Knowledge and Challenges of DDGS Use in the Swine Industry

Dr. Jerry Shurson
Department of Animal Science
University of Minnesota
What Do We Know About DDGS Use in Swine Diets?

- Nutrient composition, digestibility, and physical characteristics vary among sources.
  - Energy ≥ corn
  - Light, golden color indicative of high lysine digestibility
  - Phosphorus digestibility is very high

- Economical partial replacement for
  - Corn
  - Soybean meal
  - Dicalcium phosphate

- Variability among DDGS sources > among soybean meal sources

- Maximum diet inclusion rates have been initially determined under specific diet formulation conditions.

- It works!
  - ~ 1.1 million metric tons were fed to pigs in 2004.
Estimated DDGS Usage in U.S. Swine Feeds 2001-2004 (Metric Tonnes)
DDGS Feeding Limitations Have Been Identified

- Formulate diets on a digestible amino acid basis if > 10% is added to corn-SBM diets

- Adding DDGS to swine diets will generally:
  - reduce dry matter digestibility
  - slightly increase manure output
  - increase N excretion
  - reduce P concentration in manure if formulations based on available P

- Pork fat quality and belly firmness appear to be reduced as increasing levels are added to the diet

- Feed intake and growth rate may be reduced when added to diets for pigs weighing less than 15 lbs

- Sows require a short adaptation period when abruptly switching from a corn-soybean meal diet to a diet containing high levels of DDGS
Fat Quality Characteristics of Market Pigs Fed Corn-Soy Diets Containing 0 to 30% DDGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 %</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belly thickness, cm</td>
<td>3.15^a</td>
<td>3.00^a,b</td>
<td>2.84^a,b</td>
<td>2.71^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly firmness score, degrees</td>
<td>27.3^a</td>
<td>24.4^a,b</td>
<td>25.1^a,b</td>
<td>21.3^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted belly firmness score, degrees</td>
<td>25.9^a</td>
<td>23.8^a,b</td>
<td>25.4^a,b</td>
<td>22.4^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodine number</td>
<td>66.8^a</td>
<td>68.6^b</td>
<td>70.6^c</td>
<td>72.0^c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means within a row lacking common superscripts differ (P < .05).
Effect of Feeding 0 and 50% DDGS Gestation Diets and 0 and 20% DDGS Lactation Diets on Sow Lactation ADFI
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*a,b,x,y* Different superscripts indicate significant difference (P < .10).
Unique, Value-Added Attributes of DDGS Have Been Identified

- Improvements in gut health related to *Lawsonia intracellularis*
- Increased litter size weaned when high levels are fed to sows
- Manure P concentration is reduced
Effect of Dietary Treatment on Lesion Length (21 d Post-Challenge) Experiment 2

* Effect of disease challenge ($P < .01$).
Effect of Dietary Treatment on Lesion Severity (21 d Post-Challenge) Experiment 2

* Effect of disease challenge ($P < .01$).
Effect of Dietary Treatment on Lesion Prevalence (21 d Post-Challenge) Experiment 2

* Effect of disease challenge ($P < .01$).
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Effect of Feeding 0 or 50% DDGS Gestation Diets and 0 or 20% DDGS Lactation Diets on Pigs Weaned/Litter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dietary treatment</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control/Control</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/DDGS</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDGS/Control</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDGS/DDGS</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant difference (P < .10).
Effect of Feeding Corn-SBM Diets With or Without 20% DDGS or Phytase on Fecal Phosphorus Concentration (%)

a, b Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P < .05).
Effect of Feeding Corn-SBM Diets With or Without 20% DDGS or Phytase on Daily Fecal Phosphorus Excretion (g/d)

a, b, c Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P < .05).
x, y Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P < .15).
Effect of Feeding Corn-SBM Diets With or Without 20% DDGS or Phytase on Phosphorus Digestibility (%)

a, b Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P < .05).
Barriers for Increased DDGS Use in Swine Diets

- Variability in nutrient content and digestibility
- Low particle size and flowability problems
- Perceived risk of mycotoxins (sows)
- Ability to pellet DDGS diets
- Understanding and managing effects on pork fat quality
DDGS Varies Nutrient Content and Digestibility, Color, and Particle Size Among U.S. Sources
Comparison of Nutrient Composition of Golden Corn DDGS to Other “DDGS Sources” (100% Dry Matter Basis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Golden Corn DDGS</th>
<th>Solulac</th>
<th>Badger State Ethanol</th>
<th>ADM - Peoria</th>
<th>Extruded DDGS/Soy (XDS Plus)</th>
<th>AGP Pelleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protein, %</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat, %</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fiber, %</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF, %</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash, %</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE, kcal/kg*</td>
<td>4053</td>
<td>3808</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3796</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME, kcal/kg*</td>
<td>3781</td>
<td>3577</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td>3749</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lys, %</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met, %</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thr, %</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trp, %</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca, %</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, %</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated energy values for swine
Variability (CV, %) of Selected Nutrients Among U.S. DDGS Sources vs. U.S. Soybean Meal Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>DDGS</th>
<th>Soybean Meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fat</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fiber</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysine</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methionine</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threonine</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryptophan</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Regression of digestible lys (%) and color (L*, b*)

Source: Dr. Sally Noll (2003)
Variation in Particle Size Among DDGS Samples Representing 25 U.S. Ethanol Plants
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Variation in Particle Size Among Soybean Meal Samples Representing 6 U.S. Plants 2003
Barriers for Increased DDGS Use in Swine Diets

- Controversy over palatability and negative effects on feed intake at high dietary inclusion rates
- Fast, accurate, and inexpensive *in vitro* methods to estimate amino acid digestibility among sources
- Net energy values
- Need for research and education to avoid confusion over new types of DDGS
Comparison of Nutrient Content of Dakota Gold DDGS with High Protein Dakota Gold (100% DM Basis)
Comparison of Amino Acid Content of Dakota Gold DDGS with High Protein Dakota Gold (100% DM Basis)
Ongoing Research Addressing Key Issues

- Impact of feeding diets containing DDGS with & without phytase on manure P excretion, and P chemistry in manure and soil
  - University of Minnesota

- P digestibility among DDGS sources
  - South Dakota State University

- Amino acid digestibility among a large number of diverse corn and sorghum DDGS sources
  - SDSU and U of MN

- Evaluation of *in vitro* procedures for predicting amino acid digestibility among DDGS sources
  - SDSU and U of MN

- Flowability
  - NCERC – Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville
  - AURI - Minnesota
We have developed a DDGS web site featuring:

* nutrient profiles and photos of DDGS samples
* research summaries
  - swine, poultry, dairy, & beef
  - DDGS quality
* presentations given
* links to other DDGS related web sites
* international audiences