



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.03

TPI 2019; 8(3): 394-396

© 2019 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 16-01-2019

Accepted: 20-02-2019

**MK Singh**

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,  
State Veterinary Deptt, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**SS Atkare**

Associate Professor Deptt. of  
Poultry Science, N.D.V.S.U.,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**JK Bhardwaj**

Principal scientist, Director  
farms, N.D.V.S.U., Jabalpur,  
Madhya Pradesh, India

**RP Nema**

Professor and Head of Deptt. of  
Poultry Science, N.D.V.S.U.,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**Kiran Chikwa**

T.A, Veterinary Polytechnic,  
N.D.V.S.U., Jabalpur, Madhya  
Pradesh, India

**RPS Baghel**

Dean, college of veterinary  
science & A.H., Jabalpur,  
N.D.V.S.U., Jabalpur, Madhya  
Pradesh, India

**SK Joshi**

Registrars, N.D.V.S.U.,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**Correspondence**

**MK Singh**

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,  
State Veterinary Deptt, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Effect of protein, energy and probiotics on juvenile growth and economy of dual colour chicks

**MK Singh, SS Atkare, JK Bhardwaj, RP Nema, Kiran Chikwa, RPS Baghel and SK Joshi**

### Abstract

Effect of protein, energy and probiotics on juvenile growth traits and economic of colour dual chicks was evaluated by feeding diet having 3 protein levels i.e. P<sub>1</sub> (17% cp), P<sub>2</sub> (19% cp), P<sub>3</sub> (21% cp), 2 energy levels i.e. E<sub>1</sub> (2700 Kcal ME/kg), E<sub>2</sub> (2900 Kcal ME/kg) and 3 probiotic levels i.e. B<sub>0</sub> (0%), B<sub>1</sub> (0.025%), B<sub>2</sub> (0.05%) in a factorial designed experiment, conducted during summer period. Body weight (BWt), Feed intake (FI), Feed efficiency (FE) and Shank length (SL), were similar in P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein and found significantly higher than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. Breast angle (B A), and carcass yield were significantly higher in P<sub>2</sub> than P<sub>1</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein diets. Significantly better FE, BA and carcass yield were recorded in E<sub>2</sub> energy diet. Body wt, FI and SL were non significantly different in E<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>2</sub> diet. Probiotic levels B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> did not differ significantly for BWt, FE, BA, SL and carcass yield and found significantly better than B<sub>0</sub> diet for all these traits. FI was significantly higher with increased level of probiotics. Cost benefit analysis showed that P<sub>2</sub> protein, E<sub>2</sub> energy and B<sub>2</sub> probiotic levels in diet fetched higher net return at 10<sup>th</sup> week of age during summer.

**Keywords:** Colour dual chicks, protein, energy, probiotics, growth traits, economics

### 1. Introduction

Rural poultry has enormous growth potential but the major constraints lies with availability of suitable germplasm. Aiming this objective, a colour dual flock containing 75% Jabalpur colour and 25% kadaknath inheritance has been developed at Jabalpur centre under All India Co-ordinated Research Project. To assess growth performance of any flock, protein and energy are two first consider nutrients. Genetic and environmental influence on requirement of these nutrients has been reported in literature Sorenson, (1996) [17] Probiotic in poultry as an alternate of antibiotic as well as performance enhancer has been widely accepted in poultry production. In the above context the present study was therefore conducted to evaluate the affect of protein, energy and probiotic supplementation on juvenile growth traits and economy of rearing colour dual chicks.

### 2. Materials and Methods

Dual type coloured chicks (75% Jabalpur colour, 25% kadaknath) were generated by crossing synthetic Jabalpur colour line females with crossbred kadaknath males (50% JBC : 50% Kd). 180 day old healthy chicks were randomly distributed in nine dietary treatment groups. Each treatment group having two replicates of 10 chicks in each. Six diets were prepared with protein levels P<sub>1</sub> (17% cp), P<sub>2</sub> (19% cp), P<sub>3</sub> (21% cp) and energy levels E<sub>1</sub> (2700 Kcal ME/kg), E<sub>2</sub> (2900 Kcal ME/kg). Each of these six diets were supplemented with probiotics at levels of B<sub>0</sub> (Without probiotic), B<sub>1</sub> (0.025%), B<sub>2</sub> (0.05%). Body weight and feed efficiency were measured biweekly. Conformation traits and carcass yield were measured at 10<sup>th</sup> week of age. Birds were slaughtered using appropriate method. Ingredients involved in diet preparation were maize, rice polish, deoiled rice polish, soyabean meal, mineral mixture, vitamin mixture, salt and coccidiostat. Probiotic used was manufactured by Tetragon chemie pvt. Ltd. Bangalore. Each kg of provilacc containing sacchromycess creviscae (5855 billion cfu), lactobacillus sporogens (14040 million cfu), lactobacillus acidophilus (14040 million cfu) and Bacillus subtilis (15000 million cfu). Factorial design was used to conduct experiment and analysis of data as per snedecor and Cochran (1989) [16].

### 3. Results and Discussion

Tenth week body weight was non significant between P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein and these were

significantly higher than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. Janoria (2010) [4] reported higher 12<sup>th</sup> week body weight of colour dual chicks fed 22-18% cp. diet. Moderate protein requirement of dual type vanraja chicks was reported by Rao *et al.* (2005) [10]. The present finding was in agreement to these authors. Chicks in E<sub>2</sub> dietary energy gained higher body weight than E<sub>1</sub> with non significant difference between them. B<sub>0</sub> probiotic chicks had significantly lower body weight than B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> which were non significantly different. Consistent finding for effect of probiotics on body weight was reported by Sabiha *et al.* (2005) [12], Singh *et al.* (2009) [15] and Nikpiram *et al.* (2013) [7]. Feed intake was significantly higher and feed efficiency was significantly better with P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein were non significantly different for FI and FE. These results supported finding of Rajpura *et al.* (2010) [9] and Giri *et al.* (2011) [2]. Increasing dietary energy from E<sub>1</sub> to E<sub>2</sub> level has result in decreased FI and improved FE of birds, although significant difference was observed for FE. The results collaborated with the finding of Rajini *et al.* (1998) [8] and Rajpura *et al.* (2010) [9]. Significantly higher FI in probiotic supplemented diet was in accordance with the results of Hoshmani *et al.* (2006) [3], Toghyani and Tabeidiant (2011) [19] whereas, significantly better feed efficiency with probiotic substantiated finding of Hoshamani *et al.* (2006) [3] and Singh *et al.* (2009) [15]. In synergism with body weight breast angle and Shank length were recorded significantly higher in P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. Mahadik (1994) [5] and Cahaner *et al.* (1995) [1] reported significantly better conformations in high protein diet. Giri *et al.* (2011) [2] observed similar finding in colour broilers. The present result was in agreement to these authors. Significantly higher BA was recorded in E<sub>2</sub> than E<sub>1</sub> lower energy diet whereas SL was unaffected by dietary energy. Supplementation of probiotic significantly improved BA and SL over B<sub>0</sub> diet. B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> were non significantly different for these traits. Carcass yield in P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> were

similar and significantly better than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. Consistent finding for protein effect was reported by Saki *et al.* (2007) [13] and Janoria *et al.* (2010) [4]. In contrary Mandal *et al.* (2010) did not observed effect of protein on carcass yields of colour broilers. Dietary energy E<sub>2</sub> has significantly higher carcass yield than E<sub>1</sub> lower energy diet. Significantly increased carcass yield was observed with probiotic supplementation whereas two levels of probiotic did not revealed significant difference. Similar to the present finding, Shabani *et al.* (2012) [14] reported significant effect of probiotic on meat yield of broilers. Contrarily non significant effect of probiotics on carcass yield was reported by Mehr *et al.* (2007) [6].

Cost benefits analysis presented in table 2. Feeding cost of coloured dual birds reared upto 10<sup>th</sup> week was similar in P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> protein and recorded significantly higher than P<sub>1</sub> lower protein diet. Dietary energy E<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>2</sub> revealed non significant difference in cost of feeding. This was due to lower feed intake with E<sub>2</sub> high energy diet. Supplementation of probiotic has increased feeding cost due to increased feed intake. Other expenditures (Chicks, litter, medicines and light cost), as common value was added to feedings cost of each treatment to estimate total expenditure.

Birds were sold @ Rs. 105/kg body weight. At 10<sup>th</sup> week of age, net return / bird in P<sub>2</sub> (Rs. 10.53) and P<sub>3</sub> (Rs. 10.56) were almost similar and significantly higher than P<sub>1</sub> (Rs. 8.40) lower protein diet. E<sub>2</sub> energy diet has significantly higher net return / bird (Rs. 10.15) than E<sub>1</sub> (Rs. 8.22) lower energy diet. Effect of dietary energy on cost - benefit ratio has been reported by Roy *et al.* [10]. The respective net return in B<sub>0</sub>, B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> protiotic levels were Rs. 8.49, Rs. 11.40, Rs. 12.95 per bird, shown significant difference. The increased net return with probiotic supplementation was in agreement with result of Swain *et al.* [18] and Mehr *et al.* [6]. The result shown higher net return at 10<sup>th</sup> week from coloured dual chicks with P<sub>2</sub> protein, E<sub>2</sub> energy and B<sub>2</sub> probiotic level in diet.

**Table 1:** Effect of treatments on performance of colour dual chicks at 10<sup>th</sup> week age during summer

Treatment	Body wt. (g)	Feed intake (g)	Feed efficiency	Breast angle (°)	Shank length (cm)	Carcass yield (%)
P <sub>1</sub>	1064.2 <sup>b</sup>	2915 <sup>a</sup>	2.74 <sup>b</sup>	58.19 <sup>b</sup>	7.61 <sup>b</sup>	67.74 <sup>a</sup>
P <sub>2</sub>	1120.7 <sup>a</sup>	3010 <sup>b</sup>	2.68 <sup>a</sup>	60.09 <sup>a</sup>	7.93 <sup>a</sup>	68.48 <sup>b</sup>
P <sub>3</sub>	1125.0 <sup>a</sup>	2990 <sup>b</sup>	2.65 <sup>a</sup>	59.17 <sup>b</sup>	7.84 <sup>a</sup>	68.78 <sup>b</sup>
E <sub>1</sub>	1095.0	3015	2.75 <sup>b</sup>	58.81 <sup>b</sup>	7.78	68.13 <sup>b</sup>
E <sub>2</sub>	1110.5	2990	2.69 <sup>a</sup>	59.49 <sup>a</sup>	7.80	68.51 <sup>a</sup>
B <sub>0</sub>	1075.0 <sup>b</sup>	2940 <sup>a</sup>	2.73 <sup>b</sup>	57.58 <sup>b</sup>	7.61 <sup>b</sup>	68.08 <sup>b</sup>
B <sub>1</sub>	1125.0 <sup>a</sup>	3020 <sup>b</sup>	2.68 <sup>a</sup>	60.45 <sup>a</sup>	7.90 <sup>a</sup>	68.47 <sup>a</sup>
B <sub>2</sub>	1160.0 <sup>a</sup>	3130 <sup>c</sup>	2.69 <sup>a</sup>	60.43 <sup>a</sup>	7.88 <sup>a</sup>	68.35 <sup>a</sup>

Means in a column for a trait with uncommon superscripts differ significantly (p<0.01).

**Table 2:** Effect of treatments on economic of rearing colour dual chicks upto 10<sup>th</sup> week of age during summer

Treatment	Cost per kg feed (Rs.)	Feeding cost up to 10 <sup>th</sup> week (Rs.)	Other expenditure (Chicks, litter, light, medicines) (Rs.)	Total expenditure (Rs.)	Income on sale of birds @Rs. 105/kg	Net return (Rs.)
P <sub>1</sub>	23.44	68.32 <sup>b</sup>	35	103.32 <sup>b</sup>	111.72 <sup>b</sup>	8.40 <sup>b</sup>
P <sub>2</sub>	23.97	72.14 <sup>a</sup>	35	107.14 <sup>a</sup>	117.67 <sup>a</sup>	10.53 <sup>a</sup>
P <sub>3</sub>	24.27	72.56 <sup>a</sup>	35	107.56 <sup>a</sup>	118.12 <sup>a</sup>	10.56 <sup>a</sup>
E <sub>1</sub>	23.80	71.53 <sup>a</sup>	35	106.75 <sup>b</sup>	114.97 <sup>a</sup>	8.22 <sup>b</sup>
E <sub>2</sub>	23.87	71.37 <sup>a</sup>	35	106.40 <sup>b</sup>	116.55 <sup>a</sup>	10.15 <sup>a</sup>
B <sub>0</sub>	23.60	69.38 <sup>a</sup>	35	104.38 <sup>b</sup>	112.87 <sup>c</sup>	8.49 <sup>c</sup>
B <sub>1</sub>	23.75	71.72 <sup>b</sup>	35	106.72 <sup>b</sup>	118.12 <sup>b</sup>	11.40 <sup>b</sup>
B <sub>2</sub>	23.90	73.85 <sup>c</sup>	35	108.85 <sup>a</sup>	121.80 <sup>a</sup>	12.95 <sup>a</sup>

Means in a column for a trait with uncommon superscripts differ significantly (p<0.01).

#### 4. Conclusion

Factorial experiment shown that P<sub>2</sub> Protein was found adequate in improving body weight, feed intake, feed efficiency and carcass yield. Energy (E<sub>2</sub>) diet significantly better in feed efficiency, breast angle and carcass yield. Probiotic supplementation significantly improved all economic traits and P<sub>2</sub> Protein, E<sub>2</sub> Energy and B<sub>2</sub> probiotic level in diet.

#### 5. Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful to the Department of Poultry Science, College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, NDVSU, Jabalpur, M.P. for providing all the input and facilities to carry out this study.

#### 6. References

1. Cahaner A, Pinchasov Y, Nir I, Nistan I. Effect of dietary protein under high ambient temperature on body weight, breast meat yield and abdominal fat deposition of broilers stock differing in growth rate and fatness. *Poultry Science*. 1995; 74(6):968-75.
2. Giri AK, Bhardwaj JK, Soren SK. Effect of housing system and dietary protein levels on conformation traits, feed efficiency and mortality of dual purpose coloured birds. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2011; 46(1):107-110.
3. Hoshmani SV, Shivkumar MC, Patel NA, Harpanehalli MD. Effect of feeding antibiotics and probiotics on broiler performance. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2006; 41(2):180-182.
4. Janoria RBS. Effect of protein levels and supplementation of methionine and lysine on pure bred and crossbred kadaknath M.V. Sc. thesis, submitted to Nana ji Deshmukh Veterinary Science University, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, 2010.
5. Mahadik PJ. Genotype by nutrient level interaction on juvenile growth of commercial broilers production from dwarf broiler breeder dam. M.V. Sc. & A.H. thesis submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, 1994.
6. Mehr MA, Shamsharg M, Dastar B, Hassani S, Akbari MK. Effect of different levels of protein and protxin on broiler performance. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2007; 6(8):573-577.
7. Nikpiram H, Taghavi M, Khodadadi A, Athari SS. Influence of protein and probiotic on broiler chickens performance and immune status. *Journal of Applied Science*. 2013; 2(8):256-259.
8. Rajini RA, Narhari D, Kumar R. Influence of season, form of feed, dietary energy level, age and sex on broiler organ biometry. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 1998; 44(1):77-80.
9. Rajpura RM, Khanna K, Savaliya FP, Patel AB. Growth and feed efficiency traits of coloured crossbred broilers reared on different dietary energy and protein levels. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2010; 45(2):146-149.
10. Rao SVR, Panda AK, Raju MLVN, Sunder GS, Bhanja SK, Sharma RP. Performance of vanraja chicks fed different concentration of protein at constant ratio with limiting amino acids. XXII Annual Conference and National Symposium on Indian Poultry Production in changed global scenario, 2005.
11. Roy SC, Alam MS, Ali MA, Choudhary ED, Goswami C. Different levels of protein on performance of synthetic broilers. *Bangladesh Journal of Veterinary Medicines* 2010; 8(2):112-122.
12. Sabiha MKA, Elizabeth VK, Jalaludeen A. Effect of supplementation of probiotic on growth performance of broiler chicken. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2005; 40:73-75.
13. Saki AA, Pour HA, Ahmadi A, Ajhar MT, Tabatabaie MM. Decreasing broiler crude protein requirement by methionine supplementation. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Science*. 2007; 10(5):757-762.
14. Shabani R, Nosrati M, Jarandel F, Kioumars H. Effect of probiotics on carcass and internal organs of broilers. *Biological Research*, 2012; 3(12):5475-5477.
15. Singh SK, Niranjan PS, Singh VB, Koley S, Verma DN. Effect of dietary supplementation of probiotic on broiler chicken. *Animal Nutrition and Feed Technology*. 2009; 9:85-90.
16. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. *Statistical methods*. 8<sup>th</sup> edition. Iowa State Univerisyt, IOWA USA, 1989.
17. Sorenson P. Influence of diet in response to selection for growth and feed efficiency. *Poultry Science*. 1996; 43(3):442-49.
18. Swain BK, Naik PK, Chakrugar EB, Singh NP. Effect of probiotic on growth performance of Grampriya chicks. *Indian Veterinary Journal*. 2007; 88(10):51-53.
19. Toghiani M, Tabeidian SA. Effect of probiotic as antibiotic growth promoter substitution on production and carcass traits of broiler chicks. *Proceeding International conference on food Engineering and Biotechnology*, Singapore, 2011.