



**E-ISSN: 2320-7078**  
**P-ISSN: 2349-6800**  
 JEZS 2018; 6(6): 31-35  
 © 2018 JEZS  
 Received: 05-09-2018  
 Accepted: 07-10-2018

**Pratik Rathod**

Department of Poultry Science,  
 Nagpur Veterinary College,  
 Maharashtra Animal and Fishery  
 Sciences University, Nagpur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**MM Kadam**

Department of Poultry Science,  
 Nagpur Veterinary College,  
 Maharashtra Animal and Fishery  
 Sciences University, Nagpur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**KK Khose**

Department of Poultry Science,  
 Nagpur Veterinary College,  
 Maharashtra Animal and Fishery  
 Sciences University, Nagpur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**AR Patil**

Department of Veterinary Public  
 Health, Nagpur Veterinary  
 College, Maharashtra Animal  
 and Fishery Sciences University,  
 Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

**PC Kamble**

Department of Poultry Science,  
 Nagpur Veterinary College,  
 Maharashtra Animal and Fishery  
 Sciences University, Nagpur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**Correspondence**

**KK Khose**

Department of Poultry Science,  
 Nagpur Veterinary College,  
 Maharashtra Animal and Fishery  
 Sciences University, Nagpur,  
 Maharashtra, India

## Nutrient requirement of Kadaknath chicken during the finisher phase to optimize the growth and economic performance

**Pratik Rathod, MM Kadam, KK Khose, AR Patil and PC Kamble**

**Abstract**

The present experiment was carried out after completion of an earlier experiment of nutrient requirement of Kadaknath chicken during starter phase (0-6 weeks) was continued for finisher phase (7-14 weeks) to optimize the growth and economic performance. The 270 Kadaknath chickens were distributed into five treatment groups having three replicates containing 18 birds in each. The different dietary treatment groups were viz., control group A: birds fed diet CP- 18%, ME- 2700 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.38%, Lysine- 0.85%; B: birds fed diet CP- 17%, ME- 2900 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.45%, Lysine- 0.95%; C: birds fed diet CP- 18%, ME- 3000 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.45%, Lysine- 0.90%; D: birds fed diet CP 19%, ME- 3100 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.40%, Lysine- 1.00%; E: birds fed diet CP- 20%, ME- 3200 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.38%, Lysine- 1.10%. The live body weight and weight gain in treatment groups C, D and E were significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) higher as compared to control group at the 14<sup>th</sup> week. The feed intake and feed conversion ratio showed non-significant differences among all treatment groups. The treatment group D was recorded highest live body weights and lowest cost of production rupees per kg live body weights as compared to other treatment groups. The results of the present experiment suggested that Kadaknath birds fed with finisher diet containing a CP-19%, ME- 3100 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.40%, Lysine- 1.00% from 7<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> week of age recorded better growth performance and lowest cost of production of Kadaknath chicken.

**Keywords:** Kadaknath, finisher phase, nutrients, growth performance, economics

**1. Introduction**

Presently nineteen poultry breeds are registered at the National level, ICAR- National Bureau of Animal Genetic Resources [1]. Out of these breeds, one well known native breed is 'Kadaknath' meaning a fowl having black flesh. The bird is native of Jhabua and Dhar districts in Western parts of Madhya Pradesh. As per available literature Kadaknath lays around 80-90 eggs annually [2] and the bird is not a good brooder. Ability to adapt to local climatic conditions, breed specific criteria, meat qualities and disease resistant are the factors responsible for the popularity of Kadaknath bird. The Kadaknath breed contains a high percentage of protein and believed to have aphrodisiac properties [3]. The last couple of years the demand for Kadaknath bird is increased tremendously. To grab the demanding market of Kadaknath farmers started rearing Kadaknath bird intensively. Scarcely information was available on nutrient requirement of Kadaknath birds. The base of the nutrient requirement for Kadaknath was considered on the basis of data available in the book Nutrient requirements of Animals published by the Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR), New Delhi [4]. Hence, the experiment was planned to know the nutrient requirement of Kadaknath chicken during the finisher phase (7-14 weeks) to optimize the growth performance.

**2. Materials and Methods**

The present experiment was carried out after completion of an earlier experiment of nutrient requirement of Kadaknath chicken during starter phase (0-6 weeks) was continued for finisher phase (7-14 weeks). The present experiment was carried out to investigate the nutrient requirement of Kadaknath chicken during the finisher phase from 7 to 14<sup>th</sup> week age of Kadaknath birds. The experiment was conducted on 270 Kadaknath chicken of age of 7<sup>th</sup> week on ward were distributed into five treatment groups A, B, C, D and E having three replicates containing 18 birds in each. While initiating the experiment the live body weight at the 6<sup>th</sup> week of age was considered as initial live body weight for the experiment (7-14 weeks).

The different dietary treatment groups for the earlier experiment were control group A birds fed on diet containing crude protein (CP)- 18%, Metabolizable energy (ME)- 2700 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.38%, Lysine- 0.85%, group B birds fed on diet containing CP- 19%, ME- 2800 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.40%, Lysine- 0.90%, group C diet containing CP- 20%, ME- 2900 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.48%, Lysine- 1.00%, group D Birds fed on diet containing CP- 21%, ME- 3000 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.45%, Lysine- 1.10% and group E diet containing CP- 22%, ME- 3100 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.50%, Lysine- 1.20%.

## 2.1 Experimental diets and nutrient composition

The feed formulation of the experimental diet, the control diet was prepared as per Singh <sup>[4]</sup> standard available in Nutrient requirement of animals-poultry book published by Indian council of Agriculture Research (ICAR), New Delhi. Considering the same standards for the control diet as basal feed and other dietary treatment groups feed was formulated. The experimental diet feed was formulated to prepare the finisher phase (7-14 weeks) diets for different treatment groups (Table 1). The diet was prepared by using major ingredients as maize, soybean meal, wheat bran and maize gluten. The experimental feed formulation and calculated nutritional composition is given in the Table 1.

**Table 1:** Feed ingredients (%) and nutrient composition of different treatment groups

Feed Ingredients (%)	Treatments groups				
	A	B	C	D	E
Maize	58.13	71.86	67.67	63.28	62.48
Soya DOC (45%)	24.30	23.35	18.80	18.00	0.00
Soya DOC Hypro	0.00	0.00	7.00	8.50	24.30
Wheat bran	13.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maize glutan (65%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.60	3.50
Vegetable oil	0.00	0.00	1.80	3.90	4.90
Monocalcium phosphate	1.50	1.53	1.60	1.58	1.65
Limestone powder (LSP)	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.11	2.10
Salt ( NaCl)	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Trace mineral mixture	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Vitamin premix	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
DL- Methionine	0.10	0.18	0.18	0.11	0.07
L-Lysine	0.02	0.13	0.00	0.07	0.15
Choline chloride (75%)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Toxin binder	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Coccidiostat	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Sodium bicarbonate	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Nutrient Composition					
Metabolizable energy (Kcal/kg)	2700	2910	3006	3105	3203
Crude protein (%)	18.1	17.12	18.09	19.12	20.13
Ether extract (%)	2.5	2	3.56	3.59	4.86
Crude fibre (%)	5.06	4.25	4.24	4.2	4.15
Total lysine (%)	0.85	0.95	0.9	1.01	1.11
Total methionine (%)	0.38	0.45	0.46	0.4	0.38
Calcium (%)	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.10
Available phosphorous (%)	0.46	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.49

## 2.2 Management of birds and parameters studied

The experimental Kadaknath chicks were reared on deep litter system and all the groups were provided similar

environmental and managerial condition throughout the experimental period (7-14 weeks). Each bird provided 1 square feet of floor space. Mortality was recorded as and when it occurred. The birds were offered *ad-lib* fresh and clean drinking water throughout the experiment. The birds were vaccinated against Ranikhet disease (Lasota strain) at the 8<sup>th</sup> week of age. The data were recorded collectively replicate wise to calculate the mean live body weight per bird, weight gain in each treatment and the feed intake to calculate feed consumption per bird. The recorded data of feed intake and gain in body weight were used to calculate feed conversion ratio. The cost of rearing the Kadaknath birds for the experiment was calculated by considering the prevailing costs of Kadaknath birds up to 6<sup>th</sup> week of age, feed, litter and vaccine etc. The economics were calculated by considering all the input and output of rearing Kadaknath birds.

## 2.3 Statistical analysis

Data obtained from the experiment were subjected to one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the using Complete Randomized Design of Snedecor and Cochran <sup>[5]</sup>.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Live body weights and weight gain

In continuation to earlier experiment the mean initial live weights in treatment groups A to E at the beginning of 7<sup>th</sup> week of age (i.e. at the end of 6<sup>th</sup> week) were 251.74, 303.92, 266.76, 322.44 and 282.64, respectively. The significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher mean live body weight was observed in treatment groups B, D and E as compared to control group A from 7<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> weeks of age (Table 2). At 13 and 14<sup>th</sup> week, the live body weight was significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher in treatment group C compared to control group, whereas, there was non-significant differences during 7<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> weeks. At the 14<sup>th</sup> week of age, the mean live body weight was significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher in all other treatment groups as compared to control group. The present findings are accordance with a researcher who reported that increased dietary protein (19-21% CP) and energy (3000 kcal/kg) levels in Betong chicken significantly improved growth performance Nguyen *et al.* <sup>[6]</sup>. However, Tandekar <sup>[7]</sup> reported that the diet containing 20% of CP have higher average live body weight and average weight gain compared to treatment containing CP 18% and 16%, respectively.

The cumulative weight gain was significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher in treatment groups C, D and E compared to control group at the 14<sup>th</sup> week (Table 2). However, there was non-significant difference in control group and treatment group B at 14<sup>th</sup> week. The non-significant difference for cumulative weight gain was recorded in all treatment groups from 7<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> weeks. The non-significantly difference for weight gain in different dietary treatments was in agreement with the result of Magala *et al.* <sup>[8]</sup> who reported that two protein levels (18 and 20% CP) and three energy levels (2800, 2900 and 3000kcal/kg ME) in cockrel diets were not significantly affected body weight gain by the dietary regimes. However, Nguyen *et al.* <sup>[6]</sup> reported that the increase in dietary protein and energy levels did not significantly affect feed intake in Betong chickens.

**Table 2:** Weekly live body weight (g/bird) and weight gain (g/bird) of Kadaknath chicken in different dietary treatment groups

Age (weeks)	Treatment groups					CD	CV
	A	B	C	D	E		
<b>Live body weights (g/bird)</b>							
7 <sup>th</sup>	317.92 <sup>c</sup> ±8.87	366.7 <sup>ab</sup> ±11.74	328.07 <sup>c</sup> ±4.28	394.21 <sup>a</sup> ±15.23	340.80 <sup>b</sup> ±6.82	45.81 <sup>**</sup>	5.06
8 <sup>th</sup>	398.67 <sup>d</sup> ±8.51	443.3 <sup>b</sup> ±2.03	410.67 <sup>cd</sup> ±5.36	480.00 <sup>a</sup> ±15.28	432.66 <sup>bc</sup> ±8.11	40.30 <sup>**</sup>	3.59
9 <sup>th</sup>	485.67 <sup>d</sup> ±6.89	541.33 <sup>ab</sup> ±10.84	501.66 <sup>cd</sup> ±4.84	568.00 <sup>a</sup> ±15.72	524.66 <sup>bc</sup> ±7.80	44.64 <sup>**</sup>	3.29
10 <sup>th</sup>	579.66 <sup>d</sup> ±6.98	636.33 <sup>ab</sup> ±11.33	597.00 <sup>cd</sup> ±4.51	661.33 <sup>a</sup> ±15.60	620.33 <sup>bc</sup> ±7.80	44.89 <sup>**</sup>	2.80
11 <sup>th</sup>	680.33 <sup>d</sup> ±5.78	741.33 <sup>ab</sup> ±11.84	704.00 <sup>cd</sup> ±4.00	766.00 <sup>a</sup> ±15.72	727.33 <sup>bc</sup> ±8.09	44.90 <sup>**</sup>	2.39
12 <sup>th</sup>	786.33 <sup>d</sup> ±5.36	848.00 <sup>ab</sup> ±12.1	812.00 <sup>cd</sup> ±4.51	871.33 <sup>a</sup> ±15.51	835.66 <sup>bc</sup> ±8.09	44.78 <sup>**</sup>	2.08
13 <sup>th</sup>	901.00 <sup>c</sup> ±5.51	963.00 <sup>ab</sup> ±12.50	935.66 <sup>b</sup> ±6.36	990.33 <sup>a</sup> ±15.43	960.00 <sup>ab</sup> ±8.50	46.46 <sup>**</sup>	1.89
14 <sup>th</sup>	1025.00 <sup>c</sup> ±4.36	1089.33 <sup>b</sup> ±12.84	1072.66 <sup>b</sup> ±7.42	1124.66 <sup>ab</sup> ±15.84	1096.66 <sup>ab</sup> ±8.19	47.29 <sup>**</sup>	1.69
<b>Body weight gain (g/bird)</b>							
7 <sup>th</sup>	66.17 ±10.28	62.80 ±1.95	61.31 ±2.80	71.77 ±10.25	58.16 ±5.02	NS	19.03
8 <sup>th</sup>	146.92 ±9.94	139.41 ±9.66	143.91 ±0.98	157.56 ±9.83	150.02 ±4.23	NS	9.21
9 <sup>th</sup>	233.92 ±8.70	237.41 ±1.85	234.91 ±0.91	245.55 ±10.33	242.02 ±4.80	NS	4.69
10 <sup>th</sup>	327.92 ±8.54	332.41 ±2.05	330.24 ±0.87	338.89 ±10.17	337.69 ±5.08	NS	3.34
11 <sup>th</sup>	428.59 ±7.50	437.41 ±1.81	437.24 ±1.28	443.55 ±10.33	444.69 ±4.50	NS	2.42
12 <sup>th</sup>	534.59 ±6.93	544.08 ±2.69	545.24 ±0.87	548.89 ±10.18	553.02 ±5.06	NS	1.93
13 <sup>th</sup>	649.25 ±6.56	659.08 ±2.58	668.91 ±1.88	667.89 ±10.22	677.36 ±5.99	NS	1.62
14 <sup>th</sup>	773.25 <sup>c</sup> ±5.73	785.4 <sup>bc</sup> ±2.26	805.9 <sup>a</sup> ±2.79	802.22 <sup>ab</sup> ±10.51	814.02 <sup>a</sup> ±5.95	27.74 <sup>**</sup>	1.35

Means bearing different superscript within a row differ significantly. \*\* $P < 0.01$ , NS- Non- significant.

### 3.2 Feed Intake, feed conversion ratio (FCR) and mortality (%)

There was non-significant difference for cumulative feed intake in all treatment groups from 8<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> weeks (Table 3). The treatment group C was recorded significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher feed intake as compared to control at 7<sup>th</sup> week, whereas, there was non-significant difference in treatment groups B, D and E as compared to control group. The studies are agreement with a researcher who stated that the birds fed on diet containing 160 and 180 g CP/kg showed non-significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference in feed intake Kingori *et al.* [9]. However, Nguyen *et al.* [6] who reported that no significant difference was observed for feed intake at different dietary protein and energy levels in Betong chickens. The results are accordance to the findings of Mandal *et al.* [10] and Elangovan *et al.* [11] who reported no significant influence of feed intake in Naked Neck x CARI Red chicks due to dietary treatments with crude protein of 18, 16, 14 and 12 per cent.

The cumulative weekly feed conversion ratio showed non-significant differences among all treatment groups from 7 to 14<sup>th</sup> weeks of age (Table 3). However, at the 14<sup>th</sup> week of age poor FCR was recorded in treatment group E as compared to

other treatment groups, but statistical difference was non-significant. The findings are accordance with Reddy [12] reported that the birds fed on low protein diet viz. 18, 19 and 20% showed the similar feed efficiency but had non-significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) effect with birds fed on a diet containing 16% CP. However, the dietary energy levels (3000-3200 ME kcal/kg) did not show significant effect on FCR in Betong chicken Nguyen *et al.* [6]. Magala *et al.* [8] reported that the feed conversion ratio was not significantly affected by the two dietary protein levels (18 and 20% CP) and three energy levels (2800, 2900 and 3000 ME kcal/kg) in cockerels.

The mortality (%) in all treatment groups was within normal range (Table 3). The post mortem examination revealed that the mortality occurred could not be attributed due to dietary treatment. The present findings are in accordance with reporter who observed that there was no significant mortality percentage due to different dietary protein and energy ratio in indigenous chickens Mohammad and Sohail [13]. Similarly, in cockerels the mortality percentages were within the limits during the experimental period in cockerel birds. There was no significant mortality due to dietary nutrient level difference Tandekar [7].

**Table 3:** Feed Intake (g/bird), feed conversion and mortality (%) ratio of Kadaknath chicken in different dietary treatment groups

Age (weeks)	Treatment groups					CD	CV
	A	B	C	D	E		
<b>Feed intake (g/bird)</b>							
7 <sup>th</sup>	348.53 <sup>bc</sup> ±14.56	388.04 <sup>ab</sup> ±5.82	395.08 <sup>a</sup> ±2.46	385.85 <sup>ab</sup> ±25.89	337.54 <sup>c</sup> ±6.26	43.962*	6.513
8 <sup>th</sup>	684.19 ±27.81	739.0 ±8.98	641.41 ±12.07	737.84 ±41.28	646.54 ±37.45	NS	7.196
9 <sup>th</sup>	954.53 ±24.25	1040.70 ±15.65	862.41 ±42.82	967.84 ±97.93	951.87 ±37.75	NS	9.482
10 <sup>th</sup>	1269.53 ±36.67	1371.37 ±28.03	1183.41 ±61.48	1318.84 ±121.10	1259.21 ±21.90	NS	8.778
11 <sup>th</sup>	1511.19 ±3985	1639.03 ±47.33	1464.08 ±48.45	1574.18 ±125.23	1513.54 ±24.59	NS	7.537
12 <sup>th</sup>	1795.19 ±38.39	1928.70 ±6109	1788.08 ±53.25	1874.84 ±126.44	1817.21 ±44.19	NS	6.784
13 <sup>th</sup>	2166.53 ±36.31	2252.03 ±85.80	2155.75 ±26.12	2250.18 ±200.98	2321.54 ±37.02	NS	7.857
14 <sup>th</sup>	2560.14 ±35.30	2590.13 ±129.71	2529.75 ±35.53	2623.51 ±201.62	2804.65 ±38.18	NS	7.324
<b>Feed conversion ratio</b>							
7 <sup>th</sup>	5.60 ±1.10	6.19 ±0.18	6.47 ±0.29	5.48 ±0.43	5.86 ±0.37	NS	16.758
8 <sup>th</sup>	4.69 ±0.34	5.35 ±0.39	4.45 ±0.09	4.69 ±0.06	4.30 ±0.17	NS	9.140
9 <sup>th</sup>	4.09 ±0.16	4.38 ±0.06	3.66 ±0.17	3.92 ±0.22	3.93 ±0.10	NS	6.584
10 <sup>th</sup>	3.87 ±0.13	4.12 ±0.07	3.58 ±0.18	3.87 ±0.23	3.72 ±0.03	NS	6.659
11 <sup>th</sup>	3.52 ±0.09	3.74 ±0.10	3.35 ±0.11	3.53 ±0.20	3.40 ±0.05	NS	5.790
12 <sup>th</sup>	3.35 ±0.07	3.54 ±0.10	3.28 ±0.09	3.41 ±0.16	3.28 ±0.08	NS	5.502
13 <sup>th</sup>	3.33 ±0.09	3.41 ±0.12	3.22 ±0.03	3.36 ±0.25	3.42 ±0.06	NS	6.853
14 <sup>th</sup>	3.31 ±0.07	3.29 ±0.16	3.14 ±0.04	3.26 ±0.21	3.44 ±0.04	NS	6.459
<b>Mortality (%)</b>							
7-14 <sup>th</sup>	3.70	3.70	5.55	3.70	3.70		

Means bearing different superscript within a row differ significantly. \* $P < 0.05$ , NS- Non- significant.

### 3.4 Economics of production

It was found that the production cost of Kadaknath chickens expressed in terms of rupees per kg live weight in treatment groups A, B, C, D and E was 313.89, 257.33, 301.03, 257.35 and 308.02 respectively (Table 4). The low cost of production was observed in treatment group B followed by treatment

groups D, C, E and A. These results are in agreement with earlier researcher Perween *et al.* (2016) who reported that the higher energy with medium protein diet positively reflects to obtain desirable performance economically in Vanaraja chicken [14].

**Table 4:** Production cost of Kadaknath chickens from 7<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> week of age

Particulars	Treatments				
	A	B	C	D	E
Bird cost at the end of 6 <sup>th</sup> week (Rs./bird)	261.11	218.62	255.39	217.56	256.23
Feed cost(Rs./kg)	21.73	21.89	23.83	25.49	27.30
Average live body weight (g/bird)	1025.00	1089.33	1072.67	1124.67	1096.67
Cumulative weight gain (g/bird)	773.26	785.42	805.91	802.22	814.03
Feed intake/ bird (g/bird)	2560	2590	2623	2623	2804
FCR	3.31	3.30	3.14	3.26	3.45
Mortality (%)	3.70	3.70	5.55	3.70	3.70
Total Feed cost (Rs./ bird)	55.63	56.70	62.52	66.87	76.57
Medicine, Vaccine, Litter, Miscellaneous cost.(Rs./bird)	5	5	5	5	5
Production cost (Rs./bird)	321.74	280.32	322.91	289.44	337.80
Production cost (Rs./kg live weight)	313.89	257.33	301.03	257.35	308.02

### 4. Conclusion

The results of the present experiment suggested that Kadaknath birds fed with finisher diet a containing CP-19%,

ME- 3100 kcal/kg, Methionine- 0.40%, Lysine- 1.00% from 7<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> week of age recorded better growth performance and lowest cost of production of Kadaknath chicken.

## 5. Acknowledgement

The authors are highly grateful to Director of Research, Maharashtra Animal and Fishery Sciences University, Nagpur and Associate Dean, Nagpur Veterinary College, Nagpur for providing necessary facilities to carry out this experiment.

## 6. References

1. ICAR-National Bureau of Animal Genetic Resources (NBAGR), registered breeds of chickens. <http://www.nbagr.res.in/book.html>, 2008.
2. Rahangdale PB, Sahu B, Dange A. Growth performance of Kadaknath poultry breed in intensive and backyard rearing. *Contemporary Research in India*. 2017; 7(3):354-359.
3. Rao GV, Thomas PC. The breed characteristics of Kadaknath breed of Indigenous (Desi) chicken. *Avian Research*. 1984; 68:55-57.
4. Singh R. Nutrient Requirement of Animals-Poultry (ICAR-NIANP). Edn 3, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, 2013, 22-23.
5. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. *Statistical Methods*. Edn 8, Iowa state University Press, Ames, Iowa, U.S.A, 1994.
6. Nguyen TV, Bunchasak C, Chantsavang S. Effects of dietary protein and energy on growth performance and carcass characteristics of Betong chickens (*Gallus domesticus*) during growing period. *International Journal of Poultry Science*. 2010; 9(5):468-472.
7. Tandekar S. Study of protein requirement on commercial cockerels. Unpublished M.V. Sc. thesis submitted to Maharashtra animal and fishery sciences university Nagpur Veterinary College, Nagpur, 2012.
8. Magala H, Kugonza DR, Kwizera H, Kyarisiima CC. Influence of varying dietary energy and protein on growth and carcass characteristics of Ugandan local chickens. *J. Anim. Prod. Adv.* 2012; 2(7):316-324.
9. Kingori AM, Tuitoek JK, Muiruri HK, Wachira AM. Protein requirements of growing indigenous chickens during the 14-21 weeks growing period. *South African Journal of Animal Science*. 2003; 33(2):78-82.
10. Mandal AB, Shrivastava HP, Chandra D, Elangovan AV. Optimizing energy protein needs of native and alien chickens employing feed techno-tenets. *CARI Annual Report*, 2001-2002.
11. Elangovan AV, Chandra D, Mandal AB, Singh DP, Shrivastava HP. Protein requirements of growing (12-20 weeks) Naked neck x CARI-Red (Hitcari) and Frizzle x CARI-Red (Up cari) pullets. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2004; 39(1):61-65
12. Reddy JK. Studies on the optimum requirement of energy and protein for commercial Giriraja chicks. Unpublished M. V. Sc thesis submitted to Department of Poultry Science, Veterinary College, Bangalore Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, Bidar, 2011.
13. Mohammad SA, Sohail HK. Effect of different energy protein ratio on the performance of desi native chickens during growing phase. *Asian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2008; 2(1):42-47.
14. Perween S, Kumar K, Chandramoni Kumar S, Singh PK, Kumar M, Dey A. Effect of feeding different dietary levels of energy and protein on growth performance and immune status of Vanaraja chicken in the tropic. *Veterinary World*. 2016; 9(8):893-899.