



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**CHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND DIGESTIBILITY OF NATURAL AND
DOMESTIC FOOD OF THE LAR GIBBON (HYLOBATES LAR) IN
MALAYSIA**

VELLAYAN SUBRAMANIAM

FPV 1981 1

CHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND DIGESTIBILITY OF NATURAL AND DOMESTIC
FOOD OF THE LAR GIBBON (HYLOBATES LAR) IN MALAYSIA

By


VELLAYAN SUBRAMANIAM

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Science in the Universiti
Pertanian Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor.


October, 1981.




This thesis attached hereto, entitled "Chemical composition and digestibility of natural and domestic food of the lar gibbon (Hylobates lar) in Malaysia" prepared and submitted by Vellayan Subramaniam in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, is hereby accepted.




.....
Dr. Mohamed Mahyuddin Dahan
Chairman, Board of Examiners
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia.



.....
Dr. Rudy I. Hutagalung
Chief Supervisor,
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia.



.....
Dr. M. K. Vidyadaran,
Co-Supervisor,
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia.



.....
Prof. (Dr.) Pran Vohra,
External examiner,
University of California, Davis.

Date: 2nd December, 1981.

Dedicated to my mother
and to the memory
of my father.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. R.I. Hutagalung, Dr. M. Kavanagh and Dr. M.K. Vidyadaran for their guidance and direction in the preparation and supervision of this dissertation. My deepest appreciation is also due to Prof. (Dr.) Syed Jalaludin Syed Salim, Dean of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Sciences and Dr. Mohd. Mahyuddin Dahan, Head of the Department of Animal Sciences, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia for their encouragement and provision of facilities throughout the study.

The Department of Wildlife and National Parks was of great assistance, for which I thank the Director-General, Encik Mohamed Khan Momin Khan and the research officer, Mr. Louis Ratnam. I thank Encik Mohamed Khan for allowing me to work in the Krau Game Reserve of Pahang and to live free of charge in the visitors accommodation at the Kuala Lompat post. I am also grateful to his department for loaning the gibbons for captive studies. Thanks to Mr. K.M. Kochummen of the Forest Research Institute, Kepong for kindly identifying the figs.

In the forest the personalities of Kalang anak Tot and Ali Draman married to their seemingly limitless knowledge and skill in climbing the tropical rain forest trees and their unfailing reliability, made them more than the perfect field assistants. I am indebted to Dr. J.J. Raemaekers for his assistance in identifying the gibbon food trees and for his encouragement and support throughout the study. I thank Encik Kassim Yunus, Ketua Polis Daerah, Temerloh, Pahang for permitting me to enter the reserve during the study period. I am grateful to

Miss Elizabeth Bennett (post-graduate student - University of Cambridge) for helping me in sample collection while I was away at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, U.K.

I owe a great deal to many people both in Malaysia and United Kingdom for the successful laboratory work. Sincere thanks to Dr. Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman, Head of the Department of Pathology and Microbiology, UPM for permitting me to undertake gut measurements on the gibbon carcasses from Zoo Negara, Ulu Klang, Kuala Lumpur. My sincere appreciation to the laboratory staffs of Clinical Pathology, UPM for undertaking pH and specific gravity measurements for the gibbon urine samples. At the Department of Animal Sciences, I would like to thank Mr. P. Ganesamurthi who assisted me in the chemical analyses of the food samples. Appreciation is also extended to Puan Rohana Atan, Mr. Donald Eric Anthony (Department of Animal Sciences, UPM), Mr. A. Manimaran (Institute Pertanian, Serdang), Mr. Chan Tin Wan (Department of Food Science and Technology, UPM), Cik Zainab Nasri (Department of Soil Science, UPM) and Mr. V. Devarajan (FES, Serdang). I am grateful to the staffs of the Primate Unit, UPM, Dr. N. Sewellenggam, Encik Mior Mohamed Dwazi, Encik Abdul Ghafar and Encik Ramli Yunus for taking good care of the gibbons and for assisting me in the metabolic studies. Thanks to Dr. Tan Hock Seng and Dr. Faridah Noor of the Department of Clinical Studies, UPM for treating the sick gibbons. I thank also the Dean of the Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences, Dr. Ang Kok Jee for loaning a freeze to store the gibbon foods and to Dr. Law Ah Theem of the same faculty for loaning some of his glasswares for the laboratory work. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Peter Waterman of the University of Strathclyde, U.K. for permitting me to analyse for



plant secondary compounds in his Phytochemistry Research Laboratory. Sincere thanks to Dr. Norman S. Ritchie of the Department of Animal Husbandry, Veterinary School, University of Glasgow, U.K. for analysing 120 food items for the protein content.

The staff of the UPM library were very useful during the whole study period. I would like to thank Cik Salmah Salleh, Cik Halimatun Halaliah Mokhtar and Cik Hajar Abdul Bakar for their help. At the University of Cambridge, I am grateful to Dr. David Chivers for his encouragement and support throughout the Malaysian Primates Research Programme. I also thank him for the library facilities which he provided me while I was at Cambridge.

I received assistance from a number of people to whom I am extremely grateful: Prof. (Dr.) M.R. Jainudeen (Head of the Department of Clinical Studies, UPM), Dr. Hew Peng Yew, Mr. M. Ayahsamy, Cik Normadiyah Sukaimi, Puan Siti Patimah Idris and Puan Aminah Ibrahim (all from the Department of Animal Sciences, UPM); Encik Abdul Rahman Othman (Dean's Office, UPM), Dr. K. Ragavan (Department of Pathology and Microbiology, UPM); Mr. K.M. Vellasamy (Department of Biology, UPM); Encik Maarouf Abdul Wahid, Mr. L. Muthu, Mr. A. Bhanu and Puan Rahimah Abdullah (all from the Department of Agronomy, UPM); Encik Sulaiman Atan and Puan Faridah Mohamed (3rd College, UPM); Dr. A. Retnasabapathy (Animal House, Universiti Malaya); Dr. Mohd. Nordin Hasan (Department of Zoology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia); Dr. Wendell Wilson, Dr. Clive Marsh and Dr. Berry Yeverme (University of Cambridge); Prof. (Dr.) Pran Vohra (University of California, Davis), and Dr. Peter Waterman (University of Strathclyde). I thank Mrs. Josephine Chu for typing the thesis immaculately.



The study was supported financially by the National Institute of Health, U.S.A. via University of Cambridge contract No. NO1-Co-85409 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia grant No. 1803-1-004. I express my gratitude to these institutions.

I declare that this dissertation is my own original work, except where it is expressly stated to the contrary that no part of it has been submitted to any other University.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES	xvii
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF PLATES	xx
ABSTRACT	xxii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Recent Studies of Primate Ecology	8
The Need for Nutritional Studies in Primates	11
Field Studies of Wild Gibbons	13
Preliminary Nutritional Work on Primates	16
Secondary Compounds in Primate Foods	20
General Review of Laboratory Nutritional Studies of Primates	23
Conclusion	27
CHAPTER III MATERIALS AND METHODS	28
Location of Study	28
Classification and Description of Plant Food Parts	30
Selection of Food Trees	31
Sample Collection	31
Storage of Wild Foods	32
Processing of Samples	33
Sampling	34
Defination of Terms	34
Reporting of Analytical Data	36
Metabolic Studies	38
Digestibility Experiments	38
Design of Metabolic Cage	40
Experimental Animals	45
Basal Diet	46
Digestibility Trials	46
Fecal Collection	48

	<u>Page</u>
Urine Collection	48
Processing of Feces	49
pH Measurement of Urine	49
Specific Gravity of Urine	49
Weighing of Gibbons	50
Measurement of Water Intake	50
 CHAPTER IV RESULTS	 51
Classification of Food for Gibbons	51
Chemical Composition of Gibbons Foods in the Rank Order	61
Protein Content of Food Items	61
Fibre Content of Food Items	66
Fat Composition of Lar Gibbon's Foodstuffs	66
Carbohydrate Content in the Lar Gibbon's Food	69
 Results of the Comparison of Nutrients in the Natural Foods of Lar Gibbons	 69
Comparison between Crude Fibre and Crude Protein Content	69
Comparison between calcium and phosphorus	74
Comparison between Acid Detergent Lignin and Total <u>in vitro</u> Digestibility	74
<u>In vitro</u> Digestibilities of Lar Gibbon Food	74
Comparison between Total Phenol and Tannin	79
 Comparison of Nutrients in Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	 79
Comparison of Crude Fibre between Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	79
Comparison of Crude Protein between Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	83
Comparison of Gross Energy between Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	83
Comparison of Calcium and Phosphorus in Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	86
Comparison between Acid Detergent Lignin and <u>in vitro</u> Digestibility in Young Leaf and Mature Leaf	86

	<u>Page</u>
Results of the Comparison of Nutrients in Whole Ripe Fruit and Whole Unripe Fruit of Lar's Food	89
Results of the Nutrient Analyses of <u>Ficus</u> Fruits	97
Chemical Composition of Stored and Non-Stored Food	99
Chemical Composition of the Ingredients used to Formulate the Basal Diet	104
Results of Amino Acid Analyss	104
Results of Digestibility Studies with Captive Gibbons	109
Digestibility Studies using Natural Foods	109
Digestibility Studies using Domestic Foods	117
Comparison between <u>in vitro</u> and <u>in vivo</u> Digestibility	118
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION	140
Introduction	140
Factors Influencing Food Intake	141
The Natural Diet	142
Intake of Foliage	143
Chemical Composition of Foliage	144
Intake of Flowers	147
Chemical Composition of Flowers	148
Intake of Fruits	150
Ficus	150
Other Fruits	151
Chemical Composition of Fruits	152
Ficus	152
Other fruits	154
Tannins and Alkaloids	157
Digestibility Studies	160
Conclusion	163

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY	165
APPENDICES	184
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	233



LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Classification of Hylobates	6
2. Sample size for chemical analyses	35
3. Analytical report of results	37
4. Age and sex of the gibbons	45
5. Composition of the basal diet	47
6. Ratio of basal diet to test diet and gibbons used	47
7. Chemical composition of various foodstuffs of lar gibbon	52
8. Chemical composition of eaten food of lar gibbon	59
9. Chemical composition of proteinacious food of lar gibbon	62
10. Chemical composition of eaten food of gibbons in their ranking order	63
11. Protein content of lar gibbon's food	65
12. Fibre content of lar gibbon's food	67
13. Fat content of lar gibbon's food	68
14. Carbohydrate content of lar gibbons food	70
15. Sugar content of the food of lar gibbon	71
16. Comparison between crude fibre and crude protein content of lar gibbon food	72
17. Comparison between calcium and phosphorus composition of lar gibbon food	75
18. Comparison between Acid Detergent Lignin and total <u>in vitro</u> digestibility	77
19. <u>In vitro</u> digestibility assay of lar gibbon food	80
20. Comparison between total phenol and tannin in lar gibbon's food	82

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
21. Crude fat, crude fibre, crude protein and gross energy content of <u>Ficus</u> fruits	103
22. Chemical composition of stored and non-stored food	103
23. Chemical composition of ingredients used in the basal diet (100 g edible portion)	106
24. Chemical composition of basal diet	106
25. Amino acid analyses of selected food of lar gibbon	107
26. Amino acid analyses of natural food used for <u>in vivo</u> digestibility	108
27a. Chemical composition of basal diet and feces ..	110
27b. Digestion trial with basal diet - Miko I	110
27c. Digestion trial with basal diet - Miko II	110
27d. Digestion trial with basal diet - Roslah I	111
27e. Digestion trial with basal diet - Roslah II	111
27f. Digestion trial with basal diet - Minah I	111
27g. Digestion trial with basal diet - Minah II	112
27h. Mean value for basal diet	112
28a. Chemical composition of <u>Randia scortechinii</u> (40%) diet, Roslah's and Minah's feces	113
28b. Digestion trial with <u>Randia scortechinii</u> (40%) diet - Roslah	113
28c. Digestion trial with <u>Randia scortechinii</u> (40%) diet - Minah	114
28d. Mean digestibility values for <u>Randia scortechinii</u> (40%) diet	114

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
28e. Mean digestibility values for <u>Randia scortechinii</u> fruit	114
29a. Chemical composition of <u>Knema cinerea</u> (30%) diet, Minah's and Roslah's feces	115
29b. Digestion trial with <u>Knema cinerea</u> (30%) diet - Roslah	115
29c. Digestion trial with <u>Knema cinerea</u> (30%) diet - Minah	115
29d. Mean digestibility values for <u>Knema cinerea</u> (30%) diet	116
29e. Mean digestibility values for <u>Knema cinerea</u> fruit	116
30a. Chemical composition of <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet and feces	119
30b. Digestion trial with <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet - Roslah I	119
30c. Digestion trial with <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet - Roslah II	119
30d. Digestion trial with <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet - Minah I	120
30e. Digestion trial with <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet - Minah II	120
30f. Mean digestibility values for <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> (40%) diet	121
30g. Mean digestibility values for <u>Sarcotheca grifithii</u> fruit	121
31. Intake of water, urine output, pH and specific gravity of urine during digestibility studies in gibbons	122
32a. Chemical composition of <u>Arachis hypogaea</u> (40%) diet and the feces	123
32b. Digestion trial with <u>Arachis hypogaea</u> (40%) diet - Miko	123

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
32c. Digestion trial with <u>Arachis hypogaea</u> (40%) diet - Roslah	123
32d. Digestion trial with <u>Arachis hypogaea</u> (40%) diet - Minah	124
32e. Mean digestibility values for <u>Arachis hypogaea</u> (40%) diet	124
32f. Mean digestibility values for <u>Arachis hypogaea</u>	124
33a. Chemical composition of <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> (40%) diet and feces	125
33b. Digestion trial with <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> (40%) diet - Miko	125
33c. Digestion trial with <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> (40%) diet - Roslah	125
33d. Digestion trial with <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> (40%) diet - Minah	126
33e. Mean digestibility values for <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> (40%) diet	126
33f. Mean digestibility values for <u>Musa paradisiaca</u> fruit	126
34a. Chemical composition of whole boiled egg (25%) diet and feces	127
34b. Digestion trial with whole boiled egg (25%) diet - Miko	127
34c. Digestion trial with whole boiled egg (25%) diet - Roslah	127
34d. Digestion trial with whole boiled egg (25%) diet - Minah	128
34e. Mean digestibility values for egg (25%) diet	128
34f. Mean digestibility values for egg based on 100% diet	128
35. Mean digestibility values for the test diets (based on 100% diet)	129

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
36.	Results of the comparison of <u>in vitro</u> and <u>in vivo</u> digestibility of natural lar's diet	129
37.	Initial and final weights of captive lar gibbon during digestibility studies	130
38.	<u>Ficus</u> in lar and siamang diet	150

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
A	Procedures of the chemical analyses	184
B	List of lar gibbon's food trees and the food items collected during a one year period	214
C	Roughage food of lar gibbon and their chemical analyses	217
D	Energy food of lar gibbon	223
E	Concentrate food of lar gibbon and their chemical analyses	230

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Distribution of gibbons	7
2. Kuala Lompat Study Area, Krau Game Reserve, Pahang showing the location of the food trees	29
3. Metabolic cage - Side elevation	42
4. Metabolic cage - Front elevation	42
5. Metabolic cage - Floor	42
6. Metabolic cage - Side locking hook	42
7. Metabolic cage - Cage stand	43
8. Metabolic cage - Collection tray	43
9. Metabolic cage - Water trough with bottle	44
10. Metabolic cage - Feed trough	44
11. Comparison of crude fibre in young leaf and mature leaf	84
12. Comparison of crude protein in young leaf and mature leaf	84
13. Comparison of gross energy in young leaf and mature leaf	85
14. Comparison of Calcium and phosphorus in young leaf and mature leaf	87
15. Comparison between acid detergent lignin and <u>in vitro</u> digestibility in young leaf and mature leaf	88
16. Comparison between the levels of digestibilities in young leaf and mature leaf	90
17. Comparison of crude fibre, acid detergent fibre and acid detergent lignin in young leaf and mature leaf	91
18. Comparison of crude fibre in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	92
19. Comparison of crude protein in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	92

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
20. Comparison of gross energy in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	94
21. Comparison between calcium and phosphorus in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	94
22. Comparison between acid detergent lignin and <u>in vitro</u> digestibility in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	95
23. Comparison between the levels of digestibilities between whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	96
24. Comparison of crude fibre, acid detergent fibre and acid detergent lignin in whole fruit ripe and whole fruit unripe	98
25. Comparison of <u>in vitro</u> digestibility assays in <u>Ficus</u> fruits	100
26. Comparison between calcium and phosphorus content in <u>Ficus</u> fruits	101
27. Comparison between total phenol and tannin in <u>Ficus</u> fruits	102
28. Dietary proportions of lar gibbon as percentage of feeding time spent as different food classes	143

LIST OF PLATES

<u>Plate</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Flowers of <u>Sloetia elongata</u>	131
2.	Flowers of <u>Xanthophyllum stipitatum</u>	131
3.	Flowers of <u>Polythia hypoleuca</u> with the mature leaves	131
4.	Whole fruit and transverse section of <u>Ficus sumatrana</u>	132
5.	Whole fruits of <u>Ficus dubia</u> with the main fruit stalk	132
6.	Whole fruits of <u>Knema cinerea</u> with the main fruit stalk	132
7.	Split open fruit of <u>Knema cinerea</u> , exposing the red pulp	133
8.	Whole fruits of <u>Sarcotheca griffithii</u> with the mature leaves	133
9.	Whole fruit of <u>Randia scortechinii</u>	133
10.	Longitudinal section of <u>Artocarpus nitidus</u> fruit	134
11.	Whole fruit, rind, pulp and seeds of the fruit of <u>Sapium baccatum</u>	134
12.	Whole fruits of <u>Dialium platysepalum</u>	134
13.	Longitudinal section of <u>Dialium platysepalum</u> , exposing the pulp and seed separately	135
14.	Whole fruits of <u>Gnetum globosum</u> with the mature leaves	135
15.	Whole fruit and longitudinal section of <u>Gnetum globosum</u> , exposing the seed	135
16.	Whole fruits of <u>Gnetum funiculare</u> in a bunch .	136
17.	Drinking bottle, water and feed trough used in the metabolic cage.....	136
18.	Feed trough attached to the metabolic cage ...	136
19.	Metabolic cage stand showing the collection tray and the aluminium cover	137

<u>Plate</u>		<u>Page</u>
20.	Metabolic cage stand showing the collection of urine from the collection tray through the funnel	137
21.	Metabolic cage stand showing the direction in which the floor and the collection tray can be removed for cleaning	137
22.	A lar gibbon (Minah) in a metabolic cage	138
23.	A lar gibbon (Minah) drinking water from the metallic nozzle	138
24.	Shows the viscera of a lar gibbon after thorax and abdomen have been incised to expose	138
25.	Shows the viscera after removal from a dead specimen	139
26.	Shows the simple stomach of a lar gibbon	139
27.	Shows the stomach, intestines, caecum and appendix of a lar gibbon	139

ABSTRACT

The collection of samples of natural foods of the lar gibbon (Hylobates lar) was undertaken at the Krau Game Reserve over a period of one year. A total of 145 plant items were collected of which 35 were consumed by the lar gibbon. Food samples were chemically analyzed for both primary and secondary metabolites. The non-eaten food items were analyzed for all or some of these measures. The principal diet of the lar gibbon is Ficus spp. There are probably attracted to these most because of their soft and succulent nature. The protein and amino acid requirements in the wild are achieved by consuming young leaves and invertebrates. The lar tends to avoid foods of high fat content. It avoids mature leaves due to their poor nutritive value. The lar obtains carbohydrates, readily available sugars and energy from the ripe pulp of fruits. High *in vivo* digestibility values were obtained for the formulated basal diet when compared to the natural and domestic foods. The *in vivo* and *in vitro* assays of Randia scortechinii, Krema cinerea and Sarcotheca griffithii gave values in fairly good agreement with one another. The present study concludes that the lar gibbon lacks specialisation of the gastro-intestinal tract for either the bulk intake of fibrous food or for the detoxification of alkaloids. The lar gibbon tends to avoid food with a high level of tannins. Therefore they are selective feeders in comparison with some other primates, being restricted to a diet of succulent fruit pulp, young leaves, flowers and invertebrates.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Interest in primates has developed dramatically during the last 20 years. The ordinary man has become as enthusiastic as the researcher, whether it be to marvel at the complexity and cleverness of their behaviour or to protest at abuses such as habitat destruction and trading evils. From an anthropocentric view, no other group of animals has attracted such intense multi-disciplinary interest that numerous national and international societies have been established to promote their protection and research.

The main interest during the nineteenth century was in their natural history and anatomy. It was not until the 1930's that intensive studies of primate behaviour began. In the beginning psychologists investigated mental processes and they concentrated on the apes. The sexual bond was thought to be the basic cohesive element of primate groups whose structure was determined by social dominance (Zuckerman, 1932).

Carpenter (1934, 1940) pioneered the field study of primates, observing howling monkeys and spider monkeys in Central America, and gibbons in Thailand. Carpenter's observation and perception led to an uncanny understanding of primate society. He was enlightened, as were Nissen and Bingham in their searches for African apes, by Robert Yerkes, whose own important contribution was in the laboratory study of primates.

Further, primatological research was delayed by the Second World War. It was not until the late 1950's that studies were resumed,



mainly in Japan and by Americans in Africa. In the West, anthropologists searched for models of human evolution. More and better information was amassed on the ecology and behaviour of wild primates (De Vore, 1965; Altmann, 1967; Jay, 1968) with the discovery that behaviour patterns were not species specific, but that variation in behaviour occurred within species.

The quantitative description of primate behaviour in recent years was stimulated by Kummer (1971), Jolly (1972), Rowell (1972), Michael and Crook (1973), and Hinde (1974). They have produced some explanation and many hypotheses to explain primate behaviour and these are now being tested by refined techniques. This has led to increased efforts on ecological, sociological and physiological aspects of behaviour (Clutton-Brock, 1977; Chivers and Hladik, 1978).

In recent years, there has been increasing emphasis on detailed studies of feeding ecology (Clutton-Brock, 1977; Montgomery, 1978). But data collection has been conducted on diet selection and feeding behaviour with scant attention being paid to the nutrient analysis of natural foods nor to their digestibility.

In West Malaysia, Chivers (1974) has studied the feeding behaviour of siamang and Raemaekers (1977) that of lar gibbons at the Krau Game Reserve. Gittins (1979) has similarly reported on the agile gibbon in Perak. However, little work has been done on the nutrition of these species, in particular the type, chemical composition and digestibility of foods, feeding pattern and systems of feeding.