

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF  
LEAST-COST LAYER RATIONS

---

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Agricultural Science in Farm  
Management at Massey University.

---

OLIVER PATRICK RYAN

1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: NUTRITIONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN LAYER PRODUCTION	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Expression of the energy relationships in layer nutrition	6
2.3 Energy utilization by laying hens and its relation to voluntary feed consumption	9
2.4 The relationship between energy intake and production responses	11
2.5 Protein utilization by laying hens and its relation to voluntary feed consumption	13
2.6 The relationship between protein intake and production responses	15
2.7 Amino acid relationships in layer nutrition	19
2.8 The relationship between amino acid intake and production responses	22
2.9 Calcium and phosphorus utilization by laying hens	28
2.10 Factors affecting egg size	30
CHAPTER THREE: LAYER NUTRITION TRIAL 32- <u>EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS</u>	32
3.1 Aims	32
3.2 Experimental design	32



	Page
5.3 Egg number	96
5.3.1 Discussion	107
5.4 Egg weight	108
5.5 Body weight gain	111
CHAPTER SIX: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	117
6.1 Outline of the economic model	117
6.2 Method of analysis	121
6.3 Experimental design	124
6.4 Ration formulation	128
6.5 Egg and culled hen price	128
6.6 Experimental results	130
6.7 Net revenue function	135
6.8 Conclusion	142
CHAPTER SEVEN: ASPECTS OF LAYER RESPONSES	146
7.1 Introduction	146
7.2 Treatment 17	147
7.2.1 Feed intake	147
7.2.2 Egg number	148
7.3 Treatments 16, 18	149
7.3.1 Feed intake	149
7.3.2 Egg number	150
7.4 Analysis of the periods 1-140, 168-315 days in the laying cycle	152
7.5 Feed consumption	152

	Page
7.5.1 1-140 days	153
7.5.2 168-315 days	156
7.5.3 Discussion	159
7.6 Egg number	160
7.6.1 1-140 days	160
7.6.2 168-315 days	162
7.6.3 Discussion	166
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION	167
APPENDIX A: VARIABLES USED AND THEIR NOTATION	173
APPENDIX B: EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS 1-140, 168- 315 DAYS	174
APPENDIX C: AMINO ACID ANALYSES	181
APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS OF MINERAL AND VITAMIN ADDITIVE	183
APPENDIX E: ANALYSIS OF TREATMENTS 1-6	184
APPENDIX F: AN EXAMPLE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STRUCTURAL AND REDUCED FORM EQUATIONS	190
APPENDIX G: SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS	191
REFERENCES	192

LIST OF FIGURES:

	Page
Figure 2.1: Energy relationships in layer nutrition	8
2.2: Essential amino acids	19
2.3: The response of egg yield to methionine intake	27
3.1: Dietary energy and protein levels of the treatments in LN/32	40
5.1: Feed consumption vs. dietary energy concentration	84
5.2: Energy consumption vs dietary energy concentration	85
5.3: Egg number vs. dietary energy concentration	97
5.4: Egg number vs. observed energy intake	100
5.5: Egg number vs. observed methionine intake	101
5.6: Predicted energy intake vs. observed energy intake.	102
5.7: Egg number vs. predicted energy intake	103
5.8: Egg number vs. predicted methionine intake	104
5.9: Average egg weight vs. dietary energy concentration	109
5.10: Liveweight gain vs. dietary energy consumption	112
6.1: Relationships between estimated net revenue and energy density of layer rations	137

Figure 6.2:	Relationship between estimated net revenue and energy density at different methionine intakes (gms.); isoleucine at 0.55%	143
7.1:	Daily feed consumption vs. dietary energy concentration (1-140 days)	154
7.2:	Daily feed consumption vs. dietary energy concentration (168-315 days)	157
7.3:	Egg number vs. dietary energy concentration (1-140 days)	161
7.4:	Egg number vs. dietary energy concentration (168-315 days)	163

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere appreciation of the advice and encouragement provided throughout this study by my supervisor, Professor R J Townsley, Professor of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, Massey University.

I am grateful to Mr R Patchell, Director, Poultry Research Centre, Massey University for his cooperation in providing research facilities and assistance during the study.

Staff of the Poultry Research Centre have been most helpful.

Financial assistance was obtained from the Agricultural Economics and Farm Management Department, Massey University and Poultryman's Cooperative Limited, Auckland.

The manuscript was typed by Mrs P Reynolds and Mrs G P Percy and I am appreciative of this.

I wish to thank my wife Carolyn for her encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank Alan, Stephen and others who helped develop, during the period of this study, the authors appreciation of non-academic pursuits.

ABSTRACT

Fifteen treatments, replicated once, each containing eighty four birds of three strains of White Leghorn layers (White Base a, White Base b, M. Line) were fed rations ad libitum of five different metabolisable energy levels (2315, 2535, 2756, 2976, 3197 k. cal. M.E. per kg.) and three different protein levels (16, 17, 18 gms. per hen per day, based on an energy intake of 305 k. cal. per hen per day) to obtain quantitative estimates of the physical input/output relationships of layer production. Three other treatments, plus a control, were fed to obtain data on the response of laying hens to restricted energy intake and improved protein quality. All rations were formulated to least cost using Linear Programming.

Least Squares multiple regression was used to obtain linear response functions for feed intake, egg number, egg weight and liveweight gain (the variables included in a net revenue function for layers under New Zealand production conditions).

Feed intake was expressed in terms of dietary energy concentration and initial liveweight<sup>+</sup>. Statistical problems encountered dictated that predicted nutrient intakes were used as the independent variables in the estimation of the egg number and liveweight gain functions. Predicted energy intake and methionine intake accounted for differences in egg number, particularly for White Base b layers. Predicted energy intake, methionine intake and isoleucine intake accounted for differences in liveweight gain. There were no significant differences between average egg weights.

There were significant strain differences in ad libitum feed consumption, egg number, average egg weight and liveweight gain.

A net revenue function was estimated in terms of the endogenous variables (dietary nutrient concentrations) which were included in the layer response functions. This was analysed in terms of the endogenous variables for the then current egg and feed prices.