Short- and medium-chain fatty acids as a feed supplement for weaning and nursery pigs
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Abstract

The effect of supplementing piglet diets with acidifiers containing the short-chain fatty acids – SCFA (propionic C₃ and formic) together with medium-chain fatty acids – MCFA (caprylic C₈ and capric C₁₀) on performance, nutrient apparent digestibility, intestinal microflora and small intestine structure was investigated. The study was performed on 326 piglets allocated to 5 experimental groups. They were fed a standard diet (Group I – control) or a standard diet supplemented with 0.5% propionic and formic acids (Group II – PF). Group III (PF + C₈), group IV (PF + C₁₀) and group V (PF + C₈ + C₁₀) received the same mixture as group II with a supplement of 0.2% of caprylic and/or capric acids, respectively. Apparent digestibility of nutrients and microbiological analyses were performed. The structure of jejunum mucosa was also examined. Piglets receiving capric acid (groups IV and V) had the highest body weight gains. Piglets receiving MCFA digested protein and fiber better (P ≤ 0.05) than piglets receiving SCFA as acidifier. There was no difference in intestinal microflora except for *Clostridium perfringens*, the population of which was reduced by SCFA (group II). Villi of the mucosal epithelium were the highest (P ≤ 0.05) in piglets receiving SCFA with capric acid (group IV). Under the conditions of this study a mixture of SCFA (propionic and formic) with capric acid significantly improves performance of piglets.
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Introduction

Weaning is the most dangerous time in a piglet’s life. During this period, the intestinal tract and immune system of piglets are not fully developed (Bailey et al. 2005), which makes them easy targets for microorganisms which induce gastrointestinal pathologies (Castillo et al. 2006). They also have to adapt to the new stressful conditions which are associated with reduced feed consumption, temporary malnutrition...
and growth retardation (Lalles et al. 2004). Antibiotic
growth promoters were used to prevent these prob-
lems but they were banned by the European Union
several years ago (Anadón, 2006).

Different agents are proposed to prevent piglet
gastrointestinal disorders, among them short-chain
fatty acids (SCFA), used for many years as antimic-
robial acidifiers (Partanen and Mroz 1999). Gedek et
al. (1992) found that the antimicrobial activity of
fumaric acid is higher than that of hydrochloric acid
or antibiotic tylosine. Medium-chain fatty acids
(MCFA) are another type of organic acid which could
be considered as antibiotic replacers as they have
strong antibacterial activity against Gram-positive
cocci (Bergsson et al. 2001) and Escherichia coli
(Skrivanowa et al. 2009). Apart from this antimic-
robial activity they can also improve postweaning gut
development (Tang et al. 1999). Such positive changes
(greater villus height) may result in improved per-
formance of piglets, as was found in our previous
study (Hanczakowska et al. 2011a).

Research hypothesis: Short chain fatty acids have
a positive effect on piglet performance. This effect
can be enhanced by the addition of medium chain
fatty acids.

The aim of this study was to determine possible
synergistic effects enhancing the positive effect of
both dietary SCFA (propionic C₃ and formic) mixed
with MCFA (caprylic C₈ and capric C₁₀) on piglet
health and performance, apparent digestibility of nu-
trients, intestinal microflora and structure of mucosal
epithelium of the small intestine.

Materials and Methods

All procedures included in this study, relating to
the use of live animals, were accepted by the II Local
Ethics Committee for Experiments with Animals in
Krakow, Poland.

Animals, housing and management

The study was performed on 326 weaning and
nursery pigs derived from 30 Polish Landrace × Large
White Polish sows mated with Devon × Pietrain boars.
All sows were in their 3rd or 4th parity. The trial started
at 7 days of piglet age and lasted until 84 days of age.
The piglets were weaned at 35 days of age. All animals
were kept in groups in straw bedded pens (one litter
per pen), and had free access to water. During the study
all piglets were individually weighed at 1, 35, 56
and 84 days of age and the daily weight gains were
 calculated for every piglet. At 56 days of age six pig-
lets were randomly chosen from each group (i.e. one
animal from each litter) and slaughtered. Their intesti-
tines were prepared and digesta from the small intesti-
ne (jejunum) was taken for microbiological analysis.

Between 56 and 70 days of age, randomly selected
piglets from the growth study (10-12 animals from
each group) were used for the digestibility trial. Ap-
parent digestibility of nutrients was estimated using
the indicator method with Cr₂O₃ (3.0 g/kg). The adap-
tation period lasted 10 days and the balance period
5 days. Feces from one litter were collected once a day
and frozen at -20°C. At the end of the collection peri-
od all daily feces were mixed together and an average
sample was prepared for each litter.

Design of experiment

The piglets were allocated to 5 groups with differ-
ent treatment. The design of the experiment was as
follows: Group I (control) – standard feed mixture;
Group II (PF) – standard mixture supplemented with
0.5% of 1:1 w/w ratio mixture of propionic and formic
acids. Group III (PF + C₈), Group IV (PF + C₁₀) and
Group V (PF + C₈ + C₁₀) received the same mixture
as Group II but supplemented with 0.2% of caprylic
(C₈) or 0.2% of capric (C₁₀) acid or 0.2% of 1:1 w/w
ratio mixture of caprylic and capric acids (C₈ + C₁₀),
respectively. All acids were supplied by Sigma Al-
drich.

Diets and treatments

The experimental feed mixture was based on
soybean, wheat, barley and milk products. It was fed
ad libitum from the 7th day of age to weaning (day 35).
Rationed feeding was used from weaning to the end
of the experiment (day 84), according to the scheme:
35-42 days of age – 0.2 kg of feed per litter; 43-49 days
of age – 0.4 kg; 50-56 days of age – 0.6 kg; 57-63 days
of age – 0.8 kg; 64-70 days of age – 1.0 kg; 71-84 days
of age – 1.25 kg. Diets contained 205 g of protein and
12.65 MJ EM per kg.

Microbiological analyses

Microbiological tests were made in cecum and
small intestine digesta. The number of Escherichia
coli and Clostridium sp. was determined. The presence
of yeasts and molds was also estimated. The tests were
carried out using plate methods with agar medium by

Histological analysis

Samples from the small intestines were spread on polystyrene plates and fixed in 10% buffered formalin. The intestinal wall was precisely cut and four slides were prepared from each sample. They were stained with hematoxylin and eosin and embedded in paraffin. Villus height and crypt depth were evaluated using a light microscope. Data acquisition was performed with a Zeiss Axioscop microscope (Zeiss GmbH, Germany) and CDD ZVS-47DE camera (Optronics Inc., USA) connected by RGB line with a graphic card GraBIT PCI (Soft Imaging System GmbH, Germany) installed in a standard PC computer.

Chemical analyses

Gross composition of feeds and feces was analyzed according to AOAC (2005). Chromium content in feed and feces was determined after a nitric acid × perchloric acid wet ash preparation (AOAC, 2005). Apparent digestibility coefficients (ADC) were calculated using the following equation:

\[
ADC(\%) = 100 - \left[100 \times \frac{a}{b} \times \frac{c}{d}\right]
\]

where: \(a\) = chromium content in feed (%), \(b\) = chromium content in feces (%), \(c\) = nutrient content in feces (%), \(d\) = nutrient content in feed (%).

Acidity of stomach, ileum, and cecum contents was measured with a CP-411 pH meter (Elmetron, Zabrze, Poland) equipped with a Metron 12-01 electrode (Metron, Torun, Poland). Volatile fatty acids (VFA) in the ileum and cecum digesta were separated on a CP-Wax 58 column (Varian BV, Middelburg, the Netherlands) (25 m, 0.53 mm, 1 m, carrier gas – helium, 6 ml/min), with a column oven temperature program from 90 to 200°C, using a Varian 3400 gas chromatograph (Varian Associates Inc., Walnut Creek, USA) equipped with a Varian 8200 CX autosampler (2000 C), FID detector (2600 C), and Star Chromatography Workstation Software.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of treatment effects was conducted by analysis of variance with comparisons of means using Duncan’s multiple range test at \(P \leq 0.05\) and \(P \leq 0.01\) levels of significance using the Statistica v 5.1 package.

Results

Mean body weight of piglets at the beginning of the study (7th day of age) were in the range of 2.62 to 2.79 kg (Table 1). At the end of the study piglets receiving acidifiers had significantly (\(P \leq 0.05\)) higher body mass than those of the control group. Differences between group II, obtaining SCFA alone, and groups obtaining SCFA with MCFA were not significant. There was also no significant difference in the number of culled piglets between particular groups. Groups with mixed acidifiers (III, IV and V) grew faster than the control and SCFA groups (\(P \leq 0.05\)) until weaning and also during the following three weeks. In the last period of the experiment (56-84 days of age) none of the acids used had any effect on piglet body weight gain. At the end of the experiment all piglets receiving MCFAD had higher body weight than that of the control (\(P \leq 0.05\)). Differences in feed conversion were significant (\(P \leq 0.05\)) only in the period between 35 and 56 days of age and between control group I and group III (PF + C8) receiving caprylic acid.

Piglets receiving MCFAD digested protein significantly (\(P \leq 0.05\)) better than those from groups with SCFA alone or without any acidifier (Table 2). Digestibility of fat was significantly (\(P \leq 0.05\)) higher in piglets receiving capric acid (PF + C10) and both MCFAD (PF + C8 + C10). Digestibility of fiber was also significantly higher in all MCFAD groups compared to control and SCFA groups.

Stomach contents of piglets from control and SCFA groups had a lower pH than the others (Table 3) and in the case of piglets receiving only propionic and formic (group II -PF) acids this difference was significant (\(P \leq 0.01\)). Some significant (\(P \leq 0.05\)) but irregular differences were also found in the jejunum contents. There was also no significant difference in the total content of volatile fatty acids in ileum or cecum contents between the control and experimental groups (Table 3). The total amount of these acids was much higher in the cecum than in the ileum. In the ileum the only significant difference (\(P \leq 0.01\)) was found for valeric and isovaleric acids and also for isobutyric acid (\(P \leq 0.05\)), the content of which were the highest in group II. Differences in cecum content, though significant in the case of butyric, isobutyric and valeric acids, were irregular.
### Table 1. Rearing indices of piglets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group I (control)</th>
<th>Group II (PF)</th>
<th>Group III (PF+C₈)</th>
<th>Group IV (PF+C₁₀)</th>
<th>Group V (PF+C₈+C₁₀)</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of piglets born</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No of piglets born per litter</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No of piglets weaned per litter</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No of piglets at 84th day per litter</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead piglets at 35 day, No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead piglets at 35 to 84, No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight (kg) in days of age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>7.45a</td>
<td>7.87ab</td>
<td>8.07b</td>
<td>8.20a</td>
<td>8.12ab</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th</td>
<td>10.82Aa</td>
<td>11.36Abb</td>
<td>13.06Cc</td>
<td>12.59Cbc</td>
<td>12.93Cc</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84th</td>
<td>21.85a</td>
<td>22.94Abb</td>
<td>24.00b</td>
<td>24.54Abb</td>
<td>24.27a</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily gain (g) in periods of life:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th – 35th</td>
<td>168Aa</td>
<td>182Abb</td>
<td>189Abb</td>
<td>195Abb</td>
<td>190Abb</td>
<td>2.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th – 56th</td>
<td>160Aa</td>
<td>166Aa</td>
<td>238Abb</td>
<td>209Abb</td>
<td>229Abb</td>
<td>6.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th – 84th</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>6.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th – 84th</td>
<td>294a</td>
<td>308ab</td>
<td>325ab</td>
<td>334b</td>
<td>329ab</td>
<td>5.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st – 84th</td>
<td>250a</td>
<td>264ab</td>
<td>275b</td>
<td>284a</td>
<td>281b</td>
<td>3.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion ratio (kg/kg) in periods of life:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th – 35th</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th – 56th</td>
<td>1.59b</td>
<td>1.44ab</td>
<td>1.07a</td>
<td>1.20ab</td>
<td>1.16ab</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th – 84th</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th – 84th</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th – 84th</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations: Mean values in the same row with different letters differ significantly at P ≤ 0.01 (A, B, C) or P ≤ 0.05 (a, b, c).

### Table 2. Apparent digestibility coefficients of nutrients, % (based on 4 litters per group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group I (control)</th>
<th>Group II (PF)</th>
<th>Group III (PF+C₈)</th>
<th>Group IV (PF+C₁₀)</th>
<th>Group V (PF+C₈+C₁₀)</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry matter</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein</td>
<td>72.6Aa</td>
<td>73.3Aa</td>
<td>76.5Abb</td>
<td>78.5Abb</td>
<td>76.3Abb</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fat</td>
<td>30.6c</td>
<td>33.9gbc</td>
<td>31.03c</td>
<td>39.9g</td>
<td>39.3g</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fiber</td>
<td>20.5a</td>
<td>21.1Aa</td>
<td>35.3bc</td>
<td>33.1Bbc</td>
<td>28.4Abb</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-free extract</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations: Mean values in the same row with different letters differ significantly at P ≤ 0.01 (A, B) or P ≤ 0.05 (a, b, c).

Significant differences were found only in the intestinal population of *Clostridium perfringens* (Table 4), which was significantly (P ≤ 0.01) lowered by supplement of formic and propionic acids when compared with both groups fed caprylic or capric acids alone. No significant difference was observed in intestinal content of *Escherichia coli*, yeasts and molds.

The results of epithelium structure estimation are shown in Table 5. Villi of the mucosa epithelium of piglets receiving caprylic acid (PF + C₁₀) were higher than those from control and SCFA groups (P ≤ 0.01) and also from the remaining groups receiving MCFA (P ≤ 0.05). Crypts were deepest (P ≤ 0.01) in the epithelium of piglets in the control group.

**Discussion**

Partanen et al. (2007) found a beneficial effect from a mixture of formic and propionic acids on piglet performance. However, according to Kabara et al. (1972) the effect of these acids is not as strong as that of MCFA; thus, mixing SCFA with MCFA should produce better results. In our earlier study (Hanczakowska et al. 2011b) with dicarboxylic fumaric acid we found such an improvement only in the case of caprylic, but not capric, acid. This could be due to better digestibility of protein, which in turn was the result of higher intestinal villi in this group. In the present experiment piglets receiving caprylic acid had slightly better body weight gains.
Table 3. Acidity of digesta in the stomach and in various parts of intestines and volatile fatty acid (VFA) content of piglets' chyme, μmol/g chyme (based on 6 piglets per group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group I control</th>
<th>Group II (PF)</th>
<th>Group III (PF+C₈)</th>
<th>Group IV (PF+C₁₀)</th>
<th>Group V (PF+C₈+C₁₀)</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>1.65 AB</td>
<td>1.26&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.06&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.08&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.15&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small intestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duodenum</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jejunum</td>
<td>5.87&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.69&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.57&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.45&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.88&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileum</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecum</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile fatty acid content of ileum and caecum chyme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acetic</td>
<td>4.590</td>
<td>5.930</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propionic</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isobutyric</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butyric</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isovaleric</td>
<td>0.037&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.351&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.089&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.084&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.091&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valeric</td>
<td>0.017&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.199&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.036&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.027&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.032&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.804</td>
<td>7.620</td>
<td>4.466</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>4.830</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acetic</td>
<td>53.233</td>
<td>68.747</td>
<td>53.085</td>
<td>41.818</td>
<td>57.880</td>
<td>4.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propionic</td>
<td>38.432</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>40.547</td>
<td>35.117</td>
<td>31.989</td>
<td>1.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isobutyric</td>
<td>0.472&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.161&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.675&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.681&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.442&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butyric</td>
<td>20.332&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14.755&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.497&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21.814&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.837&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isovaleric</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valeric</td>
<td>3.217&lt;sup&gt;ABb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.555&lt;sup&gt;ABb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.314&lt;sup&gt;ABb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.037&lt;sup&gt;ABa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.639&lt;sup&gt;ABa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115.909</td>
<td>126.104</td>
<td>122.447</td>
<td>102.476</td>
<td>105.041</td>
<td>6.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations: Mean values in the same row with different letters differ significantly at P≤0.01 (A, B) or P≤0.05 (a, b).

Table 4. Microbial counts in small intestine (ileum) digesta, log₁₀CFU/(1 g chyme) (based on 6 piglets per group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group I control</th>
<th>Group II (PF)</th>
<th>Group III (PF+C₈)</th>
<th>Group IV (PF+C₁₀)</th>
<th>Group V (PF+C₈+C₁₀)</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escherichia coli</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clostridium perfringens</td>
<td>2.14&lt;sup&gt;Abb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.41&lt;sup&gt;Aa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.84&lt;sup&gt;lb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.75&lt;sup&gt;lb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.89&lt;sup&gt;Abb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candida albicans + Candida sp</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulds</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungi and moulds</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations: Mean values in the same row with different letters differ significantly at P≤0.01 (A, B) or P≤0.05 (a, b).

Table 5. Mucosal epithelium structure of the ileum (based on 6 piglets per group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ileum morphology</th>
<th>Group I control</th>
<th>Group II (PF)</th>
<th>Group III (PF+C₈)</th>
<th>Group IV (PF+C₁₀)</th>
<th>Group V (PF+C₈+C₁₀)</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villus height, μm</td>
<td>255&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>264&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>272&lt;sup&gt;Abb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>292&lt;sup&gt;Bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>272&lt;sup&gt;Abb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villus width, μm</td>
<td>116&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>122&lt;sup&gt;Bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>127&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>129&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>109&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt depth, μm</td>
<td>287&lt;sup&gt;Aa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>391&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>328&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>293&lt;sup&gt;Aa&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>305&lt;sup&gt;Ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villus height/Crypt depth</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations: Mean values in the same row with different letters differ significantly at P≤0.01 (A, B) or P≤0.05 (a, b).
than those fed caprylic acid. This could be due to the slightly better protein and significantly better fat digestibility of caprylic acid, which, in turn, could result from higher intestinal villi.

It is known that MCFA are valuable energy sources especially for weaning piglets as their absorption is less dependent on both enzymatic and emulsifying agents (Chiang et al. 1990). On the other hand they have to be fed in relatively high amounts to be a source of energy, i.e. 8% as in the study of Cera et al. (1989). In this study a lower amount of MCFA was used (0.2%), which shows that the significant improvement in performance of piglets, especially before 56 days of age, must be a result of other factors. In any case, limited nutrition was used to supply piglets with the same amount of supplements.

Marounek et al. (2003) observed strong antimicrobial activity of caprylic acid and, to a lesser extent capric acid against *Escherichia coli*. No lowering effect of MCFA on the population of these bacteria was found in the present study. This could be due to the differences in *E. coli* strains as there is a strain-dependent variability in the susceptibility of *E. coli* to MCFA (Skřivanowa and Marounek 2007). In the study of Marounek et al. (2003) caprylic acid had antimicrobial activity against *E. coli* at pH about 6.0 or higher. In this study pH was lower than 6.0 in all parts of the digestive tract. A significant reduction in the amount of *Clostridium perfringens* was found in group II. These bacteria are the most important cause of clostridial enteric disease in domestic animals (Songer and Uzal, 2005) but no improvement of piglet health or performance was found in this group, though such an improvement was found earlier by Partanen et al. (2007). Of the two types of *C. perfringens* infections, the type C infection is characterized by frequently hemorrhagic, often fatal, necrotic enteritis in young pigs (Songer and Meer, 1996). Because no such cases were found in this study, it can be assumed that *C. perfringens* type A was found in these animals; it is a member of the normal flora of the pig intestine (Nabuurs et al. 1983). Thus changes in intestinal microflora were perhaps not the reason for differences in piglet performance between 7 and 56 days of age.

In the present study the mixture of propionic and formic acids lowered the pH of chyme in the stomach but this difference was not significant. In the small intestine and cecum differences were small. This could be due to the buffering capacity of feed which is high especially in feeds with high protein content (Lević et al. 2005), and such feeds are used in piglet feeding. Similar results were obtained by Bolduan et al. (1988). The significantly weaker acidic reaction of stomach contents in piglets fed with MCFA is hard to explain, although Zentek et al. (2012) found increased production of ammonia, which could increase the pH of digesta in piglets fed with MCFA not in the stomach, but in the small intestine.

Neither SCFA nor MCFA had an effect on volatile fatty acid (VFA) content in the ileum except for isobutyric, isovaleric and valeric acids, but their content was low. These acids originate from decomposition of proteins, from valine, leucine and proline, respectively (Arkowitz et al. 1994, Mackie et al. 1998) and their higher content suggests higher protein fermentation. In this study only numbers of *Escherichia* and *Clostridium* were estimated and results did not confirm this view, but changes in other kinds of bacteria, e.g. *Lactobacillus* (Castillo et al. 2006) cannot be excluded. Similar results were obtained earlier by Gabert et al. (1995).

Results of studies on supplementing pig diets with propionic or formic acids are not consistent. It seems that they are active primarily in the stomach; Risley et al. (1992) found no appreciable effect of organic acids on stomach, ileum or cecum pH, VFA profile or microflora population. Perhaps the gut ecosystem has a substantial capacity to resist changes (Jensen 1998).

The large intestine in monogastric animals is a main site of microbial hydrolysis of undigested feed, mainly fiber, hence the large content of VFA in the cecum. In pigs, this VFA production is intensified by a rapid rate of digesta passage. In spite of this higher VFA content, the pH of digesta in the cecum and ileum did not differ, as also reported by Argenzio and Southworth (1975).

Piglets’ intestinal epithelial cells serve, among others, digestive and absorptive functions. They also serve as a barrier against antigens and bacteria and maintain proper viscosity of the luminal contents (Pacha 2000). The epithelial cells near the villous tip have the greatest digestive and absorptive capacity, and hence villous height gives an indication of the functional capacity of enterocytes (Hampson 1986). In the present study villi in the ileum of piglets receiving SCFA with caprylic or capric acids were slightly higher than those of control animals. These differences could be one of the reasons for higher nutrient absorption and digestibility, especially in the case of piglets receiving SCFA and capric acid.

These piglets also had high body weight gains before 56 days of age, i.e. the day when samples of intestine were collected. Similar results were obtained in previous studies on the effects of medium-chain fatty acids alone or mixed with fumaric acid on nursery pig performance (Hanczakowska et al. 2011a,b).
Conclusion

Mixture of short-chain fatty acids (propionic and formic) with capric acid significantly improves performance of weaning and nursery pigs. An acidifier mixture of SCFA with capric acid improves the digestibility of nutrients, probably due to structural changes in the small intestine mucosa.
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