

Print ISSN : 0972-8813  
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 19(3), September-December, 2021]

# Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and  
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



## **ADVISORY BOARD**

### **Patron**

Dr. Tej Partap, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Members**

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. A.K. Sharma, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. N.S. Jadon, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. R.S. Chauhan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. R.S. Jadaun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

### **Members**

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India

Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India

Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India

Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W.P. Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A.

Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India

Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium

Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines

Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India

Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India

Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India

Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India

Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia

Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.

Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India

Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India

Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.

Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.

Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India

Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India

Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

### **Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

### **Managing Editor**

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Assistant Managing Editor**

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Technical Manager**

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India



# PANTNAGAR JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

Vol. 19(3)

September-December, 2021

## CONTENTS

<b>Unrevealing the role of epistasis through Triple Test Cross in Indian mustard</b> NARENDER SINGH, USHA PANT, NEHA DAHIYA, SHARAD PANDEY, A. K. PANDEY and SAMEER CHATURVEDI	330
<b>Testing of InfoCrop model to optimize farm resources for mustard crop under tarai region of Uttarakhand</b> MANISHA TAMTA, RAVI KIRAN, ANIL SHUKLA, A. S. NAIN and RAJEEV RANJAN	335
<b><i>In vitro</i> evaluation of endophytes and consortium for their plant growth promoting activities on rice seeds</b> DAS, J., DEVI, R.K.T. and BARUAH, J.J.	342
<b>Effect of subsurface placement of vermicompost manure on growth and yield of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. Var. UP 2526)</b> ABHISHEK KUMAR and JAYANT SINGH	348
<b>Assessment of different nutrient management approaches for grain yield, gluten content and net income of common bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) in Western Himalayan region of Uttarakhand</b> BHAWANA RANA and HIMANSHU VERMA	359
<b>Suitability assessment of land resources for assava (<i>Manihot esculentus</i> L.) and yam (<i>Dioscorea spp</i> L.) cultivation in Khana LGA, Rivers State, Southern Nigeria</b> PETER, K.D., UMWENI, A.S. and BAKARE, A.O.	367
<b>Biophysical and biochemical characters conferring resistance against pod borers in pigeonpea</b> PARUL DOBHALL, R. P. MAURYA, PARUL SUYAL and S.K. VERMA	375
<b>Population dynamics of major insect pest fauna and their natural enemies in Soybean</b> SUDHA MATHPAL, NEETA GAUR, RASHMI JOSHI and KAMAL KISHOR	385
<b>Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils and their combinations against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (Linnaeus)</b> NIDHI TEWARI and S. N. TIWARI	389
<b>Long term efficacy of some essential oils against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (Linnaeus)</b> NIDHI TEWARI and S. N. TIWARI	400
<b>Management strategies under chemicals, liquid organic amendments and plant extracts against black scurf of potato caused by <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> Kühn in tarai regions of Uttarakhand</b> SURAJ ADHIKARI, SHAILBALA SHARMA, R. P. SINGH, SUNITA T. PANDEY and VIVEK SINGH	408
<b>Effective management strategies against ginger rhizome rot caused by <i>Fusarium solani</i> by the application of chemicals, bioagents and Herbal <i>Kunapajala</i> in mid hills of Uttarakhand</b> SONAM BHATT, LAXMI RAWAT and T. S. BISHT	417

<b>Distribution and morphological characterisation of isolates of <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> fsp. <i>subglutinans</i> causing Pokkah Boeng disease of sugarcane in different sugarcane growing areas of Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand</b> HINA KAUSAR, BHAGYASHREE BHATT and GEETA SHARMA	<b>429</b>
<b>Biointensive management of <i>Meloidogyne enterolobii</i> in tomato under glasshouse conditions</b> SHUBHAM KUMAR, ROOPALI SHARMA, SATYA KUMAR and BHUPESH CHANDRA KABDWAL	<b>435</b>
<b>Effect of pre-harvest application of eco-friendly chemicals and fruit bagging on yield and fruit quality of mango</b> KIRAN KOTHIYAL, A. K. SINGH, K. P. SINGH and PRATIBHA	<b>447</b>
<b>A valid and reliable nutrition knowledge questionnaire: an aid to assess the nutrition friendliness of schools of Dehradun, Uttarakhand</b> EKTA BELWAL, ARCHANA KUSHWAHA, SARITA SRIVASTAVA, C.S. CHOPRA and ANIL KUMAR SHUKLA	<b>452</b>
<b>Potential of common leaves of India as a source of Leaf Protein Concentrate</b> RUSHDA ANAM MALIK, SHAYANI BOSE, ANURADHA DUTTA, DEEPA JOSHI, NIVEDITA, N.C. SHAHI, RAMAN MANOHARLAL and G.V.S. SAIPRASAD	<b>460</b>
<b>Job strain and muscle fatigue in small scale unorganized agri enterprises</b> DEEPA VINAY, SEEMA KWATRA, SUNEETA SHARMA and KANCHAN SHILLA	<b>466</b>
<b>Drudgery reduction of farm women involved in weeding of soybean crop</b> SHALINI CHAKRABORTY	<b>475</b>
<b>Childhood obesity and its association with hypertension among school-going children of Dehradun, Uttarakhand</b> EKTA BELWAL, K. UMA DEVI and APARNA KUNA	<b>482</b>
<b>Spring water and it's quality assessment for drinking purpose: A review</b> SURABHI CHAND, H.J. PRASAD and JYOTHI PRASAD	<b>489</b>
<b>Spatial distribution of water quality for Indo-Gangetic alluvial plain using Q-GIS</b> SONALI KUMARA, VINOD KUMAR and ARVIND SINGH TOMAR	<b>497</b>
<b>Application of geospatial techniques in morphometric analysis of sub-watersheds of Nanak Sagar Catchment</b> AISHWARYA AWARI, DHEERAJ KUMAR, PANKAJ KUMAR, R. P. SINGH and YOGENDRA KUMAR	<b>505</b>
<b>Evaluation of selected carbon sources in biofloc production and carps growth performance</b> HAZIQ QAYOOM LONE, ASHUTOSH MISHRA, HEMA TEWARI, R.N. RAM and N.N. PANDEY	<b>516</b>
<b>Calcium phosphate nanoparticles: a potential vaccine adjuvant</b> YASHPAL SINGH and MUMTESH KUMAR SAXENA	<b>523</b>
<b>Factors affecting some economic traits in Sahiwal Cattle</b> DEVESH SINGH, C. B. SINGH, SHIVE KUMAR, B.N. SHAHI, BALVIR SINGH KHADDA, S. B. BHARDWAJ and SHIWANSHU TIWARI	<b>528</b>
<b>The effect of probiotics and growth stimulants on growth performance of Murrah Buffalo</b> SAMEER PANDEY, RAJ KUMAR, D.S. SAHU, SHIWANSHU TIWARI, PAWAN KUMAR, ATUL SHARMA and KARTIK TOMAR	<b>532</b>

## The effect of probiotics and growth stimulants on growth performance of Murrah Buffalo

SAMEER PANDEY<sup>1</sup>, RAJ KUMAR<sup>2</sup>, D.S. SAHU<sup>3</sup>, SHIWANSHU TIWARI<sup>4</sup>, PAWAN KUMAR<sup>5</sup>, ATUL SHARMA<sup>6</sup> and KARTIK TOMAR<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,5,6,7</sup>Department of Animal Husbandry, College of Agriculture, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Modipuram-250110(Meerut), <sup>4</sup>Department of Animal Genetics and Breeding, College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145(U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

**ABSTRACT:** The present study was conducted to evaluate the impact of Probiotics and growth stimulants on growth performance of murrah buffalocalves. The calves were selected from Livestock Research Center at Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut. Eighteen murrah buffalo were divided into three groups. T<sub>0</sub> as control in which animals were fed normal basal diet while in group T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> animals were fed in addition to normal basal diet, one and two bolus of probiotics and growth stimulant (Ecotas bolus), respectively. Each bolus contains (*Lactobacillus sporogenes* 20×10<sup>6</sup> CFU, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* 25×10<sup>9</sup>CFU, *Aspergillus oryzae* 20×10<sup>6</sup> CFU, Zinc sulphate 200 mg, Cobalt sulphate 40 mg, Copper sulphate 100 mg, DL-Methionine 1 g and Fructo-oligosaccharide 250 mg). The parameters studied were growth Body weight at fortnightly interval, body weight gain, average daily gain, feed consumption and Feed conversion ratio. The supplementation of probiotics and growth stimulants had significant effect on body weight gain, average daily gain and FCR. Probiotic and growth stimulants supplementation showed improved total gain 26.22 and 33.32 %, ADG 23.48 and 32.35 % and FCR 12.32 and 15.67 % in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group respectively. On the basis of above results It may be concluded that the “ Ecotas bolus” a combination of probiotics and growth stimulants improved growth performance and feed conversion efficiency in buffalo calves.

**Key words:** Average daily gain, body weight gain, buffalo, feed conversion efficiency, probiotic

India has emerged today as the largest producer of milk in the world crossing 97 million tons annually. The organized dairy sector in India is largely dependent on buffalo milk as they contribute more than 57 Per cent of the total milk produced in the country. India is the world's seventh largest country occupying 2.47% of the world geographical area which supports about 16% of earth's human population and 15% of the world's livestock population and has 23.81% forest and tree cover. Livestock is the backbone of the rural economy in India. Livestock enable integrated farming, sustain livelihoods. About 70% of the population is engaged in agriculture and rearing of livestock is subsidiary to agriculture (Yadav and Gulati, 2006). Livestock and livelihood go hand in hand towards reducing poverty. Buffalo production business in India is mainly in the hands of small and marginal farmers, in which males are either replaced in their own herd, used for draft purpose or are slaughtered for meat production. However, in general it is observed that males are neglected and underfed due to non

remunerative cost of raising male animals by the farmers to save milk from the dam for disposal in the market. Thus, in India, every year, about ten million such male calves succumb to death incurring a loss of about Rs. 750 million per annum. These calves could otherwise be salvaged for meat production, which will improve the economic condition of the farmers (Ranjhan, 2006). There is lot of scope for buffalo meat production in comparison to cow meat, due to its tender and low cholesterol content, low intra-muscular fat and 25% higher protein than beef (Yadav and Gulati, 2006), besides a very good source of iron, vitamin B2, B6, B12. Moreover, no social taboos attached to the buffalo slaughter unlike cow and swine. In India, the tremendous export potential lies with buffalo meat. Export opportunities have increased in the recent years with growth in demand for animal products in the developing countries and India is at advantage to provide variety of livestock products that could bind better acceptability in term of price and preference to these ever increasing

consumers. The term probiotic was first used by Parker (1974) to describe “microorganisms and substances which contribute to intestinal microbial balance”.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Eighteen murrah buffalo (female) calves between 12 to 18 months of age groups were selected from Livestock research center (LRC). The Ecotas bolus which contains Probiotics (*L. sporogenes*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae*) and growth stimulants (Zinc sulphate, Cobalt sulphate, Copper sulphate, DL- Methionine and Fructo-oligosaccharide) were procured from Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd. All the experimental animals were kept under conventional housing system consisting of 18 normal pens of almost similar sizes (2X3) feet. The housing conditions for all animals were similar during entire period of experiment. The sheds were washed and cleaned daily to prevent any infections. The ingredient composition of concentrate mixture fed to the all animals was same. Clean and fresh water was provided freely to all animals twice a day. The animals were divided in to three groups, T<sub>0</sub> as control in which animals were fed normal basal diet while in group T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> animals were fed in addition to normal basal diet, one and two bolus of probiotics and growth stimulants i.e. Ecotasbolus respectively, The groups were maintained as per SVPUA&T standard feeding schedule (Morning 5 AM and Evening 5 PM). However, in treatment groups feed additives as Ecotas bolus. were offered per day per animal as detailed below

The animals were weighed before feeding and watering in the morning on two consecutive days at the start of experimental and thereafter at fortnightly interval during the experimental period of 90 days. The body weight gain of animals and average daily weight gain (g/day) calculated using formulae given below:

Body weight gain = final body weight-initial body weight

Average body weight gain (Kg)=

$$\frac{\text{Final weight of animal} - \text{Initial weight of animal}}{\text{Number of feeding days}}$$

**Feed conversion ratio (FCR)** - FCR was calculated by the amount of dry matter intake (kg) required for per unit (per kg) weight gain by animals during the trial period.

$$\text{FCR} = \frac{\text{Average Feed Consumption (Kg)}}{\text{Average body weight gain (Kg)}}$$

## Statistical Analysis

Data acquired in the experiment were analysed as per Snedecor and Cochran (1994).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean maximum body weight (122.01 kg) was in T<sub>2</sub> and minimum body weight was (118.04 kg) in control (T<sub>0</sub>). In T<sub>1</sub> group the mean body weight was recorded (120.11 kg). Body weights of calves fed with or without probiotics and growth stimulants at fortnightly interval were presented in Table 1. Final body weights recorded were 132.01 kg, 140.36 kg and 141.80 kg in T<sub>0</sub>, T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group respectively after the 90 days of feeding trial.

Feed additive/animal/day is given at detailed below (Ecotas Bolus)

Feed additive	Groups		
	T <sub>0</sub> (Control group)	T <sub>1</sub> (treatment group)	T <sub>2</sub> (treatment group)
<i>Lactobacillus sporogenes</i>	-	10 ×106 CFU	20×106 CFU
<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	-	12.5×109 CFU	25×109 CFU
<i>Aspergillus oryzae</i>	-	10×106 CFU	20×106 CFU
Zinc sulphate	-	100 mg	200 mg
Cobalt sulphate	-	20 mg	40 mg
Copper sulphate	-	50 mg	100 mg
DL-Methionine	-	0.5 g	1 g
Fructo-oligosaccharide	-	125 mg	250 mg
Biotin	-	5 mg	10 mg

The improvement in growth performances observed in animals fed with probiotics (Malik and Bandla, 2010). The final body weight at T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group was 4% and 12% higher in comparison of control groups. Youssef *et al.* (2017) reported that the antibiotic, probiotics and lactic acid supplementation increased the body weight compared that of control. But Sarangi *et al.* (2016) report the prebiotic and probiotic groups showed lower body weight than symbiotic and control groups.

**Table 1: Body weight (kg) of murrah buffalo calves fed with or without probiotics and growth stimulants at fortnightly interval**

Fortnights	Treatments		
	T <sub>0</sub>	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
0	104.55±4.78	106.18±5.74	105.18±10.05
1	109.00±4.76	110.96±5.98	109.43±10.19
2	113.25±4.92	116.15±6.24	114.46±10.35
3	117.91±4.99	121.78±6.41	120.75±10.50
4	122.43±4.97	128.05±6.46	127.71±10.60
5	127.11±5.02	133.91±6.47	134.78±10.74
6	132.01±5.18	140.36±6.56	141.80±10.79
Mean±SE	118.04±4.95a	120.11±5.56a	122.01±10.44a

The mean maximum body weight (122.01 kg) was in T<sub>2</sub> and minimum body weight was (118.04 kg) in control (T<sub>0</sub>). In T<sub>1</sub> group the mean body weight was recorded (120.11 kg).

Effect of probiotics and growth stimulants on body weight gain is depicted in Table 2 and Fig 1. Body weight gain show significant difference (pvalue) amongst the treatment groups. The body weight gain was significantly higher in the murrah buffalo calves of T<sub>2</sub> group (36.61±0.37 kg) as compare to that of T<sub>0</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> group.

**Table 2: Body weight gain (kg) in murrah buffalo calves during feeding 90 days**

Fortnights	Treatments		
	T <sub>0</sub>	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
1	4.45±0.17	4.78±0.30	4.08±0.47
2	4.25±0.29	5.18±0.42	5.20±0.38
3	4.66±0.26	5.63±0.18	6.28±0.28
4	4.51±0.17	6.26±0.21	6.96±0.42
5	4.68±0.23	5.86±0.23	7.06±0.35
6	4.90±0.20	6.45±0.20	7.01±0.34
TOTAL	27.46±0.22c	34.18±0.26b	36.61±0.37a

The similar improvement in increases the weight gain of young individuals with supplementation of probiotic were observed by Pandey and Agrawal (2001), Hussain Dar *et al.* (2017), Di Francia *et al.* (2008) and Radzikowski (2017). Yadav *et al.* (1996) also reported that supplemented with probiotics the body weight gains were increased in murrah buffalo calves. Overall average daily gain was significantly higher in the animals of T<sub>2</sub> group (408.72 g/day) as compare to T<sub>0</sub> group (304.77 g/day). However, the ADG (381.31 g/day) of T<sub>1</sub> was similar with the ADG (408.72 g/day) of T<sub>2</sub>, where ADG of T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group of calves were not significantly different. Higher average daily gain (g/day) in the animals of treatment group represents the higher growth rate as compare to the animals of control group (Table 3). Higher growth rate of murrah buffalo calves supplemented with probiotic and growth stimulants could be due to positive effect of probiotic and growth stimulants which provide the microbial protein and nutrients.

**Table 3: Average daily gain (g/day) in murrah buffalo during feeding trial of 90 days**

Fortnights	Treatments		
	T <sub>0</sub>	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
1	296.33±11.90	318.44±20.23	285.00±29.04
2	283.00±19.79	345.27±28.44	346.30±25.89
3	310.66±17.85	386.33±15.06	418.66±18.72
4	300.83±11.77	417.33±14.47	464.16±28.16
5	311.66±15.81	390.83±15.66	470.66±23.62
6	326.16±13.47	429.66±13.96	467.50±23.19
Mean±SE	304.77±15.10b	381.31±17.97a	408.72±24.77a

The similar improvement in average daily gain was observed by Spaskaya (1998) who reported that daily weight gain increase of 4.0 to 11.6 per cent in probiotics fed treatment group. Gombos (1995), Kumar *et al.* (1998) and Nehru *et al.* (2017) also reported that the average daily weight gain was significantly higher (P<0.01) in treatment group which fed probiotics.

-The average feed consumption (dry matter intake) was similar among three groups, which was 2.61, 2.87 and 2.89 kg/day, respectively in T<sub>0</sub>, T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group of calves (Table 4).

The feed consumption increased in linearly with increased period of feeding probiotics and growth stimulants.

**Table 4: Feed consumption (dry matter intake in kg/day) in murrah buffalo calves during feeding 90 days**

Fortnights	Treatments		
	T <sub>0</sub>	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
1	2.35±0.10	2.58±0.13	2.55±0.24
2	2.47±0.11	2.62±0.15	2.65±0.24
3	2.56±0.09	2.78±0.14	2.79±0.23
4	2.63±0.11	2.92±0.15	2.93±0.26
5	2.74±0.11	3.07±0.15	3.10±0.26
6	2.93±0.11	3.25±0.13	3.29±0.26
Mean±SE	2.61±0.10a	2.87±0.14a	2.89±0.25a

The results pertaining to the feed consumption in the present findings are in agreement with the previous studies of Higginbotham and Bath (1993) reported that the feed intake (FI) increased in probiotic fed group compared to control group. However, Kamalamma (1996) and Timmerman *et al.* (2005) reported no effect of probiotic treatment on daily meal intake.

Feed conversion ratio in terms of feed consumption (kg) per kg gain is an important tool to measure the efficiency of feed. The FCR of different groups over the experimental period are presented in Table 5. An improved FCR was significantly higher in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> than that of T<sub>0</sub> (control) group of animals. However no significant difference was observed in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> groups. The highest FCR 7.32 was in T<sub>2</sub> followed by T<sub>1</sub> (7.61) and T<sub>0</sub> (8.68).

**Table 5: Feed conversion ratio in murrah buffalo during feeding trial of 90 days**

Fortnights	Treatments		
	T <sub>0</sub>	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
1	7.98±0.44	8.16±0.29	9.37±1.22
2	8.95±0.72	7.78±0.59	7.81±0.88
3	8.39±0.57	7.20±0.14	6.73±0.64
4	8.83±0.57	7.01±0.28	6.33±0.49
5	8.91±0.54	7.93±0.51	6.62±0.57
6	9.01±0.29	7.60±0.29	7.09±0.63
Mean±SE	8.68±0.52a	7.61±0.35b	7.32±0.74b

The results pertaining to the feed consumption ratio

in the present findings are in agreement with the previous study of Malik and Bandla (2010), Hossain *et al.* (2012) and Gupta *et al.* (2015). Whereas Riddell *et al.* (2010) and Hosseinabadi *et al.* (2013) reported a non-significant improvement in FCR with addition of probiotic during pre-weaning period in calves.

## CONCLUSION

The supplementation of probiotics and growth stimulants had significant effect on body weight gain, average daily gain and FCR. Probiotic and growth stimulants supplementation T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> improved total gain 26.22 and 33.32 %, ADG 23.48 and 32.35 % and FCR 12.32 and 15. 67 % respectively. Therefore, it is concluded that supplementation of probiotics and growth stimulants in buffalo calves feed improve the growth performance and feed conversion efficiency of buffalo calves.

## REFERENCES

- Di Francia, A., Masucci, F., De Rosa, G., Varricchio, M. L. and Proto, V. (2008). Effects of *Aspergillus oryzae* extract and a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* fermentation product on intake, body weight gain and digestibility in buffalo calves. *Journal Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 140: 67–77.
- Gombos (1995). Effect of probiotics and yeast culture on the performance of pigs and dairy cows. *Krimiva*, 37(1): 13-17.
- Gupta, P., Sharma, K. S., Porwal, M. and Joshi, M. (2015). Biological performance of female calves fed diets supplemented with different strains of *Lactobacilli*. *Int. J. of Sci. Environment and Technology*, 4: 1181 – 1187.
- Higginbotham, G. E. and Bath, D. L. (1993). Evaluation of *Lactobacillus* fermentation cultures in calf feeding systems. *J. Dairy Sci.*, 76(2): 615-620.
- Hossain, S. A., Parnekar, S., Haque, N., Gupta, R. S., Kumar, D. and Tyagi, A. K. (2012). Influence of dietary supplementation of live



- yeast (*Saccharomyces Cervisiae*) on nutrient utilization, ruminal and biochemical profiles of Kankrej calves. *Int. J. App. Anim. Sci.*, 1: 30-38.
- Hosseiniabadi, M., Dehghan-Banadaky, M. and Zali, A. (2013). The effect of feeding of bacterial probiotic in milk or starter on growth performance, health, blood and rumen parameters of suckling calves. *Res. Anim. Product*, 4:8-14.
- Hussain Dar, A., Singh, S. K., Mondal, B. C., Palod, J., Kumar, A., Singh, V., Sharma, R. K. and Khadda, B. S. (2017). Effect of probiotic, prebiotic and synbiotic on faecal microbial count and cell-mediated immunity in crossbred calves. *Indian Journal of Animal Research*, 52(10): 1452-1456
- Kamalamma, Krishnamoorthy, U. and Krishnappa, P. (1996). Effect of feeding yeast culture (Yea-sacc 1026) on rumen fermentation *In vitro* and production performance in crossbred dairy cows. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 57(3):247-256
- Kumar, U., Sareen, V. K. and Singh, S. (1998). Effect of supplementation of yeast culture (Yea-sacc1026) in the diet on live weight gain in buffalo calves. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 68(5): 501-503.
- Malik, R. and Bandla, S. (2010). Effect of source and dose of probiotics and exogenous fibrolytic enzymes (EFE) on intake, feed efficiency, and growth of male buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) calves. *NDRI Karnal, Animal Health and Production.*, 42: 1263-1269.
- Nehru, P. A., Sunandhadevi, S., Rama, T. and Muniyappan, N. (2017). Effect of Probiotic Supplementation on Growth Performance of Crossbred Calves in an organized Cattle Farm. *J. Anim. Health Prod.*, 5(3): 89-91.
- Pandey, P. and Agrawal, I. S. (2001). Nutrient utilization and growth response in crossbred calves fed antibiotic and probiotic supplemented diets. *Indian J. Ani. Nutl.*, 18(1): 15-18.
- Ranjhan, S. K. (2006) Safety assurance of exported Indian carabeef: Meeting WTO guidelines. Proceedings of Animal Nutrition Association World Conference, New Delhi, Pp 54-58.
- Riddell, J. B., Gallegos, A., Harmon, D. and Mcleod, K. (2010). Addition of a *Bacillus* based probiotic to the diet of pre ruminant calves: influence on growth, health, and blood parameters. *Int. J. Appl. Res. Vet. M.*, 8:78-85.
- Sarangi, N. R., Babu, L. K., Kumar, A., Pradhan, C. R., Pati, P. K. and Mishra, J. P. (2016). Effect of dietary supplementation of prebiotic, probiotic, and symbiotic on growth performance and carcass characteristics of broiler chickens, *Veterinary World*, 9(3): 313-319.
- Spaskaya, T. A. (1998). The use of probiotics for improving disease resistance in calves. *Izvestiya Timiryazevskoi Seiskokhozyaistvennoi Akademii*, 4: 169-179.
- Timmerman, H. M., Mulder, L., Everts, H., Van Espan, D. C., Van Der Wal, E., Klaassen, G., Rouwers, S. M. G., Hartemink, R., Rombouts, F. M. and Beynen, A. C. (2005). Health and growth of veal calves fed milk replacers with or without probiotics. *J. Dairy Sci.*, 88(1): 2154-2165.
- Yadav, R. S. and Gulati, H. K. (2006). Management and buffalo production system in India. Proceedings of National symposium on Buffalo for Rural Upliftment- management and production systems, Pp. 146-158.
- Yadav, M. S., Sengupta, B. P., Yadav, R. S. and Singh, B. (1996). Effect of feeding yeast culture with BY-Pass protein on growth, feed efficiency and ruminal profile in murrah buffalo calves and heifers. *Indian J Anim. Prod. Mgmt.*, 12 (3,4): 170-173.
- Youssef, I., Mostafa, M. I., Ahmad, S., Mariam and Abdel-Wahab, A. (2017). Effects of Dietary Inclusion of Probiotics and Organic Acids on Performance, Intestinal Microbiology, Serum Biochemistry and Carcass Traits of Broiler Chickens. *Journal of World's Poultry Research*, 7(2): 57-7.

Received: November 11, 2021

Accepted: December 31, 2021