

## Effect of Dried Tomato Pomace Feeding on Feed Intake, Body Weight Gain and Economic Efficiency of Rhode Island Red Grower Chicks

Melkamu Bezabih Yitbarek

*Department of Animal Science, Debre Markos University, Ethiopia*

[Received: October 19, Accepted: December 17, 2012]

### ABSTRACT

This experiment was carried out to evaluate the effect of feeding Dried Tomato Pomace (DTP) with commercial ration on feed intake, body weight gain, feed conversion ratio (FCR) and economic efficiency of Rhode Island Red (RIR) grower chicks. A total of three hundred RIR grower chicks at the age of eight weeks were grouped into 20 pens of 15 chicks each, and randomly assigned to five treatments (control fed a commercial ration; 5% DTP; 10% DTP; 15% DTP; 20% DTP). Birds fed on 5, 10, 15, and 20% DTP had the higher dry matter (DM) intake (72.93, 72.75, 72.98 and 73.15 g/bird/day) than the control group (72.10g/bird/day). The daily body weight gain of birds ranged from 13.3 to 15.3 g/day, the highest being on birds fed on 5% DTP; The feed conversion ratio (FCR) of birds were 5.3, 4.8, 5.0, 5.3, and 5.5 for the control and for birds that consumed 5, 10, 15, and 20% DTP, respectively. The higher significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was observed at 5% compared with 20% DTP. The economic efficiency of the experimental diets was 1.35, 1.79, 1.80, 1.78, and 1.82 for a group fed on the control, 5, 10, 15, and 20% DTP, respectively. There was a higher significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) difference on a group fed on DTP and the control diet. 20% DTP brought the highest economic efficiency among the groups. Based on these results it could be concluded that dried tomato pomace could be incorporated at the level of 20% without any adverse effect on growth performance in order to increase the economic efficiency.

**Keywords:** Dried Tomato Pomace, Feed intake, Weight gain, Economic Efficiency.

### INTRODUCTION

Scarcity of poultry feed is the major problem and the expected output from birds is very low in Ethiopia. To run efficient poultry production in the country regular availability of good quality ingredients and a fully balanced complete feed are very essential. In food insufficient countries, using of alternative feed ingredients in poultry ration is a key determinant of successful poultry production. One such non-conventional feedstuff, which could be of value for poultry feeding, is tomato pomace. Tomato pomace is an inexpensive and primary by-product of tomato manufacturing. In Ethiopia there are two tomato processing factories that is Melgi-Wondo and Upper Awash Agro industry. Annually more than 234,902 quintal of tomato can be processed into tomato paste and tomato juice<sup>[1]</sup>. When tomatoes are processed into products, 10 to 30% of their weight becomes waste or "pomace". It consists mainly of the skins, seeds and hard tissues of the whole tomatoes. Tomato pomace contains 5.1% moisture, 11.9% fat, 26.8% protein and 26.3% crude fiber<sup>[2]</sup>; it contains 13% more lysine than soybean protein<sup>[3]</sup>, a good source of vitamin B, fair source of vitamin A and no known antinutritive factors<sup>[4]</sup>. It is also fiber rich feed resource and thought to act as a cholesterol reducing feedstuff in poultry products<sup>[3]</sup>.

However, this huge by product has not yet been extensively utilized as a feed source for poultry. The majority of it is just dumped and allowed to decay in the surrounding areas near the factories<sup>[5]</sup>. This creates favorable condition for the breeding of mosquito to spread malaria in to human. So finding

solutions to utilize these abundant and inexpensive wastes is very crucial. One of the best alternative means is to utilize this feed stuff as a feed ingredient in poultry ration. Therefore, the possibility of utilizing this waste in feeding Rhode Island Red (RIR) grower chicks (which widely spread in Ethiopia) is the most promising one to alleviate chronic feed shortages for poultry and reduce cost of feed. The objective of this study intended to evaluate the potential use of Dried Tomato Pomace which could be used in poultry feeding on the performance of Rhode Island Red (RIR) grower chicks under intensive management conditions.

### METHODS AND MATERIALS

#### The study area

The study was carried out in Ethiopia at Wolaita Zone in Soddo town, which is found in the Southern Region and located 390 km Southwest of Addis Ababa and 165 km from the town of the region-Awassa. Its total areas is 4383 km square (438370 ha). The mean annual temperature of the area is 19°C. The average rainfall is 1014 mm. The livestock population of the area is estimated to be 1.8 million, of which 53% are cattle, 9% sheep and goat, 3% equines and 35% poultry.

#### Management of experimental birds

A total of 300 (180 male and 120 female) male and female Rhode Island Red (RIR) grower chicks at eight weeks of age were purchased from Awassa Poultry Multiplication Center. All the birds were randomly divided into 20 pens with 15 (9 male and 6 female) birds /pen. The 20 pens were randomly

assigned to five treatment groups. Replicates were housed in the partitioned house with all the necessary facilities for seventy days experimental period.

Table 1 : Ingredients of experimental diets fed to the RIR Grower Chicks

Feed ingredients	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)
DTP	0	5	10	15	20
Corn	30	28.5	27	25.5	24
Wheat bran	10	9.5	9	8.5	8
Wheat middling	27.15	25.65	24.15	22.65	21.15
Nouge cake	15	14.25	13.5	12.75	12
Soya bean	5	4.75	4.5	4.25	4
Rape seed	10	9.5	9	8.5	8
Lime stone	2	2	2	2	2
Salt	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Vitamin premix	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Lysine	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Methionone	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Total	100	100	100	100	100
CP (%)	18.66	19.84	21.36	18.82	18.77
ME(kcal/kg DM )	3157.08	3087.07	3084.95	2789.60	2763.48

Source: Control diet from [6].

Standard vaccination schedule was done and strict sanitary measures were followed during the experimental period. All birds were vaccinated la-sota vaccine against New Castle Disease for three times at 60, 90,120 days of age. Amprolium was used as a prophylactic treatment for three times (At a time 30g /100 liters of water for 5 days).

Table 2 chemical analysis of experimental diets on Dry Matter basis

DM -Dry Matter ;OM-Organic Matter ;CP-Crude Protein; ME-

Nutrient content	Unit	Experimental Diets					
		DTP	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
DM	%	93.2	90.56	91.42	91.37	91.28	91.36
OM	%	94.00	89.27	90.28	90.75	91.24	92.64
CP	%	21.6	18.66	19.84	20.36	18.82	18.77
ME	kcal/kg DM	773.3	3157.08	3087.07	3084.95	2789.60	2163.48
CF	%	38.8	8.67	9.26	10.21	13.46	17.00
EE	%	9.5	7.59	6.5	7.26	7.16	7.61
MM	%	6.2	10.73	9.71	8.71	8.75	8.06
NFE	%	24.1	54.35	54.68	52.92	51.80	60.89
Ca	%	0.54	0.64	0.56	0.47	0.64	0.39

Metabolizable Energy; CF-Crude Fiber; EE-Ether Extract; MM-Mineral Matter NFE-Nitrogen free Extract; Ca-Calcium

**Experimental diet**

Wet Tomato Pomace was obtained from Upper Awash tomato processing plant. It was dried by spreading and exposing to sunlight at an open place using plastic sheet as drying material. The particle size of pomace was reduced by beating using stick and hand crushing. Over sized DTP was ground using a hand mortar and passed through 3 mm sieve size. The formulated commercial grower chick ration was bought from Kaliti Animal Feed Processing Factory (KAFPF) & used as a control diet which is presented on table 1.

The chicks were fed in the form of mash for grower diets from the age of eight weeks to eighteen weeks. Feed and water were provided on ad libitum basis. Feed intake and refusals were weighed and recorded every day to estimate the feed consumption for each

replicate and treatment. Individual weight of each replicates was taken once per week. Body weight gain was calculated by subtracting of the live body weight at the beginning of measuring date from that of the second measuring date (BWG, g/d). Feed conversion ratio was calculated as gram feed intake /per gram body weight gain.

**Economic Efficiency of experimental diets**

Feed cost per live weight gain was computed by the cost of feed consumed to attain a kilogram (kg) live weight gain and the economic efficiency was

calculated as the ratio between income (price of weight gain) and the cost of feed consumed [7]. The data were calculated that the price of one kg body weight of bird on selling time and the cost of feeds used according to the prices available in Ethiopian market during the experimental period. By using of the following formula the economic Efficiency was calculated[7].

$$\text{Price of feed consumption (Birr)} = \text{Average feed consumption} \times \text{price/kg feed}$$

$$\text{Total revenue (Birr)} = \text{Average daily gain (g)} \times \text{price of one (kg) body weight on selling (Birr)}$$

$$\text{Net revenue (NR) Birr} = \text{Total revenue (Birr)} - \text{feed cost (Birr)}$$

$$\text{Economic efficiency (ECE)} = \frac{\text{NR (Birr)}}{\text{Feeding cost of this gain in (Birr)}}$$

Table 3 Mean Dry Matter intake of RIR Grower Chicks

Parameters	Experimental Diets					SEM	P-value
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
Mean daily DM intake (g/bird)	72.10 <sup>b</sup>	72.93 <sup>a</sup>	72.75 <sup>a</sup>	72.98 <sup>a</sup>	73.15 <sup>a</sup>	0.178	0.000
Mean total DM intake (g/bird)	5046.98 <sup>b</sup>	5102.85 <sup>a</sup>	5092.18 <sup>a</sup>	5108.90 <sup>a</sup>	5120.50 <sup>a</sup>	11.82	0.000

Means with a different superscript in a row are significantly different (P < 0.05)

**Laboratory Analysis**

Representative samples of experimental diets were taken to Debre Zeit National Veterinary Institute for chemical analysis from each of the feed ingredients used in the experiment and analyzed before mixing with the actual dietary treatments. Feed samples were analyzed for dry matter (DM), crude protein (CP), ether extract (EE), crude fiber (CF) and ash [8]. The metabolizable energy (ME) levels of feed ingredients was calculated using the formula ME (Kcal/kg DM) = 3951 + 54.4 EE - 88.7 CF - 40.8 Ash [9] presented on table 2.

Table 4: Body weight gain (g/bird) and Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR) of RIR Grower Chicks

Parameters	Experimental Diets					SEM	P-value
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
Initial bodyweight(g)at eight weeks of age	485.5	485.2	484	486.4	484.3	10.715	0.999
Mean final body weight(g)	1433.5 <sup>b</sup>	1559.1 <sup>a</sup>	1508.4 <sup>ab</sup>	1453.05 <sup>ab</sup>	1414.2 <sup>b</sup>	39.284	0.013
Mean daily weight gain(g/bird)	13.5 <sup>b</sup>	15.3 <sup>a</sup>	14.6 <sup>ab</sup>	13.8 <sup>ab</sup>	13.3 <sup>b</sup>	0.561	0.012
Mean total gain(g)	948.3 <sup>b</sup>	1073.9 <sup>a</sup>	1024.4 <sup>ab</sup>	966.7 <sup>ab</sup>	929.9 <sup>b</sup>	39.5	0.014
Feed conversion ratio(FCR)	5.3 <sup>ab</sup>	4.8 <sup>b</sup>	5.0 <sup>ab</sup>	5.3 <sup>ab</sup>	5.5 <sup>a</sup>	0.200	0.016

Means with a different superscript in a row are significantly different (P < 0.05)

**Experimental design and statistical analysis**

The experiment was arranged in completely randomized design (CRD).The data were analysed to one way ANOVA using SPSS (Version .13) and SAS (Version 6.12 and GLM procedures) softwares. These help to observe the output of the two and for cross-checking purpose. When treatment effects were found to be significant (P<0.05), mean separation was undertaken using Turkey HSD test. All values were calculated on a pen average basis.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Dry Matter Intake**

The daily and the total mean DM intake of grower chicks fed with the treatment levels of DTP is presented in Table 3. The average daily dry matter intake among the treatments that comprised DTP ranged from 72.75 to 73.15 g/bird, and as a significantly (P<0.05) differed from the control

group (72.10 g/bird). The maximum cumulative DM consumption per bird was 5120.50g in the birds fed on T5. The intake was higher when birds fed different levels of DTP than those fed on the

commercial ration alone.

Dried Tomato Pomace did not affect the DM intake of grower chicks and it increased the mean daily and cumulative feed consumption of birds. The increased intake might be due to the higher crude fiber or lower Metabolizable Energy (ME) content of DTP. Such fiber increases fecal bulk and speed up the passage of feed through the digestive tract and keeps the health of gastro intestinal tract Anderson et al [10]. Inclusions of high fiber ingredients are usually limited because of the poor metabolizable energy contents ( Johnston et al [11]. To fulfill their energy requirement birds need to consume more feed. If the energy level is low the consumption and FCR are high and vise versa [12].

**Body Weight Gain and Feed Conversion Ratio**

The effect of the inclusion of various levels of DTP in growers ration on body weight gain is presented in Table 4.The mean daily body weight gain of grower chicks during this study was 13.5, 15.3, 14.6, 13.8 and 13.3 gram fed on T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5, respectively. The diet containing 5% DTP led to significantly higher body weight gain than those placed on a 20% DTP and the control diet. Although statistically not significant different from the other treatments, the least mean daily body weight gain was recorded from chicks fed on diets containing 20% DTP.

Feed conversion ratio of the experimental chicks expressed as grams of feed consumption per unit body weight gain are shown in Table 4. There was no statistically marked variation in the feed conversion ratio among all treatments compared to the control group. The mean feed conversion ratio was 5.3, 4.8, 5.0, 5.3 and 5.5 for the group fed on T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5, respectively. A group fed with a diet containing 5% dried tomato pomace had

significantly higher feed conversion ratio compared with a group that fed a diet containing 20% DTP. Thus, more feed was needed to attain a unit gain compared with a bird fed a diet containing 5% DTP; this may be due to the higher crude fiber content in the experimental diet. The inclusion of 20% DTP was higher fiber content that led to reduced body weight gain.

Table 5 Mean Dry Matter intake of RIR Grower Chicks

Parameters	Experimental Diets					SEM	P-value
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
Mean daily intake (g/bird)	DM 72.10 <sup>b</sup>	72.93 <sup>a</sup>	72.75 <sup>a</sup>	72.98 <sup>a</sup>	73.15 <sup>a</sup>	0.1784	0.000
Mean total intake (g/bird)	DM 5046.98 <sup>b</sup>	5102.85 <sup>a</sup>	5092.18 <sup>a</sup>	5108.90 <sup>a</sup>	5120.50 <sup>a</sup>	11.826	0.000

Means with a different superscript in a row are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ )

The presence of slightly higher crude protein and less amount of crude fiber in the group fed on the 5% DTP might have contributed to the increase in body weight, as higher amount of protein is broken down in the intestines into its constituent amino acids which may then be absorbed into the blood and used for muscle growth, replacement of body cells, and for the synthesis of body tissue [13]. The most commonly deficit amino acids in grower chicken ration are lysine, methionine, tryptophane glycine and arginine [14]. DTP contain these amino acids and could satisfy their amino acid requirements. In addition, they require fats and carbohydrates, vitamins (A, D3, E, K, riboflavin, B12, niacin, panthothenic acid and choline), minerals (Calcium, Phosphorus, Manganese, Iodine, Sodium Chlorine and Zinc) and cannot exist on high fibre diets [15]. In case of the group fed with the diet containing 20% DTP the live body weight & body weight gain was significantly lower than the group fed with 5% DTP due to increased level of crude fiber. In the monogastric animal, fiber represents theinsoluble matter of plant cell walls that is indigestible by animal enzymes, but can be partially degraded by gastrointestinal microflora [16]. The constituents of fiber affect the gastrointestinal tract differently, ultimately affecting the nutrition of the animal. The crude fiber level not less than 6% and not above 6.5% will be suitable for optimal growth [17]. The maximum amount of crude fiber, for grower chicks should be 7.0 % [18].

### Economic Efficiency

The cost effectiveness of the nonconventional feed is shown in Table 5. Feed cost (in Birr) /total gain was 20.16, 19.25, and 18.28, 17.41 and 16.49 Birr for the groups fed on the control diet, 5% DTP, 10% DTP, 15% DTP, and 20% DTP, respectively. The inclusion of DTP in growers ration and feed cost per kg feed were inversely proportional. The Economic Efficiency of the experimental diets was 1.35, 1.79, 1.80, 1.78, and 1.82 for a group fed on the control diet, 5% DTP, 10% DTP, 15% DTP and 20% DTP, respectively. There was a significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) difference between a diet containing 5%,

10%, 15% and 20% DTP compared with the control (commercial) diet. The highest economic efficiency was obtained at a diet containing 20% DTP.

Feed is the principal determinant of the economics in production [19]. The cost of feed ingredients represents 60-80% of the total cost of production for intensively reared poultry in the tropics Fajimi *et al.* [20,21]

Exploitation of agricultural by-products may make a substantial contribution towards better and more economic feeding of poultry. In view of the shortage

and the high costs of protein feed stuffs. Tomato pomace could provide part of the protein needed by poultry [22].

The present result clearly indicated that the inclusion of Dried Tomato Pomace at 20% inclusion level in grower commercial ration reduces much production cost, economically feasible and brought high economic efficiency without affecting feed intake, weight gain, feed conversion efficiency, carcass yield and dressing percentage of grower chicks.

Based on the overall result obtained in this study concluded that the lowest and highest DM intake were observed at the control group and 20% DTP inclusion level, respectively. Birds fed on at 5% DTP inclusion level had the highest body weight gain than the control group. When the level of DTP inclusion in a commercial ration was increased, the body weight gain of birds was reduced. However, by increasing DTP inclusion in the growers ration similar body weight gain was observed that of the control group. Higher feed conversion ratio (FCR) was obtained when DTP was included at 5 % level compared with 20% inclusion level. Significantly similar carcass yield and dressing percentage was observed at 20% of DTP inclusion on grower chicks. At 20% DTP inclusion in grower commercial ration significantly reduced the feed cost and increased the economic efficiency for producers compared to the commercial diet.

### REFERENCES

1. Upper Awash Agro industry (UAAI) (2009). Amount of Processing Tomato. Unpublished progress reportl .Upper Awash Agro Industry, Merti. Pp, 3.
2. King, A.J. and Zeidler G (2004).Tomato Pomace May be a Good Source of Vitamin E in Broiler Diets. California Agriculture, volume 58, Number 1.
3. Al-Betawi, N.A (2005). Preliminary Study on Tomato Pomace as Unusual Feedstuff in Broiler Diets. Pak. J. Nutr., 4: 57-63.

4. Giesman, J.R. (1981). From Tomato to Resources Protein from Tomato Seeds. Ohio Rep., 66: 92-94.
5. Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) (2006). Agricultural Bulletin (Amharic version), pp15-18
6. Kality Animal feed Processing Factory (KAFPF) (2009). Unpublished Feed Formulation Manual. Addis Ababa. Kality. pp 1.
7. Waheed Attia and Eltaieb Ibrahim (2005). Inclusion of Some Wastes in Rabbit Diets. Department of Animal Production, Faculty of Agriculture, Alazhar University. pp 14-26.
8. A.O.A.C (Association of Official Analytical Chemists) (2000). Official Methods of Analysis. 13<sup>th</sup> Edition, Washington D.C.
9. Wiseman J (1987). Feeding of Non-Ruminant Livestock. Butterworth and C.Ltd. pp. 370.
10. Anderson J, Perryman S., Young L. and Prior S (2010). Dietary Fiber . Colorado State University Extension pp 1
11. Johnston Lee J., Sally Noll, Antonio Renteria, and Jerry Shurson (2005). Feeding By-Products High in Concentration of Fiber to Nonruminants. West Central Research and Outreach Center University of Minnesota. PP 15.
12. Ralph Say R (1987). Manual of Poultry Production in the Tropics. Published by CAB international. pp. 53
13. Firman Jeffre D. (2004). Nutrient Requirements of Chickens and Turkeys. National academy press Washington D.C. pp 19.
14. Gillespie James R. (1992). Modern Livestock and Poultry Production. 4th edition . Delmar publisher.inc. pp 612.
15. Burton and Silverman (2009). Adequacy of a vegetarian diet. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2009 59, 1238S-1241S. PubMed: 8172128.
16. Damron B.L and Sloan, D.R (2009). Poultry Diets for Small Flocks. University of Florida IFAS extension. pp 1.
17. Chandrasekaran D (2005). Juvenile Broiler Nutrition .Department of Animal Nutrition, Veterinary College & Research Institute Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Namakkal 637001.
18. Anjum M.I., Khan A.G., Azim A. and Afzal M (2005). Effect of Dietary Supplementation of Multi-Strain Probiotic On Broiler Growth Performance. Animal Nutrition Programme, Animal Sciences Institute, National Agricultural Research Centre (NARC), Islamabad-45500, Animal Sciences Division, Pakistan Agricultural Research Council (PARC), Islamabad, Pakistan.
19. Negussie Dana and Alemu Yami ( 2005). Characterization and Classification of Potential Poultry Feeds in Ethiopia Using Cluster Analyses. Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization, Debre Zeit Agricultural Research Center, P.O.Box 32, Eth. J. Anim. Prod. 5(1) - 2005: 125-131
20. Fajimi A. O., Babatunde G. M., Ogunlana F. F. and Oyejide A. ( 1993). Comparative Utilization of Rubber Seed Oil and Palm Oil by Broilers in Humid Tropical Environment. *Animal Feed Science and Technology.* 43:177-178
21. Tewe O. O (1997). Sustainability and Development Paradigm from Nigeria's Livestock Industry. Inagural lecture delivered on behalf of Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Pg 50. The Ensminger Publishing Co., Clovis, CA, USA.
22. Rahmatnejad E., M. Bojarpour, K.H.mirzadeh, M.Chaji and MO.Asheyzideh (2009). The Effect of Different Levels of Dried Tomato Pomace on Broiler Chicken Hematological Indices Economic. Department of Animal Science, Ramin University of Agricultural and Natural Resources, Ahvaz, Iran.