

The Effect of Expired Milk Substitution in Feed on Nutrient Digestibility and Growth of Native Chickens

I. Made Nuriyasa*, I Putu Ari Astawa**, & I Gusti Lanang Oka Cakra***

Faculty of Animal Science, Udayana University, Jalan PB Soedirman, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study used 200 native chickens. The experimental design used was a completely randomized design (CRD), with initial body weight of chicken 89 g \pm 2.11g. The experiment used 5 treatment groups and 4 replications, each experimental unit used 10 native chickens. The treatments in this experiment were feed without substitution of expired milk (A); feed with 5% substituted expired milk (B); feed with 10% expired milk (C); feed with 15% expired milk supplementation (D); feed with 20% expired milk substitution (E). The study found that substituted expired milk in feed had no effect on feed digestibility. Expired milk substitution to the level of 10% in the feed did not affect the performance of native chickens (P>0.05) but the substitution of 15% and 20% decreased (P<0.05) performance. It can be concluded that expired milk can be used in native chicken rations to the level of 10% without reducing growth of native chicken.

KEYWORDS: digestibility, growth native chicken, substitution of expired milk

INTRODUCTION

Fish meal and soybean meal are often used as a source of protein in animal feed, there is a problem because they are expensive and their use is competitive with other animals so they are often difficult to obtain. According to SNI (1996) good quality fish meal contains between 50-60% crude protein and is rich in essential amino acids, especially lysine and methionine. Irianto (2011) stated expired milk is milk that is no longer used or consumed by humans. It is also the remnants of powdered milk attached to the production process equipment or it can also be milk that has expired so that the nutritional levels are not much different from expired milk.

Cheap feed prices can be obtained by utilizing agro-industrial waste (expired milk) which is rich in nutrients so that it is hoped that the productivity of native chickens will not decrease with cheaper feed prices. In the Indonesian market the price of expired milk is 60% of the price of fish meal. Nuriyasa *et al.* (2018) found that the use of agro-industrial waste in animal feed resulted in a financial analysis that gave higher profits to farmers. Research by Puger *et al.* (2019) found that replacing 50 percent of fish meal with gold snail flour had no effect on weight gain and feed conversion for male Bali ducks.

Expired milk is one of the ingredients for native chicken that has not been explored for its potential. Based on the results of the proximate analysis of the Udayana, Indonesia Laboratory 2023, expired milk contains 3023.12 kcal/kg metabolized energy, 13.57% protein, 1.83% calcium, 0.13% phosphorus, 18.63% crude fat and 6.29% crude fiber. The components



of expired milk are macronutrients and micronutrients. Alim *et al.*(2012) stated macronutrients include protein, fat and lactose. The average macronutrient content of rejected milk per 100 g is 25.8% protein, 0.9% fat, 4.6% lactose. The levels of micronutrients in rejected milk are very complete, such as vitamins, minerals and amino acids. The vitamins contained in milk fat are vitamins A, D, E, K, while the vitamins that are soluble in milk are vitamin B complex, vitamin C, vitamin A and vitamin D. The most important soluble vitamins in milk are vitamin B1, B2, nicotinic acid, and pantothenic acid (vitamin B5). Minerals contained in milk are calcium, magnesium, phosphorus Substitution of expired milk in native chicken feed is expected to have no effect on productivity and reduce blood serum cholesterol content.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Animal, Experimental design, and management

A total of 200 male native chicken and weighed individually. Chicken were vaccinated according to the standard veterinary practices. The chicken were randomly distributed into 5 treatment groups (4 replicates with 10 chicken per replicate) using a completely randomized design. The treatments consisted of: A (basal diet without expired milk substitution). B (substitution of expired milk 5%), C (substitution of expired milk 10%), and D (substitution of expired milk 15%), E (substitution of 20% expired milk).

Feed Formulation

The feed was prepared from the following ingredients: yellow corn, coconut meal, fish flour, tapioca flour, expired milk, rice bran, coconut oil, NaCl, and mineral mix. The feed is made with the same energy content (2500 kcal/kg) and protein (14%), according to the SNI (2013) standard, as shown in Table 1.

| $C_{amposition}(0/)$ | Treatment | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Composition (%) | A | В | С | D | Е | | |
| Yellow Corn | 45 | 40 | 40 | 35 | 35 | | |
| Coconut Meal | 18 | 18 | 16.4 | 20 | 19 | | |
| Fish flour | 10 | 8.25 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6 | | |
| Tapioca flour | 4 | 6 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 | | |
| Rice Bran | 21.25 | 21 | 18 | 17.5 | 14 | | |
| Coconut oil | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Expired milk | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | | |
| NaCl | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | | |
| Mineral Mix | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | |
| Feed Nutrient Content | | | | | | | |
| Energy Metabolism | 2500.07 | 2504,.71 | 2504.08 | 2503.85 | 2503.16 | | |
| (Kcal/kg) | | | | | | | |
| Crude protein (%) | 14.02 | 14.01 | 13.99 | 14.04 | 14.03 | | |
| Calcium (%) | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.83 | | |

| Table 1 | Composition | of Feed | Ingredients | and | Nutrient | Content of | Experimental |
|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|-----|----------|------------|--------------|
| | Feed | | | | | | |



and Studies

| Phosphorus (%) | 0.53 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.42 | 0.41 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Fat (%) | 5.27 | 5.67 | 6.63 | 7.49 | 8.23 |
| Crude Fiber (%) | 4.40 | 4.70 | 5.77 | 5.31 | 5.76 |

Experimental Variables

Feed Digestibility

Nutrient digestibility was calculated by the total collection method, for 1 week. The excreta were collected and dried in the sun to air dry, then dried in an oven at a temperature of $(100 - 105^{\circ}C)$ for five hours until the excreta were dry. The energy content of excreta can be determined with a bomb calorimeter and protein excretion can be determined by Kjelldhal analysis. All treatment feeds were analyzed proximately to determine the energy and protein content. Dietary dry matter digestibility and nutrient digestibility were calculated by the formula:

$$\mathrm{KC} = \frac{\mathrm{(A-B)}}{\mathrm{A}} \times 100\%$$

Information : KC: nutrient digestibility (%) A : nutrient consumption (g) B : nutrients in feces (g)

Chicken Growth

Initial body weight is the weight of the animal before receiving treatment and the final weight is obtained from weighing the animal's weight at 8 weeks old. Weight gain was obtained by subtracting the final body weight from the weight at the beginning of the experiment. Feed consumption is calculated once a week, namely calculating the difference between the amounts of feed provided and the rest of the feed. Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR) is the ratio between the amounts of feed consumed and weight gain, in the same period of time.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results showed that the dry matter digestibility of feed in animals that received feed treatment without substitution of expired milk (A) was 75.51%, treatment of expired milk substitution was 5% (B), substitution of expired milk 10% (C), substitution of expired milk 15% (D) and 20% expired milk substitution (E) caused the dry matter digestibility to be 0.44%, 0.61%, 0.75%, and 0.77% lower but statistically not significantly different (P>0.05). The efficiency of converting GE to DE in animals that received treatment A was 85.77%, treatments B, C, D and E were 0.51%, 0.83%, 1.04% and 1.22% lower, respectively (P>0.05) compared to treatment A. Treatment A caused digestibility of crude protein 72.16%, treatments B, C, D and E caused digestibility of crude protein 0.15%, 0.28%, 1.73% and 1, 77% compared to treatment A but not significantly different (P>0.05).



| Table 2 | Nutrient Digestibility in Native Chickens fed with expired Milk Substitution |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | with Different Levels |

| Variabal | Treatment | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|--|--|
| Variabel | А | В | С | D | E | | |
| Dry Matter | 75.51±0.74 | 75.18±0.7 | $75.05 \pm .50^{a}$ | 74.98±1.0 | 74.93±0.4 | | |
| Digestibility (%) | а | 2 ^a | | 1 ^a | 0 ^a | | |
| Efficiency of | 85.77±1.06 | 85.33±0.8 | 85.05±0.2 | 84.88±0.1 | 84.72±0.5 | | |
| Converting GE to | а | 4 ^a | 7 ^a | 2^{a} | 1 ^a | | |
| DE (%) | | | | | | | |
| Crude Protein | 72.16±0.41 | 72.05±0.1 | 71.96±1.8 | 70.91±0.2 | 70.88±0.8 | | |
| Digestibility (%) | а | 6 ^a | 8 ^a | 6 ^a | 7 ^a | | |

Information: a.b (standard deviation) = similar letter notes means there is no significant difference at the Duncan test level has a value of 5% Bagiarta *et al.* (2017) stated that feed digestibility was influenced by crude fiber content. The higher the fiber, the lower the nutrient digestibility. All treatment feed contained crude fiber which was not much different, so it had no significant effect on feed digestibility. The results of the Puger and Nuriyasa research (2019) using fermented wine waste in ducks got the same results.

| Variable | Treatment | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| variable | A | В | С | D | Е | | | |
| Initial Weight | 82.9±0.19 ^a | 83.97±0.40 ^a | 82.98±0.13 ^a | 84.01±0.1 | 85.24±0.4 | | | |
| (g) | | | | 3 ^a | 9 ^a | | | |
| Final Weight | 1064.18±24. | 1058.84±25. | 1028.25±28. | 984.53 ± 8^{b} | 950.45±8. | | | |
| (g) | 2 ^d | 9 ^{cd} | 4 ^c | | 9 ^a | | | |
| Weight Gain | 17.54±0.43 ^d | 17.41±0.45 ^{cd} | 17.18±0.50 ^c | 16.07±0.1 | 15.44±0.1 | | | |
| (g/bird/day | | | | 2 ^b | 1 ^a | | | |
| Consumption | 49.94 ± 0.30^{d} | 46.35±0.34 ^c | 44.08 ± 0.40^{b} | 41.12±0.4 | 41.01±0.2 | | | |
| (g/bird/day) | | | | 9 ^a | 7 ^a | | | |
| Feed | 2.68 ± 0.7^{a} | 2.67 ± 0.8^{a} | 2.57 ± 0.8^{a} | 2.56±0.04 ^a | 2.66±0.03 ^a | | | |
| Conversion | | | | | | | | |
| Ratio | | | | | | | | |

 Table 3
 Grwth of native chickens fed with expired milk substitution at Level

 Different

Information: a.b (standard deviation) = similar letter notes means there is no significant difference at the Duncan test level has a value of 5%

The body weight of native chickens at the beginning of the study ranged from 82.98g to 85.24g which statistically showed no significant difference (P>0.05). This indicates that the weight of the chickens at the beginning of the study was homogeneous. The body weight of native chickens at the end of the study (age 10 weeks) was highest in A treatment, which was 1064.18g. The body weight of chickens at the end of the study that received treatments B and C were 0.51% and 3.38% lower, respectively, but statistically not significantly different



(P>0.05) compared to treatment A. Treatments D and E were 7 ,84% and 10.68% lower (P<0.05) than treatment A. Fish meal is a palatable protein source for poultry and has a high content of essential amino acids, especially lysine, cystine, methionine, and thriptophan (NRC, 1994). Research results McDonald *et al.* (1995) found that fish meal has high minerals (100-200 grams/kg) such as calcium, manganese, iron, iodine, phosphorus, and contains lots of B vitamins, especially choline, B-12, and riboflavin.

The highest weight gain of native chickens occurred in treatment A, namely 17.54 g/day, treatments B and C were 0.74% and 2.05% lower (P>0.05), while treatments D and E were lower respectively. 8.38% and 11.98% (P<0.05) compared to treatment A. The same initial and final weights of treatment B and C compared to treatment A caused the increase in body weight of chickens that received treatment B and C was not different from treatment A. The final weight of chickens treated D and E was significantly different compared to treatment A caused an increase in weight of chickens in treatments D and E were also significantly different, according to the research results of Nuriyasa *et al.*, (2021).

Feed treatment with 20% expired milk substitution (E) caused the lowest feed consumption, namely 41.01 g/bird/day. Treatment D was 0.26% higher (P>0.05) treatment E, while treatment C, B and A were respectively higher (P<0.05) 7.49%, 13.02% and 14.46% compared to treatment E. Feed with expired milk substitution makes it less tasty for native chickens. This condition causes the substitution rate of expired milk to be higher, feed consumption is getting lower, in accordance with the research results of Nuriyasa *et al.* (2018).

Feed conversion was not affected by substitution treatment for expired milk on native chickens. Undifferentiated conversions indicate that growth differences are due to differences in feed consumption, not differences in feed efficiency, according to the results of Puger *et al.* (2019).

CONCLUSION

From the results of the study, it can be concluded that supplementation of expired milk in native chicken feed has no effect on feed digestibility, substitution of 15% and 20% causes a decrease growth of native chickens.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his gratitude to the Chancellor of Udayana University for the financial support, the authors also thank the Dean of the Faculty of Animal Science, for the research facilities provided.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

I Made Nuriyasa, I Putu Ari Astawa compiled the research idea, I Gusti Lanang Oka Cakra performed the analysis of native chicken blood serum, I Made Nuriyasa was responsible for statistic analysis, all author contributed equally to writing of the final manuscript.



Conflict of Interest

The authors state that they have no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

- i. Alim, M.N., H.D. Sunaryo and Wurlina. 2012. Effect of giving expired milk on the performance of male broilers. Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. Airlangga University. Surabaya.
- Bagiarta, I.W., I.,M. Nuriyasa, A.W. Puger. 2017. Nutrient Diets Digestibility of Local Famale Rabbit (*Lepus nigricollis*) Offered Grass Field Supplemented Multi Nuitrient Block (MNB). International Journal of Agriculture Innovations and Research. 5(6): 921-924.
- iii. Indonesian National Standard. 2013. Free-range chicken feed-part 2: growers. http://pakan.ditjenpkh.pertanian.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/SNI-7783.2-2013_Pakan-ayam-buras_grower.pdf
- Irianto, A. 2011. The Effect of Giving Expired Milk Yoghurt Enriched with Nata de Coco in Controlling Blood Cholesterol in White Rats. General Sudirman University Faculty of Biology. Purwokerto.
- v. McDonald P, Edwards RA, Greenhalgh JFD dan Morgan CA. 1995. *Animal Nutrition*. 5th Ed. Singapore (SG): Longman Singapore Publisher Ltd
- vi. National Research Council[NRC]. 1994. *Nutrient Requirements of Poultry*. Ed Rev ke-9. Washington DC: Academy Pr.
- vii. Nuriyasa, I.M., E. Puspani, W. Sayang Yupardi. 2018. Performance and Carcass of Local Rabbit (Lepus nigricollis) Fed Concentrate on Different Levels Based Levels Based on Carrot Leaf Waste (Daucus carota L,). International Journal of Life Sciences. 2(3): 13-19
- viii. Nuriyasa, I.M., A.W. Puger, I.G.A.A, Putra. 2021. Effect of Dietary Different Lipid Sources on Serum Cholesterol Concentration, Fat Composition and Growth Performance in Ducks. Adv.Anim.Vet.Sci. 9(6): 926-932
- Puger, A.W., E.Puspani, I.M. Nuriyasa, W.Sayang Yupardi. 2019. Effect of Raplacement of Fish Mill with Golden Snail Mill in Ration to Performance of Male Bali Duck. International Journal of Life Sciences. 3(1): 25-30.
- x. Puger, A.W. and I.M Nuriyasa. 2019. Ration Digest Value and Performance of Male Bali Duck Feed Waste Wine Fermented with Different Levels. International Journal of Life Sciences. 3(3): 1-7.
- xi. SNI. Native chicken feed standard. 2013. http://pakan.ditjenpkh.pertanian.go.id/wpcontent/uploads/2019/08/SNI-7783.2-2013_Pakan-ayam-buras_grower.pdf48-855.