

A combination of direct fed microbials and xylanase, amylase and protease enzymes improves nutrients digestibility, gut health, performance and welfare of broilers

#### 22 October 2015 AMENA, Mexico

Y. Dersjant-Li, A. Awati, C. Evans and K. Gibbs

Danisco Animal Nutrition/DuPont

# Introduction: synergy between enzymes and DFM

- Nutrients digestibility
- Immune response under challenge
- Compatible with AGPs
- Animal welfare and economic benefit

# Key words (abbreviations)

### **Mixed enzymes:**

XAP =Xylanase (an endo-xylanase from Trichoderma reesei)Amylase (alpha-amylase from Bacillus licheniformis)

**Protease** (serine protease from *B. subtilis*)

DFM = Direct Fed Microbials (probiotics): a combination of spores from three Bacillus strains



### Synergies between enzymes and DFM



Romero et al., Animal Feed Science and Technology 181 (2013) 35-44

# Additive effect of enzymes and DFM



<sup>abc</sup> Values without a common superscript are significantly different (P<0.05)</li>
XAP= xylanase, amylase and protease
Bacillus = 3 strains combination

- Cobb x Cobb 500 male broilers;
- •Corn/SBM, 10% corn DDGs
- Challenge: NE (necrotic enteritis) induced by a broth culture of *Clostridium perfringens* during day 20-22

\* FCRc is body weight corrected FCR, corrected 3 points for every 100g difference in BW versus challenged control

# Outline of the presentation

• Introduction: synergy between enzymes and DFM

# Nutrients digestibility

- Immune response under challenge
- Compatible with AGPs
- Animal welfare

# Protease on top of xylanase and amylase further improved protein digestibility, with no interactions at 21 d



Romero et al., 2014 Poultry Science 93 :2501-2513

### Enzymes and DFM combination improved energy utilization more effectively in high fiber diets

#### 2 x 4 factorial design:

Low fiber: Corn/SBM (2.6% CF)

High fiber: wheat middlings + DDGS (3.4% CF)

- o NC
- XAP: xylanase, amylase, protease

scal/kg

- DFM: 3 strains of Bacillus spp. (75000CFU/g)
- XAP+DFM
- 21d digestibility study
- Cobb 500 broilers
- 8 replicate (x 6 birds/cage)



Singh et al. Poult. Sci. 94 (E-Suppl. 1): 9 (2015)

SEM = 49.5

### Apparent ileal gross energy digestibility



- High fiber reduced ileal energy digestibility
- XAP+DFM improved ileal energy digestibility vs control (P<0.05)</li>

Singh et al. (2015)

# Outline of the presentation

- Introduction: synergy between enzymes and DFM
- Nutrients digestibility
- Immune response under challenge
- Compatible with AGPs
- Animal welfare

202 Effect of multi-enzymes and DFM combination on performance, intestinal histology and immune response of broilers with or without a coccidia challenge. Yueming Dersjant-Li\*1, Ajay Awati<sup>1</sup>, Kirsty Kemmett<sup>1</sup>, and Kirk C. Klasing<sup>2</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Danisco Animal Nutrition, DuPont Industrial Biosciences, Marlborough, UK, <sup>2</sup>Department of Animal Science, University of California Davis,, Davis, CA. PSA, 2015

### Background:

- Coccidiosis and necrotic enteritis (NE) are two enteric poultry diseases
- NE affects up to 40% of commercial broiler flocks and cost approximately 5¢ per broiler in the United States (McDevitt et al., 2006)
- Avian coccidiosis, caused by the intracellular parasite *Eimeria*, was estimated to contribute to annual loss of more than \$3 billion worldwide (Williams, 1999)

# Functionality of the gastro-intestinal tract (GIT)

- Maintaining gut "health" requires ≈ 20% of dietary energy

 $\downarrow$  reduced production

- GIT responds to many "challenges" through changes to:
  - Innate immune responsiveness (including inflammation and acute phase response)
  - Other responses

### Challenge model:

#### High fiber diet

#### ╋

A mild coccidial challenge:
 at day 5 challenged birds received
 6-fold Advent® coccidiosis vaccine

#### **↓**

 Induced a necrotic enteritis-like syndrome

(Klasing et al., 2002, Journal of Nutrition 132, 2274-2282)

#### **Basal diet composition**

Ingredients	g/kg		
Corn	363.2		
Wheat	199.6		
Rye	80		
Wheat middlings	37.3		
Soybean meal	209.8		
Poultry meal	80		
L-lysine HCl	2.70		
DL-methionine	2.40		
L-threonine	0.56		
Salt	2.80		
Isoleucine	0.06		
Limestone	10		
DCP	3.1		
Choline chloride	0.62		
Phytase and cornstartch	1.0		
Vitamins and trace minerals			
premix	7.0		
Calculated nutrient composition			
Crude protein (%)	22.4		
ME kcal.kg <sup>-1</sup>	2910		
Lysine (%)	1.30		
Digestible lysine (%)	1.19		
Methionine (%)	0.58		
Methionine + cysteine (%)	0.97		
Fat (%)	3.29		

## **Trial design**

4 Treatments with 8 replications (6 birds/pen), 2 x 2 factorial arrangement:

Un-c	hallenge	Cha	llenge
Control (UC)	UC + XAP*+DFM**	Control (CC)	CC + XAP+DFM

\* XAP: xylanase, amylase, protease
\*\* DFM: 3 strains of *Bacillus* spp. (75000CFU/g)

Animals: Cobb 500, 0-21d raised on built up litter

Feeding: ad lib in mash form

Statistics: 2 x 2 factorial analysis on main effect and interactions; comparison of treatment means

\* The enzymes consisted of an endo-xylanase from *Trichoderma reesei*, alpha-amylase from *Bacillus licheniformis* and serine protease from *B. subtilis* (XAP). The DFM contained a combination of spores from three strains of *Bacillus spp*.

# Performance 0-12 day

Un-challenge:

- XAP+DFM improved 3.4% BWG
- Reduced 3.5% FCR
- Used125 kcal less energy per kg
   BWG

#### Challenge:

- XAP+DFM improved 8% BWG
- Reduced 5.8% FCR
- Used 221kcal less energy per kg
   BWG



#### Calorie conversion, kcal/kg BWG



SEM = 51; P<0.01

## Performance: 0-21 day

				Cal conversion
1-21d	Gain g/b/d	FI g/b/d	FCR	(kcal/kg BWG)
UC	34.1 <sup>ab</sup>	44.4 <sup>a</sup>	1.30 b	3754 <sup>c</sup>
UC + XAP+DFM	<b>35.2</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>43.4</b> <sup>a</sup>	1.24 <sup>c</sup>	3562 d
CC	32.0 <sup>c</sup>	44.9 a	1.40 a	4051 ª
CC+ XAP + DFM	33.1 bc	44.2 <sup>a</sup>	1.33 b	3852 b
SEM	0.51	0.79	0.012	33.3
P Treatment	0.04	0.31	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
P Challenge	0.0003	0.40	< 0.0001	< 0.0001

<sup>a, b</sup>: different superscript in a column indicates significant difference at P < 0.05;

UC: un-challenged control; CC: challenged control;

#### CC + XAP+DFM maintained performance comparable to UC

#### Intestinal morphology (duodenum) day 12

			<b>IE lymphocy</b>	tes	Lamina Pr	opria
	Villus height (	μm)	(number)	I	(µm)	
UC	992	ab	42.9	b	19.3	b
UC + XAP+DFM	1041	a	42.9	b	21.1	ab
CC	800	b /	61	а	27.8	a /
CC+ XAP + DFM	931	ab	50.5	ab	20.8	ab
SEM	68.8		3.88		2.63	
P Treatment	0.20		0.20		0.34	
P Challenge	0.037		0.002		0.13	
<sup>a, b</sup> : P < 0.05; UC: un-challenged control; CC: challenged control;	,	38 - 36 -	Villus height vs E	3WG	•	
CC+ XAP+DFM main IE (intraepithelial) Is and Lamina Propriation comparable to UC	ntained VH, /mphocytes level	<b>p</b> /334 - <b>50</b> /38 32 - 30 - 28 -	•		y = 0.0128x + R <sup>2</sup> = 0.956	21.597 58
		70	0 800	900	1000	1100
			Duoden	um villus	height (um)	

Duodenum vinus neight (µm)

#### Plasma acute phase proteins (APP) day 12

#### 7 days post challenge



SEM = 0.013; P < 0.05

SEM = 0.025; P < 0.05

- Challenged control (CC) increased APP at day 12, 7 days post challenge, indicating inflammatory response
- CC + XAP+DFM reduced APP to the level comparable to unchallenged control

#### Intestinal mucosal cytokines, day 12

#### 7 days post challenge

- IL-6 and IL-1β are the proinflammatory cytokines
- CC increased IL-6 and IL-1β at
   7 days post challenge
- XAP+DFM limited the level of inflammation
- Reduced the negative effects of inflammation on performance/gut function
- Which was correlated with reduced heterophil in circulation



SEM = 0.059; P < 0.05



SEM = 0.059; P < 0.05

#### Intestinal mucosal cytokines, day 21

#### 16 days post challenge



- At 16 days post challenge, inflammatory response still observed in CC in jejunum, indicating a prolonged effect
- CC+ XAP+DFM significantly reduced jejunum IL6 vs CC
- CC+XAP+DFM limited the prolonged inflammatory response, promoting the restoration of homeostasis and gut balance

#### day 12:

- Test x challenge interaction was found for ileal intraepithelial lymphocytes (IEL)
- CC + XAP+DFM significantly reduced IEL vs CC
- UC + XAP+DFM numerically increased IEL
- Indicating reduced inflammatory response under challenge



SEM = 3.48; P interaction < 0.05

- Xylanase, amylase and protease + Bacillus strain improved feed efficiency under both non-challenged and moderate NE-like challenged situation
- XAP + Bacillus strain was more effective under challenge (higher improvement at day 12, similar improvement at day 21)
- Challenge induced inflammatory responses: increased IL6, APP, lymphocytes, reduced Villus Height and increased crypt depth
- Addition of XAP + Bacillus strain reduced inflammatory response, maintained gut integrity under challenge
- Reduced energy cost for immune response under challenge and improved energy efficiency

# Outline of the presentation

- Introduction: synergy between enzymes and DFM
- Nutrients digestibility
- Immune response under challenge
- Compatible with antibiotic growth promoters (AGPs)
- Animal welfare



### **XAP+DFM** as alternative to AGPs



Flores et al., 2014, Poult. Sci. 93(E-Suppl. 1): 19

### XAP+ DFM in broiler diets with/without AGPs

#### Trial design:

- Cobb 500 male broilers, 9 replications (40 birds/pen) using built up litter
- ➢ 6 treatments, 1-42 days
  - Control 1 (C1)
  - C1 + XAP+ DFM (xylanase, amylase and protease and Bacillus DFM)
  - Control 2 (C2 = C1+BMD (Bacitracin Methylene Disalicylate, 55g/ton of feed))
  - C2 + XAP+ DFM
  - Control 3 (C3 = C1+ virginiamycin, 22g/tonne of feed)
  - C3 + XAP+ DFM

#### **Diets:**

- Control diet based on corn/soybean meal and 10% wheat containing 500 FTU/kg phytase
- Fed ad-libitum in pelleted form in three phases: 1-10 (crumble); 11-21 and 22-42 days

Flores et al., 2015Poult. Sci. 94 (E-Suppl. 1): 8

### Feed composition, %

	Starter	Grower	Finisher	
Corn	47.85 52.88		60.03	
Soybean Meal	31.00	24.78	17.99	
DL - Methionine	0.31	0.27	0.20	
Lysine HCL	0.29	0.25	0.21	
L - Threonine	0.10	0.08	0.05	
Fat, Blended	0.61	1.75	1.49	
Wheat	10.00	10.00	10.00	
Limestone	1.35	0.89	0.68	
Monocalcium Phosphate	0.65	0.33		
Salt	0.34	0.28	0.10	
Sodium Bicarbonate		0.03	0.28	
Trace Minerals <sup>1</sup>	0.05	0.05	0.05	
Vitamins <sup>2</sup>	0.25	0.25	0.25	
Choline	0.10	0.10	0.10	
Coban 90 <sup>3</sup>	0.05	0.05	0.05	
LO - DDGS	5.00	5.00	5.00	
MBM	2.04	3.00	3.52	
Phytase <sup>4</sup>	0.01	0.01	0.01	
Analyzed Nutrient % <sup>5</sup>	Starter	Grower	Finisher	
Moisture	12.98	12.25	12.49	
Dry Matter	87.02	87.75	87.51	
Crude Protein	21.7	19.7	18.9	
Crude Fat	4.60	4.86	4.98	
Fiber	3.4	3.6	3.1	
Ash	4.88	4.68	4.47	

<sup>1</sup> All diets included phytase at 500 FTU/kg feed

<sup>2</sup> Test materials provide 2000U xylanase, 200U amylase and 4000U protease/kg feed and 75000cfu/g feed of 3 *Bacillus strains* 

### **Comparison of treatment means**



 $^{AB}$  = P<0.10;  $^{ab}$  = P<0.05 (paired comparison)

FCRc: Body weight corrected FCR, 3 points correction per 100g BW vs C1

Pair comparison, P values			$\frown$	
	BWG, g	FCR	FCRc	ADFI, g
C1 vs XAP+DFM	0.49	0.05	0.07	0.26
BMD vs BMD+ XAP+DFM	0.08	0.18	0.09	0.99
Virg vs Virg + XAP+DFM	0.15	0.02	0.02	0.86

Virg: virginiamycin

### Main Effects: Body Weight (g) – Day 42



<sup>ab</sup> Superscripts indicate significant differences between treatments (P< 0.05)

### Main Effects: Feed Conversion Ratio – Day 0-42



<sup>ab</sup> Superscripts indicate significant differences between treatments

# Summary

- XAP + *Bacillus* DFM significantly improved BW, average daily gain, and reduced FCR compared to the control
- Significant reduction in FCR with AGP inclusion compared to non-medicated treatment
- XAP+ Bacillus DFM can be used as alternative to AGPs or added on top of AGPs

# Outline of the presentation

- Introduction: synergy between enzymes and DFM
- Nutrients digestibility
- Immune response under challenge
- Compatible with AGPs
- Animal welfare and economic benefit

### **XAP+DFMs reduced pathogenic bacterial counts**



<sup>abc</sup> *P* < 0.05 Jayaraman *et al.,* 2013 \*P < 0.05 XAP: xylanase, amylase, protease DFM: 3 strains of *Bacillus subtilis* Murugesan *et al.*, 2013

# Effect of XAP and *Bacillus* DFM combination on animal performance under commercial settings

- Trial in NL
- Male broiler Ross 308
- Commercial diet (wheat/corn/SBM)
- Containing Salinomycin
- 5 replications/tr
- 700 broilers/rep
- Treatments:
  - Control (500 FTU/kg phytase)
  - C + Bacillus + XAP

	Control	DFM+XAP	Р
Day 0-21			
Body weight gain (g)	781	774	0.41
Feed intake (g)	1102.9	1071.3	0.07
FCR	<b>1.41</b> ª	1.38 <sup>b</sup>	0.015
Calorie conversion	<b>4149.1</b> ª	4066.7 <sup>b</sup>	0.015
Day 0-42			
Body weight gain (g)	2328 <sup>b</sup>	2433 <sup>a</sup>	0.04
Feed intake (g)	4063 <sup>b</sup>	4166 <sup>a</sup>	0.003
FCR	1.75	1.71	0.22
Calorie conversion	5302.6	5205.3	0.144
Mort, %	4.11	3.71	0.6
Production Efficiency			
Factor	296	315	

Calorie conversion: kcal /kg BWG

XAP+DFM resulted in 100 kcal saving per kg BWG, indicating economic benefits

### Effect of XAP and *Bacillus* DFM combination on animal welfare parameters under commercial settings – trial in NL



Dersjant-Li et al., 2015, J. Appl. Poult. Res. 00:1-11

# Take home message

- Maintaining 'gut health' is important for production efficiency
- Xylanase, amylase and protease enzymes and *Bacillus* DFM can help to maintain 'gut integrity'
- The XAP + Bacillus DFM combination is more effective than used individualy, espacilly under challenge
- Using XAP+ *Bacillus* DFM can result in economic benefit in broilers production

# Thank you for your time

#### Questions



\*Copyright © [2015] DuPont or its affiliates. All rights reserved. The DuPont Oval Logo, DuPont<sup>™</sup> and all products denoted with <sup>®</sup> or <sup>™</sup> are registered trademarks or trademarks of DuPont or its affiliates. Local regulations should be consulted regarding the use of this product, as legislation regarding its use may vary from country to country. The information and all technical and other advice are based on DuPont's present knowledge and experience. However, DuPont makes no representation or warranty with respect to this information or the accuracy, reliability or completeness of this information. DuPont provides this information to the reader without any warranties of any kind, either express or implied. Furthermore, DuPont assumes no liability for such information or advice, including the extent to which such information or advice may relate to third party intellectual property rights. In no event shall DuPont be liable for any damages arising from the reader's reliance upon or use of this information or any consequence thereof. The reader should conduct their own tests to determine the suitability of our products for their own specific purposes. DuPont reserves the right to make any changes to information or advice at any time, without prior or subsequent notice.



The miracles of science™

Copyright © 2012 DuPont or its affiliates. All rights reserved. The DuPont Oval Logo, DuPont<sup>™</sup> Danisco<sup>®</sup> and all products denoted with <sup>™</sup> or <sup>®</sup> are registered trademarks or trademarks of E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company or its affiliates.