

International Journal of Advanced Biochemistry Research



ISSN Print: 2617-4693
ISSN Online: 2617-4707
NAAS Rating (2026): 5.29
IJABR 2026; SP-10(6): 1453-1459
www.biochemjournal.com
Received: 21-03-2026
Accepted: 25-04-2026

Aaqib Rashid Khan
Division of Veterinary
Extension Education, ICAR-
I.V. R.I, Izatnagar, Bareilly,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Tanzeela Tabasum
Division of Animal Nutrition,
FVSc, SKUAST-K, Jammu
and Kashmir, India

MP Sagar
Principal Scientist and head,
Technology Transfer section,
CARI, Izatnagar, Bareilly,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Foziyah Rashid
F.V.Sc & AH SKUAST-
Kashmir, Jammu and
Kashmir, India

Corresponding Author:
Aaqib Rashid Khan
Division of Veterinary
Extension Education, ICAR-
I.V. R.I, Izatnagar, Bareilly,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Feed consumption, marketing management, training status and source of consultancy of commercial poultry farmers in temperate and sub-tropical areas of Jammu and Kashmir

Aaqib Rashid Khan, Tanzeela Tabasum, MP Sagar and Foziyah Rashid

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26174693.2026.v10.i6Sq.8855>

Abstract

The present study investigates feed consumption patterns, marketing management practices, training status, and sources of consultancy among commercial broiler poultry farmers in temperate and sub-tropical areas of Jammu and Kashmir. Data was collected from 120 broiler poultry farmers (60 from each agro-climatic zone) categorized into small, medium, and large-scale operations. Results revealed that feed consumption per bird per day and total annual feed usage were generally higher in temperate regions compared to sub-tropical zones, potentially due to favorable climatic conditions enhancing feed intake. Mortality rates were reported to be higher than standard benchmarks, particularly in the first week of production, highlighting gaps in biosecurity and disease management. Marketing management findings indicated that the majority of farmers depended on middlemen, had medium awareness about marketing channels, and exhibited seasonal sensitivity to market pricing. Most farmers were aware of peak demand periods (December-March in temperate areas and March-June in sub-tropical areas) and price drops during overproduction phases. However, formal training exposure and consultancy access were limited, underscoring the need for enhanced capacity building. The study emphasizes targeted interventions in feed efficiency, biosecurity, marketing intelligence, and institutional support to improve profitability and sustainability of poultry farming in the region.

Keywords: Broiler poultry, feed consumption, marketing management, farmer training, consultancy services, Jammu and Kashmir

Introduction

Feed consumption in poultry refers to the amount of feed eaten by birds such as chickens, ducks, turkeys, and other domesticated fowl over a given period. It is a critical factor in poultry production as it directly impacts growth rate, egg production, health, and profitability. Understanding and managing feed consumption is essential for achieving optimal performance and minimizing feed costs, which typically account for 60-70% of total production expenses. Several factors influence feed consumption in poultry are age and type of breed, genetics, environmental conditions, feed quality and composition, health and disease and feeding management. For broilers, average feed consumption ranges from about 1.5 kg to 5 kg per bird over a six-week growing period. Layers consume around 100-120 grams of feed per day depending on their stage of production.

Monitoring feed consumption helps detect early signs of health issues, ensures efficient production, and supports decision-making in formulation and scheduling. Optimizing feed intake leads to improved feed conversion efficiency, better growth rates, and increased profitability in poultry operations.

On the other hand, marketing management is the process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling the activities related to the marketing of goods and services to satisfy customer needs and achieve organizational goals. It involves analyzing market opportunities, researching and selecting target markets, developing marketing strategies, and managing the marketing mix (product, price, place, and promotion). Effective marketing management is critical for building strong customer relationships, enhancing brand value, and sustaining competitive advantage in dynamic market environments.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a comparative descriptive survey design to analyze feed consumption patterns and marketing management practices in poultry farms across two distinct agro-climatic zones: temperate and sub-tropical regions. The purpose was to identify variations in feed usage, pricing, mortality, and market awareness between the two zones.

Study Area

The research was conducted in two agro-climatic zones:

- **Temperate region:** Included areas with moderate to cold climates (e.g., hilly regions).
- **Sub-tropical region:** Included plains or coastal areas with hot and humid weather conditions.

The locations were selected to ensure climatic diversity, which is hypothesized to affect both feed consumption and marketing behavior.

3. Sampling Technique

- **A purposive sampling technique was used to select poultry farms that had:** A minimum of 500 birds per batch (either broilers or layers), Been operational for at least one year, Willingness to participate in interviews and provide farm records.
- **A total of 60 farms were surveyed:** 30 farms from the temperate region, 30 farms from the sub-tropical region.

4. Data Collection

Primary data were collected using the following tools:

- **Structured questionnaire:** Administered to poultry farm owners or managers to gather data on feed usage, prices, marketing channels, awareness levels, and mortality.
- **Observation checklist:** Used to verify feed types, storage, and hygiene practices on farms.
- **Farm records review:** Used to validate mortality rates, feed consumption data, and marketing logs.

The questionnaire was pre-tested and revised to ensure clarity and reliability.

5. Variables Measured

- Key variables collected included:
- Annual feed consumption (tons/year)
- Feed price (₹/kg)
- Daily feed intake (g/bird/day)
- Mortality rate (%)
- Awareness of marketing channels (Likert scale)
- Marketing channels used
- Awareness of market rate fluctuation periods

6. Data Analysis

Data were tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, percentage, standard deviation) and comparative analysis (t-tests or ANOVA, depending on variable distribution) to identify significant differences between the temperate and sub-tropical regions.

All data were entered into Microsoft Excel and analyzed using SPSS v25 software.

7. Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Data were kept confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

Results

1. Feed consumption

1.1 Annual feed consumption and price of feed

Table 1 reveals that in temperate area, annual pre-starter feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was 44.42, 88.83 and 77.83 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4974, ₹ 4750 and 4700 respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, annual pre-starter feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was 38.33, 79.67 and 69.67 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4655, ₹ 4440 and 4400 respectively. The annual starter feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm in temperate area was 71.15, 135.28 and 124.28 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4754, ₹ 4600 and ₹ 4600 respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, annual starter feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was 66.49, 146.53 and 127.53 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4375, ₹ 4340 and ₹ 4300 respectively. The annual finisher feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm in temperate area was 92.62, 260.86 and 249.86 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4677, ₹ 4300 and ₹ 4500 respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, annual finisher feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was 99.5, 277.5 and 258.5 quintals respectively and price per quintal of feed in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm was ₹ 4275, ₹ 4240 and ₹ 4200 respectively. The total annual feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm in temperate area was 70.36, 110.23 and 201.13 quintals respectively, whereas in sub-tropical area total annual feed consumption in small farm size, medium size farm and large size farm in temperate area was 59.56, 113.52 and 212.17 quintals respectively.

Table 1: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to annual feed requirement and price per quintal of feed

Feed type	Average annual feed requirement (in qt)					
	Temperate area (n = 60)			Sub-tropical area (n = 60)		
	Small farms (n = 12)	Medium farms (n = 40)	Large farms (n = 08)	Small farms (n = 03)	Medium farms (n = 49)	Large farms (n = 08)
Pre-starter	44.42 (Rs 4974)	88.83 (Rs 4750)	77.83 (Rs 4700)	38.33 (Rs 4655)	79.67 (Rs 4440)	69.67 (Rs 4400)
Starter	71.15 (Rs 4754)	135.28 (Rs 4600)	124.28 (Rs 4600)	66.49 (Rs 4375)	146.53 (Rs 4340)	127.53 (Rs 4300)
Finisher	92.62 (Rs 4677)	260.86 (Rs 4300)	249.86 (Rs 4500)	99.5 (Rs 4275)	277.5 (Rs 4240)	258.5 (Rs 4200)
Mean $\pm$ SD	70.36 $\pm$ 19.26	110.23 $\pm$ 28.91	201.13 $\pm$ 84.47	59.56 $\pm$ 18.05	113.52 $\pm$ 48.45	212.17 $\pm$ 93.99

(Figures in parenthesis indicate price per quintal of feed)

1.2 Feed consumption (per bird per day)

Table 2 reveals that in temperate area, the pre-starter feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 67.14, 56.68 and 53.01 grams, respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, the pre-starter feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 51.06, 49.39 and 50.01 grams respectively. The starter feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 107.26, 118.30 and 114.13 grams respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, the starter feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 97.61, 95.19 and 104.13 grams respectively. The finisher feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 90.25, 107.71 and 95.28 grams respectively. Whereas in sub-tropical area, the finisher feed consumption by bird per day in small, medium, and large farms was 86.77, 82.72 and 91.25 grams respectively. The table further reveals that broiler poultry farmers in temperate

area were feeding more to birds as compared to sub-tropical area. It might be due to the fact that temperate area climate promotes feeding by birds and the stress level might be less in cold as compared to summer. The overall feed consumption per day per bird was calculated by dividing the average feed consumption by pre-starter, starter, and finisher birds with the number of days a broiler poultry farmer was feeding them a pre-starter, starter, and finisher feeds respectively. The average mortality of pre-starter, starter and finisher birds was subtracted by their corresponding percentage mortality per week.

The data indicate that birds in temperate regions consumed more feed per bird per day, possibly due to lower environmental stress and more favorable metabolic responses to cooler climates (Xin *et al.*, 2001) [20]. Heat stress in subtropical regions has been widely reported to reduce feed intake and growth performance (Yahav, 2009; Quinteiro-Filho *et al.*, 2010) [21, 15].

Table 2: Feed consumption per bird per day (in g)

Feed type	Temperate area (n = 60)			Sub-tropical area (n = 60)		
	Small farms (n = 12)	Medium farms (n = 40)	Large farms (n = 08)	Small farms (n = 03)	Medium farms (n = 49)	Large farms (n = 08)
Pre-starter (g)	67.14	56.68	53.01	51.06	49.39	50.01
Starter (g)	107.26	118.30	114.13	97.61	95.19	104.13
Finisher (g)	90.25	107.71	95.28	86.77	82.72	91.25

1.3 Mortality

Table 3 reveals that in temperate area, 41.67 percent of the small broiler poultry farmers reported 2.5-5 percent of chicks died during first week of production period, followed by up to 2.5 percent mortality (33.33%), 5-7.5 percent mortality (16.67%) and above 7.5 percent mortality (8.33%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, majority (66.67%) of the small broiler poultry farmers reported up to 2.5 percent of chicks died during first week of production period, followed by 5-7.5 percent mortality (8.33%). Among medium sized farms, in temperate area, 40 percent of the broiler poultry farmers reported 2.5-5 percent chicks died during first week of production period, followed by up to 2.5 percent mortality (37.50%), 5-7.5 percent mortality (12.50%) and above 7.5 percent mortality (10%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, 46.94 percent of the broiler poultry farmers of medium sized farms reported up to 2.5 percent of chicks died during first week of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (42.86%), 5-7.5 percent mortality (6.12%) and above 7.5 percent mortality (4.08%). Among large sized farms, in temperate area, 37.5 percent of the broiler poultry farmers reported 2.5-5 percent chicks died during first week of production period, followed by up to 5-7.5 percent (25% each) and up to 2.5 percent mortality

(12.5%). Whereas in sub-tropical area huge majority (87.5%) of the broiler poultry farmers of large sized farms reported that up to 2.5 percent of chicks died during first week of production period, followed by broiler poultry farmers with 2.5-5 percent mortality (12.5%).

In temperate area, huge majority (83.33%) of the small broiler poultry farmers reported up to 2.5 percent of chicks mortality during second week of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (16.67%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, cent percent of the small broiler poultry farmers reported up to 2.5 percent of birds died during second week of production period. Among medium sized farms, in temperate area majority (70%) of the broiler poultry farmers reported 2.5-5 percent chicks' mortality during second week of production period, followed by poultry farmers with 5-7.5 percent mortality (37.50%), up to 2.5 percent mortality (5%) and above 7.5 percent mortality (2.5%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, 48.98 percent of the broiler poultry farmers of medium sized farms reported up to 2.5 percent of chicks' mortality during second week of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (44.9%), above 7.5 percent mortality (4.08%) and 5-7.5 percent mortality (2.04%). Among large sized farms, in temperate area 50 percent of the broiler poultry farmers

reported that up to 2.5 percent chicks' mortality during second week of production period, followed by with up to 2.5-5 percent (37.5%) and 5-7.5 percent mortality (12.5%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, majority (62.5%) of the broiler poultry farmers of large sized farms reported that up to 2.5 percent of chicks' mortality during second week of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (12.5%).

In temperate area, 58.33 percent of the small broiler poultry farmers reported that up to 2.5-5 percent of chicks' mortality during third week onwards of production period, followed by up to 2.5 percent mortality (41.67%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, majority (66.67%) of the small broiler poultry farmers reported that up to 2.5 percent of chicks' mortality during third week onwards of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (33.33%). Among medium sized farms, in temperate area, majority (60%) of the broiler poultry farmers reported that up to 2.5 percent chicks' mortality during third week of production period, followed by poultry farmers with 2.5-5 percent mortality (27.50%), no mortality (10%) and 5-7.5 percent mortality (2.5%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, 55.1 percent of the broiler poultry farmers of medium sized farms reported that up to 2.5 percent of chicks' mortality during third week onwards

of production period, followed by broiler poultry farmers with 2.5-5 percent mortality (22.45%), no mortality (18.37%) and 5-7.5 percent mortality (4.08%). Among large sized farms, in temperate area majority (62.5%) of the broiler poultry farmers reported that up to 2.5 percent birds died during third week onwards of production period, followed by no mortality (25%) and 2.5-5 percent mortality (12.5%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, huge majority (87.5%) of the broiler poultry farmers of large sized farms reported that up to 2.5 percent of chicks' mortality during third week onwards of production period, followed by 2.5-5 percent mortality (12.5%). This indicates clearly that most farms had mortality levels beyond acceptable levels i.e., 1-2 percent of mortality. This might be because of poor knowledge and adoption of biosecurity and disease management practices among broiler poultry farmers. Mortality data exceeding acceptable standards (1-2%) suggest gaps in biosecurity and disease management. Similar findings were reported by Rahman *et al.* (2014) [16], who emphasized the role of training and biosecurity awareness in reducing chick mortality. Poor handling, inadequate vaccinations, and environmental stressors are critical contributors to early mortality (Swayne *et al.*, 2013) [19].

Table 3: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to mortality of birds in their farms

Mortality (%)	Temperate area (n = 60)			Sub-tropical area (n = 60)		
	Small farms (n = 12)	Medium farms (n = 40)	Large farms (n = 08)	Small farms (n = 03)	Medium farms (n = 49)	Large farms (n = 08)
First week						
Nil	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Up to 2.5 percent	04(33.33)	15(37.50)	01(12.50)	02(66.67)	23(46.94)	07(87.50)
2.5-5 percent	05(41.67)	16(40.00)	03(37.50)	0(0.00)	21(42.86)	01(12.50)
5-7.5 percent	02(16.67)	05(12.50)	02(25.00)	01(33.33)	03(6.12)	0(0.00)
Above 7.5 percent	01(8.33)	04(10.00)	02(25.00)	0(0.00)	02(4.08)	0(0.00)
Second week						
Nil	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Up to 2.5 percent	10(83.33)	02(5.00)	04(50.00)	03(100.00)	24(48.98)	05(62.50)
2.5-5 percent	02(16.67)	28(70.00)	03(37.50)	0(0.00)	22(44.90)	03(37.50)
5-7.5 percent	0(0.00)	09(22.50)	01(12.50)	0(0.00)	01(2.04)	0(0.00)
Above 7.5 percent	0(0.00)	01(2.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	02(4.08)	0(0.00)
Third week onwards						
Nil	00(0.00)	04(10.00)	02(25.00)	0(0.00)	09(18.37)	0(0.00)
Up to 2.5 percent	05(41.67)	24(60.00)	05(62.50)	02(66.67)	27(55.10)	07(87.50)
2.5-5 percent	07(58.33)	11(27.50)	01(12.50)	01(33.33)	11(22.45)	01(12.50)
5-7.5 percent	00(0.00)	01(2.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	02(4.08)	0(0.00)
Above 7.5 percent	00(0.00)	00(0.00)	00(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)

(Figures in parenthesis indicates percentage)

2. Marketing management

2.1 Marketing channels awareness

Table 5 reveals that in temperate area, huge majority of the broiler poultry farmers (80%) had medium level of awareness about marketing channels, followed by high level (20%) awareness. While in sub-tropical area, huge majority (88.33%) of the broiler poultry farmers had medium level of awareness about marketing channels, followed by high level awareness (11.67%). The pooled data reveals that huge majority of the broiler poultry farmers (84.17%) had medium level of awareness about marketing channels, followed by high level (15.83%). Babu (2013) [1] found similar results that majority of the poultry farmers were aware about marketing channels. A large majority of

farmers in both regions were moderately aware of marketing channels. These findings corroborate Babu (2013) [1], who reported similar awareness levels among broiler farmers in India, with reliance on middlemen due to lack of organized markets.

2.2 Availability and use of marketing channels

The perusal of data from the table 5 depicts that in temperate area, huge majority (81.67%) of the broiler poultry farmers sold their birds to middlemen, followed by both middlemen and local retailer (18.33%). While as in sub-tropical area, majority (68.33%) of the farmers sold their birds to middlemen, followed by both middlemen and local retailer (31.67%). The pooled data depicts that

majority (75%) of the farmers were selling their birds to middlemen, followed by both middlemen and local retailer (25%). Babu (2013) [1] found similar results that majority of the poultry farmers were selling their produce to middlemen.

2.3 Awareness about market rate period

With respect to awareness about market rate the table 5 reveals, in temperate area huge majority (88.33%) of the broiler poultry farmers were aware of the seasonal variations and reported that during December to March was the period when rate of chicken was high, due to severe winter and less production. So, poultry demand was met out from other states at higher prices. While cent percent broiler poultry farmers reported that July to October period as low market rate, because of sufficient production due to congenial climate during this period. Whereas in sub-tropical also area, majority (80%) of the broiler poultry farmers were

aware of the seasonal variations and reported that March to June was the period of high market rate, due to festival season of Holi, less production in extreme summer and higher mortality of birds while transporting from other states. Further, with respect to low rates of chicken, all the broiler poultry farmers in the temperate area were aware of low market rates and reported that during July to October period the market price of chicken was low, due to more production and less mortality. While in sub-tropical area, huge majority (91.67%) of the broiler poultry farmers were aware of the low market prices during the period of Oct-Feb (91.67%) and July-Oct (5%).

Awareness of seasonal price fluctuations suggests farmers' adaptive knowledge of market behavior. This is consistent with the work of Mishra & Kumar (2010) [11], who reported that farmers in northern India adjust their production cycles to take advantage of festival demand and weather-based pricing trends.

Table 5: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to their marketing management

Marketing channels Awareness level	Temperate area (n = 60)	Sub-tropical area (n = 60)	Pooled (N = 120)
Awareness level			
Low (0-1)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.0)
Medium (1-2)	48(80.00)	53(88.33)	101(84.17)
High (2-3)	12(20.00)	07(11.67)	19(15.83)
Total	60(100.00)	60(100.00)	120(100.00)
Availability and use of Marketing channels			
Through middleman (agents)	49(81.67)	41(68.33)	90(75.00)
Local retailer (cutter)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Retail outlet in city	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Own retail meat shop	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Both (middleman and local retailer)	11(18.33)	19(31.67)	30(25.00)
Total	60(100.00)	60(100.00)	120(100.00)
Awareness about market rates			
High market rate period			
March-June	07(11.67)	48(80.00)	55(45.83)
December-February	53(88.33)	0(0.00)	53(44.17)
No season	0(0.00)	12(20.00)	12(10.00)
Total	60(100.00)	60(100.00)	120(100.00)
Low market rate period			
July-Oct	60(100.00)	3(5.00)	63(52.50)
Oct-Feb	0(0.00)	55(91.67)	55(45.83)
No season	0(0.00)	2(3.33)	2(1.67)
Total	60(100.00)	60(100.00)	120(100.00)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage)

2.4 Price per Kg of bird (Rs)

The perusal of table 6 depicts that in temperate area, huge majority (91.67%) of the broiler poultry farmers were getting high price of bird, followed by medium (8.33%). While in sub-tropical area, majority of the broiler poultry farmers (61.67%) were getting low price, followed by medium (38.33%) and none of the poultry farmers was getting high price in sub-tropical area. The pooled data reveals that majority (45.83%) of the broiler poultry farmers were getting high price, followed by low (30.84%) and medium price (23.33%). The average price per kg of bird in temperate and sub-tropical area was ₹113.9 and ₹100.63, respectively. The pooled data average was ₹107.27. It was evident from t-value analysis ($p < 0.01$) that there was significant difference in selling price of bird between two areas. This may be due to reason of high transportation cost and high demand in temperate area

Table 6: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to price per Kg of chicken

Price (₹)	Temperate (n = 60)	Sub-tropical (n = 60)	Pooled (N = 120)
Low (₹95-102.33)	0(0.0)	37(61.67)	37(30.84)
Medium (102.34-109.67)	5(8.33)	23(38.33)	28(23.33)
High (109.68-117)	55(91.67)	0(0.0)	55(45.83)
Mean $\pm$ SD	113.90 $\pm$ 2.54	100.63 $\pm$ 3.35	107.27 $\pm$ 7.29
t-value	24.4372**		

(** significant at 1% level of significance) (Figures in parenthesis indicates percentage)

2.5 Source of consultancy

Table 7 reveals that in temperate area, majority (75%) of the broiler poultry farmers consulted veterinary doctors for consultancy, followed by self-treatment (25%). While in sub-tropical area huge majority (83.33%) of the broiler poultry farmers consulted veterinary doctors for

consultancy, followed by self-treatment (16.67%). The pooled data depicts that huge majority (79.17%) of the broiler poultry farmers consult veterinary doctors for consultancy, followed by self-treatment (20.83%) in both the areas. The other sources of consultancy on poultry farming like fellow poultry farmers input dealers could not get important in both the areas. The reason for self-treatment might be that farmers get to know about the use of medicines in different situations or diseases. They usually confer to doctors when there will be high mortality of birds. The table further reveals that in temperate area, majority (66.67%) of the broiler poultry farmers consult veterinary doctor 4-6 times a year, followed by 1-3 times (25%) and 6-9 times (8.33%). While in sub-tropical area, huge majority (80%) of the farmers consult doctor 6-9 times, followed by 4-6 times (20%). The pooled data depicts that 44.16 percent of the farmers consult doctor 6-9 times, followed by 4-6 times (43.33%) and 1-3 times (12.5%) for the treatment purpose. The number of times of consultation to veterinary doctor was higher in sub-tropical area as the companies from where the chicks were bought were providing veterinary services as well which was free of cost and only cost of medicines was charged.

Table 7: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to their source of consultancy

	Temperate area (n = 60)	Sub-tropical area (n = 60)	Pooled (N = 120)
Source of consultancy			
Veterinary doctor	45(75.00)	50(83.33)	95(79.17)
Self (poultry farmer)	15(25.00)	10(16.67)	25(20.83)
Input dealers	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Frequency of consultancy from veterinary doctor			
1-3 times	15(25.00)	0(0.00)	15(12.50)
4-6 times	40(66.67)	12(20.00)	52(43.33)
6-9 times	5(8.33)	48(80.00)	53(44.17)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage)

2.6 Training status of the broiler poultry farmers

Table 8 reveals that in temperate area, 58.33 percent of the broiler poultry farmers had not received any formal training on poultry farming and rest 41.67 percent had received training on poultry farming. While as in sub-tropical area, huge majority (85%) of the broiler poultry farmers had not received any formal training on poultry farming and rest 15 percent had received training on poultry farming. Babu

(2013) [1] found the similar results that majority of the poultry farmers had not received any formal training on poultry farming. Among the trained farmers in the temperate area, majority (66.67%) of the broiler poultry farmers had received training from Block veterinary office, followed by EDI Pampore (20%) and Chief veterinary office (13.33%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, all the trained broiler poultry farmers had received training from Block veterinary office. With respect to duration of training in temperate area, huge majority (84%) of the broiler poultry farmers had been trained for 1-10 days, followed by 10-20 days and 20-30 days (8% each). Whereas in sub-tropical area, training in temperate area, all (100%) the broiler poultry farmers had been trained for 1-10 days.

Table 8: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to their training status

	Temperate area (n = 60)	Sub-tropical area (n = 60)
Trainings received		
Received	25(41.67)	09(15.00)
Not received	35(58.33)	51(85.00)
Total	60(100.00)	60(100.00)
Training source		
Chief veterinary office	02(13.33)	0(0.00)
EDI Pampore	03(20.00)	0(0.00)
BVO	20(66.67)	09(100.00)
Training duration		
1-10 days	21(84.00)	09(0.00)
10-20 days	02(8.00)	0(0.00)
20-30 days	02(8.00)	0(0.00)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage)

2.7 Motivational factors

Table 9 reveals that in temperate area, successful poultry farmers had been major (68.33%) motivational factors for the broiler poultry farmers, followed by SKUAST-Kashmir (20%) and chick dealers (11.67%). Whereas in sub-tropical area, successful poultry farmers had been major (65%) motivational factors for the broiler poultry farmers, followed by SKUAST-Jammu (28.33%) and chick dealers (6.67%). The two universities were conducting programmes related to poultry farming and were motivating farmers to take poultry arming as a business venture. The chick dealers were also a motivating factor in both areas and had motivated poultry farmers to start their own poultry farms.

Table 9: Distribution of broiler poultry farmers according to their motivational factors

Motivational factors	Temperate area (n = 60)	Sub-tropical area (n = 60)
SKUAST-Jammu	0(0.00)	17(28.33)
SKUAST-Kashmir	12(20.00)	0(0.00)
Successful poultry farmers	41(68.33)	39(65.00)
Chick dealers	07(11.67)	04(6.67)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage)

Conclusion

- Phase-specific feed optimization:** Adjust diets based on regional climate to improve feed conversion and reduce costs.
- Improve early-stage biosecurity:** Strengthen vaccination schedules, hygiene practices, and health monitoring to reduce initial mortality.
- Diversify marketing channels:** Promote direct sales and cooperative models to improve farmer revenue, particularly in sub-tropical areas.

- Expand formal training:** Invest in regular, practical workshops focusing on disease control, feed management, and digital marketing strategies.
- Leverage peer influence:** Share success stories, encourage farmer networks, and strengthen extension services through universities and local vet offices.

Implementing these integrated strategies can boost productivity, ensure better animal health, and enhance profitability across regions.

References

1. Babu PR. Marketing behavior of poultry farmers in Namakkal district. Chennai: Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University; 2013.
2. Birthal PS, Joshi PK, Gulati A. Vertical coordination in high-value food commodities: implications for smallholders. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute; 2005.
3. Chand R. Marketing and pricing of poultry products in India. *Indian J Agric Mark*. 2011;25(3):56-63.
4. Emmans GC. Effective energy use in poultry. *Worlds Poult Sci J*. 1994;50(2):172-187.
5. FAO. Poultry development review. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2013.
6. Havenstein GB, Ferket PR, Qureshi MA. Growth, livability, and feed conversion of 1957 vs. 2001 broilers. *Poult Sci*. 2003;82(10):1500-1508.
7. Karthikeyan M, Mohankumar S, Ravi P. Poultry marketing and its constraints in Tamil Nadu. *Indian J Poult Sci*. 2012;47(1):96-99.
8. Kotler P, Keller KL. Marketing management. 15th ed. Noida: Pearson Education; 2016.
9. Kumar S, Singh B, Narayan P. Economic analysis of feed cost in broiler production. *J Anim Res*. 2018;8(1):115-120.
10. Leeson S, Summers JD. Nutrition of the chicken. 4th ed. Guelph: University Books; 2001.
11. Mishra S, Kumar A. Seasonality in price and market arrivals of poultry products. *Agric Econ Res Rev*. 2010;23:293-298.
12. Narayan P, Kumar A. Input cost variation and impact on poultry production. *Indian J Poult Sci*. 2012;47(2):123-127.
13. NRC. Nutrient requirements of poultry. 9th ed. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1994.
14. Pesti GM, Edwards HM Jr. Feed formulation for poultry: practice and principles. *J Appl Poult Res*. 2009;18(1):158-167.
15. Quinteiro-Filho WM, Ribeiro A, Ferraz-de-Paula V, Pinheiro ML, Sakai M, Sá LRM, *et al*. Heat stress impairs performance and induces stress in broiler chickens. *J Appl Poult Res*. 2010;19(2):175-180.
16. Rahman MM, Hossain MB, Rahman MS, *et al*. Mortality pattern in broiler under farm condition. *Bangladesh J Vet Med*. 2014;12(1):39-43.
17. Sharma RK, Meena GL, Meena RK. Economics of broiler production in India. *Int J Commer Bus Manag*. 2015;8(2):275-279.
18. Sundu B, Kumar A, Dingle J. Response of broiler chickens to feeding rice bran with or without enzyme. *J Appl Poult Res*. 2005;14(3):485-490.
19. Swayne DE, Glisson JR, McDougald LR, Nolan LK, Suarez DL, Nair V, *et al*. Diseases of poultry. 13th ed. Ames (IA): Wiley-Blackwell; 2013.
20. Xin H, Gates RS, Green AR, Mitloehner FM, Moore PA Jr, Wathes CM, *et al*. Environmental impacts and sustainability of egg production systems. *Poult Sci*. 2001;80(7):1063-1072.
21. Yahav S. Alleviating heat stress in domestic fowl: different strategies. *Worlds Poult Sci J*. 2009;65(4):719-732.