

ISSN Print: 2617-4693 ISSN Online: 2617-4707 IJABR 2024; 8(2): 113-117 www.biochemjournal.com Received: 24-12-2023 Accepted: 29-01-2024

#### **Gagandeep Kour**

Division of Animal Nutrition, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

#### Nazam Khan

Division of LFC, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

#### RK Sharma

Division of Animal Nutrition, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

#### Vikas Mahajan

Division of LFC, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

#### JS Sassan

Division of VAN, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

Corresponding Author: Nazam Khan Division of LFC, F.V.Sc. & A.H., SKUAST-J, R.S. Pura, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

# Evaluation of nutrient metabolizability and intestinal micrometry of layer quail on supplementing different phytoadditives

# Gagandeep Kour, Nazam Khan, RK Sharma, Vikas Mahajan and JS Sassan

### DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26174693.2024.v8.i2b.563

#### Abstract

In order to evaluate the effect of supplementation of different phytoadditives over nutrient intake and metabolizability of layer quails, 360 birds of same hatch (6 weeks old) were randomly distributed into eight groups (n = 45), having three replicas of fifteen quail layers per replica. These eight dietary groups were: Negative control (NC; maize-soya based diet with no additive), positive control (PC; herbal growth promoter- Reproforte plus<sup>™</sup> was supplemented @ 500 gm per ton feed), whereas T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> groups were supplemented with 1% dietary additive namely turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, aloe vera and oregano powder, respectively. These additives were fed consecutively for 22 weeks and a metabolisability trial was conducted at 20<sup>th</sup> week of trial. Also, at end of trial, representative sample of duodenum, jejunum and ileum was evaluated for villi length to crypt depth ratio and gland diameter. Results of nutrient intake showed no difference (p>0.05) amongst different dietary groups and was similar in all the treatment groups. The metabolizability of DM, CP, EE, CF, TA, OM and NFE also revealed non-significant differences (p>0.05) on phytoadditive supplementation. Also, villi length to crypt depth ratio was significantly higher (p < 0.05) in duodenum for T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> group in comparison to the NC group, but statistically (p>0.05) similar values was observed for jejunum and ileum. Also, gland diameter (µm) showed no difference in all the three segments of intestine. It may be inferred that 1% phytoadditives supplementation has no effect on nutrient intake and metabolizability in layer quail, but there is improvement in villi length to crypt depth in 1% garlic, fenugreek and cumin supplemented groups.

Keywords: Quail layer, phytogenic feed additives, nutrient intake, villus crypt ratio

#### Introduction

The use of feed additives in poultry ration improves feed utilization which in turn reduces the input feed cost. But now-a-days use of phytoadditives in poultry ration has gained momentum, as they play a significant role in maintaining optimal gut function, animal health and performance by virtue of active principles present in them. Phytogenic feed additives (PFAs) and/or Herbal feed additives are botanical products with their source belonging to herbs, spices, essential oils, or oleoresins (Ogbuewu et al., 2020)<sup>[17]</sup>. Herbs and spices are commonly used as whole plant or their parts to improve animal performance. Prophylactic antibiotic usage as feed additive in poultry ration improves the utilization of feed, but has resulted in antibiotic resistance, antibiotic residues in meat/eggs and also results in declining the diversity of normal gut microflora (Abd El-Hack et al., 2022)<sup>[2]</sup>. PFA has the potential to serve as an alternative of antibiotic growth promoters and are non-toxic and natural in nature besides being cost-effective (Abou Kassem et al., 2021)<sup>[3]</sup>. A milieu of bioactive chemicals such as curcumin, anethole, allicin, allyl-isothiocyanate, lecithin, choline, trigonelline, cuminaldehyde, carvacrol, and thymol are present in PFA that accounts for different properties viz. antioxidant, antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory, digestive stimulant, etc and possess numerous beneficial properties over poultry health and growth performance (Yatoo et al., 2012; Alinian et al., 2016; Batiha et al., 2020; Chowdhary et al., 2021; Behnamifar et al., 2023) [22, 4, 8, 10, 9].

Quail (*Coturnix coturnix*) is a small and robust bird, reared intensively for egg and meat production.

They are resistant to environmental constraints and need no vaccination and medication (ICAR, 2013)<sup>[14]</sup>. Quail possess characteristics of fast growth, early sexual maturity and high rate of egg production. But, a range of phyto-additives are available in the market to counter microbial resistance and improving feed efficiency *viz*. turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, *aloe vera* and oregano powder. With this background, a study has been carried out to compare different phytoadditives as a feed supplement by evaluating the nutrient intake/nutrient metabolizability and villus crypt ratio in layer quails.

# **Material and Methods**

The present trial was carried out at Division of Animal Nutrition, Faculty of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry, SKUAST-Jammu, India. Three hundred sixty Japanese quail (Coturnix coturnix japonica) layers of same hatch (6 weeks old) were randomly distributed into eight groups (n=45), having three replicas of fifteen quail layers per replica. A maize-soya based basal diet for layer quails was formulated as per specifications given by ICAR (2013) <sup>[14]</sup> (Table 1). The eight dietary groups were: Negative control (NC) group contains no additive, positive control (PC) is supplemented with commercial growth promoter (Reproforte plus<sup>™</sup> containing Adhatoda vasica - 20%, Asparagus officinalis- 15%, Leptadenia reticulate - 15%, Zingiber officinalis- 10%, Rubia cordiolia- 10%, Tribulus terrestris- 10%, Solena amplexicaulis- 10%, Punica granatum- 10% and was supplemented @ 500 gm per ton feed, supplied by Arvind Herbal Labs, Saharanpur, UP), whereas T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> groups were supplemented as 1% dietary additive with turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, aloe vera and oregano powder, respectively. All the phytoadditives used except aloe vera and oregano powder were purchased raw from local market. These were dried and grinded to powder form before mixing in the basal feed whereas Aloe vera powder was bought from AMORVET, UK, India. At the 20<sup>th</sup> week of feeding trial, layer quails were transferred to battery cages for conduction of metabolism trial. A metabolism trial of four days was carried out and three birds per group *i.e.* nine birds per group were transferred to the battery cages. Birds were weighed at start and end of metabolism trial for getting initial, final and average body weight (g) of layer quails. Feed and faecal samples were collected daily for assessment of proximate composition as per method described by AOAC (2012)<sup>[5]</sup> for estimating the nutrient intake and nutrient metabolizability. At the end of feeding trial (i.e. 22 weeks of trial), nine birds per group were slaughtered and duodenum, jejunum and ileum tissue specimens were collected and then fixed in 10% Neutral Buffered Formaline solution (Luna, 1968)<sup>[16]</sup> for histo-morphological processes. The micrometrical observations were recorded (Haematoxylin and Eosin-stained sections) by using ocular micrometry which was duly calibrated with stage micrometer and villus length to crypt depth ratio and gland diameter (µm) was determined.

# Statistical analysis

The data pertaining to different parameters were subjected to statistical analysis as per Snedecor and Cochran (1994) <sup>[19]</sup>. The means in different treatments were subjected to Duncan's multiple range test (1995) <sup>[11]</sup> for ranking (p<0.05).

# **Results and Discussion**

Results for nutrient intake and nutrient metabolisability of layer quail at 20<sup>th</sup> week of trial are presented in Table 2 and 3, respectively. It was found that supplementation of phytoadditives @ 1% in layer quail diet had no effect on the body weight of layer quail during initiation and completing the metabolizability trial. Similarly, no effect was observed on metabolizability of different nutrients i.e. dry matter, crude protein, ether extract, crude fibre and organic matter on supplementation of phytoadditives at the rate of 1%. Similar to our findings, Silva et al. (2017)<sup>[18]</sup> revealed that turmeric supplementation at the rate of 0, 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2% did not affect the dry matter; crude protein and ether extract metabolizability in layer quails. Likewise, Abaza (2007)<sup>[1]</sup> and Yatoo et al. (2012) [22] reported no effect of fenugreek supplementation @ 0.5% and 1% on metabolisability values of nutrients in laying hens and broilers, respectively. In line to our results, Kichloo et al. (2023) [15] also reported that aloe vera supplementation @ 0.4 and 0.6% in meat quail diet had no effect on nutrient metabolizability. Similar findings were also reported by earlier authors also on aloe vera supplementation (Tarig et al., 2015 [21]; Barman et al., 2019) <sup>[6]</sup>. On the contrary, Zeweil et al. (2011) <sup>[23]</sup> revealed that the supplementation of 0.75% of dried garlic resulted in a significant (p < 0.01) improvements in digestibility coefficients of crude protein and nitrogen free extract (NFE) in layer quails. But this study has been carried out in 12 weeks old quail, however the present study is carried out in 26 weeks old quail (20 weeks of trail). However, EL-Mallah et al. (2005)<sup>[12]</sup> stated that supplementation of fenugreek seeds @ 2% in diet of turkey chicks resulted in significant increase in digestibility of NFE%, and attributed it to saponin content of fenugreek seeds. Species difference and dosage difference might be the possible reason for the difference in these two studies. Similarly, Yatoo et al. (2012) <sup>[22]</sup> reported higher DM digestibility on supplementing 1% cumin in boiler diet. The literature pertaining to the effect of phytoadditive supplementation on nutrient intake and its metabolizability is scanty, thus cannot be discussed.

The structure of intestinal epithelium have important role in nutrient digestion, absorption, and overall gut health (Soumeh et al., 2019) <sup>[20]</sup>. Among micrometrical observations, significantly higher (p < 0.05) villi length to crypt depth ratio was observed in garlic  $(T_2)$ , fenugreek  $(T_3)$ and cumin  $(T_4)$  supplemented groups in the duodenum, but in the jejunum and ileum no effect was observed on phytoadditive supplementation. Higher villus height to crypt depth ratio reflects vast area for nutrient utilization and higher absorptive capacities (Ashayerizadeh et al., 2023)<sup>[6]</sup>. Gland diameter (µm) was similar in all three intestinal segments viz. duodenum, jejunum and ileum. Similar to our study, Ashayerizadeh et al. (2023) <sup>[6]</sup>, revealed that supplementation of turmeric powder at 0.5% in the diet of quail showed no significant difference in terms of villus height and crypt depth ratio in duodenum and jejunum. He et al. (2017)<sup>[13]</sup> revealed that addition of 100 mg/kg oregano essential oils in the diet of layer quail increased villus height to crypt depth ratios (p < 0.01) in the duodenum compared with the control group. However, in jejunum, after the addition of oregano essential oils, there was no effect on villus height to crypt depth ratios. The difference can be due to different form of phytoadditive used. Longer and slender villi result in increased surface area which leads to better

absorption of nutrients which is expressed in improved digestibility of nutrients (Chowdhary *et al.*, 2021)<sup>[10]</sup>. Data pertaining to the effect of dietary inclusion of different

phytoadditive is scarce; therefore the results cannot be compared.

| <b>Fable 1:</b> Ingredient and chemical | l composition of | f quail layer | basal diet. |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------|
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------|

| Attributes                     | Ingredient composition (%) |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Maize                          | 62.66                      |  |  |  |  |
| Meat bone meal                 | 4.02                       |  |  |  |  |
| Soybean meal                   | 24.65                      |  |  |  |  |
| Salt                           | 0.25                       |  |  |  |  |
| Sodium bicarbonate             | 0.01                       |  |  |  |  |
| Soybean oil                    | 1.30                       |  |  |  |  |
| DL-Methionine                  | 0.10                       |  |  |  |  |
| L-Lysine hydrochloride         | 0.12                       |  |  |  |  |
| Limestone powder               | 6.72                       |  |  |  |  |
| Vitamin supplement             | 0.05                       |  |  |  |  |
| Trace minerals                 | 0.10                       |  |  |  |  |
| Chemical compositi             | on (on DMB, %)             |  |  |  |  |
| Organic Matter                 | 95.31                      |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Protein                  | 18.62                      |  |  |  |  |
| Ether Extract                  | 5.51                       |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Fibre                    | 4.19                       |  |  |  |  |
| Total Ash                      | 4.69                       |  |  |  |  |
| Nitrogen free extract          | 66.99                      |  |  |  |  |
| ME (Kcal/kg; calculated value) | 2850                       |  |  |  |  |

 Table 2: Effect of supplementation of different phytoadditives on body weight (g) and nutrient intake (g) during metabolism trial of layer quail

| Attributos             |                   |             |             | Gr                    | <b>Overall mean</b> | D voluo     |             |             |             |                |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Attributes             | NC                | PC          | $T_1$       | <b>T</b> <sub>2</sub> | <b>T</b> 3          | <b>T</b> 4  | T5          | <b>T</b> 6  | ± SEM       | r - value      |
| Initial body<br>weight | 209.17±5.74       | 213.67±6.42 | 215.33±6.04 | 213.00±4.77           | 214.50±2.75         | 217.33±6.24 | 218.50±6.00 | 219.3±5.88  | 215.10±1.88 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| Final body<br>weight   | 212.33±5.67       | 217.67±6.88 | 218.97±5.85 | 219.17±4.34           | 218.17±4.00         | 223.83±5.55 | 221.33±5.81 | 222.33±5.11 | 219.23±1.85 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| Average body<br>weight | 210.75±5.67       | 215.67±6.63 | 217.15±5.80 | 216.08±4.51           | 216.33±3.31         | 220.58±5.65 | 219.92±5.87 | 220.83±5.47 | 217.16±1.83 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
|                        |                   |             |             | Nu                    | trient intake       |             |             |             |             |                |
| Feed                   | $163.88 \pm 5.10$ | 167.76±3.93 | 164.69±4.34 | $169.05 \pm 4.39$     | $169.77 \pm 4.01$   | 169.91±4.05 | 169.96±3.91 | 168.94±3.64 | 168.02±1.36 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| DM                     | 152.40±4.74       | 156.01±3.66 | 153.35±4.04 | 157.22±4.08           | 157.89±3.73         | 158.02±3.76 | 158.06±3.64 | 157.11±3.39 | 156.26±1.27 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| CP                     | $28.38 \pm 0.88$  | 29.05±0.68  | 28.55±0.75  | $29.27 \pm 0.76$      | 29.40±0.69          | 29.42±0.70  | 29.43±0.68  | 29.25±0.63  | 29.10±0.24  | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| EE                     | 7.71±0.24         | 7.89±0.19   | 7.76±0.20   | 7.96±0.21             | 7.99±0.19           | 8.00±0.19   | 8.00±0.18   | 7.95±0.17   | 7.91±0.06   | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| CF                     | 6.39±0.40         | 6.54±0.15   | 6.43±0.17   | 6.59±0.17             | 6.62±0.16           | 6.62±0.15   | 6.58±0.14   | 6.58±0.14   | 6.55±0.05   | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| TA                     | 7.15±0.22         | 7.32±0.17   | 7.19±0.19   | 7.37±0.19             | 7.40±0.17           | 7.41±0.18   | 7.41±0.17   | 7.37±0.16   | 7.33±0.06   | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| OM                     | $145.26 \pm 4.52$ | 148.70±3.49 | 146.15±3.85 | 149.85±3.89           | $150.48 \pm 3.55$   | 150.60±3.59 | 150.65±3.47 | 149.74±3.23 | 148.93±1.21 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| NFE                    | 102.78±3.20       | 105.22±2.47 | 103.42±2.72 | 106.03±2.75           | $106.48 \pm 2.51$   | 106.57±2.54 | 106.60±2.45 | 105.96±2.28 | 105.38±0.86 | <i>p</i> >0.05 |

Negative control (NC; contains no additive), positive control (PC; herbal growth promoter- Reproforte plus<sup>TM</sup> was supplemented @ 500gm per ton feed), whereas  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ , T5 and T6 groups were supplemented with 1% dietary additive namely turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, aloe vera and oregano powder, respectively; DM (Dry matter), OM (Organic matter), CP (Crude protein), EE (Ether extract), CF (Crude fibre), TA (Total ash) and NFE (Nitrogen free extract)

Table 3: Effect of supplementation of different phytoadditives on digestibility (%) of nutrients in meat quail

| Attributos |                  |            | Ownell meen   SEM | D volue               |                  |                  |                  |                  |                   |                |
|------------|------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Auribules  | NC               | PC         | <b>T</b> 1        | <b>T</b> <sub>2</sub> | <b>T</b> 3       | T4               | <b>T</b> 5       | T <sub>6</sub>   | Overall mean ±SEN | r-value        |
| DM         | 67.59±1.92       | 72.38±1.36 | 71.84±1.78        | 72.65±2.50            | 72.63±1.47       | 72.48±1.42       | 72.15±1.74       | 72.34±1.53       | 71.76±0.62        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| OM         | 68.63±1.99       | 73.45±1.32 | 73.02±1.79        | $73.84{\pm}2.61$      | 73.70±1.54       | 73.70±1.35       | 73.27±1.76       | 73.50±1.52       | 72.89±0.63        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| СР         | $68.36 \pm 2.47$ | 69.94±1.04 | 70.81±1.45        | $70.72 \pm 2.85$      | $70.68 \pm 1.11$ | 70.02±2.23       | $69.64 \pm 2.90$ | 70.37±1.95       | 70.07±0.67        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| EE         | 72.04±3.17       | 74.29±2.05 | 73.94±3.04        | $74.40 \pm 2.62$      | 73.43±1.48       | $74.18 \pm 1.84$ | 73.46±2.98       | 73.68±1.89       | 73.68±0.78        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| CF         | $50.00 \pm 2.23$ | 50.48±3.10 | $49.06 \pm 2.38$  | $48.86 \pm 4.00$      | 46.16±2.70       | $46.08 \pm 2.95$ | 50.30±2.18       | $47.88 \pm 3.06$ | 48.60±0.94        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |
| NFE        | 69.61±2.13       | 75.79±1.61 | 75.04±1.99        | 76.21±2.53            | 76.26±1.62       | 76.40±1.05       | 75.68±1.48       | 75.94±1.59       | 75.12±0.68        | <i>p</i> >0.05 |

Negative control (NC; contains no additive), positive control (PC; herbal growth promoter- Reproforte plus<sup>TM</sup> was supplemented @ 500gm per ton feed), whereas T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> groups were supplemented with 1% dietary additive namely turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, *aloe vera* and oregano powder, respectively; DM (Dry matter), OM (Organic matter), CP (Crude protein), EE (Ether extract), CF (Crude fibre), TA (Total ash) and NFE (Nitrogen free extract)

Table 4: Effect of phytoadditives supplementation on Micrometry of different components small intestine of layer Quails

|        | Duo         | denum              | Jeju              | num                | Ileum             |                    |
|--------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Groups | Diameter of | Villi length/crypt | Diameter of gland | Villi length/crypt | Diameter of gland | Villi length/crypt |
|        | gland (µm)  | depth              | (μm)              | depth              | (µm)              | depth              |
|        |             |                    |                   |                    |                   |                    |

| NC                | 50.09±1.53     | 8.63 <sup>a</sup> ±0.20   | 45.30±1.38     | 9.31±0.46      | 42.87±2.62     | 4.64±0.21       |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| PC                | 54.90±3.99     | 9.56 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.33 | 46.08±1.47     | 9.34±0.52      | 42.73±2.01     | 4.77±0.31       |
| T1                | 60.63±2.71     | 9.14 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.32 | 45.30±1.34     | 10.09±0.49     | 47.33±2.24     | $4.85 \pm 0.18$ |
| T <sub>2</sub>    | 56.65±2.80     | 10.01 <sup>b</sup> ±0.41  | 47.32±1.20     | 10.05±0.76     | 47.12±1.43     | 4.96±0.12       |
| T3                | 50.82±2.79     | 9.65 <sup>bc</sup> ±0.28  | 45.86±0.64     | 9.68±0.27      | 44.58±1.94     | 4.63±0.23       |
| T4                | 56.45±3.11     | 9.99 <sup>b</sup> ±0.28   | 47.46±1.31     | 9.72±0.45      | 47.57±1.63     | 4.95±0.22       |
| T5                | 54.32±2.28     | 9.51 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.31 | 47.44±1.17     | 9.63±0.55      | 42.32±1.21     | 4.71±0.25       |
| T <sub>6</sub>    | 55.76±3.02     | 9.00 <sup>ab</sup> ±0.27  | 45.82±1.48     | 9.57±0.55      | 43.91±1.73     | 5.01±0.40       |
| Overall mean± SEM | 54.95±1.02     | 9.39±0.11                 | 46.32±0.44     | 9.67±0.18      | 44.80±0.68     | 4.82±0.09       |
| P-value           | <i>p</i> >0.05 | p < 0.05                  | <i>p</i> >0.05 | <i>p</i> >0.05 | <i>p</i> >0.05 | <i>p</i> >0.05  |
|                   |                |                           |                |                |                | 4 0 - 4 4       |

Negative control (NC; contains no additive), positive control (PC; herbal growth promoter- Reproforte plus<sup>TM</sup> was supplemented @ 500gm per ton feed), whereas  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ ,  $T_5$  and  $T_6$  groups were supplemented with 1% dietary additive namely turmeric, garlic, fenugreek, cumin, *aloe vera* and oregano powder, respectively

# Conclusion

It can be concluded that garlic and cumin supplementation in layer quails resulted in increased villus height to crypt depth ratio in duodenum and it resulted in numerically higher nutrient metabolisability.

# Acknowledgement

The authors extended their gratitude to the Vice-Chancellor, SKUAST-Jammu for providing necessary amenities to accomplish the study.

# References

- 1. Abaza IM. Effect of using fenugreek, chamomile and radish as feed additives on productive performance and digestibility coefficients of laying hens. Poultry Science, 2007;27:199-218.
- 2. Abd El-Hack ME, El-Saadony MT, Elbestawy AR, Gado AR, Nader MM, Saad AM, El-Tahan AM, Taha AE, Salem HM, El-Tarabily KA. Hot red pepper powder as a safe alternative to antibiotics in organic poultry feed: An updated review. Poultry science. 2022;101(4):101684.
- Abou-Kassem DE, Mahrose KM, El-Samahy RA, Shafi ME, El-Saadony MT, Abd El-Hack ME, *et al.* Influences of dietary herbal blend and feed restriction on growth, carcass characteristics and gut microbiota of growing rabbits. Italian Journal of Animal Science. 2021;20(1):896-910.
- Alinian S, Razmjoo J, Zeinali F. Flavanoids, anthocynuns, phenolics and essential oil produced in cumin (*Cuminum cymium* L.) accessions under different irrigation regimes. Industrial Crops and Products, 2016; 81: 49-55.
- 5. AOAC. Official Method of Analysis.19<sup>th</sup> edn. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. Inter., Washington, DC; c2012.
- 6. Ashayerizadeh O, Dastar B, Shargh MS, Soumeh EA, Jazi V. Effects of black pepper and turmeric powder on growth performance, gut health, meat quality, and fatty acid profile of Japanese quail. Frontiers in Physiology, 2023, 14.
- Barman S, Samanta A, Das B, Goswami R, Gali J, Devi P. Effect of dietary supplementation of aloe vera and Lactobacillus acidophilus on growth performance, nutrient utilization and carcass characteristics of broiler birds. International Journal of Livestock Research. 2019;9(5):102-112.
- Batiha ES, Beshbishy M, Wasef G, Elewa YHA, Al-Sagan AA, Abd-El-Hack ME, *et al.* Chemical constituents and pharmacological activities of Garlic (*Allium sativa* L.): A Review. Nutrients, 2020;12(3):872.

- 9. Behnamifar A, Rahimi S, Karimi Torshizi MA, Mohammad Zade Z. Effect of chamomile, wild mint and oregano herbal extracts on quality and quantity of eggs, hatchability, and some other parameters in laying Japanese quails. Journal of Medicinal plants and Byproduct. 2018;7(2):173-180.
- Chowdhary S, Khan N, Sharma RK, Sasan JS, Mahajan V. Effect of dietary inclusion of turmeric (*Curcuma longa*) and garlic (*Allium sativum*) powders as feed additives on performance of broiler chicken. Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition, 2021;38(1): 92-99.
- 11. Duncan DB. New Multiple Range and Multiple Test. Biometrics. 1995;11:1-42.
- 12. El-Mallah GM, Ibrahim SA, Abdo MZ. Garlic and fenugreek as feed addatives to different levels of protein and energy in diets of growing turkeys. Egyptian Poultry Science Journal. 2005;25:911-929.
- 13. He X, Hao D, Liu C, Zhang X, Xu D, Xu X, *et al.* Effect of supplemental oregano essential oils in diets on production performance and relatively intestinal parameters of laying hens. American Journal of Molecular Biology. 2017;7(01):73.
- 14. ICAR, Nutrient requirement of Animals-Poultry (ICAR-NIANP), Indian Council of Agriculture Research, New Delhi; c2013.
- Kichloo AA, Khan N, Sharma RK, Mahajan V, Amrutkar S, Sassan JS. Response of Japanese quail on supplementing different Aloe vera forms during summer. Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition. 2023;40(2):160-167.
- Luna, L.G. Manual of histological staining methods of the armed forces institute of Pathology. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edn. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co; c1968. p. 39-40.
- 17. Ogbuewu IP, Okoro VM, Mbajiorgu CA. Meta-analysis of the influence of phytobiotic (Pepper) supplementation in broiler chicken performance. Tropical animal health and production, 2020;52:17-30.
- Silva WJ, Gouveia AB, Sousa FE, Santos FR, Minafra-Rezende CS, Silva JM, *et al.* Turmeric and sorghum for egg-laying quails. Italian Journal of Animal Science. 2018;17(2):368-76.
- 19. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. Statistical methods. 8th Edition, The lowa state university, lowa, U.S.A; c1994.
- 20. Soumeh EA, Mohebodini H, Toghyani M, Shabani A, Ashayerizadeh A, Jazi V. Synergistic effects of fermented soybean meal and mannan oligosaccharide on growth performance, digestive functions, and hepatic gene expression in broiler chickens. Poult. Sci. 2019;98:6797-6807.
- 21. Tariq H, Roa PVR, Raghuvanshi RS, Mondal BC, Singh SK. Effects of aloe vera and clove powder

supplementation on carcass characteristics, composition and serum enzymes of Japanese quails. Vet World. 2015;8(5)0:664-668.

- 22. Yatoo MA, Sharma, RK, Khan N, Rastogi A, Pathak AK. Effect of fenugreek and black cumin seeds as feed additives on blood biochemical profile and performance of broilers. Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition. 2012;29(2), 174-178.
- 23. Zeweil H, Dosoky W, Farag S, Basyony M. Effect of dried garlic and hot pepper as feed additives on the performance and egg quality of laying Japanese quail hens. Conference: XX<sup>th</sup> European Symposium on the Quality of Poultry Meat; c2011, b-042.