

**THE EFFECT OF TEMPERATURE ON
RESPONSES OF LAYING HENS TO
CHOICE FEEDING AND
FEED AND WATER RESTRICTION**

by

Yusuf Leonard Henuk

**Ir. (Engineer) in Animal Nutrition - Nusa Cendana University,
Kupang - N.T.T., 85361 Indonesia (1984).**

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Rural Science
at the University of New England.**

**Department of Animal Science
University of New England
Armidale, N.S.W. 2351
AUSTRALIA**

November, 1995

*"Listen to advice and accept instruction,
that you may gain wisdom for the future".
(Proverbs, 19 : 20).*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	vii
PREFACE	xi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xii
ABBREVIATIONS COMMONLY USED IN THIS THESIS	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
LIST OF PLATES	xx
Chapter 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
2.1. Feed intake of laying hens.	7
2.2. Choice feeding.	12
2.2.1. The bird's ability to choose.	14
2.2.2. Effect of choice feeding on the bird's performance.	16
2.2.3. Economic advantages of choice feeding.	19
2.2.4. Effect of environmental temperature on choice feeding.	21
2.2.5. The number of containers required to present feedstuffs.	24
2.3. Feed restriction.	27
2.4. Water intake of laying hens.	32
2.4.1. Drinking water.	33
2.4.2. Feed water.	38
2.4.3. Metabolic water.	39
2.5. Water restriction.	39

2.6. Conclusion.	42
Chapter 3. EXPERIMENTAL	43
STUDIES ON EGG PRODUCTION OF CAGED HENS EXPOSED TO DIFFERENT REGIMES OF FEEDING, WATERING AND TEMPERATURE.	
3.1. General introduction.	43
3.2. Choice feeding experiments.	43
3.2.1. Introduction.	43
3.2.2. Common materials and methods.	46
3.2.2.1. Procedures common to Experiments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.	46
3.2.2.2. Experiments 1, 2 and 3.	46
• Feedstuff separation.	49
• Measurements.	51
• Statistical analysis.	53
3.2.2.3. Experiments 4 and 5.	53
• Feedstuff separation.	56
• Measurements.	56
• Statistical analysis.	57
3.2.3. Experiment 1 at 20 °C - Free-choice of whole wheat, protein pellets and oyster-shell grit, or that of a complete diet (mash).	58
3.2.4.1. Introduction.	58
3.2.4.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	59
3.2.4.3. Results.	60
3.2.4.4. Discussion.	61
3.2.4. Experiment 2 at 32 °C - Free-choice of whole wheat, protein pellets and oyster-shell grit, or that of a complete diet (mash).	67

3.2.4.1. Introduction.	67
3.2.4.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	68
3.2.4.3. Results.	69
3.2.4.4. Discussion.	70
3.2.5. Experiment 3 at 20 °C (night) : 32 °C (day) - Free-choice of whole wheat, protein pellets and oyster-shell grit, or that of a complete diet (mash).	76
3.2.5.1. Introduction.	76
3.2.5.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	78
3.2.5.3. Results.	78
3.2.5.4. Discussion.	79
3.2.6. Experiment 4 at 20 °C - Free-choice of whole maize, protein meal and oyster-shell grit, or that of a complete diet (meal).	86
3.2.6.1. Introduction.	86
3.2.6.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	87
3.2.6.3. Results and discussion	87
3.2.7. Experiment 5 at 32 °C - Free-choice of whole maize, protein meal and oyster-shell grit, or that of a complete diet (meal).	94
3.2.7.1. Introduction.	94
3.2.7.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	96
3.2.7.3. Results.	97
3.2.7.4. Discussion	98
3.3. Feed and water restriction experiments.	103
3.3.1. Introduction.	103
3.3.2. Common materials and methods.	106
3.3.2.1. General procedure for feed- and water-restriction experiments (Experiments 6 and 7).	106
3.3.2.2. Experiment 6.	107

3.3.2.3. Experiment 7.	107
3.3.2.4. Data collection.	108
3.3.2.5. Statistical analysis.	109
3.3.3. Experiment 6 - The effects of feed restriction at 20 °C.	109
3.3.3.1. Introduction.	109
3.3.3.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	111
3.3.3.3. Results and discussion.	112
3.3.4. Experiment 7 - The effects of water restriction at 20 °C.	127
3.3.4.1. Introduction.	127
3.3.4.2. Experimental hypothesis and design.	128
3.3.4.3. Results and discussion.	129
3.4. General discussion.	145
3.4.1. Choice feeding.	145
3.4.2. Feed and water restriction.	149
REFERENCES	152

SUMMARY

Studies were conducted to attempt to solve three particular nutritional problems of feeding laying hens in the author's home country, West Timor, Indonesia, namely: (1) the high cost of processed (protein) feedstuffs (all of which are currently imported), (2) seasonal shortages of feedstuffs (particularly in the period before a new harvest), and (3) seasonal shortages of drinking water (particularly during the later stages of the annual dry season).

The first five experiments were conducted to obtain information on the practical application of choice feeding to laying hens in a single feeder at 20 °C (Experiments 1 and 4), 32 °C (Experiments 2 and 5) or 16 h/d at 20 °C and 8 h/d at 32 °C (Experiment 3). A total of 68 light hybrid pullets of White Leghorn x Australorp genotype (Tegel Tint, Hy-Line 300) were used in the first three experiments and 76 pullets from the same strain in Experiments 4 and 5. Two feeding treatments (choice feeding and complete diets) and two grains (wheat and maize) were used.

In Experiments 1 and 4, the choice-fed birds not only consumed less feed in total (114.6 vs 126.5; and 120.3 vs 123.8 g/d), but also converted feed more efficiently to eggs (2.0 vs 2.2 and 2.2 vs 2.3 g feed intake/g egg weight) and laid eggs at a similar rate (91.6 vs 91.4; and 93.8 vs 94.2 %) to those fed the complete diet. The overall saving in total feed intake in Experiment 1 (whole wheat) was greater than in Experiment 4 (whole maize; 10.4 vs 2.9 %). Body weights of the choice-fed birds in both experiments were greater than those fed the complete diet (1839 vs 1786; and 1719 vs 1693 g).

Unlike Experiment 1, the protein intake of hens on choice feeding was significantly ($P < 0.01$) reduced by about 3 % compared to those fed a complete diet in Experiment 4. Birds on choice feeding in Experiment 1 consumed a diet which was slightly deficient in Ca and the control birds ate a slight excess of Ca (3.1 vs 5.8 g/hen/d), resulting in the choice-fed birds having a mean egg-shell quality which was highly significantly (1.083 vs 1.084 g/ml; $P < 0.01$) less strong. In Experiment 4, however, the choice-fed birds had similar mean Ca intakes (3.8 vs 3.9 g/hen/d), egg specific gravity (1.083 vs 1.082 g/ml), and they also tended to have slightly greater egg-shell thickness than did the controls (365 vs 358 μm). This indicated that oyster-shell grit was a better Ca source than limestone. Overall, improvements in efficiency of laying hens on choice feeding can be expected under the conditions of Experiments 1 and 4, presumably because the choice-fed birds were able to self-select the appropriate feedstuffs related to their physiological status and level of egg production from a range of feed ingredients mixed together in a single feeder.

The results of Experiments 2 and 5 indicate that at high temperatures, choice feeding can help in solving the problems of decreasing nutrient intake and poor performance that are commonly experienced by laying hens fed a complete diet in the hot tropics. Birds in the current work which had previously been trained in choice feeding were able to do this at both constant high temperature (32 °C; Experiments 2 and 5) and under a cyclical hot-temperature regime (e.g. 16 h/d at 20 °C and 8 h/d at 32 °C; Experiment 3). The total feed intakes of the choice-fed birds in Experiments 2, 5 and 3 were similar to those fed the complete diet (110.7 vs 109.9; 115.8 vs 115.7; and 106.6 vs 105.9 g/hen/d respectively). With the exception of Experiment 5, the current results indicated that choice-fed hens selectively consumed more protein than energy at high environmental temperatures. Thus, their protein intakes were significantly higher ($P < 0.01$) than those fed the complete diet in Experiments 2 and 3 (22.4 vs 18.2; 22.3 vs 17.4 g/hen/d).

As in Experiments 1 and 4, the body weights of the choice-fed hens in Experiments 2, 3 and 5 were greater than in complete-fed birds (1969 vs 1912; 2033 vs 1910; and 1711 vs 1685 g respectively). The increased protein intake and/or body weights of the choice-fed hens in these experiments were of economic importance because they supported a slightly improved level of egg production (88.1 vs 85.7; 84.1 vs 81.3; and 82.1 vs 81.9 %) and even egg weight in Experiment 5 (56.8 vs 56.3 g). Although mean Ca intakes of the choice-fed hens in Experiment 3 were higher than in Experiments 1 and 2 (3.3 > 3.1 and 3.1 g Ca/hen/d), the mean value of their egg-shell quality was lower (1.074 < 1.077 < 1.083 g/ml), and this presumably resulted from the direct effects of heat stress on hens. As in Experiment 1, the specific gravity of eggs in Experiment 2 declined progressively with time, and this suggests that further studies are required on techniques to increase Ca intake and thus improve the shell quality of eggs produced by hens fed oyster-shell grit as a Ca source in the choice-feeding system.

While the cost savings and improved feed efficiency of choice-fed hens at 'normal' temperature, and their maintenance of adequate performance at high temperatures, could be of considerable importance in modern layer operations where all-mash diets are normally fed *ad libitum*, choice feeding can offer even more to small-holder farmers in many developing countries in the tropics, to whom the high cost of processed (protein) diets is a considerable burden. Choice feeding allows birds to choose their own nutrient mix, and thus obviates the need for chemical analysis, and indeed there is no longer any need for mechanical feed grinding and mixing. Capital costs can thus be considerably reduced. An additional practical outcome is in a more assured supply of feedstuffs, since home-produced ingredients can readily be utilised.

In West Timor, Indonesia, the author's home country where feed, transport and feed-milling facilities are scarce and the need to contain costs is great, choice feeding is thus considered to have an immediate and widespread application as an alternative to the use of complete diets for laying hens. Moreover, oyster-shell grit, which proved to be a better Ca source than

limestone in the current work, is readily available in West Timor at a lower cost than limestone, and its use could thus further benefit small-holding poultry farmers in this area.

The last two experiments in the series were conducted to study the effects of short-term feed and water restriction programs on water requirements, egg production and body weight and on the utilisation of feed in light-weight White Leghorn cross hens. Three weeks were chosen as the experimental period as this approximated the period during which seasonal deficits of feed and water affect hens in small-holder operations in West Timor. Other production traits (i.e. egg weight and egg specific gravity) and the relationships between water and feed intakes were also examined.

A total of 30 White Leghorn hens of the Leach 'Reds' strain (New Hampshire x Single Comb WL) were used in the experiments. Four feeding and watering levels were utilised in each experiment. In Experiment 6, the hens in treatment 1 served as an *ad libitum*-fed control group; those in treatments 2, 3 and 4 were restricted to 80, 60 and 40 % respectively of each individual hen's mean feed intake during the last week of the preliminary period. In Experiment 7, the birds in treatment 1 served as an *ad libitum*-watered control group and those in the other three groups (treatments 2, 3 and 4) were restricted to 85, 70 and 65 % of their respective mean *ad libitum* water intakes recorded in the week immediately before the experiment began.

Restricting the feed intake of hens to 80 or 60 % for three weeks in Experiment 6 resulted in no loss in egg production, but there were significant reductions in body weight (of from 6 to 17 %; $P < 0.001$). Similarly, water restriction in Experiment 7 had no significant effect on egg production, but in this case there were only small (from 4.7 to 10.9 %) and non-significant reductions in body weight. In most cases, feed restriction was more effective in reducing the live weight of the hens used in these experiments than water restriction, and consequently, the feed restriction practice was most effective in controlling the body weights of hens and thus in protecting them from any adverse effects of excessive fat deposition, which is especially a problem in light-bodied White Leghorn cross hens.

Overall FCR (g feed intake/g egg weight) and water : feed intake ratio (ml water drunk/g feed intake) were more affected by restricted feeding than by restricted water intake. In Experiment 6, the efficiency of feed utilisation was higher in the birds on the most pronounced feed restriction. Experiment 7 showed an overall reduction in water : feed intake ratios when water intake was restricted, and restricted watering thus offers an added advantage in that it is likely to limit the so-called 'wet-droppings' problem. Difficulties with odours, flies, disease and removal of faeces from the poultry house could thus be reduced in restrictedly watered birds, which could be expected to produce drier faeces.

Traits such as egg weight and egg specific gravity were not significantly ($P > 0.05$) affected by feeding treatment in Experiment 6. In contrast, the two parameters were significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by watering treatment, but only during the 1st week of treatment in Experiment 7. The birds in Experiments 6 and 7 produced eggs with specific gravities (range 1.029-1.042 g/ml) which were lower than the accepted "standard" of > 1.080 g/ml, a fact which is attributed to their advanced age (> 62 weeks). The regressions of water intake (dependent variable) on feed intake (independent variable) of hens in both Experiments 6 and 7 were compared with the available literature in which water and feed intakes of hens were provided *ad libitum*. The current results clearly indicated that the two parameters were most closely correlated when the water, rather than the feed, intake of birds was restricted ($r = 0.74-0.91$ vs $0.04-0.39$).

The results of Experiments 6 and 7 indicate that the restricted feeding and watering of laying hens are likely to have some beneficial effects of economic significance to small-holder egg producers in areas such as the author's home region, West Timor, Indonesia. However, the small number of birds used, and the short period of time of these experiments, suggest that the effects of feed and water restriction in laying hens require further investigation. Future experiments should indeed be of at least several month's duration, particularly in the "recovery" phase, should include groups of larger size, and if possible should be conducted under practical, field conditions so that feeding, watering, housing, and climatic conditions are those actually used by the industry.

PREFACE

The investigations described in this thesis are original, and were conducted at the John Hammond Climate Laboratory and the New Animal House complex, during the period July 1991 - November 1995 when the author was a Post-graduate Master in Rural Science candidate in the Department of Animal Science, School of Rural Science, Faculty of the Sciences, The University of New England.

I certify that the results reported in this thesis have not already been submitted in substance for any other degree and are not being currently submitted for any other degree or award at any other University.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, any help received in the preparation of this thesis, and all information derived from the published work of other authors is specifically acknowledged in the text and an alphabetically arranged list of such publications is included in the references.

.....
Yusuf L. Henuk.
November 30, 1995.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Conduct of the experiments and initiation of the writing of this thesis have been made possible by the help and understanding of my first supervisor, Assoc. Prof. C. John Thwaites. I am deeply indebted to him for his inspiration and assistance in the early formation of the general topic and overall guidance during 1991-1992. Special thanks are also extended to my other supervisor, Dr. Merv K. Hill (retired in August 1994), and his colleagues, Prof. Rob B. Cumming (retired) and Assoc. Prof. John V. Nolan, for their constant guidance, encouragement and friendship during the preparation of experiments and the continuation of writing of the thesis while Assoc. Prof. Thwaites was away in Ethiopia from October 1992 - October 1994.

Thanks are also due to Dr. David Smith and Dr. H. Ian Davies of the Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computing Science for their help with the statistics. It is indeed a pleasure to thank Mr Neil D Baillie, Graham Chisholm, Winston Hewitt and Mrs Ilona Schmid for their skilled technical and administrative assistance. My thanks to Dr. G.D.P. Jones (Department of Animal Science), Mr John Smallsaw (Animal House Complex), Mr Evan Thompson and Mrs Wendy Ball (Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Nutrition), for their help during formulation, grinding and mixing the feed during the experimental phase. Thanks are also given to Dr. Juliet R. Roberts of the Department of Physiology for the use of the Mitutoyo Model 2109-10 gauge in determining egg-shell thickness.

The author appreciates the advice and companionship of staff members and fellow post-graduate students in the Department of Animal Science, University of New England. The studies in this thesis were funded by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID, formerly known as AIDAB : Australian International Development Assistance Bureau), to whom the author wishes to express sincere thanks. I would like to express my appreciation to the Government of Indonesia through the Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, West Timor, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, for the leave which gave me a good opportunity to study in Australia as well as to complete this thesis. My sincere thanks are extended to my fellows and relatives of the Indonesian Students Association of Armidale ("Himpunan Keluarga Mahasiswa Indonesia di Armidale") for their good friendship; relationships that made my stay in Armidale worthwhile. Particular thanks is due to Dr. David R. Evans (retired) for his kindness in proof-reading of the manuscript.

My deepest gratitude is to my parents and family in Kupang (West Timor - Indonesia), especially to my mother, whose moral support, not diminished by physical distance, gave strength in difficult moments throughout the time of my candidature in Australia. Finally, the author expresses his gratitude to his wife Alemina (Nina) Henuk-Kacaribu, SE in Medan (North Sumatra - Indonesia), for her understanding, patience and encouragement in the completion of these post-graduate studies.

ABBREVIATIONS COMMONLY USED IN THIS THESIS

<i>et al.</i>	et alia, and others
e.g.	exempli gratia, for example, for
instance	
i.e.	id est, that is (to say), in other words
etc.	et cetera, and so on
vs	versus
%	per cent
<i>ad libitum</i>	free access or according to pleasure
<i>per se</i>	per (by), se (self): by (or in) itself considered, intrinsically
min	minute(s)
h	hour(s)
d	day(s)
a.m.	ante meridian, before noon
p.m.	post meridian, after noon
CP	crude protein
ME	metabolisable energy
MJ	megajoules
kJ	kilo joule
Kcal	kilo calorie
Ca	calcium
P	phosphorus
FCR	feed conversion ratio
g	gram
kg	kilogram
m	metre
cm	centimetre
mm	millimetre
ml	millilitre
kW h	kilowatts per hour
°C	degrees Centigrade
:	ratio sign, divided by, is to
=	equals
±	plus or minus
LSD	least significant differences
SEM	standard error of the mean
<	less than
>	greater than
/	per
WL	White Leghorn
RH	relative humidity
Hg	mercury
w.v.p	water vapour pressure

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Chapter 2 :	
Table 1 : Dietary self-selection by chicks.	16
Table 2 : Performance of Leghorn hens fed a control corn - soyabean laying diet or when choice-fed (20 - 40 weeks).	18
Table 3 : Performance of laying hens at 17 °C.	23
Table 4 : Performance of laying hens as affected by environmental temperatures and dietary treatments.	24
Table 5 : Daily water intake of laying hens.	35
Table 6 : Water to feed intake ratios of laying hens at different ambient temperatures.	38
Chapter 3 :	
Table 7 : Composition of the complete diet (diet A) used in Experiments 1, 2 and 3.	48
Table 8 : Composition of the three feed components (diet B) used in Experiments 1, 2 and 3.	49
Table 9 : Composition of the complete diet (diet A) used in Experiments 4 and 5.	55
Table 10 : Composition of the three feed components (diet B) used in Experiments 4 and 5.	55
Table 11 : Effects of feeding treatments on the nutrient intake and laying performance of hens from 24 to 32 weeks of age in Experiment 1.	60
Table 12 : Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of feed components, intake of water, FCR, water : feed intake ratios and body weight of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive fortnightly periods in Experiment 1.	62
Table 13 : Mean \pm SEM weekly egg production, daily egg weight and weekly egg specific gravity of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive weeks in Experiment 1.	63

Table 14 : Effects of feeding treatments on the nutrient intake and laying performance of hens from 34 to 42 weeks of age in Experiment 2.	69
Table 15 : Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of feed components, intake of water, FCR, water : feed intake ratios and body weight of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive fortnightly periods in Experiment 2.	71
Table 16 : Mean \pm SEM weekly egg production, daily egg weight and weekly egg specific gravity of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive weeks in Experiment 2.	72
Table 17 : Effects of feeding treatments on the nutrient intake and laying performance of hens 44 to 54 weeks of age in Experiment 3.	79
Table 18 : Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of feed components, intake of water, FCR, water : feed intake ratios and body weight of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive fortnightly periods in Experiment 3.	80
Table 19 : Mean \pm SEM weekly egg production, daily egg weight and weekly egg specific gravity of hens as affected by feeding treatments during the successive weeks in Experiment 3.	83
Table 20 : Effects of feeding treatments on the nutrient intake and laying performance of hens from 24 to 32 weeks of age in Experiment 4.	88
Table 21 : Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of grain, protein meal and oyster-shell grit of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 4.	89
Table 22 : Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of ME, protein and Ca of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 4.	90
Table 23 : Mean \pm SEM daily total feed intake, egg weight and FCR of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 4.	92
Table 24 : Mean \pm SEM weekly egg production, albumen quality and yolk colour of hens as affected by	

	feeding treatments in Experiment 4.	92
Table 25 :	Mean \pm SEM weekly body weight, egg-shell thickness and egg specific gravity of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 4.	93
Table 26 :	Effects of feeding treatments on the nutrient intake and laying performance of hens from 24 to 32 weeks of age in Experiment 5.	97
Table 27 :	Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of grain, protein meal and oyster-shell grit of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 5.	99
Table 28 :	Mean \pm SEM daily intakes of ME, protein and Ca of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 5.	99
Table 29 :	Mean \pm SEM daily total feed intake, egg weight and FCR of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 5.	101
Table 30 :	Mean \pm SEM weekly egg production, albumen quality and yolk colour of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 5.	101
Table 31 :	Mean \pm SEM weekly body weight, egg-shell thickness and egg specific gravity of hens as affected by feeding treatments in Experiment 5.	102
Table 32 :	Mean body weight (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	112
Table 33 :	Mean feed intake (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	115
Table 34 :	Mean water intake (ml) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	117
Table 35 :	Mean egg numbers \pm SEM (%) of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	118
Table 36 :	Mean egg weight (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	122

Table 37 : Mean egg specific gravity (g/ml) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	122
Table 38 : Mean FCR (g feed intake/g egg weight) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	122
Table 39 : Mean water : feed intake ratios (ml water drunk/g feed intake) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 6.	124
Table 40 : Regression equations of water intake (dependent variable, Y) on feed intake (independent variable, X) of hens in Experiment 6.	125
Table 41 : Mean body weight (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	130
Table 42 : Mean feed intake (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	133
Table 43 : Mean water intake (ml) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	135
Table 44 : Mean egg numbers \pm SEM (%) of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	137
Table 45 : Mean egg weight (g) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	138
Table 46 : Mean egg specific gravity (g/ml) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	139
Table 47 : Mean FCR (g feed intake/g egg weight) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.	140
Table 48 : Mean water : feed intake ratios (ml water drunk/g feed intake) \pm SEM of hens during feed restriction	

and a subsequent recovery period in Experiment 7.....	142
Table 49 : Regression equations of water intake (dependent variable, Y) on feed intake (independent variable, X) of hens in Experiment 7.	143

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Chapter 2 :	
Figure 1 : Influence of environmental temperature on the daily water intake of laying hens.	37
 Chapter 3 :	
Figure 2 : The body weight of hens in Experiment 6.	113
Figure 3 : The relationships between water and feed intakes within weeks in Experiment 6 as compared to the relationship under <i>ad libitum</i> conditions reported by Savory (1978).	126
Figure 4 : The body weight of hens in Experiment 7.	131
Figure 5 : The relationships between water and feed intakes within weeks in Experiment 7 as compared to the relationship under <i>ad libitum</i> conditions reported by Savory (1978).	146a

LIST OF PLATES

	Page
Chapter 3 :	
Plate 1 : An example of a single feeder used in all experiments. 47
Plate 2 : All sieves used in Experiments 1 - 5. 51