# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Effect of Supplementation of Combination of Prebiotic and Acidifier on Performance of Broiler Chicken

Sachin Khemalapure, Bhushan Ramteke, Ganesh Gadegaonkar\*, Narendra Karambele, Suresh Jagadale

### ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to evaluate the effect of supplementation of prebiotics (Mannanoligosaccharide, MOS) and acidifier combination on the performance of broilers. The feeding trial was conducted on 135-days-old 'Cobb-400' broiler chicks for a period of six weeks. The day-old broiler chicks were randomly divided into three equal groups viz.  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  comprised 45 birds each, further subdivided into three replicates of 15 birds each. Group  $T_0$  served as control and received a standard broiler diet. The birds in groups  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  were fed diets containing prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% and 0.75%, respectively. The birds from group  $T_1$  received diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of feed. The birds from group  $T_2$  received a diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of feed. The birds from group  $T_2$  received a diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of feed. The birds from group  $T_1$  received a diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of feed. The birds from group  $T_2$  received a diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of feed. The birds from group  $T_2$  received a diet containing a prebiotic (MOS) and acidifier combination (p = 0.05%) of the feed. The final live body weight and total weight gain of birds of  $T_1$  group was significantly (p < 0.01) higher than control and  $T_2$  group. The average feed consumption of birds of experimental groups was comparable. The feed conversion ratio was significantly (p < 0.05) better than control and  $T_2$  group. The average dressing percentage, giblet weight percentage, gut pH, and gut length of birds of  $T_1$  group was comparable. The average total viable count (TVC) and total coliform count (TCC) did not vary between experimental groups The group  $T_1$  recorded the highest net profit per bird.

Keywords: Acidifier, Broiler, Combination, Performance Poultry Prebiotic.

Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech (2022): 10.21887/ijvsbt.18.3.26

#### INTRODUCTION

mong the alternatives to antibiotic invented recently, Aprebiotic is one of the most important classes. Prebiotics was defined as a non-digestible food ingredient that beneficially affects the host by selectively stimulating the growth and or activity of one or a limited number of bacteria in the colon and thus improves host health (Falaki et al., 2011). Acidifiers or organic acids include short-chain fatty acids, volatile fatty acids and weak carboxylic acids that are only partly dissociated. Acidifiers may play a role in maintaining gut integrity by reducing the colonization of pathogens (like Salmonella and E.Coli) in the intestinal wall by lowering the intestinal pH below 6 and promoting normal micro-flora of gut. Short-chain fatty acids such as butyric acid increase epithelial cell proliferation, quick repairing of the intestinal epithelium, increased villus height, and increased absorptive capacity (Hosna, 2018).

Feed additives like prebiotics and acidifiers have been observed to improve the growth performance of birds by increasing the count of favorable micro-flora present in the gut of poultry (Li *et al.* 2008). Sizeable work of combination of prebiotic and probiotic has been tried on the broilers to improve the growth performance; however, very scanty information is available on supplementation of a combination of prebiotic and acidifier in broiler. Therefore present experiment was planned to study the effect of prebiotic (mannan-oligosaccharides, MOS) and gut acidifier on growth performance and gut health of broiler. Department of Animal Nutrition, Bombay Veterinary College, Parel, Mumbai- 00 012, Maharashtra, India

**Corresponding Author:** Ganesh Gadegaonkar, Department of Animal Nutrition, Bombay Veterinary College, Parel, Mumbai- 00 012, Maharashtra, India, e-mail: drgmgadegaonkar@gmail.com

**How to cite this article:** Khemalapure, S., Ramteke, B., Gadegaonkar, G., Jagadale, N.K.S. (2022). Effect of Supplementation of Combination of Prebiotic and Acidifier on Performance of Broiler Chicken. Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech. 18(3), 112-114.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

Submitted: 26/12/2021 Accepted: 23/05/2022 Published: 10/07/2022

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This experiment was conducted after prior approval from the Institutional Animal Ethics Committee (Approved No. III/19) in the Department of Animal Nutrition, Bombay Veterinary College, Mumbai.

One hundred and thirty-five day-old 'Cobb-400' broiler chicks were divided into three treatment groups of 45 each and randomly assigned to three treatment diets, which were further subdivided into three replicates of 15 birds each for a period of six weeks. Group  $T_0$ , was fed basal diet (BIS, 2007), Group  $T_1$  had basal diet supplemented with prebiotic (Mannanoligosaccharide, MOS) and acidifier combination (1:1) @0.05 % of feed, and in Group  $T_2$ : basal diet was supplemented with prebiotic (Mannan-oligosaccharide, MOS) and same acidifier combination used for experimental

<sup>©</sup> The Author(s). 2022 Open Access This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

group T<sub>1</sub> @0.075 % of feed. The acidifier combination used in the present experiment was a mixture of formic, acetic, propionic, butyric, lactic and fumaric acid. The prebiotic and acidifier were used in both the treatment groups in 1:1 ratio.

All the chicks were kept hygienically on a deep litter system in separate pens and adopted uniform management conditions. The brooding was carried out for first two weeks by using electric bulbs. Standard vaccination schedule was followed. All birds were weighed individually at the end of each week of the experimental period (6 weeks). The weight on first day (at the start of the experiment) and 42 days of age were recorded. At the end of experiment, six birds per treatment were randomly selected and euthanized by cervical dislocation. After opening abdominal cavity, gizzard, liver, heart, duodenum, jejunum and ileum were weighed and recorded. Feed intake per pen was recorded weekly to arrive at the average weekly feed consumption and feed conversion ratio (FCR).

The gut pH was determined using pH meter, whereas gut length was measured with the help of measuring tape. Estimation of total viable count and total coliform count of intestinal content of six birds from each group was also carried out at the end of sixth week (Garrido *et al.*, 2004). The economics of broiler production was calculated at the end of the experiment. Using a completely randomized block design, all the data obtained were subjected to statistical analysis as per Snedecor and Cochran (1995).

## **R**ESULTS AND **D**ISCUSSION

The effect of adding prebiotic in combination with acidifier on the performance of the birds is presented in Table 1. The data reveals that the average final live body weight and total weight gain of birds in T<sub>1</sub> group were significantly (p < 0.01) higher than control and T<sub>2</sub> group. The present observation are in agreement with Antongiovanni *et al.* (2007) in broiler birds supplemented with a combination of prebiotic and acidifiers. This may be attributed to the lowered pH conducive to the growth of favorable bacteria, simultaneously hampering the growth of pathogenic bacteria that grow at a relatively higher pH. However, Riad *et al.* (2010) reported that the addition of prebiotic had no significant effect on body weight.

The average feed consumption of birds of the experimental groups was comparable. The present findings agree with Corduk *et al.* (2008), who reported non-significant effect of organic acid, prebiotic, and their combination on feed intake. Mahdavi and Torki (2009) also observed non-significant difference in feed intake of birds of treatment groups receiving butyric acid @ 2 or 3 g per kg feed. Contrary to the present observations Riad *et al.* (2010) and Lende (2007) reported higher feed consumption on addition of Bio-MOS @ 1 g/kg diet of broilers and acidifier @ 0.1 and 0.05 % in starter and finisher diet, respectively.

The feed conversion ratios in feed intake per unit gain in weight for the birds from group T1 were significantly (p < 0.05) higher than control and T<sub>2</sub> groups. However, difference between control and T<sub>2</sub> group was non-significant

		Groups			Stat.
Parameters		T <sub>o</sub>	<i>T</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>T</i> <sub>2</sub>	Sign.
Initial weight (g)		44.53 ± 0.31	$44.33\pm0.29$	$44.60\pm0.29$	
Final weight (g)		$2288.76^{b} \pm 46.00$	$2492.71^{a} \pm 34.60$	$2343.82^{b} \pm 50.06$	**
Total gain in weight (g)		$2244.22^{b} \pm 46.00$	$2448.38^{a} \pm 34.54$	$2299.22^{b} \pm 50.06$	*
Total feed consumption (g)		$4160.36 \pm 46.73$	$4030.76 \pm 34.79$	4048.67 ± 76.95	NS
Average feed conversion ratio		$1.85^{b} \pm 0.03$	1.65 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.03	1.76 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.03	*
Dressing %		71.51 ± 0.45	$72.43 \pm 0.79$	$72.16 \pm 0.57$	NS
Giblet wt. (%)	Liver wt.	$1.99 \pm 0.04$	$2.04\pm0.08$	$2.02 \pm 0.06$	NS
	Gizzard wt.	$2.15\pm0.06$	$2.14\pm0.04$	$2.06 \pm 0.07$	NS
	Heart wt.	$0.40\pm0.006$	$0.40 \pm 0.01$	$0.42 \pm 0.015$	NS
Gut pH	Duodenum	5.17 ± 0.11	$5.08 \pm 0.15$	5.01 ± 0.02	NS
	Jejunum	$5.88\pm0.08$	$5.83 \pm 0.08$	5.82 ± 0.11	NS
	lleum	$7.17 \pm 0.15$	$6.78 \pm 0.22$	6.85 ± 0.22	NS
Gut length (cm)		194.73 ± 5.70	204.26 ± 5.72	$202.99\pm6.08$	NS
Total viable count (CFU/ ml)		$2.29 \times 10^{12}$	$1.49 \times 10^{12}$	$1.73 \times 10^{12}$	
Total coliform count (CFU/ ml)		$2.02 \times 10^{12}$	$0.94 \times 10^{12}$	$1.54 \times 10^{12}$	
Net profit per bird (₹)		4.99	23.21	11.70	
Net profit per kg (₹)		2.19	9.32	4.82	

Table 1: Supplemental effect of prebiotic and acidifier combination on performance of broiler chicken

Means having common superscript in the same row do not differ significantly NS- Non Significant \*- Significant at 5% level \*\*- Significant at 1% level

(p > 0.05). The present study results agree with Ao and Choct (2013), who reported significantly better FCR by addition of MOS @ 1 kg/ton and 0.5 kg/ton in starter and in finisher diet, respectively. Hu and Guo (2007) observed non-significant effect on FCR in broiler birds supplemented with 500, 1000 and 2000 mg acidifier per kg of broiler diet.

There was no significant variation in average dressing and giblet weight, gut pH and gut length of birds at the end of six week in the experimental groups. Similar findings were reported by Samanta *et al.* (2009) and Paul *et al.* (2007).

The average total viable count (TVC) and total coliform count (TCC) in the T1 group supplemented with prebiotic and acidifier combination @ 0.05% were numerically lowest followed by the T2 and control group. However, there were differences between the various treatment groups was non-significant. Thus, it revealed that prebiotic and acidifier combination @ 0.05% of diet helped reduce the TVC and TCC of the intestines. The present study results agree with Yang *et al.* (2007) who found reduced coliform load at the gut mucosa on supplementation of MOS @ 1g/kg of feed.

Net profit per bird and per kg were higher in both the supplemented groups (T1 and T2) than control (T0), with the highest in T2, revealing that supplementation of prebiotic and acidifier in combination is economically profitable.

# CONCLUSION

From the results of this study, it is concluded that dietary inclusion of prebiotic and acidifier in combination @ 0.05% in the diet is beneficial in improving growth performance and higher margin of profit in broilers.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Professor and Head of the Department, Poultry Science, Bombay Veterinary College, Parel, Mumbai- 400012 and their staff for kind permission, help and cooperation extended in taking up this research work.

# References

- Antongiovanni, M.,BuccioniA., Petacchi F., Leeson S., Minieri S., Martini A. and Cecchi R. (2007). Butyric acid glycerides in the diet of broiler chickens: effects on gut histology and carcass composition. *Italian J. of Anim.Sci.*, **6**(1): 19-26.
- Ao, Z. and ChoctM.(2013).Oligosaccharides Affect Performance and Gut Development of Broiler Chickens.*Asian-Australasian J. of Anim. Sci.*, **26**(1): 116-121.

- BIS (2007). Indian Standards of Poultry feed specification, 5<sup>th</sup> revision. IS: 1374, Bureau of Indian Standards, ManakBhavan New Delhi, India.
- Corduk, M., CeylanN., DedeN. and TelO.Y. (2008). Effects of novel feed additives on performance, carcass traits and E. coli, aerobic bacteria and yeast counts in broilers.*Arch.Geflugelk.*,**72** (2): 61-67.
- Falaki M, SharghS.M., DastarB. and ZarahdaranS.(2011) Effects of different level of probiotic and prebiotic on performance and carcass characteristics of Broiler chickens. J. Anim. Vet. Adv.;**10**(3):378–384
- Garrido, M. N., SkjervheimM., OppegaardH. and SorumH. (2004). Acidified litter benefits the intestinal flora balance of broiler chicken. *Applied Environmental Microbiology*, **70**: 5208-5213.
- Hosna H. (2018) Application of organic acids in poultry nutrition, International Journal of Avian & Wildlife Biology.;**3** (4): 324-329
- Hu, Z., and GuoY. (2007). Effects of dietary sodium butyrate supplementation on the intestinal morphological structure, absorptive function and gut flora in chickens. *Anim. feed Sci. and Tech.*,132(3-4): 240-249.
- Lende, S. R. (2007). Comparative efficacy of gut acidifier and lactobacillus sporogenes on theperformance of broilers. Thesis approved by MAFSU Nagpur, (Maharashtra)
- Li, X., Liu, L.Q. and Xu, C.L. (2008) Effects of supplementation of fructo-oligosaccharide and/or Bacillus subtilisto diets on performance and intestinal microflora in broilers.*Arch. TierzuchtDummerstorf.*, 51: 64-70.
- Mahdavi, R. and TorkiM. (2009). Study on usage period of dietary protected butyric acid on performance, carcass characteristics, serum metabolite levels and humoral immune response of broiler chickens. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv*, **8**(9): 1702-1709.
- Paul, S. K., SamantaG., HalderG.andBiswasP. (2007).Effect of a combination of organic acid salts as antibiotic replacer on the performance and gut health of broiler chickens.*Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 19(11):171-179.
- Riad, S. S, SafaaH., Mohamed F.R., Siam S. S. and El-MinshawyH.A. (2010). Influence of probiotic, prebiotic, and or yeast supplementation in broiler diets on the productivity immune response and slaughter traits. *J. of Animal and PoultryProd.*, **1**(2): 1-14.
- Samanta, S., HaldarS. and Ghosh T. K. (2009). Comparative efficacy of an organic acid blend and bacitracin methylene disalicylate as growth promoters in broiler chickens: Effects on performance, gut histology, and small intestinal milieu. *Vet. Med. Int.* 2010. Article ID 645150,https://doi.org/10.4061/2010/645150
- Snedecor, G.W. and CohranW.G. (1995) Statical Method (6<sup>th</sup>edn ) Oxford and IBH Publishing Co.Pvt.Ltd.New Delhi.
- Yang Y., Iji P. A. and Choct M. (2007). Effects of Different Dietary Levels of Mannanoligosaccharide on Growth Performance and Gut Development of Broiler Chickens. *The Asian-Australian J. of Anim. Sci.*, **20**(7): 1084 – 1091.

