

Effects of thyme or/and celery on feed utilization, growth performance and meat quality of **Barki lambs**

Introduction

- The EU and many other countries have banned the use of ionophore antibiotics in food animal production.
- Natural feed additives posses bioactives with a wide range of antimicrobial activities.
- Natural bioactives/phytochemicals have the potential to replace ionophore antibiotics use.
- Inclusion of important natural feed additives such as celery and thyme in the diet of Barki lambs was evaluated.
- Our objective was to investigate the effects of in-feed inclusion of celery, thyme or their mixture on nutrient intake, digestion, blood parameters, growth performance and meat quality of Barki lambs.

Materials and Methods

- Fifty-five Barki lambs weighing 18.5 ± 1.1 kg and about 90 ± 5 days old were randomly assigned to five experimental treatments.
- Treatments were control diet, control + 15 g thyme, control + 15 g celery, control + 15 g thyme/celery mix or 1 g salinomycin.
- The study was arranged in a completely randomized design with 11 replicates/treatment.
- We estimated DMI, nutrient intake and digestibility.
- Blood and carcass samples were collected and evaluated for some blood parameters and meat quality, respectively.

NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY • COLLEGE of AGRICULTURE and ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Uchenna Y. Anele¹, Mahmoud M. Shaaban², Ahmed E. kholif³, Ahmed M. Abd El Tawab³, Mohamed A. Radwan⁴, Fatma I. Hadhoud³, Mostafa S.A. Khattab³, Hisham M. Saleh²

Table 1

Feed intake and digestibility of diets fed to Barki sheep and supplemented with thyme, celery, their mixture or salinomycin.

	Treatment ¹					SEM	<i>P</i> value		
	Control	Thyme	Celery	Thyme- Celery	Salinomycin	_	Treatment (T)	Period (P)	T×P
Nutrient intake	, g/d								
Concentrate	840.2	891.2	882.1	888.0	816.6	25.22	0.140	< 0.001	1.000
Maize fodder	460.9 ^b	537.7 ^a	531.9 ^a	535.1 ^a	432.5 ^b	12.61	< 0.001	< 0.001	1.000
Total intake	1301.1 ^b	1428.9 ^a	1414.0 ^a	1423.1 ^a	1249.1 ^b	32.67	0.004	< 0.001	0.999
Nutrient digest	ibility, g/kg I	DM							
DM	700.5 ^b	771.7 ^a	725.8 ^b	771.3 ^a	734.7 ^{ab}	18.16	0.034	0.077	0.095
OM	752.8 ^b	811.2 ^a	772.5 ^b	813.7 ^a	782.7 ^{ab}	15.73	0.037	0.044	0.143
CP	665.3 ^b	745.3 ^a	690.7 ^{ab}	740.3 ^a	684.7 ^{ab}	12.50	0.015	0.177	0.140
EE	557.7	564.8	554.0	568.0	571.8	34.60	0.400	0.107	0.053
NDF	582.8 ^d	657.5 ^{ab}	640.8 ^b	672.2 ^a	618.5 ^c	9.43	0.001	0.542	0.996
ADF	668.5 ^c	760.0 ^{ab}	710.2 ^{bc}	768.0 ^a	702.5 ^c	24.89	0.030	0.079	0.169
IThe basel diet b	acad an 600	a of concent	rotos food r	nivtura/leg D	$\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ and $400 \mathrm{g}$ of t	Foddor m	aiza/leg DM with	no additiva (Control

The basal diet based on 600 g of concentrates feed mixture/kg DM and 400 g of fodder maize/kg DM with no additive (Control treatment). Means in the same row with different superscripts differ, P < 0.05. P-value is the observed significance level of the Ftest for treatments; SEM = standard error of the mean.

Table 2

Growth performance of Barki sheep fed diet supplemented with thyme, cel

		Treatment					SEM	<i>P</i> value		
		Control	Thyme	Celery	Thyme-	Salinomycin		Treatment	Period	ТуD
			-	-	Celery			(T)	(P)	I×P
	Initial BW, kg	19.2	19.2	19.3	19.3	18.5	0.811	0.965	-	-
d	Final BW, kg	43.6b	48.1ab	51.7a	48.7ab	47.5ab	2.324	0.020	_	-
	Weight gain, kg	24.5b	28.6ab	32.1a	29.5ab	29.0ab	2.034	0.013	-	-
e	ADG, g/d	85.1b	99.0ab	111.1a	98.3ab	98.9ab	5.29	0.017	< 0.001	0.103
	Maans in the same roy	v with different	taunargari	sta diffor	P < 0.05	P value is the obser	rvad sign	nificanca lava	l of the E	tost for

Means in the same row with different superscripts differ, P < 0.05. P-value is the observed significance level of the F-test for treatments: SEM = standard error of the mean.

Table 3

Carcass traits of Barki sheep fed diet supplemented with thyme, celery, the
Treatment

		Treatment	-				SEM	P value
		Control	Thyme	Celery	Thyme-Celery	Salinomycin	_	
Ь	Live body weight (kg)	51.8	55.8	55.3	56.8	55.0	2.29	0.620
u	Hot carcass weight (kg)	23.5	27.6	26.6	28.5	25.2	1.51	0.207
	Dressing (%)	45.4	49.3	48.1	50.2	45.9	1.5	0.170
	Fat thickness (cm)	0.40^{b}	0.30 ^b	0.35 ^b	0.65 ^a	0.35 ^b	0.038	< 0.001
	LM area (cm ²)	17.0 ^c	26.7 ^a	20.9 ^b	21.7 ^b	19.6 ^{bc}	1.04	0.001
	Lean (%)	52.3 ^c	57.2 ^{ab}	58.5 ^a	54.4 ^{bc}	59.7 ^a	1.08	0.001
d	Fat (%)	25.6 ^a	20.6 ^b	21.4 ^b	25.0 ^a	18.7 ^b	1.05	0.001
	Bone (%)	22.1	22.2	20.2	20.6	21.6	0.65	0.149
. 1	N <i>F</i> 1 1 1	11.00	• 1• 00		~ 1 • 1 1	1 1 1 01 1	1 0 1 -	0

Means in the same row with different superscripts differ, P < 0.05. P-value is the observed significance level of the F-test for treatments: SEM = standard error of the mean.

¹North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, Greensboro, NC 27411, USA; ²Dairy Science Department, National Research Centre, 33 Bohouth St. Dokki, Giza, Egypt; ³Biological Applications Department, Nuclear Research Center, Atomic Energy Authority, Inshas, Cairo, Egypt; ⁴Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

Results

1	.1 •	• ,	1•	•
Δrv	tho1r	mivfilmo	or coline	mucin
		IIIIALUIC	UI Samu	//////////////////////////////////////
,				

heir mixture or salinomycin.

- intakes.

- proportion.
- capacity.

Additives increased (P<0.05) both corn stover and total

• Thyme and thyme/celery mix increased nutrient digestibility (P<0.05) compared with the control treatment.

• Celery, thyme/celery mix and salinomycin treatments decreased serum cholesterol.

• Celery increased (P<0.05) final body weight, weight gain and average daily gain without affecting shrunk liveweight, hot carcass weight or dressing percent.

• Thyme/celery mix increased fat thickness (P<0.001), while thyme, celery and thyme/celery mix treatments increased (P=0.001) the ribeye area.

• Salinomycin, celery and thyme treatments increased (P<0.05) the lean proportion and decreased the fat

 Thyme, celery and thyme/celery mix treatments decreased (P<0.001) carcass protein, while thyme and thyme/celery treatments increased (P=0.001) carcass water holding

 Salinomycin, thyme and celery treatments decreased (P=0.002) meat brightness score, while Celery treatment increased (P<0.05) redness of meat, without affecting yellowness, chroma or hue of the meat.

• In conclusion, further studies are planned to validate results and their mechanism of action.