



**Altering broiler gut development, morphology,  
microbiology and function by manipulating feed  
grain type, particle size and milling method  
affects life-long performance**

**Nicholas James Rodgers**

B.Rur.Sc. (University of New England, Armidale, Australia)

**A thesis submitted for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy, University of New England, Armidale,  
Australia**

Submitted: May 2008



## Declaration

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.

Nicholas James Rodgers

22 May 2008

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Paul A. Iji, Professor Mingan Choct, and Dr. Lene Lind Mikkelsen for their guidance and support throughout my candidature. Without the help and support of Professor Choct especially, this thesis and project would not have been possible. It is primarily through Mingan's guidance and sometimes dogged determination – with a stern word or two – that got me through the final stages of writing up, and for that I am truly thankful. Dr. Andreas Kocher is also acknowledged for co-supervision during the first six months of my candidature.

Project funding from the Australian Poultry Cooperative Research Centre, without which this project would not have been possible, is acknowledged with thanks. Stipends granted to me from the Australian Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation's Chicken Meat Program, and the Australian Poultry Cooperative Research Centre during my candidature were greatly appreciated.

I am very thankful to all the staff of Animal Science, School of Rural Science and Agriculture, UNE, Armidale, NSW, who assisted me with the animal and analytical work during my candidature. Great thanks are owed to Mr. Mark Porter, Mrs. Barbara Gorham, Mrs. Shuyu Song, Mr. Simon Stachiw, Mr. Grahame Chaffey, Mr. Gary Taylor, Mr. Patrick Littlefield and Mr. Michael Raue. Sincere thanks are also extended to my fellow postgraduates, particularly Dr. Janak Vidanarachchi, Mr. Adam Sacranie, Dr. James Turnell, Mr. Chen Guang, Dr. Yumin Bao, Dr. Ying Yang, Ms. Monette Swanson and Mr. Mir Shakouri, for their assistance in sampling and other day to day work associated with analyses and trial work. Special appreciation is extended to Annette McLeod, Histology Laboratory, UNE, for her most valuable assistance with the histological analyses.

Much thanks and appreciation goes to the Svihus-Klingen Family in Norway (Birger, Ingeborg, Liva and Haagen), with whom I spent three months as part of the family. Additional thanks are given to Dr. Birger Svihus for his help and support at the University of Life Sciences' Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences during my stay. Others to be thanked for their help and support during this time are Dr. Harald Hetland, my fellow postgraduate students who helped me with experimental work (and

some language), the staff of Fôrtek for feed manufacture, and the chicken house staff for their help at weighing, dissection, and bird husbandry throughout the trial.

I would also like to thank the team at Bartter Enterprises for the coordination, set-up and running of the third, commercial scale trial for this project. Special thanks go to Dr. Tim Walker, Ms. Felicity Rappo, Mr. Jonathan Stone and the feed mill and trial shed staff at the Hanwood facilities. A special note of appreciation is included for the DSM Wagga Wagga team for putting together the special premixes used for the Bartter trial at short notice.

Finally, I wish to thank my fiancé Erin Love, my parents Michael and Janelle, and my siblings Charles, Alex and James, for their love and continuous support throughout my candidature.

# Table of contents

Declaration .....	i
Acknowledgements .....	ii
Table of contents .....	iv
List of tables.....	viii
List of figures .....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Literature review .....	3
1.1 The modern broiler industry .....	3
1.1.1 Chicken meat industry statistics .....	3
1.1.2 Structure/management .....	4
1.2 Poultry nutrition.....	5
1.2.1 Carbohydrates.....	6
1.2.2 Proteins .....	13
1.2.3 Lipids (fats and oils) .....	16
1.2.4 Vitamins and minerals .....	17
1.2.5 Feed additives.....	18
1.3 Feed processing.....	20
1.3.1 Milling types and particle size .....	21
1.3.2 Pelleting and further processing .....	22
1.4 The gastrointestinal tract and digestion.....	23
1.4.1 Digestive organs and their roles .....	23
1.4.2 Digestive enzymes.....	34
1.4.3 Microbiota (role in digestion and health).....	38
1.4.4 Enteric diseases .....	40

1.5 Effect of grain type on bird performance, gut development and digestion .....	41
1.5.1 Growth performance, FCR.....	41
1.5.2 Organ development.....	42
1.5.3 Gut morphology .....	42
1.5.4 Enzyme secretion and activity.....	44
1.5.5 Nutrient digestion .....	45
1.5.6 Gut microbiota.....	45
1.5.7 Disease .....	46
1.6 Effect of feed processing on bird performance, gut development and digestion .....	47
1.6.1 Growth performance, FCR.....	47
1.6.2 Organ development.....	51
1.6.3 Gut morphology .....	51
1.6.4 Enzyme secretion and activity.....	52
1.6.5 Nutrient digestion .....	54
1.6.6 Gut microbiota.....	57
1.6.7 Disease .....	58
1.7 Aim of Ph. D. project and hypotheses .....	59
Chapter 2: General materials and methods.....	61
2.1 In vivo experiments.....	61
2.1.1 Experiment One.....	61
2.1.2 Experiment Two .....	66
2.1.3 Experiment Three .....	70
2.2 Analytical procedures.....	76
2.2.1 Feed, milled grain, and duodenal digesta particle size .....	76

2.2.2 Microbiology of the tract .....	80
2.2.3 Ileal volatile fatty acid and lactate analyses.....	82
2.2.4 Apparent metabolisable energy corrected for nitrogen loss (AME <sub>n</sub> ).....	83
2.2.5 Acid insoluble ash .....	84
2.2.6 Crude protein digestibility .....	86
2.2.7 Ileal total starch digestibility .....	87
2.2.8 Intestinal histomorphology .....	89
2.2.9 Membrane-bound enzyme activity .....	92
2.2.10 Digesta flow marker preparation, administration and analyses .....	95
2.2.11 Statistical analyses .....	97
Chapter 3: Effect of particle size, grain type and milling method on broiler performance and apparent metabolisable energy.....	99
3.1 Abstract .....	99
3.2 Introduction .....	99
3.3 Materials and Methods .....	102
3.4 Results .....	103
3.5 Discussion.....	109
Chapter 4: Effect of grain type, milling method and particle size on digestive tract morphology and digesta pH of cage reared broilers .....	112
4.1 Abstract .....	112
4.2 Introduction .....	113
4.3 Materials and methods .....	114
4.4 Results .....	115
4.5 Discussion.....	123



Chapter 5: Effect of grain particle size and type on enzyme activity and nutrient digestibility, digesta particle size and passage rate in cage reared broilers .....	127
5.1 Abstract .....	127
5.2 Introduction .....	127
5.3 Materials and methods .....	129
5.4 Results .....	130
5.5 Discussion.....	136
Chapter 6: Effect of grain type and particle size on gut microbiology and digesta short chain fatty acid profile in cage reared broilers.....	138
6.1 Abstract .....	138
6.2 Introduction .....	138
6.3 Materials and methods .....	141
6.4 Results .....	141
6.5 Discussion.....	147
Chapter 7: Effect of wheat milling type and particle size on broiler gut morphology, enzyme activity, starch digestibility, microbiology and performance under commercial conditions.....	149
7.1 Abstract .....	149
7.2 Introduction .....	149
7.3 Materials and methods .....	150
7.4 Results .....	152
7.5 Discussion.....	167
Chapter 8: General discussion .....	172
Bibliography .....	178

## List of tables

Table 2.1.1: The composition of the semi-purified diet for Experiment One (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> diet on an ‘air dry’ basis). .....	64
Table 2.1.2: Production characteristics of the four sorghum diets through a commercial steam conditioner and pellet press (Experiment One). .....	64
Table 2.1.3: Composition of the experimental diets for Experiment Two (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> diet on an ‘air dry’ basis). .....	68
Table 3.4.1: Mean performance values from 11 d to 35 d (Experiment One). .....	106
Table 3.4.2: Mean performance values on a per bird basis, from 1 - 35 d (Experiment Two). .....	107
Table 3.4.3: Nitrogen corrected apparent metabolisable energy (AME <sub>n</sub> ) and AME <sub>n</sub> :GE <sub>diet</sub> ratio for the semi-purified sorghum diets (Experiment One). .....	108
Table 3.4.4: Nitrogen corrected apparent metabolisable energy (AME <sub>n</sub> ) and AME <sub>n</sub> :GE <sub>diet</sub> ratio for the wheat and sorghum diets (Experiment Two). .....	108
Table 4.4.1: Average relative organ weights (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> live-weight) of male broilers at 21 and 35 d (Experiment One) <sup>1</sup> . .....	118
Table 4.4.2: Relative organ weights (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> live-weight) from 7 - 21 d (Experiment Two) <sup>1</sup> . .....	119
Table 4.4.3: Relative organ weights (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> live-weight) at 35 d (Experiment Two) <sup>1</sup> . .....	120
Table 4.4.4: Digesta pH of male broiler chicks from 7 - 35 d (Experiment One). .....	120
Table 4.4.5: Digesta pH of male broiler chicks from 7 - 35 d (Experiment Two). .....	121
Table 4.4.6: Jejunal histomorphology measurements (µm) of male broilers at 7, 21 and 35 d (Experiment Two). .....	122

Table 5.4.1: Ileal total starch and crude protein digestibility (%) in male broilers at 21 and 35 d (Experiment Two). .....	132
Table 5.4.2: Protein content (mg.g <sup>-1</sup> tissue) and jejunal membrane bound disaccharidase activity (nmol.mg protein <sup>-1</sup> .min <sup>-1</sup> ) (Experiment Two).....	133
Table 5.4.3: Averaged particle characteristics of duodenal digesta from 21 d and 35 d broilers fed four sorghum based diets (Experiment One).....	134
Table 6.4.1: Bacterial counts (log <sub>10</sub> CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> wet digesta) on selective agars from the gizzard, ileum and caeca of male broilers at 21 d (Experiment Two).....	143
Table 6.4.2: Bacterial counts (log <sub>10</sub> CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> wet digesta) on selective agars from the gizzard, ileum and caeca of male broilers at 35 d (Experiment Two).....	144
Table 6.4.3: Total ileal short chain fatty acid content (μmol.g <sup>-1</sup> wet digesta), and subsequent proportions of fatty acids (% of total) at 21 d (Experiment Two).....	145
Table 6.4.4: Total ileal short chain fatty acid content (μmol.g <sup>-1</sup> wet digesta), and subsequent proportions of fatty acids (% of total) at 35 d (Experiment Two).....	146
Table 7.4.1: Performance and mortality (%) of broilers under commercial conditions at 43 d (Experiment Three). .....	156
Table 7.4.2: Digestive organ weights (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> live-weight) of mixed sex broilers at 21 d (Experiment Three) <sup>1</sup> .....	157
Table 7.4.3: Digestive organ weights (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> live-weight) of mixed sex broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three) <sup>1</sup> .....	158
Table 7.4.4: Jejunal histomorphology measurements (μm) of broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three).....	159

Table 7.4.5: Protein content ( $\text{mg.g}^{-1}$ tissue) and jejunal membrane bound disaccharidase activity ( $\text{nmol.mg protein}^{-1}.\text{min}^{-1}$ ) of male broilers (Experiment Three).....	161
Table 7.4.6: Digesta pH of mixed sex broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three).....	162
Table 7.4.7: Bacterial counts ( $\log_{10}\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ wet digesta) on selective agars from the gizzard of mixed sex broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three). ....	163
Table 7.4.8: Bacterial counts ( $\log_{10}\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ wet digesta) on selective agars from the ileum of mixed sex broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three).....	164
Table 7.4.9: Bacterial counts ( $\log_{10}\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ wet digesta) on selective agars from the caeca of mixed sex broilers at 41 d (Experiment Three). ....	165
Table 7.4.10: Total ileal short chain fatty acid content ( $\mu\text{mol.g}^{-1}$ wet digesta), and subsequent proportions of fatty acids (% of total) for 41 d mixed sex broilers (Experiment Three).....	166

## List of figures

Figure 1.2.1: Fractions of non starch polysaccharides (Choct, 1997).....	8
Figure 2.2.1: Milled sorghum particle size distributions of the milled grain treatments for Experiment One. ....	78
Figure 2.2.2: Particle size distributions of three processed sorghum diets after mixing with all other ingredients except soy oil (Experiment One). ....	78
Figure 2.2.3: Grain particle size distributions for the four diets used in Experiment Two. ....	79
Figure 2.2.4: Particle size distributions of the seven diets used in Experiment Three. ....	79
Figure 5.4.1: Liquid (Co; graphs A, B) and solid (Cr; graphs C, D) phase marker passage rate of birds fed HM1 (■), HM3 (✕) and WS (▲) diets (Experiment One). A and C: excretion pattern. B and D: cumulative excretion.....	135
Figure 7.4.1: Ileal total starch digestibility (%) of 41 d mixed sex broilers (Experiment Three).....	160

