Improving growth rates of Ongole crossbred bulls by formulation and level of supplement of by-products
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ABSTRACT

Context. Formulating diets using agro-industrial by-product concentrates to increase the growth performance and cost efficiency of Ongole crossbred bulls. Aims. This study was conducted to evaluate the inclusion of agro-industrial by-products of dried cassava powder (DCP), mixed copra meal (CM), palm kernel cake (PKC) and soybean hull (SBH) into rations at low and high levels of feeding on bull liveweight gain and farmer profitability. Methods. Fifty Ongole crossbred bulls with an initial bodyweight (BW) of 227 ± 66.5 kg and aged between 12 and 18 months, were arranged in a randomised complete-block design of five treatments, with 10 heads per treatment. The control group (T0) was provided the current feeding system (CFS) fed ad libitum. The supplemented treatments consisted of CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% PKC) at 1% BW/day (T1), CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% SBH) at 1% BW/day (T2), CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% PKC) at 2% BW/day (T3), CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% SBH) at 2% BW/day (T4). The experiment was conducted for 12 weeks. Key results. The BW gain over 12 weeks (kg) for T0, T1, T2, T3 and T4 was 39.5, 56.2, 68.9, 57.5 and 62.1 kg respectively. The income over feed cost was significantly higher in T2. Conclusions. Supplementation with by-products increased bull liveweight gain compared with current feeding practices. A concentrate supplementation of DCP mixed with CM and SBH at 1% BW/day was the most effective and profitable supplementation method to increase income of farmers in this district and there was no advantage of increasing the level of supplement. Implications. A combination of DCP, CM and SBH to form a concentrate supplement and fed at 1% BW/day will increase bull liveweight gain and income of farmers.
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Introduction

There are approximately 18.1 million head of beef cattle across Indonesia, and 98% of the cattle population are raised by smallholder farmers (LGDS 2022). However, Indonesia is often unable to meet domestic demand for beef production. Cattle raised by smallholder farmers often have low growth rates and poor feed conversions due to the lack of feed and/or poor diet formulations. Wiyatna et al. (2012) and Handayanta et al. (2017) observed average daily gain (ADG) values of beef cattle of ~0.20–0.25 kg/day under smallholder-farmer systems. Farmers offer forage to cattle usually on the basis of availability without regard to meeting energy and protein requirements (Adiwinarti et al. 2011). The use of by-product supplements can increase growth rates of cattle in smallholder farms (Marsetyo et al. 2021; Rethanengrum et al. 2021, Winarti et al. 2022a, 2022b).

Agro-industrial by-products are potentially valuable sources of energy and protein. The dried cassava powder (DCP) has a high metabolisable energy (ME) value (approximately 12.2 MJ/kg DM), but recent feeding trials have shown that DCP inclusion should not exceed 40% of a ration for fattening bulls because feed intake and subsequent ADG are
reduced at higher levels (Retnaningrum et al. 2021). The DCP has a low crude protein (CP) content (approximately 2.9% CP), so it needs to be combined with a supplement with a high protein content, such as the agro-industrial by-products of copra meal (CM), palm kernel cake (PKC) or soybean hulls (SBH). The CP content of CM is ~22% (Heuzé et al. 2015), PKC is ~16% (Gunawan 2014) and SBH is ~13% (Heuzé et al. 2017). Formulation can be facilitated by the use of a least cost ration formulator (LCR) when prices and availability of ingredients change (Poppi et al. 2021).

Previous research results showed that Ongole crossbred bulls fed a concentrated supplement of between 1% and 1.6% bodyweight (BW)/day had an ADG of 0.56–0.78 kg/day (Lestari et al. 2011; Marsetyo et al. 2021; Winarti et al. 2022a, 2022b), but it is not known how bulls under smallholder systems will respond to a higher level of feeding such as that achieved by Retnaningrum et al. (2021) under feedlot conditions. The inclusion of SBH has not been studied extensively in indigenous cattle in Indonesia.

This study aims to determine the effect of agro-industrial-derived supplements (CM, PKC, SBH) and their level of feeding on the ADG of Ongole crossbred bulls and profitability of smallholder farmers. The hypothesis of this experiment is that supplement type and level of supplementation will increase the ADG of Ongole bulls and daily income over feed costs (IOFC).

### Materials and methods

#### Location and animal care

Fifty Ongole crossbred bulls with an initial BW of 227 ± 66.5 kg and aged between 12 and 18 months old were used in this village experiment. This size of animal is typical of smallholder production systems. The bulls were owned by a smallholder-farmer cooperative located in Banaran and Bleberan villages, Playen Subdistrict, Gunungkidul Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The bulls received an identification number that was attached to a neck collar. Prior to the experiment, all bulls were treated with macrocyclic lactone via an ivermectin subcutaneous injection (dose: 1 mL/50 kg BW) for the prevention of parasite infection.

#### Experimental design

Bulls were randomly allocated into either a control group (T0) or one of four treatments (T1, T2, T3 and T4), as shown in Table 1, and housed in individual pens over the experimental period. Feed nutrient content of the current feeding system/CFS (T0) and the concentrate supplement of treatments (T1, T2, T3 and T4) can be seen in Table 2. The control group (T0) was fed the CFS, whereas treatment groups (T1 and T2) were fed CFS and dietary concentrate supplements at an approximate 1% BW/day on a DM basis and treatment groups (T3 and T4) were fed CFS and dietary concentrate supplements at an approximate 2% BW/day on a DM basis. Each treatment involved 10 bulls (five bulls in Banaran village and five bulls in Bleberan village), making the total number of bulls 50 in this experiment.

#### Diet and feeding management

This feeding trial was conducted for 12 weeks, commencing on the 29 April and concluding on the 22 July 2018. The bulls were offered the CFS ad libitum to each animal in the morning (about 06.00 hour to 07.00 hours) and in the afternoon (about 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours). After 1 h of offering CFS, bulls (T1, T2, T3, T4) were fed their concentrate supplements according to each treatment. The CFS predominantly consisted of native grasses (Paspalum conjugatum, Cynodon dactylon), cultivated grasses (Pennisetum purpureum), agricultural waste (corn stover, peanut straw) and tree leaf (Artocarpus heterophyllus, Albizia chinensis). These forages were collected in bulk and chopped by sickle to an approximate

<p>| Table 1. Dietary treatments of T0, T1, T2, T3 and T4. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Composition of feed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T0</td>
<td>Current feeding system (CFS) ad libitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% PKC) offered at estimated DM level of 1% BW/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% SBH) offered at estimated DM level of 1% BW/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% PKC) offered at estimated DM level of 2% BW/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>CFS ad libitum + concentrate (50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% SBH) offered at estimated DM level of 2% BW/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFS, current feeding system, consisted of native grass (Paspalum conjugatum, Cynodon dactylon), cultivated grass (Pennisetum purpureum), agricultural waste (corn stover, peanut straw) and tree leaf (Artocarpus heterophyllus, Albizia chinensis); DCP, dried cassava powder; CM, copra meal; SBH, soybean hulls; PKC, palm kernel cake; DM, dry matter; BW, bodyweight.

<p>| Table 2. Feed nutrient content of the current feeding system (T0) and of the concentrate supplement of treatments (T1, T2, T3 and T4). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diet</th>
<th>DM (% as fed)</th>
<th>CP (% DM)</th>
<th>EE (% DM)</th>
<th>CF (% DM)</th>
<th>NFE (% DM)</th>
<th>TDN (% DM)</th>
<th>Cost (IDR/kg DM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>3638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1/T3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>67.02</td>
<td>4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2/T4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>3638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T0, current feeding system (CFS); T1 and T3: 50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% PKC; T2 and T4: 50% DCP, 25% CM, 25% SBH; DM, dry matter; CP, crude protein; EE, ether extract; CF, crude fibre; NFE, nitrogen free extract; TDN, total digestible nutrients, calculated from Harris et al. (1972), as follows: TDN = −54.572 + 6.769 (CF) − 51.083 (EE) + 1.851 (NFE) − 0.334 (CP) − 0.049 (CF)2 + 3.384 (EE)2 − 0.086 (CF) × (NFE) + 0.687 (EE) × (NFE) + 0.942 (EE) × (CP) − 0.112 (EE) × (CF) × (CP) for T0 and TDN = −202.866 − 1357 (CF) + 2638 (EE) + 3003 (NFE) + 2.347 (CP) + 0.046 (CF)2 + 0.647 (EE)2 + 0.041 (CF) × (NFE) − 0.081 (EE) × (NFE) + 0.553 (EE) × (CP) − 0.046 (EE)2 × (CP) for supplements T1, T2, T3 and T4.
chop length of 10–20 cm. The concentrate supplement was a mixture of 50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% PKC or 50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% SBH, formulated by the use of the LCR and supplemented to a level of either 1% or 2% BW/day. The concentrate was mixed as a ground uniform mash. Drinking water was provided to each bull after the feeding in the morning and evening, each as much as 15 L. A mineral block was provided ad libitum to each bull in the feeding box during the experiment.

Prior to the feeding trial, bulls were adapted over 4 weeks by gradually increasing the concentrate supplement to the required level of 1% or 2% BW/day. Feed adaptation was conducted by administration of CFS ad libitum and adding supplement starting from 0.25% BW/day to reach 1% BW/day or 2% BW/day on a DM basis.

**Parameter measurements**

Parameters observed were ADG, DM intake, feed for gain ratio (FFG) and IOFIC. The ADG (kg/head per day) of bulls was calculated from the BW at 12 weeks minus initial BW and dividing by the time period (84 days). All bulls were weighed individually every 3 weeks (0, 3, 6, 9 and 12 weeks), in the morning before feeding and after feed and water were removed at 22:00 hours the previous night as a further check on the ADG and to adjust level of supplement.

Dry-matter intake was calculated from the summation of the forage intake and concentrate supplement intake, following the procedures of Winarti et al. (2022a, 2022b). Samples of CFS were taken and stored once every 3 weeks for DM analysis. This value was used to measure DM intake as described by Winarti et al. (2022a, 2022b).

The amount of concentrate supplement was adjusted to 1% or 2% of BW/day in 0–3-week, 3–6-week, 6–9-week and 9–12-week periods, which were calculated by weighing of bulls every 3 weeks, namely at Weeks 0, 3, 6 and 9. Samples of supplements were collected in Weeks 1 and 12 of the experiment for the analysis of DM, ash, CP, ether extract (EE) and crude fibre (CF). All samples (CFS and supplements) were dried in a hot-air circulating oven (55°C) before chemical analysis. Dry-matter was determined by Method No. 930.15 (AOAC 2005), CP by Method No. 978.04 (AOAC 2005), EE by Method No. 930.09 (AOAC 2005) and CF was determined by Method No. 930.10 (AOAC 2005). The amount of nitrogen-free extract (NFE) was determined by the following equation: NFE (% DM) = 100 − (％EE + ％ash + % CF + % CP). The concepts of NFE and CF are standards for feed analysis in Indonesia.

Feed to gain ratio (FFG) is the ratio of the DM intake to ADG (expressed kg feed DM/kg BW gain). Income over feed cost (IOFC) was obtained from the ADG multiplied by the value of the ADG (Indonesian rupiah (IDR)/kg BW) minus the average daily feed costs of DM intake (IDR/day) as previously reported by Cowley et al. (2020). The daily feed cost was total cost of feed (forage and supplement)/day.

**Statistical analyses**

The experiment was arranged in a randomised complete-block design, whereby animals were stratified by initial BW before random allocation into five dietary treatments and 10 animal replications. Data were analysed using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the initial BW of bulls as covariate to control the effect of this variable on the dependent variable (Montgomery 2013) and continued by Duncan multiple-range test (DMRT) for analysing significant difference among treatments (Cohort 2022).

**Ethics approval**

This experiment was awarded an Animal Ethics Certificate (AEC) approval with the number SAFS/516/17/INDONESIA/VILLAGE and approved by the University of Queensland Australia. This research is part of the project No. LPS/2013/021 entitled Profitable Feeding Strategies for Smallholder Cattle in Indonesia, which is a partnership of the University of Queensland and Northern Territory Department of Industry, Tourism and Trade in Australia and Indonesian Universities and Indonesian Agency for Agricultural Research Development (IAARD) in Indonesia.

**Results**

The total forage intake of bulls over the 12-week experiment did not differ significantly (P > 0.05) among the treatments, with the CFS (T0) being 487 kg DM/head, which was not different from the forage intake in supplemented T1–T4 treatments (257–441 kg DM/head) (Table 3). Total diet intake of bulls in treatment T3 (containing PKC at 2% BW) was significantly (P < 0.01) higher than that in treatments T0 and T2 (containing SBH at 1% BW) (Table 3). The ADG of bulls in treatment T2 was significantly (P < 0.05) higher than that in treatment T0, and the PKC-containing treatments T1 and T3, but not differing from that in treatment T4 (with SBH 2% BW) (Table 3). Increasing the level of concentrate supplement did not increase ADG. Feed to gain ratio of bulls did not differ among treatments (P > 0.05), with the value for T0 being 14.81, which was not different from that in T1–T4 treatments (8.55–14.77) (Table 3). Income over feed cost of bulls in treatment T2 was the highest and significantly (P < 0.01) different from that in the 2% BW-supplemented treatments T3 and T4, but not different from that in treatments T0 and T1 (Table 3).

**Discussion**

Previous work by Winarti et al. (2022a, 2022b) showed that ADG could be increased over that of the current village-based systems by feeding a supplement based on combinations of
Table 3. Growth performance of Ongole crossbred bull supplemented with concentrate (T1, T2, T3 and T4) and without concentrate (T0) after 12 weeks of treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T0</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>s.e.m.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forage intake (kg DM per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>486.9</td>
<td>441.1</td>
<td>349.4</td>
<td>407.2</td>
<td>257.0</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forage intake (% BW/day)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate intake (kg DM per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>0.0c</td>
<td>191.9b</td>
<td>224.1b</td>
<td>411.6a</td>
<td>397.1a</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate intake (% BW/day)</td>
<td>0.0c</td>
<td>1.10b</td>
<td>1.11b</td>
<td>2.20a</td>
<td>2.25a</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total feed intake (kg DM per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>486.9b</td>
<td>633.0ab</td>
<td>573.5b</td>
<td>818.8a</td>
<td>654.1ab</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial BW (kg/head)</td>
<td>270.3</td>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>222.8</td>
<td>210.7</td>
<td>9.797</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM intake (% BW/day)</td>
<td>2.14b</td>
<td>3.64ab</td>
<td>2.84ab</td>
<td>4.38a</td>
<td>3.70a</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWG (kg/head per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>39.5c</td>
<td>56.2b</td>
<td>68.9a</td>
<td>57.5b</td>
<td>62.1ab</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADG (kg/head/day)</td>
<td>0.47c</td>
<td>0.67b</td>
<td>0.82a</td>
<td>0.68b</td>
<td>0.74ab</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed cost (IDR/head per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>304 285c</td>
<td>973 791b</td>
<td>1123 771b</td>
<td>1751 920a</td>
<td>1764 952a</td>
<td>90 247</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed for gain ratio (kg FI in DM/kg ADG)</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOFC (IDR/head per 12 weeks)</td>
<td>1 868 215ab</td>
<td>2 117 209ab</td>
<td>2 665 729a</td>
<td>1 410 580b</td>
<td>1 650 548b</td>
<td>114 127</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The price of ADG of bull was IDR55 000/kg BW. Price of forage is IDR/kg DM. At the time of the experiment, the price of DCP was IDR/kg DM. Price of concentrate was IDR/kg DM. Price of concentrates T1 and T3 are IDR/kg DM. Price of concentrates T2 and T4 are IDR/kg DM.

DM, dry matter; BW, bodyweight; BWG, BW gain (WB at 12 weeks – initial BW); ADG, average daily gain, BWG at 12 weeks divided by the time period (84 days); FI, feed intake; IOFC, income over feed cost; IDR, Indonesian rupiah (currency); T0, current feeding system (CFS); T1, CFS; T2, CFS and concentrate 1% (50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% PKC); T3, CFS ad libitum and concentrate 1% (50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% SBH); T4, CFS ad libitum and concentrate 2% (50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% PKC); T5, CFS ad libitum and concentrate 2% (50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% SBH). DCP, dried cassava powder; CM, copra meal; SBH, soybean hulls; PKC, palm kernel cake; s.e.m., standard error of the mean.

Different letters between treatments within a row indicate significant differences (P < 0.05).

Gliricidia sepium, CM, PKC, SBH and DCP at a level of 1% BW/day. The dietary treatment rations were formulated on the basis of an LCR system and resulted in increased ADG and IOFC for smallholder farmers. In the current study, the same approach was used except that only combinations using DCP, CM and PKC were used to increase the ME content of the supplement and by feeding it at higher levels of 2% BW/day, approaching that used by Retnaningrum et al. (2021).

The concentrate supplements increased ADG and total weight gain over the 12-week period, but there was no effect from increasing the level of supplement from 1% to 2% BW/day (Table 3). While this was not reflected in total DM intake, it was most likely due to errors in measuring refusal of the CFS. The participants can measure what they offer easily, but refusals are a problem. The cost structure is largely dictated by the amount offered, so this is unlikely to affect the IOFC calculation. The amount of concentrate offered and consumed and the ADG are measured accurately. There may also be effects of the level of concentrate on the digestibility of the basal diet, but this could not be determined under the present housing arrangements. Treatment T2 (mixture of DCP, CM and SBH) at 1% BW/day yielded a significantly higher ADG of 0.82 kg/day than in the control group at 0.47 kg/day (Table 3). However, increasing the level of feeding had no further increase in ADG in this experiment. The reason for this is unclear, but on first principles, the total ME intake from both levels of supplement and CFS of the total diet must be similar, even though this was not reflected in the estimate of total DM intake for reasons alluded to above, suggesting a higher level of substitution than was measured. The ADG values with these concentrate supplements were similar to the values recorded in earlier experiments of Winarti et al. (2022a, 2022b) and Marsetyo et al. (2021), which are much lower than achieved by Mayberry et al. (2014) and Cowley et al. (2020) with the same breed type of Ongole who measured approximately 1.4 and 1.2 kg/day ADG respectively. Nevertheless, the T2 treatment resulted in a very high ADG for a village-based system.

Cassava and its various by-product forms are widely available in Indonesia and, with its high ME content, it can be used to increase the ME of formulated rations. It is low in CP and needs combinations with high-protein by-products such as CM, PKC and SBH, all of which are available at variable prices throughout Indonesia. The current study showed that PKC and SBH are practically interchangeable, with little effect on ADG, although the combinations T2 and T4 using SBH (50% DCP, 25% CM and 25% SBH) gave a significantly higher ADG result at both levels of supplement. Table 2 shows that the supplements contained 40% higher TDN (and therefore ME) contents and 100% higher CP contents than did the CFS. As such, the concentrate containing formulations achieved the objective of increasing ME and CP content of the total ration above that of the CFS, which resulted in a higher ADG. However, the lack of effect of level of feeding of the concentrate supplement was surprising, suggesting a
substitution effect on intake that was not reflected in the estimates of forage intake (Table 2).

The estimate of forage intake by the methodology used here was measured as accurately as possible under close supervision. Average total forage intake of bulls over the 12 weeks ranged from 257 to 487 kg DM/head or from 3.1 to 5.8 kg DM/head.day (Table 3). In terms of %BW/day, the forage intake ranged from 2.14 to 4.38, which is considered high for long-chopped tropical pastures; however, these values are still within the scope found in other research 1.91–5.19 (Handayanta et al. 2017) for Ongole bulls. The higher forage intake probably reflects more the amount offered and, hence, the cost rather than intake, given the potential for error in measuring residues.

The estimate of supplement intake was accurate because amounts were weighed for the week, before being distributed to farmers. Because supplement cost is by far the greatest expenditure, then the results for IOFC (Table 3) reflect more the level of supplement than the forage intake and the lack of ADG response to higher levels of feeding of supplement.

The offered concentrate was completely consumed by bulls. Forage intake of bulls maintained under T₀ (using forage feed without concentrate) was 486.9 kg DM/head for 12 weeks (Table 3) or 5.80 kg DM/head.day or 2.12% BW/day, which was within the range found by Handayanta et al. (2017). The level of cassava inclusion was less than 40% of the final ration (from 15% to 30%, Table 3), and, so, would not be expected to decrease the intake and ADG (Retnaningrum et al. 2021). Retnaningrum et al. (2021) suggested possible reasons why there was a depression in intake and ADG when cassava was included at greater than 40% of the final ration. These primarily were related to HCN intake and high starch intake, although there was no conclusive reason why there was an upper limit of 40% inclusion. However, the depression of intake and ADG at high levels of inclusion of cassava has been found in a number of studies (Mayberry et al. 2014; Cowley et al. 2020; Retnaningrum et al. 2021; Kusmartono et al. 2022).

The FFG is a measure of the animal’s efficiency in converting feed to liveweight. The FFG ratio of bulls (kg diet intake in DM/kg ADG) in this experiment ranged from 8.55 to 14.81, which agreed with the FFG values from Lestari et al. (2011), Marsetyo et al. (2021) and Winarti et al. (2022). Who supplemented at levels up to 1.6% BW/day. However, Retnaningrum et al. (2021) found a very low value (5.5) in Ongole × Limousin crossbred bulls fed a feedlot formulation based on some of the same ingredients as used here. This may be a breed effect, but more likely to be due to a complete feedlot formulated ration used by Retnaningrum et al. (2021), with better control over feeding and husbandry.

Income over feed cost (IOFC) of bulls ranged from IDR 410 580 to IDR 665 729/head over 12 weeks or from IDR 16 792 to IDR 31 734/day. The highest IOFC was found in the T₂ treatment, which reflected the higher ADG, but there was no further advantage to a higher level of supplement at 2% BW/day; in fact, the values at a supplement level of 2% BW/day were lower than those in the CFS (Table 3). This highlighted the importance of examining IOFC for a smallholder system, because some supplementation strategies can depress IOFC and therefore profitability for the farmer, even though ADG was improved compared with the CFS. However, the cost of providing a supplement was high (Table 3) and access to funds can be difficult for a smallholder where the risk is high. The feed cost is dependent on location and season and can fluctuate widely. Having a system such as the LCR can enable extension staff and farmers to quickly modify ration composition to increase IOFC. The higher feed quality improves the growth performance of cattle as indicated by the ADG, which affects the IOFC as previously reported by Priyanti et al. (2012) and Cowley et al. (2020).

Overall, Ongole crossbred bulls supplemented with agro-industrial by-products increased ADG by 42–74% when the concentrate was supplemented at 1% or 2% BW/day (T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄). The use of SBH gave the best results but, practically, it could be substituted by PC. There was no significant improvement in ADG when feeding concentrate at the higher levels of 2% BW/day.

Conclusions

The use of agro-industrial by-products of DCP, CM, PKC and SBH formulated by a LCR process and fed as a supplement at 1% BW/day to Ongole bulls increased ADG, but there was no advantage in increasing the level of supplement to 2% BW/day.
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