The Prolific Variation, Body Morphometrics, and Breeding Value of Indonesian Local Etawah Goat Based in East Java
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ABSTRACT. A crucial trait of a high economic value of goats is calving to more than one kid (prolificacy potency). The high prolificacy potency (> 1 kid) has a higher income compared to single kids. This study described the potential of Indonesian Local Etawah Goat (ILEG) for prolific trait and the morphometric of body and breeding values in various environments as a basis for selection. It involved smallholder farmers who breed ILEG does from 14 villages in East Java. The research was conducted on a field survey to obtain primary data about the phenotypic superior ILEG goats based on the status of the prolific trait. The study used 520 does with 1347 prolific records obtained. The results showed that the prolificacy values ranged from 2.12-1.42 heads/calving (medium to high category). The variation of prolificacy was 0.53, and the breeding values of the prolificacy trait were 1.48-1.74. The average of body morphometrics was varied with the following details. Chest circumference was 81.06 ± 4.63 cm, body length was 76.64 ± 4.33 cm, shoulder height was 75.34 ± 5.83 cm and ear length were 27.44 ± 3.02 cm. This study concluded that the prolific rate was medium to high category. The prolific variation was higher than body morphometry variation, and the prolificacy EBVs of breeding villages divided into four unique pattern boxplots. The prolific trait could be the basis for new considerations in the ILEG breeding program, either through selection or mating.
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Introduction
Local livestock has been continuously investigated as a source of global germplasm. Smallholder farmers mainly raise indigenous goats as a common practice in the tropical and subtropical regions of Indonesia like East Java. Local goats are well adapted to the environment (feed and weather) and exhibit resistance to diseases (Bett et al., 2012; Goddard and Hayes, 2009; Mdladla et al., 2017; Mudawamah et al., 2019; Pai and Chakravarty, 2020; Schwartz, 2017).

The goat that has existed for decades and adapted to the Indonesian environment is the Indonesian Local Etawah Goats, abbreviated as ILEG (also known as PE goats in Indonesia). ILEG comes from the crossing of Etawah goats with indigenous or Kacang goats. Etawah Goat was
earlier imported from India during pre-independence era under the Dutch government. The characteristics of ILEG are the combination of Etawah goats from India and indigenous goats, with exterior features similar to those of Indian Etawah goats, such as a convex face with long, drooping ears. However, the body size is smaller than that of Etawah goats but bigger than Kacang goats (Mudawamah et al., 2015).

One of the contributing factors to the productivity of goats is the number of offspring per calving that exceeds one (He et al., 2001; Haldar et al., 2014). Such prolific trait would be well expressed if supported by a conducive environment (Ling et al., 2015). One of the representative areas for research is East Java province because it is the second-ranked region of 34 provinces in Indonesia regarding the number of goat populations (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2018). Therefore, the objective of this study is to examine the prolific of ILEG through genetic parameters and body morphometrics, and breeding values in breeding centers.

**Materials and Methods**

There were 140 farmers involved in this study with the criteria of having ILEG does calving at least two times. The numerators were the students from Animal Husbandry study program who were specifically pre-trained by a team of experts to observe prolific data and measure body morphometrics, to conduct an interview with farmers, and to write data on recording paper.

The research method was a survey by purposive sampling. The prolific data was the primary data obtained from a face-to-face interview with each farmer in the goat houses while we pointed at a specific doe directly. The talk included the litter size of dams and the number of does that had calved. The farmer was interviewed in a cage while looking directly at the dam in a house, discussing the potential fecundity and measuring body morphometrics.

The farmer ownership was 3-10 does, and the calving number was 2-7 times.

Body morphometrics studied included eight types of measurement as follows: (1) chest circumference (CC) from the front of the ribs to just behind the front legs, (2) body length (BL) from a distance pulled straight from the shoulder joints (tubal humerus) to the lumps of the filter (Tuber ischiadicus), (3) shoulder height (SH) is the highest distance of Tuber coxae to bottom, (4) ears length (EL) from the range of the ear’s base to the tip of the ear, (5) ears width (EW) from a distance between the edges of the ear, (6) tail length (TL) from the reach of the base of the hair tail to the tip of the hair tail, (7) length of hairtail (LHT) from the bottom to the most extended tail hair's end, and (8) pelvis height (PH) from the highest distance (Lumbar vertebrae) from perpendicular to the ground surface.

The selected 14 samples of rural regions in East Java included Banyuwangi Licit (BL), Blitar Ponggok (BP), Gresik Delik Sumber (GDS), Jombang Wonosalam (JW), Kediri Papar Bulurejo (KPB), Lumajang Bruno (LB), Malang Ampel Gading (MAG), Malang Dampit (MD), Malang Wonosari (MW), Nganjuk Sumber Urip (NSU), Sumenep-Kalianget (SK), Sumenep-Porteran (SP), Sumenep-Saronggi (SS), Trenggalek Sumber Bening (TSB). The necessary consideration was that the regions had does that calved at least one time, available feed resources and breeding regions.

The statistical analysis used one-way ANOVA and Least Square Difference (LSD) to know the difference body morphology among breeding village centers in East Java.

Heritability was estimated for the prolific traits of ILEG does and used dam-daughter relationship with formulas $h^2 = 2\sigma^2_X/COV_{XY}$, no correction data because the does parity and the environment were relatively identical. The repeatability estimates were analyzed using ANOVA’s (Becker, 1992) with formulas $r = \sigma^2_s/(\sigma^2_s + \sigma^2_w)$. The prolific data of genetic
parameter estimations were from does calving at least three kids and the relatively same environment (feed and management).

The Estimated Breeding values (EBVs) were used to select goat ILEG candidates based on their prolificacy value. The formula as follows:

\[ EBV_s = \frac{h^2}{1 + (n - 1)r} (P_i - P_P) + P_P \]

### Results and Discussions

#### Prolific Data of ILEG Does

Results that obtained including data of prolific does in 14 difference villages in East Java (Table 1). Data gathered 1195 recording as prolificacy information, record from 452 does

| Area Code | Number of prolific data | Number of does | The average of birth frequency | Prolific average (heads/calving) | Prolific variations (VP) | Average of prolific category |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 BL      | 105                     | 49             | 1.74                         | 1.42                            | 0.53                    | Medium                      |
| 2 BP      | 114                     | 47             | 2.06                         | 1.75                            | 0.46                    | Medium                      |
| 3 GDS     | 85                      | 49             | 1.67                         | 1.48                            | 0.50                    | Medium                      |
| 4 JW      | 100                     | 53             | 1.69                         | 1.84                            | 0.47                    | High                        |
| 5 KDR     | 48                      | 27             | 1.81                         | 1.71                            | 0.21                    | Medium                      |
| 6 LB      | 136                     | 55             | 2.01                         | 1.76                            | 0.56                    | Medium                      |
| 7 MAG     | 116                     | 26             | 2.79                         | 2.12                            | 0.69                    | High                        |
| 8 MD      | 105                     | 60             | 1.87                         | 1.75                            | 0.72                    | Medium                      |
| 9 MW      | 327                     | 39             | 2.94                         | 1.84                            | 0.48                    | High                        |
| 10 NSU    | 39                      | 22             | 2.05                         | 1.77                            | 0.67                    | Medium                      |
| 11 SK     | 19                      | 16             | 1.95                         | 1.58                            | 0.51                    | Medium                      |
| 12 SP     | 37                      | 16             | 1.84                         | 1.68                            | 0.53                    | Medium                      |
| 13 SS     | 51                      | 42             | 2.00                         | 1.49                            | 0.50                    | Medium                      |
| 14 TSB    | 65                      | 19             | 2.50                         | 1.81                            | 0.58                    | Medium                      |
| Total     | 1347                    | 520            | 28.92                        | 24.00                           | 7.41                    |                             |
| Average   | 97.83                   | 36.52          | 2.09                         | 1.72                            | 0.53                    | Medium                      |

Table 1 showed that the does with a calving rate at least twice had an average number of calving of 1.72 kids/doe, the highest value of 2.12 kids/doe, and the lowest value of 1.42 kids/doe and the medium category. The number of kids per calving from ILEG is higher than that of goats in Romania, with average kids per calving of 1.30 kids/doe (Pascal and Zaharia, 2016) and 1.43 kids/doe of Serrana goat (Margatho et al., 2019), 1.63 kids/doe of Begait goat (Abraham et al., 2018). It was almost the same as the average number of kids at German Improved Fawn goats with the kids per calving around1.70 kids/doe (Samardzija et al., 2013), and the ordinary calving of Saanen goats were 1.74 kids/doe (Kasap et al., 2013).

#### Morphometric Body of ILEG Does

The average morphometric body components included CC, BL, BH, EL, EW, TL, LHT, and PH on ILEG Does in 14 different villages in East Java, could be seen in Table 2

The average morphometric body of the ILEG population (Table 2) at CC 81.06 ± 4.63 cm, BL 76.64 ± 4.33 cm, SH 75.34 ± 5.83 cm and EL 27.44 ± 3.02 cm.

The average value was higher than the national standard for ILEG does (National Standard Agency, 2015), in which ILEG standards were CC 72 cm, SH 69 cm, BL 65 cm, and EL 26 cm. Based on breeding centers, the regions with ILEG goats were similar to the four national standards: BP, GDS, JW, KPB, LB, MAG, MD, MW, NSU, and TSB. Some regions such as BL, SP, and SS only fulfilled national standards for CC, SH, and BL measurements but not up to the EL measurement standards. EL size was smaller than that of the national standard of ILEG because the ILEG had a more genetic composition of Kacang goats than Etawah goats.
The morphometric body at CC, BL, and SH was higher than goats in the central zone of Tigray, Ethiopia (Birhanie et al., 2019). The average body morphometry, especially HG, was also higher than that of other breed goats, such as Damascus goats (72.67 cm) and Kilis goats (69.70 cm) raised in the Southeastern Anatolia Region of Turkey (Tartar et al., 2019).

The ILEG in the region had genetic uniformity compared to that of local goats in various regions > 50% were not significantly different (P < 0.05). In contrast, in BL, SH and LHT, only < 50% were not significantly different (P < 0.01) in various areas of goat breeding based on morphometry body. The size of CC, EL, EW, TL, and PH in various regions > 50% were not significantly different (P > 0.05). In contrast, in BL, SH and LHT, only <
36% village breeding center was not significantly different (P> 0.05). It indicated that BL, SH, and LHT were more varied than CC, EL, EW, TL, and PH. Therefore, selection based on BL, SH, or LHT was more effective than CC, EL, EW, TL, or PH. The coefficient of variance the prolific trait and morphometric bodies was calculated from standard deviation divided by the means are presented in Table 3

| No | Area Code | Coefficient of Variation for prolific trait (%) | Coefficient of Variation for morphometric body (%) |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | BL        | 51.27                                         | 5.20                                             |
| 2  | BP        | 38.76                                         | 3.31                                             |
| 3  | GDS       | 47.78                                         | 4.72                                             |
| 4  | JW        | 37.26                                         | 5.68                                             |
| 5  | KDR       | 26.80                                         | 4.28                                             |
| 6  | LB        | 42.52                                         | 2.87                                             |
| 7  | MAG       | 39.18                                         | 3.14                                             |
| 8  | MD        | 48.49                                         | 3.71                                             |
| 9  | MW        | 37.65                                         | 4.32                                             |
| 10 | NSU       | 46.24                                         | 5.20                                             |
| 11 | SK        | 45.20                                         | 4.27                                             |
| 12 | SP        | 43.33                                         | 3.11                                             |
| 13 | SS        | 47.46                                         | 3.89                                             |
| 14 | TSB       | 42.08                                         | 4.12                                             |
|    | Average   | 42.43                                         | 4.13                                             |

The expression of the prolific trait was more diverse than the morphometric body (Table 3.) because the breeders did not make the selection with considering prolificacy potential but solely on external performance, especially in buck selections with a natural mating system. The variation of a trait in a livestock population, including genetic variation, was significant as an asset for selection to increase the livestock’s genetic trend in the future for economic sustainability (Hassan et al, 2016 and Atoui et al., 2018).

**Estimation of Breeding Values (EBVs) of prolific potency**

Heritability estimates of prolific traits were 0.20 (n = 20) with variance component of dam 0.18, covariance component of dam and daughter 0.02. Repeatability estimates of the prolific characteristic were 0.89 with variance component of dam 2.18 and variance component between progeny within female 0.27. The EBVs average prolific potency of the ILEG Does in 14 regions (478 data) in East Java was 1.55 ± 0.16 kg with a minimum of the prolificacy of 1.39 and a maximum prolific potency of 2.23 (Table 4).

The EBVs data (Table 4) showed that the average EBVs from lowest to highest were 1.48-1.74, with a standard deviation of 5-24% of 478 does in various breeding villages. EBVs of MAG, BP, MW, and LB (28 % of 4 regions of 14 breeding villages) were higher than the average population EBVs (1.55 heads/calving). It indicated that the mean of EBVs for prolific traits was in the medium range with a reference that the prolificacy of sheep had > 2.23 heads/doe was the high category, >1.20-1.82 heads/doe was the medium category, and <1.20 heads/doe was a low category. The breeding value research gave guidelines to improve indigenous goats' genetic quality (Al-Samarai et al., 2019). The EBV relation with the prolificacy trait was essential to improve population reproduction parameters (Abdouli et al., 2019).
EBVs distribution of does prolific trait from 14 regions (MAG till TSB) in East Java (Figure 1)

Figure 1 shows that the EBV profile of breeding village centers based on boxplot analysis was divided into four shapes. The first EBV profile was the MAG, MW, and TSB regions with a Q1 value between 1.39-1.5, a Q2-Q3 value greater than 0.1, and a Q3-Q2 value greater than 0.1. The second EBV profile was the region BP, LB, MD, NSU, SK, and SS with a Q1 value between 1.39-1.5, a Q2-Q3 value greater than 0, and a Q3-Q2 value greater than 0.1. The third EBV profile was the region of BL, GDS, KPB, and SP, Q1 values between 1.39-1.5, Q2-Q3 values greater than 0, and Q3-Q2 values greater than 0.

EBVs for the prolific traits reflected the prolific prediction of offspring in the optimal potency if kept in the same environment as the ancestor. It confirms previous studies that a selection of doe and buck candidates must use EBV values for subsequent breeding programs.
to accelerate genetic progress in the village breeding center (Chawala et al., 2017; Gizaw et al., 2011) and to establish sustainable breeding for national scale (Aljumaah, 2019).

**Conclusions**

ILEG prolificacy in the present study ranged from medium to high category. The variation of a prolific trait was higher (43.98%) compared to that of the morphometry body. The prolificacy EBVs was divided into four unique pattern boxplots. The prolific variance of ILEG had great potential for a breeding program through selection or mating program.
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