Proceedings of the Arkansas Nutrition Conference

Volume 2022

Article 8

2022

Recent Advancements on Calcium and Phosphorus Recommendations in Broilers

Justina Caldas jcaldas@aviagen.com

Marcelo Silva

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uark.edu/panc

Part of the Agriculture Commons, Nutrition Commons, and the Poultry or Avian Science Commons

Recommended Citation

Caldas, Justina and Silva, Marcelo (2022) "Recent Advancements on Calcium and Phosphorus Recommendations in Broilers," *Proceedings of the Arkansas Nutrition Conference*: Vol. 2022, Article 8. Available at: https://scholarworks.uark.edu/panc/vol2022/iss1/8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Proceedings of the Arkansas Nutrition Conference by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

Recent Advancements on Calcium and Phosphorus Recommendations in Broilers Justina Caldas*¹, Marcelo Silva*

*Aviagen Inc., Huntsville, Alabama, USA

Corresponding Author: J. Caldas, jcaldas@aviagen.com

Introduction

Calcium and phosphorus have been recognized essential nutrients in chickens since 1950's (Lesson & Summers, 2001) playing important roles in bone development, among other functions. Calcium is assumed an inexpensive nutrient in animal least cost formulation while phosphorus is considered expensive and scant. The actual economic impact comes from the influence of calcium on phosphorus requirements, changes in phosphorus digestibility, buffer capacity, gut health, trace mineral absorption, fat digestibility, welfare traits, etc. Both minerals have important interactions to be considered during formulation.

Few changes have been made over the past 20 years to calcium and phosphorus recommendations because these values have supported the steady genetic improvement and also due to the complexity presented in the calcium supplementation interfering in the determination of phosphorus requirements.

Herein, the latest calcium and phosphorus recommendations for broiler at various stages of growth will be provided.

Ca and P terminology

The definition of calcium and available phosphorus and criteria used for investigating Ca and P availability are different among evaluation systems and research groups.

Name	Abbreviation	Description	Reference	
Total Calcium	Ca	Total concentration in ingredients or complete		
		feed		
Apparent Digestible	dCa	Precaecal digestibility: Ca in feed - Ca in the	Walk et al, 2021	
Calcium	uca	lower half of the ileum		
Standardized Digestible	sdCa or dCa	Precaecal digestibility: Ca in feed - Ca in the	Walk et al. 2021	
Calcium	suca of uca	lower half of the ileum + Ca endogenous losses	want et al, 2021	
Total Phosphorus	Р	Total concentration in ingredients or complete		
		feed		
Available Phosphorus	avP	Reference Phosphate = 100 biological value.	Shastak, and	
		Sum = 100% P from inorganic sources + 33% P		
		plant sources.	Kodenutscord, 2015	
Apparent Digestible	dP	<u>Precaecal digestibility</u> = P in feed - P in the	CVB, 2018	
Phosphorus	u	lower half of the ileum		
Standardized Digestible	sdP or dP	<u>Precaecal digestibility</u> = P in feed - P in the	David et al, 2021	
Phosphorus	sur or ur	lower half of the ileum + P in endogenous losses		
Non-Phytate Phosphorus	nPP	Total concentration of P in ingredients not	Plumstead & Brake,	
		bound to phytin: Total P - Phytin P	2007	
Datainable Dheamharra	чD	Digestible but also absorbed and retained	Coon & Seo, 2007,	
recumable r nosphorus	11	Digestore out also absorbed and retailled	Schothorst	

The table above depicts a simplified and practical description that nutritionists use to give value to total, available, digestible and retainable phosphorus. There has been, and continues to be a great amount of research to find the best methodology but there is still variability among methods, thus different systems continue to be used around the world. However, some consensus is emerging and there is a possibility of agreeing in a method that best fits the needs of the chicken.

Because of the need of quantitative values of availability, retention and precaecal digestibility should be the preferred methods for evaluating P sources in poultry (Shastak and Rodehutscord, 2013). Conversely, in vitro and blood indicators seem unreliable.

Ca and avP responses in broilers

It is accepted that the total content of a mineral element has little significance unless its biological value to the nutrition of animals is evaluated (Peeler, 1972), therefore, many evaluation systems and groups have provided different recommendations that the poultry industry has been using. Despite being replaced by non-phytate phosphorus (NRC, 1994), the majority of broiler feeds in the USA are still formulated based on available Phosphorus. In other parts of the world, available phosphorus values are transitioning to digestible phosphorus, which is interchangeably adopted as retainable phosphorus and have lower values than available phosphorus recommendations.

Digestibility methods help to assess and understand the availability of inorganic and animal byproducts sources and covers the pitfalls of the phytate portion of plant protein ingredients. However, the use of phytase brings additional questions and assumptions in relation to phytate phosphorus released in each ingredient. Furthermore, negative correlation between dietary calcium and phytase activity has been demonstrated, and consequently it likely changes the optimal level of phosphorus in diets with and without phytase when using diets equally formulated for calcium.

Limestone is the main source of calcium in broiler diets and presumed consistent in its level of calcium (34 - 40%), which is easily analyzed. Despite the content of calcium, limestone comes in a wide range of white to dark shades and shapes (type of sedimentation). Not all limestones are made equal and this assumption has been ignored in animal nutrition for a long time. The traits related to origin and particle size and their respective solubility characteristics may determine distinctive calcium digestibility among the different limestones. Some initiatives are underway to develop a digestible calcium system as well as limestone characterization, which may be influential to achieve a precise, concise and reliable determination of calcium requirements. Thus, total calcium will continue being formulated in the near future and it will require specific adjustments according to the local conditions.

This complexity on calcium however should not discourage the nutritionists to stay in the same system. It is necessary to address the most influential points to determine the calcium and phosphorus requirements to better express the genetic potential of broilers on performance, gut health, welfare characteristics, and sustainability as following:

- Ca digestibility in limestone and phosphate reference sources.
- Determine the calcium digestibility of the main ingredients (Maize, wheat, SBM, SFM, rice bran, etc...)
- Determine the relationship of limestone Ca digestibility and solubility method.
- Determine the P requirements taking into account different DigCa : DigP ratios.
- Evaluate alternative high digestible sources of calcium to Limestone
- Optimize Ca:P ratios considering the complex dynamic of bone mineralization
- Evaluate bone health with focus on both the population instead of sampling and target body weights

Calcium and P recommendations according to different sources are presented in Table 2. Given the differences observed among them, nutritionists will be challenged to understand the intricacies of each set of studies and rationale behind each recommendation

		Start	er					
	Aviagen, 2022	Cobb, 2022	CVB, 2018	Angel 20	et al., 21	Brazilian Tables, 2017		
Ca, %	0.95	0.96	0.88-0.92	~0	.85	1.07		
avP, %	0.50	0.58				0.51		
dP, %			0.40	0.	53	0.45		
Age, d	0-10d	0-12d	0-10d			8d		
BW, g	44-330	42-440		22	20	250		
BW, g/period	330	398	195			140		
FI, g/period	297	435	255			210		
Grower								
	Aviagen, 2022	Cobb, 2022	CVB, 2018	Angel et al., 2021		Brazilian Tables, 2017		
Ca, %	0.75	0.80	0.68-0.71	~0.78	~0.70	0.82		
avP, %	0.40	0.40				0.38		
dP, %			0.31	0.39	0.31	0.35		
Age, d	11-24d	13-28d	10-30d			28d		
BW, g	376-1258	503-1783		650	1250	1692		
BW, g/period	928	1343	1065			1552		
FI, g/period	1256	1924	1715					
		<u>Finish</u>	<u>er 1</u>					
	Aviagen, 2022	Cobb, 2022	CVB, 2018	Angel et al., 2018		Brazilian		
	-		,	20	18	Tables, 2017		
Ca, %	0.65	0.74	0.62-0.64	0.60	0.50	0.61		
Ca, % avP, %	0.65 0.36	0.74 0.37	0.62-0.64	0.60	0.50	0.61 0.28		
Ca, % avP, % dP, %	0.65 0.36	0.74 0.37	0.62-0.64	0.60 0.25	0.50	0.61 0.28 0.26		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d	0.65 0.36 25-39d	0.74 0.37 29-39d	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d	0.60 0.25	0.50	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d	0.60 0.25 1800	0.50 0.23 2300	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730	0.60 0.25 1800	0.50 0.23 2300	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455	0.60 0.25 1800	0.50 0.23 2300	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u>	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2	0.60 0.25 1800	0.50 0.23 2300	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018	0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18	0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0.	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50	1 ables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period Ca, % avP, %	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0.	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50	1 ables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 Finish Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0.	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17	1 ables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34 40-51d	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36 40-49d	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27 40-50d	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0.	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17	1 ables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23 49d		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34 40-51d 2798-3869	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36 40-49d 3062-4001	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27 40-50d	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0. 20	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17 600	Tables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23 49d 3945		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34 40-51d 2798-3869 1172	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36 40-49d 3062-4001 1047	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27 40-50d 840	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0. 20	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17 600	Tables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23 49d 3945 727		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34 40-51d 2798-3869 1172 2597	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 <u>Finish</u> Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36 40-49d 3062-4001 1047 2299	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27 40-50d 840 1850	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0. >20	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17 500	Tables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23 49d 3945 727		
Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period Ca, % avP, % dP, % Age, d BW, g BW, g/period FI, g/period FI, g/period	0.65 0.36 25-39d 1345-2697 1439 2469 Aviagen, 2022 0.60 0.34 40-51d 2798-3869 1172 2597	0.74 0.37 29-39d 1886-2954 1171 2091 Finish Cobb, 2022 0.72 0.36 40-49d 3062-4001 1047 2299 Finish	0.62-0.64 0.28 30-40d 730 1455 er 2 CVB, 2018 0.59-0.62 0.27 40-50d 840 1850 er 3	20 0.60 0.25 1800 Angel 20 0. 0. >20	18 0.50 0.23 2300 et al., 18 50 17 600	1 ables, 2017 0.61 0.28 0.26 42d 3218 1526 Brazilian Tables, 2017 0.53 0.25 0.23 49d 3945 727		

Table 2. Latest Ca and P recommendations from various sources

As hatched for all sources except Brazilian tables which are males (standard-high performance)

0.68

0.34

>50d

>4099

0.55

0.32

52-market

>3869

0.54

0.25

0.23

56d

4591

Ca, %

avP, %

dP, %

Age, d

BW, g

Final Considerations

The actual economic impact of calcium in broiler feeds is not the inexpensive limestone cost but its influence on phosphorus requirement, change in the feed neutrality, gut health, trace mineral absorption, fat digestibility, and welfare traits.

Studies involving limestone characterization and indirect determination of its calcium digestibility will be crucial to formulate calcium and phosphorus for broilers more accurately.

Experimental designs must considerer the effect of calcium and phosphorus on population welfare characteristics. Sampling size and method may be biased and they might subsidize improper conclusions.

The adoption of adequate calcium and phosphorus levels in broiler feeds will be relying on the development of accurate matrices for such nutrients taking into account limestone characteristics, alternative raw materials, phosphate type, or enzymes, since changes in the calcium and available phosphorus contributions are expected.

Literature Review

- Angel, R., L. Wenting, P. Plumstead, 2022. Towards digestible calcium requirements and a digestible system. Proc. W. Poult. Sci. Congress, Paris, France (Abstr.)
- Cobb 500 broiler. 2022. Performance & Nutrition supplement. Cobb-Vantress Inc., Siloam Springs AR. USA.
- Coon, CN, S. Seo, and M. K. Manangi. 2007. The Determination of Retainable Phosphorus, Relative Biological Availability and Relative Biological Value of Phosphorus Sources for Broilers. Poult. Sci. 86:857–868
- David, L. S., M. R. Abdollahi, M. R. Bedford, and V. Ravindran.2021. Requirement of digestible calcium at different dietary concentrations of digestible phosphorus for broiler chickens. 1. Broiler starters (d 1 to 10 post-hatch). Poult Sci. 100:101439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2021.101439
- Leeson S., & J.D. Summers. 2001. Minerals pages 332 428 in Scott's Nutrition of the Chicken. 4th Edition
- Peeler, H.T. 1972. Biological availability of nutrients in feeds: Availability of major mineral ions. J. Anim. Sci. 35: 695-712.
- Plumstead, P.W, H. Romero-Sanchez, RO. Maguire, AG. Gernat, and J. Brake. 2007. Effect of phosphorus level and phytase in broiler breeder rearing and laying diets on live performance and phosphorus excretion. Poult Sci. 86:225-231

Caldas & Silva, 2022

- Ross 308/Ross308FF, 708. 2022. Performance Objectives. Aviagen Inc. Huntsville, Alabama, USA
- Shastak, Y. & M. Rodehutscord. 2013. Determination and estimation of phosphorus availability in growing poultry and their historical development, J.W. Poul. Sci. 69:3, 569-586, DOI: 10.1017/S0043933913000585
- Walk, C.L., L.F. Romero, and AJ. Cowieson. 2021. Towards a digestible calcium system for broiler chicken nutrition: A review and recommendations for the future. Anim. Feed Sci. &Tech. 276 (2021) 114930