

Feed intake, digestibility and growth performance of Dorper-Menz cross bred sheep fed local brewery by-product (*Atella*) and concentrate mixture at different levels of combination

Kokeb M¹, Mekonnen Y^{1*} and Tefera M²

¹Department of Animal Sciences, College of Agriculture, Wollo University, Dessie, Ethiopia.

²Debre-Birhan Agricultural Research Center, Debre Birhan, Ethiopia.

*Corresponding author. Email: mekonnenyirga474@gmail.com

Copyright © 2020 Kokeb et al. This article remains permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received 1st August, 2020; Accepted 4th October, 2020

ABSTRACT: The aim of this experiment was to evaluate the effect of graded level of local brewery by-product (*atella*) replacement to concentrate mixture on feed intake; digestibility and bodyweight change of Dorper-Menz crossbred lambs fed hay basal diet. The feeding period of 90 days was preceded by 15 days of acclimatization period. The experimental design was randomized complete block design with five treatments: T1 [control, hay *ad libitum*], T2 [25% *atella* + 75% concentrate mix]; T3 [50% *atella* + 50% concentrate mix]; T4 [75% *atella* + 25% concentrate mix] and T5 [100% *atella*]. Body weight changes were monitored fortnightly for 112 days. At the end of experiment, animals were fitted with feces collection bags and daily feces excretion was collected for seven days. Fecal output of each animal was thoroughly mixed and 20% of the voided feces were sampled to make a composite of fecal samples for each animal over the collection period. The fecal samples were stored frozen at -20°C until processing for chemical analysis. Data on feed intake, body weight change, and digestibility were subjected to analysis of variance using the General Linear Model procedure. The protein and energy contents of *atella* are high enough to increase intake, digestibility and could be categorized as medium protein feed. *Atella* alone or at different level with commercial concentrate mixture has significantly increased body weight gain of crossbred sheep. The positive weight gain results of *atella* supplemented group clearly indicate supplementation of dried *atella* could be recommended for fattening Dorper-Menz crossbred male lamb. *Atella* may lose some volatile nutrients during drying process and further research is needed to compare wet *atella* with dried one.

Keywords: *Atella*, concentrate, Dorper, feed intake, hay, Menz.

INTRODUCTION

In Ethiopia, there are six indigenous sheep breed groups and nine breeds. Among those breeds, Menz sheep is well adapted to the cool highlands of Ethiopia and has slow growth rate. In the past, efforts have been made to improve the performance of this breed through selection and cross breeding (Gebremichael, 2008). These days, pure Dorper rams have been distributed to farmers so as to overcome the slow growth rate of Menz sheep. Currently, selected

farmers and small scale private investors are producing 50% Dorper-Menz crosses. Though, sheep feeding with low quality feed resources is a common practice at farmers level in Ethiopia, improved feeding of Dorper-Menz crosses seems inevitable. Protein concentrates are not easily available and affordable for the poor farmers in Ethiopia (Mekuriaw and Asmare, 2018). Therefore, looking for local protein sources from the available feed resources

is vital and commendable.

Atella is a common strategy to improve the whole nutritional quality of the diet (Tesfay et al., 2016) and often associated with other supplements in sheep diets. The protein and energy contents of atella are high enough to greatly increase the intake, digestibility, N retention and performance of growing sheep fed diets based on low quality forage. Supplementing diets with 25 to 50% (DM) *atella* ensures that the dietary protein is able to support an acceptable rumen microbial activity, meeting the maintenance protein requirement (Nurfeta and Abdu, 2014). In this regard, locally available agro-industrial by-products seem to be a proper choice in a country where commercial concentrate is scarce and costly. The traditional agro-industrial brewery by-product (locally called *atella*) is used widely by smallholder livestock farmers in Ethiopia due to its crude protein (CP) content (21-22%) and easy availability (Mekasha et al., 2003). However, local brewery by-product (*atella*) as replacement for concentrate mixture in crossbred sheep ration was not well documented. Therefore, current experiment was conducted to evaluate the effect of graded level replacement of concentrate mixture with local brewery by-product (*atella*) on feed intake, digestibility and performance of 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred lambs fed natural pasture hay basal feed.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental site

The experiment was conducted at Debre Birhan Agricultural Research Center (DBARC). Debre Birhan is located in the central highlands of Ethiopia at about 120 km North East of Addis Ababa and 10 km from Debre Birhan town, at an altitude of 2800 meter above sea level. The geographical location of the area is 09° 35' 45" to 09° 36' 45" North latitude and from 39° 29' 40" to 39° 31' 30" East longitude. The mean annual rainfall of the area is 897.8 mm. The mean annual maximum and minimum temperature is 19.9 and 6.5°C.

Experimental animals and their management

Twenty five yearlings intact male Dorper with Menz crossbred sheep were obtained from Debre Birhan Agricultural Research Center and identified by using ear tags. The age of animals was determined based on the available records of the research center. Before start of the experiment, sheep were de-wormed with Albendazol bolus and dipping using Diazinol 60% following manufacturer's recommendation. Animals were vaccinated against Anthrax and Pasteurellosis. To fully acquaint sheep with their experimental diets, the actual feeding trial period of

ninety consecutive days was preceded by acclimatization period of 15 days. Sheep were kept in door in a well-ventilated individual pens equipped with watering and feeding troughs. Animals were continuously observed for incidence of any ill health and disorders during the experimental period.

Experimental feeds preparation and feeding management

Natural pasture hay (mostly *Andropogon abynicus*) was harvested from Debre Birhan Agricultural Research Center was dried under the shade. Grass hay was chopped into smaller size (\approx 5 cm) and fed *ad libitum* (allowing \approx 20% refusal). *Atella* was purchased from local breweries from Debre-Birhan town having similar ingredient (Barley, maize, wheat and buckthorn) and fermentation period of seven days. Commercial concentrate mixture was bought from Akaki feed processing plant. Hay and supplement (mixture of concentrate and dried *atella*) were offered separately in two equal portions at 08:00 and 16:00 hours daily. Feed offered and corresponding refusal was recorded daily once in the morning before the next feeding throughout the experimental period. Water and salt lick were freely accessed to animals during experimental period. Ingredients of the commercial concentrate mixture were 32% Noug (*Guizotia Abyssinica*) seed cake, 30% wheat bran, 35% graded maize, 2% minerals and 1% salt.

Experimental design and treatment

The experimental design was randomized complete block design (RCBD). Treatment diets were randomly assigned to each animal within each block. The total daily offer of concentrate mixture for each animal was 400 g. Treatment 1 was the control, where animals received only hay basal diet *ad libitum*. The remaining treatments involved are *atella* and concentrate mixture at different levels of combination on top of natural pasture hay basal diet.

T1 = Hay *ad libitum* (Control)

T2 = Hay *ad libitum* + 25% *Atella* (100 gm) + 75% concentrate mixture (300 gm)

T3 = Hay *ad libitum*+ 50% *Atella* (200 g) + 50% concentrate mixture (200 gm)

T4 = Hay *ad libitum* + 75%*Atella* (300 gm) +25% Concentrate mixture (100 g)

T5 = Hay *ad libitum*+ 100% *Atella* (400 g)

Data collection

Feed offer and refusal of each animal were weighed daily to calculate the daily feed intake. Animals were fasted overnight before taking body weight measurement. The

initial and final weights were taken twice on two consecutive days and the average of the two was taken as initial and final weights, respectively. Weight gain was calculated as the difference between final and initial body weights. Average daily weight gain was calculated as a weight gain divided by the number of feeding days. Feed conversion efficiency was estimated as a ratio of average daily weight gain per units of dry matter feed consumed daily. Feed intake was recorded daily whereas body weight of animals had been taken every ten days interval (before the morning feeding) with a Salter balance (50 kg capacity of 200 g precision). At the end of the feeding trial period, animals were fitted with faecal collection bags for digestibility trial and daily faecal excretion was collected for seven days. Faecal bags were emptied daily just after the morning meal, and the daily faecal output was weighed and recorded for each animal. Afterwards, the faecal output of each animal was thoroughly mixed and 20% of the voided feces were sampled to make a composite of faecal samples for each animal over the collection period. The faecal samples were stored frozen at -20°C until processing for chemical analysis. Apparent DM and nutrients digestibility were determined as the difference between nutrients intake and that recovered in feces expressed as a proportion of nutrient intake (McDonald et al., 2010).

$$DC = \frac{TFd - TFs}{TFd} \times 100$$

DC = Digestibility coefficient, TFd = Total amount of nutrients in feed and TFs = Total amount of nutrients in faeces

Chemical analysis

Feed and faecal samples were analyzed at Debere Birhan Agricultural Research Center (DBARC). Sample of feed offered, refusals and faeces were dried at 65°C in forced draft oven for about 72 hours and ground to pass 1 mm mesh screen size. The ground samples were stored in airtight plastic containers for chemical analysis. The DM was determined according to the standard methods of association of analytical chemists (AOAC, 1990). Nitrogen content of feeds was determined according to Keijldhal procedure and the crude protein was estimated as N x 6.25. Neutral detergent fiber (NDF), acid detergent fiber (ADF) and acid detergent lignin (ADL) were analyzed according to the procedures of Van Soest et al. (1991). Hemicellulose and cellulose contents were calculated as NDF minus ADF and ADF minus ADL, respectively.

Statistical analysis

Data on feed intake, body weight change, and digestibility

were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of SAS. Treatment means were separated using least significant difference (LSD). The model used for this study was $Y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + B_j + e_{ij}$ Where; Y_{ij} = the response variable (feed intake, body weight change, digestibility); μ = the overall mean; T_i = the treatment effect; B_j = the block effect; e_{ij} = the random error.

Partial budget analysis

Partial budget analysis was performed using the procedure of Shapiro et al. (1994). Labour cost was assumed to be constant for all treatments. The initial and final market prices of target animals were estimated by traders. The price differences of target animals in each treatment before and after the experiment were considered as gross/total return (TR). The cost of supplementary feeds was computed by multiplying the actual intake for the entire feeding period with the prevailing prices.

The marginal rate of return (MRR) measures the increase in net return (ΔNR) associated with each additional unit of expenditure (ΔTVC) after arranging total variable cost (TVC) in ascending order.

$$MRR = \frac{\Delta NR}{\Delta TVC} \times 100$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chemical composition of treatment feeds

The chemical composition of experimental feeds and refusals is shown in Table 1. The CP content of treatment mixture was much higher than hay, whereas the fiber fraction (NDF, ADF and ADL) in treatment mixture was clearly lower than the basal feed. The hay refusals in all treatments had lower CP and higher NDF, ADF and ADL as compared to the hay offered, which was an indication for the selectivity of animals for the better nutritious parts of the plant. The CP content of *atella* found in this study is nearly similar with previous studies of Mussa et al. (2015), similar as described by Mekcha et al., (2019), Hagos (2014) and Almaz et al. (2012). Nurfeta and Abdu (2014) noted that protein and energy contents of *atella* are high enough to greatly increase the intake, digestibility, N retention and performance of growing sheep fed diets based on low quality forage and in line with this study. According to Lonsdale (1989), feeds that have <12%, 12-20% and >20% CP are classified as low, medium and high protein sources, respectively. Therefore, dried *atella* in the present study could be categorized among the medium protein feeds that can serve as a protein supplement for low quality hay and is in agreement with Kebede et al. (2017).

Table 1. Chemical composition of treatment feed (%).

Feed offer (DM base)	DM	OM	CP	NDF	ADF	ADL	Ash
Hay	92	84.39	7.04	61.12	45.65	7.77	7.61
25% <i>atella</i> + 75% CM	92	88.41	21.1	35.57	24.18	6.71	6.59
50% <i>atella</i> + 50% CM	92	84.41	20.4	45.67	32.68	5.57	6.59
75% <i>atella</i> + 25%CM	92	84.41	21.2	50.00	35.16	4.43	6.59
Dried <i>Atella</i> (100%)	92	84.74	21.3	35.57	43.48	6.66	3.26
Refusal							
T1	91	84.39	5.0	66.84	50.00	8.88	6.61
T2	91	84.21	6.92	78.67	59.34	12.22	6.79
T3	91	85.21	6.4	9.85	52.75	10.00	5.79
T4	91	85.21	6.4	69.85	52.75	10.00	5.79
T5	90	84.21	6.92	78.67	59.34	12.22	6.79

DM=Dry matter; OM=Organic matter; CP=Crude protein; NDF=Neutral detergent fiber; ADF=Acid detergent fiber; ADL=Acid detergent lignin; CM=Concentrate mixture; T1=Hay *ad libitum*; T2=Hay *ad libitum* + 75% CM+25% *Atella*; T3= Hay *ad libitum* +50% CM +50% *Atella*, T4=Hay *ad libitum* +25% CM+75% *Atella*and T5=Hay *ad libitum* +100% *Atella*.

Feed and nutrients intake

The mean daily DM and nutrient intake of 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep is presented in Table 2. The total DM intake of sheep in this study was comparable with 25% Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep (Tilahun et al., 2014). The lowest total DMI of the control group was attributed to the low CP content of hay, because protein has great role in facilitating the rumen microorganisms and increasing the DMI. Replacement rate has not influenced the total DMI. Total NDF and ADF intake was in the order of T1>T5> T4> T3 > T2 which appeared to be associated with the level of NDF and ADF in the supplemental diets. Increment in the replacement rate of *atella* has increased NDF and ADF, but decreased CP intake. The organic matter (OM) and CP intake of feed replaced with *atella* alone was similar to its lowest replacement rate. Excluding the control group, the total DM intake of Menze-Dorper cross bred sheep of this study was 38-42% higher than the results of Mengistu et al. (2016) and Gezu et al. (2017) with different Ethiopian sheep breeds.

Body weight change

The body weight gain and feed conversion efficiency of 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep fed natural pasture hay basal diet supplemented with different proportion of *atella* and commercial concentrate mix is presented in Table 3. *Atella* alone or at different level of mixture with commercial concentrate has significantly ($p<0.05$) increased the body weight gain of 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep. Weight gain results of *atella* supplemented group clearly indicate the potential of *atella* to be supplement for Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep.

When the level of *atella* was increased in the ration, decrease in the body weight was recorded. Similar trend had also been observed in final body weight, total body weight and average daily weight gain. It appears that *atella* might contain rumen undegradable protein and if consumed in higher amount it might not be efficiently utilized by rumen microbes and may result in removal of the excess protein through faeces which is in agreement with the findings of Almaz et al. (2012). The experiment of Abreha et al. (2019) revealed that the highly valued commercial concentrate feeds can be replaced by *atella* because of their similar performance effects on local sheep and the same applies to the Menze-Dorper cross bred sheep. Body weight loss in the control group is attributed to the poor quality of natural pasture hay (low CP and higher fiber) that could not satisfy the nutrient requirement of growing Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep.

Nutrient digestibility

Apparent DM and nutrient digestibility and correlation of intake, digestibility and body weight gain (BWG) is presented in Tables 4 and 5. Average daily gain is was found to be strongly and positively correlated ($p<0.001$) with dry matter intake (DMI), organic matter intake (OMI), acid detergent fiber intake (ADFI), acid detergent fiber digestibility (ADFD) and crude protein digestibility (CPD). The increase in nutrient intake would create a favorable ruminal environment for microorganism in the rumen to increase digestibility and passage rate of the digesta with a subsequent increase in the overall DMI and improves body weight gain. Total DMI is negatively correlated with NDFI and positively correlated ($p<0.001$) with CPI, CPD, ADFI and NDFD. The negative correlation of fiber

Table 2. Daily dry matter and nutrient intakes of 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep supplemented with mixture of concentrate and *atella*.

Intake (g/day)	Treatments					SEM	SEL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
Dry matter							
Hay	624.22	627.75	604.58	603.91	627.75	14.11	NS
Total DM	624.78 ^a	991.64 ^b	968.50 ^b	967.91 ^b	991.64 ^b	3.06	**
Nutrient intake g/day							
OM	289.82 ^a	924.20 ^b	923.47 ^b	924.15 ^b	924.20 ^b	6.78	***
CP	51.4 ^a	152.0 ^d	147.40 ^d	135.9 ^c	152.0 ^d	1.38	***
NDF	541.2 ^d	127.52 ^a	135.22 ^b	392.09	448.32 ^a	18.2	***
ADF	577.84 ^d	132.97 ^a	441.35 ^b	458.35 ^b	377.97 ^a	3.6	**

^{a,b,c,d}Mean values in a row having different superscripts differ significantly; ** P < 0.05, *** = P < 0.001; NS= Not significant; SL= Significance level; SEM= Standard error of the mean; DM=Dry matter; OM= Organic matter; CM= Concentrate mixture; CP = Crude protein; NDF = Neutral detergent fiber; ADF = Acid detergent fiber; T1 = Hay *ad libitum*; T2 = Hay *ad libitum* + 75% CM+25%*Atella*; T3 = Hay *ad libitum* +50% CM +50% *Atella*, T4= Hay *ad libitum* +25% CM+75% *Atella* and T5=Hay *ad libitum* +100% *Atella*.

Table 3. Body weight change of Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep fed *atella* and concentrate at different proportions.

Parameters	Treatments					SEM	SL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
IBW (kg)	27.1	26.32	27.64	28.32	27.16	2.99	NS
FBW(Kg)	26.0 ^a	33.46 ^d	33.76 ^d	32.92 ^c	30.96 ^b	2.21	***
TBWC (kg)	-1.1 ^a	6.43 ^d	6.12 ^d	4.6 ^c	3.7 ^b	2.5	**
ADG (g)	-11.3 ^a	73.2 ^d	67.0 ^d	51.1 ^c	42.22 ^b	4.0	**
FCE (gAWG/g DMI)	-0.01 ^a	0.07 ^c	0.07 ^c	0.05 ^b	0.04 ^b	0.007	***

^{a,b,c,d} Mean values in a row having different superscripts differ significantly; NS= Not significant; **= P < 0.05; ***= P < 0.001; SL= Significance level; SEM = Standard error of the mean; ADG= Average daily gain; FCE= Feed conversion efficiency; FBW=Final body Weight, IBW = Initial body Weight. TBWC=Total body Weight change.

Table 4. Nutrient digestibility of Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep fed mixtures of *atella* and concentrate.

Digestibility	Treatments					SEM	SL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5		
DM	0.73	0.77	0.77	0.74	0.77	6.15	NS
OM	0.65	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.65	6.48	NS
CP	0.51 ^a	0.66 ^b	0.60 ^b	0.66 ^b	0.62 ^b	0.065	**
NDF	0.55 ^a	0.68 ^b	0.65 ^b	0.65 ^b	0.60 ^b	1.26	**
ADF	0.46 ^a	0.60 ^b	0.58 ^b	0.63 ^b	0.59 ^b	0.54	**

^{a,b} Mean values in a row having different superscripts differ significantly; NS= Not significant; **= p < 0.001; ADF = Acid detergent fiber; CM=Concentrate mixture CP = Crude protein; DM = Dry matter; NDF = Neutral detergent fiber; OM = Organic matter; SL= Significance level; SEM = Standard error of the mean; T1 = Hay *ad libitum*; T2 = Hay *ad libitum* + 75% CM+25% *Atella*; T3 = Hay *ad libitum* +50% CM +50% *Atella*, T4= Hay *ad libitum* +25% CM+75% *Atella* and T5=Hay *ad libitum* +100% *Atella*.

component NDF observed with feed intake is in agreement with Van Soest (1965). The non-significant (p>0.05) difference in apparent digestibility of CP among the treatments confirmed the comparable quality of *atella* with that of concentrate mixture. Feeds rich in protein promote

high microbial population which in turn facilitates rumen fermentation and the fermentative activity is usually responsible for the increased digestibility (McDonald et al., 2010). Therefore, the current finding is in agreement with Gebreyohannes et al. (2002) denoting that lambs with

Table 5. The correlation between feed intake, digestibility and body weight gain of Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep fed mixtures of *atella* and concentrate.

	DMI	DMD	CPI	CPD	OMI	OMD	NDFI	NDFD	ADFI
DMI	1.00								
DMD	0.202	1.00							
CPI	0.96***	0.141	1.00						
CPD	0.76***	0.076	0.93***	1.00					
OMI	0.97***	0.180	0.979**	0.92**	1.00				
OMD	0.226	0.99**	0.155	0.095	0.197	1.00			
NDFI	-0.176	-0.196	-0.036	-0.08	-0.17	-0.22	1.00		
NDFD	0.69**	0.25	0.703	0.61**	0.63**	0.26	0.19	1.00	
ADFI	0.92***	0.205	0.979***	0.91***	0.95***	0.217	0.041	0.69**	1.00
ADFD	0.82***	0.32	0.89**	0.86***	0.88**	0.31	0.018	0.620**	0.91***

*** = P<0.001); ** = P<0.05); ADG = Average daily body weight gain; CPD = Crude protein digestibility; CPI = Crude protein intake; DMD= Dry matter digestibility; DMI = Dry matter intake; OMI = Organic matter intake; OMD = Organic matter digestibility; NDFI= Neutral detergent fiber intake; NDFD=Neutral detergent fiber digestibility; ADF= Acid detergent fiber; ADFD= Acid detergent fiber digestibility.

Table 6. Partial budget analysis and marginal rate of return of Dorper-Menz crossbred sheep fed mixtures of *atella* and concentrate.

Particulars	Units	Treatments				
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
Purchasing price	Birr/head	804.16	788.66	869.98	941.3	744.8
Total weight gain	Kg/head	-1.02	3.81	4.6	6.12	6.43
Average daily gain	gm./head	-11.3	42.22	51.10	68.00	73.60
Hay consumed in 90 days	Kg/head	81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00
<i>Atella</i> consumed in 90 days	kg/head	0.00	36	27.00	18.00	9.00
Concentrate consumed in 90 days	kg/head	0.00	0.00	9.00	18.00	27.00
Hay cost in 90 days	Birr/head	243.00	243.00	243.00	243.00	243.00
<i>Atella</i> cost in 90 days	Birr/head	0.00	59.76	44.72	29.88	15.00
Concentrate cost in 90days	Birr/head	0.00	0.00	45.00	90.00	135.00
Total feed cost	Birr/head	243.00	302.76	332.72	362.88	393.00
Medication cost	Birr/head	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Total variableCost	Birr/head	1051.6	1095.42	1205.70	1308.8	1141.8
Total Gross Return (GR)	Birr/head	1083.3	1450.32	1516.68	1533.3	1376.6
Net Return (NR)	Birr/head	31.7	354.58	310.98	225.12	234.8
Change of Grossreturn (Δ GR)		-	367.72	140.088	16.62	-73.00
Change of variable cost (Δ TVC)		-	43.82	63.90	103.1	46.38
Change of net return (Δ NR)			322.40	76.78	-84	-119.78
Marginal retreturn (MRR)%		-	735	120.3	D	D

D = Negative value marginal ret of return. T1 = Hay *ad libitum*, T2=25%*atella* +75% concentrate mix, T3= Hay *ad libitum* +50% *atella* + 50% concentrate mix, T4 = Hay *ad libitum*+75% *atella* +25% concentrate mix, and T5 = Hay *ad libitum* + 100% *atella*,

higher growth potential have higher nutritional needs.

Partial budget analysis

Economic analysis of the experiment is computed and described for each treatment (Table 6). The major cost that determined profitability of sheep feeding was the initial price of animals and the feed cost. Sheep received T5

(*atella* alone) returned higher net income followed by sheep fed T4 (75% *atella* + 25% CM). The differences in total return, net return and marginal rate of return among treatments is mainly associated with the differences in selling price of the sheep, differences in intake and cost of feed. The marginal rate of return analysis reveals what farmers can expect to gain on the average in return for their investment. Considering the net return and MRR, sheep supplemented with dried *atella* is economically

profitable and is in agreement with the recommendation of Abreha et al. (2019).

Conclusion

Findings of the present study indicated that traditional brewery by-product (*atella*) can be used as a good protein source to replace other commercial protein supplements which are too expensive and not affordable by low income farmers. Based on partial budget analysis, different levels of *atella* with concentrate mixture could be recommended as profitable supplement for 50% Dorper-Menz crossbred male lamb fattening. *Atella* may lose some volatile nutrients during drying process and further research is needed to compare wet *atella* with dried one.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCE

- Abreha, H. H., Anmut, G., Hailemichael, A., Tedla, D. G., & Baragabr, F. H. (2019). Effect of commercial and non-conventional feeds, leaves of indigenous and improved multipurpose tree supplementation on feed intake, digestibility and growth performance of sheep. *The Open Agriculture Journal*, 13(1), 207-214.
- Almaz, A., Tamir, B., & Melaku, S. (2012). Feed intake, digestibility and live weight change of lambs fed finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) straw supplemented with atella, noug seed (*Guizotia abyssinica*) cake and their mixtures. *Agricultura Tropica et Subtropica*, 45(3), 105-111.
- Association of Official Analytical Chemist (AOAC) (1990): *Official method of analysis*, 5th edition, Washington DC, USA. 1298p.
- Gebremichael, S. (2008). *Sheep resources of Ethiopia: genetic diversity and breeding strategy*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, The Netherlands.
- Gebreyohannes, G., Geleti, D., Gizachew, L., Gojam, Y., & Gemed, D. (2003, August). Effect of noug cake and Sesbania sesban supplementation on the growth performance and carcass characteristics of Horro rams. In *Proceedings of the 10th annual conference of the Ethiopian Society of Animal Production (ESAP) held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*. ESAP, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (pp. 335-339).
- Gezu, T., Mengistu, U., & Solomon, G. (2017). Effects of supplementation with graded levels of concentrate mix of oats grain and lentil screening on feed utilization and live weight gain of menz sheep fed hay. *Advances in Life Science and Technology*, 56, 25-33.
- Hagos, H. (2014). Effect of supplementation of concentrate mixture, dried local brewery by-product (*atella*), *faidherbia albida* and sesbania sesban on the performance of local sheep fed hay basal diet, MSc Thesis, Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Haremaya University, Haremaya, Ethiopia.
- Kebede, G., Getachew, A., & Mengistu, U. (2017). Feed intake, digestibility, body weight change and carcass parameters of black head Somali sheep supplemented with local brewery by-product (Tata) and concentrate mix. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 29(4).
- Lonsdale, C. (1989). *Raw Materials for Animal Feed Compounders and Farmers*. Chalcombe publications, Great Britain, Pp. 17-47
- McDonald, P., Edwards, R. A., Greenhalgh, J. F. D., Morgan, C. A., Sinclair, L. A., & Wilkinson, R. G. (2010). *Animal Nutrition* (7th edition). In: Prentice hall. Harlow, England, London. p. 714.
- Mekasha, Y., Tegegne, A., Yami, A., Umunna, N. N., & Nsahlai, I. V. (2003). Effects of supplementation of grass hay with non-conventional agro-industrial by-products on rumen fermentation characteristics and microbial nitrogen supply in rams. *Small Ruminant Research*, 50(1-2), 141-151.
- Mekcha, E., Alemu, B., & Ayele, S. (2019). Effect of Atella, Brint and their mixture supplementation on feed intake, digestibility and body weight change of washera sheep fed oat (*Avena sativa*) straw basal diet, in Machackel district east Gojjam Zone. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 5(1), 555-562.
- Mekuriaw, Y., & Asmare, B. (2018). Nutrient intake, digestibility and growth performance of Washera lambs fed natural pasture hay supplemented with graded levels of *Ficus thonningii* (Chibha) leaves as replacement for concentrate mixture. *Agriculture and Food Security*, 7, Article number 30.
- Mengistu, U., Kefelegn, K., & Gebretnsae, W. M. (2016). Effects of supplementing cactus cladode and acacia senegal branches on intake, digestibility and body weight gain of tigray highland sheep fed barley straw. *Journal of Fisheries and Livestock Production*, 4(4), Article 191.
- Mussa, A. A., Negesse, T., & Assefa, G. (2016). Effect of dietary inclusion of local brewery by-product (tela-atella) on quality and production of egg by Lohmann white chickens. *Dynamic Journal of Animal Science Technology*, 1(2), Article ID: DJAST15/025.
- Nurfeta, A., & Abdu, Y. (2014). Feeding value of different levels of malt sprout and katikala atella on nutrient utilization and growth performance of sheep fed basal diet of Rhodes grass hay. *Tropical animal health and production*, 46(3), 541-547.
- Shapiro, B. I., Mohamed-Saleem, M. A., & Reynolds, L. (1994). Socio-economic constraints to strategic sheep fattening: evidence from the Ethiopian highlands. In: *Small ruminant research and development in Africa, Proceedings of the second biennial conference of the African Small Ruminant Research Network, Tanzania, 7-11, December 1992*, Pp. 9-14.
- Tesfay, Y., Gebrelibanos, A., Woldemariam, D., & Tilahun, H. (2016). Feed resources availability, utilization and marketing in central and eastern Tigray, northern Ethiopia. Lives working paper 11. Nairobi, Kenya: International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).
- Tilahun, M., Kefelegn, K., Abebe, G., & Goetsch, A. L. (2014). Feed intake, digestibility, weight gain, and slaughter characteristics influenced by genetic percentage of Boer in goats and Dorper in sheep in the central highlands of Ethiopia. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 46(4), 593-602.
- Van Soest, P. J. (1965). Symposium on factors influencing the voluntary intake of herbage by ruminants: voluntary intake in relation to chemical composition and digestibility. *Journal of Animal Science*, 24(3), 834-843.
- Van Soest, P. V., Robertson, J. B., & Lewis, B. A. (1991). Methods for dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 74(10), 3583-3597.