

2007

Triticale Fed to Finishing Pigs in Hoop Barns

Zeb Sullivan
Iowa State University

Mark S. Honeyman
Iowa State University, honeyman@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports



Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agriculture Commons](#), and the [Animal Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sullivan, Zeb and Honeyman, Mark S., "Triticale Fed to Finishing Pigs in Hoop Barns" (2007). *Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports*. 986.

http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports/986

This report is brought to you for free and open access by Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Triticale Fed to Finishing Pigs in Hoop Barns

Abstract

Triticale is a synthetic small grain made by crossing durum wheat and rye. Triticale has more crude protein and an amino acid profile that more closely matches the needs of the finishing pig than corn. Using triticale as an ingredient in swine diets decreases the amount of soybean meal needed to meet the amino acid needs of the pig, compared to corn-based diets. There have been conflicting results on the effects of feeding triticale to finishing pigs. Some studies reported similar pig performance when triticale replaced corn as the dietary grain source, while others have shown decreased performance. The objective of the present study was to evaluate the effects of triticale-based diets in deep-bedded hoop barns on finishing pig performance.

Keywords

Animal Science

Disciplines

Agricultural Science | Agriculture | Animal Sciences

Triticale Fed to Finishing Pigs in Hoop Barns

Zeb Sullivan, grad assistant
Mark Honeyman, professor
Department of Animal Science

Introduction

Triticale is a synthetic small grain made by crossing durum wheat and rye. Triticale has more crude protein and an amino acid profile that more closely matches the needs of the finishing pig than corn. Using triticale as an ingredient in swine diets decreases the amount of soybean meal needed to meet the amino acid needs of the pig, compared to corn-based diets. There have been conflicting results on the effects of feeding triticale to finishing pigs. Some studies reported similar pig performance when triticale replaced corn as the dietary grain source, while others have shown decreased performance.

The objective of the present study was to evaluate the effects of triticale-based diets in deep-bedded hoop barns on finishing pig performance.

Materials and Methods

Finishing pigs (n=480) were used to evaluate the effects triticale-based diets fed in hoop barns had on pig performance. The study consisted of eight trials: four in winter and four in summer at the ISU Western Research and Demonstration Farm, Castana, IA.

Each trial consisted of six pens of ten pigs (five barrows and five gilts) in three small-scale hoop barns (6.0 × 10.8 m). Each test pen had one water space and two feeder spaces. The pigs were started on experiment at approximately 150-160 lb and fed for 49 d. A two-week adjustment period was allowed for adaptation to triticale diets and experimental pens. Pens were assigned one of three dietary treatments: 1) corn-soybean meal control (0% triticale), 2)

40% triticale diet (by weight) or 3) 80% triticale diet (by weight). The 40 and 80% triticale diets had corn and soybean meal added. All diets were ground with a hammer mill through a 0.64 cm screen and fed in meal form. Composition and calculated analysis of experimental diets are given in Table 1. Pigs had *ad libitum* access to feed and water during the study. At the end of each trial, all pigs were individually scanned for backfat and loin area by a certified technician with an ultrasound. Triticale straw was used as bedding in the deep-bedded hoop barns. The first year the triticale variety was Trical 815 and the second year it was NE426GT.

Results and Discussion

During summer, average daily feed intake (ADFI) was similar for all diets, but during the winter the pigs fed corn-soy ate less and those fed the 80% triticale diet ate more (Table 2). Pigs fed the corn-soy diet grew (ADG) faster than pigs fed the 80% triticale diets (Table 2). The feed efficiency (feed:gain, lb feed per lb live weight gain) was best for the corn-soy diet and poorest for the 80% triticale diet (Table 2). When the backfat (BF 250) and loin muscle area (LMA 250) were adjusted to a standard live weight of 250 lb, backfat did not differ, but the pigs fed corn-soy diet had larger loin areas than the pigs fed 80% triticale diets (Table 2). The calculated percentage of carcass lean was similar for all diets, but calculated lean gain per day was greatest for pigs fed the corn-soy diet (Table 2). Based on these results, triticale inclusion rates of 30 to 50% of the total diet for finishing pigs may result in similar pig performance as corn-soy diets. Higher inclusion rates, approximately 80%, may result in slower gains, poorer feed efficiency, and smaller loin areas. However, triticale-based diets may be lower cost than corn-soy diets because less soy meal, dicalcium phosphate, and corn would be needed in the diet when triticale is added.

Acknowledgments

This project was supported by the Hatch Act, State of Iowa funds and the Iowa State University Agronomy Endowment Fund. The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of W. Roush and the ISU Western Research Farm staff; D. Johnson and staff at the ISU Swine

Nutrition Farm; A. Penner for data collection; and D. McDermott for conducting ultrasound scans. Mention of company or product names is for clarity and does not imply endorsement by the authors or Iowa State University, nor exclusion of any other products that may be suitable for application.

Table 1. Composition of diets fed to finishing pigs in deep-bedded hoop barns, as-fed basis.

| Ingredient, % | Control ^a | 40% Triticale ^a | 80% Triticale ^a |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Corn | 85.00 | 46.50 | 8.50 |
| Triticale | 0.00 | 40.00 | 80.00 |
| Soybean meal (48% CP) | 12.91 | 11.53 | 9.64 |
| Dicalcium phosphate | 0.60 | 0.33 | 0.07 |
| Limestone | 0.90 | 1.05 | 1.20 |
| Salt | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Vitamin premix ^b | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Mineral premix ^c | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Calculate analysis | | | |
| Crude protein, % | 12.90 | 13.60 | 14.10 |
| Lysine, % | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.61 |
| Ca, % | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.55 |
| Available P, % | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| ME, kcal/kg | 3320 | 3240 | 3160 |

^aContained 0.5 g/kg aureomycin chlortetracycline (Alpharma Inc., Fort Lee, NJ).

^bPremix supplied vitamins to meet or exceed NRC (1998) requirements for finishing pigs.

^cPremix supplied minerals to meet or exceed NRC (1998) requirements for finishing pigs.

Table 2. Performance of finishing pigs fed triticale-based diets in deep-bedded hoop barns during summer and winter^a.

| Item | Summer | | | Winter | | | SEM |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|
| | Control | 40% | 80% | Control | 40% | 80% | |
| No. of pigs | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | -- |
| No. of pens | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | -- |
| Start wt, lb | 151.9 ^e | 152.3 ^e | 148.2 ^e | 165.5 ^f | 163.7 ^f | 158.1 ^f | 2.9 |
| End wt, lb | 254.9 ^g | 247.1 ^{g,h} | 237.8 ^h | 277.8 ^e | 269.8 ^{e,f} | 258.0 ^{f,g} | 4.5 |
| ADFI, lb/d | 7.98 ^e | 7.87 ^e | 7.98 ^e | 8.92 ^f | 9.17 ^{f,g} | 9.59 ^g | 0.20 |
| ADG, lb/d | 2.13 ^{e,f} | 1.96 ^{f,g} | 1.85 ^g | 2.29 ^e | 2.17 ^{e,f} | 2.04 ^{f,g} | 0.07 |
| Feed:gain lb/lb | 3.77 ^e | 4.03 ^{e,f} | 4.33 ^f | 3.94 ^e | 4.26 ^f | 4.71 ^g | 0.11 |
| BF, in. | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.04 |
| LMA, in. ^{2,b} | 7.02 ^{e,f} | 6.54 ^{f,g} | 6.32 ^g | 7.29 ^e | 6.90 ^{e,f} | 6.59 ^{f,g} | 0.17 |
| BF 250, in. ^c | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.04 |
| LMA 250, in. ^{2,c} | 6.93 | 6.58 | 6.50 | 6.84 | 6.59 | 6.46 | 0.17 |
| Lean, % ^d | 52.8 | 52.2 | 52.2 | 52.7 | 51.5 | 51.7 | 0.8 |
| Lean gain ^d , lb/d | 0.82 ^{j,k} | 0.73 ^{l,m} | 0.69 ^m | 0.86 ^j | 0.77 ^{k,l} | 0.77 ^{l,m} | 0.02 |

^aSummer=April through September; Winter=October through March.

^bFrom ultrasound scan data.

^cCalculated values standardized to 250 lb using NPB formulas.

^dLean percentage and lean gain calculated using NPB formulas.

^{e,f,g,h}=P<0.05.

^{j,k,l,m}=P<0.01.