

	*	**		*
()				
300	Hubbard	Ross	Cobb	900
6		50		18
	Hubbard	Ross	Cobb	56
				(P<0.05)
42				28
				(P<0.05)
	Hubbard	2170	2440 2418	Ross Cobb
Hubbard	Ross Cobb		1484 1729 1710	129.2 132 129.5
	Hubbard			56
				Ross Cobb
Hubbard	Ross Cobb			(P<0.05)
Cobb				
		42		Hubbard Ross

Selected Strain Crossing

.1

Reciprocal Recurrent Selection

1908
Hybrid Vigor
Inbred Lines

(1982)

1984	63	1580	1890	1964
	47			

*

**

(2007) 42 2500
 Ross Cobb 45 McKay .(1948) Smith
 Cobb 2480 2677 Ross (2002)
 (2006) 42 2.6 40
 Hubbard Cobb 1.66
 8 .%71
 52.53 53.6 8-1 (1972) Rendel and Johansson
 Hubbard Cobb
 Ross Hubbard Cobb (1984) Marks and Pesti
) (1987) Cahaner
 () ()
 .
 (1980) Hulan
 .2
 11 / Renden
 .2005 6 2005 (1992)
 300
 Cobb 500 (1976) Evans (2007)
 18 .Hubbard Ross 308
 (3×1.5) 50 (1999) McDevitt
 () (1995) Pack and Schutte
 ad)
 (libitium
 (2004) Tona
 L E S
) 6
 (56-29 28-1) (500 E 672 S
 L
 L E S 1650 2151 2322

() (Iso Caloric-Iso Nitrogenous)
 28 .(1)
 (P<0.05) 56 42 28 1
 . 56
 42 27
 983 1096 56
 .(2) (/ /)
 (P<0.05) :(1949) Broody
 1153
 1026 1110
 925 970 1056
 Hubbard Ross Cobb
 . 28
 42
 Relative Growth Rate = $\frac{\text{Weight 2} - \text{Weight 1}}{\text{Weight 1}} * 100$
 ()
 Ross Cobb :(2006)
 Hubbard (P<0.05)
 2170 2440 2418
 . Hubbard Ross Cobb
 ()
 (2×3)
 (P<0.05))
 2278 2408 (Coefficients) .(1980)
 .(1980) Steel and Torrie
 Cobb .3
 (P<0.05)
 2273 2563 28
 (P<0.05) Cobb
 Ross Ross Hubbard
 Hubbard Hubbard
 56 1040 1105 Hubbard Ross Cobb
 . 975

...

	(4)			3543 3515 3726		Ross Hubbard Cobb	
Cobb	42	Hubbard	(P<0.05)			3626 3562	
	1484	1729	1710				
				Cobb		(3)	
			(P<0.05)	Hubbard		(P<0.05)	
	1584	1698		28	Ross		
Cobb			56	Hubbard Cobb	183.5 182.5	184.6	
2675 2632 2848			Ross	(P<0.05)			
				184.5			
					182.6		
						42	
(5)			42				
	(P<0.01)			Ross		28	
				74.4 75.9 80.5	Cobb Hubbard		
			Ross Cobb	(P<0.05)			
			Hubbard			Cobb	
Cobb	0.94	0.91	0.96				
			Ross Hubbard				
			(P<0.01)				
Ross Cobb						(P<0.05)	
	Hubbard					74.6 79.3	
	0.39 0.51 0.38					28	
			Ross Hubbard Cobb			56	
				Cobb		Hubbard	
				(P<0.05)		Ross	
Cobb	0.44	0.31	0.48		Cobb	Ross	
			Ross Hubbard	Cobb Hubbard	36.5 42.6 47.3		
						Ross	

	56		Cobb	0.48	0.45	0.55	
	Genotype)			Ross Hubbard	
			56				
Anderson and Nakhata							(6
Tona (1992)	Summers (1982)	(1982)	Ross Cobb				
	(2006)	(2004)			Hubbard		
	56	42	Ross Cobb	0.72			0.95 0.84
							.Hubbard
(1976)	Evans (1992)	Renden		(0.80	0.85)		
		(2007)	.Hubbard	(0.60)		Ross Cobb	
		42					
	Ross Cobb		Ross Cobb			(0.63	0.64)
						.Hubbard	(0.27)
							(P<0.05)
			Hubbard			Ross Cobb	
			247	275	286		
	Ross Cobb						
(1998) Pesti	Smith		Ross Cobb				
			56		42		
					(7)		
							.4
			(3)	(2)			
			28		Hubbard	Ross Cobb	
	56						42
42							

56

)

(

Ross Cobb

Hubbard

42

56

56

42

42

56

:(1)

62.00	67.24	55.16	60.36	%9
----	5.00	----	5.00	%50
30.09	21.90	37.59	29.42	%45
3.65	2.17	3.00	1.52	
0.34	0.26	0.46	0.39	
1.18	1.16	1.30	1.28	
1.86	1.46	1.87	1.39	
0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	
0.32	0.28	0.29	0.25	
0.21	0.18	0.07	0.04	
0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	
3150	3150	3045	3045	/
18.9	18.8	22.7	22.3	%
1.20	1.12	1.25	1.18	%
0.58	0.55	0.64	0.60	%
0.29	0.27	0.33	0.31	%
0.86	0.84	0.99	0.96	%
0.27	0.27	0.27	0.26	%

(2):

					/
	Ross	Hubbard	Cobb		
983 b	970 cd	925 d	1056 bc		28
1096 a	1110 ab	1026 bc	1153 a		
	1040 b	975 c	1105 a		
2278 b	2380 ab	2180 b	2273 b		42
2408 a	2500 a	2160 b	2563 a		
	2440 a	2170 b	2418 a		
3562 a	3573 a	3483 a	3360 a		56
3627 a	3513 a	3546 a	3823 a		
	3543 a	3515 a	3726 a		

(P<0.05)

(P<0.05)

(P<0.05)



:(3)

					/
	Ross	Hubbard	Cobb		
182.6 b	182.5 bc	181.5 c	183.9 ab		28
184.5 a	184.5 a	183.5 ab	185.3 a		
	183.5 ab	182.5 b	184.6 a		
79.3 a	84.1 a	80.9 ab	73.0 bc		42
74.6 b	77.0 abc	71.0 c	75.8 abc		
	80.5 a	75.9 ab	74.4 b		
43.9 a	39.9 ab	46.0 ab	45.9 ab		56
40.4 a	33.2 b	48.6 a	39.4 ab		
	36.5 b	47.3 a	42.6 ab		

.(P<0.05)

.(P< 0.05)

.(P< 0.05)



(4):

					/
	Ross	Hubbard	Cobb		
1584 b	1672 ab	1496 c	1585 bc		42
1698 a	1786 a	1473 c	1834 a		
	1729 a	1484 b	1710 a		
2672 a	2689 b	2585 b	2742 ab		56
2765 a	2662 b	2680 b	2955 a		
	2675 ab	2632 b	2848 a		

(P<0.05)

(P< 0.05)

(P< 0.05)



42

(5):

Ross	Hubbard	Cobb	
0.229**	0.232	0.346 **	/
0.94	0.91	0.96	
Y=57.21+ 0.229X	Y=50.37+ 0.232X	Y=34.93+ 0.346X	
0.00765 **	0.00748	0.00402 **	/
0.39	0.51	0.38	
Y=0.413+ 0.007 X	Y =0.648+ 0.007X	Y= 1.123+ 0.004X	

Ross	Hubbard	Cobb	
2.94	2.05	3.09	/
0.44	0.31	0.48	
Y = 1851+ 2.94X	Y = 1805+ 2.05X	Y = 1887+ 3.09X	
-0.0105	0.005178	0.004610	/
0.48	0.45	0.55	
Y=3.574 -0.0105 X	Y =0 .854+ 0. 0 051X	Y= 1.017+ 0. 004X	

(P<0.01)

**

. 56

:(6)

Ross	Hubbard	Cobb	
0.420**	0.238	0.281 *	/
0.95	0.72	0.84	
Y=10.24+ 0.420X	Y=38.01 + 0.238X	Y=25 .11 + 0. 281X	
0.00175	0.00358	0.00197	/
0.80	0.60	0.85	
Y= 2.347+ 0.0017 X	Y =1.66+ 0.0035X	Y =2.139+0.0019X	
7.818	2.972	6.126	/
0.63	0.27	0.64	
Y = 2037+ 7.818 X	Y = 2967+ 2.972X	Y = 2492+ 6.126X	
-0.00654	-0.01758	-0.005019	/

Ross	Hubbard	Cobb	
0.69	0.64	0.65	
Y=3.98 -0.00 65X	Y =5.778-0.0175X	Y=2.719- 0.00501X	

(P<0.05)

*

(P<0.05)

**

(7):

				/
Ross	Hubbard	Cobb		
328 a	305 ab	325 a		42
319 a	259 bcd	319 a		
237 cd	209 b	263 bc		56
221 cd	216 cd	240 cd		
275 a	247 b	286 a		

(P<0.05)



(P<0.05)



2006

2007

2006

(12)

1982

1980

- Broody, S. 1949. Bioenergetics and Growth. Reinhold Publ. Corp. New York.
- Cahander, A., E. A. Dunnington and D. E. Jons. 1987. Evaluation of Two Commercial Broiler Males Differing in Efficiency of Food Utilization, *Poult.Sci.*66:1101-1110.
- Evans, D. G., T. L. Goodwin and L. D. Andrews. 1976. Chemical Composition, Carcass Yield and Tenderness of Broilers as Influenced by Rearing Methods and Genetic Strain, *Poult.Sci.*55:748-755.
- Hulan, H. W., F. G. Proudfoot and D. Ramey, 1980. Influence of Genotype and Diet on General Performance and Incidence of Leg Abnormalities of Commercial Broilers Reared to Roaster Weight, *Poult Sci* .59:748-757.
- Mark, H. I. and G. M. Pesti. 1984. The Roles of Protein Levels and Diet Form in Water Consumption and Abdominal Fat Pad Deposition of Broilers, *Poult.Sci.* 63:1617-1625.
- McDevitt, R. M., J. Mock and S.Wallis. 1999. The Effect of DL-Methionine and Carcass Composition in Male Broilers. In Proceeding of the 11th *Australian Poultry Science Symposium*, Sidney: 73-76.
- McKay, J. C., N. F. Elarton, A. N. M. Kocrhum and J. McAdam. 2002. The Challenge of Genetic Change in the Broiler Chickens. Ross Breeders Limited, EH28 857 UK.
- Nakhata, N. and J. Anderson. 1982. Describing the Relation between Dietary Protein and Energy Levels and Chicks Performance by Mathematicalequation, *Poult.Sci.* 61:891-897.
- Pesti, G. M. and D. L. Flecher. 1984. The Response of Male Broiler Chickens to Diet with Various Protein Contents during the Growing and Finisher Phases, *Br. Poult. Sci.* 25:415-423.
- Johansson, I. and J. Rendel. 1972. Genetic and Animal Breeding .Oliver and Boyd. Edinbargh, 489.
- Renden, J. A., S. F. Bilgili and S. A. Kincaid. 1992. Effect of Photoschedule and Strain Cross on Broiler Performance and Carcass Yield, *Poult. Sci.* 71:1417-1426.
- Schutte, J. B. and M. Pack. 1995. Sulfur Amino Acid Requirement of Broiler Chicks from Fourteen to Thirty-Eight Days of Age. 1-Performance and Carcass Yield, *Poult. Sci.* 78: 480-487.
- Smith, E. R. and G. M. Pesti. 1998. Influence of Broiler Strain Cross and Dietary Protein on the Performance of Broilers, *Poult. Sci.* 78:276-281
- Steel, R. G. D. and J. H. Torrie. 1980. Principles and Procedures of Statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Company, INC. New York, U.S.A.
- Summers, J. D., D. Spratt and J. L. Atkinson. 1992. Broiler Weight Gain and Carcass Composition When Fed Diets Varying in Amino Acid Balance, Dietary Energy and Protein Levels , *Poult Sci* .71:263-273.
- Tona, K., O. M. Onagbesan, V. Bruggeman, K. Mertens, Y. Jego and E. Decuypere. 2004. Comparison of Feed Intake, Blood Metabolic Parameters, Body and Organ Weights of Growing Broilers Originating from Dwarf and Standard Breeders Lines, *International Jour. Poult.Sci.* 3(6): 422-426.

Influence of Genotype and Protein Source on Broiler Performance

*Nahil M. Ali**, *Thamir A. Az-Aldeen*** and *Esraa M. Tawfik**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this experiment was to quantify the responses of three broiler strains of different genotypes to two protein sources (animal and vegetable) on performance and carcass weight. Nine hundred one-day-old broiler chicks of three strains (Cobb500, Ross308 and Hubbard) were placed in 18 floor pens, three hundred chicks of each, at a rate of 50 chicks per pen, to form six treatments. The chicks were raised up to 56 days. Feed and water were available *ad libitum*.

At the end of the growing period (28d), Cobb exhibited priority in growth parameters as body weight and growth rate on both Ross and Hubbard strains.

At the age of 42 days, significant differences ($P < 0.05$) were obtained in terms of performance of strains. Over all, Cobb and Ross birds had higher body weights; i.e. 2418, 2440 vs 2170 gm for Hubbard, higher relative growth rate; i.e. 129.5, 132 and 129.2 and higher carcass weights i.e. 1710, 1729 and 1484 gm for these strains, respectively. However, at day 56, Hubbard strain showed an improvement in body weight and growth rate, to be at the mark of other strains. Economical efficiency was greatly affected ($P < 0.05$) by strains for both Cobb and Ross over Hubbard. But there was no effect of protein source on the economical efficiency at various ages. It was concluded that Cobb and Ross strains were better than Hubbard. The 42 day age is a favorable age for broiler marketing.

Keywords: Genotype, Protein Source, Broiler Economic Performance.

*Department of Animal Resources, College of Agriculture, Mosul University, Mosul, Iraq.

** Department of Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Mosul, Mosul, Iraq.

Received on 25/3/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 17/10/2007.