

## Comparative Study on Commercial Broiler Rearing Pattern in Plain and Coastal Regions of Bangladesh

M. S. Islam<sup>1</sup>, M. M. Hossain<sup>1</sup>, M. M. Kamal<sup>2</sup> and M. A. Hashem<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Science, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh-2202. <sup>2</sup>Department of Entomology, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh-2202.

Abstract: The study was conducted at Sharsa, Jhikargacha, Chawgacha and Jessore sadar upazila of Jessore District regarded as plain and Lalmohon, Borhanuddin, Daulatkhan and Bhola sadar upazila of Bhola District regarded as coastal region with a view to compare the present status and rearing pattern of broiler. Data were collected randomly from selected 52 broiler farmers through personal interview using an interview schedule. The highest number of broiler farmers 69.2% and 57.7% in Jessore and Bhola District, respectively belonged to middle aged group (31-50 years) involved in broiler farming. About 48.1% and 59.6% broiler fermers respondents of Jessore and Bhola District, respectively possessed secondary level of education involved in broiler farming. About 48.08% and 63.46% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola District, respectively disinfected their farm using lime water. About 40.38% broiler fermers administered vaccine against ranikhet, gumboro, infectious bronchitis diseases and 36.64% administered vaccine against ranikhet and gumboro diseases in Jessore and Bhola District, respectively. About 36.54% broiler fermers applied antibiotic against coccidiosis, dermatitis and respiratory infection diseases and 44.23% broiler fermers applied antibiotic against coccidiosis, dermatitis and respiratory infection diseases and 44.23% broiler fermers in Jessore District faced great marketing problems due to the unstable and high price of feed and chicks and in Bhola District the farmers faced great marketing problem due to the unstable and high price of feed and chicks.

Key Words: Broiler farming, Coastal region, Disease management and Plain region.

### Introduction

Poultry is an integral part of the farming systems and perform a variety of roles, either supplying products for household, for sale or providing inputs for crop production. Among animal population in Bangladesh about 265.7 million poultry is estimated and the number of poultry per rural household is 2.15 respectively (BBS, 2009). Commercial poultry farming system is considered an important venue to reduce unemployment, poverty and malnutrition problem (Ershad et al., 2004). Over the last decade, poultry population has grown spectacularly throughout the world, 23% in developed and 76% in developing countries, respectively. This increase, due to the commercial production, has been most notable in the Far East where growth averaged 90%. However, with increasing population and decreasing land holdings, the number of poultry is increasing at an annual rate of 5.9% (Huque et al., 1999). 69% of poultry are reared by small farmers where as 31% are managed by medium and large farmers. The majority portion of farmers raise 77.29% chicken and 84.41% duck, respectively in Bangladesh (Yasmin et al., 1989). About 70,000 different sized poultry farms have been established. Of them 20% has been rearing 1000-50000 birds and the rests are occupied by smallholders who rear 100-1000 birds (Huque Q.M.E 2001). Average annual broiler meat production was recorded as 9454 kilo broiler meat per farm. The per capita consumption of meat per annum is 5.27 kg

which is much lower than that of world's average of 9.5 Kg. of meat (Karim, 2001). Broiler production has become a specialized and speedy business at present time for the small-scale farmers of the country. Short life cycle and requirement of relatively less amount of capital attributed to its popularity to the farmers. Broilers are usually marketed at about 35 to 40 days. Within this short duration special care and attention regarding housing, feeding, prevention and control of diseases can make this business profitable. Commercial broiler farming have provided employment opportunities for unemployed family members, improved socio-economic conditions and increased women empowerment among rural people of Bangladesh. In Bangladesh most of the broiler farmers have no formal training related to broiler farming. Consequently, production performances are low. To enrich the farmers and other concerned with updated knowledge training is needed (Ershad et al., 2004). Several researches have been carried out research on broiler production in different location of Bangladesh. But there is an acute shortage of information regarding the present status and rearing pattern of broiler in plain and coastal region of Bangladesh. That's why; the present study was conducted with the following objectives:

- 1) To investigate the present status of broiler farm between plain and coastal region
- 2) To know the management practices of broiler in those areas

### Materials and methods

The locations of the study area was selected areas of Sharsa, Jhikargacha, Chawgacha and Jessore sadar upazila of Jessore District regarded as plain land and Lalmohon, Borhanuddin, Daulatkhan and Bhola upazila of Bhola District regarded as coastal region. Both districts are situated under the Agro-Ecological Zone (AEZ) of High Ganges River Floodplain and Young Meghna Estuarine Floodplain, respectively (Anonymous, 1988). All the respondents of selected areas having at least 200 or more broilers were selected randomly for the study. Out of broiler farmers, 13 broiler farmers of every upazila were selected that make the total 52 respondents in each district. Data were collected randomly from selected 52 respondents by the researchers themselves through face to face interview by using interview schedule during October 2011 to December 2011. The variables were categorized in some heads e.g. personal information of the respondents (age, educational qualification, training exposure, total annual income from broiler and sources of money), rearing pattern of broiler (strain, sources of chick, housing management, summer management, winter management, litter management, feeding management etc.) and disease management (sources of veterinary service, vaccination and antibiotic application, disinfection and disposal of dead bird ). After completion of interview all the interview schedules were compiled for its data processing. At the beginning of the data processing all the qualitative data were converted into quantitative form. Local units were converted into standard units. The data were coded and tabulated in a data sheet. Then data were entered in statistical software for further analysis. The SPSS 12.0 computer package program was used to analyze the data. All personal traits were categorized and then frequency and percentage of the respondents were calculated.

### **Results and Discussion**

# Personal and socio-economic characteristics of the broiler farmers:

It was found from the Table 1 that 69.2% in Jessore and 57.7% broiler fermers in Bhola district belongs to middle aged group, followed by young aged group 24.1% and 25.0% and only 7.7% and 17.3% in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively belongs to old aged group involved in broiler farming. It is evident that in Jessore district the middle aged people were more involved in broiler farming as compared to that of Bhola district. The maximum number of broiler farmers both in Jessore and Bhola district. respectively had secondary level of education, followed by higher secondary level 17.3% and 25% in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively. Only 11.5% farmers were illiterate in Jessore district. The majority of the broiler fermers (44.2% and 57.7%) under Jessore and Bhola district, respectively had no training on broiler farming and only lowest number of respondents (3.8%) in Jessore district had higher training. The highest percentage of the broiler farmers (76.9% & 86.54%) under Jessore and Bhola district, respectively possessed less number of broilers in their farm while the lowest number of broiler farmers (3.8% and 1.92%) in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively had large number of broiler in their farm. It was also found that 46.2% and 13.5% broiler farmers under Jessore and Bhola district, respectively earned medium income from broiler. About 17.3% and 71.2% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively earned high income from broiler. Only 36.5% and 15.4% broiler farmer in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively earned low income from broiler. It is clear that more than two-third of the respondents incurred with broiler farming in Jessore district earned medium income from broiler and in Bhola district more than half of the broiler producer earned high income from broiler.

| Age group (year)                        |                           | Num           | ıber      | Distri      |                      | N              | Iax            | М            | lin          | Me                                     | an±SD                   |
|---|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--|-------------------------|
| L                                       |                           |               |           | respo       | the<br>ndents<br>⁄6) |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
|   |                           | Jessor<br>e   | Bhol<br>a | Jessor<br>e | Bhol<br>a            | Jessore        | Bhola          | Jessor<br>e  | Bhola        | Jessore                                | Bhola                   |
| Young                                   | up to<br>30               | 12            | 13        | 24.1        | 25.0                 |                |                | C            |              |  |                         |
| Middle                                  | 31-<br>50                 | 36            | 30        | 69.2        | 57.7                 | 65             | 65             | 25           | 22           | 40.90<br>±10.86                        | 43.02<br>±9.73          |
| Old                                     | >50                       | 4             | 9         | 7.7         | 17.3                 |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Level of e                              |                           | (year)        |           |             | •                    |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Illiterate                              | 0                         | 6             | 0         | 11.5        | 0                    |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Primary                                 | 1-5                       | 8             | 1         | 15.4        | 1.9                  |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Secondar<br>y                           | 6-10                      | 25            | 31        | 48.1        | 59.6                 |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Higher<br>secondar                      | 11-12                     | 9             | 13        | 17.3        | 25                   | 18             | 17             | 0            | 5            | 8.46<br>±4.44                          | $10.81 \pm 2.70$        |
| Graduate<br>/<br>Post<br>graduatio<br>n | >12                       | 4             | 7         | 7.7         | 13.5                 |                |                |              |              | <u>-</u> 4.44                          | -2.70                   |
| Exposure                                | to trainir                | ı<br>19 (numh | er)       |             |                      |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| No<br>Training                          | 0                         | 23            | 30        | 44.2        | 57.7                 |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Low<br>Training                         | 1                         | 23            | 18        | 44.2        | 34.6                 |                | _              |              |              | 0.71                                   | 0.48                    |
| Medium<br>Training                      | 2                         | 4             | 4         | 7.7         | 7.7                  | 3              | 2              | 0            | 0            | ±0.77                                  | ±0.64                   |
| High<br>Training                        | >2                        | 2             | 0         | 3.8         | 0                    |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Farm size                               | (number                   | of broile     | er)       |             |                      | •              | •              | •            |              | •                                      | •                       |
| Small                                   | Up to 500                 | 40            | 45        | 76.9        | 86.54                |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Medium                                  | 501-<br>1000              | 10            | 6         | 19.2        | 11.54                | 10000          | 4500           | 200          | 300          | 817.31<br>±1678.46                     | 1135.58±861<br>.62      |
| Large                                   | >1000                     | 2             | 1         | 3.8         | 1.92                 |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Income fr                               |                           |               |           |             |                      |                |                |              |              |  |                         |
| Low<br>income                           | Up to<br>30000<br>0       | 19            | 8         | 36.5        | 15.4                 |                |                |              |              | 477135.5                               |                         |
| Medium<br>income                        | 30000<br>1-<br>50000<br>0 | 24            | 7         | 46.2        | 13.5                 | 360000<br>0.00 | 3037500.<br>00 | 80000.<br>00 | 75600.<br>00 | ************************************** | 814208.65<br>±556001.14 |
| High<br>income                          | >5000<br>00               | 9             | 37        | 17.3        | 71.2                 |                |                |              |              |  |                         |

### Table : Personal and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents (n=52)

## Present status of the broiler farmers:

Table 2 shows that own money and bank loan were the main source of money for 40.38% and 23.08% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively. Own and NGO's loan were also another important source of money for 32.69% and 15.38% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively. Only 5.77% and 13.31% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively used NGO's loan to start broiler farming.

Table 2 also showed that more than half of the broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively started their farm with Cov-500 broiler strain. The majority of broiler farmers (55.77% and 67.31%) in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively bought chicks from Aftab Bohumukhi Farms Ltd. About 17.31% and 7.69% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively collected day old chick from Kazi Poultry Farms Ltd. Only 11.54% farmers collected chicks from Pragon Poultry Farms Ltd. in Bhola districts. It is clear that most of the respondents bought chicks from Aftab Bohumukhi Farms Ltd. due to their better quality of chicks.

| Table 2: Ca | tegories of | the respondents of | n the basis of | of sources of | money and b | roiler stain (n=52) |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------|
|             |             |                    |                |               |             |                     |

|                                 | Citation number |  |         |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Source of money                 | Numb            | Distribution of the<br>respondents (%) |         |       |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | Jessore         | Bhola                                  | Jessore | Bhola |  |  |  |  |
| Own                             | 5               | 3                                      | 9.62    | 5.77  |  |  |  |  |
| Bank loan                       | 2               | 0                                      | 3.85    | 0     |  |  |  |  |
| NGO loan                        | 3               | 9                                      | 5.77    | 13.31 |  |  |  |  |
| Job                             | 0               | 3                                      | 0       | 5.77  |  |  |  |  |
| Own + bank loan                 | 21              | 12                                     | 40.38   | 23.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Own + NGO loan                  | 17              | 8                                      | 32.69   | 15.38 |  |  |  |  |
| Own + Job                       | 0               | 2                                      | 0       | 3.85  |  |  |  |  |
| Bank loan + NGO loan            | 1               | 2                                      | 1.92    | 3.85  |  |  |  |  |
| NGO loan + Others               | 2               | 2                                      | 3.85    | 3.85  |  |  |  |  |
| Bank loan + Job                 | 0               | 2                                      | 0       | 3.85  |  |  |  |  |
| Own + Bank loan +Job            | 0               | 3                                      | 0       | 5.77  |  |  |  |  |
| Own +NGO loan +Job              | 0               | 2                                      | 0       | 3.85  |  |  |  |  |
| Own + Others                    | 1               | 1                                      | 1.92    | 1.92  |  |  |  |  |
| Own + NGO loan + Others         | 0               | 3                                      | 0       | 5.77  |  |  |  |  |
| Name of the strain reared       |                 |  |         |       |  |  |  |  |
| Cov-500                         | 27              | 30                                     | 51.52   | 57.69 |  |  |  |  |
| Lohman meat                     | 1               | 0                                      | 1.92    | 0     |  |  |  |  |
| Habbard classic                 | 19              | 13                                     | 36.54   | 25    |  |  |  |  |
| Others                          | 5               | 9                                      | 9.62    | 17.31 |  |  |  |  |
| Name of the hatcheries supplied |                 |  |         |       |  |  |  |  |
| Aftab Bohumukhi Farms Ltd.      | 29              | 35                                     | 55.77   | 67.31 |  |  |  |  |
| Kazi Poultry Farm Ltd.          | 9               | 4                                      | 17.31   | 7.69  |  |  |  |  |
| Afil Agro Ltd.                  | 7               | 0                                      | 13.46   | 0     |  |  |  |  |
| Nourish Poultry Farm            | 3               | 4                                      | 5.77    | 7.69  |  |  |  |  |
| Pragon Poultry Farm Ltd.        | 0               | 6                                      | 0       | 11.54 |  |  |  |  |
| Others                          | 4               | 3                                      | 7.69    | 5.77  |  |  |  |  |

NB: NGO, Non-government organization.

# Special managemental precaution of the broiler farmers:

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents (44.23% and 55.77%) reduced ambient temperature using electric fan, supply of saline water and maintaining proper ventilation while 25% and 13.46% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively used electric fan and proper ventilation. Only 17.31% and 13.46% farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively used electric fan and saline water to reduce ambient temperature during

summer in broiler farm. Majority of the broiler farmers (75% and 76.92%) in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively increased ambient temperature during winter season using curtain and light. The highest number of broiler farmers (28.85%) kept their farm 15 days interval before starting another batch and 30.77% broiler farmers kept their farm 5 days interval in Jessore and in Bhola districts, respectively. Only 1.92% of broiler farmers kept interval their farm from rearing for 30 days before starting another batch in Jessore.

| Management during summer season                       | Citation Number |       |  |       |  |  |
|---|-----------------|-------|--|-------|--|--|
|   | Num             | lber  | Distribution of the<br>respondents (%) |       |  |  |
|   | Jessore         | Bhola | Jessore                                | Bhola |  |  |
| Means for reducing ambient temperature                |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Electric fan  | 3               | 5     | 5.77                                   | 9.62  |  |  |
| Proper ventilation                                    | 1               | 2     | 1.92                                   | 3.85  |  |  |
| Electric fan + ventilation                            | 13              | 7     | 25.0                                   | 13.46 |  |  |
| Electric fan + Drinking of saline water               | 9               | 7     | 17.31                                  | 13.46 |  |  |
| Electric fan + Drinking of saline water + ventilation | 23              | 29    | 44.23                                  | 55.77 |  |  |
| Others  | 3               | 2     | 5.77                                   | 3.85  |  |  |
| Management during winter season                       | •               |       |  | •     |  |  |
| Means for improving ambient temperature               |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Curtain   | 1               | 2     | 1.92                                   | 3.85  |  |  |
| Light   | 11              | 9     | 21.15                                  | 17.31 |  |  |
| Curtain + light                                       | 39              | 40    | 75.0                                   | 76.92 |  |  |
| Others  | 1               | 1     | 1.92                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| Interval between two batches (days)                   | ·               |       |  | •     |  |  |
| 5   | 10              | 16    | 19.23                                  | 30.77 |  |  |
| 7   | 7               | 2     | 13.46                                  | 3.85  |  |  |
| 9   | 3               | 10    | 5.77                                   | 19.23 |  |  |
| 12  | 9               | 7     | 17.31                                  | 13.46 |  |  |
| 15  | 15              | 11    | 28.85                                  | 21.15 |  |  |
| 18  | 2               | 1     | 3.85                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| 20  | 3               | 1     | 5.77                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| 25  | 2               | 4     | 3.85                                   | 7.69  |  |  |
| 30  | 1               | 0     | 1.92                                   | 0     |  |  |

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of special managerial precaution (n=52).

## Feeding management and performance of the broiler:

Table 4 shows that majority of the broiler farmers both in Jessore and Bhola districts, fed their chicks Vit-C after receiving. About 13.46% and 25% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively fed their chicks glucose. 21.15% and 1.92% farmers fed their broiler cost @BDT 27 / kg of feed while only 1.92% farmers fed their broilers cost @ BDT 30/kg of feed in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively. About 40.38% and 36.54% of broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively reared broiler for 35 days while only 1.92% in Bhola district, respectively reared their broiler for 43 days. Most of the respondents under Bhola district reared broiler for short duration as compare to that of Jessore district. Table 4 also shows that broiler attained 280 g/week body weight in the farm of 40.38% and 21.15% farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively. Only 13.46% and 30.77% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively told that broiler gained body weight 270 g/week.

|  | Citation Number |                            |         |           |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------|---------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Feeding management of chick after arrival          | Nun             | Number Distribution of the |         |           |  |  |  |
|  |                 |                            | respond | lents (%) |  |  |  |
|  | Jessore         | Bhola                      | Jessore | Bhola     |  |  |  |
| Vitamin-C  | 31              | 27                         | 59.62   | 51.92     |  |  |  |
| Glucose  | 7               | 13                         | 13.46   | 25.0      |  |  |  |
| Glucovate  | 1               | 2                          | 1.92    | 3.85      |  |  |  |
| Saline   | 11              | 9                          | 21.15   | 17.31     |  |  |  |
| Others   | 2               | 1                          | 3.85    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| Grower and finisher feed price (average price in I | BDT, BDT 83.75  | = 1\$))                    |         |           |  |  |  |
| 24.5   | 7               | 7                          | 13.46   | 13.46     |  |  |  |
| 25   | 4               | 5                          | 7.69    | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 25.5   | 7               | 7                          | 13.46   | 13.46     |  |  |  |
| 26   | 3               | 7                          | 5.77    | 13.46     |  |  |  |
| 26.5   | 14              | 5                          | 26.92   | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 27   | 11              | 12                         | 21.15   | 23.08     |  |  |  |
| 27.5   | 1               | 3                          | 1.92    | 5.77      |  |  |  |
| 28   | 2               | 2                          | 3.85    | 3.85      |  |  |  |
| 28.5   | 2               | 1                          | 3.85    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 30   | 1               | 1                          | 1.92    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 31   | 0               | 2                          | 0       | 3.85      |  |  |  |
| Duration of rearing (days)                         |                 | ı                          |         |           |  |  |  |
| 35   | 21              | 19                         | 40.38   | 36.54     |  |  |  |
| 36   | 5               | 9                          | 9.62    | 17.31     |  |  |  |
| 37   | 7               | 5                          | 13.46   | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 38   | 1               | 3                          | 1.92    | 5.77      |  |  |  |
| 39   | 5               | 5                          | 9.62    | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 40   | 1               | 1                          | 1.92    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 41   | 2               | 1                          | 3.85    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 42   | 7               | 9                          | 13.46   | 17.31     |  |  |  |
| 43   | 0               | 1                          | 0       | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 44   | 1               | 1                          | 1.92    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 45   | 2               | 0                          | 3.85    | 0         |  |  |  |
| Body weight gain /week (g)                         |                 |                            |         |           |  |  |  |
| 250  | 3               | 1                          | 5.77    | 1.92      |  |  |  |
| 260  | 5               | 9                          | 9.62    | 17.31     |  |  |  |
| 270  | 7               | 16                         | 13.46   | 30.77     |  |  |  |
| 280  | 21              | 11                         | 40.38   | 21.15     |  |  |  |
| 290  | 1               | 5                          | 1.92    | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 300  | 7               | 5                          | 13.46   | 9.62      |  |  |  |
| 310  | 8               | 5                          | 15.38   | 9.62      |  |  |  |

| Table 4 | 1: | Distribution | of the res | pondents of | n the | basis o | f feeding | g management | and bro | biler p | erformance ( | n=52) | ) |
|---------|----|--------------|------------|-------------|-------|---------|-----------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|-------|---|
|         |    |              |            |             |       |         |           |              |         |         |              |       |   |

### **Disease Management of Broiler:**

Table 5 shows that most of the broiler farmers (36.54%) used own veterinary knowledge for disease combat in Jessore and 28.85% farmers in Bhola district got veterinary service from NGOs. About 25% and 13.46% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively got veterinary service from private practitioner. Most of the broiler farmers (48.08% and 63.46%) disinfected their farm by using lime water while 17.31% and 1.92% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively disinfected farm using Lysol disinfectant. About 40.38% farmers administered vaccine against Ranikhet, Gumboro and Infectious Bronchitis diseases and 36.64% farmers administered vaccine against Ranikhet and Gumboro

diseases in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively. Only 25% farmers administered vaccine against Marek's and Infectious Ranikhet, Gumboro, Bronchitis diseases in Jessore and 28.85% farmers administered vaccine against Ranikhet, Gumboro and Infectious Bronchitis diseases in Bhola districts. Majority of the farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively administered antibiotic against Coccidiosis, Dermatitis and Respiratory infection diseases. About 28.85% and 25.0% of the farmers in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively administered antibiotic against Coccidiosis, Dermatitis, Respiratory infection and Wingrot diseases. It is clear that most of the farmers in Jessore district applied antibiotic against Coccidiosis, Dermatitis and Respiratory infection diseases while in Bhola, most of the farmers applied antibiotic against Coccidiosis, Dermatitis, Respiratory infection and Wingrot diseases. The occurrence of diseases varies due to geographical variation.

| Table 5: Categories | of the respondents | on the basis of diseases | management (n=52) |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
|                     |                    |                          |                   |

| Source of Veterinary Service                                 |          | Citation Number |       |  |       |  |  |  |
|--|----------|-----------------|-------|--|-------|--|--|--|
| ·  |          | Nui             | nber  | Distribution of the<br>respondents (%) |       |  |  |  |
|  |          | Jessore         | Bhola | Jessore                                | Bhola |  |  |  |
| Own veterinary knowledge                                     | 19       | )               | 6     | 36.54                                  | 5.77  |  |  |  |
| Government veterinary doctor                                 | 0        |                 | 6     | 0                                      | 11.54 |  |  |  |
| Private practitioner   | 1.       | 3               | 7     | 25.0                                   | 13.46 |  |  |  |
| Veterinary doctor from NGOs                                  | 4        |                 | 15    | 7.69                                   | 28.85 |  |  |  |
| Veterinary doctor from NGOs + Private practitioner           | 3        |                 | 2     | 5.77                                   | 3.85  |  |  |  |
| Veterinary doctor from NGOs + Government veterinary          | 1        |                 | 3     | 1.92                                   | 5.77  |  |  |  |
| doctor + Own veterinary knowledge                            |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Veterinary doctor from NGOs + Government veterinary          | 1        |                 | 7     | 1.92                                   | 13.46 |  |  |  |
| doctor   |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Own veterinary knowledge + Veterinary doctor from            | 4        |                 | 2     | 7.69                                   | 3.85  |  |  |  |
| NGOs   |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Own veterinary knowledge +Private Practitioner               | 2        |                 | 2     | 3.85                                   | 3.85  |  |  |  |
| Own veterinary knowledge + Veterinary doctor from            | 5        |                 | 1     | 9.62                                   | 1.92  |  |  |  |
| NGOs + Private Practitioner                                  |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Disinfection of farm after rearing one batch (disinfectar    | nt used) | )               |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| QAC  | 3        | 0               |       | 5.77                                   | 0     |  |  |  |
| Lysol  | 9        | 1               |       | 17.31                                  | 1.92  |  |  |  |
| Lime water   | 25       | 3               |       | 48.08                                  | 63.46 |  |  |  |
| Vircon   | 7        | 2               |       | 13.46                                  | 3.85  |  |  |  |
| Lime water + Bleaching powder                                | 2        | 1               | 2     | 3.85                                   | 23.08 |  |  |  |
| Others   | 6        | 4               |       | 11.54                                  | 7.69  |  |  |  |
| Vaccination used for the diseases                            |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Ranikhet diseases  | 5        | 3               |       | 9.62                                   | 5.77  |  |  |  |
| Gumboro + Marek's diseases                                   | 1        | 4               |       | 1.92                                   | 7.69  |  |  |  |
| Ranikhet + Gumboro diseases                                  | 5        | 1               | 9     | 9.62                                   | 36.64 |  |  |  |
| Ranikhet + Gumbor+ Marek's diseases                          | 6        | 3               |       | 11.54                                  | 5.77  |  |  |  |
| Ranikhet + Gumboro + Infectious Bronchitis                   | 21       | 1               | 5     | 40.38                                  | 28.85 |  |  |  |
| Ranikhet + Gumboro+ Marek's + Infectious Bronchitis          | 13       | 8               |       | 25.0                                   | 15.38 |  |  |  |
| diseases   |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Others   | 1        | 0               |       | 1.92                                   | 0     |  |  |  |
| Antibiotics used for the diseases                            |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Name of the Disease  |          |                 |       |  |       |  |  |  |
| Coccidiosis + Dermatitis                                     | 3        | 1               |       | 5.77                                   | 1.92  |  |  |  |
| Coccidiosis + Dermatitis+ CRD                                | 5        | 6               |       | 9.62                                   | 13.46 |  |  |  |
| Coccidiosis + Dermatitis+Pullorum                            | 3        | 3               |       | 5.77                                   | 9.62  |  |  |  |
| Coccidiosis + Dermatitis + Respiratory infection             | 19       | 2               | 3     | 36.54                                  | 44.23 |  |  |  |
| Coccidiosis +Dermatitis + Respiratory infection+ Fowl        | 1        | 3               |       | 1.92                                   | 5.77  |  |  |  |
| coryza<br>Coccidiosis + Dermatitis + Respiratory infection + | 15       | 1               | 3     | 28.85                                  | 25.0  |  |  |  |
| Wingrot  |          |                 |       | 2.05                                   | 1.00  |  |  |  |
| Dermatitis + CRD + Respiratory infection                     | 2        | 1               |       | 3.85                                   | 1.92  |  |  |  |
| Dermatitis +Pullorum +CRD+ Respiratory infection             | 3        | 1               |       | 5.77                                   | 1.92  |  |  |  |
| Others   | 1        | 1               |       | 1.92                                   | 1.92  |  |  |  |

## *Litter management of the broiler farmers:*

Table 6 shows that majority of the broiler farmers (55.77% and 63.46%) used rice husk as litter material on floor while only 3.85% and 0% respondents in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively used chopped

straw. It was found that most of the broiler farmers treated litter materials in sun light while only 5.77% and 1.92% farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively treated litter using heat. Majority of the

broiler farmers (92.31% and 98.08%) used litter 1-4 inch height on the floor while 7.69% and 1.92% farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively used litter 5-9 inch height. About 75% and 94.23% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively suggested that litter got wetted with droppings and water. Only 7.69% and 1.92% broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively suggested that litter got wetted from others sources. Most of the broiler farmers (40.39% and 30.77%) in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively treated their wet litter with Ca  $(OH)_2$  for removing of moisture. About 21.15% broiler farmers in Jessore treated litter with powder like materials. It is clear that the highest number of broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola districts treated their wet litter materials with Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>. About 5.77% and 32.69% broiler farmers disposed the spent litter materials as manure. While 34.62% and 36.54% in Jessore and Bhola districts, respectively disposed as fish feed.

**Table 6:** Categories of broiler farmers on the basis of litter materials (n=52)

| Name of the litter materials used        | Citation Number |       |  |       |  |  |
|--|-----------------|-------|--|-------|--|--|
|  | Nun             | ıber  | Distribution of the<br>respondents (%) |       |  |  |
|  | Jessore         | Bhola | Jessore                                | Bhola |  |  |
| Saw dust                                 | 21              | 15    | 40.38                                  | 28.85 |  |  |
| Rice husk                                | 29              | 33    | 55.77                                  | 63.46 |  |  |
| Chapped straw                            | 2               | 0     | 3.85                                   | 0     |  |  |
| Others (Rice polish)                     | 0               | 4     | 0                                      | 7.69  |  |  |
| Treatment of litter before using         |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Sun drying                               | 39              | 43    | 65.38                                  | 82.69 |  |  |
| Heat treatment                           | 3               | 1     | 5.77                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| Chemical treatment                       | 9               | 7     | 17.31                                  | 13.46 |  |  |
| Others                                   | 1               | 1     | 1.92                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| Height of the litter on the floor (inch) |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| 1-4                                      | 48              | 51    | 92.31                                  | 98.08 |  |  |
| 5-8                                      | 4               | 1     | 7.69                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| 9-15                                     | 0               | 0     | 0                                      | 0     |  |  |
| Source of litter get wetted              |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Droppings                                | 9               | 2     | 17.31                                  | 3.85  |  |  |
| Droppings + Water                        | 39              | 49    | 75.0                                   | 94.23 |  |  |
| Others                                   | 4               | 1     | 7.69                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| Method of treatment of wetted litter     |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub>                      | 21              | 31    | 40.39                                  | 30.77 |  |  |
| Powder materials                         | 11              | 0     | 21.15                                  | 0     |  |  |
| Change                                   | 15              | 16    | 28.85                                  | 59.62 |  |  |
| Others                                   | 5               | 5     | 9.62                                   | 9.62  |  |  |
| Uses of spent litter                     |                 |       |  |       |  |  |
| Manure                                   | 4               | 17    | 5.77                                   | 32.69 |  |  |
| Fuel                                     | 1               | 1     | 1.92                                   | 1.92  |  |  |
| Fish feed                                | 17              | 19    | 34.62                                  | 36.54 |  |  |
| Manure+ Fish feed                        | 27              | 14    | 51.92                                  | 26.92 |  |  |
| Others                                   | 3               | 1     | 5.77                                   | 1.92  |  |  |

### Problem faced for marketing:

Table 7 shows that about half of the broiler farmers faced great marketing problems due to unfavorable market for selling broiler and high price of feed and chick in Jessore district and 38.46% faced great

marketing problems due to the price of feed and chick are not fixed; high price of feed and chick in Bhola districts.

|   | Citation number |  |         |       |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------|--|---------|-------|--|--|--|
| Problems faced for marketing  | Nur             | Distribution of the<br>respondents (%) |         |       |  |  |  |
|   | Jessore         | Bhola                                  | Jessore | Bhola |  |  |  |
| Price of feed and chick are not fixed   | 1               | 4                                      | 1.92    | 7.69  |  |  |  |
| High price of feed and chick  | 6               | 2                                      | 11.54   | 3.85  |  |  |  |
| Unfavorable market for selling broiler  | 5               | 0                                      | 9.62    | 0     |  |  |  |
| Price of feed and chick are not fixed<br>+ High price of feed and chick   | 3               | 20                                     | 5.77    | 38.46 |  |  |  |
| Unfavorable market for selling broiler<br>+ High price of feed and chick  | 25              | 5                                      | 48.08   | 9.62  |  |  |  |
| High price of feed and chick<br>+ Unfavorable market for selling broiler  | 4               | 4                                      | 7.69    | 7.69  |  |  |  |
| The price of feed and chick are not fixed<br>+ High price of feed and chick<br>+ Unfavorable market for selling broiler | 2               | 10                                     | 3.85    | 19.23 |  |  |  |
| Others  | 6               | 7                                      | 11.54   | 13.46 |  |  |  |

Table 7: Categories of the respondents on the basis of marketing problems (n=52)

### Conclusion

In both districts the middle aged group and farmers of secondary level education were highly involved with broiler farming. Most of the broiler farmers in Bhola district were belonged to high income group as compared to Jessore district. About 51.52% farmers brought "Cov-500 strains" and 36.54% brought "Habbard classic" in Jessore and Bhola district respectively. More than half of the broiler farmers in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively treated litter materials in sun light. The most appropriate treating way of wet litter materials were using Ca (OH)<sub>2</sub> in Jessore and Bhola district. About 48.08% and 63.46% in Jessore and Bhola district, respectively disinfected their farm by using lime water. About 36.54% and 44.23% in Jessore and Bhola district respectively applied antibiotic against Coccidiosis, Dermatitis and Respiratory infection diseases. Further in depth study is needed to explore more information related to comparison of broiler production aspects in plain and coastal belt of Bangladesh.

### References

- Anonymous. 1988. Agroecological Region of Bangladesh, Report 2, Land Resources Appraisal of Bangladesh for Agricultural Development. United Nations Development Programme, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, pp: 570.
- BBS, 2009. Census of Agriculture 2006. Structure of Agricultural Holdings and livestock Population, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Ershad, S. M. E.; Islam, S. S.; Mondal, S. C. and Sarkar, B. 2004. Efficiency of trained farmers on the productivity of

broilers in a selected area of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Poultry Science.*, 3 (8): 503-506.

- FAO, 1997. Guidelines for the inclusion of improved household poultry production, Special Programme for Food Security, May 1997, pp: 13-14.
- Hasan M. M., and Hasan, M. A. H. 2003. Poultry research in Bangladesh: present status, development strategies in the past and in the future. Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Huque, Q. M. E. and Paul, D. C. 2001. Strategies for Family Poultry with Special Reference to Women Participation. Paper Presented *In* 1st SAARC Poultry Conference. Held on 24-26, September, 2001. At Pune, India.
- Huque, Q. M. E.; Chowdhury, S. A. and Haque M. E. 1999. Poultry research in Bangladesh: present status and its implication for future research. Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Karim, Z. 2001. Proceedings of 2nd International seminar organized by WPSA BB held in Dhaka in 2001.
- Yasmin, L., Hussain, M. A. and Miah, M. 1989. Characteristics of backyard poultry farmers affecting their knowledge on poultry production. *Bangladesh Journal of Training and Development.*, 2 (1): 22-30.