling procedure, inadequate insemination skill, poor oestrus detection and wrong time of insemination resulted in low CR. CR is also influenced by AI breeding methods, CoAIvsc FTAI. Pregnancy rate is greatly affected by cattle breeds physiological status, heat detection, production system, management systemand conception rate.

Despite its great importance, use of AI has limitations and negative impact. Long time and wide use of AI serviceon selected high yielding genotype(s) can cause livestock biodiversity loss. Moreover, use of AI servicefaces many challenges. The challenges include poor feed availability, diseases and parasites prevalence, climate change, weak transport, weak AI serviceinfrastructure, semen quality and handling procedures, breed type, production system, poor animal management, timing of insemination and poor skill of artificial insemination technicians (AITs). In developing countries, AIservice is greatly affected by seasons of the year which results in malnutrition and poor body condition of the animals. Repeated AI services to achieve a unit of conception/pregnancy brings about economic losses. Dairy producers are exposed to additional cost when their cows fail to conceive at their first AI service.

5. Recommendations

- The community cattle breeders (dairy or beef) should be engaged in adequate feed production and conservation, and should practice improved cattle management systems.
- Many literatures declared that A.M.-P.M. rule of AIservice is the rule of thumb andthe

simplest practical method of timing of inseminations.

- ❖ To improve the efficiency of AI services, strategic interventions are required including establishing well equipped AI centers, delivering AI inputs, improving the knowledge and skill of AITsandcommunity cattle breeders, introducing Do-It-Yourself Inseminators (DIYIs), proper recording and strengthening livestock extension services.
- ❖ There were criticizes in some areas on male calf birth, hence, **sex-sorted-sperm**which is in the expense of conception rate (low) should be used to enhance the number of replacement heifers of dairy herds.
- ❖ The developing countries should conduct periodic assessments of AI serviceefficiency and risk factors to enhance cattle AI serviceefficiency.

References

1. Sammad Abdul, UmerSaqib, Shi Rui, Zhu Huabin, Zhao Xueming, Wang Yachun (2020). Dairy cow reproduction under the influence of heat stress. Special Issue Article, *J AnimPhysiolAnimNutr*. 2020; 104:978-986, DOI: 10.1111/jpn.13257.
2. Roessler R, Drucker AG, Scarpa R, Markemann A, Lemke U, Thuy LT, Valle AZ (2008). Using choice experiments to assess smallholder farmers' preferences for pig breeding traits in different production systems in North West Vietnam. *Ecological Economics* 66(1):184-192.
3. Duguma G, Mirkena T, Haile A, Iñiguez L, Okeyo A, Tibbo M, Rischkowsky B, Sölkner J, Wurzinger M (2010). Participatory approaches to investigate breeding objectives of livestock keepers. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. Volume 22.
4. Ahmad, R. S., Imran, A., & Hussain, M. B. (2018). Nutritional Composition of Meat. Meat Science and Nutrition. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.77045.
5. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (2007). The appropriateness, significance and application of biotechnology options in the animal agriculture of the developing countries.
6. Duguma, B., Kechero, Y., and Janssens, G. P. J. (2012). Productive and reproductive performance of Zebu X Holstein-Friesian crossbred dairy cows in Jimma town, Oromia, Ethiopia. *Global Veterinaria*, 8(1), 67-72.
7. Ulfina, G., Jiregna, Alganesh, T., Shiv, p. and Late, M. (2013). Dairy production

potential and challenges in western Oromia milk value chain, Oromia, Ethiopia. *Journal of Agriculture and Sustainability*, 2(1), 1-21.

8. Şen A Ö, Cedden F, and Ushakov A (2021). Impacts of Artificial Insemination on Holstein Cattle Population in Turkey. *IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 937 (2021) 032029, doi:10.1088/1755-1315/937/3/032029.
9. MeleseAlemu and WagayeMathewos. (2023). Major Reproductive Health Problems of Dairy Cattle in Ethiopia: A Review. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.* 10(10): 68-78. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2023.10.10.007.
10. 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.
11. Singh M, Sharma A, Sharma A and Kumar P (2017). Repeat breeding and its treatment in dairy cattle of himachalpradesh (india): A review. *Indian journal of animal reproduction*, 38(2): 1-5.
12. Bekana, M., Gizachew and F. Regassa (2005). Reproductive Performance of Fogera heifers Treated Prostaglandin F2á for Synchronization of Oestrus. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 37: 373-379.
13. Tsadik G., Eshetu, L., Tadesse, G., Birhanu A. and Khar, S.K. (2008). Efficacy of norgestomet-estradiol valerate- PMSG combination in the reproductive performance of crossbred cattle in Ethiopia. *Proceedings of the annual research review day of the college of veterinary medicine*, Mekelle University, pp.29-34.
14. Jane A. P., Rhonda C., Vann & Jamie E. L. (2009). Oestrus detection in cattle brown animal and dairy sciences article: Loam Branch Research and Experiment Station.
15. Million T., Tadele D., Gifawesen T., Tamirate D. and Yohannis G. (2006). A study on age at first calving, calving interval and breeding efficiency of *Bostaurus* and *Bosindicus* and their crosses in the highlands of Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of animal production*, 6(2): 3.
16. Diwyanto, K. (2012). OptimalisasiTeknologiInseminasiBuatanUntukMendukung Usaha AgribisnisSapiPerahdanSapiPotong. BungaRampai.Puslitbangnak.
17. Perry George A. and Smith Michael F. (2015). Management Factors that impact the efficiency of applied reproductive technologies. *Proceedings, Applied Reproductive*

Strategies in Beef Cattle, August 17-18, 2015; Davis, CA.

18. 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).
19. Mwanga G., Mujibi F. D. N., Yonah Z. O. &Chagunda M. G. G. (2019). Multi-country investigation of factors influencing breeding decisions by smallholder dairy farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* (2019) 51:395-409, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-018-1703-7.
20. Bearden HJ, Fuquary JW, Willard ST (2004). Applied animal reproduction. 6th ed. NJ, USA: Pearson; 2004: 155-233.
21. Vishwanath R. (2003). Artificial insemination: the state of the art. *Theriogenology*. 59:571-84.
22. Tadesse B. (2002). Calf sex ratios in artificial insemination and natural mated female cross breed daily herd. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference of the Ethiopia Society of Animal Production*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; 2002. pp. 227.
23. EADD (East Africa Dairy Development) (2011). East Africa Dairy Development (EADD) project, Baseline Survey Brief No. 2: Constraints to the use of artificial insemination service and possible solutions,May 2011.
24. Melesse K, Mengistu A and GeletiDriba (2020). The performance of artificial insemination delivery system in Amhara, Oromia, SNNP and Tigray Regions of Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 11(2), pp. 84-90, April-June 2020, DOI: 10.5897/IJLP2019.0666, Article Number: 00B256663836, ISSN 2141-2448.
25. Management Entity. (2021). Ethiopia's Livestock Systems: Overview and Areas of Inquiry. Gainesville, FL, USA: Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Livestock Systems.
26. Dixit, V. B., Sharma, R. K., Bharadwaj, A., Sikka, P., &Phulia, S.K. (2016). An innovative approach to measure skill about artificial insemination in buffaloes. *The Indian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 86(2), 213-215.
27. FAO (2008). Small-scale dairy farming Manual-Artificial Insemination in Dairy Cattle and Buffalo (Vol. 4). ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/t1265e/t1280e.pdf.
28. Uddin, M., Sultana, M. N., Huylenbroek, G. V., & Peters, K. (2014). Artificial

insemination services under different institutional framework in Bangladesh. *Bang. J. Anim. Sci*, 43(3), 166-174.

29. Haque, M. N., Gofur, M. R., Asaduzzama, K. M., Bhuiyan, M. M. U. (2015). Factors Limiting the Pregnancy Rates in Artificially Inseminated Cows in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Dairy Science,* 10(6), 278-287. https://doi.org/10.3923/ijds.2015.278.287.
30. 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. DOI: 10.15406/jdvar.2016.03.00078.
31. Cabral F.J. (2016). Artificial Insemination, Livestock Productivity and Economic Growth in Senegal. AGRODEP Working Paper 0022, February 2016.
32. Shiferaw Y., Tenhagen B.A., Bekana M. and Kasa T. (2003): Reproductive performance of crossbred dairy cows in different production systems in the central highlands of Ethiopia. *Trop Anim Health Prod*. 25, 551-561.
33. 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 (Unpublished), University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe, pp.165.
34. Toelihere, M. R. (2005). The Role of Reproductive Biotechnology in Animal Husbandry Production Development in Indonesia. *Presented at the Technical Meeting and Production Coordination, Directorate General of Livestock, Cisarua Bogor*.
35. Niraj Kumar, Berihu Gebrekidan, Nigus Abebe and Etsay Kebede (2017). Performance of Crossbred Dairy Cows under Farmers' Management in and Around DebreZeit, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Veterinary Science and Animal Production (EJVSAP)* 1(1): 66-72, December, 2017, (ISSN: 2616-4647).
36. Desalegn Gebremedhin Gebreegziabiher (2008). Assessment of Problems/Constraints Associated with Artificial Insemination Service in Ethiopia. MSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
37. Jemal H, Lemma A and 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.
38. Manzi M., L. Rydhmer, M. Ntawubizi, C. Karege& E. Strandberg (2019). Reproductive

performance of Ankole cattle and its crossbreds in Rwanda. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* (2019) 51:49-54, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-018-1658-8.

39. DebirLegesse Belay, AsratTera and AzageTegeng (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 Research*, ISSN 2224-3186 (Paper), ISSN 2225-0921 (Online), 6(5), 2016, www.iiste.org.
40. Duro, E.S. (2022). Cattle Breeding Practice of the Community and Evaluation of Artificial Insemination after estrus Synchronization in Wondo Genet District, Sidama Regional State, Southern, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 12(9), 1-15.
41. BainesagnWorku (2015). Assesment of Breeding Practices and Evaluation of Estrus Synchronization and Mass Insemination Technique in Dairy Cattle in West Shoa Zone. MSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Haramaya University, Ethiopia.
42. EdaoShanku (2022). Evaluation of artificial insemination (AI) after estrus synchronization of dairy cattle in Wondo Genet District, Sidama regional state of southern Ethiopia. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.* (2022). 9(6): 109-117, ISSN: 2348-8069, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2022.09.06.011.
43. Ganchou, F.P., Belloso, E.S., Stagnaro, C.G., Castillo, G.S., Fonseca, H. (2005). Factors affecting fertility according to the postpartum period in crossbred dual-purpose suckling cows in the tropics. *J. Trop. Anim. Health. Pro*., 2005; 37: 559-572.
44. Akyuz B, Sariozkan S and Bayram D (2012). Factor XI mutation in normally fertile and repeat breeding Holstein cows in the Middle Anatolian Region of Turkey: a financial approach. *Animal Production Science*, 52, 1042-1045. https://doi.org/10.1071/AN12072.
45. Müller-Sepúlveda Andrea, Foerster Claudia, Arriagada Gabriel, Silva Juan-Eduardo and Ortiz Marlene (2020). Factors that affect the success of artificial insemination in cattle of small farmers in the O´Higgins region of central Chile. *Rev. FCA UNCuyo*. 2020. 52(2): 376-388. ISSN (enlínea) 1853-8665.
46. Urzúa González Ernesto, Pérez Luis Ángel Valdés, Garza Agustín, Mapes Gabriela, Gutiérrez Carlos G., Hernández-Cerón Joel (2017). Pregnancy rate in dairy cows treated with human chorionic gonadotropin five days after insemination. *Austral J Vet Sci* 49, 119-122 (2017), Short Communication.

47. Hamid Sm. Ahasanul, Kamruzzaman S. M. (2017). Effects of GnRH on Conception Rate at the Time of Artificial Insemination in Crossbred Dairy Cows. *International Journal of Animal Science and Technology*, 1(1), 2017, pp. 19-34. doi: 10.11648/j.ijast.20170101.14.
48. Potdar Vinod V, BhaveKaustubh, GaundareYuvraj, Awasthi Hitesh. R., KhadseJayant.R. (2016). Factors Influencing Conception Rate of Local and Crossbred Cows. *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science,* 9(10), *(IOSR-JAVS)*, e-ISSN: 2319-2380, p-ISSN: 2319-2372. Ver. I (October. 2016), PP 51-54, www.iosrjournals.org.
49. Patel G.K, N. Haque, M. Madhavatar, A.K Chaudhari, D.K Patel, N. Bhalakiya, N. Jamnesha, P. Patel and R. Kumar (2017). Artificial insemination: A tool to improve livestock Productivity. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* 2017; SP1: 307-313, E-ISSN: 2278-4136, P-ISSN: 2349-8234.
50. Abdula AM, Bilal ZM (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*. 2022; 7(1): 16-21. doi: 10.17140/VMOJ-7-163.
51. KindalemBayew (2019). The problem of Artificial Insemination (Study in JanamoraWereda) in North Gondar, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agriculture and Agribusiness*, ISSN: 2391-3991, 3(1), pp. 8-14.
52. EjigayehuDemisse (2018). Effect of Breed, Parity and Body Condition on Fficacy of Double and Single PGF2α Bovine Estrus Synchronization Protocol in Boran and Crossbreed Dairy Cattle in Bishoftu, Ethiopia. MVSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
53. TegegnFantahun and ZelalemAdmasu (2017). Evaluation of oestrus synchronization and mass artificial insemination service of dairy cattle in MizanAman area, Bench Maji zone, South West Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 8(1), pp.1-4, January 2017, DOI: 10.5897/IJLP2016.0338, Article Number: BAB187562441, ISSN 2141-2448, http://www.academicjournals.org/IJLP.
54. 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. MSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Alemaya University, Ethiopia.
55. SahinOzcan, BoztepeSaim, Keskin İsmail, Aytekin İbrahim, Ülkü Mustafa (2021). Effect

of Inseminator on Reproductive Performance in Dairy Cattle. *Research square*, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1100348/v1.

56. DerejeBerhanuZewude (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, 2018, ISSN 2079-2166, 2018, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.jri.2018.63.66.
57. Bahar F., Tanvi T.Z, Ferdous M. and Runa N.S (2024). Success rate of local and crossbred cow through Artificial Insemination (AI) in Sylhet region of Bangladesh. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 2024, 21(02), 124-129, eISSN: 2581-9615, DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.2.0359.
58. Mouffok C, A Allouni, L Semara and F Belkasmi (2019). Factors affecting the conception rate of artificial insemination in small cattle dairy farms in an Algerian semi-arid area. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 31(4) 2019.
59. Getie A, HileMelekot M, Taye M, Wuletaw Z and Tesfa A. (2015). A Survey on Breeding Practice, and Productive Performance of Simada Cattle in Tach Gayint District, Ethiopia. *J. Life Sci. Biomed.*, 5(6): 171-180.
60. AlewyaHeyredin (2014). Comparative Study of Reproductive and Productive Performance of Holstein Friesian Dairy Cows at Holeta Bull Dam Station and Genesis Farms. MSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
61. YohannesGojam, Million Tadesse, KefenaEfffa and DirebaHunde (2017). Performance of Crossbred Dairy Cows Suitable for Smallholder Production Systems at Holetta Agricultural Research Centre. *Ethiop. J. Agric. Sci.* 27(1) 121-131 (2017).
62. Kinyua J. (2016). Evaluation of Artificial Insemination Services Performance in a Smallholder Dairy Herd Under Extensive Management: A Case Study of KALRO- Lanet Herd, Kenya. *Weber Agricultural Research & Management*, 2(2), ISSN:2449-1640.
63. MwambilwaKabemba, YambayambaKavwanga E. and Simbaya Joseph (2013). Evaluation of the reproductive performance and effectiveness of artificial insemination on smallholder dairy farms in Zambia. *Scholarly Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(10), pp. 391-400 October, 2013, ISSN 2276-7118, http:// www.scholarly-journals.com/SJAS.
64. Azad, A, MA Mou, MFA Hridoy, S Azam, MA Safa, AKFH Bhuiyan, MSA Bhuiyan (2023). Production performance, breeding practices and challenges of Holstein-Local

crossbred cattle in some selected areas of Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Journal of Animal Science*52(3): 69-77. https://doi.org/10.3329/bjas.v52i3.69207.

65. Haryanto, Arif, Rudolf O. Faidiban, AndoyoSupriyantono (2019). Artificial Insemination Program of Beef Cattle in Manokwari Regency. *The 5th International Seminar on Agribusiness* 2019, IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 518 (2020) 012011, doi:10.1088/1755-1315/518/1/012011.
66. Azizah, S., Wardani, F., and Djunaidi, I. H. (2022). Breeder satisfaction and cows' artificial insemination in a national cow artificial insemination program. *Arch. Zootec*. 71(276): 262-268. 2022.
67. Wangchuk, Khandu, Nar B Tamang, TashiZangmo, KezangWangdi (2022). Performance Assessment of Community Artificial Insemination Technicians in The Eastern Region of Bhutan. *Bhutan Journal of Animal Science (BJAS)*, Special Issue, pp. 48-54, October 2022.
68. Razi K M A, Asgar M A, Kabir M H, Bag M A S and Parvez M M (2010). A Study on Estimation of Conception Rate and Service per Conception in Cattle After Artificial Insemination. *Int. J. BioRes*. 2(7): 25-29.
69. Mugisha Anthony, Kayiizi Vincent, Owiny David, and Mburu John (2014). Breeding Services and the Factors Influencing Their Use on Smallholder Dairy Farms in Central Uganda. Hindawi Publishing Corporation Veterinary Medicine International, Volume 2014, Article ID 169380, 6 pages, http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/169380.
70. 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), pp. 334-338, 30 December, 2011, ISSN 1996-0867, DOI: 10.5897/JCAB11.067, http://www.academicjournals.org/JCAB.
71. Muhammed Hamid, SadamAbduraman, and BelegeTadesse (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. *Hindawi Veterinary Medicine International*, Volume 2021, Article ID 6622487, 6 pages, https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6622487.
72. TadesseBelege, RedaAbadi Amare, KassawNuredinTeshale and TadegWedajo (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* (2022) 18:226, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-022-03325-1.

73. BeleteYehalaw, Abraham Jemberu, AbebeAsnake, AtilawWube and AlemayehuHirpa (2018). Factors Affecting the Efficiency of Artificial Insemination in Dairy Cows in and Around Bishoftu (DebreZeite), Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. *Journal of Reproduction and Infertility*9(2): 28-35, 2018, ISSN 2079-2166, 2018, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.jri.2018.28.35.
74. Mwaipopo L. C. and Mbaga S. H. (2022). Efficiency of Artificial Insemination (AI) Technology in Different dairy Herd Management Systems in the Southern Highland Zone (SHZ) of Tanzania. *European Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences*, 4(2), March 2022, ISSN: 2684-1827, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24018/ejfood.2022.4.2.458.
75. Khan Muhammad RakibulKabir, Uddin Jashim and Gofur Md. Royhan (2015). Effect of age, parity and breed on conception rate and number of service per conception in artificially inseminated cows. *Bangladesh livestock journal*. 2015. 1: 1-4, ISSN 2409-7691.
76. Hoque M.A., Salim H.M., Debnath G.K., Rahman M.A., Saifuddin A.K.M. (2003). A study to evaluate the artificial insemination success rate in cattle population based on three-year record among different sub-centers of Chittagong and Cox's Bazar District of Bangladesh. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences* 6(2): 105-111, 2003, ISSN: 1028-8880.
77. Bilkis Tahmina, Khan Md. Kabirul Islam, Das Ashutosh, Miazi Omar Faruk, Momin Md. Moksedul, Hazary Md. EnamulHaq (2016). Artificial Insemination Practices and Factors Affecting Conception Rate of Dairy Cows in the Commercial Dairy Farms. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology*, 5(5), 2016, 2689-2700, ISSN 2278-3687 (O), 2277-663X (P).
78. Mekonnen Teweldemedhn, BerheLeul (2023). Assessment of Efficiency of Artificial Insemination Service in Cattle Production in The Western Zone of Tigray Region, Ethiopia. *Slovak J. Anim. Sci*., 56(3): 29–43, ISSN 1337-9984, E-ISSN 1338-0095.
79. Howlader MMR, Rahman MM, Hossain MG and Hai MA (2019). Factors Affecting Conception Rate of Dairy Cows Following Artificial Insemination in Selected Area at Sirajgonj District of Bangladesh. *Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research*,

13(2): 2019, ISSN: 2574-1241, DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2019.13.002386.

80. TafariYolyos (2016). A study of level of reproduction of crossbred dairy cows under smallholder condition in Ethiopia. *African Journal of Dairy Farming and Milk Production*, ISSN: 2375-1258, 3(3), pp. 149-151, March, 2016.
81. Lemma Ali T and Yilma T. (2015). Effect of Management Practices on Reproductive Performance of Smallholder Dairy Cattle. *Austin J Vet Sci&AnimHusb*. 2015; 2(3): 1015,ISSN: 2472-3371 | www.austinpublishinggroup.com.
82. Mukhtar Muhammad, Salman Darmawan and Bahua Rosalina (2019). Effectiveness and Performance of Artificial Insemination Service Units in Supporting Agribusiness Programs and Increasing Beef Cattle Population in Pohuwato Regency. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 4(4), April-2019, ISSN No:-2456-2165.
83. Wondossen A, Mohammed A, Enyew N (2018) Reproductive Performance of Holstein Friesian Dairy Cows in a Tropical Highland Environment. *J Adv Dairy Res,*6(2): 203. doi:10.4172/2329-888X.1000203.
84. AberaFekataDinkissa, UlfinaGalmessaGirgo (2022). Analysis of Lactation, Reproductive Performance and Disorders of Dairy Cows in Waliso and Ilu Districts Oromia, Ethiopia. *Diyala Agricultural Sciences Journal* 2022, 14(2): 10-23, pISSN: 2073-9524, eISSN: 2310-8746,https://dx.doi.org/10.52951/dasj.22140202.
85. Mohammed Yousuf and GetachewWegari. (2021). Assessment of Challenge and Opportunity of Artificial Insemination on Dairy Cattle in Case of Sayo District West Wollega Zone, Ethiopia. *Int.J.Curr.Res.Aca.Rev*. 9(08), 62-71, ISSN: 2347-3215 (Online). doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcrar.2021.908.006.
86. Bansal S.K, Bhagat R.L, Sinha A.K, Yadav A.L and Phadke N.L (2019). Factors affecting conception rate in AI bred cattle under field conditions of Bihar. *Indian Journal of Animal Sciences,*89(1): 110-112, January 2019/Short communication.
87. Mwai, O.A., Tsuma,V., Owino, J.O., Ochieng., L. and Rao, E.J.O. (2020). Accelerating genetic improvement in emerging smallholder dairy systems through fixed-time and conventional artificial insemination technologies: organizational and operational experiences from Kenya. ISBN: 92-9146-639-5, ILRI Project Report. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI.

88. DesalegnAmanuel and EskindirAmanuel (2023). Effectiveness of Artificial Insemination after Estrus Synchronization in Dairy Cattle Breeding in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Research Square*, pp1-20, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3442060/v1.

89. Hamza JemalMussa (2023). Assessment of Artificial Insemination Service and Reproductive Performance of Dairy Cattle in Selected Districts of East Hararghe Zone of Oromia, Ethiopia. MSc. Thesis (Unpublished), Haramaya University, Ethiopia.

90. AbdelwahidHaytham H., Abdallah Alrasheed A., Mohammed Rajaa M., ShulukhEgbal S. Abu and Habib Abdelbasit B. (2019). Effects of Timed Artificial Insemination Following Oestrous Synchronization on Pregnancy Rate of Dairy Cattle in the tropics. *Int. J. of Multidisciplinary and Current research*, Vol.7 (Jan/Feb 2019), ISSN: 2321-3124, DOI: https://doi.org/10.14741/ijmcr/v.7.1.10.

91. AzubuikeUbah Simon, Ibrahim Rekwot Peter, Bode AdewuyiAbdulmujeeb, OakinaOmonteseBobwealth, AyodejiAdeyeyeAdewale, Kwinjoh Columbus Philemon, Kenneth AbahOwoicho, AdikpeAgbonuOluwa and Ejike Ejiofor Charles (2019). Pregnancy Rate of Bunaji Cows in a Fixed Time AI Synchronization Protocol Using Ovatide. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology* A 9 (2019) 46-55, doi: 10.17265/2161-6256/2019.01.005.

92. Shankar Biswas, JotanKar, Arup Sen, NijayaMohanto, SabujKantiNath. (2017). Success of estrus synchronization and artificial insemination in cattle among the NGO supported farmers at char area in Bangladesh. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.* 4(5): 166-170. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2017.04.05.018.

93. Malik Abdul, HaronAbd Wahid, YusoffRosnina, KasimAzhar, YusoffSabriMohd (2012). Pregnancy rate following artificial insemination or natural service in postpartum estrus synchronized beef cattle.Short Communication, *Turk. J. Vet. Anim. Sci.* 2012; 36(4): 451-455, doi:10.3906/vet-1008-15.

94. Sharew Mekonnen, SimretBestha, Sandip Banerjee (2021). Assessment of Breeding Practice and Statues of Estrus Synchronization and Mass Insemination Conception Rate of Dairy Cattle in North Shewa Zone, Ethiopia. *Research Square*, pp-1-18, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1091412/v1.

95. Rege, J.E.O., Nyamu, A.M. and Sendalo, D. (eds). (2006). The role of biotechnology in animal agriculture to address poverty in Africa: Opportunities and challenges.

Proceedings of the 4th All Africa Conference on Animal Agriculture and the 31st annual meeting of Tanzania Society for Animal Production, Arusha, Tanzania, 20-24 September 2005. TSAP (Tanzania Society for Animal Production), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), Nairobi, Kenya.

96. Moreki J. C., Pelaelo-Grand T. D. and Ranko A. (2019). Artificial insemination in Botswana: Challenges and Opportunities-A review. *Journal of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine*, 4(4), pp. 122-128, August 2019, Article Number: 49071F933, ISSN: 2536-7099, https://doi.org/10.31248/JASVM2019.150.
97. Aynalem Haile, Workneh, A., Noah K., Tadele Dessie and AzageTegegne. (2011). Breeding strategy to improve Ethiopian Boran cattle for meat and milk production. IPMS of Ethiopian farmers project working paper 26. Nairobi, Kenya, ILRI.
98. Nuraddis Ibrahim, RetaHailu and Abidu Mohammed (2014). Assessment of Problems Associated with Artificial Insemination Service in Selected Districts of Jimma Zone, Ethiopia. *Journal of Reproduction and Infertility*5(2): 37-44, 2014, ISSN 2079-2166, 2014, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.jri.2014.5.2.84184.
99. Ndambi OA, Van der Lee J, Ulfina GG, Berhanu T and 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.
100. Schafer D.W., Brinks J.S., and Le Fever D.G. (2007). Increased calf weaning weight and weight via estrus synchronization. Beef Program Report. Colorado State University. pp. 115-124.
101. Rick R. (2013). Synchronizing Estrus in Beef Cattle. University of Nebraska-Lincoln | Lincoln, NE 68588 | 402-472.
102. Jinks E.M., Smith M.F., Atkins J.A., Pohler K.G., Perry G.A., MacNeil M.D., Roberts A.J., Waterman R.C., Alexander L.J., Geary T.W. (2013). Preovulatory estradiol and the establishment and maintenance of pregnancy in suckled beef cows, *J. Anim. Sci.* 91 (2013) 1176-1185.
103. MergaLemesa and Tariku Robe (2015). Assessment of Sexes of the Progeny Production in the Case of Artificial Insemination of Dairy Cows in and around University of Gondar. Senior Research Project Report, Gondar, Ethiopia.

104. Regassa T, Ashebir G (2016). Major factors influencing the reproductive performance of dairy farms in Mekelle City, Tigray, Ethiopia. *J Dairy Vet Anim Res*. 2016;3(4):145-149. DOI: 10.15406/jdvar.2016.03.00088.

105. TekalignWoldehana and AmaruAmajo (2019). Assessment of Problems Associated with Artificial Insemination Services in DamotWoideWoreda, Southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Biological Sciences*, 6(7-20), ISSN: 2348-8069, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2019.06.07.005.

106. HabenFesseha, FirewDawit and Eyob Goa (2020). "Assessment of Artificial Insemination Service and its Challenge in Dairy Farms of WolaitaSodo District, Southern, Ethiopia". *EC Veterinary Science* 5.9 (2020): 93-101.

107. EphremTakeleMenta (2019). Constraints of Artificial Insemination Service in Selected Districts of Wolaita Zone. *International Journal of Research Studies in Biosciences (IJRSB)*, 7(3), 2019, PP 36-43, ISSN No. (Online) 2349-0365, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2349-0365.0703005, www.arcjournals.org.

108. Mohammed Samre, TehetnaAlemayhu and SisayWeldegebriel (2015). Major Constraints of Artificial Insemination in and Around Alamata District, Tigray, Ethiopia. *African Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*,7(5): 287-290, 2015, ISSN 2079-2034, 2015, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.ajbas.2015.7.5.96167.

109. ZerihunBaheriw, MaledeBirhan and TewodrosFentahun (2013). Assessment on Problems Associated with Artificial Insemination Services in West Gojjam Zone, Ethiopia. *Advances in Biological Research*,7(2): 59-66, 2013, ISSN 1992-0067, 2013, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.abr.2013.7.2.72142.

110. AlazarWoretaw, BemrewAdmassu, Anmaw Shite and Saddam Mohammed (2015). Assessment of Problems Associated with Artificial Insemination Services in Dairy Cattle in Debretabour Town, Ethiopia, 2015. *Journal of Reproduction and Infertility* 6(2): 48-55, 2015, ISSN 2079-2166, 2015, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.jri.2015.6.2.95106.

111. RiyadJuneyid, Anwar Hassen, Jelalu Kemal and KirosWelay (2017). Assessment on problems associated with artificial insemination service in dairy cattle in Tullo district, West Hararghe, Ethiopia. *Ethiop. Vet. J.*, 2017, 21(2), 62-74, https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/evj.v21i2.5.

112. Gizaw T. and Dima F. G. (2016). Assessment of problems and constraints associated with artificial insemination service in the two selected districts of Arsi Zone, Ethiopia. *Journal of Harmonized Research in Medical and Health Sci*. 3(1), 2016, 14-37, ISSN 2395-6046, www.johronline.com.

113. 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.

114. YohanisKebebew and Tilahun Bekele (2018). Assessment of Efficiency and Major Constraint of Artificial Insemination Service in Small Holder Dairy Farmers in and around Adama Town, Ethiopia. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci*. (2018). 5(7): 88-99, ISSN: 2348-8069, DOI: 10.22192/ijarbs, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2018.05.07.006, www.ijarbs.com.

115. Sisay W., Tamene D., Worku G., Kidanu D., Getahun B. and Nuraddis I. (2017). Evaluation of Artificial Insemination Efficiency in and Around Ejere District, Western Shoa Zone, Ethiopia. *Journal of Reproduction and Infertility*,8(3): 66-71, 2017, ISSN 2079-2166, DOI: 10.5829/idosi.jri.2017.66.71.

116. BirhanemeskelAlemshet and KideWeldegerima (2018). Participatory Evaluation of Artificial Insemination (AI) Service Delivery and Semen Quality in Northern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, Citation: IJAEB*: 11(3): 589-595, June 2018, DOI: 10.30954/0974-1712.06.2018.23.

117. Mekonnen Teweldemedhn and BerheLeul (2020). Assessment on artificial insemination service delivery system, challenges and opportunities of artificial insemination services in cattle production in Western Zone of Tigray Region, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 11(4), pp. 135-145, October-December 2020, DOI: 10.5897/IJLP2020.0722, Article Number: 97BAF3965193, ISSN 2141-2448, http://www.academicjournals.org/IJLP.

118. Alilo AA (2022). Evaluation of Achievement and Challenges of Artificial Insemination of Dairy Cow in Southwestern Ethiopia. *J Anim Res Vet Sci* 6(2): 2639-3751, DOI: 10.24966/ARVS-3751/100035.

119. Rugwiro Patrick, ManirahabaEvariste, TuyishimireAphrodis, Abijuru Jean

Claude, Nizeyimana Benjamin, HabumugishaDismas, Uwumukiza Diane and Nyabinwa Pascal (2021). Assessment of challenges associated with artificial insemination service delivery in dairy cattle in Rwanda. *International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry* 2021; 6(3): 45-57, ISSN: 2456-2912 VET 2021, http://www.veterinarypaper.com.

120. Eugene Mazimpaka, Edmund Bukenya Mugabe and Francis MbuzaBaguma (2018). Factors That Limit Delivery and Adoption of Artificial Insemination in Rwanda: Case Study in Rukomo Sector of Nyagatare District, Rwanda. *American Journal of Agricultural Science*, 5(2), 2018, pp. 28-34, ISSN: 2381-1013 (Print); ISSN: 2381-1021 (Online), http://www.aascit.org/journal/ajas.

121. Management Entity (2022). The Livestock System in Rwanda-An Overview. Gainesville, FL, USA: Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Livestock Systems.