2013)

## COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF HERBAL-METHIONINE AND DL-METHIONINE ON PERFORMANCE OF COMMERCIAL BROILERS

N.J. Bhagora, F.P. Savaliya, P.R. Pandya, R.S. Joshi, A.B. Patel,

N.D. Hirani and F.S. Qadri

Department of Poultry Science (Poultry Complex),

College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry

Anand Agricultural University, Anand - 388 110, Gujarat

Corresponding author: nikeshbhagora@ymail.com

Received 2-7-2013 Accepted 20-8-2013

## ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted on 160 commercial broiler birds from day-old age to 6 weeks of age to study the comparative efficacy of ration containing different concentration of herbalmethionine and DL-methionine on their performance in terms of weekly body weight gain, feed consumption, feed conversion ratio, livability and economics. A significant improvement in overall growth and performance was observed in birds supplemented with 50% herbal methionine and 50% DL-methionine as compared to 100% DL-methionine, 100% herbal methionine and 125% herbal methionine. The study also demonstrated that feeding with combination of 50% DL-methionine and 50% herbal methionine is more economical as compared to feeding of 100% DL-methionine, 100% herbal methionine.

**KEYWORDS** : DL-methionine, Herbal methionine, Broilers, Performance.

### INTRODUCTION

Poultry is one of the fastest growing segments among the component of agricultural sector in India. Feed constitutes near about 60-70% total cost of broiler production (Swain and Johri, 1999). Methionine is needed for better health and production in poultry. Methionine may act as lipotropic agent through its role as an amino acid in balancing protein and it is essential for various vital functions in body such as regulation of cell division, methyl donor, reduction in reactive oxygen species, energy production, overall growth performance, improvement of feed conversion ratio and livability in broilers (Kalbande *et al.*, 2009). Synthetic methionine is metabolized into highly toxic compounds such as methyl propionate, thereby, adversely affecting the performance of the birds (Bender, 1975), hence herbal methionine is an alternative source to supply limiting amino acid without affecting performance of the birds. The present research work was therefore undertaken to study the effect of supplementation of herbal methionine, DL-methionine and their combination on broiler performance.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted at Poultry Complex, College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat. The research work was carried out for six weeks duration on 160 day-old commercial broiler chicks. All the managemental practices required for optimum brooding and rearing of birds were followed. Vaccines administered were Ranikhet disease of F1 strain at the age of 7<sup>th</sup> day by I/O or I/N route and Infectious bursal disease of Intermediate strain at the age of 14<sup>th</sup> day by the route of drinking water. One hundred sixty (160) day-old commercial broiler chicks were distributed randomly into four treatment rations, i.e. T<sub>1</sub> ration containing 100% DL-methionine (Control, 135 & 90 g DL methionine/100 kg broiler starter and finisher ration, resp.), T<sub>2</sub> ration containing 100% herbal methionine (135 & 90 g herbal methionine

## INDIAN J. FIELD VET Vol. 9 No. 2

#### The Indian Journal of Field Veterinarians

/100 kg starter and finisher ration), T<sub>3</sub> ration containing 50% DL-methionine plus 50% herbal methionine (67.5 & 45 g DL methionine and 67.5 & 45 g herbal methionine /100 kg starter and finisher ration) and T<sub>4</sub> ration containing 125% herbal methionine (169 & 113 g herbal methionine /100 kg starter and finisher ration). The herbal methionine was procured from Himalaya Drugs, India and DL-methionine from Evonik Industries, Belgium. The broiler starter (0-4 weeks) and broiler finisher (5-6 weeks) feeds were prepared as per the guidelines of BIS (1992). Each treatment of 6 weeks duration had 4 replicates of 10 birds each. The parameters evaluated were weekly body weight, weekly body weight gain, weekly feed consumption, and total feed consumption up to 4<sup>th</sup> week of age TFC<sub>(0-4)</sub> and up to 6<sup>th</sup> week of age TFC<sub>(0-6)</sub>. Further thefeed cost (ROFC) and European performance efficiency index (EPEI) were calculated. The data was analyzed using Completely Randomized Design as per Snedecor and Cochran (1995). Means of replicate under each treatment was considered for analysis.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Body weight and Body weight gain:** The least square means and standard error of body weight and body weight gain in various dietary treatment groups are given in Table 1 & 2.

Trait	Treatment rations							
Iran	<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	$T_2$	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	5%			
$\mathbf{BW}_{0}$	48.42±0.14	48.33±0.05	48.35±0.18	$48.41 \pm 0.05$	NS			
BW <sub>1</sub>	131.18 <sup>a</sup> ±2.65	$140.48^{ab} \pm 2.98$	$154.06^{\circ}\pm6.05$	145.20 <sup>bc</sup> ±4.61	13.24			
BW <sub>2</sub>	265.16±6.20	262.31±9.65	292.03±12.43	$270.80{\pm}14.65$	NS			
BW <sub>3</sub>	$562.05^{b} \pm 6.89$	515.91 <sup>a</sup> ±15.13	$584.47^{b} \pm 8.37$	$520.60^{a} \pm 13.96$	35.86			
BW <sub>4</sub>	1000.40 <sup>bc</sup> ±11.92	$886.18^{a} \pm 18.00$	1049.87 <sup>c</sup> ±24.33	$956.00^{b} \pm 25.81$	64.01			
BW <sub>5</sub>	1473.57±28.69	1326.52±18.97	1528.11±28.86	$1411.05 \pm 28.02$	NS			
BW <sub>6</sub>	1962.80 <sup>b</sup> ±31.29	1797.92 <sup>a</sup> ±27.23	1993.28 <sup>b</sup> ±27.70	1896.65 <sup>b</sup> ±43.51	102.04			

Table 1. Weekly mean body weights (g) at different ages of broilers fed with different rations

BW= body weight, CD=critical difference, NS=non-significant.

Means bearing uncommon superscripts within the row differ significantly between treatments (P<0.05).

Table 2.	Mean	weekly	body	weight	gain	(g)	at	differen	t ages	and	cumulative	weight	gain	(g)	of
			bi	oilers f	ed w	ith	diff	erent tre	atmen	t rati	ions				

<b>T *</b> 4	Treatment							
Traits	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$	5%			
BWG <sub>0-1</sub>	$82.76^{a} \pm 2.70$	$92.10^{ab} \pm 2.97$	105.70 <sup>c</sup> ±5.93	$96.78^{bc} \pm 4.59$	13.12			
BWG <sub>1-2</sub>	133.96±4.62	121.82±6.75	137.95±6.60	125.60±10.10	NS			
BWG <sub>2-3</sub>	296.88 <sup>b</sup> ±8.15	$253.60^{a} \pm 7.61$	292.44 <sup>b</sup> ±9.92	$249.80^{a} \pm 3.44$	23.60			
BWG <sub>3-4</sub>	$438.35^{b} \pm 10.40$	370.27 <sup>a</sup> ±9.65	465.39 <sup>b</sup> ±18.43	$435.40^{b} \pm 12.68$	62.21			
BWG <sub>45</sub>	473.17±21.74	440.34±9.64	478.24±12.23	455.05±18.17	NS			
BWG <sub>5-6</sub>	489.22±5.21	479.09±11.70	465.17±25.81	485.60±23.55	NS			
BWG <sub>0-4</sub>	951.97 <sup>tc</sup> ±11.86	$837.84^{a} \pm 17.96$	1001.43°±24.32	$907.58^{b} \pm 25.81$	63.93			
BWG <sub>46</sub>	962.40±25.23	911.43±11.06	943.14±22.61	940.65±32.74	NS			
BWG <sub>0-6</sub>	1914.37 <sup>b</sup> ±31.30	1749.28 <sup>a</sup> ±27.21	$1944.92^{b} \pm 27.81$	1848.23 <sup>ab</sup> ±43.52	102.06			

BWG= body weight gain, CD=critical difference, NS=non-significant.

Means bearing uncommon superscripts within the row differ significantly between treatments (P<0.05).

2

# 2013) COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF HERBAL ....

The mean body weight of day-old chicks (BW<sub>0</sub>) had no significant differences among various experimental rations, while the body weight at subsequent weeks (BW<sub>1</sub>, BW<sub>2</sub>, BW<sub>3</sub>, BW<sub>4</sub> and BW<sub>6</sub>) differed significantly (P<0.05) with each other. At the end of 6<sup>th</sup> week the body weight of T<sub>3</sub> ration was higher than other treatment rations (Table 1). The body weight gain of birds supplemented with T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> ration was significantly (P<0.05) higher as compared to birds fed with T<sub>2</sub> ration. The body weight gain of birds fed with T<sub>4</sub> ration differed non-significantly with T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> rations. Body weight gain was apparently higher in birds fed with T<sub>3</sub> ration as compared to birds fed with T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> rations (Table 2). In present study, the significantly higher body weights and body weight gains in T<sub>3</sub> ration (combination of herbal and DL-methionine) clearly indicated the beneficial effects of combination of herbal and DL-methionine in improving the nutrient utilization required for growth of broilers. These results are in close agreement with those of Chattopadhyay *et al.* (2006), Halder

and Roy (2007), Kalbande *et al.* (2009) and Narayanswamy and Bhagwat (2010), who found higher body weight and body weight gain in birds supplemented with herbal methionine as compared to control birds. Contrary to this, Yuan *et al.* (2012) observed that the birds fed with synthetic methionine or DL-methionine group performed significantly better than other treatment groups.

**Feed Consumption and Feed Conversion Ratio:** The weekly mean feed consumption of the birds fed with  $T_1$  and  $T_3$  rations was significantly (P<0.05) higher than the birds fed with  $T_2$  and  $T_4$  rations (Table 3).

Tuoit	Treatment							
Iran	<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	$T_2$	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	5%			
FC <sub>1</sub>	$0.141 \pm 0.001$	$0.134 \pm 0.002$	$0.139 \pm 0.001$	$0.138 \pm 0.001$	NS			
FC <sub>2</sub>	$0.316^{ab} \pm 0.002$	$0.305^{a} \pm 0.004$	$0.327^{b} \pm 0.003$	$0.310^{a} \pm 0.005$	0.013			
FC <sub>3</sub>	$0.475^{tc} \pm 0.005$	$0.446^{a} \pm 0.008$	$0.495^{\circ} \pm 0.006$	$0.456^{ab}\pm 0.007$	0.022			
FC <sub>4</sub>	$0.933^{\circ} \pm 0.008$	$0.691^{a} \pm 0.020$	$0.808^{b} \pm 0.019$	0.732 <sup>a</sup> ±0.017	0.053			
FC <sub>5</sub>	$1.070 \pm 0.030$	0.997±0.021	1.074±0.016	$1.036 \pm 0.016$	NS			
FC <sub>6</sub>	$0.949 \pm 0.027$	0.954±0.031	0.995±0.015	$0.960 \pm 0.041$	NS			
TFC <sub>0-4</sub>	$1.865^{\circ} \pm 0.010$	$1.576^{a} \pm 0.028$	$1.768^{b} \pm 0.021$	1.635 <sup>a</sup> ±0.022	0.069			
TFC <sub>5-6</sub>	2.018±0.055	1.951±0.046	2.069±0.006	1.996±0.045	NS			
TFC <sub>0-6</sub>	$3.883^{b} \pm 0.056$	$3.526^{a} \pm 0.072$	3.837 <sup>b</sup> ±0.022	3.630 <sup>a</sup> ±0.063	0.176			

Table 3. Weekly mean feed consumption at different ages (kg/bird/week) of broilers fed with different treatment rations

FC= feed consumption, TFC= total feed consumption, CD=critical difference, NS=non-significant. Means bearing uncommon superscripts within the row differ significantly between treatments (P<0.05).

The mean FCR of the birds with the combination of herbal methionine (50%) and DL-methionine (50%) was non-significantly lower than the birds fed with control ration (100% DL-methionine) (Table 4). Halder and Roy (2007) and Salome *et al.* (2010) observed that birds fed with DL-methionine supplemented diet showed significantly higher feed intake as compared to control and herbal methionine supplemented groups. Kumari *et al.* (2012) found non-significant difference in feed intake up to 6<sup>th</sup> week of age among DL-methionine supplemented group and DL-methionine + herbal methionine supplemented groups. The present findings on FCR, however, differed from those of Chattopadhyay *et al.* (2006), who observed significantly improved (P<0.01) FCR with supplementation of herbal methionine than control group. Halder and Roy (2007) reported improved feed conversion ratio in herbal and DL-methionine supplemented group as compared to control. Kalbande *et al.* (2009) and Yuan *et al.* (2012), however, reported significantly better FCR in DL-methionine supplemented group as compared to herbal methionine group.

Troit	Treatment							
ITalt	$T_1$	$T_2$	T <sub>3</sub>	T <sub>4</sub>	5%			
FCR <sub>0-1</sub>	$1.706^{b} \pm 0.04$	$1.460^{a}\pm0.06$	1.330 <sup>a</sup> ±0.09	1.435 <sup>a</sup> ±0.05	0.20			
FCR <sub>1-2</sub>	2.366±0.07	2.523±0.12	2.380±0.13	2.508±0.19	NS			
FCR <sub>2-3</sub>	1.603±0.05	$1.762 \pm 0.07$	1.697±0.08	1.824±0.03	NS			
FCR <sub>3-4</sub>	$2.130^{\circ} \pm 0.03$	$1.886^{b} \pm 0.06$	$1.736^{ab} \pm 0.03$	$1.684^{a}\pm0.07$	0.16			
FCR <sub>4-5</sub>	$2.267 \pm 0.06$	2.269±0.10	2.248±0.07	$2.284 \pm 0.07$	NS			
FCR <sub>5-6</sub>	$1.939 \pm 0.04$	2.023±0.02	2.155±0.11	1.983±0.08	NS			
FCR <sub>0-4</sub>	$1.959^{\circ} \pm 0.02$	$1.882^{bc} \pm 0.04$	$1.766^{a} \pm 0.02$	$1.804^{ab}\pm0.04$	0.11			
FCR <sub>4-6</sub>	2.097±0.01	2.140±0.06	2.194±0.06	2.127±0.07	NS			
FCR <sub>0-6</sub>	2.028±0.01	2.014±0.04	1.970±0.03	1.966±0.04	NS			

Table 4. FCR at different ages of broilers fed with different treatment rations

FCR= feed conversion ratio, CD=critical difference, NS=non-significant.

Means bearing uncommon superscripts within the row differ significantly between treatments (P<0.05).

**Livability:** Under the standard managemental practices of rearing, the livability in the birds fed with  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  ration was 100, 97.5, 97.5 and 100 per cent, respectively. It was observed that the mortality in the experimental birds was negligible suggesting that various treatments had no adverse effect on the livability of the birds. Similar findings were reported by Chattopadhyay *et al.* (2006), Kalbande *et al.* (2009) and Maksoud *et al.* (2010), who showed that methionine supplemented diet had no detrimental effect on livability.

**Economics:** Economics was calculated in terms of ROFC and EPEI. Return over feed cost (ROFC) was calculated considering the selling price of Rs. 72/kg live weight of birds and cost of broiler feed. Price (Rs./kg) for feed of broiler starter ration was 22.23, 22.05, 22.19 and 22.09 and broiler finisher ration 22.02, 21.84, 21.93 and 21.87 in T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> rations, respectively. Return over feed cost (Rs.) in the birds fed with T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> rations was found to be 55.24, 52.08, 58.92 and 56.82, respectively. The highest ROFC was found in the birds fed with T<sub>3</sub> ration followed by T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>. These findings are in agreement with those of Kumari *et al.* (2012), who reported that economics of raising broiler chickens was better in herbal methionine + DL-methionine supplemented group, while Halder and Roy (2007) reported highest net profit in herbal methionine supplemented group. The EPEI value during 0 to 6 weeks of age was highest in T<sub>3</sub> (235.14) than T<sub>1</sub> (230.44) followed by T<sub>4</sub> (230.31) and T<sub>2</sub> (207.49) ration. The higher EPEI values indicate higher average body weight, good livability and higher feed efficiency in stipulated number of days and thus give overall economics of the birds considering various important traits.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The broiler chicks fed on ration supplemented with combination of 50% herbal- and 50% DLmethionine showed a significantly greater body weight and body weight gain as compared to the chicks fed with other treatment rations. Feeding with combination of 50% DL-methionine and 50% herbal-methionine is more economical as compared to feeding of 100% DL-methionine, 100% herbal methionine and 125% herbal methionine in commercial broilers. Hence, the study concludes that 50% herbal and 50% DL-methionine can efficiently replace 100% DL-methionine to improve growth parameters in commercial broiler flock.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to Anand Agriculture University, Anand for providing necessary facilities for this research work.

# 2013) COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF HERBAL ....

## REFERENCES

Bender, D.A. (1975). *Amino Acid Metabolism*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed., John Wiley & Sons Ltd., New York, USA, pp: 112-142.

Bureau of Indian Standard (BIS) (1992). Nutrient requirements for poultry. In: *Animal Feeds and Feeding Stuffs* - Determination of Calcium and Magnesium in Mineral Supplements IS, 13574.

Chattopadhyay, K., Mondal, M.K. and Roy, B. (2006). Comparative efficacy of DL-methionine and herbal methionine on performance of broiler chicken. *Int. J. Poultry Sci.*, **5**(11): 1034-1039.

Halder, G. and Roy, B. (2007). Effect of herbal or synthetic methionine on performance, cost benefit ratio, meat and feather quality of broiler chicken. *Int. J. Agril. Res.*, **2**(12): 987-996.

Kalbande, V.H., Ravikanth, K., Maini, S. and Rekhe, D.S. (2009). Methionine supplementation options in poultry. *Int. J. Poultry Sci.*, **8**(6): 588-591.

Kumari, K., Tiwari, S.P., Nanda, S., Saxena, M.J., Ravikanth, K. and Maini, S. (2012). Studies on comparative efficacy of herbal amino acid (Methiorep) supplement with synthetic DL- methionine on broiler growth performance and carcass quality traits. *Int. J. Scientific and Res. Publ.*, **2**(8): 1-6.

Maksoud, A.A., Yan, F., Cerrate, S., Coto, C., Wang, Z. and Waldroup, P.W. (2010). Effect of arginine level and source and level of methionine on performance of broilers 0 to 18 days of age. *Int. J. Poultry Sci.*, **9**(1): 14-20.

Narayanswamy, H.D. and Bhagwat, V.G. (2010). Evaluating the efficacy of methionine supplementation options in commercial broiler chickens. *Poultry Line, March 5-7*, p. 1-4.

Salome, I., Dafwang, I. and Bawa, G.S. (2010). Evaluation of methiorep as a substitute for methionine in broiler diets. *Int. J. Poultry Sci.*, **9**(8): 809-812.

Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. (1995). *Statistical Methods*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, USA.

Swain, B.K. and Johri, F.S. (1999). Cost benefit analysis of broilers on diet incorporated with autoclaved high fibre ingredients and enzyme feed supplement. *Indian J. Poultry Sc.*, **34**(4): 400-402.

Yuan, J., Karimi, A.J., Goodgame, S.D., Lu, C., Mussini, F.J. and Waldroup, P.W. (2012). Evaluation of herbal methionine source in broiler diets. Int. J. Poultry Sci., **11**(4): 247-250.