Study on effects of different levels of yeast on growth performance and gut morphology of commercial broilers in Chittagong, Bangladesh



By:

**Chandan Nath** 

Roll no: 13/29; Reg No: 00955

Intern ID: 28

Session: 2012-2013

A report submitted in Partial satisfaction of the requirements for the

**Degree of** 

**Doctor of Veterinary Medicine** 

**Faculty of Veterinary Medicine** 

**Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University** 

Khulshi, Chittagong, Bangladesh

Study on effects of different levels of yeast on growth performance and gut morphology of commercial broilers in Chittagong, Bangladesh



Approved by:

# Professor Md Abdul Halim

**Department of Agricultural Economics and social sciences** 

# **Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine**

Chittagong veterinary and animal sciences university

Khulshi, Chittagong-4225, Bangladesh

September 2018

Table of content	ts
------------------	----

List of tablesivList of abbreviationsvABSTRACTviCHAPTER I7INTRODUCTION7CHAPTER II10MATERIALS AND METHODS102.1 Experimental site102.2 Experimental birds102.3 Layout of the experiment.102.4 Experimental diet102.5 Experimental diet112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis12CHAPTER II12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION164.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25BIOGRAPHY26	List of figures	iv
ABSTRACT.       vi         CHAPTER I       7         INTRODUCTION       7         CHAPTER II       10         MATERIALS AND METHODS.       10         2.1 Experimental site       10         2.2 Experimental site       10         2.3 Layout of the experiment.       10         2.4 Experimental diet.       10         2.5 Experimental diet.       10         2.6 Performance data       11         2.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight       11         2.8 Gut morphology of broiler.       11         2.9 Statistical analysis       11         CHAPTER II       12         RESULTS       12         CHAPTER IV       15         DISCUSSION       15         4.1 Feed intake of broilers       15         4.2 Body weight gain of broilers       15         4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers       16         4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers       16         4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	List of tables	iv
CHAPTER I7INTRODUCTION7CHAPTER II10MATERIALS AND METHODS102.1 Experimental site102.2 Experimental birds102.3 Layout of the experiment102.4 Experimental diet102.5 Experimental diet102.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER II12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers164.6 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.7 RESULTS15DISCUSSION154.8 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.9 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.1 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	List of abbreviations	v
INTRODUCTION7CHAPTER II10MATERIALS AND METHODS102.1 Experimental site102.2 Experimental birds102.3 Layout of the experiment102.4 Experimental diet102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers164.6 Sour morphology of broilers164.7 Dessing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.8 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.9 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER II.10MATERIALS AND METHODS102.1 Experimental site102.2 Experimental birds102.3 Layout of the experiment.102.4 Experimental diet102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	CHAPTER I	7
MATERIALS AND METHODS102.1 Experimental site102.2 Experimental birds102.3 Layout of the experiment102.4 Experimental diet102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	INTRODUCTION	7
2.1 Experimental site       10         2.2 Experimental birds       10         2.3 Layout of the experiment.       10         2.4 Experimental diet.       10         2.5 Experimental design       11         2.6 Performance data       11         2.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight       11         2.8 Gut morphology of broiler.       11         2.9 Statistical analysis       11         2.9 Statistical analysis       11         2.9 Statistical analysis       12         CHAPTER III       12         RESULTS       12         CHAPTER IV       15         DISCUSSION       15         4.1 Feed intake of broilers       15         4.2 Body weight gain of broilers       15         4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers       16         4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers       16         4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	CHAPTER II	10
2.2 Experimental birds.102.3 Layout of the experiment.102.4 Experimental diet.102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler.112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers164.6 CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	MATERIALS AND METHODS	10
2.3 Layout of the experiment.102.4 Experimental diet.102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler.112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.1 Experimental site	10
2.4 Experimental diet.102.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.2 Experimental birds	10
2.5 Experimental design112.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.3 Layout of the experiment	10
2.6 Performance data112.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.4 Experimental diet	10
2.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight112.8 Gut morphology of broiler112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.5 Experimental design	11
2.8 Gut morphology of broiler.112.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.6 Performance data	11
2.9 Statistical analysis11CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight	11
CHAPTER III12RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.8 Gut morphology of broiler	11
RESULTS12CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	2.9 Statistical analysis	11
CHAPTER IV15DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	CHAPTER III	12
DISCUSSION154.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	RESULTS	12
4.1 Feed intake of broilers154.2 Body weight gain of broilers154.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers164.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers164.5 Gut morphology of broilers17CHAPTER V18CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	CHAPTER IV	15
4.2 Body weight gain of broilers       15         4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers       16         4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers       16         4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	DISCUSSION	15
4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers       16         4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers       16         4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	4.1 Feed intake of broilers	15
4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers       16         4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	4.2 Body weight gain of broilers	15
4.5 Gut morphology of broilers       17         CHAPTER V       18         CONCLUSION       18         REFERENCES       19         ACKNOWLEDGEMENT       25	4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers	16
CHAPTER V	4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers	16
CONCLUSION18REFERENCES19ACKNOWLEDGEMENT25	4.5 Gut morphology of broilers	17
REFERENCES   19     ACKNOWLEDGEMENT   25	CHAPTER V	18
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	CONCLUSION	
	REFERENCES	19
BIOGRAPHY	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	25
	BIOGRAPHY	26

# List of figures

Figure 1: Mixing of feed ingredients	
Figure 2: Brooding of chicks	
Figure 3: Vaccination of birds	
Figure 4: Live weight and carcass weight measurement	
Figure 5: Gut morphology of broilers	

# List of tables

Table 1:YCW components with their molecular weight and degree of pe	olymerisation
(DP)	8
Table 2 :Layout of the experiment	10
Table 3:Feed intake (FI), body weight gain (BWG) and feed conversion ra	tio (FCR) of
broiler fed diets formulated with yeast from (1-35 days)	12
Table 4: Effect of yeast on dressing and relative weights of different internal or	rgans in birds
at 5 weeks of age	13
Table 5: Gut morphology of broilers	14

# List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Elaboration
YCW	Yeast cell wall
gm.	Gram
μm	micrometer
N	Frequency number
DP	Degree of polymerisation
FCR	Feed conversion ratio
Kg	kilogram

#### ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to investigate the effect of diets formulated with different levels of Saccharomyces yeast on growth and gut morphology of broilers. Day-old broiler chicks of either sex (Cobb 500; n= 240) were distributed randomly into 4 (four) dietary treatments, each replicated three times, twenty birds per replicate in a completely randomized block design. Birds were reared in an open-sided housing condition with similar feeding, lighting and environmental management condition up to 35 days. Data were collected for feed intake and body weight and body weight gain and feed conversion ratio were calculated. Dressing percentage, organ weight and gut morphology of birds were measured at the end of the experiment. At 35 days of age, two birds from each replicate were sacrificed after 12 hours of fasting and samples of ileum and jejunum were taken. Result indicated that use of yeast had no significant effect (P < 0.05) on feed intake and body weight of broiler. Effect of different treatments on feed conversion ratio (FCR) of broilers differed significantly at 3rd week of age (P < 0.05). Highest dressing percentage (72.44%) was found in the broilers that received 2 % yeast treated diet but it did not differ significantly. No adverse effect was observed with respect weights of different organs of birds fed yeast. However, significantly highest liver weight (3.92 gm.) was obtained in the birds fed 2.5% yeast. In present study, no significant differences were found in the villus height, crypt depth and muscularis height with increasing level of yeast supplementation where birds fed 2% yeast had the highest mean value. Finally, it was concluded that using of 2% yeast in poultry diet would be advantageous for better growth performance of broilers without any detrimental effects.

Key words: Broiler, Yeast, Gut morphology, Growth performance

## **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Bangladesh is an agriculture based country and about 60% of her population is directly or indirectly related to agricultural activities. At present agriculture sector contributes about 22% of GDP of the country (BBS, 2009). Peoples are getting relatively cheaper source of animal protein in the form of broiler meat. So, broiler farming has become one of the major poultry industries in Bangladesh. In terms of cost, feed is the most important input for poultry production, and the availability of low-priced, high-quality feeds is critical for the expansion of the poultry industry. There is a major demand to produce high quality poultry meat at low price without relying on antibiotics and other drugs in poultry feed and water. One of the major challenges faced by poultry industry in the developing world is the issue of improving efficiency of production. In an attempt to address this issue, series of efforts have been made by researchers.

Saccharomyces cerevisiae, is a unicellular yeast that has been developed to use in animal feeds (Rosen, 2007). Broiler production can be improved by maintaining the intestinal integrity with the inclusion of yeast in their diets (Baurhoo *et al.*, 2007). Typically, the yeast cell wall (YCW) is composed of  $\beta$ -glucans, mannoproteins, and chitin with varying degrees of polymerisation, as presented in Table 1. YCW components can vary depending upon growth conditions, time of harvesting (Klis *et al.*, 2006) and most importantly, strains of yeast. In general, baker's yeast is used for producing high quality  $\beta$ -glucans with good therapeutic applications (Kim *et al.*, 2007). It is a probiotic as well as a fermenter could be used to improve feed quality and/or enhance feed nutrient utilization of broilers. Probiotics acting as bioregulators of the intestinal microflora and reinforcing the host's natural altitude defenses. Mannan-oligosaccharides are thought to block the attachment of pathogenic bacteria to the animal's intestine and colonization that may result in disease, while acting as a nutrient to other beneficial bacteria.

Macromolecules	Cell wall mass (%, dry weight) <sup>a</sup>	Mean molecular weight,
		kDa (DP)
Mannoproteins	35–40	Highly variable
1,3 β-Glucan	50-55	240(1500)
1,6 β-Glucan	5-10	24(150)
Chitin	2	25(120)

# Table 1: YCW components with their molecular weight and degree of polymerisation (DP)

a = Kwiatkowski et al., 2009.

Benefits of YCW  $\beta$ -glucans in poultry production can be partially attributed to enhanced proliferation and phagocytosis by avian macrophages and heterophils (Lowry *et al.*, 2005). Furthermore, YCW  $\beta$ -glucans can enhance broiler performance under unhygienic conditions through increases in villi height, uniformity and integrity, leading to improved intestinal function and gut health (Yang *et al.*, 2007).

Shareef and Al-Dabbagh (2009) showed that body weight gain were significantly (P<0.05) increased in the treatments having yeast at a rate of 1, 1.5 and 2%, compared with the control diet. These birds also had a significantly (P<0.05) higher feed intake and feed conversion ratio than others.

Adebiyi *et al.* (2012) conducted a experiment on ninety six day-old broiler chicks allotted to four dietary treatments in a completely randomized design. Each treatment had 3 replicates and there were eight birds per replicate. T1 (control), T2 (1g/kg yeast supplementation), T3 (1.25g/kg yeast supplementation), T4 (1.5g/kg yeast supplementation) were fed to the birds on each treatment. No significant differences were observed in the weight gain of the birds in the treatments. However, bird's fed T2 had the least significant feed conversion ratio (2.10kg) when compared with their counterparts on the T1 (2.34kg). The analysis of the ileum and jejunum showed that the villus height, crypt depth, mucosa height and area of crypt gland of birds fed T4 increased significantly (p<0.05) compared with birds fed T1. Dietary inclusion of yeast culture at1.5g/kg increased the growth performance and improved intestinal morphology and nutrient absorption.

Feeds containing no chemical additives are increasingly used in poultry nutrition. Since antibiotic growth promoters have been discredited by consumer associations, there has been an increasing trend in formulating diets without supplementation of synthetic drugs and chemical additives and many scientists are dedicated in finding natural alternatives to replace antibiotics as growth promoters (Langhout, 2000). Some studies have confirmed that the effects of yeast culture could be an alternative to antibiotic-based drugs in feed for broiler chicks (Stanley *et al.*, 2004). *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* also known "baker's yeast" is one of the most widely commercialized species and one of the effective adsorbents which is rich in crude protein (40-45%) and also rich in vitamin B complex, biotin, niacin, pantothenic acid and thiamin and its biological value is high. Whole yeast products or yeast cell wall components have been used to improve growth and affect the physiology, morphology and microbiology of the intestinal tract of turkeys and broiler chicks (Morales-Lopez *et al.*, 2009). Based on this background the main aim of the study was to investigate the effect of yeast on performance and gut condition of broiler chicks.

## **CHAPTER II**

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### 2.1 Experimental site

The experiment was conducted at a contract broiler farm, Nandir hat, Chittagong, Bangladesh. The experiment was done under the supervision of Department of Dairy and Poultry Science, CVASU.

#### 2.2 Experimental birds

A total of 240 day-old broiler chicks (Cobb 500) of either sex (Source: M. M. Agha Ltd., Chittagong, Bangladesh) was procured from a commercial dealers, and reared up to 35 days in an open-sided housing system to conduct the experiment.

#### 2.3 Layout of the experiment

Day-old broiler chicks (n=240) were randomly distributed into four dietary treatments, each treatment was replicated three times. 20 birds per replicate were used in a completely randomized block design. The layout of the experiment is given in **Table 2**.

Dietary treatments	Replications			Total no. of birds
	R1	R2	R3	
T1	20	20	20	60
$T_2$	20	20	20	60
T <sub>3</sub>	20	20	20	60
$T_4$	20	20	20	60
Total Number	80	80	80	Grand Total=240

#### Table 2 : Layout of the experiment

T1= Control (no yeast), T<sub>2</sub>= 2 % yeast, T<sub>3</sub> = 2.5 % yeast and T<sub>4</sub>= 3 % yeast

#### 2.4 Experimental diet

Three experimental diets (Diet 1, Diet 2, Diet 3 and Diet 4) were formulated with maize, full fat soya, rice polish, soybean oil as energy sources; soybean meal, meat and bone meal as protein sources along with micro-nutrients to meet or exceed the NRC recommendations. Diet 1 has considered as control, Diet 2 contained 2 %, Diet 3 contained 2.5 % and Diet 4 contained 3 % yeast. These diets were fed to the birds as mash form at *adlibitum* from day1 to 35 days. Starter diets were offered to the birds from 1st to 15th days, and then finisher diets were used for rest of the trial period. All diets were made iso-caloric and iso-nitrogenous.

#### 2.5 Experimental design

The experiment was performed by a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) consisting of four dietary treatments. The chicks were randomly divided into 4 groups consisting 3 replications in each group and were assigned to different treatments as shown in table 3.1. Twenty birds were allotted to each replication.

#### 2.6 Performance data

Live weight, body weight gain, feed intake and feed conversion ratio were weekly determined. Carcass weight, organs weight and dressing percentage etc. were recorded at 35 days.

#### 2.7 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight

The dressing percentage of broilers was calculated as follows:

Dressing percentage  $\% = \{(Dressed weight \div Body weight) \ge 100\}$ 

Chicks in all treatments were killed at the end of the experiment for blood collection and liver, gizzard, heart, spleen and proventriculus were collected, weighed, and calculated as a percentage of live body weight. Shank length and width were also recorded.

#### 2.8 Gut morphology of broiler

At 35 days of age, two birds from each replicate were sacrificed after 12 hours of fasting and samples of ileum and jejunum were taken. The specimens were fixed in 10% formalin after which they were dehydrated in 100% ethanol. The specimens were then cleared with xylene and embedded in paraffin. A microtome was used to make 5mm cuts that were mounted on glass slides and stained following the H and E (Haematoxyline and Eosin) method. Five readings each of villus height and crypt depth were taken per specimen. This was done with a light microscope (Olympus). Villus height was measured from the apical to the basal region which corresponded to the superior portion of the crypts. Crypts were measured from the basis until the region of transition between the crypt and the villus.

#### 2.9 Statistical analysis

Data were incorporated in Microsoft excel sheet (2007). Data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA of SPSS v.16 for windows and least square means were compared by Duncan's Multiple Range Test. All statements of differences were based on probability <0.5 or better.

# **CHAPTER III**

# RESULTS

**Table 3** shows live performance of experimental birds. The results showed that use of yeast had no significant effect (P < 0.05) on feed intake of broiler. No significant differences were observed in weight gain of the birds fed on different dietary treatments. Highest body weight gain (440.63 gm.) was found in dietary treatment 2 at marketing stage which was not significant. Effect of four treatments on feed conversion ratio (FCR) of broilers significantly differed at  $3^{rd}$  week of age (P<0.05). Improved FCR (1.62) were obtained in dietary treatment 2 at 5 weeks of age.

Parameters	Age	<b>Dietary Treatments (Mean ± SE)</b>				
		Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	value
Feed intake	1-7	147±7.57	140±6.78	154±8.46	$148 \pm 10.14$	0.72
(gm/day)	8-14	294±14.65	282±4.59	$289 \pm 0.67$	$304 \pm 8.83$	0.42
	15-21	527±51.57	517±4.50	539±18.24	484±81.93	0.87
	22-28	590±11.59	522±13.24	644±33.7	$604 \pm 60.85$	0.19
	29-35	781±32.31	708±12.24	684±16.94	766±39.86	0.10
Body	1-7	$88 \pm 7.00$	92±3.64	93±2.06	91±1.55	0.89
weight gain	8-14	152±12.15	142±2.66	170±9.49	157±6.58	0.19
(gm / day)	15-21	328±17.33	339±12.63	296±14.55	$283 \pm 9.88$	0.06
	22-28	374±12.74	325±20.32	343±19.68	$246 \pm 37.46$	0.58
	29-35	425±18.79	440±26.38	380±14.99	420±36.06	0.43
FCR(Feed	1-7	$1.66 \pm 0.06$	$1.51 \pm 0.05$	1.67±0.12	$1.63 \pm 0.09$	0.58
Gain)	8-14	$1.94 \pm 0.09$	$1.77 \pm 0.06$	1.71±0.09	1.93±0.03	0.15
	15-21	$1.69 \pm 0.07^{b}$	$1.53 \pm 0.05^{b}$	$1.81 \pm 0.09^{b,c}$	1.88±0.04°	0.03
	22-28	$1.76 \pm 0.08$	$1.62 \pm 0.12$	$1.90 \pm 0.05$	$1.82\pm0.09$	0.23
	29-35	$1.84 \pm 0.04$	$1.62 \pm 0.08$	$1.80 \pm 0.05$	1.83±0.06	0.09

Table 3: Feed intake (FI), body weight gain (BWG) and feed conversion ratio (FCR) of broiler fed diets formulated with yeast from (1-35 days)

[Data represent means  $\pm$  SE of 9 birds per replicate group at day 35; D<sub>1</sub>= Control (no yeast),

 $D_2=2$  % yeast,  $D_3=2.5$  % yeast and  $D_4=3$  % yeast, <sup>a,b</sup>Means bearing alphabet not in common within a row differed significantly at P<0.05].

Dressing percentage did not significantly differ (P<0.05) in the group of birds fed different levels of yeast. But, highest dressing percentage (72.44%) was shown in the birds having 2 % yeast treated diet. No adverse effects on various organs relative weights were noted in birds of all treatments (Table 4). In this study, significantly higher liver weight (3.92%) was obtained in the birds fed 2.5% yeast. On the other hand, relative weight of all internal organs was increased due to supplementation of 2.5% yeast in diet.

Parameters	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	P value
Dressing	68.57±0.62	72.44±3.81	69.57±0.69	70.30±0.60	0.59
Percentage					
Liver	$3.56{\pm}0.05^{a,b}$	$3.72 \pm 0.07^{b}$	$3.92 \pm 0.12^{b}$	$3.29{\pm}0.16^{a}$	0.02
Spleen	$0.25 \pm 0.02$	$0.17 \pm 0.03$	$0.27 \pm 0.05$	0.21±0.03	0.22
Heart	$0.84 \pm 0.06$	$0.90{\pm}0.01$	$1.09 \pm 0.08$	$0.89{\pm}0.05$	0.07
Gizzard	3.24±0.40	3.06±0.10	$3.40 \pm 0.44$	2.92±0.12	0.72
Proventriculus	$0.87 \pm 0.09$	$0.84 \pm 0.06$	0.97±0.15	$0.89 \pm 0.08$	0.80
Shank length	1.61±0.23	$1.81 \pm 0.01$	$1.79 \pm 0.06$	$1.82 \pm 0.03$	0.50
Shank width	$0.53 \pm 0.11$	$0.56 \pm 0.02$	$0.63 \pm 0.05$	$0.47 \pm 0.03$	0.37

 Table 4: Effect of yeast on dressing and relative weights of different internal organs in birds at 5 weeks of age

[Data represent means± SE of 9 birds per replicate group at day 35;  $D_1$ = Control (no yeast),  $D_2$ = 2 % yeast,  $D_3$  = 2.5 % yeast and  $D_4$ = 3 % yeast, <sup>a,b</sup>Means bearing different superscripts not in common within a row differ significantly at P<0.05].

**Table 5** shows the gut morphological indices of broilers fed different levels of yeast. In our findings no significant differences were found in villus height, crypt depth and muscularis height with increasing level of yeast supplementation although birds fed diet 2 had the highest mean value for villus height and crypt depth. However, the result for the muscularis thickness showed that birds fed diet 4 had the highest mean for ileum (37.16  $\mu$ m). From this result, it may be deduced that increase in the villus height suggests an increased surface area capable of greater absorption of available nutrients (Caspary, 1992).

	Parameter s (µm)	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	P value
	Villus height	194.51±10.41	231.71±10.32	180.75±17.27	158.29±9.34	0.09
Ileum	Crypt depth	168.65±11.08	194.05±21.38	134.04±22.82	140.21±16.72	0.16
	Muscularis thickness	31.70±8.03	29.23±2.23	32.99±4.56	37.16±2.37	0.72
	Villus height	359.36±26.66	377.65±26.38	347.30±38.09	341.03±21.85	0.82
Jejunum	Crypt depth	266.49±38.76	282.60±15.86	209.20±37.25	243.73±28.56	0.43
	Muscularis thickness	32.40±2.31	31.54±4.16	26.47±2.55	30.73±3.18	0.57

# Table 5: Gut morphology of broilers

# CHAPTER IV DISCUSSION

The huge potential of good quality food in promoting and maintaining adequate health has set the tone of research in the area of food for health world-wide (Kapila *et al.*, 2006). There are also a few sound data about the impact of probiotics on metabolic functions of the host (Mikelsaar *et al.*, 2009). Probiotics are mainly represented by mannanoligosaccharides and fructo-oligosaccharides present in the cell wall of yeasts, such as *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. They exert their action by maintaining or reestablishing the conditions of eubiosis in the digestive tract, and thus, maintaining a normal microbial flora and balanced gastrointestinal tract (Santin *et al.*, 2001). Addition of probiotic to broiler feed resulted in significant improvement concerning hematobio-chemical parameters (Agawane *et al.*, 2004).

### 4.1 Feed intake of broilers

The results showed that feed intake did not significantly (P<0.05) differ between dietary treatment of broiler. This is in agreement with the findings of Al-Monsour *et al.* (2011) but contradicted to the findings of Shareef and Al-Dabbagh (2009) who reported that level of yeast significantly affect feed intake during the first three weeks of life. However, feed intake was found higher (781.50 gm) in control group (Diet 1) at 5 weeks of age which was not significant. This is in accordance with the findings of Saied *et al.* (2011) but contradictory with the findings of Adebiyi *et al.* (2012) and Gao *et al.* (2008). Adebiyi *et al.* (2012) and Gao *et al.* (2008) stated that birds supplemented with yeast consumed more and grew faster than broilers given feed without yeast.

#### 4.2 Body weight gain of broilers

Result represents that no significant differences were observed in the values of the weight gain of the birds fed on the different dietary treatments. This is in agreement with the findings of Al-Mansour *et al.* (2011). The authors reported that yeast levels did not significantly affect body weight gain at first three weeks of life. Al-Monsour *et al.* (2011) also reported that body weight gain increased by the addition of yeast which was not statistically different between groups over the 42 day experimental period.

#### 4.3 Feed conversion ratio of broilers

The FCR of broiler chickens for the entire duration of the experiment were determined. Result showed that the effect of four diets on feed conversion ratio (FCR) of broilers significantly differed (P< 0.05) at  $3^{rd}$  week of age. A significant improvement in FCR (1.53) was obtained in diet 2 at 3rd week of age. This is in agreement with the findings of Shareef and Al-Dabbagh (2009) who reported that addition of 1 % yeast on broiler ration significantly increased the FCR of broilers at 21 days of age. Author reported that baker yeast (Saccharomyces cerevisiae) supplementation of broilers, at the level of 1%, significantly (P<0.05), increased feed conversion efficiency, compared with control group and group added to its diet 0.5 % baker's yeast. Aluwong et al. (2012) found FCR 1.14 to1.18 for Marshall Broiler chickens at 42 days of age supplemented with 1.5 and 2.0% dietary Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Gao et al. (2008) reported that dietary supplemental yeast at 2.5g/kg improves feed conversion and average daily gain during grower and overall periods. But, Al-Monsour et al. (2011) reported that yeast level did not significantly affect FCR during the first three weeks of life. Probiotics act by reducing the feed conversion, thereby resulting in an increase of the daily live weight gain (Nilson et al., 2004). Improvement in FCR might be due to efficient ileal digestibility of nutrients (Pelicia et al., 2004). Bansal et al. (2011) reported significant and better weekly feed conversion efficiency on probiotic supplementation in the diet of commercial broiler chicks.

#### 4.4 Dressing percentage and relative organs weight of broilers

The results showed that use of yeast had no significant effect (P<0.05) on dressing percentage of broiler. This finding was not similar to the findings of Gheisari and Kholeghipour (2005). They stated that treatments containing 0.3% powdery yeast had a higher dressing's percentage when compared with control. There was no adverse effect on various organs relative weights in birds of all treatments (Table 4). Highest liver weight was found in the birds fed 2.5% yeast. However, Rezaeipour *et al.* (2012) revealed that dietary yeast had no effect on carcass characteristics. On the other hand, Paryad and Mahmoudi (2008) stated that addition of dietary yeast at all levels improve carcass characteristics of broilers. These different results may be due to dose or kind of yeast used, strain of broilers, basal diet or environmental conditions. The beneficial effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is

attributed to the fact that it is a naturally rich source of proteins, minerals and B-complex vitamins (Davis *et al.* 1976).

#### 4.5 Gut morphology of broilers

In our study no significant differences were recorded in villus height, crypt depth and thickness of muscularis with increasing level of yeast where birds fed diet 2 had the highest mean value. Greater villus height increases the activity of enzymes secreted from the tip of the villi resulting in improved digestibility (Hampson, 1986). Cell wall components of yeast may provide a protective function to mucosa by preventing pathogens from binding to villi and allowing fewer antigens to be in contact with the villi. Taller villi indicate more mature epithelia and enhance absorptive function due to increased absorptive area of the villus. It may therefore be stated that adding supplemental yeast to the diets of broiler birds at 2% will improve the performance gut integrity and nutrient utilization.

# **CHAPTER V**

## **CONCLUSION**

Although various levels of yeast had no significant effect on growth performance of experimental bird but it can be concluded that 2% yeast can improve the FCR of broilers without detrimental effects on performance indices of broiler chickens. No adverse effects on various organs relative weights were noted in birds of all treatments but significantly higher liver weight (3.92%) was obtained in the broilers fed 2.5% yeast. More research is, however, required in both experimental and field conditions to confirm this conclusion.

### REFERENCES

- Adebiyi OA, Makanjuola BA, Bankole TO and Adeyori AS. 2012. Yeast culture (Saccharomyces cerevisae) supplementation: effect on the performance and gut morphology of broiler birds. Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Biological Sciences. 12 (6): 32-36.
- Agawane SB and Lonkar PS. 2004. Effect of probiotic containing *Saccharomyces boudandii* on experimental ochratoxicosis in broilers: hematobiochemical studies. Journal of Veterinary Science. 5: 359-367.
- Al-Mansour S, Al-khalf A, Al-Homidan and Fathi MM. 2011. Feed efficiency and blood hematology of broiler chicks given a diet supplemented with yeast culture. International Journal of Poultry Science. 10 (8): 603-607.
- Aluwong T, Raji MAB, Hassan BF, Kawu MU, and Ayo JO. 2012. Effect of different levels of supplemental yeast on performance indices and serum biochemistry of broiler chickens. The Open Conference Proceedings Journal. (Suppl 1-M7): 41-45.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS). 2009. Statistical Yearbook 2009. Document available at: <u>www.bbs.gov.bd</u>.
- Bansal GR, Singh VP and Sachan N. 2011. Effect of probiotic supplementation on the performance of broilers. Asian Journal of Animal Science. 5: 277-284.
- Baurhoo, B, Phillip, L and Ruiz-Feria CA. 2007. Effects of purified lignin and mannan oligosaccharides on intestinal integrity and microbial populations in the ceca and litter of broiler chickens. Poultry Science. 86: 1070-1078.
- Caspary WF. 1992. Physiology and pathophysiology of intestinal absorption. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 55: 299S- 308S.
- Chowdhury SR, Smith TK, Boermans HJ and Woodward B. 2005. Effects of feed-borne fusarium mycotoxins on hematology and immunology of laying hens. Journal of Poultry Science. 84: 1841-1850.

Coles EH. Veterinary clinical pathology 4th Ed. WB Saunders Company, Washington. USA.

Davis P. Single cell protein. 2nd Ed. Academic press. New York, USA. 1976.

- Feldman FB, Zinki GJ and Jain CN. 2000. Schalm's Veterinry Haematology. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Lippincott Willams and Wilkins, Baltimore, Maryland, USA. P. 1344.
- Gao J, Zhang HJ, Yu SH, Wu SG, Yoon I, Quigley J, Gao YP and Qi GH. 2009. Effects of yeast culture in broiler diets on performance and immunomodulatory functions. Journal of Poultry Science. 87: 1377-1384.
- Gheisari AA and Kholeghipour B. 2005. Effect of dietary inclusion of level yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) on growth performance, immune responses and blood parameters of broiler chickens. Thesis, Azad University, Iran.
- Gross WB, Siegel HS. 1983. Evaluation of the heterophil/lymphocyte ratio as a measure of stress in chickens. Avian Disease. 27(4): 972-979.
- Hampson DJ, 1986. Alterations in piglet small intestinal structure at weaning. Research in Veterinary Science. 40: 32-40.

http://www.fao.org/english/newsroom/news/2002/7833-en. html on 19/04/09.

- Kapila S and VibhaSinha PR. 2006. Antioxidative and hypocholesterolemic effect of *Lactobacillus caseisppcasei* (biodefensive properties of lactobacilli). Indian Journal of Medical Science. 60: 361-370.
- Kim YH, Kang SW, Lee JH, Chang HL, Yun CW, Paik HD, Kang CW and Kim SW. 2007. High density fermentation of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* jul 3 in fed-batch culture for the production of β-glucan. Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry. 13: 153-158.
- Klis FM, Boorsma A. and De Groot PWJ. 2006. Cell wall construction in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Yeast. 23: 185-202.
- Kwiatkowski S, Thielen U, Glenny P and Moran C. 2009. A study of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cell wall glucans, The Institute of Brewing & Distilling. 115 (2): 151-158.
- Langhout P. 2000. New additives for broiler chickens. World Poultry. 16 (3): 22-27.
- Lowry VK, Farnell MB, Ferro PJ, Swaggerty CL, Bahl A and Kogut MH. 2005. Purified βglucan as an abiotic feed additive up-regulates the innate immune response in immature chickens against *Salmonella enterica* serovar Enteritidis. International Journal of Food Microbiology. 98: 309-318.
- Mayor CS. 2010. High blood Protein Retreived from mhtml:file://H:/Other files/High blood protein-MayoClinicp-com.mht.

- Mikelsaar M and Zilmer M. 2009. *Lactobacillus fermentum* ME-3-an antimicrobial and antioxidative probiotic. Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease. 21: 1-27.
- Morales-Lopez R, Auclair E, Garcia F, Esteve-Garcia E. and Brufau J. 2009. Use of yeast cell walls; -1, 3/1, 6-glucans; and mannoproteins in broiler chicken diets. Poultry Science. 88: 601-607.
- Nilson A, Peralta JMF and Miazzo RD. 2004. Use of brewer's yeast (*S. cerevisiae*) to replace part of the vitamin mineral premix in finisher broiler diets. XXII World poultry Congress, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Onifade AA, Odunsi AA, Babatunde GM, Olorede BR and Muma E. 1999. Comparison of the supplemental effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and antibiotics in low-protein and high-fiber diets fed to broiler chicken. Archives of Animal Nutrition. 52: 29-39.
- Osman N, Adawi D, Ahme S, Jeppsson B and Molin C. 2007. Endotoxin- and Dgalactosamine-induced liver injury improved by the administration of *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobactrerium* and blueberry. Digestive and Liver Disease. 39: 849-856.
- Panda AK, Reedy MR, Rama Rao SV, Raju MVLN and Praharaj NK. 2000. Growth, carcass characteristics, immunocompetence and response to *Escherichia coli* of broilers fed diets with various levels of probiotic. 64(4): 152-15.
- Paryad A, Mahmoudi M. 2008. Effect of different levels of supplemental yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) on performance, blood constituents and carcass characteristics of broiler. <u>African journal of agricultural research</u>. 3(12): 835-842.
- Pelicia K, Mendes AA, Saldanha ES, Piazzolante C and Takahanshi S. 2004. Probiotic and prebiotic utilization in diets for free range broiler chickens. Brazillian Journal of Poultry Science. 92: 99-104.
- Piccione G, Francesco F, Elisabetta G, Fortunata G and Massimo M. 2005. Nycthemeral change of some haematological parameters in horses. Journal of Applied Biomedicine. 3(3): 123–128.
- Rezaeipour V, Fononi H, Irani M. 2012. Effects of dietary L-threonine and Saccharomyces cerevisiae on performance, intestinal morphology and immune response of broiler chickens. SA J Anim Sci., 42: 266-273.
- Rosen GD. 2007. Holo-analysis of the efficacy of bio-mos® in broiler nutrition. British Poultry Science. 48: 21-26.

- Santin E, Maiorka A, Macari M, Grecco M, Sanchez JC, Okada TM and Myasaka AM. 2001. Performance and intestinal mucosa development of broiler chickens fed diets containing *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cell wall. Journal of Applied Poultry Research.10: 236-244.
- Shareef AM and Al-Dabbagh ASA. 2009. Effect of probiotic (*Sachharomyces cerevisiae*) on performance of broiler chicks. Journal of Iraq Veterinary Sciences. 23(1): 23-29.
- Stanley VG, Gray C, Daley M, Krueger WF and Sefton AE. 2004. An alternative to antibiotic-based drugs in feed for enhancing performance of broilers grown on *Eimeria*. Poultry Science. 83: 39-44.
- Yalcin S, Uzunoglu K, Duyum HM and Eltan O. 2012. Effects of dietary yeast autolysate (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) and black cumin seed (*Nigella sativa* L.) on performance, egg traits, some blood characteristics and antibody production of laying hens. Livestock Science.145: 13-20.
- Yang Y, Iji PA, Kocher A, Mikkelsen LL and Choct M. 2007. Effects of mannanoligosaccharide on growth performance, the development of gut microflora, and gut function of broiler chickens raised on new litter. The Journal of Applied Poultry Research. 16: 280-288.

# FIGURES



Figure 1: Mixing of feed ingredients



Figure 2: Brooding of chicks



Figure 3: Vaccination of birds



Figure 4: Live weight and carcass weight measurement



Figure 5: Gut morphology of broilers

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is ever grateful and indebted to the Almighty God without whose grace it would have never been possible to pursue this study in this field of science and to complete this Clinical report writing for the Degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM).

The author would like to thanks his reverend and beloved teacher and supervisor Professor M A Halim, Dept. of Agriculture Economics and social sciences, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University for his valuable advice, suggestions and kind co-operation during the study period.

The author expresses his sincere gratitude and gratefulness to, DR. Babu Kanti Nath, Assistant professor, Dept. Of Dairy and poultry science, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University for his valuable advice, inspiration, cordial co-operation, and valuable suggestion during the study period.

The author would like to thanks to the Director of External affairs, Professor Dr. AKM Saifuddin, Dept. of Physiology, Biochemistry and Pharmacology, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University for his suggestion.

#### The Author

### **BIOGRAPHY**

I am Chandan nath, from Chittagong. I completed my Secondary School Certificate (SSC) examination in 2009 with GPA-5 from S A Noor High School, Patiya, Chittagong and Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) examination in 2011 with GPA 5.00 from Chittagong Govt. City College, Chittagong. Currently I have been doing my internship programme which is the compulsory of DVM programme under the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal



Sciences University. My favorite hobby is reading books. I feel much interest in exploring new techniques for contributing in development of veterinary field in Bangladesh.