

*

E-mail: Haytham2004_s@yahoo.com

(2018/ 1 / 23 2017/ 12 /12)

(*Coturnix coturnix japonica*) 297 ()

T1 / 11 3 3 3
 (P≤ 0.05) (%1 0,5) T3 T2
 5

T2 (P≤ 0.05)
 (P≤ 0.05)

(P≤0.05)

T2 T2
 (P≤0.05)

T3 T2 T1
 T2 T1
 T1

:

The Effect of Adding Different Proportions of Ginger Powder on Production in Performance and Carcass Characteristics and Egg of Quail Strains

Hytham M. Sabeh

Esraa M. Tawfeeq

Department of Animal Science/Agriculture and Forestry College / University of Mosul

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the effect of adding different levels of ginger powder to the lying Quail rations of three strains (white, gray, black). 297 Quail bird (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*) were randomly distributed into 3 treatments with 3 and 3 strains, replications of 11 birds/ replication

The addition of G.P to the treatments T1 (control), T2 and T3 was (0,0.5 and 1%) respectively. The results revealed a significant increase ($P \geq 0.05$) in feed consumption and body weight at age of 5 weeks, and relative weight of chest, back and thigh as well as body and carcass weight, and significant increase ($P \geq 0.05$) in egg yolk weight and shell thickness in favor to T2. As for strain both white and black strain showed a significant increase ($P \geq 0.05$) in carcass percentage fragments, gnat ratio, carcass weight and fragment weights of chest, back and thigh compared to gray line, a significant increase ($P \geq 0.05$) in egg length and width in favor to black strain. while there were no significant differences of the ginger in average daily gain, coefficient of food conversion, gnat ratio, egg, white and shell weight respectively and egg white and yolk height between addition levels. As for the interaction between ginger addition and strain, the results revealed a significant differences ($P \geq 0.05$) in body weight and feed consumptions in favor to interaction between gray, white strain, and between T2 and white, black strain of feed conversion efficiency and significant differences ($P \geq 0.05$) in egg width in favor to the interaction between T3 and gray strain, and egg produced for favor to the interaction between white strain and T1, T2, egg yolk and white weight and yolk height for favor to the interaction between B.S and both T1 and T2. For shell thickness the interaction between W.S. and T1 was significantly superior ($P \geq 0.05$) than other treatments.

Keywords: quail, ginger, production characteristics, carcass characteristics, egg production.

(Mossa, 1987)

(1986)

.(Herawati, 2010)

Ginger

(Srinivasan *et al.*, 2003) (Patel and Srinivasan, 2000)

(Yamahara, 1991)

(proteolytic)

(2008) .(Watson, 2001) E

shogaol

(Onu, 2010)

.....

(*Coturnix coturnix japonica*) 297 .2013/7/26 2013/6/ 7

3 3 . / 33 ()

0.5 .(1) (1994 N.R.C) % 1

:

() () (:) ()
 () () ()
 (%) (%) (%) () () ()
 .(:)

:1

22	
43	
23	
6	
5	
0.5	
0.25	
0.25	
100	
	*
2896	(/)
20.02	%
3.47	%
2.95	%
2.75	%

(1994 N.R.C) *

(3×3×3)

: (SAS, 2001)

Duncans

$$Y_{ijk} = m + A_i + B_j + (AB)_{ij} + e_{ijk}$$

$\left. \begin{array}{l} i= 1,2,3 \dots (a) \\ j= 1,2,3 \dots (b) \\ k=1.2, 3 \dots (r) \end{array} \right\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & b_j () a_i k = Y_{ijk} \\
 & = M () \\
 & \%1 0,5 i () A_i = A_i \\
 & j () B_j = B_j \\
 & B_j A_i = (AB)_{ij} \\
 & = e_{ijk}
 \end{aligned}$$

(2)

192,91

162,97

zingiberen, gingerols,

and Shogaol

(Ahamed *et al.*, 2000)

.(2009)

.(Arkan *et al.*, 2012 ; Herawati, 2011)

29 34

43 36 24 36

) (2010)

(/)

(2009

.(/ 4.23)

5

200,14

176,87

167,48

145,60

37,09

37,83

7

(3)

210,00

125,72 125,59

.....

(5-1)

:2

/		/	5		
*	*	*	*		
0.11 ± 4.51	0.72 ± 36.24	2.37 ± 162.97	3.63 ± 192.20	0.43 ± 11.00	T1
0.09 ± 4.23	0.56 ± 36.42	1.99 ± 153.76	2.94 ± 192.91	0.43 ± 10.78	% 0.5 T2
0.11 ± 4.36	0.35 ± 34.29	2.33 ± 149.09	2.45 ± 182.09	0.44 ± 10.67	%1 T3
				*	
0.13 ± 4.44	0.39 ± 35.72	3.46 ± 158.28	1.81 ± 188.38	0.22 ± 9.78	
0.10 ± 4.27	0.73 ± 35.93	2.92 ± 153.17	3.55 ± 190.77	0.39 ± 11.11	
0.09 ± 4.39	0.86 ± 35.30	2.28 ± 154.37	4.48 ± 188.06	0.38 ± 11.56	
*	*	*	*	*	
0.23 ± 4.73	0.77 ± 35.51	4.87 ± 167.48	3.62 ± 187.87	0.33 ± 10.33	× T1
0.17 ± 4.52	1.28 ± 36.12	0.48 ± 162.90	4.13 ± 188.73	0.33 ± 9.67	× T2
0.10 ± 4.28	1.82 ± 37.09	4.87 ± 158.52	3.01 ± 188.53	0.33 ± 9.33	× T3
0.12 ± 4.46	0.89 ± 35.81	0.48 ± 159.39	6.47 ± 191.27	0.88 ± 10.67	× T1
0.12 ± 3.99	0.34 ± 37.83	4.87 ± 151.02	2.24 ± 200.14	0.58 ± 11.00	× T2
0.13 ± 4.24	1.16 ± 35.64	0.48 ± 150.89	3.32 ± 180.89	0.67 ± 11.67	× T3
0.19 ± 4.13	0.64 ± 35.84	4.87 ± 147.98	8.91 ± 197.45	0.58 ± 12.00	× T1
0.11 ± 4.31	0.78 ± 33.84	0.48 ± 145.60	6.51 ± 189.87	0.88 ± 11.67	× T2
0.18 ± 4.64	0.61 ± 33.17	4.87 ± 153.71	3.29 ± 176.87	0.58 ± 11.00	× T3

(P ≤ 0.05)

:3

			T3 %1	T2 %0,5	T1	
204.66 1.17±	193.05 5.81±	213.23 0.85±	206.46 1.45±	1.62± 210.00	194.47 6.34±	7
125.31 1.18±	113.95 2.72±	± 131.23 1.12	125.59 1.67±	2.40± 125.72	119.96 3.96±	
1.52± 54.20	0.65± 47.91	0.39± 57.81	1.21± 54.33	1.80± 52.11	53.48 2.03±	
0.45± 41.20	1.67± 38.38	0.73± 44.52	0.53± 43.33	0.74± 43.86	37.70 1.53±	
0.28± 30.31	0.47± 28.38	0.15± 28.90	0.13± 28.86	0.16± 29.75	28.78 0.75±	
0.17± 3.30	0.21± 3.29	0.09± 3.49	0.11± 3.37	0.05 ± 3.80	0.14 ± 2.89	
0.02± 1.67	0.01± 1.64	0.08± 1.83	0.09± 1.80	0.02± 1.62	0.03± 1.16	
0.07± 3.27	0.14± 3.36	0.14± 3.71	0.10± 3.48	0.10± 3.49	0.20± 3.37	

(P≤ 0.05)

%2 1,5 5.1.0 0

(Herawati , 2011)

0.75, 0.5, 0.25

(Fakhim *et al.*, 2013)

53,48 54,33

% 1

43.86

52,11

43.33

47,91

54,20 57,81

41,20 38,38

44,52

28,90

28,38

30.31

.(3)

(4)

%2 1

(2011)

(2009)

.(Zomrawi *et al.*, 2012)

:4

			T3	T2	T1	
			%1	%0,5		
0,73± 73,93	0,69± 73,27	0,37± 74,22	0,28± 73,70	0,63± 72,65	0,60± 75,07	%
0,97±36,42	0,34±35,38	0,85± 36,26	0,54± 36,42	0,32±33,78	0,31± 37,87	%
0,56±33,34	0,34±32,81	0,53± 34,10	0,18± 33,97	0,23± 34,91	0,19± 31,37	%
0,51±24,50	0,35± 25,73	0,14± 23,55	0,32± 23,62	0,33± 25,07	0,58± 25,11	%
0,02± 2,31	0,11± 2,24	0,06± 2,35	0,13± 2,32	0,05± 2,67	0,06± 2,07	%
0,02± 1,16	0,02± 1,14	0,06± 1,23	0,05± 1,24	0,04± 1,14	0,02± 1,16	%
0,06± 2,28	0,06± 2,48	0,09± 2,50	0,09± 2,41	0,03± 2,44	0,14± 2,41	%

(P≤ 0.05)

%0.5

%33.78

% 31,37 33,97 34,91

0.8 0.4 0

(2010)

%1.2

%33,34 34,10

% 35,38

% 36,42 36,26

% 32,81

(5)

(2012)

%2.5 2 1.5 1 0

49.33 49.22

52,33

32,63

47.33

48.56

55

(Malekizadeh *et al.*, 2012)

(6)

3.29 3.66 4.16

0.28 0.26 0.34

10.36

()

.....

	.	3,27				4,61
			6,79			
10,91						5,42
				.	7,93	
				0,44		
						.

					/
*		*			
1.17± 52.33	0.34 ± 11.09	0.04± 1.22	1.02 ± 30.47	0.24 ± 25.25	T1
1.50± 49.22	0.41 ± 11.46	0.03± 1.22	0.79 ± 31.11	0.23 ± 25.54	% 0.5 T2
1.20± 49.33	0.34 ± 11.61	0.02± 1.24	0.45 ± 31.52	0.23 ± 25.52	%1 T3
*			*		
0.29± 55.00	0.29 ± 11.09	0.04± 1.21	0.95 ± 30.20	0.23 ± 25.16	
1.18± 48.56	0.45 ± 11.56	0.03± 1.18	0.68 ± 30.28	0.22 ± 25.61	
0.33± 47.33	0.28 ± 11.52	0.01± 1.28	0.30 ± 32.63	0.24 ± 25.55	
*				*	
1,22 ± 56,00	0,47± 11,15	0,01± 1,29	3,14± 29,69	0,31±25,86	× T1
1,23± 55,00	0,20± 11,23	0,04± 1,26	0,73± 31,54	0,33± 25,15	×T2
1,32± 54,00	0,51± 10,55	0,02± 1,23	0,21± 30,39	0,33± 24,78	×T3
1,04± 53,00	0,52± 10,64	0,02± 1,21	0,98± 30,54	0,34± 25,15	× T1
1,33± 46,67	1,10± 11,75	0,08± 1,14	1,67± 29,00	0,42± 25,54	×T2
1,06± 46,00	0,47± 12,28	0,02± 1,20	0,67± 31,29	0,24± 26,13	×T3
1.00± 48,00	0,57± 11,14	0,01± 1,29	0,37± 32,19	0,53± 25,07	× T1
1,22± 46,00	0,82±11,41	0,02± 1,26	0,67± 32,80	0,41± 25,94	×T2
1,10± 48,00	0,01± 11,99	0,01± 1,28	0,62± 32,88	0,26± 25,65	×T3

(P≤ 0.05)

: 6

*					*	
0.03 ± 0.34	0.21 ± 4.45	0.45 ± 9.30	0.07 ± 1.74	0.16 ± 5.86	0.14 ± 3.29	T1
0.01 ± 0.26	0.20 ± 4.45	0.32 ± 9.55	0.06 ± 1.66	0.26 ± 5.77	0.22 ± 4.16	% 0.5 T2
0.02 ± 0.28	0.13 ± 4.12	0.33 ± 9.93	0.07 ± 1.56	0.25 ± 6.17	0.10 ± 3.66	%1 T3
		*				
0.04 ± 0.31	0.18 ± 4.40	0.43 ± 8.96	0.07 ± 1.55	0.20 ± 5.79	0.14 ± 3.60	
0.02 ± 0.29	0.11 ± 4.09	0.23 ± 9.48	0.08 ± 1.64	0.29 ± 5.81	0.16 ± 3.69	
0.01 ± 0.29	0.23 ± 4.52	0.26 ± 10.36	0.05 ± 1.50	0.20 ± 6.21	0.28 ± 3.81	
*		*		*	*	
0,04 ± 0,44	0,44 ± 4,90	0,89± 7,93	0,17± 1,43	0,30± 6,33	0,13± 3,27	× T1
0,04± 0,25	0,05± 4,18	0,54± 9,72	0,08± 1,66	0,29± 5,63	0,20± 4,08	×T2
0,03± 0,24	0,05± 4,12	0,61± 9,22	0,14± 1,57	0,32± 5,42	0,10± 3,44	×T3
0,03± 0,28	0,09± 3,92	0,27± 9,87	0,15± 1,48	0,33± 5,56	0,25± 3,45	× T1
0,02± 0,25	0,24± 4,26	0,48± 8,88	0,09± 1,80	0,75± 5,55	0,39± 3,78	×T2
0,01± 0,32	0,24± 4,10	0,24± 9,68	0,12± 1,64	0,39± 6,31	0,23± 3,85	×T3
0,01± 0,30	0,30± 4,53	0,34± 10,10	0,07± 1,51	0,30± 5,70	0,36± 3,15	× T1
0,01± 0,28	0,46± 4,91	0,57± 10,07	0,10± 1,52	0,29± 6,13	0,46± 4,61	×T2
0,04± 0,27	0,38± 4,14	0,37± 10,91	0,14± 1,43	0,13± 6,79	0,16± 3,68	×T3

(P≤ 0.05)

.(2010)
 .(4)8
 .(2012)
 .(2)6
 .(2009)
 .(2)33
 .(2008)
 /
 .(2011)
 .(2)3
 .(1986)
 /
 .(2010)
 (*Zingiber officinale*)
 .(3)2

- Ahmed, R.S.; Seth, V.; Pasha, S.T.; Banerjee, B.D. (2000). Influence of Dietary Ginger (*Zingiber officinales Roscoe*) on Oxidative Stress Induced by Malathion in Rats. *Food and Chem. Toxicol.*, **38**(5), 443-50.
- Arkan, B.M.; Mohammed, A.M.; Ali, Q.J. (2012). Effect of Ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) on performance and blood serum parameter of broiler. *Internat.J. Poultry Sci.* **11**(2), 143-146.
- Fakhim, R.; Ebrahimnezhad, Y.; Seyedabadi, H.R.; Vahdatpour, T. (2013). Effect of different concentration of aqueous extract of Ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) on performance and carcass characteristics of male broiler chickens in wheat – soybean meal based diets. *J. Bio. Sci. Biotech.* **2**(2), 95-99.
- Herawati, M. (2011). The effect of feeding red Ginger (*Zingiber officinale Rosc*) as phytobiotic on broiler slaughter weight and meat quality. *Internat. J. Poultry Sci.*, **10**(12), 983-985.
- Malekizadeh, M.; Moeini, M.M.; Ghazi, Sh. (2012). The effect of different level of Ginger (*Zingiber officinale Rosc*) and turmeric (*curcuma longa linn*) rhizomes powder on some blood metabolites and production performance characteristics of laying hens. *J. Agriculture Sci. Tech.* **14**, 127-134.
- Moorthy, M.S.; Ravi, M.; Ravikumar, K.; Viswanathan, S.C.; Edwin, (2009). Ginger, Pepper and Curry Leaf Powder as Feed Additives in Broiler Diet. *International J. Poultry Sci.*, **8**(8), 779- 782.
- Mossa, J.S. (1987). "Medicinal Plants of Saudi Arabia. King". Saud. Univer. Riyadh. 244 p.
- N.R.C. (1994). "Nutrient Requirements of Poultry". 9th ed. National Academic Press, Washington, DC.20
- Onu, P.N. (2010). Evaluation of two herbal spices as feed additives for finisher broilers. *Biotechnology in Animal Husbandry* 26 (5-6), 383-392, Institute for Animal Husbandry, Belgrade-Zemun UDC 636.087.8

- Patel, K.; Srinivasan, R. (2000). Influence of dietary Spices and active Principles on pancreatic digestive enzymes in Albino. *Nahrung.*, **44**, 42-46.
- SAS. (2001). "SAS / STAT User's Guide for Personal Computers". Release 6.12. SAS Institute Inc Cary Nc, U.S.A.
- Srinivasan, V.; Hamza; S.; Krishnamurthy, K.S.; ThanKaman, C.K. (2003). Threshold level of Soil Zinc for optimum production of ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Rosc.) In National Seminar on New perspectives in spies, Medical and Aromatic plants., 69-70 (Abst).
- Watson, R.R. (2001). "Vegetables, Fruits and Herbs in Health Promotion". CRC Press Chapter 12, 180 p.
- Yamahara, J. (1991). Gastrointestinal motility enhancing effect of ginger and its active constituents. *Chem. and Pharm. Bull.*, **38**, 430-431.
- Zomrawi, W.B.; Abdel Atti, K.A.; Dousa, B.M. (2012). Teb bccbCT I c Gingbo oiit pi wdbo (*zingiber officinale*) suppibmbtatiin in bollibo ceicks pboel omancb, billd and sboumci nstitubnts. *Online J. Animal and Feed Research.* **1**(6), 457-460.