

Data for meta-analysis need standardization—a response to “Assessing the nutritional equivalency of DL-methionine and L-methionine in broiler chickens: a meta-analytical study” by Asasi et al.

Andreas Lemme ^{*,1} and Ali Afsar[†]

^{*}Evonik Operations GmbH, Hanau, Germany; and [†]Evonik Iran, Teheran, Iran

2023 Poultry Science 00:103351

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2023.103351>

Letter to the editor,—Concerning “Assessing the nutritional equivalency of DL-methionine and L-methionine in broiler chickens: A meta-analytical study” by Roya Asasi, Hamed Ahmadi, Mohammad Amir Karimi Torshizi, Karimi Torshizi, Rasoul Vaez Torshizi, Farid Shariatmadari.

For a meta-analysis for evaluating the nutritional value of L-methionine vs. DL-methionine in broiler nutrition data from 13 feeding experiments were analyzed by simultaneous regression (linear, exponential) and visualization. While this is an appreciated objective, we have concerns with respect to data selection and preparation.

Original performance data (daily gain; feed conversion ratio) were put into one plot while it was not considered that data within study are more correlated than between studies. Approaches like mixed-models would be more suitable for such analysis.

A major concern is that responses were plotted only to supplemented methionine although the magnitude of responses in single trials are largely dependent on the overall (digestible) methionine+cysteine level. For example, the total Met+Cys levels of basal diets varied between 0.17% and 0.52% in assay 1 of Dilger and Baker (2007) and highest sulfur amino acid level was reported for assay 4 by Dilger et al. (2007; 0.89%). While the sulfur amino acid level of the basal diet would affect performance and magnitude of response, regressing against Met+Cys levels would impact position of data points of different publications in the plot. Moreover, also the methionine to cysteine ratio within sulfur amino acids impact responsiveness to methionine supplementation. Data by Dilger and Baker (2007) clearly provide evidence for this interaction. However, Asasi et al. (2023) did not put attention to this

interaction and all data of this publication were included in the meta-analysis and certainly biased its outcome. For example, in assay 1 of Dilger and Baker (2007) methionine to sulfur amino acid ratio decreased from 70% to 23%. Finally, intake of sulfur amino acids is more suitable as basis for comparison than “% in diet” and would be impacted by feed intake as well. Therefore, studies are hardly comparable without normalizing data.

While not all studies included a basal, nonsupplemented diet (e.g., Rehman et al., 2019), trials reported by Dilger and Baker (2007; assay 2) and Dilger et al. (2007; assay 3) included more L-Met than DL-Met treatments which would imbalance the data base.

Therefore, it might be doubted whether the reported relative bioavailability figure for DL-methionine compared to L-methionine remains when the above would be adequately considered.

DISCLOSURES

Authors declared no conflict of interest. This can be questioned as second author is representant of an L-methionine producer /agent in Iran.

REFERENCES

- Asasi, R., H. Ahmadi, M. A. Karimi Torshizi, R. V. Torshizi, and F. Shariatmadari. 2023. Assessing the nutritional equivalency of DL-methionine and L-methionine in broiler chickens: a meta-analytical study. *Poult. Sci* 102:103143.
- Dilger, R. N., and D. H. Baker. 2007. DL-methionine is as efficacious as L-methionine, but modest L-cystine excesses are anorexigenic in sulfur amino acid-deficient purified and practical-type diets fed to chicks. *Poult. Sci.* 86:2367–2374.
- Dilger, R. N., C. Kobler, C. Weckbecker, D. Hoehler, and D. H. Baker. 2007. 2-keto-4-(methylthio) butyric acid (keto analog of methionine) is a safe and efficacious precursor of L-methionine in chicks. *J. Nutr.* 137:1868–1873.
- Rehman, A. U., M. Arif, M. M. Husnain, M. Alagawany, M. E. Abd El-Hack, A. E. Taha, S. S. Elnesr, M. A. Abdel-Latif, S. I. Othman, and A. A. Allam. 2019. Growth performance of broilers as influenced by different levels and sources of methionine plus cysteine. *Animals* 9:1056.

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of Poultry Science Association Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Received October 25, 2023.

Accepted December 1, 2023.

¹Corresponding author: andreas.lemme@evonik.com