

## Probiotic and prebiotic feed additives in calf nutrition

### Probiotická a prebiotická krmná aditiva ve výživě telat

Luboš ZÁBRANSKÝ<sup>1</sup> (✉), Anna POBORSKÁ<sup>1</sup>, Gabriela MALÁ<sup>2</sup>, Branislav GÁLIK<sup>3</sup>, Eva PETRÁŠKOVÁ<sup>1</sup>, Naděžda KERNEROVÁ<sup>1</sup>, Ondřej HANUŠOVSKÝ<sup>3</sup>, Josef KUČERA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Zootechnical Sciences, Studentská 1668, 370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Animal Science, Department of Technology and Management of Ruminants, Přátelství 815, 104 00 Praha Uhřetěves, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup> Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Agrobiological Sciences, Department of Animal Nutrition, Trieda A. Hlinku 2, 94976 Nitra, Slovakia

✉ Corresponding author: [zabransky@zf.jcu.cz](mailto:zabransky@zf.jcu.cz)

Received: October 5, 2020; accepted: November 2, 2020

#### ABSTRACT

The target of the research was to analyze the effect of antidiarrheal feed additives on calves average daily weight gain. In the study, 120 calves were analyzed. Newborns were selected into 3 treatment groups, control (without supplementation) and group with *Ascophyllum nodosum* (prebiotics), and mixture of *Lactobacillus sporogenes*, *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Bifidobacterium bifidum* (probiotics). Individual body weight of animal were determined after 2 hours *post-partum*. Monitoring of the growth intensity, as well as health status were done till 56 days of age. Significant effects ( $P < 0.01$ ) of additive supplementation were found in the group with probiotics, in body weight at the age 21 days, as well as at the age of 56 days of life. Significant effect ( $P < 0.01$ ) of probiotics supplementation was found also in daily weight gains of animals. On the base of analyzed results, probiotics in calves nutrition stimulate the body weight.

**Keywords:** calves, probiotics, prebiotics, health, nutrition

#### ABSTRAKT

Cílem této studie bylo prokázání vlivu krmných aditiv s protiprůjmovým účinkem na hmotnostní přírůstky a zdraví telat. Do experimentu bylo zařazeno celkem 120 telat. Po narození byla telata rozdělena do tří skupin: *Ascophyllum nodosum* (hydrolyzát hnědých mořských řas, prebiotikum), kombinaci *Lactobacillus sporogenes*, *Enterococcus faecalis* a *Bifidobacterium bifidum* (probiotikum) a kontrolní skupinu. Všechna telata byla zvážena do dvou hodin po narození. Přírůstky a zdravotní stav byly sledovány od narození do 56. dne věku. Ve srovnání s kontrolní skupinou byl nalezen signifikantní vliv aplikovaných krmných aditiv u probiotické skupiny u hmotnostních přírůstků 21. den po otelení ( $P < 0,01$ ), u hmotnostních přírůstků 56. den po otelení ( $P < 0,01$ ) a průměrných denních přírůstků ( $P < 0,01$ ). Z této studie vyplývá, že užívání probiotik, má významný pozitivní vliv na zvýšení přírůstků u telat.

**Keywords:** telata, probiotika, prebiotika, zdraví, výživa

## INTRODUCTION

Health of the calf is an important factor in the animal production area. Risks of the health prior to weaning are very sensitive factor to disease and environmental stress during this period (Hammon et al., 2020). Calves diarrhea, pathogens infection, is a high mortality and morbidity critical points of neonatals (He et al., 2017). Livestock intensive management system, mainly in calf rearing without dams, beneficial microflora is negative affected by pathogens to intestinal microflora colonization (Renaud et al., 2019; Rosmini et al., 2004). The occurrence of dairy calves metabolic problems in the Czech Republic is very actual. An important factor in this field is insufficient colostrum nutrition of the calves (Podhorský et al., 2007; Šlosárková et al., 2014). Many studies (f.e. Svensson et al., 2003; Kamal et al., 2014) shows that, growth intensity, as well as occurrence of diarrheas are affected by dams parity and year season of the birth.

Probiotics and prebiotics are feed additives with the beneficial effects to intestinal microflora stabilization, as well as calf health status and welfare improves. The positive impact of *Lactobacillus sporogenes* on *Salmonella dublin* was published by Frizzo et al. (2011), beneficial effect of *Lactobacillus* on growth intensity by Higginbotham and Bath (1993). The positive effect of *Pediococcus acidilactici*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, *Lactobacillus casei* and *Bifidobacterium bifidum* on calf diarrhoeas reduction was published by Renaud et al. (2019).

Probiotics nutritional supplementation can help in balanced microflora with the improving the health status of calf (Soto et al., 2011). These additives are live microorganisms with positive effect on host health (Kaur et al., 2002). Probiotics mode of action is that, they are pathogenics competitors in intestinal space colonization, in nutrient sources; they reduce intestinal pH value by the organic acids production, and stimulate the host immunity. These supplements decrease the risk of many intestinal infections and other problems (Ewaschuk et al., 2004). Ohasi and Ushida (2009) suggest using probiotics in calves nutrition so long as possible is. Interesting way

of probiotics utilization is in using of a specific oils in the feed rations (Hajiaghapour and Rezaei-pour 2010; Rolínek et al., 2020).

Prebiotics are feed supplement with selective effects in the large intestine, in composition and growth of selected bacteria in the gastrointestinal tract. Large intestine is an very important internal organ, prebiotics can affect functions of this organ (Geigerová et al., 2019; Wang 2009). Prebiotics have a positive effect on the short-chain fatty acids production in the intestine (Scheid et al., 2013).

Feed additives like probiotics and prebiotics have a positive effects on calves, they can reduce the diarrheal disease incidence, as well as improve the health status of animals. The goal of this research was to analyze the effect of these supplements on the growth intensity of calves.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

One hundred twenty Holstein calves (40 in probiotic group, 40 in prebiotic group and 40 in control group) were included in the experiment. All calves were after birth absolutely randomly divided into three treatment groups: group 1 *Ascophyllum nodosum*, group 2 combination *Lactobacillus sporogenes*, *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Bifidobacterium bifidum* and control group 3. The calves were detached and weaned from mothers within two hours after birth. All calves were moved to outdoor individual boxes, where they remained until the age of 56. The Colostrum received they ad libitum 3 times a day from a bucket with rubber nipple. From the fifth day after birth they were receiving 4.5 kg of milk replacer (concentration 1:8) per day divided into 3 portions, a starter mixture (crushed wheat 20%, crushed barley 15%, whole maize grains 10%, whole oat grains 19.5%, extracted rapeseed meal 15%, extracted soybean meal 15%, Tetravit (Nita-Farm, Saratov, Russia) – vitamin-mineral premix 5%, calcium 0.5%) and *alfalfa* hay ad libitum until weaning. The calves drank colostrum and intermediate milk replacer from plastic buckets with rubber nipples. These buckets were placed at a height of

40 cm above the ground. All calves had *ad-libitum* access to drinking water. The experiment was conducted from April 2019 to August 2019.

The probiotic experimental group received orally 3 g *Lactobacillus sporogenes* ( $4,1 \times 10^7$  CFU/g) + 1g *Enterococcus faecalis* ( $4,1 \times 10^7$  CFU/g) + 1g *Bifidobacterium bifidum* ( $4,1 \times 10^7$  CFU/g). The probiotics were added to colostrum from the first to the fifth day after birth. Then were added to milk replacer and thoroughly mixed to the fourteenth day of age. These feed supplements were served with once a day at the second feeding. The calves from the control group received 1.5 kg of milk replacer per feeding (totally 4.5 kg), starter mixture and alfalfa hay *ad libitum*. The calves from experimental groups and control group were observed from the birth to the 56<sup>th</sup> day of age.

Experimental group with prebiotic received orally 5 ml *Ascophyllum nodosum* to colostrum and milk replacer from the first to the fourteenth day after birth.

The longest two hours after birth were all calves weighed. Then again on the 21<sup>st</sup> day and on the 56<sup>th</sup> day after birth. In this experiment was used the classical method for the evaluation and expression of diarrhea according to Larson et al. (1977). Health assessment was performed mainly according to the type of feces, measuring the temperature in the rectum and the state of respiration. The condition of the coat, brightness in the eye and symptoms of dehydration (exhaustion, sunken eyes and inelastic skin) were also monitored.

In the case of long-lasting diarrhea, calves were given Argivo Se at a dose of 40 g per day and per piece.

The values obtained were analyzed using a General Linear Model ANOVA (four ways with the interactions) of the statistical package STATISTIC 12 (Statistix Analytical Software. Tallahassee, Florida, USA).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The probiotic group had the highest live body weight at the 21<sup>st</sup> day and 56<sup>th</sup> day. The data obtained were statistically significant compared to the control group and

showed better but not significantly results with the first group at the 21<sup>st</sup> day ( $54.43 \pm 5.08$  kg vs  $51.75 \pm 5.16$  kg vs  $52.23 \pm 5.21$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). The data obtained were statistically significant compared to the control group and showed better but not significantly results with the first group at the 56<sup>th</sup> day ( $86.24 \pm 5.08$  kg vs  $81.33 \pm 5.16$  kg vs  $82.65 \pm 5.21$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). Also, the overall average of daily live weight gain was the most significant in the probiotic group, significant was in comparing with control (3<sup>rd</sup>) group ( $486.1 \pm 78.0$  g vs  $435.7 \pm 86.0$  g,  $P < 0.01$ ) and in comparing with prebiotic (1<sup>st</sup>) group  $486.1 \pm 78.0$  g vs  $448.4 \pm 67.0$  g,  $P < 0.05$ ) (Table 1). A number of studies are described which report the positive effect of the use of probiotic feed supplements on the health and live weight gain of calves (Zhang et al., 2016; Raabis et al., 2019; Renaud et al., 2019). The expected effect of feeding with probiotic and prebiotic feed additives was as in Bayatkouhsar et al. (2013) reduction in the incidence of diarrheal diseases and the associated increase of weight gain. Froehlich et al. (2017) report in their study that the combination of prebiotics and essential oils in milk replacer had a positive effect on live weight gain. The combination of prebiotics and essential oils in starter feed resulted in increased growth performance, probably due to better intestinal health, rumen fermentation, and improved immune status Liu et al. (2020). The use of probiotic and prebiotic feed additives did not have a statistically significant effect on the incidence of diarrheal diseases in calves but we can observe positive trends in the combination of probiotic feed supplements  $p = 0.07$ . He et al. (2017) did not prove a positive effects combination probiotic or prebiotic on diarrhea in calves. Stefańska et al. (2020) demonstrated in his study the positive effect of probiotics and phytobiotics on the reduction of the development of diarrheal diseases but the effect of the combination of these feed supplements on live weight gain was not demonstrated.

**Table 1.** The effect of nutrition supplements on body weight gain and health condition

Variables	N	Treatment groups			P	Significance
		1. Prebiotic	2. Probiotic	3. Control		
		$\bar{x} \pm SD$	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	$\bar{x} \pm SD$		
BW at birth (kg)	120	37.81±5.21	37.63±5.08	37.76± 5.16	0.4642	
BW in 21 <sup>st</sup> day (kg)	120	52.23±5.21	54.43±5.08	51.75±5.16	0.0012**	2:3**, 2:1*
BW in 56 <sup>th</sup> day (kg)	120	82.65±5.21	86.24±5.08	81.33±5.16	0.0012**	2:3**, 2:1*
ADG from birth to 56 <sup>th</sup> day (g)	120	448.4±67.0	486.1±78.0	435.7± 86.0	0.0012**	2:3**, 2:1*
Duration of diarrhea (day)	120	1.65±3.37	1.29±3.09	2.36.4±3.54	0.1845	
Total number of diarrheas (frequency)	120	0.20±0.38	0.14±0.32	0.33±0.45	0.0692	

\*P<0.05; \*\*P<0.01; SD - standard deviation; ADG - average daily gains; BW - body weight; P - significance; N - number (1 – *Ascophyllum nodosum*, N=40, 2 - *Lactobacillus sporogenes*, *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Bifidobacterium bifidum*, N=40; and 3 – control, N=40)

## CONCLUSION

The use of probiotic and prebiotic feed additives to increase weight gain was statistically demonstrated in this study, as in several others. Unfortunately, no significant effect on reducing the incidence of diarrheal diseases has been demonstrated. The combination of probiotics, prebiotics and phytobiotics could be achieve more convincing results in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by project NAZV QK1910438.

## REFERENCES

- Bayatkouhsar, J., Tahmasebi, A. M., Naserian, A. A., Mokarram, R.R., Valizadeh, R. (2013) Effects of supplementation of lactic acid bacteria on growth performance, blood metabolites and fecal coliform and lactobacilli of young dairy calves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 186, 1-11.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2013.04.015>
- Hajiaghapour, H., Rezaei-pour, V. (2010) Comparison of two herbal essential oils, probiotic, and mannan-oligosaccharides on egg production, hatchability, serum metabolites, intestinal morphology, and microbiota activity of quail breeders. *Livestock Science*, 210, 93-98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2018.02.007>
- Dhakal, K., Maltecca, C., Cassady, J. P., Baloch, G., Williams, C. M., Washburn, S. P. (2013) Calf birth weight, gestation length, calving ease, and neonatal calf mortality in Holstein, Jersey, and crossbred cows in a pasture system. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 96, 690-698. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-5817>
- Ewaschuk, J. B., Naylor, J. M., Palmer, R. S. J., Zello, G. A. (2004) D-Lactate Production and Excretion in Diarrheic Calves. *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*, 18 (5), 744-747.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-1676.2004.tb02615.x>
- Frizzo, L. S., Soto, L. P., Bertozzi, E., Zbrun, M. V., Signorini, M. L., Sequeira, G., Armesto, R. R., Rosmini, M. R. (2011) Intestinal populations of lactobacilli and coliforms after in vivo salmonella dublin challenge and their relationship with microbial translocation in calves supplemented with lactic acid bacteria and lactose. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 170, 12-20.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.07.016>
- Froehlich, K. A., Abdelsalam, K. W., Chase, C., Koppien-Fox, J., Casper, D. P. (2017) Evaluation of essential oils and prebiotics for newborn dairy calves. *Journal of Animal Science*, 95, 3772-3782.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2017.1601>
- Geigerová, M., Bunešová, E., Vlčková, E., Salmonová, H., Rada, V. (2017) Selection of prebiotic oligosaccharides suitable for synbiotic use in calves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 229, 73-78.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2017.05.011>
- Hammon, H., Liermann, W., Fritzen, D., Koch, C. (2020) Review: Importance of colostrum supply and milk feeding intensity on gastrointestinal and systemic development in calves. *Animal*, 14, 133-143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731119003148>
- He, Z. X., Ferlisi, B., Eckert, E., Brown, H. E., Aguilar, A., Steele, M. E. (2017) Supplementing a yeast probiotic to pre-weaning Holstein calves: Feed intake, growth and fecal biomarkers of gut health. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 226: 81-87.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2017.02.010>
- Higginbotham, G. E., Bath, D. L. (1993) Evaluation of lactobacillus fermentation cultures in calf feeding systems. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 76, 615-620.  
DOI: [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(93\)77382-8](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(93)77382-8)
- Kaur, I. P., Chopra, K., Saina, A. (2002) Probiotics potential pharmaceutical applications. *European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 15, 1-9. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S09280987\(01\)00209-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S09280987(01)00209-3)
- Larson, L. L., Owen, F. G., Albright, J. L. (1977) Guidelines toward more uniformity in measuring and reporting calf experimental data. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 60, 989-991.  
DOI: [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(77\)83975-1](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(77)83975-1)

- Liu, T., Chen, H., Bai, Y., Wu, J., Cheng, S., He, B., Casper, D. P. (2020) Calf starter containing a blend of essential oils and prebiotics affects the growth performance of Holstein calves. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103, 2315-2323. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-16647>
- Ohashi, Y., Ushida, K. (2009) Health-beneficial effects of probiotics its mode of action. *Animal Science Journal*, 80, 361-371. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.17400929.2009.00645.x>
- Podhorský, A., Pechová, A., Dvořák, R., Pavlata, L. (2007) Metabolic disorders in dairy calves in postpartum period. *Acta Veterinaria Brno*, 76, 45-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2754/avb200776S8S045>
- Raabis, S., Li, W., Cersosimo, L. (2019) Effects and immune responses of probiotic treatment in ruminants. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology*, 208, 58-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2018.12.006>
- Renaud, D. L., Kelton, D. F., Weese, J. S., Noble, C., Duffield, T. F. (2019) Evaluation of a multispecies probiotic as a supportive treatment for diarrhea in dairy calves: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 102, 4498-4505. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15793>
- Rolinec, M., Medo, J., Gábor, M., Miluchová, M., Bíro, D., Šimko, M., Juráček, M., Hanušovský, O., Schubertová, Z., Gálik, B. (2020) The Effect of Coconut Oil Addition to Feed of Pigs on Rectal Microbial Diversity and Bacterial Abundance. *Animals*, 10, 1764. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10101764>
- Rosmini, M. R., Sequeira, G. J., Guererro-Legarreta, I., Martí, L. E., Dalla-Santina, R., Frizzo, L., Bonazza, J. C. (2004) Production of probiotics for animals: importance of using internal intestinal microflora (in Spanish). *Mexican Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 3, 181-191. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2754/avb201584030269>
- Scheid, M. M. A., Moreno, Y. M. F., Maróstica, M. R., Pastore, G. M. (2013) Effect of prebiotics on the health of the elderly. *Food Research International Journal*, 53, 426-432. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.04.003>
- Soto, L. P., Frizzo, L. S., Avataneo, E., Zbrun, M. V., Bertozzi, E., Sequeira, G., Signorini, M. L., Rosmini, M. R. (2011) Design of macrocapsules to improve bacterial viability and supplementation with a probiotic for young calves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 12, 176-183. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.03.001>
- Stefańska, B., Sroka, J., Katzer, F., Goliński, P., Nowak, W. (2020) The effect of probiotics, phytobiotics and their combination as feed additives in the diet of dairy calves on performance, rumen fermentation and blood metabolites during the preweaning period. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 114738, In Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2020.114738>
- Šlosárková, S., Fleischer, P., Pěnkava, O., Skřivánek, M. (2014) The assessment of colostrum immunity in dairy calves based on serum biochemical indicators and their relationships. *Acta Veterinaria Brno*, 83, 151-156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2754/avb201483020151>
- Tarboush, H. M. A., Saiady, M. Y. A., Din, A. H. K. E. (1996) Evaluation of diet containing lactobacilli on performance, fecal coliform, and lactobacilli of young dairy calves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 57, 39-49. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401\(95\)00850-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401(95)00850-0)
- Wang, Y. (2009) Prebiotics: Present and future in food science and technology. *Food Research International* 1, 8-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2008.09.001>
- Zhang, R., Zhou, M., Tu, Y., Zhang, N. F., Deng, K. D., Ma, T., Diao, Q. Y. (2016): Effect of oral administration of probiotics on growth performance, apparent nutrient digestibility and stress-related indicators in Holstein calves. *Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition*, 100, 33-38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpn.12338>