



## Beneficial Microorganisms in Animal Production and environment

Th.A. Ezzulddin and Dh.M. Jwher\*

Department of Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Mosul, Mosul, Iraq

\*Corresponding Authors: Dh.M. Jwher, E-Mail: [Deea@gmx.us](mailto:Deea@gmx.us)

### ABSTRACT

The aim of this review was to demonstrate beneficial microorganisms in different areas of animal production, including large animals, poultry and fish. Microflora or beneficial microorganisms are well defined by several authors as "effective dietary supplement" which have beneficial effect on host's health. Comparative studies were carried out on several species of animals administered "Beneficial Microorganisms (BM)" active beneficial microorganism-had revealed a bundle of merits and advantages for the host as compared with the flora normally exist in the gastro-intestinal tract. The benefits include food supplementation as well as the protection of the host against pathologic agent. Moreover, BM act as a biological factor in modulation microbiome of the digestive system as well as the adjustment of the reaction with the environment and to create a useful development of immunity response. The use of effective organisms is a useful strategy that has a clear impact on improvement of growth and increase feed conversion efficiency and body weight ratio and health parameters in animals.

### Review Article:

DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.21608/javs.022.137968.11477>

Received :11 May, 2022.

Accepted :20 June, 2022.

Published in July, 2022

**Keywords:** Beneficial Microorganisms, food supplementation, microbiome, Microflora. *J. Appl. Vet. Sci., 7 (3) : 64-71.*

### INTRODUCTION

Recently, providing safe nourishment is a constant and increasing order from consumers. Therefore, modern supplements have been used to increase animal's production with no reverse consequence on human health (Higa, 1993). For a long time, medical drugs have been utilized in animal breeding as curative tools to handle exposure to microbes that decline animal production and give rise to diseases. However, according to the unfavorable outcomes of antibiotics on animals' health and human, because it remains in the meat and other products, the evolution of bacterial impedance, and growing concern in finding alternatives to antibiotics becomes a requirement (Edens, 2003). Beneficial microorganisms are treated as live helpful microbial feed and water additives that have a worthy impact on gut microflora equilibrium (Kabir *et al.*, 2005), immunity (Nayebpor *et al.*, 2007 and Apata, 2008), and serum lipids (Ignatova *et al.*, 2009). Furthermore, Awad *et al.*, (2009) demonstrated that BM improve feed efficiency, performance, manage the animal's intestines, also, decrease the feces odor.

The Danmap (1997) revealed that using lower doses of antibiotics in animal ration leads to rising resistance in zoonotic creatures. Over the world, the

discussion has cover this information, but The result of the research has led to a novel alteration in the method of animal feeding at present. In the year1999, the European countries prohibit the employment of several antibiotics responsible for growth-promoting in poultry rations. Later in the year 2006, the EU formally stopped the utilization of antibiotics as growth-assistance material in the feed of all animal types. Curative use of suitable antibiotics was permitted through medication only by specialists. So, the using beneficial microorganisms in the poultry enterprises is an option for animal growth boosters (Baiao and Lara, 2005).

### Definition of Beneficial Microorganisms:

Over time the term beneficial microorganisms have been utilized in different forms. BM name primarily described materials created by a protozoan (Lilly and Stillwell, 1965), however afterward employed to characterize animal feed complements that had a beneficial impact on animal performance by activating their Digestive flora (Parker, 1974). Higa, (1993) gives the term BM to "a culture of defined living beneficial microbes that are given to the livestock to assure the effectiveness of gut populations of beneficial microorganisms. A Live beneficial microorganisms feed addition has dramatically affected animals' performance by supporting the intestinal

microbial equilibrium. The United States National Food Component Association offered probiotics as the origin of live microorganisms formed from bacteria, yeast, and fungi (Miles and Bootwalla, 1991). The United States National Food Component Association offered probiotics as the origin of live microorganisms formed of bacteria, yeast, and fungi (Miles and Bootwalla, 1991). Beneficial Microorganisms was developed in Japan 30 years ago by Beneficial Microorganisms Research organization BMRO Japanese institute Kyushu University - Okinawa - Japan and is now a global technology with an enormous following around the world, formative in a liquid mixed culture made up of multiple beneficial microorganisms, which are divided into anaerobic and oxybiotic.

BM is composed of five groups of microorganisms: Lactic acid bacteria, Yeasts, Actinomycetes, Photosynthetic bacteria, and Fungi, with more than 80 strains (lactic acid bacilli(LAB), *Lac. Plantarum*; *Lac. casei*; *S. lactis*; photosynthetic bacteria: *R. sphaeroides*; *R. palustris*; yeast: *saccharomyces cerevisiae*; *Candida utilis torula*; *Pichia Jadinii*; Actinomycetes: *Streptomyces albus*; *S. griseus* and fermenting fungi: *Mucor hiemalis*; *Aspergillus oryzae* which has been carefully examined and assured guarantee for humans and animals, they are the basis for all multi-Kraft products, which are created by fermentation. the fermentation process of organic substances (such as herbs, sugar cane molasses) is happened by enzymes or microorganisms. The addition of microorganisms enables organic substances to be changed, which would be very difficult or even impossible to produce chemically (Higa, 1993).

The strength of BM is that it is a diverse combination of microbes, which will give it flexibility in terms of the vast scope of applications that it can use in and working by getting the natural processes as nature intended. The basic concept to understanding how microbes work is that they work as teams and rely on each other to perform individually to be effective as a combination (Kalbasiet *et al.*, 2006).

After entering animals' bodies as a feedstuff, these microbes can proliferate rapidly, they limit the development of other pathogenic microbes and create a natural microbial population within the gut to provide vital vitamins for the animal body, produce nutrients and stop the aggression of the harmful microbes (Li Wei-Jionge *et al.*, 1994); Kengo and Hui-lian 2000). More accurately, the probiotics are nonpathogenic and nontoxic live microorganisms that when have been given through the digestive system are beneficial to animal health (Guillot, 1998). Currently defined by

FAO/WHO (2001), probiotics are living microorganisms that if given in appropriate quantities award health to the animal body.

### **General description**

Lactic acid bacteria, phototrophic bacteria, and yeast, that formed the BM can ferment organic materials. Manure fermented and decomposed by BM is broken down in the soil and absorbed by plants. Also, BM includes plenty of elements to boost plant growth. In an aquatic environment, BM will decompose the sludge by fermentation and ease for other microorganisms and protozoans to live on the decomposition products (Jin *et al.*, 1996). BM possesses metabolites generated by several microorganisms that stimulate other microorganisms which earlier located in the soil and assist in diversifying the microbiome (Nahanshon *et al.*, 1996; Walker, 2000). Microorganisms shape the foundation of the environmental pyramid, so when microorganisms in soil are varied, the ecosystem in the ground could be improved in different ways, such as an increase in the number of earthworms. A healthy and diverse ecosystem will aid shape rich soil (Kalbasi *et al.*, 2006).

### **Mode of action of BM**

#### **1. Keeping natural intestinal microflora (Kizerwelter-swide and Binek, 2009) through:**

##### **1.1. Competitive exception**

Lactobacillus has the inadequate ability to stick to the inner surface of the intestine and differs among varieties and strains.

##### **1.2. Hostile vigor**

Lactobacillus's Hostile effectiveness versus various pathogenic microorganisms has correlated to the secretion of bacterial materials such as bacteriocins, hydrogen peroxides, and organic acids.

#### **2. Changing metabolic rate by rising digestive enzymes action and reducing pathogenic microbe's enzymes efficiency (Yoon *et al.*, 2004) through**

##### **2.1. Digestive enzyme efficiency**

Lactobacillus makes up the bulk of beneficial microorganisms. The BM has shown the ability of digestive enzymes production in vitro, and these enzymes may raise the concentration of the animal intestinal enzymes (Szylyt *et al.*, 1980), such as amylase, lipolytic, and proteolytic (Jin *et al.*, 1996).

##### **2.2. Enzymatic efficiency**

Goldin and Gordbach (1977) revealed that the effectiveness of nitroreductase, 3-glucuronidase, and azoreductase in the intestine of rats, could be decreased by feeding complementary of *L. acidophilus*,

similar effects obtained in humans. A remarkable depression in glucuronidase was noticed in chickens given 30% yogurt in the water (Coloe *et al.*, 1984).

### **2.3. Ammonia emission**

Reducing ammonia emission and urea's action can be useful for animal health and improving performance, as ammonia can induce harm to the superficies of cells. Chiang and Hsien (1995) assured that probiotics comprising *L. acidophilus*, *S. faecium*, and *B. subtilis* lower the ammonia emission from broiler feces.

### **3. Feed consumption and digestion improvement**

The gut flora of animals has a remarkable turn in the break down and absorption of feed. It takes part (Awad *et al.*, 2006) in the metabolism of the dietary components like proteins, carbohydrates, lipids, minerals, and vitamins synthesis. Nahanshon *et al.* (1996) mentioned that the supplement of BM to corn, soybean, and wheat diets prompted feed consumption and raised fat, nitrogen, phosphorus, calcium, manganese, and copper, detention in layer chicken.

### **4. Activation of the immune system. (Brisbin *et al.*, 2008)**

The immune response happened due to of exposure digestive canal to different antigens type, so the dietary protein is necessary for keeping animals versus enteric diseases (Perdigon *et al.*, 1995). Dunhan *et al.*, 1993) indicated that chicken handled with *L. reuteri* showed deeper crypts and longer ileal villi, this is a reaction linked with improved T cells mission and increasing formation of anti-Salmonella IgM antibodies. Nahanshon *et al.*, (1994) revealed activation of the mucosal immune system that reacted to antigenic stimuli by immunoglobulin (IgA) secretion.

## **Beneficial application of BM in Animal production**

### **1. Animal Husbandry**

The BM was efficiently used to reduce odor, decrease disease incidence, maintain livestock health, and Reduce ammonia emissions due to animals overcrowding (Dahal, 2006). BM decrease, the decomposition processes prevent the buildup of odors. BM can improve animal enclosure climate.

### **The yields of BM in animal welfare**

The advantage of employing BM products in animal welfare is that the different microorganisms found in BM and metabolites created by these microorganisms enhance the microflora in shelters and animals' bodies. Splashing BM inside the brans will raise the animal's hygiene. Also, the addition of BM

into their drinking water to repair the intestinal environment of animals will maintain them in good health. (Dahal, 2006).

## **2. Advantages of using BM products in animal breeding**

### **2.1. Amelioration of malodors**

BM could reduce accumulated odors from trimethylamine and ammonia of alkaline nature, while organic acids included in BM of acidic qualities, sprinkling BM will equalize them, and the aroma will have repressed quickly. Spraying BM orderly will settle beneficial bacteria, which will put down the increase of harmful bacteria. Also, adding BM to animals' feed will ameliorate their internal microbes and decrease the smell emissions from their feces (Dahal, 2006).

### **2.2. Reduction dosages of antiseptics and antibiotics**

Spraying BM on shelter ground, besides adding BM to diet, and drinking water for livestock will enhance the environment of the shelter, as well as the intestinal flora of the animals, and protect the soundness of the entire process. Therefore, BM will minimize the usage of antiseptics and antibiotics to prevent diseases (Safalaoh and Smith 2001).

### **2.3. Stress Reduction**

Animal health is affected by stress, which leads to suppressing maturing, increasing morbidity rates, and generating a decrease in economic output. Spraying BM inside shelters can improve the animal's environment, by minimizing orders and reducing the digit of insects (Dahal 2006).

### **2.4. BM for increased productivity**

Usage of BM orderly for livestock welfare will enhance animals' health, reduce the diseases happening and raise productivity. In animals breeding, the infection with diarrhea will decline growth rates and is one of the reasons for animal's mortality. Employing BM will adjust the intestinal environment and mend diarrhea. also, upgrade the digestion efficiency and improve feed conversion ratio (FCR), thereby raising animal's production (Jwher, *et al.*, 2013 and Dahal, 2006).

### **2.5. Improved animal products quality (meat, eggs, milk)**

As mentioned earlier, BM will improve malodor, in addition to the intestinal ambiance, thereby sustaining animal health and reducing the chance of disease incidence. Consequently, fat quality will get better, no abnormal meat smell, the products will remain fresh for a more extended time and enhance the savor and products quality of livestock. Also, it reduces the employment of antibiotics and vaccines, thus

supporting securer production from the viewpoint of both clients and producers (Ouwehand, 1998; Dahal, 2006). Mohammad *et al.*, 2018, revealed that supplementing *Lactobacillus* spp. lead to improving the milk production, milk fat contents, health of dairy cows, lowering the production wages, and reducing odor inside animals' houses. The economic estimation for utilizing BM in dairy farms implies that BM is an inexpensive product and can achieve profitably on dairy farms.

In another investigation done by Deribe *et al.*, (2017) on the impact of the supplement of beneficial microorganisms (BM) on lambs growth fed on minimum protein rate, the researcher gained lambs of heavier weight. The productivity evaluated in this trial is valuable for the livelihood of small-scale breeders. So, 5% BM could have applied as a financially profitable percentage for lambs fed on a low protein ratio under smallholder breeders' management conditions. In another work carried on goats in Nepal, it was concluded that the use of BM had an essential role in improving the quality of feed, which in turn reflected on performance (Dahal, 2006).

## **2.6. Further advantages**

### **2.6.1. Composting of livestock manure**

Utilizing Beneficial Microorganisms products decreased odor so make it simpler to manage manure. Beneficial Microorganisms also accelerate up fermentation and compost production, due to the fast feces' dryness time. Also, using BM enables to manufacture of high-efficiency manure which has a soil-improvement impact (Taher, 2009; Zuraini *et al.*, 2010).

### **2.6.2. Fix drainage problems and improve wastewater treatment**

Animals' manure sprayed with BM, will be of less odor, and spoilage suppressed, which makes wastewater handling achieved effectively. Also, running BM into septic tanks will elevate refining. Besides, BM raises the decomposition of wastewater, reduces sludge, and effectively employs slurry (Karthick Raja *et al.*, 2011).

## **2.6.3. poultry production**

### **2.6.3.1. Growth performance**

Many investigations assure that BM has favorable influences on chicken productivity, the addition of either mix of BM containing *Lactobacilli* cultures or a blend of *Lactobacilli* and other microorganisms to broilers' ration as shown fluctuating effects, where Mohan *et al.*, (1995) and Jwher *et al.*, (2013) revealed that chicken weight increased by 6 % to 10 % when their feed provided with BM including a

blend of *Bifidobacterium bifidum*, *L. acidophilus*, and *L. Casei*. A report by (Jin *et al.*, 1996b) mentioned that using *Lactobacilli* in chicks' feed under a humid and hot environment resulted in significantly better feed efficiency and higher weight gain. Yeo and Kim (1997) assured that chicken feed having BM leads to increased average daily weight gain and higher feed consumption (Zulkifli *et al.*, 2000). Kalavathy *et al.*, (2003) confirmed that a blend of 12 *Lactobacillus* varieties significantly improved daily weight gain, body weight, and feed efficiency. Huang *et al.*, (2004) and Jwher *et al.*, (2013) mentioned that *Lactobacillus acidophilus* addition resulted in an improvement in broiler chickens' productivity.

### **2.6.3.2. Mortality average**

Abd-Elsamee and Abd El-Hakim (2002) found no mortalities when BM was added based on *Lactobacillus* culture over the testing interval. Eglal (2006) mentioned that the mortality ratio declined in broiler chicks provided with BM as a probiotic-based on *Lactobacillus* culture. While Zulkifli *et al.*, (2000) indicated that broiler chicks given a feed including *Lactobacillus* culture (1gm/kg feed) had no impact on mortality rate.

### **2.6.3.3. -Performance index**

Numerous researchers demonstrated that the usage of BM in drinking water improved feed efficiency, feed consumption, and entire body weight (Jwher *et al.*, 2013).

### **2.6.3.4. Modifying intestinal microbes**

Fuller, (1977) noticed that host-specific *Lactobacillus* varieties can reduce *E. coli* in the digestive canal of chicken. Francis *et al.*, (1978) assured that the supplemented *Lactobacillus* varieties at 75 mg per 1kg of ration declined the pathogen enumerations in the turkey's gut and ceca. Also, the usage of BM in drinking water has a Clear effect on increasing goblet cell count, crypts depth, and villi height (Jwher *et al.*, 2013).

### **2.6.3.5. Immune reaction**

Havenaar and Spanhaak (1994) and Dahal, (2006) have mentioned that BM promotes poultry immunity in two methods:

Probiotics flora emigrates throughout the gut and reproduces for a short period, absorption of antigens that are emitted from the dead organisms, therefore promoting the immune system. Also, the advancement of the immune system happened in three ways: Improved production of antibodies of interferon, IgM, and IgG. Promote macrophage vigor and increase the power of microorganism's Phagocytose, and rise number of domestic antibodies at the interior mucosal surface, like the gut coliforms suppression by the

digestive wall flora. The use of BM led to an increase in relative weights of spleen, thymus, and bursa of Fabricius. Increased lymphocyte percentage of necropsied birds (Jwher *et al.*, 2013).

#### **2.6.3.6. Serum cholesterol, triglycerides and total lipids**

A report by (Jin *et al.*, 1998) mentioned that blood cholesterol was remarkably minimized in broilers chicken given feed having lactobacillus cultures at 3-4 weeks of feeding. (El-Gendy, 1993) revealed that broiler fed on ration included yeast as a probiotic-based on lactobacilli had a notable influence on blood cholesterol and triglyceride.

#### **2.6.3.7. The chemical composition of carcass**

Increasing interest noticed over the last years in the modification of the fatty acid composition and cholesterol level in poultry meat and eggs due to the spread of cardiovascular heart and blood pressure diseases are related to the diet rich in saturated fat and cholesterol contents (Sacks, 2002). There is a crucial requirement to go back to equiponderant fatty acid food by reducing the consumption of saturated fats and cholesterol (Evans *et al.*, 2002). There is a possibility to minimize lipids content in poultry meat throughout the feeding on high-quality feed (Wang *et al.*, 2005).

#### **2.6.4. BM in fish**

The results of several studies showed the great BM on the hygienic status of the fish (Stephens *et al.*, 2015). It follows that these bacteria may form a fraction of the intestinal microflora, hence it may serve as a substitution to decrease the application of antibiotics in fish farms (Ismail and Alhamdani 2019). The supplementation of these organisms may aid in the restoring of the disturbed and abnormal microflora to their healthy situation (Liu *et al.*, 2016). It is worthy to say that the effect of BM in fish farms does not include their impacts on the intestinal tract but also in improving fish hygiene. The health development can be attributed to the modulation of BM on the causative agents as well as their ability to improve water quality by the adjustment of the various microbes in the water and sediment (Verschuere *et al.*, 2000).

### **CONCLUSION**

The employment of beneficial microorganisms can contribute extensively to the general progress in our condition of health and support this in many ways: by providing good environmental protection and assuring an economical food supply of safe and high-quality, through its benefits in agriculture and animal production by cracking problems of environmental pollution using big-scale recycling processes, which

would reduce oppressive use of our valuable natural resources; and, ultimately, by improving our capability to heal ourselves.

#### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### **REFERENCES**

- ABD-ELSAMEE, M. O. and ABD-ELHAKIM, A. S. 2002. Performance of broiler chicks as affected by using poultry by-product meal and probiotic supplementation. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 22, 745-761. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1068.2356&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- APATA, D. F. 2008. Growth performance, nutrient digestibility and immune response of broiler chicks fed diets supplemented with a culture of *Lactobacillus bulgaricus*. J. Sci. Food Agric., 88, 1253-1258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.3214>
- AWAD, W. A., BOHM, J., RAZAZI-FAZELI, E., GHAREEB, K. and ZENTEK, J. 2006. Effect of addition of a probiotic microorganism to broiler diets contaminated with deoxynivalenol on performance and histological alterations of intestinal villi of broiler chickens. Poult. Sci., 85, 974-979. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/85.6.974>
- AWAD, W. A., GHAREEB, K., ABDEL-RAHEEM, S. and BOHM, J. 2009. Effect of dietary inclusion of probiotic and symbiotic on growth performance, organ weights and intestinal histomorphology of broiler chickens. Poult. Sci., 88, 1, 49-56. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2008-00244>
- BAIAO, N. S. and LARA, L. J. 2005. Oil and fat in broiler nutrition, Brazilian J. of poul.Sc., 7, 192-141. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1516-635x2005000300001>
- BRISBIN, J. T., ZHOU, H.; GONG, J., SABOUR, P., AKBARI, M. R., HAGHIGHI, H. R., YU, H., CLARKE, A., SARSON, A. J. and SHARIF, S. 2008. Gene expression profiling of chicken lymphoid cells after treatment with *Lactobacillus acidophilus* cellular components. Dev. Comp. Immunol., 32, 563-574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2007.09.003>
- CHIANG, S. H. and HSIEM, W. M. 1995. Effect of direct feed microorganisms on broiler growth performance and litter ammonia level. Asian-Australian J. Anim. Sci., 8, 159-162. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.1995.159>
- COLOE, P. J.; BAGUST, T. J. AND IRELAND, L. 1984. Development of the normal gastrointestinal micro-flora of specific pathogenfree chickens. J. of Hygiene., 92, 79-87. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022172400064056>
- DAHAL, B.K. 2006. Effective Microorganism (EM) for Animal Production. In International Conference on Kyusei Nature Farming (Vol. 6, pp. 156-162). <http://www.infric.or.jp/knf/PDF%20KNF%20Conf%20Data/C6-3-227.pdf>
- DANMAP, 1997. Use of antimicrobial agents and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria from food animals, foods and humans in Denmark. [https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/140535625/DANMAP\\_2016\\_LOW\\_241017.pdf](https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/140535625/DANMAP_2016_LOW_241017.pdf)



- DERIBE, G., SHIMELIS, M., FITSUM, T., MELESE, Y., SHEWANGIZAW, W. and TEWODROS, G. 2017. Effect of Inclusion Rate of Effective Microbes (Em) On Growth Rate of Lambs Fed Low Protein Diet. *Biomed J Sci & Tech Res* 1(6). <https://doi.org/10.26717/bjstr.2017.01.000517>
- DUNHAN, H. J., WILLIAMS, C., EDENS, F. W., CASAS, I. A. and DOBROGOSZ, W. J. 1993. *Lactobacillus reuteri* immune modulation of stress-associated diseases in newly hatched chickens and turkeys. *Poult. Sci.*, 72 (2), 103-104. [https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/140535625/DANMAP\\_2016\\_LOW\\_241017.pdf](https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/140535625/DANMAP_2016_LOW_241017.pdf)
- EDENS, F. W. 2003. An alternative for antibiotic use in poultry: probiotics. *Rev. Bras. Cienc. Avic.* 5:(2)3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1516-635x2003000200001>
- EGLAL, A. 2006. Studies on productive performance and some physiological parameters in broiler chicks. Ph.D. thesis, faculty of Agriculture, Moshtohor, benha university. Egypt. <https://inis.iaea.org/collection/NCLCollectionStore/Public/46/066/46066325.pdf>
- EL-GENDY, H. 1993. Effect of adding vegetable oils to the diet on the performance on rabbits. *Egyptian J. of Rabbit Sci.*, 3, 103-111. [http://www.esnsaeg.com/download/researchFiles/\(8\)%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%2011%20-%202015%20%20.pdf](http://www.esnsaeg.com/download/researchFiles/(8)%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%2011%20-%202015%20%20.pdf)
- EVANS, M. ROBERTS, A. and REES, A. 2002. The future direction of cholesterol-lowering therapy. *Curr. Opin. Lipidol.*, 13, 663-669. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00041433-200212000-00010>
- FAO/WHO. 2001. Health and nutritional properties of probiotics in food including powder milk with live lactic acid bacteria. Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Evaluation of Health and Nutritional Properties of Probiotics in Food Including Powder Milk with Live Lactic Acid Bacteria; FAO/WHO: Amerian Córdoba Park Hotel, Córdoba, Argentina; pp. 1-34. [http://www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/fs\\_management/en/probiotics.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/fs_management/en/probiotics.pdf?ua=1)
- FRANCIS, C., JANKY, D. M., ARAFAM A. S. and HARMS, R. H. 1978. Interrelationship of *Lactobacillus* and zinc bacitracin in diets of turkey poults. *Poult. Sci.*, 57, 1687-1689. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0571687>
- FULLER, R. 1977. The importance of *Lactobacillus* in maintaining normal microbial balance in the crop. *Br. Poult. Sci.*, 18, 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071667708416332>
- GOLDIN, B.R. and GORBACH, S. L. 1977. Alternations in fecal micro-flora enzymes related to diet, age, *Lactobacillus* supplements and dimethylhydrazine. *J. National Cancer Institute.*, 40, 2421-2426. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0142\(197711\)40:5+<2421::aid-cncr2820400905>3.0.co:2-i](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0142(197711)40:5+<2421::aid-cncr2820400905>3.0.co:2-i)
- GUILLOT, J.F. 1998. Les probiotiques en alimentation animale. *Cah. Agric.*, 7, 49-54. <https://revues.cirad.fr/index.php/cahiers-agricultures/article/view/30066/29826>
- HAVENAAR, R. and SPANHAAK, S. 1994. Probiotics from an immuno-logical point of view. *Curr. Opin. Biotech.*, 5, 320-325. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0958-1669\(94\)90036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0958-1669(94)90036-1)
- HIGA, T. 1993. Revolution for Helping World. Sukjai publishing, Bangkok. 199. <https://www.amazon.in/Food-Revolution-Your-Diet-World/dp/1573244872>
- HUANG, M. K., CHOI, Y. J., HOUEDE, R., LEE, J. W., LEE, B. and ZHAO, X. 2004. Effects of *Lactobacilli* and an *acidophilic* fungus on the production performance and immune responses in broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.*, 83, 788-795. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/83.5.788>
- IGNATOVA, M., SREDKOVA, V., and MARASHEVA, V. 2009. Effect of dietary inclusion of probiotic on chicken performance and some blood indices. *Biotech. in Anim. husbandry.*, 25, 1029-1085. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.900.1285&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- ISMAIL, R., ALHAMDANI, A. (2019). Effect of probiotic (Poultrystar®) and heat stress on some blood parameters in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio L.*). *Iraqi J Vet Sci.* 33(2):221-225. <https://doi.org/10.33899/ijvs.2019.125539.1061>
- JIN, L.Z., HO, Y.W., ABDULLAH, N. and JALALUDIN, S. 1996a. Influence of dried *Bacillus subtilis* and *Lactobacilli* culture on intestinal micro-flora and performance in broilers. *Asian-Australian J. Anim. Sci.*, 9, 397-404. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.1996.397>
- JIN, L.Z., HO, Y.W., ABDULLAH, N. and JALALUDIN, S. 1996b. Effect of *Lactobacillus* culture on the digestive enzymes in chicken intestine. *Proceedings of the 8th Anim. Sci. Congress, Tokyo, Chiba, Japan*, pp. 224-225.
- JIN, L.Z., HO, Y.W., ABDULLAH, N. and JALALUDIN, S. 1998. Growth performance, intestinal microbial populations, and serum cholesterol of broilers fed diets containing *Lactobacillus* cultures. *Poult. Sci.*, 77, 1259-1265. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/77.9.1259>
- JWHER, DH.M.T., and S.K. AND MOHAMMAD, A.G. 2013. The study of using effective microorganisms (EM) on health and performance of broiler chicks. *Iraqi Journal of Veterinary Sciences*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 2013 (73-78). <https://doi.org/10.33899/ijvs.2013.82784>
- JWHER, DH. M. and AL-SARHAN, M. R. 2022. Evaluation the Role of Effective Microorganisms (EM) on the Growth Performance and Health Parameters on Common Carp (*Cyprinus carpio L.*). *Journal of Applied Veterinary Sciences*, 7 (2): 46- 52. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21608/javs.2022.122809.112>
- KABIR, S.M.L., RAHMAN, M.M., RAHMAN, M.B., HOSAIN, M.Z., AND, AK, M.S.I. AND DAS, S.K. 2005. Viability of probiotics in balancing intestinal flora and effecting histological changes of crop and caecal tissues of broilers. *Biotech.*, 4, 325-330. <https://docsdrive.com/pdfs/ansinet/biotech/2005/325-330.pdf>
- KALAVATHY, R., ABDULLAH, N., JALALUDIN, S., WONG, M.C.V.L. and HO, Y.W. 2006. Effects of *Lactobacillus* feed supplementation on cholesterol, fat content and fatty acid composition of the liver, muscle and carcass of broiler chickens. *Anim. Research.*, 55,

77-82.

<https://animres.edpsciences.org/articles/animres/pdf/2006/01/z204059.pdf>

- KALBASI, A., MUKHTAR, S., HAWKINS, S.E. and AUVERMANN, B.W. 2006.** Design, Utilization, Bioscurity, Environmental and Economic Consideration of Carcass Composting. Compost Science and Utilization, Vol.14 NO2:90-102. <https://agrilife.org/envsys/files/2016/03/Kalbasi-et-al.-2006.pdf>
- KARTHICK RAJA, S. NAMSIVAYAM. G. NARENDRAKUMAR and ARVIND KUMAR J. 2011.** Evaluation of Effective Microorganism (EM) for treatment of domestic sewage, Journal of Experimental Sciences Vol. 2, Issue 7, Pages 30-32. [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Evaluation-of-Effective-Microorganism-\(EM\)-for-of-Namsivayam-Narendrakumar/85b826988f2a6bd5804c1b90522290108f4f3221](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Evaluation-of-Effective-Microorganism-(EM)-for-of-Namsivayam-Narendrakumar/85b826988f2a6bd5804c1b90522290108f4f3221)
- KENGO, Y. and HUI-LIAN, X. 2000.** Properties and applications of an organic fertilizer inoculated with effective microorganisms. Journal of Crop production, 3(1): 255-268. [https://doi.org/10.1300/j144v03n01\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1300/j144v03n01_21)
- KIZERWETTER-SWIDA, M. and BINEK, M. 2009.** Protective effect of potentially probiotic Lactobacillus strain on infection with pathogenic bacteria in chickens. Pol. J. Vet. Sci., 12, 15-20. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19459435/>
- LI WEI-JIONGE 1994.** Effect of EM on crop and animal husbandry in China. In Proceedings of the 3rd Conference On E M Technology, 16-19th, Nov, 1994. <https://www.emturkey.com.tr/>
- LILLY, D.M. and STILLWELL, R.H. 1965.** Probiotics: Growth promoting factors produced by microorganisms. Sci., 147, 747-748. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.147.3659.747>
- LIN, H., GUO, X., GOONERATNE, S.R., LAI, R., ZENG, C., ZHAN, F., WANG, W. (2016).** The gut microbiome and degradation enzyme activity of wild freshwater fishes influenced by their trophic levels. Sci. Rep. (1)6:240 243. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24340>
- MILES, R.D. and BOOTWALLA, S.M. 1991.** Direct-fed microbials in animal production. A review; national food ingredient association: West Des Moines, Iowa, USA, pp. 117-132. <https://lpec.org/direct-fed-microbial-products-dfm/#:~:text=The%20concept%20of%20Direct%20Fed,this%20category%20of%20feed%20additives.>
- MOHAN, B., KADIRVEL, R., NATARAJAN, A. and BHASKARAN, M. 1996.** Effect of probiotic supplementation on growth, nitrogen utilization and serum cholesterol in broilers. Briti. Poult. Sci., 37, 395-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071669608417870>
- MOHAMED, M., AMARASINGHE, A., and NAYANANJALIE, W. 2018.** Use of Effective Microorganisms in Dry Zone Dairy Farms in Sri Lanka. International Journal of Livestock Research, 8(4), 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.5455/ijlr.20171019045459>
- NAHANSHON, S.N., NAKAUE, H.S. and MIROSH, L.W. 1994.** Performance of Single Comb White Leghorn laying pullets fed diets supplemented with direct - fed microbials. Poult. Sci., 73, 1699-1711. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0731699>
- NAHANSHON, S.N., NAKAUE, H.S. and MIROSH, L.W. 1996.** Performance of Single Comb White Leghorn layers fed with a live microbial during the growth and egg laying phases. Anim. Sci. and Techno., 57, 25-38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401\(95\)00852-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401(95)00852-7)
- NAYEBPOR, M., FARHOMAND, P. and HASHEMI, A. 2007.** Effects of different levels of direct fed microbial (Primalac) on growth performance and humoral immune response in broiler chickens. J. Anim. Vet. Adv., 6, 1308-1313. <https://www.primalac.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Nayebpour-Broiler-Iran.pdf>
- Ouwehand, A 1998.** Antimicrobial components from lactic acid bacteria. In Lactic acid bacteria Microbiology and Functional Aspects ed Salminen, S Von Wright A., pp.139-159. New York:Marcel Dekker Inc.
- PARKER, R.B. 1974.** Probiotics, the other half of the antibiotics story. Anim. Nutr. Health., 29, 4-8. [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(vtj3fa45qm1ean45wffcz5%205\)\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=3035534](https://www.scirp.org/(S(vtj3fa45qm1ean45wffcz5%205))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=3035534)
- PERDIGON, G., ALAVARES, S., RACHID, M., AGUERO, G. and GOBBATO, N. 1995.** Immune system stimulation by probiotics. J. Dairy Sci., 78, 1597-1606. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302\(95\)76784-4](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302(95)76784-4)
- SACKS, F.M. 2002.** The role of high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol in the prevention and treatment of coronary heart disease. Am. J. Cardiol., 15, 139-143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9149\(02\)02436-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9149(02)02436-0)
- SAFALAOH, A.C.L. and SMITH, G.A. 2001.** Effective Microorganisms (EM) as an alternative to antibiotics in broiler diets. effect on broiler performance, feed utilization and serum cholesterol. In Proceedings of The 6th International Conference On Kyusei Nature Farming, South Africa, 1999.
- STEPHENS, W.Z., BURNS, A.R., STAGAMAN, K., WONG, S., RAWLS, J.F., GUILLEMIN, K., BOHANNAN, B.J.M. (2016).** The composition of the zebrafish intestinal microbial community varies across development. ISME J. 1(10) 644-654. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4817687/pdf/ismej2015140a.pdf>
- SZYELIT, O., CHAMP, M., AIT-ABDELKADER, N. and RAIBAUD, P. 1980.** Role of five Lactobacillus strains on carbohydrate degradation in monoxenic chickens. Reproduction, Nutrition, Development., 20, 1701-1706. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6984203/>
- TAHER, D.M. and TABBAA, D. 2009.** Comparison normal composting with composting using effective microorganisms for poultry carcasses disposal in poultry farms Journal of Vet. Science 2 (23);127-131. <https://doi.org/10.33899/ijvs.2009.5736>
- WALKERM W.A. 2000.** Role of nutrients and bacterial colonization in the development of intestinal host defense. J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr. 30: S2-S7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005176-200000002-00002>
- WANG, J.J., PAN, T.M. and SHIEH, M.J. 2006.** Effect of red mold rice supplements on serum and meat cholesterol levels of broiler chicken. Journal of Applied Microbiology. 71, 812-818. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-005-0222-4>

- VERSCHUERE, L., ROMBAUT, G., SORGELOOS, P., VERSTRAETE, W. (2000).** Probiotic bacteria as biological control agents in aquaculture. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev.* 64:655-71.  
<https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.64.4.655-671.2000>
- YEO, J. and KIM, K. 1997.** Effect of feeding diets containing an antibiotic, a probiotic or yucca extract on growth and intestinal unease activity in broiler chicks. *Poult. Sci.*, 76, 623-385.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/76.2.381>
- YOON, C., NA, C.S., PARK, J.H., HAN, S.K., NAM, Y.M. and KWON, J.T. 2004.** Effect of feeding multiple probiotics on performance and fecal noxious gas emission in broiler chicks. *Kor. J. Poult. Sci.*, 3, 229-235.  
<https://www.koreascience.or.kr/article/JAKO200430710410176.pdf>
- ZULKIFLI, J., ABDULLAH, N., AZRIM, N.M. and HO, Y.W. 2000.** Growth performance and immune response of two commercial broilers strains fed diet containing lactobacillus culture and oxytetracycline under heat stress conditions. *Br. Poult. Sci.*, 41, 593-597.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/713654979>
- ZURAINI, Z., SANJAY, G. and NORESAH. M. 2010.** Effective Microorganism (EM) technology for water quality restoration and potential for sustainable water resources and management. *Proceedings of the International Congress on Environmental Modelling and Software Modelling for Environment's Sake, Fifth Biennial Meeting held between 5th- 8th July 2010, Ontario Canada.*  
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2493&context=iemssconference>

**How to cite this article:**

**Th.A. Ezzulddin and Dh.M. Jwher, 2022.** Beneficial Microorganisms in Animal Production and environment. *Journal of Applied Veterinary Sciences*, 7 (3): 64– 71.

**DOI:**<https://dx.doi.org/10.21608/javs.2022.137968.11477>