Original Research Article

~~Economic costanalysis~~Feasibility~~of including~~ Pprobiotics ~~in~~ Supplementation~~the feed of~~in~~caged~~ Caged ~~broilers~~Broilers

Abstract

As part of the Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology, and Sciences in Prayagraj, this experiment was carried out at the Small Animal Lab~~that~~ whichis part of the research unit. ~~In this study, w~~We investigated the ~~"c~~Economic cost ~~analysis~~ of including probiotics in the feed of caged broilers~~"~~. We used a total of 96 day-old chicks and were randomlyassigned ~~Each of the~~ four groups of 24 chicks (T_0, T_1, T_2, and T_3) ~~contained~~ andeight replicates each~~, which meant that each group contained twenty-four chicks~~. ~~A total of 96 day-old chicks were randomly divided~~ into these groups. The groups were as follows; T_0control~~(untreated)~~group was fed the basal diet (BD), T_1 was ~~given~~ fed*Bacillus coagulans* at ~~a concentration of~~ 40 ~~parts per million~~ppm in ~~addition to the basal diet~~BD, T_2 was ~~given~~ fed~~*Bacillus B.*~~*subtilis* at ~~a concentration of~~ 50 ~~parts per million mixed~~ppm in ~~with the basal diet~~BD, and T_3 was fed *B.licheniformis* and *B.coagulans*~~given the basal diet at a concentration of~~at 20 ~~parts per million~~ppmin BD~~together with *Bacillus licheniformis* and *Bacillus coagulans*~~. After a 35-day~~s(five-week)~~ trial period, an analysis of the economic effects of ~~adding~~ theprobiotics supplementation ~~in feed~~ was calculated.The ~~major difference was noted due to~~results revealed a decrease in FCR as birds achieved more weight, leading to increased body weight and resulting in a higher price per kg. ~~It was also noted that a~~Adding probiotics to the feed doesn't increase the variable cost, and treatment groups had a lower variable cost than the control group. ~~From the above study, i~~It was found that the maximum profit was obtained in T3~~,i.e.,~~ (Rs. 5771.32), ~~followed by~~ T_0 (Rs. 5297.3), and T_2 (Rs. 5074.92), whereas the T1group had the least revenue. ~~Therefore, it can be concluded that m~~Mixing probiotics in poultry feed increases profit without much affecting the production cost.

Keywords: Cost, Economics, FCR, Probiotics, Profit and Revenue.

1. INTRODUCTION

Among the agricultural and veterinary industries, poultry is experiencing rapid expansion. Poultry production spends a significant amount on feed, which accounts for 70% of the total. Poultry growers

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

UNDER PEER REVIEW

are seeing a decline in their profit margins due to the ever-increasing cost of compounded feed and other poultry feed additives. Consequently, the most crucial requirement for optimal genetics for economically viable chicken production is balanced and effective feeding.~~A number of~~Some feed additives, including growth promoters, synthetic hormones, and antibiotics, have been widely utilized to increase ~~the~~ poultry output ~~of chickens~~. Nevertheless, antibiotic growth promoters (AGPs) used in poultry have the potential to impact human health through residues in chicken products and the development of antibiotic-resistant microorganisms. Using AGPs in chicken feed is illegal in many European nations. As a result, a lot of studies have focused on finding alternatives that can meet the needs of consumers and international markets without compromising production or being hazardous to animals or humans. One of these approaches that stands out is ~~adding~~ probiotics ~~to animal feed~~. Feed additives containing probiotics reduce the risk of gastrointestinal diseases by increasing the ~~human~~ immune response, secreting antimicrobial compounds, and ~~preventing the~~exerting a competitive exclusion ~~of~~ of harmful bacteria **[1].** These products have been shown to have no residue in animal products and have been found to enhance animal performance and health. This has been supported by various studies ~~conducted by~~ **[2-6].** The reason behind this improvement is that these products enhance the digestibility of the ~~animals'~~ animal's diet~~, as demonstrated by~~ **[7].** This leads to better utilization of nutrients and, consequently, higher productivity, as indicated ~~by studies conducted by~~ **[8-10]**. Probiotics can be administered to chickens either by mixing them with feed or by ~~by~~ adding them to drinking water **[11].**The growth of pathogens ~~bacteria,~~ including *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella sp.*, can be inhibited by lactic acid bacteria probiotics, which have been shown to have a favorable effect **[12-16].** In addition to producing lactic acid and bacteriocins, lactic acid bacteria ~~have the ability to~~can colonize the intestines and survive**[17].** The probiotic and antimicrobial properties of *Lactobacillus casei* make it a promising candidate for use as a functional probiotic in animal feed **[18].**You can treat your birds/animals with probiotics in both feed and water, but it's important to note that probiotics in water can make them gain weight and reduce the feed conversion value. ~~You can find out if i~~Investigating whether it's more profitable to give broiler probiotics in water should be carried out by doing an economic study. Thus we aimed to explore ~~Finding out~~ how much money broiler farms make by switching from ~~antibiotic growth promoters (~~AGPs~~)~~ to probiotics like ~~*Bacillus*~~ *B.Subtilis*, ~~*Bacillus*~~ *B.Coagulans*,and *B~~acillu~~.slicheniformis* ~~in order~~ to increase feed conversion and weight was the main motivation for this research.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

2. MATERIALSANDMETHODS

UNDER PEER REVIEW

As part of the Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology, and Sciences in Prayagraj, this experiment was carried out at the Small Animal Lab~~that~~ whichis part of the research unit. ~~In this study, w~~We investigated the "~~e~~Economic cost analysis of including probiotics in the feed of caged broilers~~"~~. We used a total of 96 day-old chicks and were randomlyassigned four groups of 24 chicks (T_0, T_1, T_2, and T_3) andeight replicates each. into these groups. The groups were as follows; T_0controlgroup was fed the basal diet (BD), T_1 was fed*Bacillus coagulans* at 40 ppm in BD, T_2 was fed*B.subtilis* at 50 ppm in BD, and T_3 was fed *B.licheniformis* and *B.coagulans*at 20 ppmin BD~~Each of the four groups (T_0, T_1, T_2, and T_3) contained eight replicates, which meant that each group contained twenty-four chicks. A total of 96 day-old chicks were randomly divided into these groups. T_0control (untreated) group was fed the basal diet,T_1 was given *Bacillus coagulans* at a concentration of 40 parts per million in addition to the basal diet, T_2 was given *Bacillus subtilis* at a concentration of 50 parts per million mixed in with the basal diet, and T_3 was given the basal diet at a concentration of 20 parts per million together with *Bacillus licheniformis* and *Bacillus coagulans*~~. After a 35-day~~s~~(five week)~~trial period, an analysis of the economic effects of adding probiotics in feed was calculated.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table1:Variablecostoftreatments

Description	T_0	T_1	T_2	T_3
Transport (Rs)	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Feed additive (Rs)	0	0.18	1.58	0.30
DOC broiler (Rs)	768	768	768	768
Feed (Rs)	1533.6	1440	1382.76	1313.88
Total (Rs)	**2314.1**	**2220.68**	**2164.08**	**2094.68**

T_0 control group was fed the basal diet (BD), T_1 was fed*Bacillus coagulans* at 40 ppm in BD, T_2 was fed*B.subtilis* at 50 ppm in BD, and T_3 was fed *B. licheniformis* and *B. coagulans*at 20 ppm in BD.

The provided table outlines the breakdown of costs associated with different treatments (T~~reatment~~$_0$, T~~reatment~~$_1$, T~~reatment~~$_2$, and T~~reatment~~$_3$), along with ~~a~~T~~reatment~~$_0$ (control group), across various categories. Here's a detailed explanation of each category:

Transport (Rs):

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Left

UNDER PEER REVIEW

- ~~Transport~~represents the cost of transportation for each treatment group as well as the control group.

- The cost of transportation ~~is~~ was consistent across all groups ~~at Rs 12.5~~.

Feed additive (Rs):

- ~~Feed additive~~ displays the cost of feed additives (probiotics) for each treatment group and the control group as shown in Table 1.~~:~~

  - ~~The cost of feed additives varies across treatments:~~

- ~~Treatment$_0$ (Control): No cost (Rs 0)~~

- ~~Treatment$_1$: Rs 0.18~~

- ~~Treatment$_2$: Rs 1.58~~

- ~~Treatment$_3$: Rs 0.30~~

DOC broiler (Rs):

- ~~DOC~~indicates the cost associated with Day Old Chicks (DOC) for each treatment group and the control group.

- The cost of DOC broiler ~~remains~~ remained constant across all groups (Table 1) ~~at Rs 768~~.

Feed (Rs):

~~Feed~~represents the cost of feed for each treatment group and the control group.

The cost of feed varies across treatments as shown in Table 1~~s~~:

- ~~Treatment$_0$: Rs 1533.6~~

- ~~Treatment$_1$: Rs 1440~~

- ~~Treatment$_2$: Rs 1382.76~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

UNDER PEER REVIEW

- ~~Treatment$_3$: Rs 1313.88.~~

Total (Rs): is the

~~Total Rupees~~sum~~sup~~ of the total variable costs for each treatment group and the control group.

It ~~includes~~ included the costs of transportation, feed additives, DOC broiler, and feed.

The total cost varies across treatments as shown in Table 1.~~:~~

- ~~Treatment$_0$: Rs 2314.1~~
- ~~Treatment$_1$: Rs 2220.68~~
- ~~Treatment$_2$: Rs 2164.08~~
- ~~Treatment$_3$: Rs 2094.68~~

Each row in the table provides a detailed breakdown of the variable costs associated with transportation; feed additives, DOC broiler, feed, and the total cost for each treatment group and the control group. This breakdown allows for a comprehensive comparison of costs across different treatments and the control group.

Table2:Totalofrevenueandprofitfor96broilerchickenstreatment

Description	T_0	T_1	T_2	T_3
Final of body weight production (kg)	40.06	34.40	38.10	41.40
Final of body weight sell/kg (Rs)	190	190	190	190
Total of Revenue (Rs)	7611.4	6536	7239	7866
Total of cost (Rs)	2314.1	2220.68	2164.08	2094.68
Profit (Rs)	5297.3	4315.32	5074.92	5771.32

T_0 control group was fed the basal diet (BD), T_1 was fed *Bacillus coagulans* at 40 ppm in BD, T_2 was fed *B.subtilis* at 50 ppm in BD, and T_3 was fed *B. licheniformis* and *B. coagulans* at 20 ppm in BD.

Final body weight production (kg):

~~Final body weight production~~ shows the average final body weight production in kilograms for each treatment group at the end of the treatment period. It indicates the weight gain achieved by the broiler chickens (Table 2).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Left

Final body weight sell/kg (Rs):

The selling price per kilogram of broiler chickens remains constant ~~at Rs 190~~ across all treatment groups (Table 2). This indicates the price at which the broiler chickens are sold.

Total Revenue (Rs):

~~Total Revenue~~represents the total revenue generated from selling broiler chickens for each treatment group. It is calculated by multiplying the final body weight production by the selling price per kilogram.

Total Cost (Rs):

~~Total Cost~~displays the total cost incurred for treating 96 broiler chickens in each treatment group. The costs include transportation, feed additives, DOC broiler, and feed~~, as shown in the previous tables~~.

Profit (Rs):

~~Profit~~shows the profit generated from the sale of broiler chickens for each treatment group. It is calculated by subtracting the total cost from the total revenue, indicating the financial gain from the broiler chicken treatment.

Each row in the table provides detailed information about the final body weight production, revenue, cost, and profit for each treatment group, facilitating comparison and analysis of the effectiveness and profitability of different treatments.

Discussion: Probiotics of the type T2, T3, T4, and T5 administered by feed or water can enhance body weight while decreasing feed conversion**[19].** Adding 0.25 g probiotic/liter through drinking water yields the highest production performance results and the most profitable economic analysis. Therefore, for optimal agricultural performance and profit, farmers can administer 0.025 g probiotic/liter through water, and study by **[20]**during the study period, 60% of broiler farms were found to be in operation. When it came to economic losses, broiler flocks were the worst hit, ~~with the exception of~~except for two farms (B1 and B6), caused by factors such as reduced body weight gain, ~~and~~ increased feed conversion ratio (FCR), mortality, chemotherapy, and chemoprophylaxis. There was no subclinical form of coccidiosis documented in farm B6, loss due to chemotherapy was higher

UNDER PEER REVIEW

compared to poor FCR, whereas in farm B6 no subclinical form of coccidiosis was recorded. Chemotherapy was higher than low FCR in farm B2, and mortality was the main cause of loss in farm B1 due to concomitant infection of inflammatory bowel disease.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

~~From the above study i~~It was found that the maximum profit was obtained in T_3 ~~i.e., (~~Rs. 5771.32)~~,followed by~~ T_0 (Rs. 5297.3), and T_2 (Rs. 5074.92) whereas the T_1 group had the least revenue. The major difference was noted due to a decrease~~d~~ in FCR as birds achieved more weight leading to increased ~~Body~~ body weight and resulting in more price per kg.~~It was also noted that a~~Adding ~~Probiotics~~ probiotics ~~in~~ tothe feed doesn't increase~~d~~ the variable cost and treatment groups had variable cost less than the Control group.

~~Therefore, from the above study it can be concluded that m~~Mixing probiotics in poultry feed increases the profit/revenue without much affecting the production cost. Hence, probiotics can be included in poultry feed however ~~large~~ large-scale studies in the future are recommended.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

REFERENCES

1. Corcionivoschi, N., Drinceanu, D., Stack, D., Ștef, L., Julean, C. and Bourke, B. The effect of probiotics on animal health. Review. Scientific Papers Animal Science and Biotechnologies. 2010; 43(1): 35-35.
2. Fuller, R. Probiotic in man and animals. J. Appl. Bacteriol. 1989; 66: 131-139.
3. Jin, L.Z., Ho, Y.W., Abdullah, N. and Jalaludin, S. Probiotics in poultry: modes of action. World's Poultry Science Journal. 1997; 53(4):351-368.
4. Zulkifli, I., Abdullah, N., Azrin, N.M. and Ho, Y.W. Growth performance and immune response of two commercial broiler strains fed diets containing Lactobacillus cultures and oxytetracycline under heat stress conditions. British poultry science. 2000; 41(5):593-597.

Comment [es1]: Although the references are sufficient as 30% (6 out of 20) of the listed references were published in the past five years. Preferred to update and increase the percentage to at least 35-40%. The topic contains a lot of studies including the impact of adding probiotics forms on immunity and performance

5. Ferreira A J P, Pizarro L D C R and Leme I L. Probióticose prebióticos. Spinosa, H.S.; Gorniak, S.L.; Bernardi, M.M.(Eds.) Farmacologiaaplicada à medicinaveterinária. 3. ed.RiodeJaneiro:GuanabaraKoogan. 2002;574–578.
6. PattersonJAandBurkholderKM.Applicationofprebioticsandprobioticsinpoultryproduction.PoultryScience. 2003;82:627–31.
7. Apata D F. Growth performance, nutrient digestibility andimmuneresponseofbroilerchicksfeddietssupplementedwithacultureofLactobacillusbulgaricus.JournalofScienceFoodAgriculture. 2008;88:1253–58.
8. KabirSML,RahmanMMandRahmanMB.Thedynamicsof probiotics on growth performance and immune response inbroilers.InternationalJournalofPoultryScience. 2004;3: 361–64.
9. MountzourisKC,TsirtisikosPandKalamaraE.Evaluationoftheefficacyofaprobioticcontaining*Lactobacillus,Bifidobacterium,Enterococcus*and*Pediococcus*strainsinpromotionbroilerperformanceandmodulationcecalmicrofloracompositionandmetabolicactivies.PoultryScience. 2007; 86:309–17.
10. Mountzouris K C, Tsirtisikos P and Palamidi I. Effects ofprobioticinclusionlevelsinbroilernutritionongrowthperformance, nutrient digestibility, plasma immunoglobunis,and cecalmicroflora composition. Poultry Science. 2010; 89: 58–67.
11. Utomo A M. Effect of probiotic giving with *Lactobacillussp*.and*Saccharomycescerevisiae*againstbroilerweightgain.(Thesis),AirlanggaUniversity.Surabaya. 2012.
12. HudaK,LokapirnasariWPandSoeharsonoS.Additionofprobiotic *Lactobacillus acidophilus*and*Bifidobacteriumsp*to the analysis of laying hens infected by *Escherichia coli*.MimbarAgribusiness. 2019; 5:176–82.
13. Najwan R, Lokapirnasari W P and Huda K. Effect of theadditionofprobiotic*Lactobacillusacidophilus*and*Bifidobacterium*totheproductionoflayinghensinfectedwith *Escherichiacoli*.Briliant. 2019;4:125–31.
14. WardhaniHCP,LokapirnasariWPandSoepranianondoK.Useofcombinationprobiotic*Lactococcuslactis*and*Lactobacillusacidophilus*asasubstituteofantibioticsinchickenlayerinfectedby*Escherichiacoli*onbusinessanalysis.MimbarAgribusiness. 2019;5:183–92.
15. Rahman N F N, Lokapirnasari W P, Soepranianondo K, HidanahS and Sarmanu S. The effect of using *Lactobacilluscasei* and *Bifidobacterium sp*. probiotics on feed

UNDER PEER REVIEW

conversionratioandfeedconsumptioninlayinghensinfectedwith*Escherichiacoli*.Briliant. 2019;4:167–73.

16. Nouri, M., Rahbarizadeh, F., Ahmadvand, D., Mousakhani, F., Sadeghzadeh, E., Lavasani, S. and Khodami, V.V. Inhibitory effects of Lactobacillus salivarius and Lactobacillus crispatus isolated from chicken gastrointestinal tract on Salmonella enteritidis and Escherichia coli growth. 2010.
17. Salminen S, Wright A V and Ouwehand A. 2004. Lactic acidBacteria: microbiologycal and functional aspects, revised andexpanded.3rded.MarcelDekker,Inc.NewYork. 2004; 177.
18. AmaravadhiSC,MallamM,ManthaniGPandKomireddyKR.Effectofdietarysupplementationofprobioticsandenzymesonthehaematologyofrabbitsrearedundertwo housingsystemsVeterinaryWorld. 2012;5:748–53.
19. Andriani, A.D., Lokapirnasari, W.P., Karimah, B., Hidanah, S. and Al-Arif, M.A., 2020. Potency of probiotic on broiler growth performance and economics analysis. Indian Journal of Animal Sciences. 2020; 90(8): 1140-1145.
20. Pant, S., Bhatt, P. and Singh, A.K. Economic impact assessment and disease prevalence of coccidiosis in broilers around tarai region. 2019; 548-655.

UNDER PEER REVIEW