



Corrigendum II: Phytogetic Feed Additives as an Alternative to Antibiotic Growth Promoters in Broiler Chickens

Ganapathi Raj Murugesan¹, Basharat Syed², Sudipto Haldar³ and Chasity Pender^{1*}

¹BIOMIN America Inc., San Antonio, TX, USA, ²BIOMIN Holding GmbH, Getzersdorf, Austria, ³Department of Animal Nutrition, West Bengal University of Animal and Fishery Sciences, Kolkata, India

Keywords: digestibility, histomorphology, microbiota, performance, poultry

A corrigendum on

Phytogetic feed additives as an alternative to antibiotic growth promoters in broiler chickens by Murugesan GR, Syed B, Haldar S and Pender C. *Front Vet Sci* (2015) 2:21. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2015.00021

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Michael Kogut,
United States Department of
Agriculture – Agricultural Research
Service, USA

Reviewed by:

Kenneth James Genovese,
United States Department of
Agriculture – Agricultural Research
Service, USA

*Correspondence:

Chasity Pender
chasity.pender@biomin.net

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Veterinary Infectious Diseases,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Veterinary Science

Received: 11 March 2016

Accepted: 24 March 2016

Published: 04 April 2016

Citation:

Murugesan GR, Syed B, Haldar S
and Pender C (2016) Corrigendum II:
Phytogetic Feed Additives as an
Alternative to Antibiotic Growth
Promoters in
Broiler Chickens.
Front. Vet. Sci. 3:28.
doi: 10.3389/fvets.2016.00028

REVISED CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that MICRO-PLUS Konzentrate GmbH, now a subsidiary of BIOMIN Holding GmbH, financially sponsored this project. The authors GM and CP are affiliated with BIOMIN, which produces the phytogetic feed additive used in this trial. BS, affiliated with MICRO-PLUS Konzentrate GmbH at the time the experiment was conducted, is currently affiliated with BIOMIN following the acquisition.

ETHICS DECLARATION

At the time this experiment was conducted, the Institutional Animal Ethics Committee standards for conducting research on poultry species were not established, thus no committee approval was required, and the experiment was conducted according to the ethical norms of the University. The principal investigator of the study has provided the journal's Editorial Office a retrospective statement that approval was not needed.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

GM: final approval of the version to be submitted, drafting the article, or revising it critically for important intellectual content; BS: contributions to conception and design of the experiment and analysis and interpretation of data; SH: contributions to conception and design of the experiment, acquisition of data, and analysis and interpretation of data; CP: final approval of the version to be submitted, drafting the article, or revising it critically for important intellectual content.

Copyright © 2016 Murugesan, Syed, Haldar and Pender. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.