International Journal of Business and Management Innovations
Volume1, Issue 1 2025

A portion of the budget was examined in relation to the 75% decrease in the use of acaricide and the adoption of infection and treatment methods on pastors' cattle in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Varsha Jain[1], Akansha Boaz[2]

[1]*Researcher and Doctoral Candidate, Mount Kenya University, Kenya*

Research Article

Date of Submission: 25-05-2025 **Date of Acceptance: 26-05-2025** **Date of Publication: 13-07-2025**

ABSTRACT

In order to assess the partial budgeting analysis of infection and treatment method (ITM) utilizing the Muguga cocktail vaccination with a 75% decrease in acaricide usage on pastoralist cattle in Narok County, Kenya, a 3-month prospective cross-sectional and simulation research was conducted. The investigation was conducted in Narok County's Osupuko and Loita subcounties. Positive net returns, a sign of the ITM technology's profitability, were obtained by partial budgeting analysis with a 75% decrease in the usage of acaricides. The ITM achieved a net return of Ksh. 906.4 per inoculated animal with 75 decreases in acaricide usage. The fact that the data applied to the vast Narok County made this noteworthy. With a 75% decrease in the usage of acaricides in Narok County, the research concludes that immunizing cattle against ECF is economically beneficial.

Keywords: *Infection and Treatment method, Partial budgeting analysis*

INTRODUCTION

Partial budgeting analysis refers to the financial or economic analysis of only those parts of a production system that would be affected by the decision to be made (Sloan and Arnold, 1970). It is thus, a decision-making tool, assisting in arranging information in such a way that the economic implications are clear. It is time saving since analyzing only the relevant parts of the production system will take less time than analyzing the whole production system with and without the implementation of the decision. The basic framework for partial analysis is: (Brown, 1978; Putt et al 1983).

Table 1: The basic framework for partial budget analysis

Costs	Benefits
a) Extra costs	c) Costs saved
b) Revenue loss	d) Extra revenue

Partial analysis can be undertaken for one year, or for a period of several years. If the analysis only covers one year, benefits and costs can be compared as shown:

Table 2: The partial budget analysis computation for one year

a + b = Total costs and c + d = Total benefits
Net benefit = Total Benefits - Total Costs = (c + d) – (a + b)
Benefit-Cost ratio = Total Benefit / Total Costs = (c + d) / (a + b)

When looking at several years the costs and the benefits should be quantified separately for each

year, using the basic partial analysis framework. However, they cannot simply be added up as shown immediately above. The comparison of costs and benefits should then be done according to the rules of discounting (**Gittinger, 1973**).

The four categories of benefits or costs provide a checklist for ensuring that all areas of cost and benefit resulting from the decision under consideration have been covered. If the decision is whether or not to implement a given livestock project, then the four components of the basic framework are some of the items that might be identified. It should be noted that all four categories will not always be needed. Many projects will not involve any revenue lost or cost saved. All projects will involve extra revenue (hopefully, unless the project is a failure) and extra costs (**Brown, 1978; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b)**

Extra costs

Extra costs consist of the basic costs of the livestock project. These could involve pasture improvement, housing improvement, extension inputs, nutritional supplements, disease control inputs such as veterinary interventions, drugs, disinfectants, fees for vaccinations and dipping (**Brown, 1978; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b**). They also include extra time invested by the producer in implementing the project, although this may be difficult to value. Where livestock numbers increase as a result of the project, extra costs will also include the extra cost of maintaining the animals.

Revenue lost

Revenue lost refers to revenue lost as a result of the type of project implemented. For many projects, there may not be any items to fill in revenue lost. Animal disease control provides some examples: a reduction in emergency slaughtering due to a reduction in mortality rates, or a reduction in the value of the herd due to slaughtering of diseased stock **(Brown, 1978; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b).**

Costs saved

Projects do not always involve cost savings, but these do occur where the project makes it possible to produce livestock products at a lower cost. Again, livestock disease control provides a useful example. Where a disease has been present in the livestock population, a comprehensive control programme should lead to a reduction in the incidence or severity of the disease. This should lead to a saving in the costs of measures previously used to deal with the disease, especially in treatment costs and in time spent caring for the sick animals **(Brown, 1978; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b).**

Extra revenue

Extra revenue is usually the ultimate goal of a livestock project. In order to estimate it correctly, it is necessary to go through all the items included in the output calculation. Often, it is calculated as: **(Brown, 1978; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b).**

Extra revenue = output with the project minus output without the project

This works very well, but in this case, any revenue lost will usually be automatically accounted for in the above calculation and should not be estimated separately. For example, if there is a reduction in mortality due to disease control, the extra revenue or difference between output with disease control and output without disease control will reflect: a reduction in home consumption of animals due to emergency slaughter; an increase in the final herd value due

to presence of these animals. Estimating the reduction in home consumption again separately under the heading revenue lost would thus not be correct in this case **(Brown, 1973; Gittinger, 1973; World Bank, 1981b).**

Financial viability studies

The aspect of ITM financial viability using the cost/financial analysis of ITM can be observed from studies carried out by different scholars as outlined below. **Mbogo et al (1994)** carried out a study in Limuru and Kikuyu sub-counties of Kiambu County to assess morbidity and mortality amongst immunized and non-immunized calves. Twenty-three calves were immunized and compared to 24 controls over a 7- month period. Results obtained from the study showed that the annual mortality risk in immunized calves was 45% compared to 84% in the non-immunized group. The annual incidence rate for ECF amongst immunized calves was 9.1% compared to 61.7% amongst the non-immunized. However, the differences in the incidence rates were at p=0.21 at 5% significance level.

Muraguri et al (1998) carried out a cost analysis of immunization against ECF on smallholder dairy farms in central Kenya. Data from an immunization trial carried out on 102 calves and yearlings on 64 farms in Githunguri Sub-county of Kiambu County was used in the analysis. A reference base scenario of a mean herd size of five animals, a 10% rate of 15 reaction to the immunization and a 2-day interval monitoring regimen (a total of 10 farm visits) was simulated. Under these conditions, they showed that the mean cost of immunization per animal was US$ 16.48 (Ksh.955.78 at the 1998 exchange rate); this was equivalent to US$82.39 (Ksh. 4,778.90) per five-animal farm. They noted that under the commonly reported reactor rate of 3%, the cost per animal would decrease to US$14.63 (Ksh.848.29). Reducing the number of farm monitoring visits from 10 to 7 would further reduce the total cost by 10%, justified if farmers were trained to undertake some of the monitoring work. The fixed costs were 53% of the total cost of immunization per farm. They further noted that the cost of immunization decreased with increasing number of animals per farm, showing economies of scale.

Mukhebi et al (1992) estimated that the benefit-cost ratio of immunization against ECF was in the range of 9-17, thus indicating a high level of economic returns. Data obtained from a trial site in Kitale showed that tick control by means of acaricide application could be reduced by 83% (from weekly dipping to only nine times a year) without increasing the risk of cattle to contract ECF under mixed crop-livestock production systems typical of Kitale **(Kiara et al 2000**). Observations by **Wesonga et al (1998)** and **Rumberia et al (1998)** during trial studies in Nakuru and Trans-Nzoia counties showed that dipping interval could be relaxed from once weekly to once every three weeks following ECFiM without exposing animals to increased risks of contracting ECF or other tick-borne diseases. A similar study by the Tick-borne Diseases Division (TBD) at Muguga on 30 farms in Limuru and Kikuyu sub-counties of Kiambu County showed that the mean acaricide application frequency reduced from 3.03 times a month to twice a month thus representing a 34% reduction in a acaricide use or a 34% reduction in cost of tick control as no other TBDs were reported during the study period **(Mbogo et al 1996).** The age at which calves were treated against ticks rose from a mean of 2.5 months to 3 months, thus representing a 20% increase. While this had the potential of increasing the incidence of ECF, it was, however, advantageous because it created a chance for immunity against other TBDs such as babesiosis and heartwater to develop. **Tenesi et al 2023** did a study on partial budgeting analysis of Muguga cocktail vaccine in Narok County and the net returns were positive. However, no financial viability assessment study on ITM with current tick control method has been carried out in pastoral systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design

The cross sectional and simulation study of pastoralists'herds which participated in Muguga cocktail stabilate (Infection and treatment method) against ECF in cattle with the seventy-five reduction in acaricide use was carried out in the months of October, November and December 2004. The study

covered the four trial farms and other thirty (36) pastoralists'farms who had benefited from commercial vaccination launched by the Veterinarie Sans frontier German (VSF-German) in October, 2002.The herd data were collected from the respondents of the forty pastoralists'herds. Narok County data were collected from the Narok County Veterinary and Livestock production officers. The other data were collected from the existing reports.

Partial budget analysis

Partial farm budget analysis was used to estimate the profitability level of herd immunization against ECF by the infection and treatment method (ITM) with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use in Narok County. Partial budgeting provides a simple economic description and comparison of different disease control measures **(Dijkhuizen et al 1995)** and **Tenesi et al 2023.** The partial budget framework and the components and parameters used are as shown in Tables 3 and 4 respectively.

Table 3: Partial farm budget framework.

1. Additional returns
2. Costs no longer incurred
3. Subtotal: 1 + 2
4. Foregone returns 5. Additional costs 6. Subtotal: 4+5
7. Difference: 3 – 6: Derived net return. If net return is negative, then the procedure is not recommended and vice versa.

Table 4: Parameters and components of Partial budget analysis in Infection and Treatment method with seventy five percent reduction in acaricide use in Narok County**.**

Parameters	Components considered
Additional returns	1. Beef offtake revenue 2. Lost beef revenue 3. Lost milk revenue 4. Lost revenue from surviving
Additional costs incurred	1. Immunization cost
Costs No longer incurred	1. Mortality costs reduced.
Foregone returns	1. Hides revenue

DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

The partial budget analysis was computed based on the partial budget framework (**Table 3)** and parameters and components of partial budget analysis in infection and treatment method with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use in Narok County (**Table 4).**

RESULTS

Partial budget analysis of infection and treatment method with seventy five reduction in acaricide use

Partial farm budget analysis was used to estimate the profitability level of herd immunization against ECF by the infection and treatment method (ITM) with the seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use in the Narok County.

Animal health economic spreadsheet

The Narok county Zebu cattle population in 2004 was 488,424 and 76% of this Zebu population was at the risk of contracting ECF.

The herd level parameters are as shown in **Table 5.** They were collected from the cross sectional data, longitudinal data and secondary reports.

The production and money values are as shown in **Table 6**. They were collected from the cross sectional data, longitudinal data and secondary reports.

The current tick control method is as shown in **Table 7.** The information in this table is collated from **Table 5** and **Table 6.** The current tick control practice is one where cattle are spayed weekly for fifty-two weeks annually.

The seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use and adoption of Infection and treatment method **(ITM)** is as shown in **Table 8.** The data in this **Table 8** is compared with the data in **Table 7** for computing partial budgeting analysis.

The net return of ITM with seventy-five percent reductions in acaricide use is as shown in **Table 9.** This is the table that produces the four components of partial budgeting analysis. (Additional returns + Costs no longer incurred) – (Additional costs incurred + Foregone returns) = Net return.

Table 5: Herd level parameters of the pastoralists herds in 2004, Narok, Kenya.

Item	proportion	ECF incidence	ECF case fatality	Source Calving rate
Calves female	7.75%	36.3%	34.2%	Study data
Calves male	3.66%	36.3%	34.2%	Study data
Weaners female	19.86%	16.1%	16.1%	Study data
Weaners male	21.83%	16.1%	16.1%	Study data
Breeding female	44.14%	3.9%	3.9%	Study data 43.1%
Breeding male	2.76%	3.9%	3.9%	Study data
Non- theileriosis for calves	-	-	10%	Study data
Non-theileriosis forweaners	-	-	6%	Study data
Non theileriosis for adults	-	-	6%	Study data

Livestock categories	total	incidence of ECF	fatality cases	Healthy surviving	surviving from ECF	Total surviving	non ECF mortality	Total Mortality	Mortality cost	offtake of total surviving
female's calves	37,853	13,741	4,699	20,327	9,041	29,368	3,785	8,485	71,270,628	2,937
Male calves	17,876	6,489	2,219	9,599	4,270	13,869	1,788	4,007	33,657,405	1,387
Weaner's female	97,001	15,617	2,514	75,564	13,103	88,667	5,820	8,334	140,018,305	4,433
weaners male	106,623	17,166	2,764	83,059	14,403	97,462	6,397	9,161	153,907,400	4,873
Breeding female	215,590	8,408	328	194,247	8,080	202,327	12,935	13,263	445,647,296	10,116
Breeding male	13,480	526	21	12,145	505	12,651	809	829	27,864,583	633
	488,423	**61,947**	**12,545**	**394,942**	**49,402**	**444,343**	**31,535**	**44,080**	**872,365,618**	**24,379**

livestock categories	milk output in sick surviving	lost milk revenue	Total Milk Revenue	Hides revenue from dead ECF cows	Hides revenue from dead non ECF	Total hides revenue	Beef yield offtake kg	beef offtake revenue	Beef yield unsold kg	Total Beef value
female's calves				939,860	757,060	1,696,920	176,210	24,669,457	1,762,104	246,694,572
Male calves				443,847	357,520	801,367	83,215	11,650,100	832,150	116,500,995
Weaner's female				1,005,745	2,328,024	3,333,769	531,999	74,479,925	10,639,989	1,489,598,495
weaners male				1,105,510	2,558,952	3,664,462	584,771	81,867,950	11,695,421	1,637,359,000
Breeding female	262,603	43,105,765	278,655,990	229,539	9,054,780	9,284,319	2,427,920	339,908,835	48,558,405	6,798,176,704
Breeding male				14,352	566,160	580,512	151,808	21,253,171	3,036,167	425,063,417
	262,603		**278,655,990**	**3,738,852**	**15,622,496**	**19,361,348**	**3,955,925**	**553,829,437**	**76,524,237**	**10,713,393,182**

livestock categories	sprayed 40%	treated 40%	No sprayed per year	spray cost per year	treatment cost per year	Calving %	lost revenue from surviving	milk output in healthy surviving	lost beef revenue	milk output loss in surviving
female's calves	15,141	15,141	787,342	3,936,712	9,841,780		3,797,363		71,270,628	
Male calves	7,150	7,150	371,821	1,859,104	4,647,760		1,793,297		33,657,405	
Weaner's female	38,800	38,800	2,017,621	20,176,208	25,220,260		22,012,701		140,018,305	
weaners male	42,649	42,649	2,217,758	22,177,584	27,721,980		24,196,247		153,907,400	
Breeding female	86,236	86,236	4,484,272	44,842,720	56,053,400	83,720	27,149,128	10,883,636	445,647,296	262,603
Breeding male	5,392	5,392	280,384	2,803,840	3,504,800		1,697,529		27,864,583	
	195,369	**195,369**	**10,159,198**	**95,796,168**	**25,397,996**	**83,720**	**80,646,265**	**10,883,636**	**872,365,618**	

Table 8: 75% reduction in Acaricide use and adoption of ITM

livestock categories	total	incidence of ECF	fatality cases	Healthy surviving	surviving from ECF	Total surviving	non ECF mortality	Total Mortality	Mortality cost
female's calves	37,853	2,748	188	31,320	2,560	33,880	3,785	3,973	33,375,484
Male calves	17,876	1,298	89	14,791	1,209	16,000	1,788	1,876	15,761,503
Weaner's female	97,001	3,123	101	88,058	3,023	91,080	5,820	5,921	99,466,660
weaners male	106,623	3,433	111	96,792	3,323	100,115	6,397	6,508	109,333,241
Breeding female	215,590	1,682	13	200,973	1,668	202,641	12,935	12,949	435,070,154
Breeding male	13,480	105	1	12,566	104	12,670	809	810	27,203,236
	488,423	**12,389**	**502**	**444,499**	**11,888**	**456,387**	**31,535**	**32,036**	**720,210,278**

livestock categories	offtake of total surviving	sprayed 40%	treated 40%	No sprayed per year	spray cost per year	treatment cost per year	immunized	immunization cost	Calving %	lost revenue from surviving
female's calves	3,388	15,141	15,141	196,836	984,178	1,968,356	28,390	17,033,850		1,075,265
Male calves	1,600	7,150	7,150	92,955	464,776	929,552	13,407	8,044,200		507,792
Weaner's female	4,554	38,800	38,800	504,405	5,044,052	5,044,052	4,850	2,910,030		5,078,401
weaners male	5,006	42,649	42,649	554,440	5,544,396	5,544,396	5,331	3,198,690		5,582,152
Breeding female	10,132	86,236	86,236	1,121,068	11,210,680	11,210,680	10,780	6,467,700	86,619	5,606,111
Breeding male	634	5,392	5,392	70,096	700,960	700,960	674	404,400		350,528
	25,313	**195,369**	**195,369**	**2,539,800**	**23,949,042**	**25,397,996**	**63,431**	**38,058,870**	**86,619**	**18,200,250**

livestock categories	offtake of total surviving	sprayed 40%	treated 40%	No sprayed per year	spray cost per year	treatment cost per year	immunized	immunization cost	Calving %	lost revenue from surviving
female's calves	3,388	15,141	15,141	196,836	984,178	1,968,356	28,390	17,033,850		1,075,265
Male calves	1,600	7,150	7,150	92,955	464,776	929,552	13,407	8,044,200		507,792
Weaner's female	4,554	38,800	38,800	504,405	5,044,052	5,044,052	4,850	2,910,030		5,078,401
weaners male	5,006	42,649	42,649	554,440	5,544,396	5,544,396	5,331	3,198,690		5,582,152
Breeding female	10,132	86,236	86,236	1,121,068	11,210,680	11,210,680	10,780	6,467,700	86,619	5,606,111
Breeding male	634	5,392	5,392	70,096	700,960	700,960	674	404,400		350,528
	25,313	**195,369**	**195,369**	**2,539,800**	**23,949,042**	**25,397,996**	**63,431**	**38,058,870**	**86,619**	**18,200,250**

livestock categories	milk output in healthy surviving	lost beef revenue	milk output loss in surviving	milk output in sick surviving	lost milk revenue	Total Milk Revenue	Hides revenue from dead ECF cows	Hides revenue from dead non ECF	Total hides revenue
female's calves		33,375,484					37,594	757,060	794,654
Male calves		15,761,503					17,754	357,520	375,274
Weaner's female		99,466,660					40,230	2,328,024	2,368,254
weaners male		109,333,241					44,220	2,558,952	2,603,172
Breeding female	11,260,517	435,070,154	54,226	54,226	42,082,679	282,868,571	9,182	9,054,780	9,063,962
Breeding male		27,203,236					574	566,160	566,734
	11,260,517	**720,210,278**		**54,226**		**282,868,571**	**149,554**	**15,622,496**	**15,772,050**

livestock categories	Beef yield offtake kg	beef offtake revenue	Beef yield unsold kg	Total Beef value
female's calves	203,278	28,458,972	2,032,784	284,589,716
Male calves	95,998	13,439,690	959,978	134,396,897
Weaner's female	546,482	76,507,507	10,929,644	1,530,150,140
weaners male	600,690	84,096,658	12,013,808	1,681,933,159
Breeding female	2,431,698	340,437,692	48,633,956	6,808,753,846
Breeding male	152,045	21,286,238	3,040,891	425,724,764
	4,030,191	**564,226,757**	**77,611,061**	**10,865,548,522**

Table 9: Net return of immunization against ECF with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use in Narok County, Kenya.

Parameter
***Additional returns** **Beef offtake revenue kshs (564,226,750-553,829,437) = kshs 10,397,313** **Lost beef revenue kshs (872,365,618-720,210,278) = kshs 152,155,340** **Lost milk revenue kshs (43,105,765 – 42,082,679) = kshs 1,023,086** **Lost revenue from surviving kshs (80646265-18200250) = kshs 62,446,015**
Additional costs incurred **Cost of immunization Ksh.38,058,870**
Foregone returns **Hides revenue kshs (19,361,348 – 15722050) = kshs 3,639,298**
Costs no longer incurred **Mortality costs kshs (872365618 – 720210278) =kshs 152,155,340** **Net return = Ksh (10,397,313+152,155,340+ 1,023,086+62,446,015+152,155,340) –(38,058,870-3,639,298) = 336,478,926** Average net return per animal = Kshs. 906.4

* Average exchange rate to US dollars was kshs.80
The ITM with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use realized a net return of Ksh.906.4 per immunized animal. Total net return was Kshs. 336,478,926 for about 371,202 susceptible cattle in

DISCUSSION

Partial budgeting analysis results of the study showed that ITM technology with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use was financially profitable. The ITM with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use realized a net return of Ksh.906.4 per immunized animal. This was significant generalization to the whole of Narok county because it shows a positive net return in ITM with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use. High net returns are indicators of high profitability of immunization **(Dijkhuizen et al 1995). Tenesi et al 2023** did find also a net positive return per immunized calf. Therefore, this can be concluded from the study that it was still economically worthwhile to immunize cattle against ECF with seventy-five percent reduction in acaricide use in Narok County.

CONCLUSION

The use of Muguga cocktail stabilate resulted in a 75% decrease in the usage of acaricides, according to the partial costs and partly benefits. To evaluate the financial sustainability of the ITM and tick control techniques, a thorough financial and economic study is required. When doing research on tick management methods and the ECF vaccine, fundamental scientists should use the findings of this study.

REFERENCES

[1]. Peters, A., Lynen, G., Babo Martin, S., Di Guilio, G., and Rushton, J. (2010). evaluating the effects of East Coast Fever vaccination based on the mode of infection and treatment in Tanzanian pastoralist settings. 97: 175–182 in Preventive Veterinary Medicine.
[2]. M. Brown (1973). Farm budgets: From agricultural project analysis to farm income analysis. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
[3]. Huir, R.B.M., Jalvingh, A.W., and Dijkhuizen, A.A. (1995). economic evaluation of animal illnesses and how to prevent them.

Veterinary Preventive Medicine, 25: 135-149.
[4]. Price, J. Gittinger (1973). examination of agricultural projects' economics. edition two.
[5]. Economic Development Edi series. The University Press of Johns Hopkins. London and Baltimore.
[6] Kiara, H., Muraguri, G.R., Matere, C.N., Mulira, G., Mbogo, S.K., and Kariuki. (2000). Assessment of different tick management methods in cattle after East Coast fever vaccination and the use of simulation modeling. Proceedings of the International Society for Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics' (ISVEE) 9th Symposium, August 6–11, 2000. Colorado, USA.
[7]. Mbogo, S.K., Ngumi, P.N., Kariuki, D.P., and McHardy, N. (1996). A weak strain of Theileria parva that may be used to prevent East Coast fever. 6: 41–47 in Veterinary Parasitology.
[8]. Mbogo, S.K., Peeler, E., and Wanjohi, J.M. (1994). A comparison of the Limuru/Kikuyu Division's vaccinated and non-immunized calves. (Unpublished) Kenya Agricultural Research Institute.
[9]. Kruska, R., Perry, B.D., and Mukhebi, A.W. (1992a). Theileriosis control's estimated economic impact in Africa.
Veterinary Prevention, 12: 73-85.
[10]. Muraguri, G.R., McHardy, N., Mbogo, S.K., and Kariuki, D.P. (1998). East Coast fever vaccination costs for Kenyan smallholder dairy farms are examined. Veterinary Preventive Medicine, 34: 307–316.
[11]. Putt, S.N.H., Woods, A.J., Tyler, L., Shaw, A.P.M., and James, A.D. (1988). African veterinary epidemiology and economics. A guide for creating and evaluating animal health policies. ILCA Manual No. 3. Department of Agriculture, University of Reading, Berkshire,

England; Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics Research Unit
[12]. Wanjohi, J.M., Rumberia, R.M., Ngeranwa, J.J.N., Muraguri, G.R., and Mbogo, S.K. (1998). Ixodid tick fluctuations on livestock in Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya's north Rift Valley Province. Muguga, NVRC, 1998. The National Veterinary Research Center in Muguga hosted a midyear scientific meeting. S.K. Mbogo, M. Gatongi, D.P. Kariuki, H.M. Wamwayi, and S.W. Wanyangu (Eds.). Kenya Agricultural Research Center, 1998, pages 20–21.
[13]. Arnold, Zurchar, and Sloan, Harods (1970). Economics Dictionary, Fifth Edition. Bames and Noble, New York.
[14]. Tenesi, G.M., Kitala, P.M., Gathuma, J.M., and Kiara, H.K. (2015). evaluation of the financial and economic advantages in Kenya's Narok County as well as the effectiveness of the infection and treatment methods against east coast fever. master's thesis. Nairobi University.
[15]. Tenesi, G.M., Kitala, P.M., Gathuma, J.M., and Kiara, H.K. (2023). A partial budgetary study of the Muguga combo vaccination in Kenya's Narok County. 1024940/theijbm/2023 is the DOI number.
[16]. Rumberia, R.M., Wesonga, F.D., Ndungu, S.G., and Muraguri, G.R. (1998). Tick management in Rongai after East Coast Fever (ECF) vaccination. The National Veterinary Research Center held a mid-year scientific meeting in Muguga in 1998. Muguga. S.W. Wanyangu, H.M. Wamwayi, D.P. Kariuki, P.M. Gatongi, and
S.K. Mbogo (Eds). Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, 1998.pg19.
[17]. World Bank. (1981b). A Handbook on monitoring and evaluation of Agricultural and Rural Development projects, Washington, D.C.
itions of