

# Turn\_TASJ\_2018

*by* B Hartoyo

---

**Submission date:** 08-Apr-2023 01:04PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 2058890118

**File name:** Artikel\_3.\_Performance\_Intestinal.pdf (312.6K)

**Word count:** 5512

**Character count:** 28794

## Performance and Intestinal Profiles of Tegal Duck Fed Ration Supplemented with Prebiotics

N. Iriyar<sup>25</sup>, B. Hartoyo, & S. Suhermiyati

Animal Nutrition Laboratory, Faculty of Animal Science, Jenderal Soedirman University

Jalan Dr. Soeparno 60, Purwokerto 53112, Indonesia

\*Email of corresponding author: [ningiriyanti@gmail.com](mailto:ningiriyanti@gmail.com)

(Received 06-10-2017; Reviewed 02-11-2017; Accepted 13-01-2018)

### ABSTRACT

This research was aimed to determine the effects of prebiotics on performance and gastrointestinal profiles of Tegal ducks. One hundred two-month-old male Tegal ducks were distributed into 5 treatment groups;  $R_0$  = control;  $R_1$  = FOS;  $R_2$  = MOS;  $R_3$  = Inulin; and  $R_4$  = natural prebiotic (water hyacinth/*Eichhornia crassipes*). The prebiotics were given at 0.2% of the total feed (w/w). The observed variables were performances and gastrointestinal profiles. This study used a completely randomized design and continued with honestly significant difference test. Performance (live weight, body weight gain, feed intake) and intestinal profile (percentage weights of intestine, gizzard, crop, and pancreas) of ducks were not significantly affected by prebiotic supplementation in feed. FOS prebiotic and natural prebiotic from water hyacinth showed increased ( $P < 0.05$ ) the percentage of carcass and cecum weight compared to the other treatments. In conclusion, the use of different prebiotics resulted in relatively similar performances and digestive tract profiles except the percentage of carcass and cecum weight that increased by 4.5% and 36.67%, respectively, with the supplementation of either FOS or water hyacinth.

**Keywords:** prebiotic, Tegal duck, performance, gastrointestinal profile, water hyacinth

## INTRODUCTION

Duck is a type of waterfowl which is commonly reared by farmers in rural areas with the main purpose of producing eggs and meat. Duck is a native Indonesian duck with the capacity to produce meat and egg to fulfill animal protein demand (Yulianti *et al.*, 2015). Ducks contribute 16% egg and 2% meat in national demand (Ketaren, 2007). Duck farming is growing from rural to suburban area in Indonesia.

Male ducks are used because they are very potential as meat producers. The weight of male duck at the age of 8 weeks matches with consumers need and the meat has the best quality. Young male or female ducks that are marketed as livestock at 7 to 10 weeks old, are commonly called green duck.

Increasing livestock production is not only reached by giving the right amount of nutrient (quantity and quality), but also optimizing production by giving feed additives in the form of prebiotic, probiotic, antibiotic, *et cetera*. According to Kompang *et al.* (2007), the most commonly used feed additive in commercial scale are sub-therapeutic and pharmaceutical-type antibiotics. Nowadays, however, health experts suggest that the use of antibiotics in sub-therapeutic level is the cause of the growth of antibiotics-resistant bacteria. Currently, the government has started to implement the reduction of

antibiotics use. To overcome the reduction of antibiotic use which is needed as growth promotant, feed additive like probiotic is considerably. Prebiotics, a well-known substance, can be used in order to support the growth-promoting effect of probiotic.

Prebiotic is a non-digestible food ingredient which has good effects to improve the growth of one or more microorganisms in the colon. Prebiotic, in general, is a carbohydrate complex which is not digested nor absorbed in the intestine.

Various types of oligosaccharides, such as inulin, fructooligosaccharides (FOS), galactooligosaccharides (GOS), soya-oligosaccharides (SOS), xylo-oligosaccharides (XOS), pyrodextrins, isomalto-oligosaccharides (IMO), and lactulose, are commonly considered as prebiotics (Alloui *et al.*, 2013). Prebiotic such as inulin, is a polydisperse carbohydrate material consisting of  $\beta$ - (2-1) fructosyl-fructose links (Roberfroid, 2010).

Oligosaccharides-prebiotic supplementation of the diets, such as FOS, may have an effect on improvement of microbial population in the rumen (Fernandez *et al.*, 2010) and supplementation with GOS increases the growth of certain gastrointestinal bacteria, especially the lactic acid bacteria, *Bifidobacteria*, and/or their fermentation products such as short chain fatty acid (SCFA). SCFA production is an important physiological process of colonic microorganisms and may be useful in improv-

ing gastrointestinal health by reducing the occurrence of diarrhoea through the modulation of microbiota (MacFarlane *et al.*, 2008).

Inulin is a prebiotic derived from fructan carbohydrate that stimulates the activities and growth of beneficial gut bacteria, particularly Bifidobacteria and Lactobacili, and prevents colonization of pathogenic gut bacteria. FOS and inulin as prebiotics increase the absorpti of nutrients through the improvement of mucose structure of the intestine (Rehman *et al.*, 2007). The use of prebiotic (water hyacinth) is the most appropriate for duck, because water hyacinth is a waste product, very potential to be developed, and contains mineral and 29 amins which support the development of male duck. The objective of the present experiment was to evaluate the effects of prebiotic use on gastrointestinal function.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Design, Animal, and Diets

This experiment used 100 heads of two-month-old male Tegal ducks. The feed components were rice bran, corn, fish meal, soybean meal, methionine, and lysine. The feed components were purchased from PT. Cheil Jedang Superfeed Indonesia. The feed also contained palm oil, CaCO<sub>3</sub>, and premix. The feeds were formulated isoprotein and isoenergy with 18.47% protein and 2930 kcal metabolizable energy (ME) g. The detailed diets compositions are presented in Table 1. The chemical

compositions of the experimental diets were analyzed according to AOAC (2006). During the experiment, feed and water were provided *ad libitum*.

### Experimental Diet

The level of prebiotic used was 0.2% of the total feed (w/w). Applied treatments were as follow: R<sub>0</sub>= Basal Feed as a Control; R<sub>1</sub>= Basal Feed + FOS (*Fructo-oligosaccharides*); R<sub>2</sub>= Basal Feed + MOS (*Mannan-oligosaccharide*); R<sub>3</sub>= Basal Feed + Inulin; R<sub>4</sub>= Basal Feed + Prebiotic water hyacinth. Prebiotics were in powder form and mixed into the basal feed.

### Variables Measured

The observation of intestinal profiles was performed at the end of the experiment, after treating the experimental Tegal ducks with experimental rations for two months. Therefore, the age of experimental ducks was 4 months or 16 weeks. The gastrointestinal profile analysis was conducted after treatment. The observed variables were duck's performance (daily weight gain, feed consumption, final weight, and carcass percentage) and intestinal profiles (the weights of intestine, caecum, crop, gizzard, and pancreas). Eight hours prior to slaughtering, 10 ducks from each treatment were abtained from f<sub>34</sub> (2 ducks per replicate).

The final weight of the duck was weighed at the end of the experiment at the age of 16 weeks. Daily body weight gain was calculated by subtracting the final body

Table 1. Ingredients and chemical compositions of experimental diets (as-fed basis)

Ingredient	R0 (Control)	R1 (FOS)	R2 (MOS)	R3 (Inulin)	R4 (Water Hyacinth)
Corn, (%)	47	47	47	47	47
Rice bran, (%)	27	27	27	27	27
Soybean meal, (%)	13	13	13	13	13
Fish meal, (%)	9	9	9	9	9
Coconut oil, (%)	2	2	2	2	2
Premix, (%)	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Dicalcium-phosphate, (%)	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Methionine, (%)	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
Lysine, (%)	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Prebiotic, (%)	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total, (%)	100	100.2	100.2	100.2	100.2
Calculated nutrient contents					
Crude protein, (%)	18.472	18.448	18.448	18.448	18.448
Metabolizable energy, (kcal/kg)	2929.2	2933.2	2933.2	2933.2	2933.2
Crude fat, (%)	4.038	4.038	4.038	4.038	4.038
Crude fiber, (%)	5.015	5.017	5.017	5.017	5.017
Calcium, (%)*	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
Available phosphorus, (%)*	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Lysine, (%)*	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79
Methionine, (%)*	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55

Note: The results of the analysis at the Laboratory of Animal Nutrition and Feed Science, Faculty of Animal Science, Jenderal Soedirman University. \*) based on the calculation of NRC table (1994).

weight with the initial body weight then dividing it with the number of nurturing days (final weight – initial weight)/(number of nurturing days).

Feed consumption was measured by subtracting the left-over and <sup>46</sup>ittered feed from the original amount of given feed. At the age of 16 weeks, the ducks were slaughtered by cutting their jugular veins. Before slaughtering, the experimental ducks were not fed for 12 hours prior to slaughtering. The carcass data were obtained after the duck was slaughtered <sup>6</sup> and cleaned from feathers, blood, viscera, head, and feet. The weight of each carcass was recorded and dressing percentage was calculated on the basis of dressed meat including giblets and skin. The heart, liver, gizzard, spleen, and pancreas were also weighed.

Carcass weight percentage was calculated by dividing carcass weight with living weight multiplied by 100%. The percentage of intestine, caecum, gizzard, crop, and pancreas weights were obtained by weighing each organ then dividing each with living weight and multiplying the number by 100%.

#### Data Analyses

At the beginning of experiment, the age of experimental ducks used was 8 weeks or 2 months because at this age the experimental <sup>21</sup>ucks were readily adaptable to environment and feed. The experiment was arranged in a completely randomized design, with 5 treatments and 5 replicates, consisted of 4 male Tegal ducks per replicate. The data were analyzed statistically with analysis of variance (ANOVA) and further test with honestly significance effect (Steel & Torrie, 1994).

## RESULTS

### Performance

The final live weights of male Tegal ducks varied from 1184±80.81 g/duck (R1) to 1238.5±78.46 g/duck (R4) with daily weight gains of 4.33±2.30 <sup>42</sup>uck to 6.94±1.68 g/duck (Table 2). These results were in line with the result reported by Mangisah *et al.* (2009) that daily weight gains of male Tegal ducks were around 6.56-8.19 g/duck.

The averages feed consumption across treatments were 101.45±2.45 to 104.14±2.75 (g/bird/day) and this range was within the normal range, while the feed consumption of local male ducks at the same age was 107.14 g/bird/day. However, the range of average feed consumption was around 729.87 to 741.07 (g/bird/week). This feed consumption was equivalent to 102.27±1.09 g/bird/day that was far lower than feed consumption of ducks raised intensively (210-250 g/bird/day).

### Gastrointestinal Profile

The use of different prebiotics did not significantly affect the percent <sup>44</sup> of intestine, gizzard, crop, and pancreas weights (Table 3). The weight percentages of intestine, gizzard, crop, and pancreas were 3.34±0.27%-4.04±0.65%, 3.91±0.51%-4.97±0.24%, 3.46±0.40%-<sup>17</sup>5±0.29%, and 0.37±0.02%-0.40±0.04%, respectively. These results were in line with those reported by Faishal *et al.* (2013) that 6-week male ducks supplied with mangosteen skin meal had the weight percentage of intestine, gizzard, crop, and pancreas around 3.05±0.35%, 4.28±0.30%, 3.98%-4.58%, and 0.40±0.05%-0.37±0.07%, respectively. Rohmah *et al.* (2016) reported that 10-week

Table 2. The performances of Tegal ducks fed prebiotic

Variables	Prebiotic treatments				
	R0 (Control)	R1 (FOS)	R2 (MOS)	R3 (Inulin)	R4 (Water hyacinth)
<sup>30</sup> Final live weight (g)	1205 ± 94.09	1184 ± 80.81	1195.5 ± 79.43	1237.5 ± 140.43	1238.5 ± 78.46
Daily weight gain (g)	5.57 ± 1.46	4.33 ± 2.30	6.59 ± 1.69	6.93 ± 1.19	6.94 ± 1.68
Feed consumption (g/bird/day)	104.14 ± 2.75	102.13 ± 5.93	101.52 ± 6.22	102.09 ± 5.56	101.45 ± 2.45
<sup>3</sup> Carcass (%)	57.14 ± 3.52 <sup>a</sup>	59.55 ± 1.99 <sup>b</sup>	57.72 ± 5.21 <sup>a</sup>	58.19 ± 2.27 <sup>a</sup>	59.75 ± 1.97 <sup>b</sup>

Note: Means in the same row with different superscripts differ significantly (P<0.05)

Table 3. Gastrointestinal profile of Tegal ducks

Variables	Prebiotic treatments				
	R0 (Control)	R1 (FOS)	R2 (MOS)	R3 (Inulin)	R4 (Water hyacinth)
Intestine (%)	3.34± <sup>23</sup> 0.27	3.51±0.34	3.95±0.80	4.02±0.40	4.04±0.65
Caecum (%)	0.30±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	0.41±0.05 <sup>b</sup>	0.32±0.05 <sup>a</sup>	0.29±0.06 <sup>a</sup>	0.40±0.04 <sup>b</sup>
Gizzard (%)	4.20±0.19	3.91±0.51	4.18±0.71	4.42±1.02	4.97±0.24
Crop (%)	3.46±0.40	4.05±0.53	4.15±0.68	4.20±0.79	4.45±0.29
<sup>20</sup> Pancreas (%)	0.37±0.02	0.40±0.04	0.38±0.02	0.37±0.05	0.38±0.03

Note: Means in the same row with different superscripts differ significantly (P<0.05); % = Weight of organ (g) / body weight of sampling duck (g)] x 100%.



male ducks supplemented with soursop leaves meal had weight percentages of intestine, gizzard, and pancreas in the ranges of 3.796%–5.946%, 3.786%–5.355% (with average of 4.571±0.785%), and 0.25%–0.442% (with average of 0.349±0.093%), respectively.

Experimental ducks supplemented with FOS prebiotic had the highest weight of caecum about 0.29±0.06–0.41±0.05% ( $P<0.05$ ). This result was in line with that reported by Rohmah *et al.* (2016) that the average percentage of intestine weight was 0.286±0.106% within the range of 0.186%–0.387%.

## DISCUSSION

### Performance

Final weights, daily weight gains, and feed consumptions were not significantly affected by prebiotic supplementation (Table 2). These nonsignificant effects could be related to the age of treatment. At the age of 8 weeks, experimental ducks supplemented with FOS, GOS, inulin, and water hyacinth were still used these prebiotics for bacterial growth in the digestive tract, to produce active ingredients to balance microbes in digestive tract like bacteriocin, to gain energy to fight against pathogenic bacteria in getting food, and to form colony in intestines villi. It is the role of probiotic to maintain duck's health and immune system. Digestive tract microbes, especially Lactic Acid Bacteria (LAB) are not optimal in producing enzymes in digestive tract so the nutrient absorption is not optimal.

Different prebiotics used in this study resulted in different carcass percentages that ranged from 57.14±3.52% to 59.55±1.99%. Analysis of variance results showed a significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) in carcass percentages indicating that prebiotics had varied responses to the growth of probiotic microbes and therefore causing disparity in carcass percentages. Carcass percentage in this research was lower than 60.77%–61.91% reported by Pratama *et al.* (2012).

The use of prebiotic FOS and water hyacinth were able to produce the highest carcass percentage, because FOS and water hyacinth could be used optimally for the growth of microbes in the digestive tract that optimized nutrient absorption. Fructooligosaccharides (FOS) is a non-structural carbohydrate with  $\beta$ - (2-1) fructosyl units that are undegradable by the enzymes in the small intestines, so the units will reach caecum and are further degraded by microbial enzymes. Inulin is the prebiotic that is frequently used in research for animal or human because of its high availability, safety, and higher nutrient absorbability (Roberfroid *et al.*, 2010).

Supplementation of the diets with prebiotic oligosaccharides such as FOS, may have an effect to improve rumen microbial population, including a reduction in *Salmonella* colonization. This chance suggests that supplementation of diet with FOS might have been a viable option in both *Salmonella* control and antibiotic programmes (Charalampopolus & Rastall, 2009). Performance parameters in broilers have been evaluated with prebiotic supplementation. In parallel, body weight gain, feed conversion, and carcass weight were

improved by prebiotic supplementation (Józefiak *et al.*, 2008).

Feeding supplementation of inulin and FOS to broilers might have increased the absorption of nutrients by improving the intestinal mucosal structure and increasing villus height (Rehman *et al.*, 2007). Total SCFA and lactic acid concentrations are more often increase during the decrease of intestinal pH as a result of prebiotics supplementation. Regarding intestinal morphology, increasing the height of intestinal villus was reported when prebiotics were included in the broiler diet (Baurhoo *et al.*, 2007). Other changes of intestinal characteristics have been observed, including an increase in rumen length.

Ducks supplemented with 50 g/duck/day water hyacinth in feed showed a highly significant increase ( $P<0.01$ ) about 5.86% in feed intake, 9.79% in egg laying rate, and 2.36% in egg weight compared to those of control ducks without prebiotic supplementation with a relatively similar feed conversion (Jianbo *et al.*, 2008). Water hyacinth contains moderate crude protein (11.2%), nitrogen free extract (47.2%), and metabolic energy (2028.5 Kcal/kg). Water hyacinth was a potential feed for livestock especially during scarcity period (Hossain *et al.*, 2015).

### Gastrointestinal Profile

Weights of intestine, gizzard, crop, and pancreas were not significantly affected ( $P>0.05$ ) by prebiotic supplementations. The use of prebiotic did not affect the percentage of intestine weight because the intestine of mature duck is no longer developing, particularly the villi. The contributing factors to the development of intestine in the experimental ducks are age, level of feeding, type and nutrient contents of feed, and live weight of experimental ducks. The main function of small intestine is feed digestion and nutrients absorptions.

The carrying capacity of digestion process on feed and nutrient absorption is affected by the area of epithelial intestine, epithelial folds, the height of villi, as well as the amount of villi and microvilli that broaden the area of absorption (Ruttanavut *et al.*, 2009). The process of nutrient absorption is also affected by the height and breadth of the villi, duodenum, jejunum, and ileum (Sugito *et al.*, 2007).

Crude fiber is one of the nutrients in the duck's feed that affect the intestine weight because crude fiber stimulates peristaltic movement of digestive tracts to secure the ease of digestive process. The activity of digestive organs will increase as the capacities of digestive organs are intensified. Crude fiber in feed has low digestibility and in certain amount will make the intestine work harder and thicken the intestine wall that eventually increases the weight of intestine (Sandi *et al.*, 2012).

The weights of gizzard, crop, and pancreas were similar in control and treatments groups. The nonsignificant effects of prebiotics supplementations on the weights of gizzard, crop, and pancreas are due to the types of those organs that are not inhabited by microbes which are benefited by the use of prebiotic.

Gizzard is located between proventriculus and the duodenum that functions as the mechanical digestive organ that reduces the particle size of incoming feed through the contraction of smooth muscle in gizzard with the presence of grits and is one of the digestive organs that serves as temporal food reservation.

Purba & Prasetyo (2014) showed that there is a tendency of increasing weight of gizzard along with the increased crude fiber content of diet. The function of gizzard in poultry including duck is to grind and crush food (mechanical process) with the help of enzymes, for example lipase, before the food moving to the intestine. The level of crude fiber in the ration provides a significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) in the weight of gizzard. High level of crude fiber in the ration causes the increased load of gizzard in grinding food and the gizzard becomes thicker because of the more active muscle contraction of the gizzard (Sutrisna, 2011).

Svihus (2014) stated that the size of gizzard is mainly influenced by feed particle and fiber components, while the digestibility is affected by feed retention time and gizzard pH. Besides the longer retention time, gizzard pH and fibre-rich feed might increase pepsin secretion and amylum digestibility (Sacranie *et al.*, 2012).

The increasing activity of gizzard to digest food causes a vigorous contraction of gizzard muscle that thickens gizzard tendon and increases the weight of the gizzard. This activity occurs when duck is fed with high crude fiber. Besides age, the other contributing factors to gizzard development is the size of feed particle. The larger the particle, the harder the work of gizzard and the higher the weight of gizzard.

The crop is a digestive organ which only functions as temporary feed storage before it goes to the intestine, while pancreas produces pancreatic juice which contains digestive enzymes. Crop in duck is not developed as well in chicken. The function of crop in ducks is a temporary storing of feed, and the remaining feed in the crop can induce illness. Prebiotic supplemented in the diet of ducks is not stored in the crop so the weight of the crop does not increase. The development of crop is affected by feeding rate.

A faster crop development is found in birds eating fresh forage. Crop is the modified crop layered with folds of thin epithelium, contains mucosal gland to wet and smooth ingluvies wall and serves as lubrication fluid to soften the feed. Wet feed is easier to excrete than the dry feed. Tunica muscularis in the crop play roles in the process of feed softening so that the feed is thoroughly digested, therefore it needs a stronger and more solid crop structure. Accordingly, the structure of tunica muscularis of the crop in ducks consists of longitudinal and circular bundles of smooth muscle (Zainudin *et al.*, 2014).

Pancreas is a digestive organ that produces digestive enzymes that include lipase, amylase, and protease which convert lipid, starch, and protein, respectively, into a less complex nutrients namely fatty acids, glucose, and amino acids. Prebiotic supplementation does not affect pancreas performance because the performance is affected by feed nutrient contents and anti-nutrition in feed including tannin, B-glucan inhibitor, and tryp-

sin inhibitor. The activity of pancreatic enzymes are also influenced by the age of cattle, amino acids, and cholecystokinin.

The activity of pancreatic enzymes, lipase, amylase, and trypsin increased in chickens supplemented with prebiotics and synbiotics because of the presences of microbial enzymes, exocrine enzymes, and zymogen in the pancreas (Pruszyńska-Oszmolek *et al.*, 2015).

Rohmah *et al.* (2014) stated that the weight of pancreas is not affected by the presence of relatively small amount of tannin and saponin in the diet. Pancreas is an organ which produces digestive enzymes, and the presence of tannin or saponin can cause the increase in the weight of pancreas because of the work of lipase in fat digesting process and the increase of bile salts in fat absorbing process (Faishal *et al.*, 2013).

Four-time feeding highly significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased body weight and body weight gain percentage compared to two-time feeding in mule duck than in Muscovy ducks. Pancreas weight and percentage was significantly higher ( $P<0.01$ ) in mule ducks ( $9.56\pm0.17$  g,  $0.17\pm0.01\%$ ) than those in Muscovy ducks ( $7.71\pm0.30$  g,  $0.14\pm0.01\%$ ) because of different levels of feed intake in each duck (El Sayed *et al.*, 2013).

The use of FOS prebiotic produced the highest percentage of cecum weight ( $0.41\pm0.05\%$ ) ( $P<0.05$ ), because FOS (fructooligosaccharide) is a nonstructural polysaccharide that can be digested by cellulolytic and hemicellulolytic microbes in cecum. FOS supplementation makes the cellulolytic microbes in the cell wall form a colony that eventually increases the weight of cecum.

The unconsumed prebiotics would have been digested by cellulolytic microbes in the caecum. The weight of normal intestine was around 30.21–39.79 g or 2.33%–3.29% of live body weight (Nena *et al.*, 2013).

With the addition of FOS, the weight of caecum increased. This happened due to cellulolytic microbes in the caecum are able to digest carbohydrate/polysaccharide complex including FOS. Roberfroid (2010) reported that the other benefits of FOS were: (1) increasing adaptation ability of good bacteria in the colon, (2) decreasing the number of *Clostridium perfringens* in the digestive tract and intermediate product of food putrefaction process in urine and feces, (3) decreasing toxic metabolites and unneeded enzymes. Digesting process of 3–6g of FOS and GOS per day could decrease toxic substance production in the digestive tract and unnecessary enzyme as much as 44.6% and 40.9%, respectively, (4) preventing diarrhea caused or not caused by pathogenic bacteria.

Proliferation of cecum epithelium causes the increase in the weight of cecum. The higher production of VFA may affect organ proliferation and is assumed to cause organ thickening and increased weight (Sutrisna, 2012).

The prebiotic can be selectively fermented by a certain probiotic and other beneficial gastrointestinal microbiota into short-chain fatty acids (SFCA), mainly acetate, propionate, and butyrate, that lowered the luminal pH and decreased pathogenic bacteria (Pourabedin & Zhao, 2015). Prebiotics are non-digestible substances that provide a beneficial physiological effect on the host



by selectively stimulating the favorable growth or activity of a limited number of indigenous bacteria (Sekhon & Jairath, 2010).

## CONCLUSION

The use of different prebiotics resulted in a relatively similar performances and digestive tract profiles except the percentage of carcass and the weight of cecum that increased by 4.5% and 36.67%, respectively, with the supplementation of either FOS or water hyacinth.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project was funded by Ministry of Research and Tecnology and Higher Education of The Republic of Indonesia through "Hibah Kompetensi 2015: program"

## REFERENCES

- Alloui, M.N., W. Szczurek, & S. Świątkiewicz. 2013. The usefulness of prebiotics and probiotics in modern poultry nutrition: a review. *Ann. Anim. Sci.* 13: 17–32.
- AOAC. 2006. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International. 18th ed. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem., Arlington.
- Baurhoo, B., A. Letellier, X. Zhaoand, & C. A. Ruiz-Feria. 2007. Cecal populations of lactobacilli and bifidobacteria and *Escherichia coli* populations after in vivo *Escherichia coli* challenge in birds fed diets with purified lignin or mannanoligosaccharides. *Poultry Sci.* 86: 2509–2516. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2007-00136>
- Charalampopolus, D. A & R.A. Rastall. 2009. Prebiotics and Probiotics Science and Technology. Springer Verlag, New York, Vol.1: p. 516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79058-9>
- El-Sayed, El., Y. Mona, & U. E. Mahrous. 2013. Influence of over-feeding on productive performance traits, foie gras production, blood parameters, internal organs, carcass traits, and mortality rate in two breeds of ducks. *International Journal of Animal and Veterinary Science.* 7:220-226.
- Faishal, I. J., I.H. Djunaidi, & E. Sudjarwo. 2013. Effect of addition mangosteen peel powder (garcinia mangostana.l) to feed on carcass and internal organs mojosari drake. *Jurnal Brawijaya* 5: 1-10.
- Fernandez, F., M. Hinton, & B. Van Gils. 2010. Dietary mannan-oligosaccharides and their effect on chicken caecal microflora in relation to *Salmonella enteritidis* colonization. *Avian Pathol.* 31:49-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079450120106000>
- Gong, J., W. Si. R.J. Forster, R.Huang, H. Yu, Y. Yin, C. Yang, & Y. Han. 2007. 16S rRNA genebased analysis of mucosa-associated bacterial community and phylogeny in the chicken gastrointestinal tracts: from crops to ceca. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 59:147-157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6941.2006.00193.x>
- Hossain, M.E., H. Sikder, Md. H. Kabir, & S.M. Sarma. 2015. Nutritive Value Of Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*). *Journal of Animal and Feed Research.* 5:40-44.
- Jianbo, LU, Zhihui, FU, & Zhaozheng, Y. 2007. Performance of a water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) system in the treatment of wastewater from a duck farm and the effects of using water hyacinth as duck feed. *Journal of Environmental Sciences.* 20: 513-519
- Józefiak, D., S. Kaczmarek, & A. Rutkowski. 2008. A note on the effects of selected prebiotics on the performance and ileal microbiota of broiler chickens. *J. Anim. Feed Sci.* 17: 392–397. <https://doi.org/10.22358/jafs/66633/2008>
- Ketaren, P.P. 2007. Peran itik sebagai penghasil telur dan daging nasional. *Wartazoa* 17: 117-127.
- Kompiang, I. P., S. Supriyati, & O. Sjojan. 2007. Pengaruh suplementasi ragi laut terhadap penampilan ayam petelur. *Jurnal Ternak Tropika* 6:36-44.
- MacFarlane, G.T., H. Steed, & S. Macfarlane. 2008. Bacterial metabolism and health related effects of galacto-oligosaccharides and other prebiotics. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 104: 305–344.
- Mangisah, I., B. Sukanto, & M. H. Nasution. 2009. Implementation of fermented eceng gondok in duck ration. *J. Indon. Trop. Anim. Agric.* 34: 127-133.
- NRC. 1994. Nutrien Requirement of Poultry. The 9<sup>th</sup> Ed. National Academic Press. USA
- Nena, K. A., Ismoyowati, & S. Mugiono. 2013. Perbedaan bobot dan persentase bagian-bagian karkas dan non karkas pada itik lokal (*Anas platyrhynchos*) dan Itik Manila (*Cairina moschata*). *Jurnal Ilmiah Peternakan* 1: 1086-1094.
- Pourabedin, M. & X. Zhao. 2015. Prebiotics and gut microbiota in chickens. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 362:1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsle/fnv122>
- Pratama I., Fatmawaty, & D. Sulistiawati. 2012. Penampilan dan produksi karkas itik lokal jantan (*Anas platyrhynchos*) yang diberi pakan mengandung tepung limbah rumput laut (*Eucheuma cottonii*) fermentasi. *J. Agrisains* 13: 173-183.
- Pruszyńska-Oszmalek, E., Kolodziejewski, P. A., Stadnicka, K., Sassek, M., Chalupka, D., Kuston, B., & Bednarczyk, M. 2015. In ovo injection of prebiotics and synbiotics affects the digestive potency of the pancreas in growing chickens. *Poult. Sci.* 94: 1909-1916. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pev162>
- Purba, M., & L.H. Prasetyo. 2010. Respon Pertumbuhan dan produksi karkas itik pedaging EPMp terhadap perbedaan kandungan serat kasar dan protein dalam pakan. *JITV* 19: 220-230
- Rehman H., C. Rosenkranz, J. Böhm, & J. Zentek. 2007. Dietary inulin affects the morphology but not the sodium dependent glucose and glutamine transport in the jejunum of broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 86:118–122. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/86.1.118>
- Roberfroid, M.B. 2010. Prebiotics and probiotics: are they functional foods. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 71 (suppl):1682S–7S.
- Rohmah, N., E. Tugiyanti, & Roesdiyanto. 2016. Pengaruh tepung daun sirsak (*Annona muricata* L.) dalam ransum terhadap bobot usus, pankreas dan gizzard itik tegal jantan. (The effect of dried soursop leaf meal (*Annona Muricata* L.) in rations on weight of intestine, pancreas and gizzard of male Tegal Duck). *Agripet* 16: 140-146. <https://doi.org/10.17969/agripet.v16i2.5957>
- Ruttanavut, J., K. Yamauchi, H. Goto, & T.Erikawa. 2009. Effects of dietary bamboo charcoal powder including vinegar liquid on growth performance and histological intestinal change in Aigamo ducks. *International Journal of Poultry Science* 8:229-236. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ijps.2009.229.236>
- Sacranie, A., B. Svihus, V. Denstadli, B. Moen, P. A. Iji, & M. Choct. 2012. The effect of insoluble fiber and intermittent feeding on gizzard development, gut motility, and performance of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* 91 :693–700. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2011-01790>
- Sandi, S., R. Palupi, & Amnesti. 2012. Pengaruh penambahan ampas tahu dan dedak fermentasi terhadap karkas, usus dan lemak abdomen ayam broiler. *Agrinak* 2:1-5.
- Steel, R.G.D. & J.H. Torrie. 1994. Principles and Procedures of Statistics. Mc Graw-Hill Book Co. Inc. Pub. Ltd. London.
- Sekhon B.S., & Jairath S. 2010. Prebiotics, probiotics & synbiotics: an overview. *J Pharm. Educ. Res.* 1: 13-36.
- Sugito, W. Manalu, D. A. Astuti, E. Handharyani, & Chairul. 2007. Morfometrik usus dan performa ayam broiler yang diberi cekaman panas dan ekstrak n-heksana kulit batang "Jaloh" (*Salix tetrasperma* Roxb). *Med. Pet.* 30:198-206

- Sutrisna, R. 2012. Pengaruh beberapa tingkat serat kasar dalam ransum terhadap perkembangan organ dalam itik jantan (Effect of levels crude fiber in feed for developments visceral organs in male duck). Jurnal Penelitian Pertanian Terapan 12: 1-5.
- Svihus, B. 2011. The gizzard: Function, influence of diet structure, and effects on nutrient availability. World's Poult. Sci. J. 67:207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043933911000249>
- Yulianti, D.L., P. Trisunuwati, O. Sjoftan, & E. Widodo. 2015. Effect of *Andrographis paniculata* phytobiotic on consumption, feed conversion and Mojosari duck egg production. Int. J. Poult. Sci. 14: 529-532. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ijps.2015.529.532>
- Zainuddin, D. Masyitha, Y. Mulyana, & Fitriani. 2014. Struktur histologi tembolok (ingluvies) pada unggas (the histological structure of the crop (ingluvies) in poultry). Jurnal Medika Veterinaria 8: 47-50.
- Vasai, F., K.B. Ricaud, M.D. Bernadet2, L. Cauquil, O. Bouchez6, S. Combes & S. Davail. 2014. Overfeeding and genetics affect the composition of intestinal microbiota in *Anas platyrhynchos* (Pekin) and *Cairina moschata* (Muscovy) ducks. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 87 (2014): 204–216.



## ORIGINALITY REPORT

19%

SIMILARITY INDEX

15%

INTERNET SOURCES

14%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	<a href="http://jurnal.unimor.ac.id">jurnal.unimor.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
2	<a href="http://www.animalproduction.net">www.animalproduction.net</a> Internet Source	1 %
3	<a href="http://repository.pertanian.go.id">repository.pertanian.go.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
4	<a href="http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id">www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
5	<a href="http://rp2u.unsyiah.ac.id">rp2u.unsyiah.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
6	<a href="http://banglajol.info">banglajol.info</a> Internet Source	1 %
7	<a href="http://patentimages.storage.googleapis.com">patentimages.storage.googleapis.com</a> Internet Source	1 %
8	<a href="http://publications.waset.org">publications.waset.org</a> Internet Source	1 %
9	Jessada Rattanawut. "Effects of Dietary Bamboo Charcoal Powder Including Bamboo Vinegar Liquid Supplementation on Growth	1 %

Performance, Fecal Microflora Population and  
Intestinal Morphology in Betong Chickens",  
The Journal of Poultry Science, 2013

Publication

10

Mohamed Zommiti, Mounir Ferchichi.  
"Probiotics and Prebiotics in Animal Feed",  
Elsevier BV, 2021

Publication

<1 %

11

A. Rebole. "Effects of inulin and enzyme  
complex, individually or in combination, on  
growth performance, intestinal microflora,  
cecal fermentation characteristics, and jejunal  
histomorphology in broiler chickens fed a  
wheat- and barley-based diet", Poultry  
Science, 02/01/2010

Publication

<1 %

12

Submitted to Higher Education Commission  
Pakistan

Student Paper

<1 %

13

[ubb.ac.id](http://ubb.ac.id)

Internet Source

<1 %

14

[jurnal.ipb.ac.id](http://jurnal.ipb.ac.id)

Internet Source

<1 %

15

Rasha Hassan, Usama Mahmoud, Omar Amin,  
Ghada Abdel-Raheem, Diya Al-Rammamneh.  
"Effect of Prebiotic on the Behavioural  
Patterns, Performance, Carcass

<1 %

Characteristics, Antibody Titer and Some  
Blood Parameters of Mule Ducks", SVU-  
International Journal of Veterinary Sciences,  
2019

Publication

16

Submitted to Syiah Kuala University

Student Paper

<1 %

17

library.wur.nl

Internet Source

<1 %

18

"Prebiotics and Probiotics Science and  
Technology", Springer Science and Business  
Media LLC, 2009

Publication

<1 %

19

Sugiharto Sugiharto. "Role of nutraceuticals in  
gut health and growth performance of  
poultry", Journal of the Saudi Society of  
Agricultural Sciences, 2016

Publication

<1 %

20

doi.org

Internet Source

<1 %

21

www.comunicatascientiae.com.br

Internet Source

<1 %

22

repository.uantwerpen.be

Internet Source

<1 %

23

Submitted to TechKnowledge Turkey

Student Paper

<1 %



24	<a href="http://orbi.uliege.be">orbi.uliege.be</a> Internet Source	<1 %
25	<a href="http://www.fapet.unsoed.ac.id">www.fapet.unsoed.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1 %
26	<a href="http://e-sciencecentral.org">e-sciencecentral.org</a> Internet Source	<1 %
27	<a href="http://medcraveonline.com">medcraveonline.com</a> Internet Source	<1 %
28	<a href="http://repository.unair.ac.id">repository.unair.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1 %
29	Munyaka, P. M., H. Echeverry, A. Yitbarek, G. Camelo-Jaimes, S. Sharif, W. Guenter, J. D. House, and J. C. Rodriguez-Lecompte. "Local and systemic innate immunity in broiler chickens supplemented with yeast-derived carbohydrates", Poultry Science, 2012. Publication	<1 %
30	Prabhat Jha, Namrata Singh, Ramashish Sah, Jagat Lal Yadav, Shyam Shankar Jha. "Comparative efficacy of garlic ( <i>Allium sativum</i> ) and black cumin ( <i>Nigella sativa</i> ) as growth promoters in broilers", Journal of Agriculture and Environment, 2014 Publication	<1 %
31	<a href="http://iojs.unida.ac.id">iojs.unida.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1 %

32	jiip.ub.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
33	www.studystack.com Internet Source	<1 %
34	T D Nova, R Zein. "The optimization of ginger and Zinc in feed to preventing heat stress at tropical in local duck", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2020 Publication	<1 %
35	www.opera-online.com Internet Source	<1 %
36	www.scielo.br Internet Source	<1 %
37	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1 %
38	"Intestinal health", Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2015 Publication	<1 %
39	Abdelbasset Benzertiha, Bartosz Kierończyk, Mateusz Rawski, Agata Józefiak et al. "Tenebrio molitor and Zophobas morio Full-Fat Meals in Broiler Chicken Diets: Effects on Nutrients Digestibility, Digestive Enzyme Activities, and Cecal Microbiome", Animals, 2019 Publication	<1 %

40	Hozan Jalil Hamasalim. "Synbiotic as Feed Additives Relating to Animal Health and Performance", Advances in Microbiology, 2016 Publication	<1 %
41	Joanna Bogucka, Agata Dankowiakowska, Gabriela Elminowska-Wenda, Adrianna Sobolewska et al. "Performance and Small Intestine Morphology and Ultrastructure of Male Broilers Injected in Ovo with Bioactive Substances", Annals of Animal Science, 2017 Publication	<1 %
42	Z. Iqbal, J. Roberts, R. A. Perez-Maldonado, F. Goodarzi Boroojeni, R. A. Swick, I. Ruhnke. "Pasture, multi-enzymes, benzoic acid and essential oils positively influence performance, intestinal organ weight and egg quality in free-range laying hens", British Poultry Science, 2018 Publication	<1 %
43	corpus.ulaval.ca Internet Source	<1 %
44	nirkrakauer.net Internet Source	<1 %
45	repository.up.ac.za Internet Source	<1 %
	talenta.usu.ac.id	



46

Internet Source

&lt;1 %

47

vdoc.pub

Internet Source

&lt;1 %

48

Abd El-Moneim Eid Abd El-Moneim, Ibrahim El-Wardany, Adel M. Abu-Taleb, Magda M. Wakwak, Tarek A. Ebeid, Ahmed A. Saleh. "Assessment of In Ovo Administration of Bifidobacterium bifidum and Bifidobacterium longum on Performance, Ileal Histomorphometry, Blood Hematological, and Biochemical Parameters of Broilers", Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins, 2019

Publication

&lt;1 %

49

Won Jun Choi, Jong Hyuk Kim, Gi Ppeum Han, Chan Ho Kwon, Dong Yong Kil. "Effects of dietary hatchery by-products on growth performance, relative organ weight, plasma measurements, immune organ index, meat quality, and tibia characteristics of broiler chickens", Animal Bioscience, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

50

Y. Yang, P.A. Iji, M. Choct. "Dietary modulation of gut microflora in broiler chickens: a review of the role of six kinds of alternatives to in-feed antibiotics", World's Poultry Science Journal, 2019

Publication

&lt;1 %

---

Exclude quotes      Off

Exclude matches      Off

Exclude bibliography      On