GROWTH PERFORMANCE INDICES, CARCASS CHARACTERISTICS AND ORGAN WEIGHTS IN BROILER FINISHERS FED DIETS CONTAINING REPLACEMENT OF SOYABEAN MEAL WITH *MORINGA OLEIFERA* LEAF MEAL

¹SULE, Kayode, ²ADEGBENRO, Muyiwa, ²AKINTOMIDE, Aanuoluwapo Adeyemi and ²ONIBI, Gbenga Emmanuel

¹Department of Animal Health and Production, Federal College of Agriculture, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. ²Department of Animal Production and Health, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: Sule, K. Department of Animal Health and Production, Federal College of Agriculture, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. **Email:** <u>olukayodesule@gmail.com</u> **Phone:** +234 703 345 3866

Received March 23, 2024; Revised April 30, 2024; Accepted May 02, 2024

ABSTRACT

The escalating prices of conventional plant protein sources like soyabean and groundnut cake in Nigeria have prompted exploration into alternative feed ingredients for poultry nutrition. Moringa oleifera leaf meal (MOLM) presents a promising substitute due to its nutrient-rich composition and cost-effective cultivation. This study investigated the effects of substituting soyabean meal (SBM) with MOLM on growth performance indices, carcass characteristics, and organ weights in broiler finishers on an equal-protein basis. Five diets were formulated, wherein SBM protein was replaced with that of MOLM at 0, 25, 50, 75, and 100% levels. 200 four-week-old broiler chickens were randomly assigned to these diets in a completely randomized design, with each treatment having four replicates. Analysis of MOLM's proximate composition suggested its suitability as a substitute for SBM. Up to 50% inclusion of MOLM resulted in weight gain and feed conversion ratio similar to the control (p>0.05). However, higher inclusion levels led to decreased feed intake, weight gain, and poorer feed conversion efficiency, likely due to increased fibre content. Carcass traits were not significantly (p>0.05) affected by MOLM inclusion up to 50% level. Organ weights were largely unaffected except for the liver, spleen, and bursa, which showed variations with different levels of MOLM inclusion. Substituting SBM with MOLM at up to 50% did not negatively impact broiler growth performance or carcass characteristics. However, further research is needed to optimize MOLM inclusion levels and address the effects of high fibre content in poultry diets.

Keywords: Equal-protein, Isocaloric, Isonitrogenous, *Moringa oleifera*, Growth performance, Carcass characteristics, Organ weight, Sustainable protein source

INTRODUCTION

Prices of conventional protein sources such as soyabean and groundnut cake have skyrocketed in recent years in Nigeria. Therefore, in the quest for sustainable and economically viable alternatives to conventional feed ingredients in poultry nutrition, it is crucial to broaden the raw material base for livestock feed formulation to incorporate other non-conventional feed resources (Mosaku, 2023). *Moringa oleifera* Lam. (Brassicales:

ISSN: 1597 – 3115 www.zoo-unn.org Moringaceae) leaf meal (MOLM) has emerged as a promising substitute in this regard. Broiler production, a cornerstone of the global poultry industry, heavily depends on optimized nutrition to achieve desirable growth performance indices during the finisher phase. Traditionally, soyabean meal (SBM) has been a staple protein source in broiler diets due to its balanced amino acid profile and high digestibility. However, concerns about its sustainability, availability, and price volatility have led to exploration into alternative protein sources (Papanikou, 2024).

MOLM is derived from the leaves of the *M. oleifera* plant and boasts an impressive array of nutrients, including protein, essential amino acids, vitamins, minerals, and bioactive compounds (Islam et al., 2021). Moreover, its cultivation is relatively inexpensive and environmentally friendly, making it an attractive option for livestock feed formulation. M. oleifera possesses a more abundant supply of minerals, such as calcium and phosphorus, and larger amounts of vitamins. Commonly referred to as the horseradish or drumstick tree, M. oleifera has attracted interest as a protein source for livestock, as demonstrated in several studies conducted by researchers (Makker and Becker, 1996; Sarwatt et al., 2002; Banjo, 2012; Sule et al., 2016; Cui et al., 2018). Moringa leaves possess guality attributes that make them a potential replacement for SBM in non-ruminant diets. Sutherland et al. (1999), Oluduro (2012) and Sodamade et al. (2013) reported that M. oleifera leaves have appreciable crude protein (CP) levels, while Makker and Becker (1996) reported that Moringa leaves and green fresh pods are rich in carotene and ascorbic acid with a good profile of amino acids. Given the significance of optimized nutrition in broiler production, this study focuses on evaluating the growth performance of finisher broilers fed diets where SBM was replaced with MOLM on an equal-protein basis. Parameters such as body weight gain, feed intake, feed conversion ratio (FCR), carcass characteristics, and organ weights were assessed to determine the efficacy of MOLM as a substitute for SBM in broiler finishers' diets.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental Site: The experiment was carried out at the Poultry Demonstration Unit of the Livestock Farm of Federal College of Agriculture, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Preparation of *Moringa oleifera* Leaf Meal (MOLM), Feed Preparation and Experimental **Treatments:** Fresh *M. oleifera* leaves harvested from a paddock at the Horticulture Section of Federal College of Agriculture, Akure, Nigeria spread out on a flat wooden platform and allowed to dry for four days under shady and aerated conditions. The dried leaves were milled to produce the leaf meal. Five isonitrogenous and isocaloric diets were formulated and fed ad*libitum* in conical troughs for four weeks. Clean drinking water was provided ad libitum. The control diet (Diet 1) contained groundnut cake and SBM as plant protein sources. The protein supplied by SBM in the control diet was replaced at 25, 50, 75 and 100% with MOLM in diets 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. 250-day-old chicks were subjected to a pre-experimental brooding period of 4 weeks during which a commercial broiler starter diet (Hybrid Broiler Starter containing 22% CP and 2900 kcal/kg ME) was fed adlibitum. After the brooding period, 200 started broilers were randomly selected, weighed and allotted 10 birds per replicate and four replicates per each of the five dietary treatments in a completely randomized experimental design. All dietary ingredients and the formulated diets were proximately assayed (AOAC, 2000). The gross composition of the broiler finisher diets is shown in Table 1.

Data Collection: Weekly feed intake and weight gain were taken by subtracting the weight of leftover feeds and final weight gain from the weight of the original feed given and the initial weight of birds respectively.

The FCR of the birds was calculated using the formula: FCR = Feed intake/Weight gain. At the end of the experimental period, four birds were randomly selected from each treatment replicate and slaughtered to assess the carcass characteristics and organ weight. Each slaughtered chicken was de-feathered after scalding in boiling water for five seconds and dressed, eviscerated and dissected into parts as described for turkey by Hahn and Spindler (2002). The following weights were taken; live, dressed, eviscerated, thigh, drumstick, neck, head, shank, wing, chest, back, liver, heart, gizzard, lungs, spleen, and pancreas. The dressed and eviscerated weights were expressed as percentages of the live weight, while others were expressed as grams per kilogram live weight.

NOLM) NOLM Groundnut cake (44% CP) - 12.00 14.05 14.00	Ingredients	MOLM	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5
Maize - 53.50 52.75 52.20 51.50 51.00 Groundnut cake (44% CP) - 12.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.50 12.00 15.50 15.00	(kg/100kg)			(25%	(50%	(75%	(100%
Groundnut cake (44% CP) - 12.00 3.50 - MOLM (29.7% CP) - - 4.95 9.90 14.85 19.80 Brewer dry grain - 5.73 5.75 5.30 5.20 2.510 Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Vitamin/Mineral Premix* - 0.22 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Metabolizable energy (kcal/kg) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Calcium -			MOLM)	MOLM)	MOLM)	MOLM)	MOLM)
Soyabean meal (42% CP) - 14.00 10.50 7.00 3.50 - MOLM (29.7% CP) - - 4.95 9.90 14.85 19.80 Wheat Offal - 9.50 9.00 8.77 8.35 7.70 Brewer dry grain - 5.73 5.75 5.30 5.20 2.50 Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.22 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.25 <th>Maize</th> <th>-</th> <th>53.50</th> <th>52.75</th> <th>52.20</th> <th>51.50</th> <th>51.00</th>	Maize	-	53.50	52.75	52.20	51.50	51.00
MOLM (29.7% CP) - - 4.95 9.90 14.85 19.80 Wheat Offal - 9.50 9.00 8.77 8.35 7.70 Brewer dry grain - 5.73 5.75 5.30 5.20 5.10 Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.22 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methoinine - 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 Total - 100.00 10	Groundnut cake (44% CP)	-	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Wheat Offal - 9.50 9.00 8.77 8.35 7.70 Brewer dry grain - 5.73 5.75 5.30 5.20 5.10 Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.22 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 Total - 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 Calclated analysis - 2823 2787 2753 2718 2685 (kcal/kg) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Calcium - 1.52 1.53 1.52 1.52 Phosphorus - 4.03 <th>Soyabean meal (42% CP)</th> <th>-</th> <th>14.00</th> <th>10.50</th> <th>7.00</th> <th>3.50</th> <th>-</th>	Soyabean meal (42% CP)	-	14.00	10.50	7.00	3.50	-
Brewer dry grain - 5.73 5.75 5.30 5.20 5.10 Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.32 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Vitamin/Mineral Premix* - 0.25 0.26 0.26 10.00	MOLM (29.7% CP)	-	-	4.95	9.90	14.85	19.80
Bone Meal - 2.30 2.40 2.50 2.50 2.50 Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.25 0.26 0.24 0.24 <th>Wheat Offal</th> <th>-</th> <th>9.50</th> <th>9.00</th> <th>8.77</th> <th>8.35</th> <th>7.70</th>	Wheat Offal	-	9.50	9.00	8.77	8.35	7.70
Oyster Shell - 1.70 1.20 0.75 0.35 - Salt - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.25 0.26 0.27 2718 2685 Crude prot	Brewer dry grain	-	5.73	5.75	5.30	5.20	5.10
Sait - 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 Lysine - 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.25 </th <th>Bone Meal</th> <th>-</th> <th>2.30</th> <th>2.40</th> <th>2.50</th> <th>2.50</th> <th>2.50</th>	Bone Meal	-	2.30	2.40	2.50	2.50	2.50
Lysine - 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.60 0.75 Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.35 0.40 0.40 Vitamin/Mineral Premix* - 0.25 0.53 Ether Str	Oyster Shell	-	1.70	1.20	0.75	0.35	-
Methionine - 0.32 0.35 0.35 0.40 0.40 Vitamin/Mineral Premix* - 0.25 0.53 Ether	Salt	-	0.50	0.50	0.50		0.50
Vitamin/Mineral Premix* - 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 Total - 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 Calculated analysis -	Lysine	-	0.20	0.35	0.48	0.60	0.75
Total - 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 Calculated analysis - 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 Metabolizable energy (kcal/kg) - 2823 2787 2753 2718 2685 Crude protein (%) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Calcium - 1.52 1.52 1.53 1.52 1.52 Phosphorus - 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.53 Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 MC% 11.50 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 <th>Methionine</th> <th>-</th> <th>0.32</th> <th>0.35</th> <th>0.35</th> <th>0.40</th> <th>0.40</th>	Methionine	-	0.32	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.40
Calculated analysis - Image: Construction of the second s	Vitamin/Mineral Premix*	-	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Metabolizable energy (kcal/kg)-28232787275327182685Crude protein (%)-19.6519.4219.1718.9418.68Calcium-1.521.521.531.521.52Phosphorus-0.540.540.550.540.53Ether Extract-4.034.074.114.164.20Crude Fibre-4.535.376.136.957.75Methionine-0.600.610.590.610.59Lysine-1.011.021.021.011.02ME: CP-143.7143.5143.6143.5143.7Proximate Composition11.5012.2513.2013.5013.2012.10CP%28.4418.5618.6419.5820.4820.24ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01	Total	-	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
(kcal/kg) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Crude protein (%) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Calcium - 1.52 1.52 1.53 1.52 1.52 Phosphorus - 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.53 Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.7 Proximate Composition 11.50 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 </th <th>Calculated analysis</th> <th>-</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Calculated analysis	-					
Crude protein (%) - 19.65 19.42 19.17 18.94 18.68 Calcium - 1.52 1.52 1.53 1.52 1.52 Phosphorus - 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.53 Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 10.1 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.7 Proximate Composition - 12.25 13.20 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24	Metabolizable energy	-	2823	2787	2753	2718	2685
Calcium - 1.52 1.52 1.53 1.52 1.52 Phosphorus - 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.53 Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.7 Proximate Composition - 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	(kcal/kg)						
Phosphorus - 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.53 Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.6 Proximate Composition - 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	Crude protein (%)	-					
Ether Extract - 4.03 4.07 4.11 4.16 4.20 Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.7 Proximate Composition - 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	Calcium	-	1.52	1.52	1.53	1.52	1.52
Crude Fibre - 4.53 5.37 6.13 6.95 7.75 Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.7 Proximate Composition - 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	Phosphorus	-					
Methionine - 0.60 0.61 0.59 0.61 0.59 Lysine - 1.01 1.02 1.02 1.01 1.02 ME: CP - 143.7 143.5 143.6 143.5 143.6 143.7 Proximate Composition - 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	Ether Extract	-					
Lysine-1.011.021.021.011.02ME: CP-143.7143.5143.6143.5143.7Proximate CompositionMC%11.5012.2513.2013.5013.2012.10CP%28.4418.5618.6419.5820.4820.24ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01		-					
ME: CP-143.7143.5143.6143.5143.7Proximate CompositionMC%11.5012.2513.2013.5013.2012.10CP%28.4418.5618.6419.5820.4820.24ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01		-					
Proximate Composition 11.50 12.25 13.20 13.50 13.20 12.10 CP% 28.44 18.56 18.64 19.58 20.48 20.24 ASH% 8.00 11.20 11.70 11.90 9.92 11.22 CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	Lysine	-					
MC%11.5012.2513.2013.5013.2012.10CP%28.4418.5618.6419.5820.4820.24ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01	ME: CP	-	143.7	143.5	143.6	143.5	143.7
CP%28.4418.5618.6419.5820.4820.24ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01	Proximate Composition						
ASH%8.0011.2011.7011.909.9211.22CF%8.255.996.246.236.277.01	MC%						
CF% 8.25 5.99 6.24 6.23 6.27 7.01	СР%	-					
	ASH%						
EE % 3.00 4.37 5.55 6.41 4.89 6.15	CF%	8.25	5.99	6.24			
	EE %	3.00	4.37	5.55	6.41	4.89	6.15
NFE% 41.19 47.63 44.67 42.38 45.24 43.28	NFE%	41.19	47.63	44.67	42.38	45.24	43.28

 Table 1: Gross composition of the experimental diets containing replacement of soyabean

 meal with *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal fed to broiler finishers

ME = Metabolizable energy; *CP* = Crude protein; *MOLM* = Moringa oleifera leaf meal; *SBM* = Soyabean meal, *Each 2.5 kg of grower vitamins and mineral premix contains 800,000 IU of Vitamin A, 1600,000 IU of Vitamin D3; 5,000 IU of Vitamin E; 2000 mg of Vitamin K; 1500 mg of B1; 4000 mg of B2; 80g of manganese, 50 g of Zinc; 20 g of Iron; 5 g of Copper, 15000 mg of Niacin; 10 mg of B12; 5000 mg of Pantothenic acid, 5000 mg of Folic acid, 20 mg of Biotin, 125 mg of Antioxidant; 200 g of Selenium; 200 mg of Cobalt and 200 mg of Choline

Statistical Analysis: All data generated were subjected to one-way ANOVA using SAS (2005). Significant means were separated using the Duncan Multiple Range Test of the same statistical package.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Proximate Composition of Moringa oleifera Leaf Meal and Experimental Diets: The proximate composition of MOLM and the five experimental diets are presented in Table 1. The CP content (28.44%) of MOLM obtained in this study compared favourably well with the values of 29.6, 27.5 and 28.2% reported by Marker and Becker (1996), Oduro *et al.* (2008) and Melesse et al. (2009) respectively. It was however lower than the values of 32.1 and 36.0% reported by Soliva et al. (2005) and Negesse et al. (2009) respectively. The similarities in the chemical composition of MOLM in the present study when compared with other studies indicated that environmental factors such as season and geographical location play a minor role in determining the nutritive value of MOLM. The CP contents of the experimental diets varied between 18.56 to 20.48%. These CP levels were within the recommended levels for broiler chicken finishers as reported by Van Eekeren et al. (2004) and Scanes et al. (2004). The nutrient composition of the experimental diets showed an increase in crude fibre with higher levels of MOLM

in the diet. This can be ascribed to the fibrous nature of MOLM and agreed with the reports of similar studies (Gadzirayi *et al.*, 2012; Oludoyi and Toye, 2012; Oghenebrorhie and Oghenesuvwe, 2016).

Table 2 shows the growth performance of finisher broilers fed diets containing the replacement of soyabean meal with MOLM. The results obtained in this study regarding feed intake demonstrated that the total feed intake of the birds fed MOLM-based diets was significantly different (p<0.05) from the control group. Numerically, birds on Diet 1 with 0% MOLM had higher feed intake, even though the reduction in feed intake among birds fed the other diets was not drastic. Alabi et al. (2017) reported similar results when aqueous extracts of *M. oleifera* leaf were incorporated into the diets of Hubbard broiler chicken. Gakuya et al. (2014) and Rajesh et al. (2022) also reported that the control groups had higher feed intake compared to the treatment groups when MOLM-based diets were fed to laying hens. The decrease in feed intake in birds fed MOLM-based diets in this study is in agreement with the finding of Portugaliza and Fernandez (2012) who reported that M. oleifera aqueous leaf extracts in drinking water significantly decreased the feed intake of broilers as the concentration increased. Divya et al. (2014) also reported that the addition of M. oleifera leaf powder at any level slightly decreased feed intake as compared to control, although the decrease was not significant (p>0.05).

Contrarily, Tesfaye *et al.* (2013) who experimented on MOLM as a protein feed ingredient in broiler rations, reported a significant increase (p<0.05) in feed intake for the supplemented groups as compared to the control group. In the same vein, Van Krimpen *et al.* (2009) with layers and Rezaei and Hajati (2010) with broilers, indicated that diets with diluted energy as a result of high fibre content promoted higher feed intake, were not confirmed in the present study.

Body weight gain in this study showed no significant difference (p>0.05) from the control group up to 50% MOLM inclusion. Numerically, a progressive decrease in weight gain was noticed with increasing levels of MOLM diets fed to birds thus, birds fed Diet 1 (0% MOLM) had the highest weight, while those on Diet 5 (100% MOLM) had the lowest weight. Similar trends have been reported in the studies of Olorode et al. (2007), Atuahene et al. (2008), Olugbemi et al. (2010), Gadzirayi et al. (2012), and Zanu et al. (2012), who recorded reductions in the weights of broiler chickens when placed on diets containing increasing levels of MOLM. The decrease in weight gain with increasing levels of MOLM inclusion may be attributed to the high fibre levels in the MOLM-based diets; this is also consistent with the finding of Ash and Petaia (1992) that inclusion of leaf meal in broiler diets at the levels of 5 - 10% led to depressed performance.

It is noteworthy that the FCR was lowest in birds placed on Diet 2 (25% MOLM) and highest in birds placed on Diet 5 (100% MOLM). This may be a direct effect of the fibre content of the diets which had earlier led to a decrease in feed intake and weight gain in birds fed MOLMbased diets. Similar results were obtained by Gadzirayi et al. (2012), who recorded the lowest FCR at a 25% level of inclusion when MOLM was substituted for SBM in broiler finishers' diets, while Kakengi et al. (2005) recorded the lowest FCR at a 20% level of inclusion when MOLM was substituted for sunflower seed meal in the diet of laying birds. Xiao et al. (2012) reported that the utilization of forage plants in non-ruminant animal diets has historically been limited due to their negative impact on animal performance; their characteristic high fibre content has been noted to be responsible for poor feed conversion rates, with many containing anti-nutritional factors. However, some evidence suggests that incorporating small amounts of forage species may enhance animal performance due to their growth-promoting properties (Banjo, 2012; Nkukwana et al., 2014; 2015; Cui et al., 2018).

Carcass Characteristics and Organ Weight:

Table 3 shows the carcass characteristics of broiler finisher chickens fed MOLM-based diets. Most of the important carcass traits (dressed, eviscerated, thigh, chest and back weights) showed no significant difference (p>0.05) with the control group up to 50% MOLM inclusion level.

Parameters	Diet 1 (0% MOLM)	Diet 2 (25% MOLM)	Diet 3 (50% MOLM)	Diet 4 (75% MOLM)	Diet 5 (100% MOLM)
IW(g/bird)	838.90 ± 7.20	855.60 ± 7.94	856.89 ± 8.27	832.56 ± 7.98	821.44 ± 7.76
FW(g/bird)	2315.10 ± 9.92 ^c	2285.00 ± 9.88 ^c	2238.90 ± 9.96 ^c	1975.70 ± 9.98 ^b	1743.20 ± 9.46 ^a
TWG(g/bir)	1476.20 ± 8.22 ^c	$1429.40 \pm 8.20^{\circ}$	1382.01 ± 8.57 ^c	1143.14 ± 8.29 ^b	921.76 ± 8.27 ^a
TFI(g/bird)	5434.30 ± 60.20 ^c	4834.40 ± 65.27 ^a	5068.70 ± 65.29 ^b	4778.80 ± 67.11 ^a	5156.80 ± 57.98 ^b
AFI(g/b/d)	194.08 ± 2.25 ^c	172.66 ± 2.30^{a}	181.03 ± 2.41 ^b	170.67 ± 2.11 ^a	184.17 ± 2.23 ^b
AWG(g/b/d)	52.72 ± 3.55 ^c	51.05 ± 4.12 ^c	49.36 ± 3.82 ^c	40.83 ± 3.11 ^b	32.92 ± 4.60 ^a
FCR	3.68 ± 0.24 ^a	3.38 ± 0.11ª	3.67 ± 0.34 ^a	4.18 ± 0.12^{b}	5.59 ± 0.24 ^c

Table 2: Growth performance of finisher broilers fed diets containing replacement of soyabean meal with *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal

^{abc} = Means along the same row with different superscripts are significantly different (p<0.05), Average feed intake, AWG – Average weight gain, FCR – Feed conversion ratio

Table 3: Relative carcass characteristics of broiler chicken finishers fed diets containing
replacement of soyabean meal with <i>Moringa oleifera</i> leaf meal

Parameters	Diet 1 (0% MOLM)	Diet 2 (25% MOLM)	Diet 3 (50% MOLM)	Diet 4 (75% MOLM)	Diet 5 (100% MOLM)
Live weight (kg)	2.34 ± 0.07	2.25 ± 0.04	2.23 ± 0.05	2.22 ± 0.06	2.20 ± 0.03
Dressing weight (%)	90.90 ± 1.39^{b}	90.80 ± 1.49^{b}	88.20 ± 1.45^{ab}	87.80 ± 1.36^{ab}	84.70 ± 1.56^{a}
Eviscerated Wt (%)	87.40 ± 1.34^{b}	83.90 ± 1.39^{ab}	83.60 ± 1.42^{ab}	80.10 ± 1.37^{a}	80.00 ± 1.38^{a}
Thigh (g/kg LW)	113.60 ± 2.79 ^b	102.60 ± 2.98^{ab}	108.10 ± 2.97^{ab}	105.6 ± 2.91^{ab}	96.60 ± 2.70^{a}
Drumstick (g/kg LW)	99.40 ± 2.43	93.30 ± 2.58	98.30 ± 2.21	86.90 ± 2.46	97.60 ± 2.57
Shank (g/kg LW)	33.30 ± 0.92	36.30 ± 0.98	36.60 ± 0.89	32.20 ± 0.99	35.80 ± 0.92
Wing (g/kg LW)	75.40 ± 1.35	77.00 ± 1.17	75.70 ± 1.32	77.20 ± 1.14	73.50 ± 1.37
Chest (g/kg LW)	210.70 ± 13.77 ^b	208.80 ± 14.22^{ab}	207.40 ± 12.98^{ab}	193.90 ± 14.02^{a}	183.50 ± 14.61^{a}
Back (g/kg LW)	$148.60 \pm 3.65^{\text{b}}$	148.50 ± 3.76^{b}	140.60 ± 3.56^{b}	129.20 ± 3.20^{a}	127.00 ± 3.23^{a}
Neck (g/kg LW)	73.50 ± 1.58^{b}	74.90 ± 1.45^{b}	45.10 ± 1.65^{a}	41.20 ± 1.45^{a}	39.20 ± 1.77ª
Fat (g/kg LW)	32.75 ± 1.32 ^c	32.68 ± 1.20 ^c	31.56 ± 1.46 ^c	27.55 ± 1.27 ^b	18.73 ± 1.45^{a}

^{abc} = Means along the same row with different superscripts are significantly different (p<0.05), LW = Live weight, MOLM = Moringa oleifera leaf meal

However, numerical values of carcass parameters measured decreased as the level of inclusion of MOLM increased in the diets. This may be attributed to the slight decrease in the metabolizable energy of the diets as the level of MOLM increased in the diets. Iyayi and Yahaya (1999) reported that a reduction in the metabolizable energy content of feed reduces the weight of carcasses. There was a drastic reduction in the quantity of abdominal fat along with the dietary treatment levels. This was a result of the restriction of nutrient intake through dietary dilution as reported by March and Hansen (1977). Olugbemi *et al.* (2010) and Kumar *et al.* (2018) also reported that abdominal fat was lower in broiler chickens fed MOLM-based diets. Sule et al. (2016) reported a decreasing trend in serum cholesterol concentration with increasing levels of MOLM in the diets of broiler finishers, and according to Tewe and Bokanga (2001), a high level of cholesterol content is an indication of a high level of fat deposition in the carcass.

The fact that there was a reduction in the amount of fat content with increasing MOLM levels in the present study affirmed the hypocholesterolemic potential of *M. oleifera*. Reduction in fat content of the carcass by MOLM-based diets may have been achieved through the lowering of plasma concentrations of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol by β -sitosterol, the bioactive phytoconstituent isolated from *M. oleifera* leaves (Saluja *et al.*, 1978; Kane and Malloy, 1982; Ghasi *et al.*, 2000).

Organ weights were largely unaffected by treatment effects except for the liver, spleen, and bursa, which showed some variations with different levels of MOLM inclusion in the diets (Table 4). Relative weights of the liver were significantly higher (p<0.05) in the control group than in the treatment groups. There was a gradual decrease in the weight of the liver with increasing levels of MOLM in the diets. This was consistent with the findings of Kumar *et al.* (2018) who also reported a reduction in the

Parameters	Diet 1 (0% MOLM)	Diet 2 (25% MOLM)	Diet 3 (50% MOLM)	Diet 4 (75% MOLM)	Diet 5 (100% MOLM)
Heart	4.30 ± 0.12	4.51 ± 0.17	4.92 ± 0.19	4.51 ± 0.14	4.44 ± 0.13
Lung	5.76 ± 0.22	4.40 ± 0.34	5.91 ± 0.33	6.07 ± 0.39	4.31 ± 0.27
Liver	$19.20 \pm 0.55^{\circ}$	17.24 ± 0.45^{b}	17.00 ± 0.62^{b}	16.40 ± 0.65^{b}	14.20 ± 0.63^{a}
Spleen	3.15 ± 0.45^{a}	4.40 ± 0.39^{b}	3.95 ± 0.68^{ab}	3.82 ± 0.47^{ab}	3.80 ± 0.51^{ab}
Pancreas	1.44 ± 0.09	1.64 ± 0.10	1.57 ± 0.12	1.53 ± 0.09	1.97 ± 0.10
Kidney	4.79 ± 0.20	5.63 ± 0.15	5.73 ± 0.27	6.38 ± 0.24	5.55 ± 0.29
Head	26.40 ± 0.55	26.80 ± 0.71	27.10 ± 0.49	24.50 ± 0.69	24.50 ± 0.76
Gizzard	21.10 ± 0.69	18.60 ± 0.66	20.49 ± 0.85	20.73 ± 0.82	21.07 ± 0.68
Proventriculus	4.43 ± 0.15	4.50 ± 0.19	4.32 ± 0.18	4.23 ± 0.17	4.23 ± 0.16
Bursa	0.60 ± 0.10^{a}	1.26 ± 0.12^{b}	0.72 ± 0.14 ^a	1.14 ± 0.14^{b}	1.43 ± 0.10^{b}

Table 4: Relative organ weight of broiler chicken finishers fed diets containing replacement of soyabean meal with *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal

abc = Means along the same row with different superscripts are significantly different (p<0.05), LW = Live weight, MOLM = Moringa oleifera leaf meal

weight of the liver when MOLM-based diets were fed to Vanaraja chicken in India. Apart from liver, birds fed the control diet had higher weights of gizzard than those on the treatment groups. Relative weights of the lung, heart, spleen, pancreas, and kidney appear to be higher in birds placed on MOLM diets than those on the control. As reported by Iyayi and Fayoyin (2004), the relative weights of the kidneys increase with high-fibre diets.

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that substituting SBM with *M. oleifera* leaf meal in broiler finisher diets up to 50% replacement level did not adversely affect growth performance or carcass characteristics. However, higher levels of MOLM inclusion led to decreased feed intake, weight gain, and feed conversion efficiency, likely due to increased fibre content. Organ weights were largely unaffected except for the liver, spleen, and bursa, which showed some variations with different MOLM inclusion levels. M. oleifera leaf meal shows promise as a sustainable alternative protein source for broiler finisher diets, but further research is needed to optimize inclusion levels and mitigate potential negative effects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend sincere gratitude to the Management of the Federal College of Agriculture, Akure for graciously permitting the research to be conducted on their Teaching and Research Farm. Our heartfelt appreciation goes to Dr J. Ajayi for his invaluable assistance in facilitating access to the College Moringa Plantation. Special recognition is also due to Mr. O. Oguntokun of the Nutrition Laboratory, Department of Animal Production and Health, Federal University of Technology, Akure, for his unwavering support in granting access to the laboratory and providing invaluable assistance throughout. The authors would like to acknowledge the diligent efforts of the students of the Federal College of Agriculture, Akure, who played a crucial role in harvesting and air drying *Moringa* leaves, which were used for this research.

REFERENCES

- ALABI, O. J., MALIK, A. D., NG'AMBI, J. W., OBAJE, P. and OJO, B. K. (2017). Effect of aqueous *Moringa oleifera* (Lam) leaf extracts on growth performance and carcass characteristics of Hubbard broiler chicken. *Brazilian Journal of Poultry Science*, 19(2): 273 – 280.
- AOAC (2000). *Official Methods of Analysis.* 17th Edition, The Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Gaithersburg, MD, USA.
- ASH, A. J. and PETAIA, L. (1992). Nutritional value of *Sesbania grandiflora* leaves for monogastric and ruminants. *Tropical Agriculture*, 69(3): 223 228.
- ATUAHENE, C. C., ATTOH-KOTOKU, V., FOSU, K. D., AMISSAH, S. E., SARFO, F. K. and MENSAH, J. J. (2008). Preliminary study

of the effect of feeding *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal as a feed ingredient on the growth performance of broiler chickens. Pages 72 – 75. *In: Proceedings of the 28th and 29th Ghana Animal Science Association,* held at the University of Education, Winneba, Mmpong Campus, Ghana.

- BANJO, O. S. (2012). Growth and performance as affected by inclusion of *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal in broiler chicks diet. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare,* 2(9): 35 – 38.
- CUI, Y. M., WANG, J., LU, W., ZHANG, H. J., WU, S. G. and QI, G. H. (2018). Effect of dietary supplementation with *Moringa oleifera* leaf on performance, meat quality, and oxidative stability of meat in broilers. *Poultry Science*, 97(8): 2836 – 2844.
- DIVYA, D., MANDAL, A. B., BISWAS, A., YADAV, A. S. and BISWAS, A. K. (2014). Effect of dietary *Moringa oleifera* leaves powder on growth performance, blood chemistry, meat quality and gut microflora of broiler chicks. *Animal Nutrition and Feed Technology*, 14(2): 349 – 357.
- GADZIRAYI, C. T., MASAMHA, B., MUPANGWA, J.
 F. and WASHAYA, S. (2012). Performance of broiler chickens fed on mature *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal as a protein supplement to soyabean meal. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 11(1): 5 – 10.
- GAKUYA, D. W., MBUGUA, P. N., MWANIKI, S. M., KIAMA, S. G., MUCHEMI, G. M. and NJUGUNA,
 A. (2014). Effect of supplementation of *Moringa oleifera* (LAM) leaf meal in layer chicken feed. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 13(7): 379 – 384.
- GHASI, S., NWOBODO, E. and OFILI, J. O. (2000). Hypocholesterolemic effects of crude extract of leaf of *Moringa oleifera* in high fat diet fed Wistar rats. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 69(1): 21 – 22.
- HAHN, G. and SPINDLER, M. (2002). Method of dissection of turkey carcases. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 58(2): 179 – 197.
- ISLAM, Z., ISLAM, S. M. R., HOSSEN, F., MAHTAB-UL-ISLAM, K., HASAN, M. R.

and KARIM, R. (2021). *Moringa oleifera* is a prominent source of nutrients with potential health benefits. *International Journal of Food Science*, 2021: 6627265. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6627265

- IYAYI, E. A. and FAYOYIN, F. K. (2004). Expanding rural poultry production through the use of low cost cassava fruit coat as alternative fibre source for broilers. Pages 5 – 7. *In: Conference on International Agricultural Research for Development,* Deutscher Tropentag, Berlin, Germany.
- IYAYI, E. A. and YAHAYA, B. (1999). Performance of broilers maintained on diets supplemented with a commercial polysaccharidase enzyme in the humid tropics. *Tropical Animal Production Investment*, 2: 125 – 130.
- KAKENGI, A. M. V., SHEM, M. N., SARWATT, S. V. and FUJIHARA, T. (2005). Can *Moringa oleifera* be used as a protein supplement for ruminants? *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 18(1): 42 – 47.
- KANE, J. P. and MALLOY, M. J. (1982). Treatment of hypercholesterolemia. *Medical Clinics of North America*, 66: 537 – 550.
- KUMAR, A., KUMAR, K., KUMAR, S. and SINGH, P. K. (2018). Effect of feeding *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal on production efficiency and carcass characteristics of Vanaraja chicken in the tropics. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 7: 1213 – 1220.
- MAKKAR, H. A. and BECKER, K. (1996). Nutritional value and antinutritional components of whole and ethanol extracted *Moringa oleifera* leaves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 63(1-4): 211 228.
- MARCH, B. E. and HANSEN, O. (1977). Lipid accumulation and cell multiplication in adipose bodies in white Leghorn and broiler type chicks. *Poultry Science*, 56(3): 886 – 894.
- MELESSE, A., BULANG, M. and KLUTH, H. (2009). Evaluating the nutritive values and in vitro degradability characteristics of leaves, seeds and seedpods from *Moringa stenopetala. Journal of the*

Science of Food and Agriculture, 89(2): 281 – 287.

- MOSAKU, E. (2023). *Skyrocketing Animal Feed Prices in Nigeria, the Way Forward.* Linkedin, <u>https://www.linkedin.com/pul</u> <u>se/skyrocketing-animal-feed-prices-nige</u> <u>ria-way-forward-emmanuel-mosaku/</u> Accessed April 07, 2024.
- NEGESSE, T., MAKKAR, H. P. S. and BECKER, K. (2009). Nutritive value of some nonconventional feed resources of Ethiopia determined by chemical analyses and an in vitro gas method. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 154(3-4): 204 – 217.
- NKUKWANA, T. T., MUCHENJE, V., MASIKA, P. J. and MUSHONGA, B. (2015). Intestinal morphology, digestive organ size and digesta pH of broiler chickens fed diets supplemented with or without Moringa oleifera leaf meal. *South African Journal of Animal Science*, 45(4): 362 – 370.
- NKUKWANA, T. T., MUCHENJE, V., PIETERSE, E., MASIKA, P. J., MABUSELA, T. P., HOFFMAN, L. C. and DZAMA, K. (2014). Effect of Moringa oleifera leaf meal on growth performance, apparent digestibility, digestive organ size and carcass yield in broiler chickens. *Livestock Science*, 161: 139 – 146.
- ODURO, I., ELLIS, W. O. and OWUSU, D. (2008). Nutritional potential of two leafy vegetables: *Moringa oleifera* and *Ipomoea batatas* leaves. *Scientific Research and Essay*, 3(2): 057 – 060.
- OGHENEBRORHIE, O. and OGHENESUVWE, O. (2016). Performance and haematological characteristics of broiler finisher fed *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal diets. *Journal of Northeast Agricultural University*, 23(1): 28 34.
- OLORODE, B. R., IBITOYE, E. B. and ABIOLA, J. O. (2007). Evaluation of *Moringa oleifera* seed meal as replacement for groundnut cake in broiler diets. *Tropical Journal of Animal Science*, 10(1-2): 59 – 62.
- OLUDOYI, I. A. and TOYE, A. A. (2012). The effects of early feeding of *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal on performance of broiler and pullet chicks. *Agrosearch*, 12(2): 160 172.

- OLUDURO, A. O. (2012). Evaluation of antimicrobial properties and nutritional potentials of *Moringa oleifera* Lam. leaf in South-Western Nigeria. *Malaysian Journal of Microbiology*, 8(2): 59 – 67.
- OLUGBEMI, T. S., MUTAYOBA, S. K. and LEKULE, F. P. (2010). Effect of *Moringa (Moringa oleifera*) inclusion in cassava based diets fed to broiler chickens. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, *9*(4), 363 – 367.
- PAPANIKOU, E. (2024). Sustainable Alternative Protein Sources for Broiler Nutrition. Feed Strategy, <u>https://www.feedstrateg</u> y.com/blogs/feed-ingredient-insights/blo g/15662487/sustainable-alternative-prot ein-sources-for-broiler-nutrition Accessed April 07, 2024.
- PORTUGALIZA, H. P. and FERNANDEZ, T. J. (2012). Growth performance of Cobb broilers given varying concentrations of Malunggay (*Moringa oleifera* Lam.) aqueous leaf extract. *Journal of Animal* and Feed Research, 2(6): 465 – 469.
- RAJESH, P., KUMARI, N. N., NAGALAKSHMI, D., RAO, M. H. and GURRAM, S. (2022). Dietary inclusion of *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal with enzyme supplementation on egg production and egg quality of laying hens. *Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition*, 39(1): 88 – 96.
- REZAEI, M. and HAJATI, H. (2010). Effect of diet dilution at early age on performance, carcass characteristics and blood parameters of broiler chicks. *Italian Journal of Animal Science*, 9(1): e19. <u>https://doi. org/10.4081/10.4081/ijas.2010.e19</u>
- SALUJA, M. P., KAPIL, R. S. and POPLI, S. P. (1978). Studies in medicinal plants. Part VI: Chemical constituents of *Moringa oleifera* (hybrid variety) and isolation of 4-hydroymellein. *Indian Journal of Chemistry*, 16(11): 1044 1045.
- SARWATT, S. V., KAPANGE, S. S. and KAKENGI, A. M. V. (2002). Substituting sunflower seed-cake with *Moringa oleifera* leaves as a supplemental goat feed in Tanzania. *Agroforestry Systems*, 56(3): 241 – 247.

- SAS (2005). *SAS/STAT Users Guide, 6.03 Edition*. SAS Institute, Incorporated, Carry, North Carolina, USA.
- SCANES, C. G., BRANT, G. and ENSMINGER, M. E. (2004). *Poultry Science*. 4th Edition, Pearson Education. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA.
- SODAMADE, A., BOLAJI, O. S. and ADEBOYE, O.
 O. (2013). Proximate analysis, mineral contents and functional properties of *Moringa oleifera* leaf protein concentrate.
 IOSR Journal of Applied Chemistry, 4(6): 47 51.
- SOLIVA, C. R., KREUZER, M., FOIDL, N., FOIDL, G., MACHMÜLLER, A. and HESS, H. D. (2005). Feeding value of whole and extracted *Moringa oleifera* leaves for ruminants and their effects on ruminal fermentation in vitro. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 118(1-2): 47 – 62.
- SULE, K., OLOWU, O. P. A., OLORUNFEMI, D. A. and ONIBI, G. E. (2016). Effects of replacing soyabean meal with *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal on haematology, serum cholesterol concentration and meat quality parameters in broiler chickens. *International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science (IJAFS)*, 6(9): 947 – 956.
- SUTHERLAND, J. P., FOLKARD, G. K. and GRANT, W. D. (1990). Natural coagulants for appropriate water treatment: a novel approach. *Waterlines*, 8(4): 30 – 32.
- TESFAYE, E., ANIMUT, G., URGE, M. and DESSIE, T. (2013). *Moringa oleifera* leaf meal as



an alternative protein feed ingredient in broiler ration. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 12(5): 289 – 297.

- TEWE, O. O. and BOKANGA, M. (2001). Cost effective cassava-plant based rations for poultry and pigs. Pages 229 – 234. In: Proceedings of the 8th International Society for Tropical Root Crops, Africa Branch Symposium, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- VAN EEKEREN, N., MAAS, A., SAATKAMP, H. W. and VERSCHUUR, M. (2004). *Small-Scale Poultry Production in the Tropics*. CTA, Agromisa Foundation, Wageningen, The Netherland.
- VAN KRIMPEN, M. M., KWAKKEL, R. P., VAN DER PEET-SCHWERING, C. M. C., DEN HARTOG, L. A. and VERSTEGEN, M. W. A. (2009). Effects of nutrient dilution and nonstarch polysaccharide concentration in rearing and laying diets on eating behavior and feather damage of rearing and laying hens. *Poultry Science*, 88(4): 759 – 773.
- XIAO, Z., LESTER, G. E., LUO, Y. and WANG, Q. (2012). Assessment of vitamin and carotenoid concentrations of emerging food products: edible microgreens. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 60(31): 7644 – 7651.
- ZANU, H. K., ASIEDU, P., TAMPUORI, M., ABADA, M. and ASANTE, I. (2012). Possibilities of using *Moringa* (*Moringa oleifera*) leaf meal as a partial substitute for fishmeal in broiler chickens diets. *Online Journal* of Animal and Feed Research, 2(1): 70 – 75.

This article and articles in Animal Research International are Freely Distributed Online and Licensed under a <u>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International</u> License (CC-BY 4.0) <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</u>