Online Journal of Animal and Feed Research

An International Peer-reviewed journal which publishes in electronic format (online)



Online ISSN: 2228-7701



Full text of Papers

Volume 1, Issue 2, 2011



EFFECTS OF WHOLE COTTON SEED SUPPLEMENTATION ON CARCASS AND MEAT QUALITIES OF THE DJALLONKE SHEEP RAISED ON STATION

G.A. TEYE^{*}, F. ADZITEY, O. ALIDU, T. ANSAH, F. ADDY, B. ALENYOREGE, J. NAADAM, E.K. SALAH and H.K. DEI

University for Development Studies, Animal Science Department, Box TL 1882, Tamale, Ghana.

*Email: teye.gabriel@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: This on-station study evaluated the effects of whole cotton seed supplementation on the carcass and meat qualities of Djallonke sheep. Twelve sheep of similar age and weight were randomly selected and supplemented with whole cotton seed (WCS) for fifteen weeks in a completely randomized design. Three treatment levels of 0 g, 200 g and 400 g were offered with four replicates. Supplementation had no adverse effect on carcass quality but significantly (P<0.001) improved juiciness and overall liking of the meat. The results suggest that whole cotton seed could be used as a supplementary feed with 200 g being enough to ensure the survival and to improve the productivity and meat quality of the Djallonke sheep.

Keywords: Djallonke sheep, cotton seed, carcass

INTRODUCTION

In Northern Ghana, small ruminants can be found in almost every household in the communities. They feed on low quality food particularly, fibrous vegetation which cannot be consumed by humans and non-ruminant animals such as pigs and poultry (Ruth, 1991). They produce the bulk of meat for households (Salifu and Teye, 2006). However, dry-season feeding is difficult due to scarcity and /or poor quality of feed resources. Productivity of animals decrease as a result of scarce and or poor quality feed resources (Danso-Meriku, 2005). The natural vegetation which is the main feed resource is often completely burnt in the dry season and this result in virtually nothing for the animals to graze. Supplementary feeding is therefore a requirement for maintenance or higher turnover in livestock production.

The consumption of meat and its value depends on carcass and meat qualities. Components of carcass and meat qualities are yield and composition, appearance, eating quality, technological characteristics, palatability, wholesomeness and ethical quality (Warriss, 2001). The most important aspect of eating quality is the combined effects of tenderness, juiciness and flavour (Jones, 1995). Tenderness of meat tends to be higher when animals grow rapidly, particularly just before slaughter (Lauorngholz and Ballet, 1997).

Cotton seed is known for its high nutritive value, which includes 25% crude protein, 20.8% crude fibre, 17.5% ether extract, 16% calcium and 5% ash (Calhoun et al., 1995). It was estimated that about 22,200 – 24,220 metric tonnes of cotton seed is produced annually in Northern Ghana (Karbo and Bruce, 2000). An on-farm experiment with cotton seed supplementation indicated that eating qualities were positively affected (Kwarteng, 2009). It is against this background that this experiment was carried out on-station to validate the effect of whole cotton seed supplementation on carcass and meat qualities of the Djallonke sheep.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Location and experimental design

The study was conducted on-station at the Nyankpala campus of the University for Development Studies. A total of twelve (12) Djallonke rams of similar age group and an average initial weight of 14 kg were randomly allocated to three (3) treatments with four (4) replicates. The supplemented groups were confined and fed with cotton seeds daily in the morning by 6:00 am before being released to join the other flock on the range. The treatment levels were as follows: Control: 0 gram whole cotton seed supplementation (WCS), T1:200 g WCS and T2:400 g WCS. The experiment lasted for fifteen weeks.

Slaughtering and Sampling

At the end of the feeding trial, the animals were taken to the University for Development Studies Meat Processing Laboratory. The final live weights of the animals were recorded before slaughtering. The animals were each stunned and bled by severing the carotid arteries in the jugular furrow close to the head. Singing was done by the use of firewood and knives to scrape off the hair on the skin. Evisceration was done immediately after singing and washing according to standard procedures.

Experimental parameters measured

Carcass and meat qualities evaluation: immediately after evisceration, the hot carcass weights were taken using a digital scale. The carcasses were then chilled overnight and cold carcass weights were taken 24 hours after slaughtering using the same scale. The weights of the primal cuts; the thigh, shoulder, and the *Longissimus dorsi* (LD) muscle were taken. The weights of empty rumen, intestine and other visceral were also taken.

Drip loss: Fifty grams of the left LD was hanged from a nylon thread in a transparent polythene bag, the ends of the bag fastened and hang in a refrigerator at +2 °C for a period of 72 hours. After which the weights were re-taken to determine the drip loss.

Fat (ether extract) extraction: crude fat content of samples was determined by the ether extraction method (AOAC 2003; method 991.36) using a Soxtec system (Foss, UK). Three grams of each sample was dried at 100 °C in an oven (J.P. Selecta, S.A) for three hours. The samples were then ground into fine powder with a ceramic laboratory mortar for the fat extraction.

Moisture determination: empty crucibles were initially weighed and approximately 3 g of each sample was put into the crucible and re-weighed. The weights of the samples plus crucibles were noted using a digital scale (Sartarious A.G. Gottingen, Germany) and noted " W_1 ". The samples plus the crucibles were put in an oven (J.P. Selecta, S.A) and the oven set at 105 °C for three (3) hours. The crucibles with the samples were put in a desiccator to cool. The samples plus crucibles were weighed using the same digital scale and was noted " W_2 ". Estimation of the moisture content was done using the formula " W_1 - W_2 "

Estimation of crude protein by digestion method: Weighed samples were put into digestion tubes. Two Kjeltabs were added to each tube and 15 ml of concentrated sulphuric acid was added to each tube and gently mixed to wet filter paper. The samples were then loaded onto the digestion block which was set at 420 °C for 30 minutes. All samples were distilled using automated/manual Kjeldahl distillation systems (Pro-Nitro II). The digested samples were placed into the Pro-Nitro II after the addition of 50 ml of 40% NaOH and distilled for nine (9) minutes. The distillates were collected into receiver solution (4% Boric Acid) and the crude protein estimated.

Sensory analysis

Eating quality was assessed by a fifteen (15) taste panellist who evaluated the intensity of these characteristics: tenderness, juiciness, colour and flavour. The LD musle was thawed at room temperature. The thawed LD was sliced into five chops of 3.5 cm thickness and griddled to a core temperature of 70 °C (using turbofan blue sealed oven, UK). During the cooking period/ the chops were turned over every five minutes. Chops were then trimmed of all adhering fats. Three rectangular samples were cut from each chop, wrapped in pieces of labelled foil and presented to the assessors. Bread was used as a neutralizer alongside water. Assessors used a five-point

category scale to evaluate sample: tenderness (1 very tender, 5 very tough), juiciness; (1 very juicy, 5 very dry), lamb flavour; (1 very strong, 5- very weak), and overall liking; (1 – like very much, 5 – dislike very much).

Statistical analysis

The data obtained was analysed using the general linear model of analysis of variance (ANOVA) of Minitab version 15.0 (Minitab, PA USA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of whole cotton seed on live, warm and cold carcass, thigh, shoulder and *Longissimus dorsi* (LD) muscle weights

The effects of supplementation and non-supplementation of whole cotton seed on live, warm and cold carcass, thigh, shoulder and *Longissimus dorsi* (LD) muscle weights are present in Table 1. Live and warm carcass weights tended to be higher for T1 and T2 compared to the control group. The thigh and LD muscle tended to favour the control group.

However, supplementation did not have any significant effect (P>0.05) on live, warm and cold carcass weights for the various treatments (Table 1). Similarly, there was no significant difference (P>0.05) in weights among the various treatments for thigh, shoulder and LD muscle, a reflection of the non-significance live and carcass weights (Table 1).

The insignificant differences observed in weights for warm and cold carcass, thigh, shoulder and *LD* muscle are an indication that whole cotton seed has no adverse effect on growth and development of the animal hence, similar carcass yields. This suggests that cotton seed has a potential for use as a supplement for sheep. This result is in agreement with a previous report that, there is a potential for increased carcass yield when sheep and goats are supplemented with cotton seed (Kwarteng, 2009).

Table1- Live weights, weights of warm and cold carcass, thigh, shoulder and LD muscle								
Weights (kg)	Control	T1	Τ2	SED*	P-value			
Live	11.50	14.50	15.50	4.858	0.70			
Warm carcass	7.83	8.34	8.75	2.860	0.96			
Cold carcass	6.95	5.63	6.00	2.154	0.79			
Thigh	0.59	0.55	0.54	0.220	0.97			
Shoulder	0.36	0.37	0.36	0.147	0.99			
LD Muscle	0.55	0.48	0.48	0.211	0.85			
*Standard error of dif	ference							

Effect of whole cotton seed on crude protein, ether extract, percentage moisture and drip loss in the Longissimus dorsi (LD)

There was no significant difference (P > 0.05) observed for the various treatments on crude protein, ether extract, and percentage moisture (Table 2). However, drip loss was significantly (P<0.05) reduced in the supplemented groups. An indication that cotton seed supplementation did not have any adverse effect on crude protein level, ether extract and percentage moisture but improved moisture retention in the meat. Thus supplementation with whole cotton seed positively improved crude protein level and percentage moisture, and relatively reduced ether extracts and drip loss in the LD muscle.

There was relatively high moisture content in the supplemented groups than the control, and a corresponding less drip loss from the supplemented groups which might have contributed to its juiciness and tenderness of the LD muscle. Muscles with better water holding capacity have an advantage for further processing. Water holding capacity

(WHC) is the ability of meat to retain its water during application of external forces such as heating, cutting, mincing and processing (Boles, 2003).

Table- 2 Crude protein, ether extract, percentage moisture and drip loss of LD muscle								
	Control	Trt 1	Trt 2	SED*	P-value			
Crude protein (%)	50.31	53.51	53.45	4.421	0.70			
Ether extract (%)	1.96	1.66	1.57	0.360	0.54			
Moisture content (%)	53.40	57.38	57.31	5.242	0.67			
Drip loss (mg)	3.5 ^₅	2.2 ª	2.5ª	0.480	0.05			
*Standard error of difference; means in the same row with similar superscripts are not significantly different (P>0.05)								

Eating qualities of Longissimus dorsi (LD) muscle

There were significant differences (P<0.001) between the various treatments for juiciness and overall liking (Table 3). There was also a significant difference ($P\le0.05$) in tenderness between the various treatments. There were no significant differences (P>0.05) in colour and flavour. *Longissimus dorsi* (LD) muscles from supplemented groups retained more moisture, making these muscles juicier, tender and likened more compared to the control. Lawrie (2006) reported that increase in water holding capacity improves tenderness of the flesh when cooked. Kwarteng (2009) also reported that there was no adverse effect on meat quality of small ruminants when supplemented with cotton seed and that a positive eating attributes of juiciness was as a result of the better water holding capacity induced as a result of cotton seed supplementation. Their reports are in agreement with our findings. Our study may also suggest that, most Ghanaians prefer meats that are moderately red, more tender and juicy, with high lamb flavour.

Table- 3 Eating qualities of the LD muscle							
Attributes	Control	Trt 1	Trt 2	*Sed	P-value		
Color	1.73	1.67	1.53	0.241	0.70		
Tenderness	2.80ª	2.10 ^b	2.67 ^{ab}	0.310	0.05		
Juiciness	3.20ª	1.70 ^b	2.40 ^{ab}	0.280	0.00		
Lamb flavor	1.67	1.93	1.45	0.252	0.19		
Overall liking	2.90ª	1.6 ^b	2.50 ^{ab}	0.243	0.00		
*Standard error of difference: means in the same row with similar superscripts are not significantly different (P>0.05)							

CONCLUSION

The result of this present study suggest that supplementation of whole cotton seed at a level of 200 g produced animals with the most favourable nutritional, and eating qualities of *Longissimus dorsi* (LD) muscles. In general feeding of whole cotton seed up to 400 g in the diets of sheep have no adverse effects on the meat quality. Therefore the readily available cheap feed (whole cotton seed) produce in excess in the Northern part of Ghana especially in can be stored and used to feed sheep during the dry season when animal feed is scare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge with gratitude the support given by DelPHE for funding the project, and University for Development Studies, Meat Processing Laboratory for providing the facilities for the data collection.

REFERENCES

Association of Official Analytical Chemists (2003). Official methods of analysis, FOSS Analytical 69, Slangerupgade DK-3400 Hilleroed, Denmark.

Boles AJ (2003). MEAT. A presentation at Montana State University, U S A.13th of August, 2003. Pp 1-8. Calhoun MC, Kuhlmann SW and Balwin BC (1995). Cotton feed product composition and gossypol availability and toxicity.2nd Nat. Alternative feeds symposium St. Louis, MO. Ed. M.L. East ridge. Pp125.

- Danso-Mireku E (2005). Dry season feeding of small ruminants in Tolon-Kumbungu District of the Northern region. BSc. Thesis. University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.
- Jones MSD (1995). The influence of carcass composition on meat quality. In: Quality and Grading of Carcass of Meat Anim. 6: 132 147.
- Karbo N and Bruce J (2000). The contribution of livestock production to food security in the Northern Ghana Overview, Conference for International Development of Agriculture, Ghana report (august, 2000). Pp. 41.
- Kwarteng A (2009). The effect of whole cotton seed on the carcass and meat qualities of small ruminants. BSc Dissertation, Department of Animal Science, U.D.S. Tamale.
- Lauorngholz HJ and Ballet H (1997). Husbandry and breed effects on suckler cow performance under extensive grassland farming conditions in Germany. In "effects extension on animal performance and product quality". Occasional publication No. 4 of concerted action AIR-CT-0947.
- Lawrie RA (2006). The eating quality of meat. In: Meat science.7th ed.Oxford: Pregammon press, UK. Pp. 1-20.
- Ruth MG (1991). The Tropical Agriculturist. Macmillan Education Ltd. London and Basingstoke p 57.
- Salifu S and Teye GA (2006). The contribution of the various ruminant species to meat production in Tamale Metropolis. The savanna Farmer, 7: 12.
- Warriss PD (2001). Meat quality, In: Meat Science, An introductory text, School of Veterinary Science. University of Bristol. UK. Pp. 106-268.



POISONOUS PLANTS IN GARDENS AND GRAZING LANDS

A. AGANGA, M. NSINAMWA, K. OTENG and B. MAULE

Botswana College of Agriculture, P/Bag 0027. Gaborone.

*Email: aaganga@bca.bw

ABSTRACT: This paper is a review of poisonous plants, their toxic agents and the symptoms of poisoning. Poisonous plants are plants, which as a whole or part thereof under all or certain conditions and in amount likely to be taken or into contact with an organism will exert harmful effects or causes death either immediately or by reason of cumulative action of toxic property due to presence of known or unknown chemical action. There are different types of diseases caused by some poisonous plants. Poisonous plants can reduce livestock productivity depending on the effect they have and the amount consumed. Since poisonous plants are potential threats to the livestock industry it is important that farmers are carefully to avoid contamination of rations prepared for livestock and removal of poisonous plants from grazing lands. Prevention and precautions are the best way to avoid any economic loss.

Keywords: Major genes, early lay traits, crossbred local chicken, humid tropics

INTRODUCTION

Poisonous plants are plants, which as a whole or part thereof under all or certain conditions and in amount likely to be taken or into contact with an organism will exert harmful effects or causes death either immediately or by reason of cumulative action of toxic property due to presence of known or unknown chemical action. The poisonous nature of the whole plant or any plant part may be due to production of toxic substances such as alkaloids, glucosides, amines, toxalbumins, picrotoxins, resins, sponins, tannins etc., many of which are harmful to man and animal life (Katewa,et.al,2006).

Poisonous plants are found everywhere, in every continent and even in the deserts (Johnson, 2009). Poisonous plants have their uses for food, drugs, ornamentals and poison. Animals have adapted to survive the low doses of poisons or they do not eat the poisonous parts. There are poisonous plants that are too toxic for food and they have their uses as well. Goats and deer avoid oleander as well as foxglove and periwinkles. Plants such as yellow bells, frangipani, and poinsettias are all toxic and are used as ornamentals. Some poisonous plants are used as a source of poison for eradicating pests and rats. Poisonous plants can also be used for healing. Medicines have been created from plants at different dosages. Poisonous plants can heal as well as kill (Johnson, 2009).

Brown (2009) stated that "just because something is on the poisonous plants list doesn't mean it can't be a good food or feed, and just because it is absent from the list doesn't mean it is safe". A poisonous plant is one which, when consumed in such quantities as will be taken by animal or man over a short or prolonged periods, exerts harmful effects on the system or causes death by virtue of toxic substance(s) normally contained in the plant. There different types of poisoning by plants. Some good fodder plants may be poisonous for example grasses that produce hydrocyanic acid when in wilting stage, improper ingestion of some plants and dry grass full of cellulose can be converted into fibre balls in the gastro-intestinal tract and cause obstruction. Feeding livestock on grass deficient in minerals, proteins, lipids and vitamins cause some diseases. A plant may be poisonous to one animal species and non-poisonous to another. Some parts of a plant may be poisonous while other parts are harmless. There are different types of diseases caused by some poisonous plants. Photosensitization is caused by ingestion of

photodynamic substance in the plant. This makes the animal hypersensitive to light such as *Tribulus terrestris, Lantana camara* and others. Table 1 shows some poisonous plants found in many parts of the world.

A muscaria: Fly Agaric A nuscaria: Fly Agaric Lantana	Table 1 - List of Scientific and Common Name Equivalents	
A pantherina: Pantheri A verse: Destroying Angels Abrus precatorius: Rissary Pea Abrus precatorius: Rissary Rissary Pea Abrus Abrus precatorius: Rissary Pea Abrus Abrus precatorius: Rissary Pea Abrus Abrus Pea Ab	A. muscaria: Fly Agaric	Lantana
A verna: Destroying Angels Acer succharum: Silver angle, Soft maple, Hard maple Acer succharum succharum: Silver All soft Marker Papaver spp: Various Poppies spi: Colonder or Deady (Nightshade Brasics asp): Rape, Cabhage, Turnise, Rocking Charlog angle: Lijver Marker Proford marker Allows spi: Colonder sense and offer spi: Horseful Euphorise spi: Charten Soft Marker Papaver spi: White Shale Charum, Silver Charum, Silver Shale Allows Supporte spi: Soft Allows Shale Allows Suphore Spi: Soft Allows Shale Allows Support Spi:	A. pantherina: Panther	Lathyrus spn : Sweet Pea Tangier Pea Everlasting Pea
Abrus precatorius: Rosairy Pea Leucontone axiliants and Leucontone axiliants axiliants and Leucontone axiliants axiliantaxiliants axiliants axiliants axiliants axiliantaxi	A. verna: Destroying Angels	Caley Pea and Singletary Pea
Acer zaccharum: Red maple, Soft maple Leucothoe and Sierra Laurel Acer saccharum: Siyer maple, Soft maple, Hard maple Leucothoe and Sierra Laurel Acer saccharum: Siyer maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp:: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acer saccharum: Siyer maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp:: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acter saccharum: Siyer maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp:: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acter saccharum: Siyer maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp:: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acter saccharum: Siyer maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp:: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acter saccharum: Bithage: Com Cockle Mellotas able and Mellotas officinalis: White and Yellow Arearantus spp:: Milewed Astrapia Sacpi: Tock in the Unit Arsena baliadonna: Deladon Milotinas of Deadly Nightshade Prassles app:: Tabck in the Unit Astrapias spp: Milewed Astrapias spp: Milewed Astrapias spp: Milewed Pastra Sacs app: Simue Term Astrapias spp: Milewed Pastra Sacs app: Simue Term Astrapias spp: Milewed Pastrapias canait, Simue Term Astrapias spp: Milewed Pastrapias canait, Simue Term Artera balistiti: Yellow Star Thistie	Abrus precatorius: Rosary Pea	Leucothoe axillaris and Leucothoe davisiae: Drooping
Acer seccharium: Silver maple, Rock maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Linum ustatistsimum: Flax Acer seccharium: Sugar maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Linum ustatistsimum: Flax Acerase spp: Benchern, Dolls Evgs, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Banchern, Dolls Evgs, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Ascenta spp: Tools the Suckeye Bancherry, Dolls Evgs, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Agent statistics: Tung Oil Tree Medicago sativa: Affafa or Lucerne Allum spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chives Medicago sativa: Affafa or Lucerne Amanta spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chives Medicago sativa: Affafa or Lucerne Amanta spp: Togbane Medicago sativa: Affafa or Lucerne Agerona mexicana: Prickly Popy or Mexican Poppy Medicago sativa: Affafa or Lucerne Argemone mexicana: Prickly Popy or Mexican Poppy Privatica aspp: Tobacco Argemone mexicana: Prickly Popy or Mexican Poppy Privatica aspp: Tobacco and Tree Tobacco Artogalaus and Doytropis spp: Locweed Privatica aspp: Tobacco and there spp: Jack In the Pulpit Astragatus and Doytropis spp: Locweed Privatica aspp: Tobacco and there spp: Jack In the Pulpit Chivatopa bittics: Mark Mariago or Cowslip Privatica aspp: Tobacco and there spp: Jack In the Pulpit Chenopodium album:: Lambs Quartes Priva	Acer rubrum: Red maple, Swamp maple, Soft maple	Leucothoe and Sierra Laurel
Acer secharum: Sugar maple, Rock maple, Hard maple Lobella spp: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian Acontum spp: Nonkey Agaric, Com Cockle Lobella spp: Birdscot Trefoil Ager stamma githaga: Com Cockle Lobella spp: Lingen Ager stamma githaga: Com Cockle Mellows spp: Lingen Aurontss offul: Tung Oil Tore Mellows spp: Lingen Amarinta spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chies Mellows spp: Lingen Amarinta spp: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Mellows spp: Lingen Angel Mushrooms Endelia spp: Tobacco and Tree Tobacco Amarintus spp: Pigweed Mellows alba and Mellotus officinalis: White and Yellow Arsena belladonna: Belladonna or Deadly Nightshade Parsela spp: Laro I ther Hulpit Astrafalus and Dydropis spp: Locoweed Phirts sponica and other spp: Japanese Pieris, Mountain Astrafalus and Dydropis Spp: Lingen Podophylium pertaum: Mayapple and Mandrake Pravers spp: Singling Out Start Maringling Courses Podophylium pertaum: Mayapple and Mandrake Provents spp: Ergit Connun seque to the spp: Lobenta spp: Mellowand There Spp: Lorewoot Robenta spp: Solution R	Acer saccharinum: Silver maple, Soft maple, White maple	Linum usitatissimum: Flax
Accease sp.: Banchebry, Dolis Eyes, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Actease sp.: Banchebry, Dolis Eyes, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Asculas sp.: Horse Chestrut, Buckeye Agrosterma giftháge: Corn Occkie Aleurites fordil: Tung Oli Tree Aleurites fordil: Tung Oli Tree Amanta sp.: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Angel Mashrooms Amaranthus spp.: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Angel Mashrooms Amaranthus spp.: Nonkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Angel Mashrooms Amaranthus spp.: Togbane Argemone mexicana: Prickly Poppy or Mexican Poppy Ariseame spp.: Jack in the Pulpit Ascelpais spp.: Milkweed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Newed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Coowed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Coowed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Coowed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Coowed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Coowed Cheropoolium aburn: Lambs Quarters Cheirdonium majus: Celandine Cheata spp.: Water Hemicko or Cowbane Clava spp.: Water Hemicko or Cowbane Clava spp.: Deiphiniums and Larkspurs Dicentra spp.: Dicethiniums and Larkspurs Dicentra spp.: Deiphiniums and Larkspurs Dicentra spp.: Corn Miy, Creening Charlie, and Gill over the G	Acer saccharum: Sugar maple, Rock maple, Hard maple	Lobelia spp.: Great Lobelia, Cardinal Flower, and Indian
Acteas spp: Baneberry, Dolls Eyes, White Cohosh, Snakeberry Acceculus spp: Horse Chesthur, Buckeye Agrostemma githago: com Cockie Medicago sativa: Alraifa or Luceme Agrostemma githago: com Cockie Medicago sativa: Alraifa or Luceme Allum spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Amanta spp: Nonkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Angel Mushrooms Amanta spp: Amaranthus spp: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Amaranthus spp: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Armana spp: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Amaranthus spp: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Armana spp: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Armana bay: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Oneins, Swamp Onions, and Armana bay: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Oneins, Swamp Onions, and Armana bay: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Oneins, Swamp Onions, and Armana bay: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Oneins, Swamp Onions, and Armana bay: Digenetic Commercial Onions, Wild Oneins, Swamp Onions, and Armana bais dathar disupretrial Mushrooms Ornitosgatum	Aconitum spp.: Monkshood, Aconite, or Wolfsbane	Tobacco
Aesculus spp:: Horse Chestnut, Buckeye Lupinus spp:: Lupine Agrosterma gihango: Con Cockie Medicago sativas: Alfaifa or Lucerne Aleurthes fordik: Tung Qil Tree Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Allium spp:: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chives Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Amania sup:: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Amsinckal Intermedia: Fiddleneck Oncolea sensibilits: Sensitive Fern Argemone mexicana: Prickly Popp or Mexican Poppy Papaver spp:: Various Poppies Including Opium Poppy Arsadeus and Oxytropis spp:: Locoweed Parasica spp:: Balaction or Deadiy Nightshade Arsace beliadonna: Beliadonna: Deadiy Nightshade Prassica spp:: Balactions or Deadiy Nightshade Brassica spp:: Rape, Cabbaeg, Turnips, Broccoli, Mustard Padoer spp:: Balactic Cherry, Bir Cherry, Beant Mangles: Lupine majus: Celandine Cheidonal ma majus: Celandine Rumus spp:: Bouncing Bet and Cow Cockle Chertare spp:: Baphne Sanpulare canadensis: Elderberry Convaliar a majus: Clain Chery, Spreeio, Groundesis, and Rayorts Sanparla spp:: Horosebrush Carlat spp::	Actaea spp.: Baneberry, Dolls Eyes, White Cohosh, Snakeberry	Lotus corniculatus: Birdsfoot Trefoil
Agrostemma gittagic Com Cockle Medicagio sativa: Alfalfa or Lucerne Allumtes fordil: Tung Oll Tree Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Allum spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Metiotus alba and Melliotus officinalis: White and Yellow Annantha spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Metiotus alba and Melliotus officinalis: White and Yellow Annanthus spp: Pigweed Oniclea sensibilits: Sensitive Fern Amaranthus spp: Jogbane Papeer spp: Yarious Poppies Including Oplum Poppy Arsense spp: Jack in the Pulpit Papeer spp: Yarious Poppies Including Oplum Poppy Arsense also dotyropis spp: Locowed Particus and other spp: Japanese Pieris, Mountain Farsface agne, Turips, Brocooli, Mustard Petrolylium petatum: Nayapile and Mandrake Chenopodium adum: Lambo Quarters Prodophyllum petatum: Nayapile and Mandrake Chenopodium madus: Lisy of the Valley Seneita spp: Water Hemilock Convallaré angles: Lity of the Valley Sanduras Spp: Songhum or Milos Seativa: Stacken Fern Convallaré majelis: Lity of the Valley Sanduras Spp: Beachers Convallaré majelis: Lity of the Valley Sanduras Spp: Songhum or Milos Suda Grass, and Johina speurdoacecla: Black Locust Dieghtinum sep: Dephniums and Larkspurs Sonaura spp: Songhum or Milos Suda Grass, and Johinson Grass Diegh	Aesculus spp.: Horse Chestnut, Buckeye	Lupinus spp.: Lupine
Aleurises fordil: Tung Oil Tree Menispermum canadense: Moonsed Allum spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chives Menispermum canadense: Moonsed Amanita spp: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death Angel Mushrooms Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Amanita spp: Spp: Locking Cap, Panthal Strends, Star of Bethlehen Amsincki Intermedia: Flidleneck Menispermum canadense: Moonseed Amsincki Intermedia: Flidleneck Oncice as ensibilitis: Sensitive Fern Appertum spp: Dogbane Ornithogalum umbellatum: Stor of Bethlehem Ascieplas spp: Including Opium Poppy Artragalus and Oxfropis spp: Locoweed Phytolesca americana: Pokeweed Atropa belladonna: Belladona Marke Prans spp: Trape, Cabbage, Turnipe, Chevisip Prans spp: Bullinilim: Bracken Fern Cannabis sattiw: Wariyuan Quercus spp: Belladonse Chencopodium ablour: Lams Quarters Sumatrus sp	Agrostemma githago: Corn Cockle	Medicago sativa: Alfalfa or Lucerne
Allium spp: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and Chives Metitotus alia and Metilotus officinalis: White and Yellow Amaranthus spp:: Metitotus alia and Metilotus officinalis: White and Yellow Amaranthus spp:: Providence Amaranthus spp:: Dephene Arsaema spp:: Dephene Arsaema spp:: Dephene Arsaema spp:: Dephene Astragalus and Oxytropis spp:: Loc weede Cathra palastrist: Metitotus alia and Metilotus officinalis: Cathra palastrititotic alia an	Aleurites fordil: Tung Oil Tree	Menispermum canadense: Moonseed
ChivesSweetcloverAmanta spp:Nonkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and DeathAngel MushroomsMerkum oleander: OleanderAmaranthus spp:PigwedAmsinckia Intermedia:FiddleneckAmsonkia Intermedia:FiddleneckApocynum spp:DogbaneApocynum spp:DogbaneApocynum spp:DogbaneApocynum spp:DogbaneApocynum spp:DogbaneAstragalus and Oxtropis spp:LocowedAstragalus and Oxtropis spp:LocowedAstragalus and Oxtropis spp:LocowedAstragalus and Oxtropis spp:ConwellCaltha palustris:Marsh Marigold or CowslipCantaba sativa:Maring Marigold or CowslipCantaba sativa:Martina Marigold or CowslipCheldonium majus:Celandano:Cheldonium albur:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria majalis:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria majalis:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria majalis:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria spp:Jinson GrassDightis puprea:Fosiloca spp:Equisetum arrense and other spp:Horsen HoustianFeduroma spp:Fosiloca spp:Equisetum arrense and other spp:Horsen HoustianConvallaria majalis:Spuraria spp:Convallaria majalis:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria majalis:Spuraria spp:Convallaria majalis:Liby of the ValleyConvallaria spp:Jinson GrassSymplocarpus feetidus:Spuraria spp:	Allium spp.: Commercial Onions, Wild Onions, Swamp Onions, and	Metilotus alba and Melilotus officinalis: White and Yellow
Amanita spp: Mentur oleander: Amgel Mushrooms Nertur oleander: Amgel Mushrooms Micotiana spp:: Amsinckla Intermedia: Fiddlenck Argein Sapp: Jack Inthe Pulpt Astragalus and Oxytropis spp:: Locowed Atropa beliadonna: Beladonna: Brassica spp:: Rape Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, Mustard Catha palustris: Marijuana Centaurea sotittalis: Fide Podophyllum peltatum: Charbogolum malum: Lamb Quarcus spp: Cheidonium majus: Celus spp:: Cleuta spp:: Water Hemlock or Cowbane Clauta spp:: Marchinium spa:: Cleuta spp:: Bised Intermedia: Convaliaria majalis: Lily of the Valley Connum aculatur: Poionina spp:: Cononilar acuidatur	Chives	Sweetclover
Angel MushroomsNicotiana spp: Tobacco and Tree TobaccoAmeranthus spp: PigwedOnoclea sensibilis: Sensitive FernAmeranthus spp: DogbaneOnoclea sensibilis: Sensitive FernApcynum spp:: DogbaneOnoclea sensibilis: Sensitive FernApconum spp:: DogbaneOnoclea sensibilis: Sensitive FernApconum spp:: DogbanePapaver spp:: Various Poppies including Opium PoppyArtsrabus and Oxytropis spp:: LocoweedPhytolacca americana: PokeweedAstragalus and Oxytropis spp:: LocoweedPhytolacca americana: PokeweedArtopa belladonna: Belladonna: Belladonna: Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, MustardPrunus spp:: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry,Cantabi sativa: MarijuanaPrunus spp:: Doild Cherry, Bitter Cher	Amanita spp.: Monkey Agaric, Panther Cap, Death Cap, and Death	Nerium oleander: Oleander
Amarahthus spp:PigweedAmsincki Intermedia:FiddlencckApocynum spp:DogbaneArgenna spp:DogbaneArgenna spp:Jack in the PulpitArseare aspp:Jack in the PulpitAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocowedAtropa belladonna:Belladonna or Deadly NightshadeBrasica spp:Reliadonna:Brasica spp::Reliadonna:Catha palustris:Marsh Marigol or CowslipCatha palustris:Cleavis spp::Catha palustris:Cleavis spp:Cheldonlum majus:CelandineCleav spp::Water HemlockCoronilla varia:Crown VetchDaphne spp::Daphne spp::Dieghti spp::Dieghiniums and LarkspursDieghti spp::Poingsume:Dieghinium spp::Delphiniums and LarkspursDieghinium spp::Delphiniums and LarkspursDieghinium spp::Delphiniums and LarkspursDieghti spp::Priose SigoveEquatorium regosum:Milo Suria spp::Euphorbia spp::Poinse Marke Cover, Red Clover, White CloverTrifolum spp::Dionson CarlasEuphorbia spp::FensteaEuphorbia spp::FensteaMaleston giomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton giomeratus: <td>Angel Mushrooms</td> <td>Nicotiana spp.: Tobacco and Tree Tobacco</td>	Angel Mushrooms	Nicotiana spp.: Tobacco and Tree Tobacco
Amsinckia intermedia: Fiddleneck Apocynum spp: Dogbae Argemone mexicana: Prickly Poppy or Mexican Poppy Argemone mexicana: Prickly Poppy or Mexican Poppy Phytolacca americana: Pokewed Pleris Japonica and other spp: Japanese Pieris, Mountain Fetterbrush Pleris Japonica and other spp: Japanese Pieris, Mountain Fetterbrush Plus ponderosa Pine Podophylum petatum: Mayapple and Mandrake Prunus spp: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Ditter Cherry, Choke Cherry, Pinc Cherry Choke Cherry, Pinc Cherry Sangunaria canadensis: Elderberry Sangunaria canadensis: Elderberry Sangunaria canadensis: Elderberry Sangunaria canadensis: Elderberry Sangunaria canadensis: Elderberry Sangunar	Amaranthus spp.: Pigweed	Onoclea sensibilis: Sensitive Fern
Apocynum spp.: DogbanePapaver spp.: Various Poppies including Opium PoppyArgemone mexikana: Prickly Poppy or Mexican PoppyPhytolacca americana: PokeweedArseama spp.: Jack in the PulpitPhytolacca americana: PokeweedAscleplas spp.: MilweedPetris Japonica and other spp.: Japanese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxtropis spp.: LocoweedPlans ponderosa: Ponderosa PineAtropa belladonna: Belladonna: Deadly NightshadePlans ponderosa: Ponderosa PineArabas ativa: MarijuanaPlans ponderosa: Ponderosa PineCantare abustris: Marsh Marigold or CowslipCholeonium majus: CelandineChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersPurus spp.: Oak TreesCheloonium majus: CelandineReturn rhaponticum: RhubarbCleuta spp.: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRichus communis: Castor BeanCarlum aguillaris: Lily of the ValleyRumex spp.: BouckCoronilla varia: Crown VetchSaponate spp.: BouckDientra spp.: Bolehiniums and LarkspursSolarum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Dicentra spp.: Bolehiniums and LarkspursSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan GrassDientra spp.: Bolehiniums and LarkspursSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan GrassDientra spp.: Bolehiniums and LarkspursSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan GrassDientra spp.: Broketing Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan GrassEquborium regiosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium regiosum: White SnakerootTrifolium spp.: HorsebrushHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonTrifolium spp.: Horsebrush <td>Amsinckia intermedia: Fiddleneck</td> <td>Ornithogalum umbellatum: Star of Bethlehem</td>	Amsinckia intermedia: Fiddleneck	Ornithogalum umbellatum: Star of Bethlehem
Arisema spp:Jack in the PulpitPhytolacca americana: PokeweedArisema spp:Astir agains and Oxytropis spp:: LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonese Pieris, MountainAstragalus and Oxytropis spp::LocoweedPieris japonica and other spp:: Japonica and other spp::Caltha palustris:Marsh Marigold or CowsinpChoke Cherry, Pin CherryCannabis sativa:MarijuanaCherry, Bitter Cherry, Cheldonlum: Bracken FernCentaurea solstitialis:Yellow Star ThistieQuercus spp:: Buttercups or CowfootChenopodium majus:Claudens spp::Castor BeanClauces spp::Dison thewickRumex spp:: DockConvallaria majalis:Lily of the ValleySanbucus canadensis:Convallaria majalis:Lily of the ValleySanpulnaria canadensis:Convallaria majalis:Lily of the ValleySanpulnaria canadensis:Diephinium spp::Deiphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp:: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Diephria spp::Beart, Spy::Note Ketle, Black Nightshade,Diephria spp::Deiphiniums and LarkspursSorghum spp:: HorsebrushTagobyryum esculentum:Buckwheat	Apocynum spp.: Dogbane	Papaver spp.: Various Poppies including Opium Poppy
Arlsaema spp.: Jack in the Pulpit Ascleplas spp.: Mikweed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Locoweed Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Locoweed Atropa belladonne: Belladonne or Deadly Nightshade Brassice spp.: Rape, Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, Mustard Cantab sativa: Marijuana Centaurea solstitulais: Yellow Star Thistle Chenopodium album: Lambs Quarters Chenopodium album: Lambs Quarters Clavita spp.: Pist Conlum maculatum: Poison Hemicok Corvallarla majalis: Lily of the Valley Corvallarla rajalis: Lily of the Valley Corvallarla majalis: Lily of the Valley Corvallarla spp.: Daphne Daphne spp.: Daphne Distent spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corm, Dutchmans Breeches Diffauls purpurea: Forgiove Equipatium rayesus: White Snakeroot Eupatorium rugosum: White Snakeroot Eupatorium sempervirens: Jessamine Gelechoma spp.: Goron layer, Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the Ground Haidgeton glomeratus: Halogeton Haidgeton glomeratus: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: Irises Layburum mager/Charlies, Edden Chain or Laburnum Haidgeton glomeratus: St. John	Argemone mexicana: Prickly Poppy or Mexican Poppy	Phytolacca americana: Pokeweed
Ascieglas spp:MilkweedAstragalus and Oxyropis spp:LocoweedAtropa belladonna:Belladonna: Deadly NightshadeBrassica spp.:Rape, Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, MustardCathta palustris:Marsinglot or CowslipCannabis sativa:Warigola or CowslipCannabis sativa:Marigola or CowslipCheldonium majus:CelandineCheldonium majus:CelandineConvaliaria majalis:Lily of the ValleyConvaliaria majalis:Lily of the ValleyCoronilla varia:Crown VetchDatura spp.:Daiphnilum spp.:Datura spp.:Diephiniums and LarkspursDiferitalis purpurea:Fostica arundinacea:Calis purpurea:Fostica arundinacea:Equisetum arvense and other spp.:HorsetailEupatorium rugosum:White SnakerootEupatorium rugosum:White SnakerootFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGlechoma spp::Coindi Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theGroundHalogeton glomeratus:Halogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:Hal	Arisaema spp.: Jack in the Pulpit	Pieris japonica and other spp.: Japanese Pieris, Mountain
Astragalus and Oxytropis spb:. LocoweedPinus ponteress: Ponderosa PineAttropa belladonnar: B	Asclepias spp.: Milkweed	Fetterbrush
Atropa belladonna: Belladonna or Deadly Nightshade Podophyllum pelatum: Mayapple and Mandrake Brassica spp.: Rape, Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, Mustard Prunus spp:: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry, Choke Cherry, Piterfolum aquilinium: Bracken Fern Catha palustris: Marsh Marigold or Cowslip Choke Cherry, Pit Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry, Pterfolum aquilinium: Bracken Fern Cantaures ostittalis: Yellow Stat Thistle Quercus spp:: Oak Trees Chelidonium majus: Celandine Ranunculus spp:: Buttercups or Crowfoot Chenopodium album: Lambs Quarters Ranunculus spp:: Buttercups or Crowfoot Clauta spp:. Water Hemlock or Cowbane Richum reponticum: Rhubarb Conlum maculatum: Poison Hemlock Ramen rhaponticum: Rhubarb Convailaria majalis: Lily of the Valley Sambucus canadensis: Elderberry Convaliata majalis: Lily of the Valley Sambucus canadensis: Bloodroot Daphne spp: Daphne Sangularia canadensis: Bloodroot Datura spp: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans Breeches Sorlaum spp:: Cormon Nightshade, Black Nightshade, Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, Potato Digitalis purpures: Foxglove Sampio-arate spp: Horsebaui Equisetum resce and ther spp:. Horsetail Symplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage Equisetum resce and ther spp: I ensamine Toxicodendron vermis: Poison vak	Astragalus and Oxytropis spp.: Locoweed	Pinus ponderosa: Ponderosa Pine
Brassica spp. : Rape, Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, MustardPrunus spp.: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry, Choke Cherry, Pin CherryCatha palustris: Marsi Marigold or CowslipChoke Cherry, Pin CherryCannabis sativa: MarijuanaPrunus spp.: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry, Choke Cherry, Pin CherryCentaurea solstitialis: Vellow Star ThistleQuecus spp.: Althour Relation spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRichus communis: Castor BeanCleute spp.: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRumex spp.: DockConsullaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySampularia canadensis: ElderberryCoronlill avaria: Crow VetchSampularia canadensis: BiodorotDaphne spp.: JaphneSaponaria spp.: Bouncing Bet and Cow CockleDicentra spp.: Bleding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSoralum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailSympiocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEuphorbi spp.: Poinsens, Sowo on the Mountain Fagoypyrum esculentum: BuckwheatTaxis cupidata: YewFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron radicans: Poison ivyGelsenium sempervirens: JessamineToxicodendron radicans: Poison ivyGlechoma spp.: Roise Work, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: IrisesFestue arundinacea: Tall FescueHalegeton glomeratus: HalogetonVicla spp.: Wini	Atropa belladonna: Belladonna or Deadly Nightshade	Podophyllum peltatum: Mayapple and Mandrake
Catha palustris: Marsh Marigold or CowslipChoke Cherry, Pin CherryCannabis sativa: MarijuanaChoke Cherry, Pin CherryCentaurea solstittalis: Yellow Star ThistleQuercus spp:: Oak TreesCheldonium majus: CelandineRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRheum Anponticum: RhubarbClouta spp: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRicinus communis: Castor BeanCloviceps spp: ErgotRobinla pseudoacacla: Black LocustConvallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySambucus canadensis: ElderberryCorrollla varia: Crown VetchSampuinaria canadensis: BloodrootDatura spp: Jamsonweed, Downy Thornapple, Devils Trumpet,Sapaniar spp.: Bouncing Bet and Cow CockleDientra spp: Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Dientra spp: Poinsettia, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andJohnson GrassSympilocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageTaxus cuspidata: YewTaxus cuspidata: YewEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetialSympilocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium seguentum: BuckwheatToxicodendron vernix: Poison ivyFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron vernix: Poison SumacGlechoma spp: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theTrifolium spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverTrifolum spp:: IrisesLabumum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumVicta spp.: WisteriaLaburum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumVestch, Purple Vetch and BroasVisteria spp:: VisteriaZuerdenus	Brassica spp, : Rape, Cabbage, Turnips, Broccoli, Mustard	Prunus spp.: Wild Cherries, Black Cherry, Bitter Cherry,
Cannabis sativa: Centaurea solstitialis: Vellow Star Thistle Centaurea solstitialis: Vellow Star Thistle Chelidonium majus: Celandine Chelidonium majus: Castor Bean Robinia pseudoacacia: Black Locust Rumex spp: Dock Sampulnaria canadensis: Elderberry Sanquinaria canadensis: Elderberry Sanquinaria canadensis: Elderberry Sanquinaria canadensis: Elderberry Sanquinaria canadensis: Bloodroot Saponaria spp: Sonotol Beant, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans Breeches Difetalis purpurea: Foxglove Equipatorium rugosum: White Snakeroot Euphorbia spp:: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the Mountain Fagoypyrum esculentum: Buckwheat Festuca arundinacea: Tall Fescue Gelsenium sempervires: Jessamine Glechoma spp:: Christmas Rose Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp:: Irises Lautuma anagroides: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantane acamara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianPretradymia spp: Posti Mestina Posti St. Solns Wort, Klamath Weed Visteria spp:: Westeria Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Ziandenus sop: Dentica Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianCanada Provision Statti St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp:: IrisesPrestina spp: Westeria Vesteria Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Ziandenus sop: Dentica Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Caltha palustris: Marsh Marigold or Cowslip	Choke Cherry, Pin Cherry
Centaurea solstitialis: Yellow Star ThistleQuercus spp.: Oak TreesCheildonlum majus: CelandineRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRanunculus spp.: Buttercups or CrowfootClouta spp.: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRicinus communis: Castor BeanClaviceps spp.: TegotRobinia pseudoacacia: Black LocustConlum maculatum: Poison HemlockRumex spp.: DockConvallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySampucus canadensis: BloodrootDaphne spp.: DaphneSaponaria spp.: Senecio, Groundsels, and RagwortsDatura spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSolanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade, Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage Taxus cuspidata: YewEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage Taxus cuspidata: YewElechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundToxicodendron radicans: Poison ivy Toxicodendron radicans: Poison oak Toxicodendron restus: HalogetonHelleborus niger: Christmas Rose Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: IrisesHeilborus Miseria Stinging NettleLaburrum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianYusteria SuncerZiadenus Spp.: IrisesConton Takanga Sage Stinging NettleLaburation Rame SubserGelesen Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianKanta	Cannabis sativa: Marijuana	Pteridium aquilinium: Bracken Fern
Cheidonium majus: CelandineRanunculus spp:: Buttercups or CrowfootChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRheum rhaponticum: RhubarbChenopodium album: Lambs QuartersRheum rhaponticum: RhubarbClouta spp.: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRheum rhaponticum: RhubarbClouta spp.: BrgotRobinia pseudoacacla: Black LocustConsuliar maculatum: Poison HemlockRumex spp.: DockConnuliar majalis: Lily of the ValleySambucus canadensis: BloodrootCoronilla varia: Crown VetchSampularia canadensis: BloodrootDatura spp.: Jimsonweed, Downy Thornapple, Devils Trumpet,Sanquinaria canadensis: BloodrootDatura spp.: Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp.: Conrono Nightshade, Black Nightshade, Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDicentra spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassBigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassEuphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the Mountain Festuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oak Toxicodendron vernix: Poison Sumac Trifolum spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White Clover Trifolum spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White Clover Trifolum spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White Clover Trifolum spp.: Stinging Nettie Veratrum californicum: Conchiebur Helleborus niger: Christmas Rose Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Irk spp.: Irises Laburrum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camare: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianRanuculus spp.: Visteria Xantan Camber Supple Visteria spp.: Wisteria Xantan Camber Supple	Centaurea solstitialis: Yellow Star Thistle	Quercus spp.: Oak Trees
Chenopoduum album: Lambs QuartersRheum rhaponticum: RhubarbCleuta spp.: Water Hemlock or CowbaneRicinus communis: Castor BeanClaviceps spp.: ErgotRobinia pseudoacacia: Black LocustConnum maculatum: Poison HemlockRumex spp.: DockConvallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySambucus canadensis: ElderberryCoronilla varia: Crow VetchSambucus canadensis: BloodrootDaphne spp.: DaphneSamura sambucus canadensis: BloodrootDatura spp.: Jimsonweed, Downy Thornapple, Devils Trumpet,Saneclo spp.: Senecio, Groundsels, and RagwortsAngels TrumpetSolanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade, Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDientra spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Joinson GrassDigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage Taxus cuspidata: YewEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage Taxus cuspidata: YewEupatorium sempervirens: Jessamine Glechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the Faroug Malogeton glomeratus: Halogeton Helleborus niger: Henbane Hyporcum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: IrisesTridium spp.: Miteria Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Zanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Zitardenus spp.: Wisteria Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur	Chelidonium majus: Celandine	Ranunculus spp.: Buttercups or Crowfoot
Cleura spp.: Water Hemiock or CowaneRichus communis: Castor BeanClaviceps spp.: ErgotRobinia pseudoacacia: Black LocustConlum maculatum: Poison HemiockRumex spp.: DockConvallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySambucus canadensis: ElderberryCoronilla varia: Crown VetchSanguinaria canadensis: BloodrootDaphne spp.: DaphneSaponaria spp.: Senecio, Groundsels, and RagwortsDatura spp.: Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Dicentra spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesSorghum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Digitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium seculentum: BuckwheatToxiccodendron diversiloba: Poison oakFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxiccodendron vernix: Poison SumacGlechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theTrifolium spp.: Alsike Clover, White CloverHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonVertarum californicum: Corn Lily, False HellboreHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVeratrum californicum: CockleburHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVeteria spp.: WisteriaIris spp.: IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumVesteria spp.: WisteriaLaburnum anagyroles: Golden Chain or LaburnumZustafer spp.: WisteriaLaburnum anagyroles: Golden Chain or LaburnumVesteriaus spp.:	Chenopodium album: Lambs Quarters	Rheum rhaponticum: Rhubarb
Claviceps spp.:ErgotConium maculatum:Poison HemlockConvallaria majalis:Lily of the ValleyCoronilla varia:Crown VetchDaphne spp.:DaphneDatura spp.:Jimsonweed, Downy Thornapple, Devils Trumpet,Angels TrumpetSanguinaria canadensis:Delphinium spp.:Delphiniums and LarkspursDicentra spp.:Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesDigitalis purpurea:FoxgloveEquisetum arvense and other spp.:Horse tailEquiptorium rugosum:White SnakerootEuphorbia spp.:Poissettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGelsenium sempervirens:JessamineGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theGroundHalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogetor glomeratus:Laburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLaburnum anagyroldes:Laburnum anagyroles:Golden Chain or LaburnumLaburnum anagyroles:Go	Cicuta spp.: Water Hemiock or Cowbane	Ricinus communis: Castor Bean
Convallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleyRumex spp.: DockConvallaria majalis: Lily of the ValleySambucus canadensis: ElderberryCoronilla varia: Crown VetchSangulinaria canadensis: ElderberryDaphne spp.: DaphneSaponaria spp.: Bouncing Bet and Cow CockleDatura spp.: Dinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainSolanum spp.: Corghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andDightalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootTaxus cuspidata: YewEuphorbia spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oakHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonTrifolum spp.: Stinging NettleHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonUrtica spp.: Stinging NettleHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: IrisesUrtica spp.: Visteria Xanthium strumarlum: Cocklebur Xanthium strumarlum: CockleburWisteria spp.: IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Claviceps spp.: Ergot	Robinia pseudoacacia: Black Locust
Convaliana majaits:Life of the ValleyCoronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Sambucus canadensis:EloderberrySanutina majaits:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Sambucus canadensis:EloderberrySanutina majaits:Coronilla varia:Coronilla varia:Coronil get and Cow CockleSaponaria spp.:Saponaria spp.:Saponaria spp.:Sonout contexted supportsDelphinium spp:Delphiniums and LarkspursDicentra spp.:Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp.:Coronilla varia:Coronilis varia:Coronicis varia:Coronilis v	Conium maculatum: Polson Hemlock	Rumex spp.: Dock
Coronina varia: Crown vetchSanquinaria canadensis: BloodrootDaphne sp.: DaphneSanquinaria canadensis: BloodrootDaphne sp.: Jimsonweed, Downy Thornapple, Devils Trumpet,Sanquinaria canadensis: BloodrootAngels TrumpetSanquinaria canadensis: BloodrootDelphinium spp: Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Digitalis purpurea: FoxgloveHorse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andDigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveJohnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootTaxus cuspidata: YewEuphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainTetradymia spp.: HorsebrushFagoypyrum esculentum: BuckwheatToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oakFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron vernbx: Poison SumacGlechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theTrifolium spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverGroundHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVirtica spp.: Stinging NettleHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVisteria spp.: WisteriaIris spp.: IrisesWisteria spp.: WisteriaLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumXanthium strumarium: CockleburLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumXanthium strumarium: Cocklebur	Convaliaria majalis: Lily of the valley	Sambucus canadensis: Elderberry
Dature spp::DepiningDature spp::Dature spp::DepiningDature spp::Discontra spp::Discontra spp::Senecio spp::Senecio, Groundsels, and RagwortsDiscontra spp::Delphiniums and LarkspursSolanum spp::Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade, Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDigitalls purpurea:FoxgloveSorghum spp::Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp::Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoDigitalls purpurea:FoxgloveSorghum spp::Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp::Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoEuphorbia spp::Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the Mountain Fagoypyrum esculentum:Textadymia spp::Eastern Skunk Cabbage Taxus cuspidata: YewFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueToxicodendron radicans:Poison oak Toxicodendron radicans:Foison oak Toxicodendron vernlx:Gelsemium sempervirens:JesamineToxicodendron vernlx:Poison Sumac Tifolum spp::Alsike Clover, White Clover Triglochin maritima:Halogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHule Veratrum californicum:Urtica spp::Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Vetch, Purple Vetch and Broad Beans Wisteria spp::Hypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Irls spp::Wisteria spp::Nisteria SamineLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianZieadenus spp::Death Camas	Coronina varia: Crown Vetch	Sanquinaria canadensis: Bloodroot
Data spp:Junisofiweed, Downly Hiomapple, Devis Humpet,Angels TrumpetDelphinium spp:Delphinium spp:Delphinium spp:Delphinium spp:Dicentra spp:Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesDigitalis purpurea:FoxgloveEquisetum arvense and other spp:Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoSonghum spp:Sorghum spp:: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andJohnson GrassJohnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp:: HorsetailSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEuphorbia spp:: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainTetradymia spp:: HorsebrushFastuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oakGelsemlum sempervirens:HogetonGroundHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HenbaneHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp:IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Daprine spp.: Daprine	Saponaria spp.: Bouncing Bet and Cow Cockle
Aligeis frumperSofanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Delphinium spp.: Delphiniums and LarkspursDicentra spp.: Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesDigitalis purpurea: FoxgloveSorghum spp.: Sorghum or Milo, Sudan Grass, andEquisetum arvense and other spp.: HorsetailJohnson GrassEupatorium rugosum: White SnakerootSymplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEuphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFastuca arundinacea: Tall FescueFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oakGelsemium sempervirens: JessamineToxicodendron radicans: Poison SumacGlechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundTrifolum spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverHalogeton giomeratus: HalogetonTrifglochin maritima: ArrowgrassHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: IrisesUrica spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,Laburnum anagvoides: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianVest Indian	Angele Trumpet	Senecio spp.: Senecio, Groundsels, and Ragworts
DepinitionDepinitionDefinitionDefinitionDicentra spp.:Bleeding Heart, Squirrel Corn, Dutchmans BreechesDigitalis purpurea:FoxgloveEquisetum arvense and other spp.:Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, PotatoEquisetum arvense and other spp.:Sorghum spp.:Euphorbia spp.:Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFagoypyrum esculentum:BuckwheatFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGelsemium sempervirens:JessamineGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theGroundHelleborus niger:Helleborus niger:HalogetonHysericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.:IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Angels Trumpet	Solanum spp.: Common Nightshade, Black Nightshade,
Sorgnum spp.:Sorgnum or Milo, Sudan Grass, and Johnson GrassDigitalis purpurea:FoxgloveEquisetum arvense and other spp.:HorsetailEupatorium rugosum:White SnakerootEuphorbia spp.:Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFagoypyrum esculentum:BuckwheatFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGelsemium sempervirens:Johnson GrassGelsemium sempervirens:Johnson GrassGelsemium sempervirens:Johnson GrassGelsemium sempervirens:Johnson GrassGelsemium sempervirens:Johnson GrassJohnson GrassPoison oakToxicodendron diversiloba:Poison oakToxicodendron vernix:Poison SumacTrifolium spp.:Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverGroundTriglochin maritima:Halogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHelleborus niger:Christmas RoseHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.:IrisesLaburnum anagyroides:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Deprimum spp.: Deprimums and Larkspurs	Horse Nettle, Buffalo Bur, Potato
Johnson GrassEquisetum arvense and other spp.:HorsetailEupatorlum rugosum:White SnakerootEuphorbia spp.:Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFagoypyrum esculentum:BuckwheatFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGelsemium sempervirens:JessamineGlechoma spp.:GroundHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHelleborus niger:Christmas RoseHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.:IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Diditalie nurnurea: Foxdiove	Sorgnum spp.: Sorgnum or Millo, Sudan Grass, and
Symplocarpus roetidus: Eastern Skunk CabbageEupatorlum rugosum: White SnakerootEuphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainFagoypyrum esculentum: BuckwheatFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueGelsemlum sempervirens: JessamineGlechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theGroundHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonHelleborus niger: Christmas RoseHyoscyanamus niger: HenbaneHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.: IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Equisetum anyonse and other son : Horsetail	Jonnson Grass
Euphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainTaxus cuspitata: YewEuphorbia spp.: Poinsettia, Spurges, Snow on the MountainTaxus cuspitata: YewFagoypyrum esculentum: BuckwheatToxicodendron diversiloba: Poison oakFestuca arundinacea: Tall FescueToxicodendron radicans: Poison ivyGelsemlum sempervirens: JessamineToxicodendron vernix: Poison SumacGlechoma spp.: Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundTrifolium spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverHalogeton glomeratus: HalogetonTrifolium spp.: Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverHelleborus niger: Christmas RoseUrtica spp.: Stinging NettleHyoscyanamus niger: HenbaneVicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leavedHypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVicia spp.: WisteriaIris spp.: IrisesKisteria spp.: WisteriaLaburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or LaburnumXanthium strumarium: CockleburLantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianZigadenus spn.: Death Camas	Eunatorium rugosum; White Snakeroot	Symplocarpus foetidus: Eastern Skunk Cabbage
Laphonola spp:Forsettal, sparges, show on the MountainFagoypyrum esculentum:BuckwheatFagoypyrum esculentum:BuckwheatFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueGelsemlum sempervirens:JessamineGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundToxicodendron vernix:Halogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHelleborus niger:Christmas RoseHyoscyanamus niger:HenbaneHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.:IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Euphorhia snn - Poinsettia Snurges Snow on the Mountain	Taxus cuspidata: Yew
Festuca arundinacea:Tall FescueToxicodendron diversitiola:Poison GakFestuca arundinacea:Tall FescueToxicodendron radicans:Poison GakGelsemlum sempervirens:JessamineToxicodendron vernix:Poison SumacGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over theTrifolium spp.:Alsike Clover, Red Clover, White CloverGroundHalogeton glomeratus:HalogetonHalogetonUrtica spp.:Stinging NettleHelleborus niger:Christmas RoseUrtica spp.:Stinging NettleHyoscyanamus niger:HenbaneVicia spp.:Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leavedHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedVicia spp.:Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leavedIris spp.:IrisesWisteria spp.:WisteriaLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumXanthium strumarium:CockleburZiedenus spn.:Death CamasZiedenus spn.:Death Camas	Fagovnvrum esculentum: Buckwheat	Teviaedendren diversilehe. Deisen ook
Gelsemlum sempervirens:JessamineGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundToxicodendron vernix:Poison SumacHalogeton glomeratus:Halogeton Helleborus niger:Christmas RoseUrtica spp.:Stinging NettleHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Irls spp.:Visiteria spp.:Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Vicia spp.:Visiteria St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West IndianVest Indian	Festuca arundinacea: Tall Fescue	Toxicouenturon uiversnoba: Poison tak
Glechoma spp.:GostamineGlechoma spp.:Ground Ivy, Creeping Charlie, and Gill over the GroundHalogeton glomeratus:Halogeton Helleborus niger:Christmas RoseUrtica spp.:Hyoscyanamus niger:HenbaneHypericum perforatum:St. Johns Wort, Klamath WeedIris spp.:IrisesLaburnum anagyroldes:Golden Chain or LaburnumLantana camara:Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Gelsemium semnervirens: lessamine	Toxicouentrion rations: Poison Ny
Ground Triglochin maritima: Arrowgrass Halogeton glomeratus: Halogeton Urtica spp.: Stinging Nettle Helleborus niger: Christmas Rose Urtica spp.: Stinging Nettle Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Vicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Iris spp.: Irises Wisteria spp.: Wisteria Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Zigadenus spn.: Death Camas Zigadenus spn.: Death Camas	Glechoma son - Ground Ivy Creening Charlie and Gill over the	Toxicouentron vernix: Poison Sunnac
Halogeton giomeratus: Halogeton Halogeton giomeratus: Halogeton Heileborus niger: Christmas Rose Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: Iris spp.: Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Ground	Tridlochin moritimo. Arrowdrass
Heileborus niger: Christmas Rose Veratrum californicum: Corn Lily, False Hellbore Hyoscyanamus niger: Henbane Vicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Vicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Iris spp.: Irises Wisteria spp.: Wisteria Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian Zigadenus spn.: Death Camas	Halogeton glomeratus: Halogeton	Inglocini manuma: Anowgrass
Hyoscyanamus niger: Henbane Vicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Vicia spp.: Common Vetch, Hairy Vetch, Narrow leaved Iris spp.: Irises Wisteria spp.: Wisteria Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian Zigadenus spn.: Death Camas	Helleborus niger: Christmas Rose	Verstrum californicum: Corn Lily False Hellbore
Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed Iris spp.: Iris spp.: Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Hvoscvanamus niger: Henbane	Vicia snn : Common Vetch Hairy Vetch Narrow leaved
Iris spp.: Iris spp.: Iris spp.: Wisteria spp.: Wisteria Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Xanthium strumarium: Cocklebur Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian Zigadenus spp.: Death Camas	Hypericum perforatum: St. Johns Wort, Klamath Weed	Vetch Purnle Vetch and Broad Beans
Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian Zigadenus spp.: Wisteria	Iris sop.: Irises	Wisteria snn · Wisteria
Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Laburnum anagyroldes: Golden Chain or Laburnum	Xanthium strumarium. Cocklebur
	Lantana camara: Lantana, Red Sage, Yellow Sage, or West Indian	Zigadenus spp.: Death Camas

Source: Brown, 2011.

Table 2 - Some poisonous plants and their symptoms in poisoned animals.

PLANT	TOXIC PART	SYMPTOMS
Live sinth Neuslasus	Dulles	HOUSE PLANTS
Daffodil	Buids	Nausea, vomiting, diarmea. Way be fatal.
Oleander	Leaves, branches	Extremely poisonous. Affects the heart, produces severe digestive upset and has caused death.
Dieffenbachia (Dumb	All parts	Intense burning and irritation of the mouth and tongue. Death can occur if base of the
Cane), Elephant Ear		tongue swells enough to block the air passage of the throat.
Rosary Pea, Castor Bean	Seeds	Fatal. A single Rosary Pea seed has caused death. One or two Castor Bean seeds are
		near the lethal dose for adults.
l arkenur	Young plant soods	Digestive upset, pervous excitement, depression, May be fatal
Monkshood	Fleshy roots	Digestive upset and nervous excitement
Autumn Crocus, Star of Bethlehem	Bulbs	Vomiting and nervous excitement.
Lilv-of-the-Valley	Leaves flowers	Irregular heart heat and nulse usually accompanied by digestive unset and mental
		confusion.
Iris	Underground stems	Severe-but not usually serious-digestive upset.
FUXBIOVE	Leaves	upset and mental confusion. May be fatal.
Bleeding Heart	Foliage, roots	May be poisonous in large amounts. Has proved fatal to cattle.
	VE	GETABLE GARDEN PLANTS
Rhubarb	Leaf blade	Fatal. Large amounts of raw or cooked leaves can cause convulsions, coma, followed
		rapidly by death.
Danhne	Berries	Eatal A few berries can kill a child
Wisteria	Seeds, pods	Mild to severe digestive upset. Many children are poisoned by this plant.
Golden Chain	Bean-like capsules in which the	Severe poisoning. Excitement, staggering, convulsions and coma. May be fatal.
	seeds are suspended	
Laurels, Rhododendrons,	All parts	Fatal. Produces nausea and vomiting, depression, difficult breathing, prostration and
Azaleas		coma.
Jasmine	Berries	Fatal. Digestive disturbance and nervous symptoms.
Lantana Camara (Red	Green berries	Fatal. Affects lungs, kidneys, heart and nervous system. Grows in the southern U.S.
Sage)	Berries foliage	And in moderate climates.
16w	bernes, rollage	symptoms.
		TREES AND SHRUBS
Wild and cultivated	Twigs, foliage	Fatal. Contains a compound that releases cyanide when eaten. Gasping, excitement
Oaks	Foliage acorns	Affects kidneys gradually. Symptoms annear only after several days or weeks. Takes a
		large amount for poisoning.
Elderberry	All parts, especially roots	Children have been poisoned by using pieces of the pithy stems for blowguns. Nausea
Black Locust	Bark sprouts foliage	Children have suffered nausea, weakness and depression after chewing the bark and
	Barri, oproato, ronago	seeds.
	Р	LANTS IN WOODED AREAS
Jack-in-the-Pulpit	All parts, especially roots	Like Dumb Cane, contains small needle-like crystals of calcium oxalate that cause
		intense irritation and burning of the mouth and tongue.
Moonseed	Berries	Blue, purple color, resembling wild grapes. May be fatal.
May apple	Apple, foliage, roots	Contains at least 16 active toxic principles, primarily in the roots. Children often eat the apple with no ill effects, but several apples may cause diarrhea.
Mistletoe	Berries	Fatal. Both children and adults have died from eating the berries.
	PLAN	TS IN SWAMP OR MOIST AREAS
Water Hemlock	All parts	Fatal. Violent and painful convulsions. A number of people have died from hemlock.
		PLANTS IN FIELDS
Buttercups	All parts	Irritant juices may severely injure the digestive system.
Nightshade	An parts, especially the	ratal. Intense digestive disturbance and nervous symptoms.
Poison Hemlock	All parts	Fatal. Resembles a large wild carrot.
Jimson Weed (Thorn	All parts	Abnormal thirst, distorted sight, delirium, incoherence and coma. Common cause of
Apple)		poisoning. Has proved fatal.
Source: Texas AgriLife Exte	nsion Service, Texas A&M System.	

Table 2 shows some diseases caused by poisonous plants to animals and humans. Laminitis is caused by ingestion of *Crotolaria burkeana* by grazing ruminants. Prussic acid poisoning is one of the common forms of plant poisoning. The glucosides in the plant break up producing prussic acid which is highly toxic to animals. Treatment involves moving the animals away to a different part of the grazing lands where the animals cannot access such plants. Treatment is not always successful, prevention is the best approach. Table 3 shows the different types of toxic agents in poisonous plants.

Table 3,a - Toxic agents in poisonous plants	
ALKALOIDS	LIPIDS
Indole Alkaloids (Beta-carbolines etc.)	Fatty Acids
Indolizidine	Cyclopropenoid fatty acids
Piperidine	Erucic acid
Polycyclic Diterpene	Fluoroacetate
Pyridine	Glycolipids
Pyrrolizidine	
Quinolizidine	
<u>Steroids</u>	
Tropane	
Tryptamine	
ALCOHOLS AND KETONES	
ALCOHOLS AND RETORES	METALS
Alcohols	
Diacetone alcohol	Heavy Metals
Diethvlene glycol	Copper
Ethanol	Mercury
Ethylene glycol	<u>Selenium</u>
Methanol	Arsenic
Propylene glycol	<u>Lead</u>
Ketones	Iron
Cicutoxin	
Tremetone	
Treratol	
CARBOHYDRATES	MYCOTOXINS
Oligosaccharides	<u>Aflatoxins</u>
Beta-glucans	Citrinin
Pectins	Fungal Tremorgens
Raffinose	Lupinosis
Simple Sugars	Ochratoxins
Favism	Patulin
Fructose	Rubratoxins
Galactose	Sporidesmin
Lactose	Stachybotyrotoxins
Sucrose	Trichothecenes
Xylose	Zearalenone

Table 3, b - Toxic agents in poisonous plants	
CHELATING POISONS	PHENOLIC TOXICANTS
<u>Nitrates</u>	Cinnamic Acid
Nitrites	Fagopyricin
<u>Oxalates</u>	Gossypol
Phytates	Hypericin
	Pterocin
	Resoricinol
	Urushiol
	<u>Tannins</u>
GLYCOSIDES	PROTEINS AND AMINO ACIDS
Calcinogenic Glycosides	Allergens
Carboxyatractylosides	Amylase Inhibitors
Cardiac Glycosides	Enzymes
<u>Coumarins</u>	Lipoxidases
Furocormarins	Thiaminases
Glucosinolates (Goitrogenic Glycosides)	locopheroloxidase
Isoflavones and Coumestans	Abrie
Nitroglycosides (Nitropropanol Glycosides)	Concanavalin
Ranoculins	Ricin
Saponins Market (San Ali	Robin
Vicine/Covicine	Plant Cytoplasmic Proteins
	Polypeptides
	Amino Acids
VITAMINS	Nutriant
Vitamin A	Methionine
Vitamin D metabolites	SMCO
	<u>Tryptophan</u>
MISCELLANEOUS	Non-nutrient
	Arginine analogs
Ipomemaron - mycotoxin?	Canavanine
Alsike Poisoning - mycotoxin?	Indospecine
Red Maple Poisoning (similar to Brassica	dibydroyynbenylalanine
induced anemia)	Lathyrogens
Plant Carcinogens	Mimosine
n-Propyl Disulfide (similar to Brassica induced	
anemia)	RESINS
	SESQUITERPENE LACTONES
Courses Brown 2000	
Source: Brown, 2009.	

Some common poisonous plants in Botswana

An Act to provide for the eradication and destruction of noxious weeds commenced in 1916 in Botswana and it is cited as Noxious Weeds Act (Government of Botswana,1916). The Act made provision for the destruction of poisonous plants such as burweed (*Xanthium spinosum*).

Xanthiums spp

The common name is Cocklebur belonging to family composite with a local name of "Motlhabakolobe "or "Khonkhorose". The genus Xanthium has four species in Southern Africa and all have characteristic burs. Burs are the fruits, which develop from composite flowers on the leaf axis. The four commonest species in Botswana are Xanthium accdentale L., Xanthium pungens Wall, Xanthium spinosum L., and Xanthium strumarium L.

The bur causes mechanical injury to cattle, sheep and goats. The bur may cause partial and even complete obstruction of the orifice of the sheath in bulls or oxen grazing on lands overgrown with *Xanthium* weed. The most susceptible animal to Xanthium poisoning is the pig, and great numbers may be lost through eating the plant at the cotyledon stage, namely the seedling with two leaves. The symptoms of poisoning by Xanthium include depression; nausea accompanied by vomiting; weakness; unsteady gait; twisting of neck muscles; rapid and weak pulse and low body temperature.

Poisoning by *Xanthium* arises from the ingestion of the immature plant and not the bur. During this cotyledon stage, the first leaves are dependent on the bur for energy, and it would appear that the toxic principle is in the seeds which are then transferred to the pair of temporary leaves. The toxic compounds that have been isolated in Xanthium are the glucoside xanthostrumarin and choline.

Like most toxic and undesirable species, *Xanthium* will invade disturbed areas around boreholes, farmsteads, villages, kraals, cultivated fields etc. It is a poisonous annual plant, which indicates misuse of the land. The burs stick to the animal and can be carried long distances. This way, the seeds get easily dispersed. *Xanthium* plants should be destroyed before the development of the seeds. On cultivated fields the soil should be ploughed before the plant matures. On rangelands, it is worth the effort to make sure that the *Xanthium* plants are grubbed before flowering.

Argemone Mexicana

Argemone Mexicana of local names either sekgarakgara or lopero is an herb of up to 60 cm tall. Stem spiny, bluesh green with a sticky yellowish latex. Leaves simple, alternate, deeply looped. Its seed and stem are poisonous when eaten in large quantities especially in early springs, in the tropics Argemone Mexicana flowers and fruits throughout the year. The flowers open early in the morning and last for two to three days. In most cases it pollinates itself though small bees usually do.

A. Mexicana is poisonous to both human and domestic animals (Sharma et al., 1999). It is common in disturbed areas throughout the country of Botswana, hence it is very important that it is identified and know and even studied as it pose an economical threat to the farming world. Cattle do not graze the plant as it is spiny but they can be poisoned if they consume it in hay or the chuff, sheep and goats can eat it when the vegetation is short of supply, while ostrich relish it.

The alkaloids sanguinare and dihydrosangunairine found in the seed and the rots are the primary toxins. The physiological active iso quinoline alkaloids berberine, protopine, coptisine, allocryptopine and dehydrochelcrythrine are found in all plants parts. According to Sharma et al., (1999) the total alkaloids toxicity has been tested on rats and mouce, the results extrapolated to man would indicate a lethal alkaloid dose for a 100kg (220 lb) would be 0,1g.as a result of testing on monkeys it has been recommended that maximum allowed contamination of oil should be less than 0, 01%.

Livestock has been poisoned by inclusion of this poisonous plant in hay but the more common route of intoxication is when the seed is being included as contaminant of other grains. Experimentally sangunarine alone fail to induce symptoms produced by oil, oil produced by pressing the seed is highly toxic (vearrier, 2009). A toxic amount of the alkaloid or its degradation products may be transmitted in the milk of animals not showing toxic symptoms. The yellow sap is slightly corrosive and produces dermatitis in sensitive individual. The prickly leaves and folds produce minor mechanical injuries to the mouths and skin of livestock.

Gastro-intestinal tract irritation is common, and toxic ingestions almost invariably result in emesis. Onset of symptoms is rapid. GI upset and vomiting start 45 minutes to 4 hours after ingestion. CNS effects include drowsiness, weakness, loss of coordination, muscle fasciculation, seizures.

In humans and chickens, widespread edema (dropsy) is the main finding. Chickens exhibit a swelling of the wattles and darkening of the tips of the comb and also a decrease in egg production, weakness, hemorrhagic enteritis and death.

Affected animals will show:

- Severe jaundice and photosensitization in the form of severe dermatitis on the light colored areas of the skin.
- Death from hemorrhagic gastroenteritis may occur if animals consume it in large quantities.

Sanguinarice has been shown to possess pro-oxidant property in invitro towards the production of free radicals including singlet oxygen and hydrogen peroxide. Prior invitro status have shown that reactive oxygen spices are involved in induced toxicity causing peroxidative damage of lipids in various hepatic sub cellular fraction including microsomes and mitochondria. In acute cases intra venous injection of a sodium thiosalfate and sodium nitrate can bring dramatic change

Dichapetalum cymosum

This is one of the most important poisonous plants in Botswana with local name "mogau". *Dichapetalum cymosum* (common name *gifblaar* or occasionally the English translation, poison leaf) is a small dwarf shrub occurring mostly in the Western parts of Botswana i.e Tsabong, Ghanzi. The poison leaf plant or mogau as widely known in the local communities has since been spread to many other parts of the country like Maun, Kgatleng and Kweneng even though it is not heavily populated. It is notable as a common cause of lethal cattle poisoning in these areas and is considered to be among the most toxic plants in Botswana. The chemical monofluoroacetate occurs in all parts of the plant and is responsible for the toxic effect. The monofluoroacetate affects the heart and nervous system reported by (Kellerman and Naude, 1996)

According to (Balinsky and Scheiderman, 1964) above the ground the plant is seen as a clump of small, woody shrub of about 15cm high. Such a clump is typically 1 plant as *gifblaar* has a huge underground root system – likened to an underground tree- and sends numerous shoots above ground in favourable conditions. The most obvious above ground parts are the leaves – simple, alternative with initially fine hairs later becoming glabrous. The leaves are bright green in colour in both sides. The secondary veins forms loops and do not reach the margins. Flowers are small, white and occur as dense clumps in the early spring. Fruit formations are rare; the fruit are orange and leathery.

Identification of *Dichapetalum cymosum* in the rangelands is important in prevention of toxicity and also in assigning it as a cause of toxicity in an outbreak. It is a small, low-growing, non-descriptive shrub and thus easily confused with other species. There are four principal "confusers" in its habitat. These are Ochna pulchra saplings, Parinari capensis, Pygmaeothamnus spp and the various genera and species of the family Rubiaceace. *Dichapetalum cymosum* occurs in dry, sandy areas in acidic soils, as well as the northern slopes of rocky hills in the southern parts of Africa. In Botswana it is widely distributed in the western veld with few plants other areas across the country. *Dichapetalum cymosum* also occurs in Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe as well as southern Angola.

The toxic compound isolated as the cause of *Dichapetalum cymosum* poisoning is monofluoroacetate. It was first isolated by Marais, (1943); the LD50 of this compound is 0,5mg\kg which translates to about 200g of dry plant material to kill a 500kg cow. The compound in itself is not toxic. However, it undergoes lethal synthesis in the body reacting with Coenymes A to make Fluoroacetyl-Coenymes A. This compound reacts with oxaloacetate to form fluorocitate, which is toxic; being an alternate substrate for aconitase (normal substrate citrate.) it binds to the aconitase but cannot be released, irreversibly binding the aconitase. This causes the Krebs cycle to shut down, leading to massive energy shortages. Furthermore, fluorocitrate stops citrate from crossing from the cytoplasm into the mitochondrion, where it is needed. In the cytoplasm it gets degraded.

Louw et al., (1970) reported that in cattle, acute death by cardiac arrest is seen following drinking or some kind of exertion. Affected animals will show dyspnoea and arrhythmias prior to this. There may occasionally be nervous signs such as trembling, twitching and convulsions. Death occurs 4 – 24hours after ingestion. In rare cases, an animal will survive the initial period only to drop dead months later of a heart failure – so called chronic *Dichapetalum cymosum* poisoning. On post-mortem, leaves may be found in the rumen, cyanosis may be seen, as well as signs of heart failure – congestion, haemorrhage, and myocardial necrosis (on histopathology.) diagnosis is based on these as well as the presence of *Dichapetalum cymosum* in the camp, particularly if signs of consumption are seen. Laboratory tests can be done for monofluoroacetate in the rumen fluid, kidneys and the liver. Treatment

- It is thought withholding water for 48hours can help.
- Ensure animals remain calm and rested.
- Remove the animals from the infected rangelands, but without exciting them.

Grobbelaar and Mario-Meyer, (1990) reported that cattle are mostly affected; with sheep, goats and game rarely being poisoned even though compound is equally poisonous to these species. An explanation is that the bulk grazing style of cattle, which is by nature less selective lends itself to the ingestion of the plant. Young sprouts have more monofluoroacetate, but all parts are lethal. The plants sprouts in late winter, before the spring rains, the cue for most plants – including grasses – to shoot. This makes it the predominant greenery during that period. Cases of poisoning are most frequent during that period. Later in the season, *Dichapetalum cymosum* poisoning is far less common, presumably enough other grazing occurs that *Dichapetalum cymosum* is not eaten. Autumn (late season) poisoning also occurs. Poisoning of carnivores, including dogs, has been reported after consumption of ruminal contents of poisoned animal stated by (Marais, 1944). Caution should be taken and animals should only be grazed later in the season, and the camps or rangelands should not be overgrazed.

CONCLUSION

Poisonous plants can reduce livestock productivity depending on the effect they have and the amount taken. Since poisonous plants are potential threats to the livestock industry it is important that farmers are carefully to avoid contamination of rations prepared for livestock and removal of poisonous plants from grazing lands. Prevention and precautions are the best way to avoid any economic loss.

REFERENCES

- Balinsky JB and Scheiderman ER (1964). Histo-chemicalstudies on *gifblaar*, *Dichapetalum cymosum*. South African Journal of Medical Science 29: 96 97.
- Brown D (2009). Toxic agents in plants. <u>http://www.ansi.Cornell.edu/</u> plants/toxic agents/ index.html. accessed 11-02-2011.
- Brown D (2011). List of scientific and common name equivalent. <u>http://www.ansi.Cornell.edu/</u> plants/toxic agents/ index.html. accessed 11-02-2011.
- Government of Botswana (1916). Noxious weeds. Chapter 35:04.In. Laws of Botswana. <u>www.laws.gov.bw</u>. Accessed 14-04-2011.
- Grobbelaar N and Mario Meyer JJ(1990). Fluoroacetate production by *Dichapetalum cymosum*. Journal of Plant Physiology. 135: 550 553.
- Johnson J (2009). Uses of poisonous plants. <u>http://www.helium.com/items/1439771-poisonous-plants-and-their-uses-the-value-of-plant</u>. Accessed 14-04-2011.
- Kellerman TS and Naude TM(1996). "The Distribution, diagnoses and estimated economic impact of plant poisonings and mycotoxicosis in South Africa". Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research 63: 65 90.
- Louw N De Villers OT and Grobblaar N (1970). The inhibition of aconitase activity from *Dichapetalum cymosum* by fluorocitrate. South African Journal of Animal Sciences. 66: 9 11.
- Marais JCS (1943). "The isolation of the toxic principle "K cymonate" from "Gifblaar", Dichapetalum cymosum". Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Sciences Ind. 18: 203.
- Marais JCS (1944). "Monofluoroacetic acid, the toxic principle of "*Gifblaar*", Dichapetalum cymosum". Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Sciences Animal Ind. 20: 67.
- Sharma B, Malhatra S, Bhatia V and Rathe M (1999). Epidemic dropsy in india, Post grad medical journal, 75:657-661
- Ketewa SS, Galav PK, Ambika NAG and Anitaja IN (2008). Poisonous plants of Southern aravalli hills of Rajasthan. Indian journal of traditional knowledge. 7:269-272
- Vaarrie D and Hamilton RJ (2009). Plant poisoning,alkaloids-quinolizidine and isoquinoline. http://emedicne.medscape.com/article/816548-overview. accessed 16-02-2011.
- Texas AgriLife Extension Service, Texas A&M System. (Undated) Some poisonous plants and their symptoms . accessed. 15-0202011.



IMPACT OF MATERNAL EGG SIZE AND RESTRICTED FEEDING REGIME ON SOME GROWTH CHARACTERIZES OF BROILERS REARED UNDER HUMID TROPICAL ENVIRONMENT

U. K. OKE, M.N. EKANEM, and O.N. OBIKE

Department of Animal Breeding and Physiology, College of Animal Science and Animal Production Michael Okpara university of agriculture Umudike, Abia State Nigeria

Email: dumukal@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: The experiment was conducted to investigate the effect of different egg size from which birds are hatched have on their performance in terms of their growth traits and also to examine the effect of feeding regimen on the performance of Anak Titan broilers in a CRD study. The feeding regimes were ad- libitum (AL) and restricted feeding.(RF) The growth traits measured were feed intake (FI) body weight (BW), thigh length (TL), shank length (SL), breast length (BL) and body girth (BG) fortnightly. Efficiency of production was also evaluated using weight gain, feed conversion ratio, and mortality. Result showed that the egg size may affect the growth traits in that birds in group C (63-68g) with higher initial weight out performed that of B (58-62g) and A (50-57g), in terms of final body weight and most of the other growth parameters studied although there were no significant difference (P<0.05) between these three groups.. Body weights at 9th week for birds in A, B and C groups were 1386.59g, 1426.50g and 1521.05g respectively. The feeding regimes employed significantly (p<0.05) affected the performance of the broilers of combined egg size with the adlibitum group being significantly (p<0.05) higher in values than birds on the restricted feeding group. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the interaction between birds of different egg size and feeding regimes. There was a high significant (p<0.05) correlation between body weight and all other growth traits throughout the study period. It is recommended that birds with egg weight range of 63-68g with high initial body weight and subsequent high performance under ad-libitum feeding should be adopted with occasioned restricted feeding to prevent wastage.

Keywords: egg size, feeding regimes, growth traits, broiler, humid tropics

INTRODUCTION

According to Adeyinka et al. (2000), egg size is known to have a positive effect on growth and subsequent weight of domestic fowls. Walleman (1997) reported that the mean egg weight represent one of the most important factors governing the profitability of a laying enterprise, even small increase in egg weight can have significant effect on grading and hence economic returns. Thus, in the fowls, egg weight has been reported to determine the early growth of the chicks it produces.

Growth functions have been used extensively to represent changes in size with age, so that the genetic potential of animals for growth can be evaluated and nutritionally matched to possible growth (Lopez et al., 2000). Broiler production is totally dependent upon growth rate, market weight and total feed consumption. In order to achieve efficient poultry production and maximize profit, it is important to bring to the knowledge of the farmers the appropriate weight of broiler chicken at day-old hatched from a reasonable egg size that will give the required market weight at 8-10 weeks of age, under required quantity of feeding regimes and proper management.

New development in management techniques is driven by the demand to improve the efficiency of broiler production. Primarily, breeders incorporates these broiler production goals like feed efficiency, low body fat and high breast meat yield into their selection programmes and feed formulation techniques to express fully the genetic potential of their stock (Middle Koop, 1997). According to Olomu (1995), for breeder stock, especially broiler breeder stock, some form of feed restriction is usually recommended. The most common management techniques consist of restricting the amount of feed per day. The practical application of this varies from limiting the period when broilers can eat to supplying limited amount of feed per day (Ramlah et al., 1996, Olomu, 1995, Casbel and Waldroup, 1990).

Ibe and Nwakalor (1987) observed that the relationship between body weight and conformation traits has an important implication in the production of broilers with desired body conformation. The exploitation of local poultry genetic resources for improving economic traits such as body weight, keel length, body depth, and breast width and shoulder length becomes one of the most important in poultry as a cherished breeding goal. (Oke et al., 2011) Growth in shank length, thigh length, and breast width has been found to have precisely followed the same trend as the body weight (Singh and Ohir, 1986, Nwachukwu et al., 2006) .Ayorinde and Oke (1995) noted that feed restriction is commonly applied to pullets to minimize mortality rates and ensure maximum production Of settable eggs. The study was therefore conducted to determine the egg size for optimum broiler production and to determine the effect of feeding regime on the growth traits of broiler chicken at different ages.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the Poultry unit, Teaching and Research Farm, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria, located on latitude 05°29'N and longitude 07°33'east. It is approximately 922m above sea level. Umudike has maximum and minimum daily temperature of 27-360° and 20-260° respectively with relative humidity of 57-91% and annual rainfall of2177mm.

A total of 500, one week old egg produced by meat type (Anak titan) breeder flocks were obtained from the farm, weighed and separated or marked into three different egg weights designated A (50-57g), B (58-62g), C (63-68g). The eggs were set in a Western type cabinet incubator. Incubation and hatchery conduction were 0-21 days, temperature of 37.2-39.4°c and relative humidity of 56-60% candling was done on the 7th and 18th day and only fertile eggs were transferred to the hatcher after the last candling. A total of 450 day-old chicks were produced from the three group of eggs weighed A, B and C respectively.

Management of experimental birds

The chicks were brooded for the first two weeks of life under continuous light thereafter they were raised on open-side deep litter. One hundred and ninety two birdsfrom each egg weight group was randomly assigned to two treatments of ad-libitum and restricted feeding (once a day feeding according to NRC, 1994), with 3 replicates per treatment of 32 birds each. The birds were fed commercial broiler starter diet containing 23% CP and 12.5 MJ ME/kg for 4 weeks and finisher diet of 20% CP and 12.5 MJ, ME/kg.

The birds were wing banded and body weight and all other body measurement taken fortnightly early in the morning before feeding the birds. Body weight was taken with a top-loading scale in grammes. All measurement of the legs was taken on the right leg in centimeter with a meter rule. Thigh lengths were measured from the beginning of the block joint to the last ring before the tarsemetatartasus digit. Breast length was taken from the point of the depression of the sharp edge (keel length). Body girth was taken in centimeter using a tape rule, the circumference of the animal posterior to the front leg. Feed intake was taken as the difference between the left over and the total feed presented measured in grammes with a scale. Weight gain calculated as final weight minus weight gain. Feed conversion ratio was calculated as gram feed over gramme weight gain, while mortality was taken as the number of dead birds over number of birds at housing multiplied by 100.

Experimental design and statistical analysis

The experiment was a 3X2 factorial involving 3 different egg size groups with two feeding regimes in a completely randomized design with the following model.

 $\begin{aligned} Y_{ijk} &= \mu + t_i + a_j + (ta)_{ij} + e_{ijk} \\ \text{Where} \end{aligned}$

Y_{ijk} = individual observation on the birds

μ = overall mean

 t_i = effect of the different egg weight

a_j = effect of the feeding regimes

 $(ta)_{ij}$ = interaction between different egg weight and feeding regime

 E_{ijk} = experimental error (*iind*, o, σ)

Data collected were subjected to a two-way analysis of variance (Steel and Torrie, 1980). Correlation between body weight, feed intake, egg weight and different growth traits were determined using Pearson correlation Analysis (Snedecor and Cochran, 1989).

RESULTS

Results indicate no significant difference (P>0.05) between mean F1 in the three different egg sizes for week 3-7. Significant difference (p<0.05) were observed in week 9 and 11 with birds in group B and C being significantly (p<0.05) higher than A. There were no significant difference (p>0.05) in percent mortality for the different groups of birds throughout the experimental period with B group having lower percent values.

Table 1 - Effe	ect of egg size on weig	sht gain (WG), <u>feed</u>	intake (FI), Feed	conversion ratio (F	CR) and mortality
(MORT)					
Age week	Egg size group	FI (g)	WG (g)	FCR	MORT (%)
3	A	479.50	315.91	1.62	0.50
		±43.06	±54.87	±0.329	±0.00
	В	498.80	317.14	1.60	0.00
		±46.76	±59.73	±0.188	±0.00
	С	500.70	330.73	1.55	0.50
		±44.64	±56.40	±0.258	±0.00
5	Α	767.00	644.94	1.21	3.00
		±132.54	±113.14	±0.218	±1.727
	В	766.60	625.14	1.24	0.00
		±134.63	±114.06	±0.151	±0.00
	C	769.50	648.73	1.20	0.00
		±132.35	±119.97	±0.177	±0.00
7	Α	1024.90	996.41	1.66	0.50
		±292.51	±119.10	±0.158	±0.00
	В	1130.00	1033.13	1.19	0.00
		±66.50	±256.19	±0.295	±0.00
	C	1151.50	1140.22	1.03	2.00
		±82.07	±214.72	±0.142	±1.727
9	Α	1205.00ª	1348.90	0.97	3.00ª
		±116.65	±439.33	±0.245	±2.727
	В	1320.00 ^b	1388.13	1.16	0.00
		±67.49	±441.57	±0.392	±0.00
	С	1297.80 ^b	1479.23	0.90	0.50
		±57.09	±275.77	±0.155	±0.00
11	Α	1406.50ª	1727.91	0.90	0.00
		±126.94	±602.76	±0.292	±0.00
	В	14871.00 ^b	1632.13	1.01	3.00
		±126.78	±500.03	±0.323	±2.00
	C	1476.70 ^b	1898.22	0.79	1.00
		±167.68	±321.56	±0.125	±0.727
a-c means with di	fferent superscripts within t	he same column in each	age group are significa	antly different (P<0.05)	

Body weight was not significantly different (P>0.05) between the three egg size groups. The body weight of C (63-68g) was higher than that of A (50-57g) and B (58-62g) throughout the rearing period with 372.05g and 1521.00g for week 3 and 9 respectively. The thigh length (TL) of birds from the three different egg sizes show no significant difference (P>0.05). The shank length (SL) also of the birds did not differ significantly (P>0.05) with an average value 3.73cm and 5.96cm for week 3 and 7 respectively Breast length (BL) took the same pattern of other traits increasing with increase in age of birds with birds in group C having the highest value for all the weeks followed

by A and B with no significant difference (P>0.05). The body girth at week 3 showed a significant difference (P<0.05) among the three egg weight groups with birds from egg weight group C, higher than those of A and B, this may be as a result of the high positive correlation between body weight and body girth.

Table 2: Effect of	of egg size grou	ping on growth t	raits of broilers	at 3-11 weeks o	f age	
Traits	Egg size	3	5	7	9	11
Body weight(g)	А	353.50	682.50	1034.00	1386.50	1765.50
	В	355.50	663.50	1071.50	1426.50	1670.50
	С	372.50	690.50	1182.00	1521.00	1940.00
	SEM	16.449	31.634	67.173	126.935	159.589
Thigh	А	7.26	9.23	10.93	11.46	12.33
length(cm)						
	В	7.23	9.22	11.03	11.60	12.28
	С	7.32	9.36	11.10	11.96	12.88
	SEM	0.155	0.171	0.233	0.243	0.303
Shank	Α	3.73	4.71	5.87	6.81	7.59
length(cm)						
	В	3.59	4.69	5.96	6.83	7.59
	С	3.87	4.93	6.07	7.25	7.91
	SEM	0.093	0.104	0.120	0.180	0.223
Breast	Α	7.53	9.49	11.04	11.70	12.42
length(cm)						
	В	7.42	9.41	11.13	12.00	12.39
	С	7.38	9.73	11.32	12.55	13.30
	SEM	0.184	0.194	0.231	0.283	0.331
Body girth	Α	18.49 ª	23.24	25.92	28.08	31.04
(cm)						
	В	18.45 ª	22.80	25.28	29.13	30.79
	С	20.25 ^b	23.05	26.35	30.08	32.72
	SEM	0.413	0.383	0.604	1.03	1.060
ac means with diffe	rant superscripts w	ithin the same colur	nn in each age grou	n are significantly dif	fferent (P<0.05)	

There were no significant difference in feed intake for the various groups except in week 11 where the AF group of A, B and C were significantly different (p<0.05) from each other. Result also indicated no significant difference (P>0.05) between the interaction of the AF and RF groups of the three different egg weight in terms of FI for week 3-9. Weight gain of broilers were not significantly different, however, ad-libitum fed group had higher weight gain than the RF with values ranging from between 344.42-1160.42 (AF), 300.07-952.76g (RF) for week 3-7 respectively. FCR between treatment groups were not significantly (P>0.05) different. Mortality was low for birds in B group than in A and C. The average mortality was lower for RF groups .This is an indication that broilers on restricted feeding had lower mortality as compared to full-fed broilers.

Result indicate no significant difference (P>0.05) for all the parameters measured throughout the period except for the significant difference (p<0.05) which was observed in F1 in week 11 and body weight in week 3.

DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the effect of egg weight grouping on feed intake (FI), weight gain (WG), feed conversion ratio (FCR), and mortality (MORT) of broilers at age 3-11 weeks. The mean values show increase in F1 with increase on age of birds, this may be because the bigger the birds the higher the feed requirement for growth and maintenance of their body size (Santoso, 2002, Oluyemi and Robert, 2000).The weight gain (WG) values for the three different groups were not significant (P>0.05) and followed the same trend with increase in age of the birds. This observation agree with the work of Oruseibo and Omu (2000) who noted that the weight gain of birds increase in proportion to the amount of feed consumed above that needed for body maintenance. The values of FCR were higher in week 3, 5 and 7 and declined thereafter till the end of the experiment. Smith (1970) had earlier confirmed that feed conversion ratio occurs at the earliest stages of growth and declines thereafter.

The mean value of body weight, thigh length, shank length, breast length and body girth for the three egg weight grouping are shown in Table 2. Birds hatched from larger eggs had higher BW, this agrees with the work of Adeyinka et al. (2000) and Latshaw and Bishop (2001). The thigh length (TL) of birds from the three different egg sizes show no significant difference (P>0.05). The shank length (SL) also of the birds did not differ significantly (P>0.05) with an average value 3.73cm and 5.96cm for week 3 and 7 respectively which was close to 3.6cm and

6.4cm obtained by Ibe and Nwachukwu (1989). Breast length (BL) took the same pattern of other traits increasing with increase in age of birds.

Table 3 shows the effect of feeding regimes, ad libitum (AF) and restricted feeding (RF) on feed intake (FI) weight gain (WG), feed conversion ratio (FCR) and mortality on broilers of three different egg weight groupings. Ad libitum fed group recorded highest feed intake than restricted group which agrees with the works of Ayorinde and Oke (1995) and Kamiaet al. (1996), which showed higher feed intake for chicken on ad-libitum feeding than those of RF groups.

The effect of egg weight grouping and feeding regimes on broiler feed intake, body weight, thigh length, shank length, breast length and body girth is shown in Table 4. Man et al. (1998) and Tina et al. (2004) reported that day-old chick with different weights begin to diverse in body weight from the end of week 3 of rearing. This is because when the birds are hatched, they still operate under the influence of maternal effect due to the presence of the yolk in them but at the end of week 3, this maternal is completely lost and they now exhibit individual characters or effect. This may account for the significant difference noted in week 3, which may assist animal breeders for broiler improvement through selection (lbe 2007).

Parameters	Ages (wks)	Egg size						
		Α		В		C		
		AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	
Feed intake	3	537.00	485.00	540.60	457.00	543.00	458.400	
		±15.508	±5.523	±23.006	±4.69	±2.915	±1.140	
	5	892.60	614.40	894.00	639.20	895.00	644.00	
		±4.278	±8.204	±2.738	±13.971	±1.581	±5.568	
	7	950.00	1099.80	1164.40	1095.60	1200.20	1103.4	
		±45.906	±74.212	±30.680	±77.809	±59.213	±76.09	
	9	1257.00	1153.00	1380.00	1257.00	1348.200	1247.4	
		±148.725	±417.07	±5.745	±17.161	±29.575	±10.40	
	11	1523.00°	1290.00°	1596.00 ^b	1366.00 ^d	1634.40 ª	1319.00	
		±39.051	±28.257	±26.22	±49.168	±7.436	±32.11	
Veight gain	3	303.410	328.410	710.64	268.64	358.23	303.23	
		±52.009	±66.555	±94.300	±31.543	±25.00	±73.73	
	5	690.41	599.41	1200.64	539.64	731.23	566.23	
		±125.193	±105.629	±199.949	±73.195	±114.923	±75.87	
	7	1034.41	958.41	1515.64	865.64	1246.23	1034.2	
		±267.899	±133.575	±299.236	±232.309	±230.152	±184.94	
	9	1525.41	1172.41	1783.64	1260.64	1652.23	1306.2	
		±549.688	±320.136	±250.040	±597.718	±260.513	±217.79	
	11	2004.41	1451.41	1.469.34	1480.64	2088.23	1708.2	
		±630.134	±565.778	±0.137	±761.695	±185.742	±365.71	
eed conversion	3	1.809 ª	1.44 °	1.49 ^b	1.72°	1.52 ^b	1.58°	
atio								
		±0.259	±0.306	±0.137	±0.704	±0.102	±0.369	
	5	1.32	1.09	1.27	1.19	1.24	1.15	
		±0.215	±0.166	±0.165	±0.143	±0.203	±0.154	
	7	1.15 ^a	1.16 ^d	0.99 ^b	1.39°	0.98 ^b	1.07 ^d	
		±0.218	±0.089	±0.0138	±.270	±0.161	±0.120	
	9	0.90	1.03	1.14	1.17	0.83	0.97	
		±0.281	±0.215	±0.352	±0.469	±0.117	±0.163	
	11	0.84	0.97	0.91	1.11	0.78	0.80	
		±0.319	±0.279	±0.099	±0.447	±0.060	±0.017	
Mortality	3	0.50ª	0.50ª	0.00 ^b	0.00 ^b	0.50ª	0.50 ª	
		±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	
	5	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	
	7	0.00°	0.50 ^b	0.50 ^b	0.00 ^c	0.00°	5.00 ^a	
		±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	
	9	7.00ª	0.00c	0.00 ^c	0.00c	0.50 ^b	0.00 ^c	
		±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	
	11	0.00c	0.00c	10.0 ª	5.00 ^b	5.00 ^b	5.00 ^b	
		±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	±0.00	

Table 4 - Effect of egg size grouping and feeding regime on feed intake, body weight, thigh length, shank length, and breast length and body girth

Parameters								
Egg size		Α		В		С		
Feed type	Ages (WK)	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	SEM
Feed intake	3	53.700	458.00	540.00	457.00	543.00	458.00	5.27
	5	892.60	641.40	894.00	639.20	895.00	644.00	3.28
	7	950.00	1099.80	1164.40	1095.60	1200.20	1103.40	80.58
	9	1257.00	1153.00	1383.00	1257.00	1348.20	1247.40	28.97
	11	1523.00 °	1290.00 e	1596.00 ^b	1366.00 ^d	1634.40 ª	1319.00°	14.74
Body weight	3	341.00 ^b	366.00°	404.00 ^a	307.00 ^d	400.00ª	345.00°	23.26
	5	728.00	637.00	749.00	578.00	773.00	608.00	44.74
	7	1072.00	996.00	1239.00	904.00	1288.00	1076.00	94.98
	9	1563.00	1210.00	1554.00	1299.00	1694.00	1348.00	178.51
	11	2042.00	1489.00	1822.00	1519.00	2130.00	1750.00	225.69
Thigh length	3	7.22	7.30	7.26	7.20	7.38	7.26	0.22
	5	9.52	8.94	9.66	8.78	9.82	8.90	0.34
	7	10.94	10.92	11.44	10.62	11.40	10.80	0.33
	9	11.68	11.24	12.00	11.20	12.28	11.64	0.34
	11	12.82	11.84	12.66	11.90	13.24	12.52	0.43
Shank length	3	3.64	3.82	3.82	3.36	4.00	3.74	0.13
	5	4.90	4.52	5.00	4.38	5.18	4.68	0.15
	7	5.88	5.86	6.18	5.74	6.30	5.84	0.17
	9	7.04	6.58	7.18	6.48	7.40	7.10	0.25
	11	7.90	7.28	7.74	7.44	8.18	7.64	0.32
Breast length	3	7.32	7.74	7.48	7.36	7.56	7.00	0.26
	5	9.68	9.30	9.94	8.88	10.18	9.28	0.28
	7	11.04	11.04	11.62	10.64	11.60	11.04	0.33
	9	12.06	11.34	12.60	11.40	13.06	12.04	0.40
	11	13.00	11.84	12.88	11.90	14.20	12.40	0.47
Body girth	3	18.48	18.50	19.08	17.82	20.50	20.00	0.58
	5	23.40	23.08	23.82	21.78	23.86	22.24	0.54
	7	25.98	25.86	26.44	24.12	26.74	25.96	0.85
	9	28.62	27.54	30.02	28.24	31.52	28.64	1.46
	11	32.26	29.82	31.54	30.04	34.00	31.44	1.50
are means with diff	foront cuporcorir	te within the c	ama aalumn in	anah ara grau	n are cignifican	thy different (ne	(0.05) A P and	C = odd cizo

grouping. AF = ad libitum feeding. RF = restricted feeding. SEM = standard error of mean

Table 5 - Correlation between body weight and linear body measurement of broilers of A (50g-57g) group at

Ages 3-11 week	S						
Bodyweight		BW	TL	SL	BL	BG	FI
group							
Α	BW	1.000					
	TL	0.900**	1.000				
	SL	0.944**	0.969**	1.000			
	BL	0.920**	0.983**	0.977**	1.000		
	BG	0.935**	0.923**	0.942**	0.931**	1.000	
	FI	0.460	0.528	0.613	0.586	0.453	1.000
В	BW	1.000					
	TL	0.900**	1.000				
	SL	0.944***	0.969**	1.000			
	BL	0.920**	0.983**	0.977**	1.000		
	BG	0.935**	0.923**	0.942**	0.931**	1.000	
	FI	0.460	0.528	0.613	0.586	0.453	1.000
C	BW	1.000					
	TL	0.906**	1.000				
	SL	0.921**	0.951**	1.000			
	BL	0.965**	0.929**	0.934**	1.000		
	BG	0.878**	0.821**	0.875**	0.864**	1.000	
	FI	0.648*	0.522	0.464	0.706*	0.543	1.000
BW= Body weight, T	L= Thigh lengtl	n, SL= shank lengtl	n, BL= Breast len	gth, BG= body gir	th, FI= Feed intak	e. * P<0.05, ** I	P<0.01

The correlation for the different growth traits including body weight and feed intake for the three different egg weight groupings, A-C, are shown in Tables 5. Correlation coefficients for the three egg weight grouping (A, B, C) were high and positive between body weight and each of the growth traits studied, supporting the observation by Ibe and Nwachukwu (1989) and Adeniji and Ayorinde (1990) that there exist high positive correlation between body weight and each of the correlated traits. According to Khan (2003), moderate to high estimate of heritability of 3rd week body weight together with high positive genetic correlation observed in this study suggest the need for selection for increased three week body weight required to achieve genetic improvement in market weight of broiler.

Correlation coefficients for the three egg weight grouping (A, B, C) were high and positive between body weight and each of the growth traits studied.

CONCLUSION

From the result of this study it can be noted that the different egg size from which the birds were hatched may impact on the performance of the birds and also quantity of feed given (AF and RF) had a direct influence on the performance of the birds irrespective of the egg weight on all the growth traits studied. Feed intake of birds increased with BW and with age of the birds. Birds with 63-68g egg weight had higher mean values for all the growth traits measured than birds with 58-62g and 50-57g and showed positive significant correlation between body weight and all the other body traits. It is therefore suggested that birds with higher initial body weight placed on AF like those in group C egg weight should be used for broiler production since they will give optimum production in the humid tropical environment.

REFERENCES

Adeyinka IA, Oni OO, Abubakar BY, Nwagu BI, Sekoni AA, Adeyinka FD and Abeke F (2000). Influence of egg size on genetic parameters of growing layer-type chickens. 25th Annual NSAP, Conf, March, 2000, Umudike, Nigeria.

- Adeniji, F. O and Ayorinde, K. L (1990) Prediction of body weight of broilers at different ages from some linear body measurement. Nigeria Journal of Animal Production 17: 42-47.
- Ayorinde KL and Oke UK (1995). The influence of juvenile body weight and two feeding regimes during the growing phase on growth performance and early lay characteristics of pullets. Nigerian Journal of Animal Production. June and Dec. No 1 and 2 (22): 101-109.
- Cabel MC and Waldroup PW (1990). Effect of different nutrient restriction programme in early lifeof broiler performance and abnormal fat content. Poultry Science 69: 652-660.
- Fayeye TR, Adeshujan AB and Olugbemi (2005). Egg traits, hatchability and early growth performance of the Fulani ecotype chicken. Livestock Research for Rural Development 17; 8: 1-7.
- Ibe SN (2007). Small but Mighty prophecies and realities in Animal Breeding. 4th Inaugural lecture held on 29th Nov. 2007. Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike Abia state Nigeria.
- Ibe, S. N and Nwachukwu, E. N (1989) Effect of food restriction on broiler performance conformation traits and isometry of growth. Nigerian Journal of Animal Production. 15. No 1 and 2: 117-184.
- Oke UK, Herbert U, Obike ON, Francis EI, and Nwosu SE (2011). Crossbreeding effect on growth and carcass traits at 8 weeks in Nigerian Naked neck, Olypian black and Isa Brown birds in a humid tropical environment Proc. 38th Annual conference of Nigeria Society for Animal Production ,University of Abuja ,Abuja Nigeria.
- Santoso U (2002). Effect of early feed restriction on the occurrence of compensatory growth, feed conversion efficiency, leg abnormality and mortality in unsexed broiler chickens reared in cages. Asian-Aust Journal of Animal science. Vol 15 No 9

Snedecor GW, and Cochran WG (1989). Statistical method (8thed) Ames, Iowa U.S.A. The Iowa State Press.

- Steel RGD and Torrie JH (1980). Principles and procedures of statistics. A biometrical approach.2nd edition. McGraw Hill Book Company, New York.
- Singh B and Dhin DS (1986). Relationship between body weight and some other physical parameters in broilers. Indian Poultry science. 55 (9): 826-827

Smith AJ (1996). Tropical Agriculturist. ICTA Macmillan Publishers.

Tona K, Onagbensan OM, Bruggeman V, Meritens K, Jego Y and Decuypere E (2004). Comparison of feed intake, blood metabolic parameters, body organ weights of growing broilers originating from dwarf and standard broiler lines. International Journal of Poultry science. 3 (6): 427-426.

Wakeman WG (1997). Manipulating egg size, egg handling and egg storage. http//www.yambarranoisa.uk/papers/technical.html



MONITORING FEED NUTRIENT CONTENT OF AVAILABLE COMMERCIAL POULTRY FEEDS IN BOTSWANA

A.A. AGANGA*, G. NOBO and T. GOPADILENG

Department of Animal Production, Botswana College of agriculture, P/Bag 0027, Gaborone, Botswana

*Email: aaganga@bca.bw

ABSTRACT: Nutrient quality in a feedstuff is the concentration of that nutrient in quantities that are sufficient for normal metabolic activities of a particular animal. Hence the study was carried out to determine nutrient quality of various locally available concentrate poultry feeds in the market and compare determined feed contents with nutrient values on labels. The samples were obtained from broiler farmers in Gaborone region. Mean analysis values from manufacturer A feeds were 19.64, 3.29, 0.19 and 0.43 for starter, 16.39, 3.98, 0.11 and 0.57 for grower, and 16.94, 4.27, 0.16 and 0.48 for finisher in g/100g on dry matter basis, crude protein, fats, phosphorus and calcium respectively. Feed label stated 22, 2.5, 0.6 and 8 for starter, 20, 2.5, 0.55 and 0.8 for grower and 18, 2.5, 0.5 and 0.8 for finisher in g/100g on dry matter basis for crude protein, fats, phosphorus and calcium respectively. Grower feeds from manufacturer B contained 18.33, 2.65, 0.24 and 0.66 in g/100g as compared to feed label values of 18.0, 2.5, 0.55 and 0.7 in g/100g on dry matter basis for crude protein, fats, phosphorus and calcium respectively. Manufacturer C finisher feed also contained 18.16, 4.1, 0.17 and 0.52 in g/100g on dry matter basis for crude protein, fats, phosphorus and calcium respectively. The quantity of minerals was found to be lower in all feeds from all manufacturers with manufacturer A lower in almost all other organic nutrients (except fats) compared to values stated on feed labels.

Keywords: Nutrient content, commercial poultry feed, Botswana.

INTRODUCTION

There is a need for good manufacturing practice of animal feed during procurement, handling storage, processing and distribution of formulated and compound animal feeds to ensure high feed quality. There is a need for consistent quality animal feed and this can be achieved by implementing sound quality control procedures. Quality animal feeds can only be made from the use of quality feed ingredient sources and not from spoilt or contaminated ingredients. Selection and purchasing of raw ingredients including ingredient quality control is essential. The ingredients used for animal feed must be wholesome and safe. It is inevitable that the quality of ingredients will vary, even from the same supplies from batch to batch. Therefore, it is important that this variability should be characterized and monitored. There is a need for periodic sampling to verify the ingredient and specifications. Nutritional and analytical characteristics of feeding stuffs are necessary. Also, the specifications should include origins, sources and contaminations if any. All ingredients should be inspected and labeled. Moldy ingredients should not be used. This is because of mycotoxins in moldy feedstuffs may have detrimental effects on animals even at very low concentrations. Manufacturing quality control must insure that the feed produced will be consistently of a quality appropriate to the species fed. Animal feed processing should include a comprehensive system of record keeping documenting that the appropriate standards of a formula are being met throughout the period of manufacturing to make the product fully traceable. Feed ingredients which are dry before processing should be kept dry and cool and used on a first-in, first-out basis. As a general rule the moisture percentage should be less than 13% particularly in the humid areas.

There are different physical forms of dry animal feeds. It may be a meal, cake, pellets, crumbles, range cubes, blocks or scratch. A complete monogastric feed consists of grains, plant proteins, animal proteins, grain

byproducts, macrominerals, specialty products, vitamins and trace minerals. Supplements usually are compounded from plant proteins, animal proteins, grain byproducts, macrominerals, specialty products, vitamins and trace minerals. A base-mix consists of grain byproducts, macrominerals, specialty products, vitamins and trace minerals. A premix consists of specialty products, vitamins and trace minerals. Grains are feeds such as maize, millet, sorghum. Plant proteins are feeds like soya bean meals, oilseed cakes like cottonseed cake, sunflower seed meal etc. Animal proteins are feeds like fishmeals, milk powder etc. Grain byproducts are dry mill byproducts from dry maize milling for example homing feed, milo germ from dry sorghum milling. Wet mill byproducts like gluten meals from fermented grain products dry brewer's spent grains. Macrominerals are from limestone (calcium), oystershell rock phosphate (calcium and phosphorous), dicalcium phosphate (calcium and phosphorous), Monosodium phosphate (phosphorous), common salt (sodium and chlorine), iodized salt contains iodine (0.007% iodine). Specialty products may include antibiotics, chemotherapeutic agents and others. Vitamins may be purchased individually or as mixtures. Trace mineral vary in utilization or biological availability. Factors to consider in biological availability include solubility in water or dilute acid, effectiveness in preventing or curing deficiency symptoms and tissue concentrating effect in animals.

Balanced diets entails the mixture of the right proportions of various ingredients to produce diet with all essential nutrients ideal for normal functioning of a concerned or particular animal. Meanwhile, farmers who produce their own feeds on the farms need to know chemical composition of each crop on farm, as this is essential in planning what crop types to plant in order to meet balanced diet requirement. Although chemical analysis is vital, nutritional value of feeds provides information on how feedstuff are digested and metabolized by the animal, mainly through interpreting differences between the input into and output out of an animal. Unbalanced diets may also produce economic loss in terms of animal health, feed conversion efficiency and, ultimately, the output of animal products, (Gizzi and Givens, 2004). Formulating of a ration is a matter of combining feeds to make a ration that will be eaten in the amount needed to supply the daily nutrient requirements of the animal (Lalman and Sewell, 1993). The objective of this study is to evaluate nutrient composition of chicken concentrate feeds and compare values obtained with the manufacturer's feed label values.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted in Botswana College of Agriculture (BCA) which is located at in the southern part of Botswana. This site is at an altitude of 991m (S 24.58455; E 025.94304). The average monthly temperature ranges from 18°C minimum to 33.4°C maximum. The climate is semiarid which experiences unreliable rainfall. The type of vegetation in this area is mixed acacia/combretum tree savanna. The average annual rainfall is 450 mm

Feed samples were collected from BCA farm and nine other farms around Gaborone, and then the nutrient analysis was done in the College laboratory. Samples of broiler starter, grower, finisher and layers mash were collected in ziplock polythene plastics to prevent any form of contamination from the farm, grounded to pass through 1mm sieve and stored in bags before chemical analysis. Contamination of feeds was avoided by sampling from freshly opened feed bags. Four replicates of each feed from three manufacturers were sampled. Mean nutrients composition was compared to the tag values for significance differences. The dry matter, water, crude protein (Kjeldahl method), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), acid detergent fiber (ADF), ether extract (Soxhlet method), ash, calcium (Ca), phosphorus (P) and magnesium (Mg) were analyzed. Rrepresentative samples of broiler mash and layer's mash were weighed and put in the oven at 70°C for 48 hours. Feed samples were analysed according to the procedures of AOAC (1996). Calcium was analyzed using ICP (Inductively Coupled Plasma/ Optimal Spectroscopy) after digesting the samples. Determination of phosphorus was carried out using UV-Vis Spectrophotometer. 1ml of the standard solutions was pipetted accurately into clean dry vials. 1ml of each sample was pipetted into another set of clean vials. To each of these vials (standards as well as samples) 10ml of dilute chloromolybdic acid was added. 1ml of stamous chloride was added to the vials, first to the standards then the samples. The solutions were left for 10 minutes. The absorbance was then read on the spectrophotometer, reading the standards first then the samples. The design was the complete randomized block design. Data collected was analyzed using ANOVA (analysis of variance), (SAS, 2004).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Poultry feed ingredients include energy concentrates such as corn, oats, wheat, barley, sorghum, and milling by-products. Protein concentrates include soybean meal and other oilseed meals (peanut, sesame, safflower, sunflower, etc.), cottonseed meal, animal protein sources (meat and bone meal, dried whey, fish meal, etc.), grain legumes such as dry beans and field peas, and alfalfa. Grains are usually ground to improve digestibility. Soybeans

need to be heated-usually by extruding or roasting-before feeding in order to deactivate a protein inhibitor. Soybeans are usually fed in the form of soybean meal, not in "full-fat" form, because the valuable oil is extracted first. Whole, roasted soybeans are high in fat which provides energy to the birds.

Table 1 shows the ingredients and their amounts used in commercial poultry feeds as indicated on the bag labels and Table 2 show the analyzed results of the same feeds. As indicated in Tables 1 and 2 the amounts of ingredients as labeled and the amount of ingredients analyzed does not match. This simply means that what is indicated in the label does not mean it is the actual content amount of the ingredients stated. Analyzed protein content of Starter's mash was 19% and labeled protein content was 22%. Kingori *et al* (2003) stated in a stress free environment, given adequate intake of essential nutrients, growth will increase until a genetically determined upper limit is reached, but feeding animals below their protein requirement does not improve protein utilization. Protein deficiency in a feed reduces growth as a consequence of depressed appetite and thus intake of nutrients.

Table 1 - Comp feeds as indica	osition in comm ted on the bag la	ercial poultry abels
Ingredients	Starter's mash	Layer's mash
Protein (%)	22	16
Moisture (%)	12	12
Fibre (%)	5.0	7.0
Calcium (%)	0.8	4.5
Phosphorus (%)	0.7	2.5
Lysine (%)	1.1	0.6

Chicken feed usually contains soybean meal which is a by-product of the oilseed industry. In the industry, soybeans are dehulled and cut into thin pieces (flaked) to improve the action of the solvent (usually hexane) which is passed through the soybean to extract the valuable oil. Vegetable oils such as soybean oil are used for edible and industrial purposes. The soybean is then toasted as a method of heat treatment to deactivate an inhibitor which would otherwise interfere with protein digestion in the animal.

Feeding the above protein requirements may not result in an increase in protein deposition, but nitrogen excretion through the urine increases rapidly (Bikker *et al.*, 2004). The amino acid concentration of typical maize-soya diets (160 and 180g CP/kg) meets the requirements of growing layer chickens (NRC, 1984).

Table 2 - Proxin mash and Laye	nate analysis of r's mash	the Starter's
Ingredients	Starter's mash	Layer's mash
Dry Matter (%)	90.05	84.65
Moisture (%)	9.95	15.35
Protein (%)	19	12
Calcium (%)	0.5	2.5
Phosphorus (%)	0.2	0.3

Calcium (%) for chicks as indicated on bag labels and analyzed was 0.8% and 0.5% respectively. Calcium (%) for layers as indicated on bag labels and analyzed was 4.5% and 2.5% respectively. Calcium is important for proper egg shell formation. The calcium requirement will vary with the age of the bird, environmental temperature, rate of lay and egg size. A general recommendation for laying hens is a daily calcium intake of 3.4 grams. After 40 weeks of age, this intake should be increased to 3.8grams. Phosphorus (%) for chicks as indicated on bag labels and analyzed was 0.7% and 0.2% respectively. Phosphorus (%) for layers as indicated on bag labels and analyzed was 2.5% and 0.3% respectively. It is necessary to assure that the phosphorus level in the diet is not excessive since excess phosphorus tends to inhibit calcium absorption from the gastro-intestinal tract tract. For layers a level of 0.3% to 0.4% available phosphorus, which is equivalent to 0.5% to 0.6% total phosphorus, is adequate. Feed analysis is important for quality assurance in feed manufacturing and for identifying the presence and concentrations of undesirable substances in feeds which can adversely affect animals' health and productivity (Adesogan, 2002). Table 3 shows the nutrient contents of all feeds sampled and analyzed. Table 4 shows the nutrients on the feed labels as presented by the manufacturer. Table 5 shows composition of broiler starter from manufacturer A. Table 6 highlights the suggested nutrient specification for different classes of poultry.

Chemical analysis of starter mash revealed low crude protein (CP), calcium (Ca) and phosphorus (P) content as compared to manufacturer A feed label values with a difference of 2.36, 0.37 and 0.41 g/100g respectively. Dry matter and fats are above the stated amounts by a difference of 3.2 and 0.79 g/100g. The levels of crude protein,

calcium and phosphorus content were also lower than the minimal levels (21.0, 1.0 and 0.6 g/100g CP, Ca, and P respectively) recommended by the National Research Inventory (NRI, 1988) to be optimum for normal broiler chick.

Grower mash from manufacturer A, DM and fats were above the stated amounts by a difference of 2.3 and 1.48g/100g. Ca, P and CP are lower by 0.23, 0.44 and 3.61 g/100g respectively from feed label values. CP, DM and fats are above feed label values by 0.33, 1.0 and 0.14 g/100g respectively in manufacturer B feeds. Ca and P are lower by 0.04 and 0.31 g/100g respectively.

Table 3 -	Chemical comp	osition of b	roiler in g/1	LOOg on dr	y matter ba	sis.				
Feed class	Manufacturer	DM	NDF	ADF	СР	FATS	ASH	Mg	Ρ	Ca
Starter	_	91.2±	20.50±	7.53±	19.64±	3.29±	4.21±	0.11±	0.19±	0.43±
	A	0.98	1.48	0.89	1.914	0.558	0.49	0.03	0.035	0.07
		90.32±	24.31±	7.72±	16.39±	3.98±	4.20±	0.11±	0.11±	0.57±
	А	042	1.48	0.867	0643	028	0.32	0.00	0.03	0.12
Grower	P	89±	17.38±	7.92±	18.33±	2.65±	5.5±	0.12±	0.24±	0.66±
	в	0.00	5.20	1.57	1.02	0.44	0.51	0.004	0.04	0.19
	A	90.6± 0.51	24.74± 1.04	7.75± 0.30	16.94± 0.57	4.267± 0227	4.146± 0.573	0.114± 0.007	0.16± 0.015	0.48± 0.037
Finisher		88.8±	24.33±	9.392±	18.16 ±	4.1±	4.53±	0.12±	0.17±	0.52±
	С	0.88	1.80	0.0522	0.98	0.39	0.99	0.01	0.03	0.064

Table 4 - The nutrient concentration of commercial poultry mash as stated on feed labels by manufacturer g/100g

		5					
Feed class	Manufacturer	DM	H ₂ O	CP	FATS	Р	Ca
Starter	Α	88	12	22	2.5	0.6	0.8
	Α	88	12	20	2.5	0.55	0.8
Grower	В	88	12	18	2.5	0.55	0.7
	Α	88	12	18	2.5	0.5	0.8
Finisher	C	-		-	-	-	

Table 5 - Mean composition of starter mash produced by manufacturer A in g/100g on dry matter basis Variable Mean **Standard deviation** Minimum Maximum DM 91.20 0.98 90.00 92.40 H₂O 8.80 0.98 7.60 10.00 NDF 20.50 1.48 18.93 22.86 8.91 ADF 7.53 0.89 6.90 CP 19.64 1.91 16.63 21.59 FATS 3.29 0.56 2.65 3.95 ASH 4.21 0.49 3.49 4.76 Mg 0.11 0.03 0.08 0.16 Ρ 0.19 0.03 0.15 0.23 Са 0.43 0.07 0.34 0.52

Table 6 - Suggested nutrient specifications for different classes of poultry*

Nutrient composition, %				Diet ty	pe			
		Layers		B	roller bree	eder	Broi	ler
	starter	grower	Layer ratios	starter	grower	layer	starter	finisher
ME (Kcal/kg)	2800	2800	2750	2800	2800	2800	2800	2800
СР	17.5	16	17	18.5	16	16	20	18.5
CF (max)	5	5	5	4.5	4	4	5	5
Ca	1	1	3.6	0.9	0.95	3.2	0.9	0.9
P (available)	0.47	0.4	0.40	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.38
Linoleic acid	0.8	1.3	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.2	0.8	0.70
Lysine	1.00	0.70	0.76	1.00	0.76	0.78	1.00	0.96
Methionine	0.40	0.33	0.35	0.45	0.36	0.38	0.50	0.48
Meth+ Cyst	0.67	0.58	0.60	0.74	0.60	0.62	0.83	077
*Source: NRC. 1984.								

Nutrient	0 to 3 weeks old	3 to 6 weeks old	6 to 8 weeks old
Metabolizable energy, Mcal/Kg	3200	3200	3200
Crude protein, %	23	20	18
Lysine, %	1.1	1.0	0.85
Methionine, %	0.50	0.38	0.32
Methionine + Cystine, %	0.90	0.72	0.60
Linoleic, %	1.00	1.00	1.00
Calcium, %	1.00	0.90	0.80
Magnesium, %	600	600	600
Nonphytate phosphorus	0.45	0.35	0.30
Niacin, mg	35	30	25

Finisher's mash content of CP, P, and Ca were lower by 1.04, 0.34 and 0.32 g/100g respectively from the manufacturer A feed label values. Fats were above the stated feed label value by 1.77 g/100g. NRI (1988) suggested that poultry feeds produce good quality broiler if they contain a maximum of 21%, 5%, 8%, 1%, 0.6% and 1.2%, a minimum of 18%, 4%, 0.9%, 0.6% and 0.8% crude protein, crude fat, crude fiber, calcium, phosphorus, and lysine respectively. On the other hand layers chicks with an age of range of 0-8 weeks would need diet which contain a maximum of 18.5%, 4%,8%, 1%, 0.7% and a minimum of 17%, 4.5%, 0%, 0.9%, 0.65% and 0.85% crude protein, crude fat, crude fiber, calcium, phosphorus and lysine respectively.

All the feeds contain excessive amounts of fiber as indicated by the neutral detergent fiber and acid detergent fiber content, which is above the recommended content of five percent. Chemical analysis revealed lower nutrient concentration in all feed classes from manufacturer A (except fat content, which is higher). Feeds from manufacturers B and C had mineral contents that were much lower than what was indicated on the feed labels. However, these lower nutrient contents indicated that farmers were sold feeds of lower nutrients quantity. Since any deficit of one nutrient could compromise functional value of other sufficient nutrients. Hence, feeds are of lower monetary value, since the prices attached should be in relation to the nutrient composition of the feeds as stated on the feed labels. Quality control is essential at all stages in the production of compound feed if the maximum and most efficient returns are to be obtained by the feed compounder and farmers.

CONCLUSION

Feeds nutrient concentration do not conform to the recommended (Perry *et al.*, 2004) concentration, mainly in minerals. However, manufacturer A was found to be most deficient in almost all nutrients compared to manufacturers B and C. The results obtained did not match all the manufacturer's feed tag labels. For optimum growth of poultry, recommended amounts of protein, calcium and phosphorus should be fed. Protein amounts of 160g/kg and 220g/kg for layers and starters respectively are recommended. Manufacturers need to improve the nutrient concentration to at least the minimal recommended amounts for normal broiler growth and indicate the actual feed nutrients composition values on their feed tags.

REFERENCES

- AdesoganAT (2002). What are feeds worth? A critical evaluation of selected nutritive value techniques. Proceedings of the 13th Annual Florida Ruminant Nutrition Symposium, 33-47.
- AOAC (1996). Official Methods of Analysis (16th edition), Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Arlington, Virginia.
- Bikker P, Verstegen MWA and Tamminga S. (2004). Partitioning of dietary nitrogen between body components and waste in young pigs. Neth. J. Agric. Sci. 42:37-45.
- Gizzi G and Givens DI . (2004). Variability in feed composition and its impact on animal production. In. Assessing quality and safety of animal feeds. FAO Animal production and health. 160 paper. ISSN 0254-6019. ISBN 92-5-105046-5.
- Kingori, AM Tuitoek JK Muiruri HK and Wachira AM. (2003). Protein requirements of growing indigenous chickens during the 14-21 weeks growing period. South African Journal of Animal Science. 33: 78-81. Retrieved on 18/09/2010 from http://www.sasas.co.za/Sajas.html
- Lalman DL and Sewell HB. 1993. Rations for growing and finishing beef cattle. Extension.missouri.edu. <u>www.nmt179.com/resources/rations-for-beef-cattle.html</u>. accessed 11-02-2011.
- NRC 1984. Nutrient requirements of domestic animals.1. Nutrient requirements of poultry. National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C.
- NRI 1988. Small-scale manufacture of compound Animal feed.87 p. Sleekfreak. ath. cx: 81 /3wdev /CD3WD /FOODPROC /NR09SE /INDEX. HTM. accessed 11-02"-2011.
- Perry TW, Cullison AE and Lowrey RS. 2004. Feeds and feeding. 6th Edition. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

SAS Institute. 2004. SAS/STAT 9.1 User's Guide. SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina, USA.



NUTRITIONAL PRELIMINARY CHARACTERIZATION OF SOME VARIETIES OF DATES AND PALM DOWNGRADED AS RUMINANT FEED

H. SELMI¹, Z. KHALDI²*, G. TIBAOUI¹, A. BEN GARA¹, B. REKIK¹ and H. ROUISSI¹

¹Département des Sciences et Techniques des Productions Animales, Ecole Supérieure d'Agriculture, 7030, Mateur, Tunisie ²Centre Régional de Recherches en Agriculture Oasienne, 2260, Degueche, Tunisie

E-mail: khaldi_zahrane@yahoo.co.uk

ABSTRACT: In Saharan regions, the date palm which forms the backbone of agriculture, offers a wide range of agricultural by-products, traditionally used for domestic purposes. The determination of chemical composition and nutritional value of these byproducts for rational use in feeding livestock is needed. The analysis showed that the byproducts of palm have total nitrogen content (CP), lipid (FAT) and (CB, NDF, ADF and ADL) also with a higher nutritional value close to that of straw and hay. The scrap value of dates offers a relatively high energy (0.87 UFL / kg DM) which is comparable to the concentrate feed but with relatively low levels of nitrogen or the need for supplementation or nitrogen treatment.

Keywords: Food, chemical, palm oil, scrap dates, nutritional value

INTRODUCTION

The date palm is a hardy tree adapted to drier parts of the world. It is a monocot tree, the family or palmaceae phoenicicacées coryphinées subfamily, genus and species phoenix dactylifera. It is the main source of living of the Saharan population and for their livestock. Use of date palm by-products in animal feed has long been practiced by local farmers in a traditional way (Chehma et al., 2000). By-products or waste of dates or sorting gap are conventionally used as adjuncts in southern Tunisia (Genin et al., 2004) and are mainly waste of dates, followed, to a lesser extent, pedicels dates and dry palms (Boudechiche et al., 2008a).

The study of their nutritional value has yielded results placing the scrap dates in the category of concentrated energy feed with 0.94 UFL / kg of dry matter. In this same context, Genin et al. (2004) reported that there is a high concentration of energy waste in dates and nuclei, high levels of fiber in the stalks and leaves. By cons, in all cases the levels of crude protein (CP) are low (3 to 6.5% DM).

The results of the nutritional value obtained by Harrak et al. (2005); Boudechiche et al.(2008a and b) rank the byproducts of date palm in 2 categories; scrap dates as concentrated energy food, and the palms dry and coarse stalks as feed, similar to straw or hay of poor quality. Indeed, scrap dates, recording a 0.85 UFL, 0.84 UFL, and 0.81 UFV / kg DM can be classified as concentrated energy, which can even replace the grain (barley, oats. .. etc..), while dry palms and pedicels record, respectively, values of PDIE, 43.87 and 26.29 g / kg DM, against 35.44 g / kg DM for barley straw , the energy values of 0.20 UF, 0.39 UFL, 0.31 and 0.34 UFV, 0.45 UFL, 0.36 against 0.35 UFV, 0.50 UFL, 0.50 to UFV barley straw and nitrogen values in g / kg DM, 22.94 and 20.03 against 16.51 for barley straw. However, we must note that these products are low in nitrogen; their use requires supplementation or nitrogen treatment. Chehma et al. (2003) showed that the refuse of dates can be incorporated in diets of young sheep for fattening. Indeed, their use in place of barley in the diets of growing sheep has resulted in superior performance by weight and better feed efficiency. The three rations allow increasing amounts of waste growth rates higher than those obtained

with the diet based on barley alone. That is a wise use of these products as part of our work, which is a study of the chemical composition and nutritional value, for use in livestock feed.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Rootstock

Twenty varieties: Ten-product Palms (Angou, Aligue, Degla, Horra, Gondi, Akhwat, Arechti, Ghares, Gasbi, and Kintichi) and ten scrap dates (Bejou, Kintichi, Deglat, Manakher, Zehdi, Akhwat, Khalt, Kenta, Tantabecht, Aligue) from Tunisian oasis were selected for this study.

Analytical Methods

Samples of different plant species studied were analyzed for their dry matter (DM), organic matter (OM) mineral content (MM), total nitrogenous matter (CP) and lipid (FAT) according to AOAC (1990). The total fiber (NDF) are obtained after dissolution under the action of a neutral detergent sodium content of Acid Detergent Fiber (ADF) was measured in the presence of cetyl trimethyl ammonium Brome and lignin (ADL) is determined on the ADF residue subjected to the action of sulfuric acid solution at 72% (Van Soest et al., 1991).

The energy and protein values of oat hay expressed UFL / kg DM have been deduced by applying the formula Sauvant (1981).

UFL / kg DM = (1.218 (100-water - MM) + 0.11 CP - 1.81CB + 1.26 FAT) / 100PDIE (g / kg DM) = 5.14 CP - (4.8 * CP * 0.4) - 0.8 CB + 68.8 MO/100PDIN (g / kg DM) = 7.44 CP - (2 * CP * 0.4) + 1.2 MO/100

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chemical composition

The dry matter of different varieties of palm by-products and scrap dates ranged from 83.8% to 90.9% which is comparable to the results of Belguedj (2000) and Boudechiche et al. (2008b) for the byproducts of Moroccan and Algerian oasis . These percentages are relatively high dry matter tell us about their freshness, hence their use as such, without drying. The levels of crude protein (CP) are higher for the byproducts of palm (11.53% for Kintichi and 18. Aligue to 03%) these values are close CP seed protein. While scrap dates for percentages of CP very low (3.33 to 6.31%). However, all varieties have been several studies by different authors in various countries have shown that the dates were deficient in protein and should be supplemented by a supply of nitrogen. It is therefore necessary to correct the deficit protein in order to enhance their dates and waste in animal feed by mixing them with food to fill this gap (Estanove, 1990).

On the lipid content (FAT), it is acceptable to the byproducts of palm and very low or even zero for scrap dates. This result concurs with that of Chehma et al. (2007). In terms of CB, we find that the results obtained have a very low rate for scrap dates with an average 7.43% DM of varieties, against relatively high rates for the dry stalks of palms that record an average grade of 34.11% which is similar to what is reported by Genin et al. (2004) and Chehma et al. (2007). This low rate of CB scrap dates is because they represent a much richer fruit sugar cytoplasmic. For the composition of the wall, we see that dry palms are the greatest rate of NDF. This is due to the physical consistency of the 4 sub-products, which depends on the phenological part occupied by each of these sub-products (pedicel and fruit). Similarly, for the same reasons, the content of other components of the wall ADF and ADL is variable, and dry palms are always higher rate, while trash dates record the lowest rates as shown in Table 1.

Food values

The scrap of dates offers a relatively high energy value (0.87 UFL / kg DM) which is comparable to the concentrate feed (Table 2). That is why it is used as an energy supplement in lieu of barley, mainly for the sheep (Boudechiche et al., 2008b). While for the by-product of palm, they are compared to straw and hay of poor quality for their low energy value. The amount of PDIE are comparable to the pedicels of palms and differential sorting of dates,

they are in the ranges (70 to 90 g / kg DM) As for nitrogen values, it is high for the by-products of palm and very low for scrap dates so their use requires supplementation or N- treatment Chehma et al. (2003).

Table 1 - Ch	emical com	position (%	DM) and	d wall-pr	oducts o	of palm	and was	ste of da	ites	
		DM (%)	MM	ОМ	CP	FAT	СВ	NDF	ADF	ADL
	Angou	86.54	5.3	94.6	15.42	6.6	36.55	89.44	65.3	20.45
	Aligue	89.3	5.44	94.55	18.03	5.6	30.5	83.04	53.88	22.45
Table 1 - Ch Byproducts of palm Waste of Dates	Degla	84.94	5.74	93.06	15.14	6.94	31.22	88.87	64.12	21.02
	Horra	85.44	3.46	96.54	16.13	5.74	33.5	85.12	58.9	23.11
	Gondi	85.63	3.46	96.54	12.56	5.2	33.1	87.1	61.58	25.4
Pann	Akhwat	84.12	9.63	90.37	12.56	5.2	33.89	82.5	66.02	22.78
	Arechti	89.2	3.62	96.38	16.26	4.2	35.25	88.99	58.7	21.21
	Ghares	81.28	5.3	94.7	13.48	4.7	36.2	89.01	66.47	22.02
	Gasbi	88.76	7.98	92.02	14.77	4.7	34.34	89	67.12	23.28
	Kintichi	90.92	2.97	92.99	11.53	4.4	36.55	86.86	66.03	25.88
Byproducts of palm Waste of Dates	Bejou	84.3	3.6	96.4	3.78	0.24	9.53	24.39	12.94	8.03
	Kintichi	89.2	2.97	97.03	3.33	0.42	8.5	21.6	13.6	6.51
	Deglat	90.3	2.28	97.72	4.33	0.08	7.4	22.2	18	4.82
	Manakher	85.1	2.44	97.56	5.07	0.7	6.2	22.1	17.7	3.92
	Zehdi	87.7	3.68	96.22	6.31	0.06	5.88	24.06	14.03	4.06
	Akhwat	87.5	2.5	97.5	4.93	0.4	9.6	26.35	17.8	5.01
	Khalt	88.5	3.56	96.44	3.94	0.6	7.7	27.1	12.22	6.75
	Kenta	86.8	2.38	97.62	4.53	0.32	8.8	26.6	17.7	4.44
	Tantabecht	83.8	1.86	98.14	4.3	0.07	5.5	25.23	17.77	4.74
	Aligue	88.3	4.04	95.96	3.74	0.5	5.22	22.12	18.12	3.82

Table 2 - Values of food	I-products and was	te palm dates		
		UFL /kg DM	PDIE, g/kg DM	PDIN, g/kg DM
	Angou	0.30	89.5	103.52
	Aligue	0.45	99.16	120.85
	Degla	0.4	87.8	101.64
	Horra	0.36	91.55	108.25
	Gondi	0.367	80.37	84.55
Byproducts	Akhwat	0.25	75.5	84.4
of palm	Arechti	0.35	90.46	109.12
	Ghares	0.21	79.59	90.64
	Gasbi	0.31	83.39	99.17
	Kintichi	0.29	71.86	77.67
	Bejou	0.86	78.3	26.03
	Kintichi	0.88	70.67	23.27
Wests of Datas	Deglat	0.91	70.14	29.83
waste of Dates	Manakher	0.88	78.48	34.84
	Zehdi	0.9	81.8	39.85
	Akhwat	0.83	75.28	33.9
	Khalt	0.87	72.88	27.31
	Kenta	0.84	74.71	31.25
	Tantabecht	0.88	76.97	29.72
	Aligue	0.94	73.89	25.98

CONCLUSION

The results obtained show that the refuse of dates can be incorporated into the rations of farm animals in arid areas during periods of food unavailability replacing all or part of the concentrate imported reverberating both beneficial the national economy and to provide an outlet for the sector dates. Indeed, for a balanced diet, one must note that these products are low in nitrogen; their use requires supplementation or nitrogen treatment. It would be interesting scientifically to continue this work to better characterize these products by determining the kinetics of production of total gas and methane, digestibility "situ" of organic matter, total volatile fatty acids and metabolizable energy.

REFERENCES

AOAC (1990). Official methods of analysis. Association of official analytical chemists, washington, DC.

- Belguedj M (2000). Les ressources génétiques du palmier dattier. Caractéristiques des cultivars de dattiers dans les palmeraies du sud-est algérien. 3D, Dossier n° 1. Unité de recherche, Biskra, INRA, Alger, p. 260-261.
- Boudechiche L, Araba A and Ouzrout R (2008a). Influence du type de complément énergétique (rebuts de dattes vs orge) sur les performances d'engraissement et caractéristiques des carcasses d'agneaux Berbères à l'engraissement. Revue Élev. Méd. vét. Pays trop., 61 (3-4): 209-214.
- Boudechiche L, Araba A, Chehma A, Ouzrout R and A Tahar A (2008b). Etude de la composition chimique des rebuts de dattes et des principales variétés de dattes communes à faibles valeurs marchandes, en vue de leur utilisation en alimentation du bétail. Livestock Research for Rural Development 20 (6).
- Chehma A, Longo HF and Belbey A (2003). Utilisation digestive de régimes à base de rebuts de dates chez le dromadaire et le mouton. Courrier du Savoir N°03, Janvier 2003, pp. 17-21.
- Chehma A, Longo HF and Sidiboukeur A (2000). Estimation du tonnage et valeur alimentaire des sous-produits du palmier dattier chez les ovins. Revue Rech. agron. INRAA, 7: 7-15.
- Chehma A, Senoussi A, Tercha Y and Benguegua S (2007). Fabrication de blocs multi nutritionnels (BMN) à base de sous-produits de palmier dattier et d'urée. In : Coll. international sur les Biotechnologies, Oran, Maroc, 24-25 Nov. 2007.
- Genin D, Kadri A, Khorchani T, Sakkal K, Belgacem F, and Hamadi M (2004). Valorisation of date-palm by-products (DPBP) for livestock feeding in Southern Tunisia. I Potentialities and traditional utilisation. Option medit. Série A: 221-226.
- Estanove P (1990). Note technique: valorisation de la datte. Institut de Recherche sur Fruits et Agrumes IRFA- CIRAD (France). Options Méditerranéennes, Série A, n°1 I Les systèmes agricoles oasiens
- Harrak H, Hamouda A, Boujnah M and Gaboune F (2005). Teneurs en sucres et qualités technologique et nutritionnelle des principales variétés de dattes marocaines. Symposium international sur le développement durable des systèmes oasiens 8-10 Mars 2005, Erfoud, Maroc.
- Sauvant D (1981). Prévision de la valeur énergétique des aliments concentrés et composés pour les ruminants. In « Prévision de la valeur nutritive des aliments des ruminants (Eds. C. dimarquilly.), ZIS7-258, (France).580 p.
- Van Soest PJ, Robertson JB and Lewis BA (1991). Methods of dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber and non starch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. Journal of Dairy Science 74: 3583- 3597.



INFLUENCE OF DIETARY CALCIUM LEVELS ON BONE DEVELOPMENT IN BROILER BREEDER HENS

J.C. Moreki^{1*}, H.J. Van Der Merwe² and J.P. Hayes³

¹Department of Animal Science and Production, Botswana College of Agriculture, Private Bag 0027, Gaborone, Botswana

²Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa

³Department of Animal Science, University of Stellenbosch, Private Bag X1, Matieland 7602, South Africa

*Email: jcmoreki@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: A study was conducted to determine the effects of three dietary calcium (Ca) levels on bone characteristics of 198 broiler breeder hens during the laying period. The pullets in each experimental diet were randomly divided into three treatment groups with 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% dietary Ca (66 birds per treatment) fed from 23 to 60 weeks of age. Treatments were arranged in a 2 x 3 factorial block design (effect of 2 ages and 3 Ca levels). Three types of breeder diets containing 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% Ca were fed from 23 to 60 weeks of age (laying period) and these include: breeder phase 1 (23 to 34 weeks), breeder phase 2 (35 to 46 weeks) and breeder phase 3 (47 to 60 weeks). The diets were isocaloric and isonitrogenous but varied only in Ca and phosphorus (P). Feed was provided in restricted amounts in accordance with the breeders' recommendations. At 35 and 60 weeks of age, 12 birds were randomly selected from each treatment and killed by cervical dislocation and tibiae (left and right) and right humeri from each bird excised. Parameters studied were bone weight, bone length, bone midshaft width, bone breaking strength (BS), bone stress, percent bone, true cortical area and bone ash percentage. These results showed no (P>0.05) beneficial effects of feeding increased Ca levels on all bone parameters except BS. Feed intake and body weight of broiler breeder hens were lower when 1.5% Ca was included in the diet. It seems that 2.5% Ca (4 g Ca/hen/day) is adequate to stimulate feed intake and support growth of broiler breeder hens. Bone stress decreased (P<0.081) with age, indicating that the degree of bone mineralisation was greater at 35 weeks compared to 60 weeks.

Keywords: Bone dimensions, bone strength, bone stress, calcium, phosphorus

INTRODUCTION

There are several different types of bones in laying hens. The main types that provide structural integrity are cortical and cancellous (or trabecular) bones, both of which are forms of lamellar bone. These bones are formed during growth, but when a hen reaches sexual maturity, a third type of nonstructural bone, medullary bone, is formed (Whitehead and Fleming, 2000). Medullary bone persists throughout the laying period and its formation is concomitant with maturation of the ovarian follicles (Dacke et al., 1999). It is argued (Whitehead and Fleming, 2000) that the conventional view that medullary bone contributes little to overall bone strength may not be totally correct. Fleming et al. (1998a) demonstrated that the presence of large amounts of medullary bone in the humerus of hens during the laying period improves bone strength. Medullary bone supplies calcium for eggshell formation at periods when dietary supply is not sufficient (Klasing, 1998). The two bones that are rich in medullary bone are femur and tibiotarsus.

Modern laying hens have a high susceptibility to bone fracture. The high incidence of fractures in live birds, which can occur both during the egg production period and in the course of depopulation and subsequent transport and handling, represents a severe welfare problem (Fleming et al., 1994). Although the growth performance of the modern broiler has changed considerably over recent years, their diets have changed little. It has been postulated

that probably the porosity observed arises from the occurrence of more rapid bone modelling and remodelling in modern birds, together with an inadequate dietary supply of calcium and phosphorus.

The objective of this experiment was to determine the effects of three levels of calcium on the bone characteristics of broiler breeder hens during the laying period.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

One hundred and ninety eight Ross broiler breeder pullets were reared up to 22 weeks according to body mass guidelines on diets containing 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0% Ca. The pullets in each experimental diet were randomly divided into three treatment groups with 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% dietary Ca (66 birds per treatment) fed from 23 to 60 weeks of age. A constant Ca : P ratio was maintained in all the diets (Table 2). The pullets were placed in individual cages, which were equipped with individual feed troughs, water nipples and perches. All data were collected on an individual bird basis and each bird was considered as an experimental unit.

Birds were first photostimulated at 154 days (22 weeks) in accordance with recommendation of Ross Breeders (2001). The photoperiod was extended with artificial light by 2 to 3 hours at 22 weeks and thereafter by one hour per week from 24 to 26 weeks of age when the birds received 16 hours of light. This was held constant until birds were depopulated at 60 weeks of age.

Experimental diets are given in Tables 1 and 2. Pullets were fed pre-breeder diet containing 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0% Ca from 19 to 22 weeks of age. Three types of breeder diets containing 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% Ca were fed from 23 to 60 weeks of age (laying period) and these include: breeder phase 1 (23 to 34 weeks), breeder phase 2 (35 to 46 weeks) and breeder phase 3 (47 to 60 weeks). A diet with 2.5% Ca was obtained by mixing the 1.5% and 3.5% Ca diets. Each dietary treatment of the layer phase was fed to 66 replicates (22 birds per subgroup). Experimental diets were isocaloric and isonitrogenous. Feed was provided in restricted amounts in accordance with the breeders' recommendations, while water was provided *ad libitum*. Feed intake by individual birds was recorded on weekly basis and body weight was determined by weighing each bird at three weekly intervals. Mortality was recorded during the course of the experiment.

At 35 and 60 weeks of age, 12 birds were randomly selected from each treatment and killed by cervical dislocation. The carcasses were stored overnight in a refrigerator at 5 °C until the following day when the tibiae (left and right) and right humeri from each of the birds were excised and defleshed without boiling. The right tibiae and right humeri were then weighed and total length and bone shaft widths measured by means of a calliper with an accuracy of 0.001 cm (Zhang and Coon, 1997). The tibiae (both left and right) and right humeri were individually sealed in plastic bags to minimise moisture loss, and stored in a freezer at -18 °C for later analysis (Zhang and Coon, 1997). The bones were then removed from refrigerator for bone ash and breaking strength (BS) determinations. The right tibiae and right humeri were used for BS while left tibiae were used for bone ash determination and histomorphometric analysis. Breaking strength (N) was determined according to procedures described by Fleming et al. (1998b). Bone stress (N/mm²), which is force per unit area of bone, was calculated by dividing bone strength with true cortical area (mm²). True cortical area was calculated by multiplying cortical area with mean percent bone and divided by 100. Percent bone which is the reciprocal of porosity was determined from microscopic observations.

Left tibiae were dissected and a 5 mm ring from midshaft taken for histological processing. Two additional samples were taken, 20 mm on either side of the ring, and combined for ash measurements according to the procedures described by Fleming et al. (1998b) and Williams et al. (2000a). The bone cross-section taken for histology was fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin, decalcified and processed for histomorphometric analysis according to procedures described by (Fleming et al., 1998b).

Data during the laying period (23 to 60 weeks) were analyzed as a 2 x 3 factorial block design (effect of 2 ages and 3 Ca levels) in which data from individual birds served as replicates. Data were subjected to ANOVA using the General Linear Models (GLM) procedure of SAS[®] (SAS Institute, 1996) (version 6.12) to assess the effect of dietary treatment on response variables relating to mechanical properties (bone strength and stress), bone dimensions (length, width and weight), bone chemical composition (ash percentage, Ca and P contents) and Ca intake. The differences between treatment means were separated using Tukey's studentised range test.

Table 1 - Physical compo	sition of layi	ng diets on a	ir dry basis (%)				
			Breeder	Phase 1			Breeder	Phase 3
	Pre-bree	eder diet			Breeder	Phase 2		
	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca
Maize	63.54	63.51	61.92	59.66	63.11	60.81	56.43	62.23
Pollard Glutten	-	-	4.45	2.3	1.8	1.0	-	-
Wheat bran	12.65	6.65	5.15	-	6.55	-	14.90	1.00
Full fat soya	-	-	-	10.0	-	9.95	-	1.70
Soybean oil cake	7.75	11.4	8.6	10.3	8.4	7.55	8.75	9.50
Sunflower oil cake	12.45	11.1	15.0	7.75	15.0	10.00	15.00	15.0
Calcium carbonate (grit)	-	-	2.0	6.15	2.3	6.75	2.25	6.60
Calcium carbonate (fine)	1.15	2.2	0.5	1.5	0.6	1.65	0.6	1.65
Mono calcium phosphate	1.49	4.25	1.29	1.36	1.40	1.50	1.28	1.53
Salt	0.24	0.26	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44
Bicarbonate	0.20	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	-
Choline liquid	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	-	0.03	-	-
Lysine	0.10	0.04	0.15	-	0.10		0.03	0.03
Methionine	0.05	0.05	0.005	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.02
	0.35	0.35	0.50	0.50	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Trace mineral / vitamin premix								

Table 2 - Nutrient comp	osition of e	xperimental	diets on air	dry basis (%))			
			Breeder	phase 1			Breeder	phase 3
	Pre-bree	der diet			Breeder	phase 2		
	1.0% Ca	2.0% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca	1.5% Ca	3.5% Ca
Moisture	11.07	10.37	10.58	9.96	9.77	9.10	9.85	9.19
Metabolisable Energy (MJ/kg)	11.96	11.70	12.09	12.00.	11.94	11.87	11.46	11.43
Protein	15.22	15.50	18.33	17.72	17.03	16.77	16.68	16.06
Crude fat	3.30	3.06	3.00	4.20	2.97	4.07	3.09	2.98
Crude fibre	7.01	5.99	0.00	0.00	6.65	5.08	8.28	6.64
Ash	0.00	0.00	6.21	11.23	6.74	12.05	6.90	11.98
Calcium	1.00	2.01	1.51	3.50	1.52	3.50	1.59	3.46
Phosphorus	0.84	1.37	0.78	0.71	0.80	0.74	0.84	0.78
Available phosphorus	0.45	0.90	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.54
Arginine	0.98	1.01	1.11	1.12	1.08	1.09	1.10	1.07
Isoleucine	0.60	0.64	0.74	0.76	0.69	0.71	0.67	0.67
Lysine			0.81	0.83	0.76	0.78	0.73	0.72
Methionine	0.35	0.34	0.38	0.38	0.35	0.36	0.33	0.33
TSAA1	0.06	0.64	0.73	0.70	0.68	0.67	0.66	0.64
Threonine	0.55	0.57	0.66	0.66	0.62	0.63	0.61	0.60
Tryptophan	0.17	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.18
TA ² Arginine	0.91	0.93	1.04	1.04	0.99	1.01	1.01	0.99
TA ² Isoleucine	0.54	0.57	0.67	0.69	0.62	0.65	0.59	0.60
TA ² Lysine	0.60	0.60	0.70	0.71	0.64	0.67	0.61	0.61
TA ² Methionine	0.31	0.31	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.33	0.29	0.30
TA ² TSAA	0.57	0.57	0.64	0.63	0.59	0.60	0.57	0.56
TA ² Threonine	0.48	0.50	0.59	0.59	0.55	0.56	0.26	0.53
TA ² Tryptophan	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
AC:Linoleic acid	1.83	1.68	1.65	2.32	1.65	2.26	1.71	1.64
Xanthophylls	0.00	0.00	23.51	17.68	17.12	14.66	11.29	12.45
Salt	0.24	0.27	0.42	0.41	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.45
Choline	1300.01	1309.56	1205.18	1204.08	1008.79	1003.18	1087.10	993.06
Sodium	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.20
Chlorine	0.22	0.57	0.33	0.29	0.33	0.31	0.32	0.32
Potassium	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.71	0.61
Magnesium			0.22	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.25	0.23
Manganese			46.82	63.94	50.82	68.71	61.84	71.60
¹ Total sulphur amino acids, ² Che	emically determin	ned						

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Feed intake

The hens' feed intake was significantly (P<0.001) different among dietary treatments. Feed intake increased with increasing dietary Ca level with 1.5 and 3.5% Ca diets giving the lowest (989.62 \pm 4.72 g) and highest (1059.60 \pm 4.80 g) average feed intake values per hen for the total period, respectively. These results are in agreement with those of Clunies et al. (1992a) who fed three levels of Ca (2.5, 3.5 and 4.5%) to white Leghorn hens and found that birds fed 2.5% Ca diet had the lowest feed intake while those fed 3.5% Ca showed the highest. Summers et al. (1976) also reported similar differences by feeding laying hens on 1.5 and 2.96% Ca diets, respectively. Kornegay et al. (1985), Clunies and Leeson (1995) and Ahmad et al. (2003), however, reported no effect of dietary Ca level on feed consumption of hens fed on diets containing Ca levels ranging from 2.5 to 5.0%. Feed intake significantly (P<0.001) increased with age.

Calcium intake

Different intakes of Ca by the hens in each treatment were achieved by feeding the various Ca levels. Keshavarz and Nakajima (1993) and Clunies and Leeson (1995) reported a significant (P<0.05) increase in Ca intake by feeding dietary Ca levels ranging from 2.5 to 5.5%. Kemp and Kenny (2004) suggested that breeders need 4-5 grams of Ca per day from the first egg throughout the laying period. This requirement is satisfied by making the change from pre-breeder (1.5% Ca) to breeder (2.8% Ca) diets immediately prior to the first egg (Ross Breeders, 1998). The 2.5% dietary Ca levels in the current study appeared to provide the recommended requirements (4-5 g). On the other hand, the Ca intake by hens fed 3.5% dietary Ca exceeds the proposed intake.

Daily Ca intake increased with age except for weeks 38 and 58. The variation in Ca intake at especially weeks 38 and 58 could be attributable to high and low temperatures. The maximum and minimum temperatures at week 38 were 35.6 °C and 17 °C, respectively. At week 58, maximum and minimum temperatures of 19.4 °C and 4.0 °C were recorded.

Body weight

Hen BW increased (P<0.05) as dietary Ca concentration increased from 1.5 to 3.5%. Birds fed 1.5% Ca diet had significantly (P<0.05) lower BW than those fed 2.5 and 3.5% Ca diets, respectively. However, BW for birds fed 2.5% and 3.5% Ca diets was not significantly different, indicating that either of these two levels is sufficient to support growth. The results of this study support those of Clunies and Leeson (1995) and Menge et al. (1977) who reported improved BW in laying Single Comb White Leghorn hens and turkey hens fed increasing dietary Ca levels ranging from 1.16 to 5.5%. A significant (P<0.001) Ca level x age interaction occurred.

Mortality

Twelve birds died (4 from each treatment) during the laying period representing a cumulative mortality rate of 6%. This indicates that treatment did not influence mortality in agreement with Atkinson et al. (1967).

Bone dimensions

As illustrated in Table 3, bone length, width and weight were not significantly (P>.05) influenced by dietary Ca level. The results of the current study are inconsistent with Williams et al. (2000b), who reported that the tibiotarsus width of broilers fed higher levels of Ca decreased linearly with increasing dietary Ca content. These workers suggested that the small dietary Ca effects on body weight and bone ash could have combined to give a stronger, but indirect, effect on bone width. However, the results of the present study do not support these findings. In contrast with the humerus, the length and width of tibia significantly (P<0.001) increased and decreased with age, respectively. No explanation could be given for this.

From Table 3 it is apparent that bone weight did not change significantly (P>.05) with age. The gradual resorption of medullary bone for eggshell formation during the laying period could have contributed to this non-significant bone weight result. Although it is generally thought that medullary bone has non-structural properties, Fleming et al. (1996) have shown that it contributes to overall bone strength. Resorption of medullary bone could result in weaker bones.

Bone mechanical properties

Measurements of breaking strengths of humeri and tibiae are given in Table 3. It seems that bone strength (BS) significantly (P<0.02) increased with increased levels of dietary Ca. Although the BS for birds fed 2.5 and 3.5%

Ca diets was not statistically different, birds on 3.5% Ca diet tended to have numerically greater BS values. These results are in agreement with those of Rowland et al. (1968) who reported significantly (P<0.05) higher BS for birds fed 6.8% Ca diets compared to 1.0%. In contrast to these results, Moore et al. (1977) observed no statistical differences in the BS of radii of 4 months old commercial layer hens fed 3.78% Ca and 1.0% P and 3.22% Ca and 0.65% P diets.

a a han i a a l'an an antia a a f han a a in h

Table 2 The offect of calcium level and are on her

		Age (weeks)			Signif	licance of effect	ct (P)
	Treatment	35	60	Means	Treatment	Age	Interaction	CV
Right tibia								
Length (mm)	1.5% Ca	124.36 ± 1.11	128.87 ± 1.16	126.62 ± 0.80ª	0.3220	0.0004	0.5903	3.1
. . ,	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{124.23} \pm \textbf{1.11}$	$\textbf{126.44} \pm \textbf{1.11}$	$\textbf{125.33} \pm \textbf{0.79}^{a}$				
	3.5% Ca	123.19 ± 1.11	$\textbf{126.79} \pm \textbf{1.11}$	124.99 ± 0.79^{a}				
	Means	$\textbf{123.93} \pm \textbf{0.64}$	$\textbf{127.37} \pm \textbf{0.65}$					
Width (mm)	1.5% Ca	7.87 ± 1.89	$\textbf{7.24} \pm \textbf{0.20}$	7.55 ± 0.14 a	0.8833	0.0001	0.4287	8.6
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{7.90} \pm \textbf{1.89}$	$\textbf{7.39} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	7.65 ± 0.13 a				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{8.10} \pm \textbf{1.89}$	$\textbf{7.12} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	$7.61\pm0.13^{\circ}$				
	Means	7.96 ± 0.11^{a}	$7.25 \pm \mathbf{0.11^{b}}$					
Weight (g)	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{17.81} \pm \textbf{0.54}$	$\textbf{18.60} \pm \textbf{0.56}$	$\textbf{18.21} \pm \textbf{0.39}^{a}$	0.2059	0.9566	0.3813	10.0
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{18.75} \pm \textbf{0.54}$	$\textbf{18.77} \pm \textbf{0.54}$	$\textbf{18.76} \pm \textbf{0.38}^{a}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{19.55} \pm \textbf{0.54}$	$\textbf{18.82} \pm \textbf{0.54}$	$\textbf{19.19} \pm \textbf{0.38}^{a}$				
	Means	$18.71 \pm \mathbf{0.31^a}$	$\textbf{18.73} \pm \textbf{0.32}^{a}$					
Bone strength (N)	1.5% Ca	235.00 ± 68.74	$\textbf{252.00} \pm \textbf{93.43}$	242.20 ±15.56ª	0.0001	0.9809	0.7308	23.3
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{320.42} \pm \textbf{56.18}$	$\textbf{315.00} \pm \textbf{58.54}$	317.71 ± 14.44^{b}				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{350.00} \pm \textbf{54.10}$	$\textbf{340.00} \pm \textbf{105.45}$	$\textbf{343.50} \pm \textbf{14.79}^{\texttt{b}}$				
	Means	$\textbf{300.93} \pm \textbf{12.00}^{a}$	$\textbf{301.34} \pm \textbf{12.38}^{a}$					
Bone stress (N/mm ²)	1.5% Ca	27.90 ± 5.47	$\textbf{19.33} \pm \textbf{6.86}$	$\textbf{23.61} \pm \textbf{4.39}^{a}$	0.5893	0.0081	0.7790	68.5
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{32.63} \pm \textbf{5.47}$	$\textbf{16.50} \pm \textbf{6.42}$	$\textbf{24.57} \pm \textbf{4.22}^{a}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{37.39} \pm \textbf{6.05}$	$\textbf{21.38} \pm \textbf{5.74}$	$\textbf{29.38} \pm \textbf{4.17}^{a}$				
	Means	$\textbf{32.33} \pm \textbf{3.27}^{a}$	$\textbf{19.07} \pm \textbf{3.67}^{\texttt{b}}$					
Right humerus								
Length (mm)	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{84.09} \pm \textbf{1.55}$	$\textbf{81.99} \pm \textbf{1.62}$	$\textbf{83.04} \pm \textbf{1.22}^{a}$	0.7338	0.7061	0.6245	6.4
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{82.94} \pm \textbf{1.55}$	$\textbf{83.88} \pm \textbf{1.55}$	$\textbf{83.41} \pm \textbf{1.10}^{a}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{84.39} \pm \textbf{1.55}$	$\textbf{84.10} \pm \textbf{1.55}$	$\textbf{84.25} \pm \textbf{1.10}^{a}$				
	Means	$\textbf{83.81} \pm \textbf{0.90}^{a}$	$\textbf{83.32}\pm\textbf{0.91}^{a}$					
Width (mm)	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{6.53} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{6.50} \pm \textbf{0.12}$	$6.51\pm0.80^{ ext{a}}$	0.8781	0.4454	0.7765	6.1
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{6.56} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{6.39} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{6.48} \pm \textbf{0.80}^{\text{a}}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{6.47} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{6.44} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	$\textbf{6.45} \pm \textbf{0.80}^{\text{a}}$				
	Means	$6.52 \pm \mathbf{0.07^a}$	$\textbf{6.44} \pm \textbf{0.07}^{a}$					
Weight (g)	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{10.28} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	$\textbf{9.83} \pm \textbf{0.77}$	$\textbf{10.05} \pm \textbf{0.53}^{a}$	0.0927	0.5169	0.4503	26.0
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{8.77} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	$\textbf{9.00} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	$8.89 \pm \mathbf{0.52^a}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{9.76} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	$\textbf{11.16} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	$\textbf{10.46} \pm \textbf{0.52}^{a}$				
	Means	$\textbf{9.60} \pm \textbf{0.42}^{a}$	$\textbf{10.00} \pm \textbf{0.43}^{a}$					
Bone strength (N)	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{235.00} \pm \textbf{22.38}$	$\textbf{252.00} \pm \textbf{23.47}$	$\textbf{243.50} \pm \textbf{16.22}^{\texttt{b}}$	0.0001	0.9768	0.8149	24.4
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{320.42} \pm \textbf{21.43}$	$\textbf{315.00} \pm \textbf{21.43}$	317.71 ± 15.15^{a}				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{350.00} \pm \textbf{21.43}$	$\textbf{340.00} \pm \textbf{22.38}$	$\textbf{345.00} \pm \textbf{15.49}^{a}$				
	Means	301.81 ± 12.56^{a}	302.33 ± 1.96^{a}					

Stress values were not significantly (P>0.05) different for any treatment, suggesting that mineralisation was similar across treatment groups. Although it was apparent from Table 3 that dietary Ca did not influence bone stress, birds fed 3.5% Ca tended to have higher stress values compared to those fed 1.5% and 2.5% Ca diets. The high coefficient of variation could have contributed to these non-significant results. Previous studies (Whitehead and Wilson, 1992) have shown that there is a constant decline in structural bone content of hens throughout the laying period. Whitehead (2004) states that the general net effect of the replacement of structural bone is to weaken the overall strength of the hen's skeleton and thus increase fracture. In the current study, no significant (P=0.98) influence of age on BS occurred. It is, however, evident from Table 3 that bone stress significantly (P<0.0081) decreased with age indicating that the degree of mineralisation of bone was greater at 35 weeks compared to 60 weeks. Bone stress decreased by approximately 46% between 35 and 60 weeks of age. This indicates progressive loss of structural bone over the life of the laying hen and its subsequent replacement with medullary bone. Crenshaw

et al. (1981) stated that as bone mineralisation increases, maximum stress and bending moment of the bone increase. At a point of optimum mineralisation, stress reaches a maximum. Conversely, the lower stress indicates that the hens had bones that were less mineralised.

Bone chemical composition

Data on bone ash, Ca and P content of bone ash are given in Table 4. There were no significant (P>0.05) differences in tibia ash among dietary Ca levels. These results are in disagreement with those of Atteh and Leeson (1983) who reported a significantly (P<0.05) higher bone ash content with increasing dietary Ca from 3.0 to 4.2%. In disagreement with Rowland et al. (1968, 1972), tibia ash did not appear to be related to BS in the current study. These workers reported that caged hens that had low BS had significantly lower tibia ash values than floor hens.

No significant (P<0.05) differences were observed between the two age periods with respect to tibia ash content. In the present study, average tibia ash content at 35 and 60 weeks was 55.2 and 54.8%, respectively (Table 4). Newman and Leeson (1999) suggested that low ash values probably indicate that medullary bone was being resorbed at a faster rate in order to supply sufficient Ca to maintain shell formation. Whitehead (2004) suggested that the considerable rise in circulating oestrogen at the onset of hen's sexual maturity has a stimulatory effect on osteoblasts, causing them to produce medullary bone instead of structural bone. In the absence of structural bone formation, continued osteoclastic resorption would be expected to give rise to a net depletion of structural bone, leading ultimately to osteoporosis (Fleming et al. 1998b). The decline (P<0.001) in Ca content observed from 35 to 60 weeks of age in the current study support the view that the medullary bone was being resorbed to support shell formation resulting in bones with lower bone stress values. These results were, however, not supported by the ash values of bones (Table 4).

		Age (v	veeks)			Signif	icance of effec	t (P)
	Treatment	35	60	Means	Treatment	Age	Interaction	
								CV
Left tibia								
Ash content, %	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{56.82} \pm \textbf{3.24}$	$\textbf{52.39} \pm \textbf{7.33}$	$\textbf{54.61} \pm \textbf{1.04}^{a}$	0.1080	0.7504	0.0661	9.3
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{52.74} \pm \textbf{3.26}$	$\textbf{54.66} \pm \textbf{7.11}$	$53.70 \pm \mathbf{1.04^{a}}$				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{56.10} \pm \textbf{4.65}$	$\textbf{57.47} \pm \textbf{3.66}$	$\textbf{56.78} \pm \textbf{1.04}^{a}$				
	Means	55.22ª	54.84ª					
Calcium, %	1.5% Ca	38.22 ± 0.96	$\textbf{14.33} \pm \textbf{0.92}$	$\textbf{26.28} \pm \textbf{0.67}^{a}$	0.7197	0.0001	0.2439	12.2
	2.5% Ca	$\textbf{39.63} \pm \textbf{0.92}$	$\textbf{13.73} \pm \textbf{0.92}$	26.68± 0.65ª				
	3.5% Ca	$\textbf{37.33} \pm \textbf{0.92}$	$\textbf{14.52} \pm \textbf{0.92}$	$25.93 \pm \mathbf{0.65^a}$				
	Means	$\textbf{38.89} \pm \textbf{0.54}^{a}$	$\textbf{14.19} \pm \textbf{0.53}^{\texttt{b}}$					
Phosphorus, %	1.0% Ca	16.87 ± 0.34	6.61 ± 0.33	$11.74 \pm 0.24^{\text{b}}$	0.0415	0.0001	0.9244	10.2
	1.5% Ca	$\textbf{16.29} \pm \textbf{0.33}$	$\textbf{5.92} \pm \textbf{0.33}$	11.11 ± 0.23^{ab}				
	2.0% Ca	$\textbf{15.98} \pm \textbf{0.33}$	$\textbf{5.89} \pm \textbf{0.33}$	10.92 ± 0.23^{a}				
	Means	16.38 ± 0.19^{a}	$6.13 \pm 0.19^{\text{b}}$					
TCA ¹ (mm ²)	1.0% Ca	13.64 + 1.45	14.14 + 1.45	13.89 + 0.99ª	0.0856	0.0987	0.5925	24.5
· · ·	1.5% Ca	15.24 + 0.99	16.84 + 1.36	16.04 + 0.84 ^a				
	2.0% Ca	15.25 ± 1.28	$\textbf{18.43} \pm \textbf{1.21}$	16.84 ± 0.88^{a}				
	Means	14.71 ± 0.72ª	16.47 ± 0.76^{a}					
Percent bone	1.5% Ca	0.82 + 0.07	0.91 + 0.06	0.86 ± 0.05ª	0.9116	0.0209	0.8706	20.6
	2.5% Ca	0.82 ± 0.04	0.92 ± 0.06	0.87 ± 0.04^{a}				
	3.5% Ca	0.77 ± 0.06	0.92 ± 0.06	0.85 ± 0.04ª				
	Means	0.81 + 0.03ª	$0.92 \pm 0.03^{\circ}$	0.00 - 0.04				

The percentage of Ca present in the mineral component of the tibia was not significantly (P=0.72) different between Ca levels (Table 4). The mean values for 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% Ca levels are 26.28, 26.68 and 25.93%,

between Ca levels (Table 4). The mean values for 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5% Ca levels are 26.28, 26.68 and 25.93%, respectively. Clunies et al. (1992b) suggested that perhaps with higher levels of dietary Ca there is a decreased dependence upon medullary bone mineral to supply Ca for shell formation. The results of the current study do not seem to support this view given the low mean Ca content of bone ash for birds on 3.5% Ca diets. According to Hurwitz and Barr (1966), medullary bone Ca increases with increasing dietary Ca levels. The results of the present study are consistent with those of Clunies and Leeson (1995) and Keshavarz and Nakajima (1993), who found no beneficial effects of feeding increased dietary Ca levels (2.5 to 5.5% Ca) on bone Ca levels of laying hens.

In the present study, birds fed 3.5% Ca diet had significantly (P<0.05) lower P content compared to those fed 1.5% Ca diets. No explanation could be given for this. Phosphorus content of the bone tended to decline with increasing dietary Ca level.

During the test period (35 to 60 weeks) both Ca and P content of bone ash significantly (P<0.001) declined by 63.5 and 62.6%, respectively. This represents a monthly decline of 2.1 % for both parameters. The decline in Ca content of bone is expected, as the hen requires Ca for eggshell formation during the laying period. It is well documented that egg weight and size increase with age, indicating that the heavier egg requires more calcium to be deposited as shell than a lighter egg. Most of the calcium required for eggshell formation is obtained from the medullary bone, which is continuously resorbed during the laying period resulting in low Ca in the bones.

True cortical area and percent bone

According to Table 4, true cortical area (TCA) and percent bone were not statistically influenced by dietary Ca level. Percent bone significantly (P<0.02) increased with age and TCA did not.

CONCLUSIONS

The present results demonstrated no beneficial effects of feeding increased Ca levels on all bone parameters except BS. The feed intake and body weight of broiler breeder hens were; however, lower when 1.5% Ca was included in the diet. Therefore, it seems that 2.5% Ca (4 g Ca/hen/day) is adequate to stimulate feed intake and support growth of broiler breeder hens. This level will also supply the requirements for bone development and Ca content. Bone stress decreased with age, indicating that the degree of bone mineralisation was greater at 35 weeks compared to 60 weeks.

ACKNOWELDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank W.K. Kellogg Foundation for funding this study, Senwesko for mixing experimental diets, Mr. Willie Combrick and Ms. Yvonne Dessels for assistance with laboratory analyses, Ms. Pulane Phitsane for bird management and Dr. S.D. Mulugeta and Mr. Mike Fair for help with statistical analysis.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad HA, Yadalam SS and Roland Sr. DA (2003). Calcium requirements of Bovanes hens. Intl. J. Poult. Sci. 2: 417-420.
- Atkinson RL, Bradley JW, Couch JR and Quisenberry JH (1967). The calcium requirement of breeder turkeys. Poultry Sci. 46: 207-213.
- Atteh JO and Leeson SS (1983). Influence of dietary calcium and magnesium levels on performance, mineral metabolism, egg mineral content of laying hens. Poultry Sci. 62: 1261-1268.
- Clunies M and Leeson S (1995). Effect of dietary calcium level on plasma proteins and calcium flux occurring during a 24 h ovulatory cycle. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 75: 439-444.
- Clunies M, Parks D and Leeson S (1992a). Calcium and phosphorus and eggshell formation of hens fed different amounts of calcium. Poultry Sci. 71: 482-489.
- Clunies M, Emslie J and Leeson S (1992b). Effect of dietary calcium level on medullary bone calcium reserves and eggshell weight of Leghorn hens. Poultry Sci. 71: 1348-1356.
- Crenshaw TD, Peo Jr. ER, Lewis AJ, Moser BD and Olson D (1981). Influence of age, sex and calcium and phosphorus levels on the mechanical properties of various bones in swine. J. Anim. Sci. 52: 1319-1329.
- Dacke CG, Sanz J, Foster K, Anderson J and Cook J (1999). Japanese quail medullary bone, an *in vivo* model for none turnover: effect of disodium pamidronate. In, J. Danks, C. Dacke, G. Flik & C. Gay (eds) Calcium Metabolism: Comparative Endocrinology. 99-102.
- Fleming RH, Whitehead CC, Alvey D, Gregory NG and Wilkins LJ (1994). Bone structure and breaking strength in laying hens housed in different husbandry systems. Br. Poult. Sci. 35: 651-662.
- Fleming RH, McCormack HA, McTeir L and Whitehead CC (1996). The influence of medullary bone on humeral breaking strength. Br. Poult. Sci. 37: S30-32.
- Fleming RH, McCormack HA, McTeir L and Whitehead CC (1998a). Medullary bone and humeral breaking strength in laying hens. Res. Vet. Sci. 64: 63-67.
- Fleming RH, McCormack HA and Whitehead CC (1998b). Bone structure and strength at different ages in laying hens and effects of dietary particulate limestone, vitamin K and ascorbic acid. Br. Poult. Sci. 39: 434-440.
- Fleming RH, Whitehead CC, Alvey D, Gregory NG and Wilkins LJ (1994). Bone structure and breaking strength in laying hens housed in different husbandry systems. Br. Poult. Sci. 35: 651-662.
- Hurwitz S and Bar A (1966). Calcium depletion and repletion in laying hens.1. Effect on calcium in various bone segments, in egg shells and in blood plasma and on calcium balance. Poultry Sci. 45: 345-352.

- Kemp C and Kenny M (2004). Precise nutrition for breeders and broilers. Agriworld Vision 4(1). http://www.aviagen.com/include.asp?sec=811&con=982
- Keshavarz K and Nakajima S (1993). Re-evaluation of calcium and phosphorus requirements of laying hens for optimum performance and eggshell quality. Poultry Sci. 72: 144-153.
- Klasing KC (1998). Comparative Avian Nutrition. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK. 238-248.
- Kornegay ET, Diggs BG, Hale OM, Handlin DL, Hitchcock JP and Barczewski RA (1985). Reproductive performance of sows fed elevated calcium and phosphorus levels during growth and development. J. Anim.Sci. 61: 1460-1466.
- Menge H, Geis EG and Trobish LT (1977). Effect of vitamin D₃ and calcium on the reproductive characteristics of the turkey hens. Poultry Sci. 56: 1472-1480.
- Moore DJ, Bradley JW and Ferguson TM (1977). Radius breaking strength and egg characteristics of laying hens as affected by dietary supplements and housing. Poultry Sci. 56: 189-192.
- Newman S and Leeson S (1999). The effect of dietary supplementation with 1,25-dihydroxycholecaciferol or vitamin C on the characteristics of the tibia of older laying hens. Poultry Sci. 78: 85-90.
- Nimmo RD, Peo Jr. ER, Moser BD, Crenshaw TD and Olson DG (1980). Response of different genetic lines of boars to varying levels of dietary calcium and phosphorus. J. Anim. Sci. 51: 112-119.
- Nimmo RD, Peo Jr. ER, Moser BD and Lewis AJ (1981). Effect of level of dietary calcium-phosphorus during growth and gestation on performance, blood and bone parameters of swine. J. Anim. Sci. 52: 1330-1341.
- Parkinson G and Cransberg P (1999). Early egg production: The relationship between calcium nutrition, appetite, growth, production and skeletal development. A report for the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation. June 1999, RIRDC Project No: DAV-143A. Attwood, Victoria, Australia. 1-24.
- Ross Breeders (1998). Ross Broiler Parent Stock Management Guide, November, 1998. Newbridge, United Kingdom. 40-46.
- Ross Breeders (2001). Parent Stock Management Manual: Ross 308. Newbridge, United Kingdom. 1-43.
- Rowland Jr. LO, Harms RH, Wilson HR, Ahmed EM, Waldroup PW and Fry JL (1968). Influence of various dietary factors on bone fragility of caged layers. Poultry Sci. 47: 506-511.
- Rowland Jr. LO, Fry JL, Christmas RB, O'Steen AW and Harms RH (1972). Differences in tibia strength and bone ash among strains of layers. Poultry Sci. 51: 1612-1615.
- SAS Institute (1996). SAS® User's Guide. Version 6.12. SAS Institute Inc., Raleigh, NC.
- Summers JD, Grandhi R and Leeson S (1976). Calcium and phosphorus requirements of the laying hen. Poultry Sci. 55: 402-413.
- Whitehead CC (2004). Overview of bone biology in the egg-laying hen. Poultry Sci. 83: 193-1999.
- Whitehead CC and Fleming RH (2000). Osteoporosis in cage layers. Poultry Sci. 79: 1033-1041.
- Whitehead CC and Wilson S (1992). Characteristics of osteopenia: In, hens Whitehead, C.C. (Ed.) Bone Biology and Skeletal Disorders in Poultry, 265-280 (Abingdon, Carfax Publishing Co).
- Williams B, Waddington D, Solomon S, Thorp B and Farquharson C (2000*a*). Skeletal development in the meat-type chicken. Br. Poult. Sci. 41:141-149.
- Williams B, Waddington D, Solomon S and Farquharson C (2000b). Dietary effects on bone quality and turnover, and Ca and P metabolism in chickens. Res. Vet. Sci. 69: 81-87.
- Zhang B and Coon CN (1997). The relationship of various tibia bone measurements in hens. Poultry Sci. 76: 1698-1701.