Effect of urea molasses mineral block (UMMB) supplementation on milk production in buffaloes under rural management practices
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Abstract
Study was conducted on 60 lactating buffaloes selected from four villages (15 from each) to assess the effect of UMMB under field conditions in Jaipur district. Overall milk yield was increased 1.02 lit (13.21%) per day as compared to pretreatment. Average consumption of urea molasses mineral block per buffalo was 375 gram per day and net profit from sale of extra milk was Rs. 13.75 per day and BC ratio was found cost of licked UMMB was 1:3.67. Thus licking of UMMB to lactating buffaloes increased the milk production and income from buffalo keeping.
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Introduction
Low milk yield, poor reproductive performance (Seasonal breeding, behavior, anoestrus and longer calving interval) and low growth rate have been reported in buffaloes (Singh et al. 1990; Qureshi et al. 2002; Sahoo et al. 2004; Wynn et al. 2009). In our country the buffaloes are mainly fed cereal straws that are highly lignified and contain low content of both fermentable protein and carbohydrates. Poor performance of buffaloes mainly due to irregular and inadequate availability of quality feedstuff and imbalance feeding. To increase the productivity of buffaloes, supplementation of nutrients, which can improve the utilization of poor quality roughages and fulfill the deficiency of nutrients, are essential as the feed utilization can be increased by supplementation of critical nutrient in ration (Sampath et al. 1995). The supplementation of urea molasses block (UMB) to buffaloes fed straw based diet has increased the growth and supported moderate milk production (Singh and Mehar 1990; Sahoo et al. 2004) Feeding of urea molasses mineral block (UMMB) has shown promising results in improving the nutrients utilization and also the productivity of animals in laboratory trials (Prasad et al. 2001) and a number of on station trials have been conducted in India on the animal response and economic benefits of using UMMB (Srinivas and Gupta 1997; Garg et al. 1998; Patel 2002; Misra and Reddy 2004) results revealed that 30 to 40% concentrate allowances could be reduced by feeding UMMB without any loss of milk production (Leng et al. 1991; Singh and Singh 2003; Misra and Reddy 2004). However, most of the studies were conducted in research station under controlled conditions and very few attempts have been made to evaluate the impact of UMMB supplementation under rural management practices especially in semi-arid Rajasthan. Therefore this study was undertaken to find out the effect of urea molasses mineral block supplementation on productivity of buffaloes in Jaipur.

Materials and Methods
Experiment was conducted on sixty lactating buffaloes identified from four villages namely Shripura, Khannipura, Berna and Sandarshar (15 from each village) of two block of Jaipur district. Trial was conducted for a period of three month from April to June 2009. The urea molasses mineral block used for the purpose was prepared by Krishi Vigyan Kendra by using urea (10%), molasses (38%), wheat bran(40%), mineral mixture (5.0%), common salt (1.0%) and cement (6%). The UMMB was kept in front of the animals in a wooden dispenser to allow free licking and to prevent biting of the blocks UMMB was fed in ad libitum to the buffaloes. Feed and fodder supplied to the buffaloes and management practices was same before treatment and during the treatment. Wheat straw was fed as dry fodder and green fodder availability was limited. Daily milk yield of individual animal was recorded through milk recording index card by farmers and also by investigator at weekly interval
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for fair degree of precision. Each block weighed about 3 kg. The consumption of UMMB was monitored weekly by weighing the blocks regularly. Data were subjected to analyze mean, percentage and standard error.

**Results and Discussion**

Daily milk yield per buffalo per day in different villages were recorded and depicted in table 1. It revealed that overall average milk production of buffaloes was 7.72±0.35 lit./day before treatment and it reached up to 8.74±0.34 lit. per day after the treatment. It clearly indicated that average per day milk yield was increased 1.02 lit. (13.21 percent). These findings are comparable with that of Makkar (2001) who reported that potential of milk increment is 14% per lactation with UMMB feeding, Upreti et al. (2010) observed that average total daily milk production per animal increased by 17.7% (i.e. 1.1 lit./day). However Mandal et al. (2001) reported higher increase (49.76%) in milk yield in UMMB supplementation group, Singh and Singh (2003) reported that UMMB supplementation improved milk yield in buffaloes 35.97%, Avila (2006) found 21.0% that UMMB licking to the lactating buffaloes has significant effect on milk yield. Similar findings were also reported by Wanapat et al. (1999).

Economic analysis of supplementation of UMMB depicted in Table 2. It revealed that overall intake of urea molasses mineral block was 375 gm per day per buffalo. In different villages it was ranged from 300 to 450 gm per day per buffalo. It was observed that as intake of UMMB increased milk yield also increased accordingly. These findings are similar to that of Mandal et al. (2001) who reported that there was positive correlation between gradually increase UMMB intake and level of milk yield. Overall cost of licking UMMB was Rs.4.88 per day and extra income from sale of extra milk was Rs.18.36 (ranged Rs. 16.74 to 21.60) per day per buffalo. Overall benefit cost ratio (BC) was found 3.67 under study. However Sudhakar et al. (2002) reported higher BC ratio (6.44) than present study.
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Table 1: Average milk production per buffaloes per day in different villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Khannipura</th>
<th>Berna</th>
<th>Shripura</th>
<th>Sandarshar</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average milk yield pre treatment (lit./day)</td>
<td>6.67±0.44</td>
<td>6.47±0.46</td>
<td>9.27±0.65</td>
<td>8.37±0.87</td>
<td>7.72±0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average milk yield post treatment (lit./day)</td>
<td>7.60±0.42</td>
<td>7.67±0.45</td>
<td>10.23±0.64</td>
<td>9.47±0.85</td>
<td>8.74±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average milk yield increased lit./day within 3 months</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage milk increased over pre-treatment</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Economic evaluation of UMMB supplemented in buffaloes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Name of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra milk yield (lit./day)</td>
<td>Khannipura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra income from the sale of milk/day/buffalo @Rs.18/lit.</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMMB intake /day / buffalo (gm.)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of UMMB intake</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net profit by UMMB supplementation</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC ratio</td>
<td>1:4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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