



Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.704.151>

Carcass Characteristics of Broiler Chicken Fed Sheep Manure Based Diets Supplemented with or without Enzymes

I.U. Sheikh*, S. Adil, M.T. Banday, A.A. Khan, Bushra Zaffer and S.S. Nissa

Division of Livestock Production and Management, Faculty of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry, SKUAST-Kashmir, Srinagar-190006, India

*Corresponding author

A B S T R A C T

An experiment was carried out to evaluate the carcass characteristics of broiler chicken fed with different levels of Sheep manure with or without enzyme supplementation. A total of 210 broiler chicks were procured from commercial hatchery and brooded under uniform managemental condition for one week. On 8th day the chicks were distributed into five treatment groups viz. T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ containing 42 chicks in each which were subdivided into three replicates of 14 chicks each. The T₁ (Control) group fed basal diet and in T₂ and T₄ the basal diet was replaced by SM at 5% and 10% level without enzyme where as T₃ and T₅ the basal diet was replaced by SM at 5% and 10% level with multi enzyme supplementation. The per cent blood loss was recorded ranged from 4.22 ± 0.08 in T₂ to 4.42 ± 0.09 in T₄. The per cent feather loss was recorded to be 5.95 ± 0.12 T₁ to 6.16 ± 0.11 in T₅. The per cent dressing yield was found to be 71.86 ± 0.38, 72.13 ± 0.29, 71.92 ± 0.22, 71.75 ± 0.28 and 72.07 ± 0.32 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. Statistically, no significant difference was observed among the different treatment groups for blood loss, feather loss and dressing yields. The per cent of different cut-up parts were found to be differed non-significantly among the different treatment groups. The per cent gibblet yield was found to be 6.88 ± 0.14, 6.28 ± 0.12, 6.82 ± 0.14, 6.48 ± 0.17 and 6.58 ± 0.15 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. Statistical analysis revealed non-significant differences among the various treatment groups.

Keywords

Sheep manure, Enzyme, Carcass traits, Broiler chicken

Article Info

Accepted: 12 March 2018
Available Online: 10 April 2018

Introduction

In poultry rearing, feed cost accounts for 60-70% of the total cost of either egg or poultry meat production and protein accounts 15% of feed cost (Singh, 1990). There is shortage of quality feed ingredients in Kashmir valley. The feeds are to be imported from other states of the country which adds more production cost of poultry. The nutritionists are often forced to formulate the cheaper diet by

inclusion of locally available non-conventional feeds. Sheep manure is a unconventional feed ingredients that is relatively high in protein and energy levels and can form a satisfactory feed ingredient in poultry diet (Onu, 2007; Abeke *et al.*, 2008; Onu and Otuma, 2008). However, the usefulness of sheep manure as feed ingredient in monogastric diets is constrained by its relative high fibre content which causes increased viscosity of the gut content resulting

lower nutrient digestibility (Galassi *et al.*, 2004; Len, 2008). According to Kanengoni *et al.*, (2002) and Partanen *et al.*, (2007), as the level of fibre in monogastric diets increases, digestibility of nitrogen and energy decreases.

Trait and Wright (1990) reported that fibre dwindle availability of nutrients by dropping the period of exposure of the food to digestive enzymes and absorptive surfaces due to the increase rate of passage of the feed induce by its fibre content. Hajati (2010) reported that endogenous enzymes of broilers cannot effectively digest nonstarch polysaccharides and thereby the ingestion of high levels of soluble NSP leads to increased digesta stickiness and reduced nutrient digestibility and absorption.

However, its incorporation in the diet of monogastric animal is encumbered by its relatively high fibre content that reduces its nutritional value (Onu, 2007). Inclusion of exogenous enzymes will improve its nutritional value and utilization by birds. In recent years the use of animal manure for feeding of livestock has generated considerable interest due to the fact that the conventional feed stuffs can no longer adequately meet the need of fast growing poultry industry (Abeke *et al.*, 2003). Therefore, the present study was conducted to evaluate the performance of broiler chicken fed with sheep manure(SM) based diets supplement with or without enzymes.

Materials and Methods

A total of 210 broiler chicks were procured from commercial hatchery and brooded under uniform managemental condition for one week. On 8th day the chicks were distributed into five treatment groups viz. T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ containing 42 chicks in each which were subdivided into three replicates of 14 chicks each. The birds were reared battery

cages. The T₁ (Control) group fed basal diet and in T₂ and T₄ the basal diet was replaced by SM at 5% and 10% level without enzyme where as T₃ and T₅ the basal diet was replaced by SM at 5% and 10% level with multi enzyme supplementation. The sheep manure was collected from the Mountain Research Centre on Sheep and Goat, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, India and dried at 80 °C for 3 hours in the hot air oven and then grounded and utilized in the diet of broiler chicken. The study was conducted upto six weeks of age. At the end of trial 30 birds (six birds from each treatment) were selected randomly to study the carcass traits. The birds were slaughtered by halal methods after overnight fasting. The dressed yield, eviscerated yield and giblet were recorded and expressed as per cent pre slaughter live weight. The yield of various cut-up parts were also recorded and expressed as per cent of dressed weight. The data collected were analysed as per the method of Snedecor and Cochran (1994).

Results and Discussion

The pre slaughter live weight was recorded to be 2150, 2148, 2090, 2185 and 2086 g respectively for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. The per cent blood loss was recorded as 4.27±0.06, 4.22±0.08, 4.37±0.06, 4.42±0.09 and 4.28±0.07 for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups, respectively. The per cent feather loss was recorded to be 5.95±0.12, 6.08±0.09, 6.15±0.08, 5.98±0.09 and 6.16±0.11 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. Statistically no significant differences were observed among different treatment groups. The per cent dressing yield was found to be 71.86±0.38, 72.13±0.29, 71.92±0.22, 71.75±0.28 and 72.07±0.32 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. Statistically, no significant difference was observed among the different treatment groups.

The per cent thigh yield recorded ranged from 14.52 ± 0.35 in T₅ to 15.42 ± 0.35 in T₁ groups. The per cent drumstick was recorded to be 13.82 ± 0.24 , 13.98 ± 0.22 , 13.88 ± 0.25 , 14.05 ± 0.22 and 14.22 ± 0.28 respectively in T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. The per cent breast was recorded to be 32.84 ± 0.52 , 33.22 ± 0.49 , 33.86 ± 0.65 , 32.67 ± 0.60 and 31.98 ± 0.58 in T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups, respectively. The per cent back recorded ranged from 16.58 ± 0.37 in T₂ to 17.43 ± 0.44 in T₁ groups. The per cent wings recorded ranged from 12.58 ± 0.29 in T₂ to 13.28 ± 0.20 in T₅ groups. The per cent neck recorded to be 5.83 ± 0.08 , 5.27 ± 0.06 , 5.82 ± 0.06 , 5.65 ± 0.08 and 5.78 ± 0.10 in T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups, respectively.

Among the cut up parts breast yield was the highest which ranges from 31.98 in T₅ group to 33.86% in T₃ group. The per cent different cut-up parts were found to be differed non-significantly among the different treatment groups. The per cent head and shank recorded to be 2.92 ± 0.07 and 4.65 ± 0.05 , 2.86 ± 0.10 and 4.75 ± 0.05 , 2.87 ± 0.08 and 4.69 ± 0.10 , 2.79 ± 0.11 and 4.78 ± 0.06 and 2.84 ± 0.11 and 4.76 ± 0.05 in T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups, respectively. The head and shank recorded in the present study were non-significant among the groups.

The per cent liver yield was ranged from 3.11 in T₁ group to 3.18 in T₃ group. The per cent heart yield was range from 0.63 in T₂ group to 0.71 in T₄ group. The per cent gizzard yield was range from 2.85 in T₃ group to 3.04 in T₁ group. Statistical analysis revealed non-significant differences for liver, heart and gizzard yields among the various treatment groups. The per cent cutting loss ranges from 1.81 in T₄ to 1.92 in T₂ groups.

The per cent blood loss was recorded as 4.27 ± 0.06 , 4.22 ± 0.08 , 4.37 ± 0.06 , 4.42 ± 0.09 and 4.28 ± 0.07 for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups,

respectively. The per cent feather loss was recorded to be 5.95 ± 0.12 , 6.08 ± 0.09 , 6.15 ± 0.08 , 5.98 ± 0.09 and 6.16 ± 0.11 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups. Statistically no significant differences were observed among different treatment groups. The blood loss and feather loss observed in the present study are in agreement with Sheikh *et al.*, (2005) while replaced the fishmeal of broilers diet with silkworm pupae meal.

Sheikh and Chatterjee (2009) also recorded similar results in Vanaraja birds. Khursheed *et al.*, (2017) also observed non-significant effect on feather loss of broiler fed mint leave as feed additive with or without enzyme supplementation.

However, Dicken and Lyon (1993) observed lower values for blood and feather loss than the findings of the present study. The per cent dressing yield was found to be 71.86 ± 0.38 , 72.13 ± 0.29 , 71.92 ± 0.22 , 71.75 ± 0.28 and 72.07 ± 0.32 respectively, for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄ and T₅ groups (Table 1).

Statistically, no significant difference was observed among the different treatment groups. This observation indicates that broiler finisher diets could be formulated with up to 10% SM with or without enzyme supplementation, as dressed weight represents the absolute value of salable meat (Tion and Ogra, 2004; Nwawe *et al.*, 2005).

This is in agreement with the findings of Onu and Otuma (2008) and Onu and Madubuike (2010) who also reported non-significant differences among different treatment groups fed with SM based diets supplemented with or without enzyme. Khursheed *et al.*, (2017) also observed similar results with non-significant effects in broilers. However, slightly higher dressing per cent recorded by Fanimo *et al.*, (2007) while feeding cashew nut testa in broiler chicken.

Table.1 Carcass characteristics of broiler birds fed sheep manure based diets

Parameter	T1 (Control)	T2 (5%SM + Enzyme)	T3 (5%SM+ without Enzyme)	T4 (10%SM + Enzyme)	T5 (10%SM + without Enzyme)
Pre Slaughter Live Weight (g)	2150	2148	2090	2185	2086
Blood loss (%)	4.27± 0.06	4.22 ± 0.08	4.37± 0.06	4.42 ± 0.09	4.28 ± 0.07
Feather Loss (%)	5.95 ± 0.12	6.08 ± 0.09	6.15 ± 0.08	5.98 ± 0.09	6.16 ± 0.11
Dressed weight (g)	1545	1549	1503	1567	1502
Dressing %	71.86 ± 0.38	72.13 ± 0.29	71.92 ± 0.22	71.75 ± 0.28	72.07 ± 0.32
Cut up parts (% Dressed weight)					
Thigh	15.42 ± 0.43	14.84 ± 0.38	15.29 ± 0.40	15.08 ± 0.34	14.52 ± 0.35
Drumstick	13.82 ± 0.24	13.98 ± 0.22	13.88 ± 0.25	14.05 ± 0.22	14.22 ± 0.28
Breast	32.84 ± 0.52	33.22 ± 0.49	33.86 ± 0.65	32.67 ± 0.60	31.98 ± 0.58
Back	17.43 ± 0.44	16.58 ± 0.37	16.88 ± 0.38	16.94 ± 0.42	16.98 ± 0.44
Wings	12.85 ± 0.22	12.58 ± 0.29	12.72 ± 0.25	12.63 ± 0.22	13.28 ± 0.20
Neck	5.83 ± 0.08	5.27 ± 0.06	5.82 ± 0.06	5.65 ± 0.08	5.78 ± 0.10
Head	2.92±0.07	2.86±0.10	2.87±0.08	2.79±0.11	2.84±0.11
Shank	4.65 ± 0.05	4.75 ± 0.05	4.69 ± 0.10	4.78 ± 0.06	4.76 ± 0.05
Giblet					
Liver (%)	3.11 ± 0.14	3.14 ± 0.12	3.18± 0.14	3.12± 0.17	3.16± 0.15
Heart (%)	0.69 ± 0.07	0.63 ± 0.07	0.70 ± 0.06	0.64 ± 0.08	0.71 ± 0.06
Gizzard (%)	3.04± 0.10	2.92 ± 0.06	2.85 ± 0.07	2.88 ± 0.07	2.95 ± 0.08

The per cent of different cut-up parts were found to be differed non-significantly among the different treatment groups. Among the cut up parts breast yield was the highest ranges from 31.98 % in T₅ group to 33.86% in T₃ group. Breast meat yield has the highest economic value, if the bird is considered as a whole. During the growth period, breast meat linearly increases as a per cent of live weight. Similar pattern have been noted by Acar *et al.*, (1993). Marapana (2016) also observed similar results. Therefore, the success of poultry meat production has been strongly related to improvements in growth and carcass yield, mainly by increasing breast yield. The per cent thigh and breast yield

recorded in the present study was lower than those observed by Akinmutimi and Okwu (2006).The per cent liver yield was ranged from 3.11 in T₁ group to 3.18 in T₃ group. The per cent heart yield was range from 0.63 in T₂ group to 0.71 in T₄ group. The per cent gizzard yield was range from 2.85 in T₃ group to 3.04 in T₁ group. Statistical analysis revealed non-significant differences for liver, heart and gizzard yields among the various treatment groups. This is in agreement with the findings of Onu and Madubuike (2010) who also reported non- significant differences among different treatment groups fed with SM based diets supplemented with or without enzyme, however, they observed significantly

($P < 0.05$) higher gizzard yield in birds fed 15% sheep manure without enzyme addition. Similar results were also reported by Onu (2007) who reported non-significant differences for liver and heart yields and significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher gizzard yield in birds fed 10% and 15% sheep manure without enzyme addition. However, the increment in gizzard weight of birds fed 15% heat treated sheep manure without enzyme supplement may reflect the extra muscular or secretory work required to process the high fibre diet as reported by Tuleun and Igba (2007). As the liver, assisted by the heart, has major role in detoxification, the similarities in liver and heart weights in all the groups suggest that there were no serious toxicity problems with the test diet. Diarra *et al.*, (2014) also recorded similar liver and heart yields when fed birds with commercial diets and cassava based diets.

The head and shank recorded in the present study were non-significant among the groups and are similar to the results that recorded by Karaoglu *et al.*, (2004) in broiler chicken. Onu and Otuma (2008) also recorded non-significant differences in shank yields. The gizzard per cent found in the present study was lower than those recorded by Akinmutimi and Okwu (2006) in broilers fed Cooked *Mucuna utilis* Seed meal for substitution of Soybean meal in broiler finisher diet.

From the present experiment it can be concluded that sheep manure could be utilized successfully in broiler chicken ration upto 10% level with or without enzyme supplementation without any significant affect on the carcass characteristics and giblet yields of broiler birds.

References

Abeke, F. O., Ogundipe, S. O., Sekoni, A. A., Bale, J. O., Adeyinka, I. A. and Oni, O.

- O. 2008. Effects of dietary levels of heat treated sheep manure (HSM) on the performance and egg quality parameters of laying hens. *Nig. J. Anim. Prod.* 35 (1):56-62.
- Abeke, F.O., Ogundipe, S.O., Adeyinka, I.A., Abubakar, B.Y., Oni, O.O and Nwagu, B.I. 2003. Response of laying hens to dietary levels of heat treated sheep manure. *Tropical J. Anim. Sci.* 6:111-116.
- Acar, N., E. T. Moran Jr., and D. R. Mulvaney. 1993. Breast muscle development of commercial broilers from hatching to twelve weeks of age. *Poult. Sci.* 72:317-325.
- Akinmutimi, A.H. and Okwu, N.D. 2006. Effect of Quantitative Substitution of Cooked *Mucuna utilis* Seed Meal for Soybean Meal in Broiler Finisher Diet. *International Journal of Poultry Science* 5 (5): 477-481.
- Diarra, S.S., Sandakabatu, D., Perera, D., Tabuaciri, P., and Mohammed. U. 2014. Growth performance and carcass yield of broiler chickens fed commercial finisher and cassava copra meal-based diets. *Journal of Applied Animal Research.* 43(3):352-356.
- Dickens, J.A. and C.E. Lyon. 1993. Effect of Two stunning voltages on blood loss and objective texture of meat deboned at various post mortem times. *Poult. Sci.* 72:589-593.
- Fanimo, A.O., Adebayo, A.J., Oduguwa, O.O. and Biobaku, W.O. 2007. Feeding value of cashew testa for broiler chickens. *Nigerian Journal of Animal Production.* 34(1): 83- 93.
- Galassi, G., Crovetto, G. M., Rapetti, L. and Tamburini, A. 2004. Energy and nitrogen balance in heavy pigs fed different fibre sources. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 85: 253-262.
- Hajati, H. 2010. Effect of enzyme supplementation on performance,

- carcass characteristics, carcass composition and some blood parameters of broiler chicken. *Ame. J. Anim. Vet. Sci.* 5(2): 155-161
- Kanengoni, A. T., Dzama, K., Chimonyo, A. M., Kusina, J. and Maswaure, S. M. 2002. Influence of level of maize cob meal on nutrient digestibility and nitrogen balance in Large White, Mukota and LW× M F1 crossbred pigs. *Anim. Sci.* 74: 127-134.
- Karaoglu, M., Machit, M., Esenbuga, N., Durdag, H., Turgut, L. and Bilgin, O. C. 2004. Effect of Supplemental Humate at Different Levels on the Growth Performance, Slaughter and Carcass Traits of Broilers. *International Journal of Poultry Science.* 3 (6): 406-410.
- Khursheed, A., Banday, M.T., Khan, A. A, Adil, S, Ganai, A. M., Sheikh, I.U. and Sofi, A. H. 2017. Effect of mint leaves with or without enzyme supplementation on blood biochemistry, carcass characteristics and sensory attributes of broiler chicken. *Adv. Anim. Vet. Sci.* 5(11): 449-455.
- Len, N. T. 2008. Evaluation of Fibrous Feeds for Growing Pigs in Vietnam: Effects of Fibre Level and Breed. Ph.D Thesis, Department of Animal Nutrition and Management, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science, Wedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.
- Marapana, R. A. U. J. 2016. Effect of Different Dress Weight Categories on Yield Part Percentage and Relationship of Live and Dress Weight of Broiler Carcasses Slaughter at Different Conditions. *J. Food Sci. Technol. Nepal.* 9: 31-38.
- Nwawe, A. K., Omoikhoje, S.O. and Nwawe, C. N. 2005. Replacement value of groundnut cake with cooked bambara groundnut meal on the carcass quality and relative organ weights of broiler chickens. *J. Agri. Forestry, Soc. Sci.*, 3: 121-128.
- Onu, P. N. 2007. The influence of heat-treated sheep manure on the performance, carcass characteristics and economics of production of starter broilers. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv.* 6(11): 1323-1327
- Onu, P.N. and Madubuike, F. N. 2010. Performance and carcass properties of finisher broilers fed exogenous enzyme supplemented sheep manure based diet. *Indian Journal of Animal Research.* 44(2): 94-99.
- Onu, P.N., and Otuma, M.O. 2008. Utilization of heat treated Sheep dropping in the diet of broiler finisher chicks. *International Journal of Poultry Science.* 7(2): 19-173.
- Partanen, K., Jalava, T. and Valaja, J. 2007. Effects of a dietary organic acid mixture and of dietary fibre levels on ileal and faecal nutrient apparent digestibility, bacterial nitrogen flow, microbial metabolite concentrations and rate of passage in the digestive tract of pigs. *Animal.* 389-401.
- Sheikh, I.U. and Chatterjee, A. 2009. Carcass characteristics and mineral profile of vanaraja birds. *Indian Veterinary Journal.* 86(8):869-870.
- Sheikh, I.U., Sapcota, D., Dutta, K.K. and Sarma, S. 2005. Effect of dietary silkworm pupae meal on the carcass characteristics of broilers. *Indian veterinary Journal.* 82 (7): 752-755.
- Singh, R. A. 1990. Poultry production. 3rd Ed., Kalyani Publishers, 1/1 Rajinder Nagar, Ludhiana-141008, New Delhi, India.
- Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran W.G. 1994. Statistical methods. 6th edition. Iowa state university press, Ames, Iowa.
- Tion, M.A. and Orga, M.T. 2004. The effect of calorie to proteins rations of practical

- diets on performance and carcass quality of boiler chickens. *Proc. of the 29th Annual conference of the Nigerian Society for Anim. Prod.* 14-16th March 2004, Benin, Nigeria. pp: 29-30.
- Toluen, C.D and Igba, F. 2007. Growth and carcass characteristics of broiler chickens fed water soaked and cooked velvet beans (*Mucuna pruriens*) meal. Proceedings of the 32nd Annual NSAP Conference, March 18-21, 2007, Calabar, Nigeria, pp: 240-243.
- Traits, J. and Wright, A. J. 1990. Effect of sugar bit-fabric and wheat bran fibre on iron and zinc absorption in rats. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 64: 547-552.

How to cite this article:

Sheikh, I.U., S. Adil, M.T. Banday, A.A. Khan, Bushra Zaffer and Nissa, S.S. 2018. Carcass Characteristics of Broiler Chicken Fed Sheep Manure Based Diets Supplemented with or without Enzymes. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 7(04): 1351-1357.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.704.151>