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**STUDY ON CASTRATION AND ITS EFFECTS ON BODY WEIGHT IN GOAT**

 **ABSTRACT**

 The present study was undertaken on castration. A total of 30 buck kids were castrated to evaluate the body weight gain and incidence of age and complications of castration. Castration was done by two methods. The Group1 and Group2 was done by open and the Group3 was done by close method. Group 2 was significantly (P<0.01, 0.05) higher live weight gain and have no complication. The incidence of age of castration about 1 month to below 2 months. The study was conducted with the aim of effects of castration and to compare its two method having complications. The value of Group 2 was 8.2 kg. The other two groups were 5.58 and 4.56 respectively.

Key words: castration, buck, kids, open method, close method, live weight, complication.