

# Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports

---

Volume 0  
Issue 10 *Swine Day (1968-2014)*

Article 135

---

1976

## Evaluation of antibacterial preparations on growth rate and feed efficiency of young pigs

G L. Allee

B A. Koch

Robert H. Hines

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr>

 Part of the [Other Animal Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Allee, G L.; Koch, B A.; and Hines, Robert H. (1976) "Evaluation of antibacterial preparations on growth rate and feed efficiency of young pigs," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 0: Iss. 10. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.5975>

This report is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. Copyright 1976 Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. Contents of this publication may be freely reproduced for educational purposes. All other rights reserved. Brand names appearing in this publication are for product identification purposes only. No endorsement is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products not mentioned. K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



---

## Evaluation of antibacterial preparations on growth rate and feed efficiency of young pigs

### Abstract

Ninety-six young pigs were used to evaluate various antibacterial preparations on rate and efficiency of gain. Each of the antibacterial preparations increased rate of gain over pigs fed the non-medicated basal diet. There were no significant differences in daily gains of pigs fed ASP-250, CSP-250, Lincomix, Mecadox, or Stafac.; Swine Day, Manhattan, KS, November 11, 1976

### Keywords

Swine day, 1976; Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station contribution; no. 519-S; Report of progress (Kansas State University. Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service); 283; Swine; Antibacterial preparations; Growth rate; Feed efficiency; Daily gain

### Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Evaluation of Antibacterial Preparations on  
Growth Rate and Feed Efficiency of Young Pigs

Gary L. Allee, R. H. Hines and B. A. Koch

---

Summary

Ninety-six young pigs were used to evaluate various antibacterial preparations on rate and efficiency of gain. Each of the antibacterial preparations increased rate of gain over pigs fed the non-medicated basal diet. There were no significant differences in daily gains of pigs fed ASP-250, CSP-250, Lincomix, Mecadox, or Stafac.

Procedures

Ninety-six pigs averaging 26.5 pounds were allotted to treatments by weight and litter. Pigs had been weaned for 7 to 10 days before allotted to treatments. Pigs were housed in a totally slatted-floor, environmentally-controlled nursery with temperature maintained at 75 - 80 F. Each pen contained a self-feeder and an automatic watering cup. The 18% protein basal diet contained 69.4% corn, 26.6% soybean meal (44%), 1.6% dicalcium phosphate, 0.9% limestone, 0.5% salt, and 1.0% vitamin, trace-mineral premix. The diets were fed in meal form. Pigs were fed the experimental diets 35 days. The treatments were:

- 1) Basal diet - nonmedicated
- 2) Basal diet + 100 grams chlortetracycline, 100 grams sulfamethazine, and 50 grams of penicillin per ton (ASP-250)
- 3) Basal diet + 100 grams cholortetracycline,

- 100 grams sulfathiazole, and 50 grams of penicillin per ton
- 4) Basal diet + 100 grams of lincomycin (Lincomix) per ton for 21 days and then 40 grams
- 5) Basal diet + 50 grams per ton of carbadox (Mecadox)
- 6) Basal diet + 25 grams per ton of virginiamycin (Stafac).

Results and Discussion

Pigs fed the diets supplemented with the various antibacterial preparations gained significantly ( $P < .05$ ) faster than those fed the non-medicated basal diet (table 31), with no significant differences among the various antibacterial preparations. Feed efficiency was improved by each of the antibacterial preparations except Mecadox. We cannot explain the poor feed efficiency of the pigs fed Mecadox. In previous trials (Swine Industry Day, 1973) Mecadox improved feed efficiency.

Close attention was given to fecal consistency to evaluate effects of the antibacterial preparations on the incidence of diarrhea. Diarrhea was not a problem with any of the pigs.

Table 31 . Performance of pigs fed indicated antibacterial preparation.

Indicated item	<u>Antibacterial preparation</u>					
	None	ASP-250	CSP-250	Lincomix	Mecadox	Stafac
No of pigs	16	16	16	16	16	16
Initial wt., lbs.	27.1	26.2	26.5	2.64	25.9	26.7
Daily gain, lbs.	1.20 <sup>a</sup>	1.32 <sup>b</sup>	1.31 <sup>b</sup>	1.40 <sup>b</sup>	1.42 <sup>b</sup>	1.33 <sup>b</sup>
Feed/gain	2.20 <sup>b</sup>	1.96 <sup>c</sup>	2.09 <sup>c</sup>	2.04 <sup>c</sup>	2.41 <sup>d</sup>	2.03 <sup>c</sup>

a,b,c,d Means with different superscripts differ significantly (P<.05).