Productive Performance of Nili-Ravi Buffaloes by the Supplementation of Bypass Fat
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Novelty statement

The present research project bears the novelty of use of non-conventional energy source in form of bypass fat supplementation to enhance milk production in indigenous buffaloes.

The research project was conducted at the Livestock Experiment Station (LES), University of Agriculture Faisalabad to evaluate the effect of bypass fat supplementation on milk yield, milk composition and change in body weight in Nili-Ravi buffaloes. 12 animals of same parity, milk production and body weight were selected and randomly allotted to 4 treatments (bypass fat supplementation) viz., T⁰ (control), T¹ (250g), T² (350 g) and T³ (450 g) in such a way that each treatment was comprised of 03 animals. The daily milk yield for seven weeks animal⁻¹ was recorded. Milk composition and weight gain records were maintained on weekly basis. The statistical analysis showed significant (p<0.05) differences in milk yield. The highest production (9.44±0.62 Kg) was found in T² and the lowest (6.88±0.62 Kg) in control group. Whilst T¹ and T² differed non-significantly (p<0.05). Fat % differed significantly (p<0.05) in all treatments. The highest (6.9±0.09) was in T³ and animals in T⁰ yielded minimum fat% (6.19±0.09). T¹ and T² differed non-significantly (p<0.05). The protein, TS and SNF % did not differ in any treatment. Body weight gain and milk cost (/Kg) did not differ significantly. The supplementation increased milk yield and fat % in all treatments.
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INTRODUCTION

Mostly farmers have to face two scarcity seasons of fodder in severe winter and summer. The steep decrease in area for fodder production is also aggravating the situation. The ration available to the dairy animals is deficient both in energy and protein which significantly affect the health and production performance of dairy animals. The high yielding animals remain in negative energy balance in their early lactation and cannot produce up to their optimum potential in addition to nourishment of their health. The productive performance can be improved by providing high energy diet. One option to enhance the energy level by the supplementation of bypass fat in the ration of dairy animals (Sirohi et al., 2010). Garg and Mehta (1998) reported that bypass fat feeding can improve the milk production during...
the first quarter of the milking period, when feed intake is the lowest. Naik (2013) observed that in high yielding dairy animals the supplementation of bypass fat was so much effective for increasing energy density of the feedstuff. No negative effect of bypass fat on rumen fermentation, dry matter intake and digestibility was observed. The body condition upgradation, enhanced yield and improvement in reproductive efficiency result of bypass fat supplementation. Bypass fat feeding to dairy animals gave an extra profit both in term of production and reproductive health of dairy animals.

Overton (1999) accentuated that to decrease the negative energy balance and calving interval; feeding of high energy diet and proper feeding management in early lactation and in transition period remained helpful. High quality feed also helped in maintenance of rumen health, improved synthesis of microbial protein and it also provided the rich energy source for dairy cows.

Buffalo is the major contributor in national milk production with the contribution of more than 60% to the total milk supply in Pakistan (Economic Survey, 2015). Buffaloes take less time to adjust to changes in the diet composition as compared to cow. So this research was planned to evaluate the effect of bypass fat supplementation on milk yield, composition of milk and any change in body weight in Nili-Ravi buffaloes.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Experimental animals: The trial was conducted at the Livestock Experiment Station, University of Agriculture Faisalabad. Twelve lactating Nili-Ravi buffaloes having almost same lactation and milk production level were divided randomly into four equal groups (T₀, T₁, T² and T³) in such a way that each group had same number of animals and similar overall milk production. The precautionary measures were taken in term of vaccination and deworming. The experimental animals were managed in individual stalls under similar climatic conditions of the same shed.

Feeding management and treatments: Green fodder base rations as per schedule of the farm was offered ad libitum in twice a day feeding frequency or two hour before every milking. Fresh drinking water was offered ad libitum thrice a day. Concentrate was offered @ 3kg day⁻¹ animal⁻¹ twice a day. An energy supplement with calcium salt of long chain fatty acids was used as bypass fat and offered by mixing in the supplements as per treatment designed for different groups for dairy animals. The bypass fat was supplemented in group T₁ @ 250 g day⁻¹ animal⁻¹, group T² @ 350 g day⁻¹ animal⁻¹ and in group T³ @ 450 g day⁻¹ animal⁻¹. Animals of group T₀ was taken as control (without bypass fat) as per described in Table 1.

Data collection and sampling: The experimental animals were weighed before the trial and thereafter weekly basis for the performance of body condition of animals on bypass fat supplementation. The data for daily milk production was collected in twice milking per day both in the morning (4.30 am) and evening (4.30 pm) milking. Composite milk samples (250ml) each of the animal were collected for analysis in the dairy laboratory, Institute of Dairy Sciences.

Milk composition and approximate analysis: Approximate analysis of the supplements was determined by (AOAC. 2005). Milk fat and protein were determined by Gerber method (Aggarwala and Sharma, 1961) and Kjeldahl method (Davide, 1977), respectively. Total solids (TS) and solid not fat (SNF) were calculated according to Fleischmann’s formula.

Statistical analysis: Data generated for milk production and milk composition for protein, fat, solid not fat (SNF) & total solid (TS) and body weight for seven weeks was analyzed statistically under completely Randomized Design using computer software MINITAB (2000, version 17.0) and the significance of means was compared using the Tuckey’s test to draw the valid conclusion at certain significance level.

RESULTS

Milk Production, milk composition and change in body weight: The analysis of data showed a significant ( P<0.05) improvements in milk production (Table 2). The highest (9.44±0.62 Kg) milk production was observed in T₁ and the lowest in T₀ (6.88±0.62 Kg) treatment. Whilst milk production was found (9.33±0.62 Kg) and (7.86±0.62 Kg) in T₁ and T³ respectively. The butter fat % also differed significantly (p<0.05). T³ showed the highest fat % whilst control group showed the lowest fat % (Table 2). The sold not fat (SNF), total solids (TS) and protein did not differ significantly (p<0.05). Their average values are given in table 2.

Milk cost: The cost per kg milk produced in differed groups varied significantly (Table 3). The highest cost (Rs.45.20±2.80) was revealed in group T³ whilst the lowest was found in animals on T² where 350g supplement was offered. The highest feeding cost was observed in group 4 (Rs.356.00) and lowest in control group (Rs.280.00). The milk cost between T² and T³ did not differ significantly.

Body weight gain: The data on body gain revealed that on an average body weight ranged from 65.68±6.02 to 73.22±6.02 (Kg) during the experimental period (Table 3) and did not differ significantly in any treatment (p<0.05).

DISCUSSION

Milk production: Average increase in milk production (in Kg) animal⁻¹ day⁻¹ with the supplementation of bypass fat was improved (P<0.05) significantly in T₁ (9.33±0.62) and
Table 1: Proximate analysis of the supplements offered to animals in various groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrients</th>
<th>T₀</th>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>T₂</th>
<th>T₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry matter (%)</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>90.06</td>
<td>92.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein (%)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fiber (%)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether extract (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash (%)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Effect of by-pass fat on milk yield and composition on Nili-Ravi buffaloes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Milk yield (kg day⁻¹)</td>
<td>6.88±0.62ᵇ</td>
<td>9.33±0.62ᵃ</td>
<td>9.44±0.62ᵃ</td>
<td>7.86±0.62ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fat (%)</td>
<td>6.19±0.09ᵇ</td>
<td>6.46±0.09ᵃᵇ</td>
<td>6.65±0.09ᵃ</td>
<td>6.90±0.09ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Protein (%)</td>
<td>5.21±0.30</td>
<td>5.24±0.30ᵇ</td>
<td>5.72±0.30</td>
<td>5.40±0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SNF (%)</td>
<td>10.20±0.55</td>
<td>10.17±0.55</td>
<td>9.71±0.55</td>
<td>10.43±0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Total solids (%)</td>
<td>16.40±0.58</td>
<td>16.63±0.58</td>
<td>16.37±0.58</td>
<td>17.33±0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weight gain (kg)</td>
<td>65.68±6.02</td>
<td>66.52±6.02</td>
<td>68.12±6.02</td>
<td>73.22±6.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± standard deviation. Values in same rows, sharing same letters differ non-significantly (P>0.05)

Table 3: Effect of by-pass fat on milk cost at different levels of supplementation and weight gain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feed cost Rs./day</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>335.00</td>
<td>340.00</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk yield (kg day⁻¹)</td>
<td>6.688±0.62ᵇ</td>
<td>9.33±0.062ᵃ</td>
<td>9.44±0.62ᵃ</td>
<td>7.86±0.62ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Value (Rs./d)</td>
<td>550±42.8ᵇ</td>
<td>716±42.8ᵇᵃᵇ</td>
<td>836±0.53ᵃ</td>
<td>610±0.53ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk cost (Rs./Kg)</td>
<td>41.15±2.80</td>
<td>34.91±2.80ᵇ</td>
<td>34.91±2.80</td>
<td>45.20±2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Wt. gain (Kg)</td>
<td>65.68±6.02</td>
<td>66.52±6.02</td>
<td>68.12±6.02</td>
<td>73.22±6.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± standard deviation. Values in same rows, sharing same letters differ non-significantly (P>0.05)

T² (9.44±0.62) as compared to T₀ (6.88±0.62) and T₃ (7.86±0.62). By the supplementation of different levels of bypass fat it was concluded that group T¹ and T² showed significant (P<0.05) results with other treatments but differed non-significantly with each other. In group T³ (450 g bypass fat) milk production was decreased (P<0.05) significantly as compared to the T¹ and T². Hammon et al. (2008) and Garg et al. (2012) work supported our results. Vahora et al. (2013) and Nawaz et al. (2007) concluded that there was significant (P<0.01) increase in milk production and FCM (fat corrected milk) yield in group having bypass fat as compared to control group. Nasim et al. (2014) studied the effect of vegetable oil and rumen bypass fats with or without supplementing niacin in rations for buffaloes and revealed that oil and addition of by-pass fat increased milk fat and lactose concentration with or without using niacin compared to control. It was concluded that bypass fat or oil supplementation increased milk fat contents.

Milk composition and change in body weight: By the supplementation of bypass fat, there was a significant improvement in fat percentage in all the groups having different levels of bypass fat as compared to control group. The group T¹ (6.46±0.09) had significantly (P<0.01) higher fat % than control (6.19±0.09). There was 4.17% increase in fat in T¹ than T₀. The group T² (6.65±0.09) also had higher (P<0.01) fat % than T¹ and T₀. There was 6.91% increase in fat% in T² than control (T₀) while there was 2.85% increase in fat% compared to T¹. The group T³ (6.90±0.09) had highest fat % than T¹, T² and T₀. About 10.28% increase was observed in fat % in group T³ as compared to T₀. The supplemental effect of rumen inert fat (fat bypass) on fat yield was reported due to the profile and level of CaLCFA (Chouinard et al., 1998). This increase in fat % was also observed by Vahora et al. (2013) who concluded that milk fat yield and fat % improved due to the supplementation of bypass fat as compared to control. The
protein contents had shown non-significant (P>0.05) results in all of the experimental groups. These results are in agreement with Lounglawan et al. (2007) who described that there was non-significant effect of supplementation of bypass fat on protein content of milk in dairy animals. Similar results were also described by Purushothaman et al. (2008) and Thakur and Shelke (2010). Total solids and solid not fat (SNF) increased with bypass fat supplementation but statistically it showed non-significant (P>0.05) results. It had already been reported by Naik et al., (2009) that there was no change observed in SNF content of milk. It might be improved by the supplementation of bypass fat (Wadhwa et al., 2012). There was no significant difference observed (Table 3) for any change in body weight in all the groups (p<0.05).

CONCLUSION

The results of all the treatments having bypass fat showed significant increase in milk production and fat percentage while there was little or no change in protein content and body weight of lactating Nili-Ravi buffaloes.
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