### THE EFFECT OF SEX AND GROWING PHASES ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND CARCASS CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCAL MUSCOVY DUCKS (CAIRINA MOSCHATA)

Nguyen Thuy Linh<sup>1</sup>, Nguyen Thi Kim Dong<sup>2</sup> and Nguyen Van Thu<sup>3</sup>

#### <sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine, School of Agriculture and Aquaculture, Tra Vinh University, Vietnam; <sup>2</sup>College of Applied Biology, Tay Do University, Vietnam; <sup>3</sup>College of Agriculture, Can Tho University, Vietnam

Corresponding author: Nguyen Thuy Linh; Email: thuylinh80@tvu.edu.vn

#### ABSTRACT

The experiment was a 2x3 factorial design. The first factor was the duck's growing periods with split phases (5-8 weeks old and 9-12 weeks old) and whole phase (5-12 weeks old). The second factor was the sex of birds, with three treatments, male birds, female birds and balanced for sex. The results showed that male local Muscovy ducks had the highest weight gain, body live weight and economic efficiency. Ducks with split phase (5-8 weeks old and 9-12 weeks old) gave a better result in weight gain, carcass traits and economic efficiency than the ducks raised in entire phase (5-12 weeks old).

Keywords: Duck phases, sex, performance, carcass, Muscovy duck.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Muscovy ducks (*Cairina moschata*) are a native duck to Middle and South of the Americas (Anonymou, 2012). To ensure the growth performance of Muscovy ducks, farmers have to provide a suitable and sufficient amount of nutrients for them following their growing phases. Crude protein (CP), amino acids and energy play a crucial role in Muscovy duck nutrition; therefore, CP and amino acids are currently of concern to scientists (Linares et al., 2012; Baeza et al., 2012 và Zhang et al., 2014). Kamran et al. (2004) recorded that CP is one of the most important components in poultry diets and that ingredients that contain protein have a high price (Ojano-Dirain and Waldroup, 2002).

Providing suitable amounts of protein and amino acids for ducks, according to age, in the diet of ducks can both improve carcass performance, reduce feed costs, improve economic efficiency, and at the same time reduce nitrogen excretion that causes pollution (Moran, 1992; Ospina-Roja, 2012). In addition, an appropriate level of metabolizable energy with the lysine content in the diet will be an important factor affecting carcass performance and quality (Eits et al., 2002; Collin et al., 2003; Purba et al., 2016). Muscovy ducks are sexually dimorphic; male Muscovy ducks have a higher growth performance than female ducks, and their body weight is 50% heavier than that of females at the finisher phase (Larbier and Leclercq, 1994; Baeza et al., 1998). Female Muscovy ducks reach maturity (at 10 weeks of age), which is earlier than males (at 12 weeks of age) (Larbier and Leclercq, 1994; Baeza et al., 1998; Bui Xuen Men, 1996; Nguyen Thi Kim Dong and Ogle, 2003). From previous studies, Nguyen Thuy Linh et al. (2017) determined a diet with 19% CP and 12.97 MJ ME/kg DM for 5-8 weeks of age and 17% CP and 13.81 MJ ME/kg DM for 9-12 weeks of age gave the best performance in daily weight gain, body weight, feed conversion ratio and carcass quality. According to the study of Tolimir et al. (2013), feed formulated by growing phases had a positive effect on the growth and development of poultry, especially increasing economic efficiency in broilers. In addition, Tolimir et al. (2013) also said that the use of feed according to growing phases had a positive effect on the performance of male birds and did not have any negative effects on bird performance.

However, studies on Muscovy ducks in this area, as well as published results, are very limited. The objective of the study was to determine the effect of growing phases and sex on feed consumption, weight gain, feed efficiency and carcass traits of Muscovy ducks.

# METHODS AND MATERIALS

## Location and time

The study was conducted from August 2019 to December 2019 at the experimental farm of Tra Vinh University and the laboratory of the Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Can Tho University.

## **Animals and Experimental Materials**

The local Muscovy ducks (Trau) used in the experiment were purchased at the local Muscovy duck farm in Duc My commune, Cang Long district, Tra Vinh Province. Experimental ducks were raised from 1 day old to 28 days old before starting the experiment and vaccinated with hepatitis antibodies, cholera and H5N1 vaccines. Ducks were allotted to the experiment at the beginning of the 5th week of age and the beginning of the 9th week of age.

# Housing

Local Muscovy ducks were raised on the floor, which was covered by husks with Balasa Bioyeast. Each cage was used for a replicate made from iron nets with an area of  $4.8 \text{ m}^2$  (1.2 m x 4 m). A total of 10 birds were allotted in one replicate.

## Feeding

The feed from this experiment was in powder form. The ingredients used in the diet were corn, broken rice, rice bran, fish meal, soybean seed, dicalcium phosphate and mineral-premix and vitamin. After making feed, one sample was taken to check feed compositions at Can Tho University and Institute of Animal Science at Ha Noi.

# **Experimental design**

The experiment was a 2x3 factorial design with a total of 180 local Muscovy ducks. The first factor was growing phases, including split phases (5-8 weeks old and 9-12 weeks old) and the whole phase (5-12 weeks old). The second factor was the sex of birds, with three treatments, male birds, female birds and balanced for sex. Each replicate included 10 local Muscovy ducks (10 males, 10 females and 5 males + 5 females). The chemical composition of the ingredients is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

| Criteria (%) | Corn | Rice<br>bran | Broken<br>rice | Fish<br>meal | Soybean | DCP  | Premix | Threonine | Lysine | Methionine |
|--------------|------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|
| DM           | 87.9 | 88.3         | 86.9           | 91.6         | 93.7    | 100  | 100    | 99.9      | 97.4   | 99.3       |
| OM           | 98.8 | 90.9         | 99.1           | 79.3         | 95.3    | 14.8 | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| СР           | 8.85 | 12.8         | 8.35           | 60.7         | 43.4    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| EE           | 3.87 | 10.6         | 2.46           | 9.03         | 18.3    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| NFE          | 82.6 | 60.7         | 86.6           | 8.50         | 24.7    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| CF           | 3.51 | 6.82         | 1.74           | 1.10         | 8.90    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |

Table 1. Chemical compositions of all ingredients used in the experiment (% DM)

| Criteria (%)  | Corn | Rice<br>bran | Broken<br>rice | Fish<br>meal | Soybean | DCP  | Premix | Threonine | Lysine | Methionine |
|---------------|------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|
| NDF           | 19.8 | 24.6         | 5.03           | 7.78         | 18.3    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| ADF           | 3.87 | 11.0         | 1.46           | 1.54         | 11.2    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| Ash           | 1.24 | 9.12         | 0.92           | 20.7         | 4.75    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| Lysine        | 0.32 | 0.51         | 0.35           | 3.97         | 2.22    | -    | -      | -         | 74.5   | -          |
| Methionine    | 0.18 | 0.25         | 0.19           | 1.38         | 0.62    | -    | -      | -         | -      | 87.1       |
| Threonine     | 0.27 | 0.51         | 0.34           | 2.33         | 1.41    | -    | -      | 97.9      | -      | -          |
| Ca            | 0.17 | 0.31         | 0.21           | 6.01         | 0.67    | 23.5 | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| Total P       | 0.30 | 1.42         | 0.25           | 2.62         | 0.64    | 18.6 | -      | -         | -      | -          |
| ME<br>(MJ/kg) | 15.6 | 11.3         | 14.2           | 12.4         | 14.7    | -    | -      | -         | -      | -          |

Note: Dry matter (DM), organic compounds (OM), crude protein (CP), crude fat (EE), crude fiber (CF), total minerals (Ash), DCP: dicalcium phosphate, ME: MJ/kg DM

The feed composition and chemical composition of the diet are shown in Table 2. The amount of CP and ME in the diet of 2 growing phases (5-8; 9-12 weeks of age) were applied from the results of Linh et al. (2017)

| Ingredients                   | 5-   | 8 weeks o | ld   | 9-   | 12 weeks o | old  | 5-1   | 5-12 weeks old |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------|------|-----------|------|------|------------|------|-------|----------------|-------|--|--|
| (%)                           | Male | Female    | Both | Male | Female     | Both | Male  | Female         | Both  |  |  |
| Corn                          | 16.5 | 16.5      | 16.5 | 37.1 | 37.1       | 37.1 | 27.0  | 27.0           | 27.0  |  |  |
| Rice bran                     | 40.3 | 40.3      | 40.3 | 22.7 | 22.7       | 22.7 | 31.62 | 31.62          | 31.62 |  |  |
| Broken rice                   | 22.0 | 22.0      | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0       | 22.0 | 22.0  | 22.0           | 22.0  |  |  |
| Fish meal                     | 9.00 | 9.00      | 9.00 | 7.20 | 7.20       | 7.20 | 8.30  | 8.30           | 8.30  |  |  |
| Soybean                       | 11.0 | 11.0      | 11.0 | 10.0 | 10.0       | 10.0 | 10.0  | 10.0           | 10.0  |  |  |
| Mineral<br>premix-<br>Vitamin | 0.30 | 0.30      | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30       | 0.30 | 0.30  | 0.30           | 0.30  |  |  |
| Lysine                        | 0.30 | 0.30      | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.20       | 0.20 | 0.24  | 0.24           | 0.24  |  |  |
| Methionine                    | -    | -         | -    | -    | -          | -    | -     | -              | -     |  |  |
| Threonine                     | 0.10 | 0.10      | 0.10 | -    | -          | -    | 0.04  | 0.04           | 0.04  |  |  |
| DCP                           | 0.50 | 0.50      | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50       | 0.50 | 0.50  | 0.50           | 0.50  |  |  |
| Total                         | 100  | 100       | 100  | 100  | 100        | 100  | 100   | 100            | 100   |  |  |

Table 2. Diet composition of the experiment of local Muscovy ducks from 5-8; 9-12 weeks old and 5-12 weeks old (% DM)

| Ingredients   | 5-    | 8 weeks o | ld    | 9-    | 12 weeks o | old   | 5-12 weeks old |        |       |  |
|---------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|------------|-------|----------------|--------|-------|--|
| (%)           | Male  | Female    | Both  | Male  | Female     | Both  | Male           | Female | Both  |  |
| DM            | 89.0  | 89.0      | 89.0  | 88.7  | 88.7       | 88.7  | 88.8           | 88.8   | 88.8  |  |
| OM            | 92.3  | 92.3      | 92.3  | 94.2  | 94.2       | 94.2  | 93.2           | 93.2   | 93.2  |  |
| СР            | 19.0  | 19.0      | 19.0  | 17.0  | 17.0       | 17.0  | 18.0           | 18.0   | 18.0  |  |
| EE            | 8.36  | 8.36      | 8.36  | 6.95  | 6.95       | 6.95  | 7.60           | 7.60   | 7.60  |  |
| NFE           | 60.0  | 60.0      | 60.0  | 65.9  | 65.9       | 65.9  | 63.1           | 63.1   | 63.1  |  |
| CF            | 4.81  | 4.81      | 4.81  | 4.23  | 4.23       | 4.23  | 4.49           | 4.49   | 4.49  |  |
| NDF           | 17.0  | 17.0      | 17.0  | 16.4  | 16.4       | 16.4  | 17.0           | 17.0   | 17.0  |  |
| ADF           | 6.79  | 6.79      | 6.79  | 5.52  | 5.52       | 5.52  | 6.12           | 6.12   | 6.12  |  |
| Ash           | 7.00  | 7.00      | 7.00  | 5.23  | 5.23       | 5.23  | 6.15           | 6.15   | 6.15  |  |
| Lysine        | 1.20  | 1.20      | 1.20  | 1.00  | 1.00       | 1.00  | 1.09           | 1.09   | 1.09  |  |
| Methionine    | 0.37  | 0.37      | 0.37  | 0.33  | 0.33       | 0.33  | 0.35           | 0.35   | 0.35  |  |
| Threonine     | 0.81  | 0.81      | 0.81  | 0.61  | 0.61       | 0.61  | 0.70           | 0.70   | 0.70  |  |
| Ca            | 0.96  | 0.96      | 0.96  | 0.83  | 0.83       | 0.83  | 0.90           | 0.90   | 0.90  |  |
| Р             | 1.09  | 1.09      | 1.09  | 0.85  | 0.85       | 0.85  | 0.98           | 0.98   | 0.98  |  |
| ME<br>(MJ/kg) | 12.97 | 12.97     | 12.97 | 13.82 | 13.82      | 13.82 | 13.39          | 13.39  | 13.39 |  |

## **Chemical analysis**

Chemical composition of feed: dry matter (DM), organic compounds (OM), crude protein (CP), crude fat (EE), crude fiber (CF), total minerals (Ash), calcium and phosphorus were analysed according to AOAC (1990), and neutral fiber (NDF) and acid fiber (ADF) were analysed according to Van Soest et al. (1991). The content of amino acids present in the raw materials was analysed by the AOAC method (AOAC, 1990). The ME value of feed ingredients was estimated according to the suggestion of Janssen (1989) cited from NRC (1994).

## **Data collection**

Experimental ducks were fed 3 times/day (7 am, 13 pm and 17 pm). The feeders and drinkers were arranged separately in each cage. Leftovers were collected and weighed the next morning to calculate daily feed intake. Ducks are provided with adequate drinking water around the clock.

The amount of feed and nutrients consumed, body mass gain, weight at the end of the experiment in both phases and economic efficiency of the experiment were recorded. Carcass traits of local Muscovy ducks were performed from 4 ducks (including 2 males and 2 females for the treatment with males and females; 4 males for the treatment of only males; 4 females for the treatment of only female ducks) in each replicate at the end of the experiment. The evaluation of carcass traits was performed according to the method of Auaas and Wilke (1978).

### Data analysis

The data were preliminarily processed by Microsoft Excel (2013) and analysed by statistical analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Minitab 16.1.0 software (2010) (two factor analysis model). The covariances of the parameters of weight gain, body weight and feed conversion ratio were analysed. Tukey test analysis was used to compare the means of treatments with 95% confidence. Mean values are considered to be significantly different when P<0.05.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### Proximate analysis of diet in the experiment

Proximate analysis of the diet for local Muscovy ducks is shown in Table 3.

| (g, Divi/nead/day)  |                   |                   |                   |                              |                      |            |                  |                           |  |  |  |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
|                     |                   | Sex               |                   | Grov<br>pha                  | ving<br>ses          |            | SEM/P            |                           |  |  |  |
| Criteria            | Male              | Female            | Both              | 5-8;<br>9-12<br>weeks<br>old | 5-12<br>weeks<br>old | Sex        | Growing<br>phase | Sex *<br>growing<br>phase |  |  |  |
| DM                  | 125 <sup>a</sup>  | 78,0 <sup>c</sup> | 111 <sup>b</sup>  | 98.6                         | 111                  | 2.79/0.001 | 2.29/0.002       | 3.96/0.961                |  |  |  |
| OM                  | 117 <sup>a</sup>  | 72.8 <sup>c</sup> | 104 <sup>b</sup>  | 91.9                         | 104                  | 2.61/0.001 | 2.13/0.002       | 3.69/0.961                |  |  |  |
| СР                  | 22.6 <sup>a</sup> | 14.0 <sup>c</sup> | 19.9 <sup>b</sup> | 17.8                         | 19.9                 | 0.50/0.001 | 0.41/0.003       | 0.71/0.957                |  |  |  |
| EE                  | 9.57 <sup>a</sup> | 5.95 <sup>°</sup> | 8.48 <sup>b</sup> | 7.55                         | 8.45                 | 0.21/0.001 | 0.17/0.003       | 0.30/0.953                |  |  |  |
| NFE                 | 79.1 <sup>a</sup> | 49.2 <sup>c</sup> | 70.0 <sup>b</sup> | 65.2                         | 70.5                 | 1.76/0.001 | 1.44/0.002       | 2.49/0.963                |  |  |  |
| CF                  | 5.65 <sup>a</sup> | 3.51 <sup>c</sup> | 5.01 <sup>b</sup> | 4.99                         | 4.46                 | 0.13/0.001 | 0.10/0.003       | 0.18/0.954                |  |  |  |
| NDF                 | 20.9 <sup>a</sup> | 13.0 <sup>c</sup> | 18.6 <sup>b</sup> | 16.5                         | 18.6                 | 0.47/0.001 | 0.38/0.002       | 0.66/0.960                |  |  |  |
| ADF                 | 7.70 <sup>a</sup> | 4.78 <sup>c</sup> | 6.82 <sup>b</sup> | 6.06                         | 6.80                 | 0.17/0.001 | 0.14/0.003       | 0.24/0.955                |  |  |  |
| Ash                 | 7.69 <sup>a</sup> | 5.14 <sup>c</sup> | 6.81 <sup>b</sup> | 6.03                         | 6.83                 | 0.17/0.001 | 0.14/0.002       | 0.24/0.965                |  |  |  |
| Lysine              | 1.37 <sup>a</sup> | $0.85^{\circ}$    | 1.22 <sup>b</sup> | 1.08                         | 1.21                 | 0.03/0.001 | 0.03/0.004       | 0.04/0.951                |  |  |  |
| Methionine          | 0.44 <sup>a</sup> | $0.27^{c}$        | 0.39 <sup>b</sup> | 0.35                         | 0.39                 | 0.01/0.001 | 0.01/0.002       | 0.01/0.961                |  |  |  |
| Threonine           | 0.88 <sup>a</sup> | 0.55 <sup>c</sup> | 0.78 <sup>b</sup> | 0.70                         | 0.78                 | 0.02/0.001 | 0.02/0.005       | 0.03/0.945                |  |  |  |
| Ca                  | 1.13 <sup>a</sup> | $0.70^{\circ}$    | 0.99 <sup>b</sup> | 0.88                         | 1.00                 | 0.03/0.001 | 0.02/0.002       | 0.04/0.965                |  |  |  |
| P in total          | 1.22 <sup>a</sup> | $0.76^{\circ}$    | 1.08 <sup>b</sup> | 0.96                         | 1.09                 | 0.03/0.001 | 0.02/0.001       | 0.04/0.968                |  |  |  |
| ME<br>(MJ/head/day) | 1.68 <sup>a</sup> | 1.05 <sup>c</sup> | 1.49 <sup>b</sup> | 1.32                         | 1.49                 | 0.04/0.001 | 0.03/0.002       | 0.05/0.960                |  |  |  |

Table 3. Proximate analysis of the diet for local Muscovy ducks from 5-12 weeks old (g, DM/head/day)

Note: a, b, c: Mean values with different letters in the same column are statistically significant differences at the P<0.05 level.

The results in Table 3 show that following the sex factor, the amount of DM and nutrients consumed by experimental ducks were lower in the female group and higher in the male group (P<0.05). This result was because ducks are sexually dimorphic, and males are heavier than females, leading to higher consumption of DM and nutrients. For the growing phase factor, the amount of DM and nutrients consumed in one raising phase from 5-12 weeks old was significantly higher (P<0.05) than in split phases (5-8; 9-12 weeks old). This result may be because the experimental ducks reared at split phases with 2 diets had higher levels of CP, ME and other nutrients than those raised in one phase from 5 to 12 weeks old. This result is consumption of 125 g/head/day for males and 88 g/head/day for females. In addition, the result of DM consumption for both sexes was similar to the results of Nguyen Thuy Linh et al. (2017), who found that DM and ME consumption was 101 g/head/day and 1.33 MJ ME/head/day, respectively. Additionally, the amount of lysine, methionine and threonine consumed was lowest in the female duck group and highest in the male group (P<0.05). This result can be explained by the higher DM consumption in these treatments.

Growth performance of local Muscovy ducks

Growth performance, including body weight gain, feed intake and feed conversion ratio, is shown in Table 4.

|                              |                   | Sex               |                   | Grow<br>phas              | ing<br>es            | SEM/P      |                  |                           |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Criteria                     | Male              | Female            | Both              | 5-8;<br>9-12<br>weeks old | 5-12<br>weeks<br>old | Sex        | Growing<br>phase | Sex *<br>growing<br>phase |  |
| Initial<br>weight            | 825 <sup>a</sup>  | 627 <sup>c</sup>  | 745 <sup>b</sup>  | 734                       | 731                  | 5.64/0.001 | 6.61/0.649       | 7.98/0.935                |  |
| Final<br>weight              | 3285 <sup>a</sup> | 2047 <sup>c</sup> | 2662 <sup>b</sup> | 2699                      | 2629                 | 106/0.001  | 22.8/0.050       | 111/0.464                 |  |
| Weight<br>gain               | 45.6 <sup>a</sup> | 23.5 <sup>c</sup> | 34.5 <sup>b</sup> | 35.1                      | 33.9                 | 1.90/0.001 | 0.41/0.050       | 1.99/0.464                |  |
| FCR                          | 2.97              | 3.1               | 3.26              | 2.86                      | 3.36                 | 0.35/0.150 | 0.08/0.001       | 0.37/0.871                |  |
| CP/weight<br>gain (g/kg)     | 495 <sup>b</sup>  | 602 <sup>a</sup>  | 582 <sup>a</sup>  | 515                       | 604                  | 16.3/0.001 | 13.2/0.001       | 22.8/0.624                |  |
| PER                          | 2.04 <sup>a</sup> | 1.68 <sup>c</sup> | 1.74 <sup>b</sup> | 1.96                      | 1.68                 | 0.05/0.001 | 0.04/0.001       | 0.07/0.960                |  |
| ME/weight<br>gain<br>(MJ/kg) | 36.9 <sup>b</sup> | 44.8 <sup>a</sup> | 43.3 <sup>a</sup> | 38.3                      | 45.0                 | 1.19/0.001 | 0.98/0.001       | 1.69/0.620                |  |

Table 4. Growth performance of local Muscovy ducks

Note: a, b, c: Mean values with different letters in the same column are statistically significant differences at the P<0.05 level.

Table 4 shows that the weight gain of experimental ducks in the male group was lower than that in the other groups. For the farming method in 2 stages, treatment 5-8; 9-12 weeks old was higher than 5-12 weeks old (P<0.05). Regarding the growing phase factor, ducks in the split phase had a higher weight gain than those 5-12 weeks old. Similarly, the final weights of the experimental ducks were similar to the weight gain results. The final weight was highest in the male group. This result can be explained by the fact that ducks raised in two phases, fed diets with CP and ME levels, are more responsive to their requirements than ducks reared in phase 1 from 5-12 weeks old, resulting in increased weight gain and higher end mass.

The results of weight gain and final weight of experimental ducks were higher than the results of weight gain of 31.7 g/day and final weight of 2,287 g/head in the study of Nguyen Thuy Linh et al. (2017) on local Muscovy ducks fed diets with different levels of lysine and ME. From the results obtained in this experiment, it was shown that applying the best CP and ME levels in the diets of Muscovy ducks at split phases in the previous study of Nguyen Thuy Linh et al. (2017) improved the performance of experimental ducks.

The feed conversion ratio (FCR) was lowest (P<0.05) in the split phases 5-8; 9-12 weeks old (2.86), possibly due to the high weight gain of ducks.

| Critoria       | Sow    | Growing             | SEM/D          |            |
|----------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| Criteria       | Sex    | 5-8; 9-12 weeks old | 5-12 weeks old | SEM/P      |
|                | Male   | 825                 | 825            | 4.7/0.958  |
| Initial weight | Female | 630                 | 625            | 8.7/0.683  |
|                | Both   | 747                 | 742            | 18/0.837   |
|                | Male   | 3422                | 3342           | 28/0.035   |
| Final weight   | Female | 1945                | 1925           | 17/0.347   |
|                | Both   | 2734                | 2615           | 140/0.544  |
|                | Male   | 46.4                | 44.9           | 0.49/0.034 |
| Weight gain    | Female | 23.5                | 23.2           | 0.36/0.529 |
|                | Both   | 35.5                | 33.4           | 2.4/0.544  |

| Table 5   | Body | weight | gain | final | weight of | ducks i | n gro  | wing | phases | factor ( | σ/ł   | oird | ) |
|-----------|------|--------|------|-------|-----------|---------|--------|------|--------|----------|-------|------|---|
| 1 abic 5. | Douy | weight | gam, | imai  | weight of | uucks i | in gru | wing | phases | Tactor ( | ς g/ι | JIIU | ) |

Table 5 shows that the final weight and weight gain of male ducks were significantly higher than those of the other ducks (P<0.05).

### Carcass characteristics of local Muscovy ducks

The carcass characteristics of local Muscovy ducks are shown in Table 6.

Table 6 shows that for the sex factor, male ducks had the highest carcass weight, followed by male + female, and the lowest carcass weight was in female ducks (P<0.05). For growing phase factors, carcass weights (1,814 g/head) were higher in the split phase treatment and lower in the 5-12-week-old treatment (1,728 g/head) (P<0.05). This result shows that the carcass weight of Muscovy ducks in both factors corresponds to the weight of the surveyed ducks and has the same trend as the results of increasing weight gain and final weight. Meanwhile, the carcass percentage among the treatments was in the range of 66.2-67.3%, and the difference was not

statistically significant (P>0.05). Breast weight was low in the 5-12-week-old treatment (343 g/head) and high (P<0.05) in the split-phase treatment (386 g/head). However, the breast percentage was not significantly different (P>0.05) between the treatments of both factors. The weight of thigh meat was higher (P<0.05) in the split-phase treatment (305 g/head) than in the 5-12-week-old treatment (263 g/head). The difference between Muscovy ducks and other ducks is that Muscovy ducks are sexually dimorphic, and males have a higher growth rate than female ducks. Therefore, the weight of males at the finisher phase is 50% heavier than that of females, and females reach maturity at 10 weeks of age, which is earlier than males (at 12 weeks of age) (Larbier and Leclercq, 1994; Baeza et al., 1998; Bui Xuan Men, 1996; Nguyen Thi Kim Dong and Ogle, 2003). Linh et al. (2007) showed that local Muscovy ducks had carcass percentage (65.1-66.6%), breast percentage (18.3-20.9%) and thigh percentage (15.4-16.1%), the percentage of both breast and thigh meat (35.3-37.9%).

|                             | S                  | bex                | Gro                | wing pha                     | ases                 | SEM/P      |                   |                            |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Criteria                    | Male               | Female             | Both               | 5-8;<br>9-12<br>weeks<br>old | 5-12<br>weeks<br>old | Sex        | Growing<br>phases | Sex *<br>Growing<br>phases |  |  |
| Live weight,<br>g/bird      | 3.377 <sup>a</sup> | 1.930 <sup>c</sup> | 2.664 <sup>b</sup> | 2.697                        | 2.617                | 27.9/0.001 | 22.8/0.030        | 39.5/0.345                 |  |  |
| Carcass weight, g           | 2.228 <sup>a</sup> | 1.292 <sup>c</sup> | 1.794 <sup>b</sup> | 1.814                        | 1.728                | 33.3/0.001 | 27.2/0.047        | 47.1/0.413                 |  |  |
| Carcass percentage          | 65.9               | 66.9               | 67.3               | 67.3                         | 66.2                 | 0.48/0.161 | 0.39/0.079        | 0.68/0.538                 |  |  |
| Breast weight, g            | 426 <sup>a</sup>   | 283 <sup>b</sup>   | 383 <sup>a</sup>   | 386                          | 343                  | 16.4/0.001 | 13.4/0.044        | 23.2/0.950                 |  |  |
| Breast percentage           | 19.1               | 21.9               | 21.3               | 21.6                         | 20.0                 | 0.99/0.160 | 0.81/0.194        | 1.41/0.705                 |  |  |
| Thigh weight, g             | 369 <sup>a</sup>   | $200^{\circ}$      | 282 <sup>b</sup>   | 305                          | 263                  | 15.3/0.001 | 12.5/0.036        | 21.7/0.982                 |  |  |
| Thigh percentage            | 16.7               | 15.5               | 15.7               | 16.8                         | 15.1                 | 0.92/0.632 | 0.76/0.120        | 0.76/0.627                 |  |  |
| Thigh + breast<br>weight, g | 795 <sup>a</sup>   | 484 <sup>c</sup>   | 665 <sup>b</sup>   | 690                          | 606                  | 22.9/0.001 | 18.7/0.008        | 32.4/0.946                 |  |  |
| Thigh and breast percentage | 35.8               | 37.4               | 37.0               | 38.4                         | 35.1                 | 1.47/0.740 | 1.20/0.071        | 2.08/0.516                 |  |  |
| Abdomen fat<br>weight, g    | 47,2               | 29.2               | 31.4               | 39.4                         | 32.4                 | 6.72/0.162 | 5.48/0.388        | 9.50/0.160                 |  |  |
| Abdomen fat percentage, %   | 2.10               | 2.24               | 1.71               | 2.14                         | 1.90                 | 0.37/0.588 | 0.30/0.594        | 0.53/0.152                 |  |  |
| Liver weight, g             | 60.0               | 28.8               | 41.1               | 42.9                         | 43.6                 | 0.65/0.001 | 0.53/0.392        | 0.92/0.811                 |  |  |
| Gizzard weight, g           | 84.7               | 72.3               | 72.3               | 72.4                         | 72.5                 | 2.32/0.001 | 1.89/0.968        | 3.28/0.954                 |  |  |
| Heart weight, g             | 20.5               | 13.7               | 17.3               | 17.1                         | 17.3                 | 0.86/0.001 | 0.70/0.827        | 1.21/0.988                 |  |  |

Table 6. Carcass characteristics of experimental ducks

Note: a, b, c: Mean values with different letters in the same column are statistically significant differences at the P < 0.05 level.

### Economic efficiency of local Muscovy ducks

The economic efficiency of local Muscovy ducks is shown in Table 7.

|                | Se      | X       | Growing phases |                        |                   |  |  |
|----------------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Criteria       | Male    | Female  | Both           | 5-8; 9-12<br>weeks old | 5-12<br>weeks old |  |  |
| Duckling costs | 75.000  | 75.000  | 75.000         | 75.000                 | 75.000            |  |  |
| Medical costs  | 5.000   | 5.000   | 5.000          | 5.000                  | 5.000             |  |  |
| Feed costs     | 34.538  | 21.483  | 30.602         | 27.294                 | 30.455            |  |  |
| Total costs    | 114.538 | 101.483 | 110.602        | 107.294                | 110.455           |  |  |
| Total revenue  | 219.906 | 125.789 | 173.853        | 175.555                | 170.810           |  |  |
| Profit         | 105.368 | 24.307  | 63.251         | 68.261                 | 60.356            |  |  |

Table 7. Economic efficiency of local Muscovy ducks (VND/head)

The prices of ingredients and birds were calculated at the time of the experiment.

The analysis of economic efficiency through the treatments showed that total cost was highest in the male group (114,538 VND/head). However, the total revenue from selling ducks at the end of the experiment was the highest (219,906 VND/head) in the male group. This leads to the highest profit in this treatment (105,368 VND/head). For the treatment of growing phases, the total cost is low in the split phases, which is 107,294 VND/head compared to 5-12 weeks old (110,455 VND). This is mainly due to an increase in feed cost. However, for growing phase factors, the total revenue from selling Muscovy ducks at the end of the experiment was high (VND 175,555/head), leading to the highest profits in this treatment (VND 68.261/head).

#### CONCLUSION

Raising Muscovy ducks according to sex, male Muscovy ducks gave the highest weight gain, body weight and economic efficiency. Muscovy ducks raised in split phases resulted in increased weight, higher carcass quality and good economic efficiency for local Muscovy ducks raised for 5-12 weeks of age.

#### REFERENCES

Anonymou. 2012. Muscovy: The other duck meat. http://www.smallholderhollow.com/muscovy.

- AOAC. 1990. Official methods of analysis, 15<sup>th</sup> edn, Association of Official Analytical Chemist, Washington DC.
- Auaas, R. and Wilke, R. 1978. Cơ sở sinh học của nhân giống và nuôi dưỡng gia cầm (người dịch Nguyễn Chí Bảo). Nhà xuất bản khoa học và kỹ thuật, Hà Nội, tr. 486-524.
- Baéza, E., Bernadet, M. D. and Lessire, M. 2012. Protein requirements for growth, feed efficiency, and meat production in growing mule ducks, Poultry Science Association, Inc.

- Baeza, E., Salichon, M.R., Marche, G. and Juin, H. 1998. Effect of sex on growth, technological and organoleptic characteristics of the Muscovy duck breast muscle. British Poultry Science, 39, pp. 398-403.
- Bui Xuan Men. 1996. Improvement of local duck prodution systems in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. M.Sc. Thesis. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala 1996.
- Collin, A., R.D. Malheiros, V.M.B. Moraes, P. Van As, V.M. Darras, M. Taouis, E. Decuypere and Buyse, J. 2003. Effects of dietary macronutrient content on energy metabolism and uncoupling protein mRNA expression in broiler chickens, Bristh Journal of Nutrition, 90 (2), pp. 261-269.
- Eits, R.M., Kwakkel, R.P., Verstegen, M.W.A., Stoutjesdijk, P. and De Greef, K.H. 2002. Protein and lipid deposition rates in male broiler chicken: Separate responses to amino acids and protein-free energy, Poultry Science, 81, pp. 472-480.
- International Journal of Poultry Science, Volume 1, pp. 40-46.
- Janssen, W. M. M. A. 1989. European Table of Energy Values for Poultry Feedstuffs, 3rd ed, Beekbergen, Netherlands: Spelderholt Center for Poultry Research and Information Services.
- Kamran, Z., Mirza, M. A., Haq, A. and Mahmood, S. 2004. Effect of decreasing dietary protein levels with optimal amino acids profile on the performance of broilers. Pakistan Veterinary Journal, Volume 24, pp. 165-168.
- Larbier, M. and leclerq, B. 1994. Use of industrial amino acids to allow low protein concentrations in finishing diets for growing Muscovy ducks. In British Poultry Science, 39, 96 pages.
- Linares, L. B., Murarolli, R. A., Guaiume, E. A., Shirley, R. B., Hoehler, D., Ledoux, D. R. and Firman, J. D. 2012. Disgestible lysine and threonine requirements of male turkeys from days 8 to 21 and days 20 to 42. J. Appl. Poult. Res. 21, pp. 384-398.
- Moran, E. T. Jr. and Bushong, R. D. 1992. Effects of reducing dietary crude protein to relieve litter nitrogen on broiler performance and processing yields. 19th World Poultry Sci. Assoc. Meetings, Amsterdam. Vol. III, pp. 466-470.
- National Research Council. 1994. Nutrient requirements poultry, 9<sup>th</sup> edn. National Academy Press, Washington, DC. 176 pp.
- Nguyen Thi Kim Dong and Ogle, B. 2003. Effect of Brewery waste replacement of concentrate on the performance of local and crossbred grpwing Muscovy ducks. Asian- Australasian journal of Animal Sciences. 16, pp. 1510-1517.
- Nguyen Thuy Linh, Nguyen Thi Kim Dong and Nguyen Van Thu. 2017. Effect of dietary crude protein and threonine levels on growth performance of local Siamese (Russian) ducks, Journal of Livestock Science and Technology, No. 77, 7/2017.
- Nguyen Thuy Linh, Nguyen Thi Kim Dong and Pham Ngoc Du. 2017. Effect of dietary metabolic energy levels on growth performance of local Siamese ducks, Journal of livestock science and technology, No. 75, 5/2017.
- Ojano-Dirain, C. and Waldroup, P. W. 2002. Protein and amino acid needs in warm weather.
- Ospina-Rojas, I.C., A.E. Murakami, C. Eyng, R.V. Nunes, C.R.A. Duarte and Vargas, M. D. 2012. Commercially available amino acid supplementation of low-protein diets for broiler chickens with different ratios of digestible glycine+serine: lysine, Poultry Science, December, 91 (12) pp. 3148-3155
- Purba, M., Sinurat, A.P. and Susanti, T. 2016. Effect of different lysine and energy levels in diets on carcass percentage of three strains of broiler duck, Proc. Intsem. LPVT, pp. 395-407.

- Tolimir1, L. Perić, N. Milošević, M. Dukić Stojčić, Bogdanović, V. and Jovanović, R. 2013. Effect of nultiphase feeding on growth, main carcass parts, and nitrogen content in faeces of broiler chickens. Biotechnology in Animal Husbandry 29 (3), pp. 483-492.
- Van Soest, P. J., Robertson, J. B. and Lewis, B. A. 1991. Symposium: carbohydrate methodology, metabolism and nutritional implication in dairy cattle: methods for dietary fiber and nonstarch polysaccharides inrelation to animal. Journal of Dairy Sciennce. Vol 74, pp. 3585-3597.
- Zhang, Q., L. Xu, A. Doster, R. Murdoch, P. Cotter, A. Gardner and Applegate, T. J. 2014. Dietary threonine requirement of Pekin ducks from 15 to 35 days of age based on performance, yield, serum natural antibodies, and intestinal mucin secretion. Poultry Science, 93, pp. 1972-1980.

Received date: 21/12/2021

Submitted date: 30/12/2021

Acceptance date: 25/02/2022

**Opponent:** Dr. Nguyen Van Duy