# EFFECT OF USING COMMERCIAL AND NATURAL GROWTH PROMOTERS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF COMMERCIAL LAYING HENS

#### By

Kout El-Kloub M.El. Moustafa. Anim. Prod. Res.Institute,Agric.Res.Center.Minist.of Agric.

Received: 10/7/2006 Accepted: 2/8/2006

**Abstract :** The present study aimed to investigate the impact of probiotic as commercial growth promoter and either fenugreek or black seed as natural growth promoter at levels of 0.05, 0.1 and 0.15% in practical laying diets on productive performance and economical efficiency during 40-59 weeks of age.

A total number of 240 Hy-Line White laying hens were distributed into 10 equal groups, each of 24 birds in four replicates. The first group received the basal diet without any supplementation, whereas the other groups were given the basal diet supplemented with either probiotic, fenugreek or black seed each at levels of 0.05, 0.1 and 0.15%. The results obtained could be summarized as follows:

- 1- The highest body weight at 59 weeks of age was obtained from 0.05% inclusion level of each of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed. However, fenugreek treatment was significantly surpassed over all dietary treatments.
- 2- The inclusion level of either 0.1% probiotic,0.05 and 0.15% fenugreek or 0.1and 0.15% black seed significantly gave higher egg production than those of control group. However, fenugreek and black seed were insignificantly superior than the probiotic group.
- **3-** Inclusion levels of probiotic, 0.05% fenugreek or 0.05 and 0.15% of black seed significantly increased egg weight. Moreover, egg mass was significantly increased with all studied levels of probiotic, black seed and 0.05% and 0.15% fenugreek.
- 4- There were no significant differences in feed consumption among all dietary treatments including the control group. While, feed conversion was significantly (P<0.05) improved at levels of 0.1, 0.05 and 0.15% for probiotic, fenugreek and black seed, respectively.

- 5- There were insignificant increase (P < 0.05) in egg shape index (SI), yolk index (YI) and shell thickness (ST) and significant effect on Haugh units (HU) for all treatments. Furthermore, probiotic at 0.1% level, fenugreek at 0.15% and black seed at all levels had significant increase on yolk color (YC).
- 6- Probiotic, fenugreek and black seed inclusion had significant effects (p<0.05) in decreasing yolk total cholesterol compared with the control group and had no significant effect on total lipids of egg yolk.
- 7- Either probiotic, fenugreek or black seed had no positive effect on unsaturated fatty acids of egg yolk oppositely, they had positive effect on some saturated fatty acids like Palmitic acid ( $c_{16:0}$ ).
- 8- Economic evaluation for egg production was improved by using all dietary treatments. However, the best value was achieved by using 0.05% fenugreek, 0.15% black seed and 0.1% probiotic.

# **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, there is a tendency to use herbs and probiotics as natural feed additives to avoid the residual cumulative effect for either antibiotics or synthetic drugs in final products of poultry, which has a negative effect on the human health.

Probiotics have been used for animals and poultry as feed additives or as growth promoter to replace the widely used antibiotics and synthetic chemical feed supplements with positive statistical effects on growth performance (**Onifade** *et al.*, 1999) and egg production properties (**Mohan** *et al.*, 1995). Furthermore, probiotics effects may be mediated by a direct antagonistic effect against specific groups of organisms, resulting in a decrease in their number (**Watkins**, 1981; **Watkins** *et al.*, 1982; and **Hentges**, 1983) or by an effect on their metabolism (**Rantala and Nurmi**, 1973 & Goldin and Gorbach, 1984) or by simulation of immunity (**Parker**, 1974 and Umesb, 1999). Mona osman (2003) found that the use of probiotic up to 4g/kg diet improved the performance of laying hens.

Fenugreek as a medical plant is considered to be a good source of crude protein, crude fat and total carbohydrates (Abd El-Aal and Rahma, 1986). Also, it has anticarcinogenic, antiviral, antifungal and antioxidant activities (Mazur *et al.*, 1998). Morsy (1995) showed a significant improvement in body weight gain and dressing percentage with broiler chicks fed diets containing 0.05% fenugreek. Similarly, Nadia Radwan (2003) observed an improvement of body weight gain and feed conversion by adding fenugreek seeds up to 2% level to broiler diets during the finishing period (29-

49 days old). Supplemented broiler diet with fenugreek seeds resulted to significant decrease in abdominal fat percentage (El-Husseiny *et al.*, 2002).

Black seed (Nigella sativa) is becoming commonly used for medical antibacterial. antifungal, antihelminthic, purposes as antidiabetic bronchodilator, immune enhancing and anti spasmodic effects (Mahdi, 1993). Adding black seeds to poultry diets resulted in improving body weight in laying hens ( El-Kaiaty et al., 2002), in growing and laying Japanese quail ( Zeweil, 1996), in broiler chicks ( Tollba and Hassan, 2003, Nadia Radwan, 2003) and improved feed conversion (Abdo, 1998 and Tollba et al., 2005). Moreover, black seeds addition has been reduced the concentration of serum cholesterol and triglycerides ( Mandour et al., 1995), serum total lipids and liver cholesterol in broilers (Abdo, 1998), reduce fat content of serum total lipids and cholesterol in ducks (Ghazalah and Ibrahim, 1996).

The present study aimed to investigate the effect of supplemented either probiotic, fenugreek or black seeds with different levels to laying hen diets on their productive performance and egg quality.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This investigation was carried out at the 20 Million Egg Project belongs to the Ministry of Agriculture, Alexandria Governorate. The tested materials were a commercial probiotic (containing Saccharomyces cerevisiae, Enterococcus faecium and Lactobacillus acidophilus), fenugreek and black seed. They were obtained from commercial supplier.

A total number of 240 Hy-Line White-egg layers (Hy-line W36) as a commercial egg strain were randomly selected at 40 weeks old from the flock of the 20 Million Egg Project, randomly assigned equally to 10 groups; each group contains 4 replicates of 6 hens each. The birds were fed corn-soy basal diet (BD) containing 2850 kcal ME/Kg, 18.51%CP, 3.53% calcium and 0.60% available phosphorus. It was supplemented with commercial probiotic, fenugreek and black seeds to produce 10 experimental diets as follows:

6-BD + 0.10% Fenugreek
7-BD + 0.15% Fenugreek
8-BD + 0.05% Black seed
9-BD + 0.10% Black seed
10-BD + 0.15% Black seed

Feed was given according to the management guide under a total of 17 hours light /day. Water was provided all time. During the experimental period (40 to 59 weeks old), individual body weight (g) was recorded at 43, 51 and 59 weeks of age. Average feed consumption (g/hen/day) was monthly measured throughout the experimental period. Eggs were collected, counted and weighed till the termination of the experiment. In order to calculate egg mass, egg production was calculated as hen daily egg production (HD) and multiplied it by the average egg weight. Feed conversion ratio was monthly calculated by dividing Kg feed consumed by Kg egg mass.

At 51 weeks of age, three fresh eggs per replicate (12 eggs/treatment) were randomly collected to determine egg quality measurements including egg shape index (SI), yolk index (YI) and Hugh units (HU) according to **Stadleman (1977),** Yolk color (YC) using Hoffman La Roch color fan, Shell thickness (ST) using a micrometer to the nearest 0.01 mm and Shell weight per unit of surface area (SWUSA) using the equation of **Carter (1975).** Yolk cholesterol and total lipids were determined (at 51 and 59 weeks of age) according to the procedures of Fisher **and Leveille (1957).** Fatty acids of egg yolk were carried out by gas liquid chromatography (GLC) technique

Economical efficiency (EEF) was estimated as feeding cost per Kg egg mass. While relative EEF was relatively calculated to the un supplemented control group as follows:

Relative feeding cost =

Supplemented group feeding cost /Kg egg mass un - sumplemented group feeding cost/Kg egg mass x 100

Data obtained were statistically analyzed using analysis of variance which was performed using SAS® software computer program (SAS, 1990) and Duncan's new multiple range test (Duncan, 1955) was used to test mean differences if a significant probability value was obtained.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## Live body weight:

The effect of either inclusion levels of probiotic, fenugreek or black seeds on body weight changes is presented in Table (2). Results showed that during the first experimental period (43 weeks of age), average live body weight did not significantly affect by any level of the tested materials. Also, at 51 weeks of age, average body weight of the control group was insignificantly (P<0.05) differed than those of all dietary treatments. On the

other hand, with feeding the experimental diet to 59 weeks of age, significant increase in body weight had been observed for all dietary treatments and levels compared with those of the control group. The highest body weight was obtained from inclusion level of 0.05% for probiotic, fenugreek and black seed; however, 0.05% fenugreek significantly surpassed all dietary treatments. These results are agreed well with those of El-Kaiaty *et al.*, (2002) and Nadia Radwan (2003) for black seed, Morsy (1995) and Nadia Radwan (2003) for fenugreek and Onifade *et al.*, (1999) for probiotic. The improvement in body weight at 59 weeks of age may be due to the antioxidant, antibacterial, antifungal and antagonistic effect of experimental materials on the micro-organisms present in the gut. Such factors may positively affect digestion and/or absorption of feed ingredients in the digestive tract, and subsequently reflected on body weight.

**Murray** *et al.*, (1991) reported that the improvement of body weight of chicks fed black seed containing diets may be due to that black seed contained 37.36% of EE which is rich in unsaturated fatty acids such as oleic, linoleic and linolenic acids, that have been considered essential for growth.

#### **Egg production:**

The effect of inclusion levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seeds in laying hens diets on egg production is presented in Table (3). Generally, egg production of all dietary treatments along with the experimental periods (40-59 wks) surpassed that of the control group. The inclusion level of 0.1% probiotic, 0.05 and 0.15% fenugreek and 0.1and 0.15% black seed gave a significant higher overall mean of egg production over that of the control group, however, fenugreek and black seed were insignificantly superior than those of probiotic group. This result agree with those of Abd El-Rahman (1988) and Mona Osman (2003) who found that probiotic inclusion has significantly increased egg production. In contrast, Cerniglia et al., (1983) and Bougon et al., (1988) observed insignificant effect of probiotic on egg production. El-Kaiaty et al., (2002) found that using fenugreek and black seed in diets at 2% level had no effect on egg production. It could be noted that using fenugreek and black seed at high level (2%) has no effect on egg production, while, their lower levels gave positive and significant increase in egg production.

The positive effect of using fenugreek on egg production my be due to the composition fenugreek of crude protein, crude fat and total carbohydrates (Abd El-Aal and Rahma, 1986). Also, it has anticarcinogenic, antiviral, antifungal and antioxidant activities (Mazur *et al.*, 1998), which represent suitable condition for higher egg production. The role of black seed in increasing egg production my be due to its antibacterial, antifungal, antihelminthic, antidiabetic bronchodilator, immune enhancing and anti spasmodic effects (**Mahdi, 1993**).

### Egg weight and egg mass:

The effects of treatments on average egg weight and egg mass are shown in Tables (4 and 5). As shown from Tables 4 and 5, all levels of dietary treatments of probiotic, black seed and fenugreek during 40-51 weeks of age significantly increased egg weight compared with control group. The same trend was observed up to 55 weeks with the exception of 0.1% fenugreek group. Up to 59 weeks of age, the groups received 0.1, 0.15 % fenugreek and 0.1% black seed resulted in statistically similar egg weight to the control, while the other dietary treatments significantly surpassed the control. Regarding to egg mass, up to 59 weeks of age all of the dietary treatments surpassed the control with the exception of 0.1% fenugreek which was similar to the control during the period from 48-59 weeks of age. Generally, 0.05% inclusion was the best supplementation for all dietary treatments studied. The descending order of the values of supplemented materials at 0.05% level were fenugreek followed by black seed then probiotic. Such increment in egg mass values could be attributed to the increase in egg weight laid by hens. In this connection, Hamid et al., (1994), Cavazzoni et al., (1998), and Mona Osman (2003) found that adding probiotic to laying hens diets improved egg weight. El-Kaiaty et al., (2002) reported that inclusion of 2% black seed and 2% fenugreek in laying hens insignificantly improved both of egg weight and mass. Similar results were obtained by Tollba et al., (2005), when they added 2% black seed to laying hen diet. It could be observed that higher levels of black seed (2%) and fenugreek (2%) does not improve egg weight or egg mass while, lower levels used in present study (0.05, 0.1 and 0.15%) had given the best results.

#### Feed consumption and feed conversion:

Results presented in Table (6) indicated no significant differences in feed consumption among all dietary treatments including the control group. In this respect, El-Kaiaty *et al.*, (2002) with laying hens and Nadia Radwan (2003) with broilers reported that there were no effect of supplemented fenugreek or black seed on feed consumption. Mona Osman (2003) did not find any effect of addition probiotic to laying hens on feed consumption.

Feed conversion values (Table 7) revealed significantly improve by adding fenugreek at levels of 0.05% and 0.15%, black seed and probiotic up to 0.15% till 55 weeks of age compared with control group. The overall mean of feed conversion at all used levels for all treatments numerically improved

compared to control group .The significant (P<0.05) improvement of feed conversion were at levels of 0.1, 0.05 and 0.15% for probiotic, fenugreek and black seed, respectively. Similar results were confirmed by El-Kaiaty *et al.*,(2002) when used fenugreek and black seed in laying hens . Mona Osman (2003) observed slight improvement in feed conversion by using probiotic (0.4%). On the other hand, Bougon *et al.*,(1988) revealed no significant effect on feed conversion value as probiotic used.

This improvement my be attributed to that fenugreek can inhibit 85-90% of formation of aflatoxins (El-Shayeb and Mabrouk, 1984), which lead to improve feed conversion of hens. In this respect, Mazur *et al.*, (1998) demonstrated that the presence of phytoestrogens in fenugreek have great value because of their antifungal and antioxidant activities. The improvements obtained from adding black seeds up to 0.15% my be attributed to that black seed can reduce mold growth and so can completely inhibit the formation of aflatoxins and accordingly lead to a higher utilization efficiency of nutrients in the feed ( Ghazalah and Ibrahim, 1996 and Abd El-Latif *et al.*, 2002). Also, the marked improvement in feed conversion from the inclusion of probiotic may be due to the improvement occurs in the balance of the intestinal flora and their metabolites (Endo *et al.*, 1999).

### External and internal egg quality:

Results in Table (8) indicated that there are insignificant (P < 0.05) increase in egg shape index (SI), yolk index (YI) and shell thickness (ST) for all treatments and levels studied except at level of 0.1% probiotic which has significant increase in SI. Probiotic and black seed had significant increase in YI at 0.15% level, while, fenugreek has no significant effect on YI. In this regard, Mona Osman (2003) did not observe differences in ST and found significantly differences in YI as using probiotic in laying hens Tollba et al., (2005) revealed no significant effect in YI when used diet. black seed at 2% level in laying hens .The probiotic, fenugreek and black seed had lower significant effect on haugh units (HU) except 0.1% fenugrek, which was similar to the control, same result obtained for probiotic on shell weight per unit of surface area (SWUSA). While, fenugreek and black seed significantly increased SWUSA at levels 0.05% and 0.1% for fenugreek and 0.1% for black seed. Furthermore, probiotic at 0.1% level, fenugreek at 0.15% and black seed at all levels had significant increase on yolk color (YC). Significant improvement of YC by using herbs may be due to the presence of natural colors in these materials.

#### Yolk cholesterol and total lipids:

Cholesterol concentration and total lipids of egg yolk among the tested groups fed the basal diet supplemented with different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed (Table 9), revealed that probiotic, fenugreek and black seed inclusion had significant effects( p<0.05 ) in lowering total cholesterol compared with the control group .Probiotic had no significant effect on total lipids, while fenugreek and black seed significantly recorded higher total lipids than the control at 51 and 59 weeks of age with the exception of 0.15% fenugreek at 59 weeks of which was similar to the control. On average, all dietary treatments had no significant effect on total lipids except 0.15% probiotic which had significantly decreased total lipids than the control. It is clear that the inclusion level of 0.05% either of probiotic, fenugreek or black seed gave the best results, economically, for producing eggs lowering in cholesterol content. Khodarv et al., (1996) reported that the decrease of cholesterol may be due to the high content of unsaturated fatty acids in black seed which may stimulate the cholesterol excretion into the intestine and the oxidation of cholesterol to bile acids. Petit et al., (1993) stated that fenugreek seeds or extracts increased the excretion of bile acids and so reduced cholesterol content of plasma due to the presence of the unsaturated fatty acids in fenugreek seeds. While, Lanksy et al., (1993) attributed this activity to steroid saponins which may either compete with cholesterol at binding sites or interfere with cholesterol biosynthesis in the liver. They added that soluble fibers and mucilage content of fenugreek seeds may block cholesterol absorption from the intestine and so reduced its level of plasma. El-Kaiaty et al., (2002) declared that supplemented diet with either 2% fenugreek or 2% black seed significantly decreased the yolk cholesterol by about 9% and 15%, respectively. Similarly, Nadia Radwan (2003)reported that broiler chicks fed black seed at different levels had lower (p<0.05) values of plasma total cholesterol content than those fed the control diet. The decreasing effect of probiotic on total cholesterol agree with the findings obtained by Mona Osman (2003). The results as shown in Table 9, revealed that the probiotic inclusion up to 0.15% significantly lowered total cholesterol and has no significant effect on total lipids. These results are in agreement with those of Mervat Yossef et al., (2001) who found that the use of Saccharomyces cerevisiae at the level of 0.1% significantly decreased egg yolk cholesterol. Similarly, Mona Osman (2003) found that the use of probiotic up to 0.1% significantly decreased the cholesterol and had no effect on total lipids of egg yolk.

### Yolk fatty acids component:

As shown in Table (10), it was found that probiotic, fenugreek and black seed had no positive effect on unsaturated fatty acids except at level of 0.05% fenugreek and probiotic which insignificantly differed than the control group on palmitoleic acid. While, they had positive effect on some saturated fatty acids like palmitic acid which was significantly deceased among all dietary treatments and levels compared to the control. Furthermore, the level of 0.05% fenugreek gave significantly the lowest value of Palmitic acid compared with all dietary treatments.

#### **Economic evaluation:**

Economic evaluation provide further evidence for the economic beneficial of using probiotic, fenugreek and black seed in laying hens diets. Total production cost was calculated including prices of feeding.

As shown in Table (11), the incorporation of fenugreek and black seed supplementation in laying hen diets decreased total feeding cost, while, probiotic increased total feeding cost allover the experimental period. In general, the lowest feed cost needed to obtain one kg of egg mass had been obtained using fenugreek (90.37%) followed by black seed (90.82) and then by probiotic (94.03), all of which are superior compared to the control diet without supplementation.

In conclusion, from the obtained results, it could be recommended to use fenugreek, black seed and probiotic as feed additives in laying hens diets at level of 0.05% with the previous order for obtaining better and economical productive performance.

### Kout El-Kloub M.El. Moustafa.

Ingredients	0⁄0
Corn yellow	53.000
Soybean meal (44%)	31.700
Vegetable oil	3.960
Bone meal	3.500
Limestone	6.883
DL-Methionine	0.158
Premix *	0.300
NaCl	0.300
Sand	0.199
Total	100
Calculated values**	
Crude protein %	18.51
M.E. kcal/kg	2850.60
C/P ratio	154.00
Methionine	0.46
Lysine	1.03
Calcium %	3.53
Available P	0.60
Fat	6.31
Fiber	2.96

Table (1): Composition and calculated analysis of the basal experimental diet given to Hy-Line White laying hens throughout the period 40-59 weeks of age.

\* Vitamins and minerals premix provides per kilogram of diet: 10500 IU vitamin A, 11.0 IU vitamin E, 1.1 mg menadione (as menadione sodium bisulfite), 2100 ICU vitamin D3, 5 mg riboflavin, 12 mg Ca pantothenate, 12.1  $\mu$ g vitamin B12, 2.2 mg vitamin B6, 2.2 mg thiamin, 44 mg nicotinic acid, 250 mg choline chloride, 1.55 mg folic acid, 0.11 mg d-biotin. 60 mg Mn, 50 mg Zn, 0.3mg I , 0.1 mg Co, 30 mg Fe,5mg Cu and 3 mg Se. \*\* Calculated according to NRC (1994).

Table (2): Ef fer an	fect of feed nugreek and b d overall exp	Effect of feeding laying hens different lev fenugreek and black seed on body weight (g) du and overall experimental periods (43-59 weeks)	s different leve dy weight (g) du s (43-59 weeks)	Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on body weight (g) during the intervals and overall experimental periods (43-59 weeks).
Trait		Body v	Body weight (g)	
/		Age	Age (wks)	
Treatments	43	51	65	Overall mean
Control	1207.40±1.7	$1479.98{\pm}14.0^{ab}$	$1499.58 \pm 16.1^{\circ}$	$1395.65 \pm 10.6^{\circ}$
Probiotic (%)				
0.05	$1200.81 \pm 1.5$	$1496.36{\pm}14.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	$1616.33{\pm}13.8^{\mathrm{a}}$	$1437.83 \pm 10.07^{b}$
0.1	$1203.29 \pm 1.7$	$1463.02{\pm}10.3^{b}$	$1570.42{\pm}14.6^{b}$	$1412.24\pm8.9^{bc}$
0.15	$1204.39 \pm 2.0$	$1519.69 \pm 7.0^{a}$	$1603.33 {\pm} 7.5^{ab}$	$1442.47\pm5.5^{b}$
Fenugreek (%)				
0.05	$1199.05{\pm}1.2$	$1525.66 \pm 9.6^{a}$	$1693.33{\pm}12.6^{a}$	$1472.68 \pm 8.0^{a}$
0.1	$1199.93{\pm}1.5$	$1518.42{\pm}14.9^{a}$	$1630.83{\pm}12.6^{\mathrm{a}}$	144973±9.7 <sup>b</sup>
0.15	$1200.15{\pm}1.1$	$1499.08{\pm}14.7^{a}$	$1590.00 \pm 11.2^{ab}$	$1429.74 \pm 9.0^{b}$
Black seed (%)				
0.05	$1209.98{\pm}1.6$	$1478.15 \pm 9.6^{ab}$	$1614.58 \pm 17.2^{a}$	$1434.23 \pm 9.5^{b}$
0.1	$1209.84{\pm}1.4$	$1465.82 \pm 15.3^{b}$	$1585.96{\pm}16.4^{ab}$	$1420.54{\pm}11.0^{\rm b}$
0.15	$1201.51 \pm 1.3$	$1467.48 \pm 13.1^{b}$	$1575.00{\pm}13.6^{b}$	$1414.66 \pm 9.3^{bc}$
<sup>abc</sup> Means within a co	olumn with no con	nmon superscripts dif	<sup>abc</sup> Means within a column with no common superscripts differ significantly (P $\leq$ 0.05) based on	05) based on
	<b>f</b>			

Probiotic, fenugreek, black seed, performance, laying hens

Means within a column with no common superscripts differ significantly ( $P \le 0.05$ ) based of Duncan's separation of means.

951

0.1 81.25 0.15 78.61 Fenugreek (%) 0.05 82.22 0.15 77.36 81.94
77.77±1.5 <sup>b</sup> 81.25±1.8 <sup>a</sup> 78.61±1.2 <sup>b</sup> 82.22±1.4 <sup>a</sup> 77.36±2.5 <sup>b</sup> 81.94±1.8 <sup>a</sup>
$\begin{array}{c} 80.97{\pm}1.0^{\rm ab}\\ 81.11{\pm}0.6^{\rm a}\\ 81.53{\pm}1.6^{\rm a}\\ 80.14{\pm}1.9^{\rm ab}\\ 82.36{\pm}0.9^{\rm a} \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} 81.80{\pm}0.4^{\rm ab}\\ 81.67{\pm}1.6^{\rm ab}\\ 80.83{\pm}1.9^{\rm ab}\\ 82.92{\pm}1.1^{\rm a}\end{array}$
$81.11\pm1.4^{ab}$ $81.11\pm1.7^{ab}$ $83.00\pm0.8^{a}$
$82.08\pm1.7^{\circ}$ $80.00\pm1.4^{ab}$ $81.39\pm1.1^{a}$
/9.89±1.9 <sup>-</sup> 82.32±1.1 <sup>a</sup>

	ble
	<u>ت</u>
product	Effect
ion	of
during t	feeding
he inter	laying
vals a	hens
nd overall	different
experi	levels
men	of
tal period	probiotic,
roduction during the intervals and overall experimental periods (40-59 weeks).	ble (3): Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and
eks)	and
•	black
	seed
	on
	egg

$0.15 \qquad 60.70 \pm 0.7  60.53 \pm 1.4^{a}  62.98 \pm 0.9^{a}  64.28 \pm 0.9^{a}  66.68 \pm 0.9^{a}  63.93 \pm 0.15  64.28 \pm 0.9^{a}  66.68 \pm 0.9^{a}  63.93 \pm 0.15  66.68 \pm 0.9^{a}  66.68 \pm 0.9^{$	0.1	0.05	Black seed (%)	0.15	0.1	0.05	Fenugreek (%)	0.15	0.1	0.05	Probiotic (%)	Control	Treatment	/	Trait	
60.70±0.7	$60.38 {\pm} 0.7$	$61.82{\pm}1.9$		$60.50{\pm}0.4$	$61.42{\pm}1.6$	$59.80 \pm 1.2$		$62.03 {\pm} 0.9$	$61.33{\pm}1.2$	$61.05 \pm 1.3$		59.82±1.6	40-43			(
$60.53{\pm}1.4^{a}$	$58.17{\pm}1.0^{a}$	$59.82{\pm}2.0^{a}$		$58.08{\pm}1.3^{a}$	$58.90{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$60.88{\pm}1.6^{a}$		$56.60 \pm 1.7^{b}$	$60.92{\pm}1.7^{a}$	$59.38{\pm}1.0^{a}$		59.82±1.6 57.02±2.1 <sup>b</sup>	44-47			
$62.98{\pm}0.9^{ m a}$	$62.07 \pm 0.5^{a}$	$63.50{\pm}1.3^{a}$		$61.75 \pm 0.8^{a}$	$61.40{\pm}0.8^{a}$	$64.03{\pm}0.7^{a}$		$62.37 \pm 0.8^{a}$	$64.07 \pm 0.6^{a}$	$63.35{\pm}0.6^{a}$		$59.95 \pm 1.7^{b}$ $62.77 \pm 1.8^{b}$	48-51	Ag	Egg	٠
$64.28{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$63.37 {\pm} 0.5^{a}$	$64.80{\pm}1.3^{a}$		$63.02{\pm}0.8^{a}$	$62.70 \pm 0.8^{b}$	$65.33 \pm 0.7^{a}$		$63.67 {\pm} 0.8^{a}$	$65.37{\pm}0.6^{a}$	$64.65 {\pm} 0.6^{a}$		62.77±1.8 <sup>b</sup>	52-55	Age (wks)	Egg weight (g)	•
$66.68 {\pm} 0.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	65.77±0.5 <sup>b</sup>	$67.20{\pm}1.3^{a}$		$65.45 \pm 0.8^{b}$	$65.10\pm0.8^{b}$	$67.73 \pm 0.7^{a}$		$66.07 {\pm} 0.8^{a}$	$67.77 \pm 0.6^{a}$	$67.05 \pm 0.6^{a}$		$65.15 \pm 1.8^{b}$	56-59			``
$63.03{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$61.95 {\pm} 0.6^{\rm b}$	$63.43{\pm}1.6^{a}$		$61.70 \pm 0.9^{b}$	$61.90{\pm}1.0^{\mathrm{b}}$	$63.55\pm0.9^{\mathrm{a}}$		$62.15{\pm}1.0^{a}$	$63.89{\pm}0.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	$63.10{\pm}0.8^{\mathrm{a}}$		$60.94{\pm}1.8^{b}$	Overall mean			

(g/hen/	'day) during th	ne intervals and	d overall experi	mental periods	(g/hen/day) during the intervals and overall experimental periods (40-59 weeks).	).
/			Egg mass	Egg mass (g/hen/day)		
Trait			Ag	Age (wks)		
/	40-43	44-47	48-51	52-55	56-59	Overall mean
Treatment						
Control	$46.34{\pm}2.0^{b}$	$46.34\pm2.0^{b}$ $45.26\pm1.6^{b}$	$48.30 \pm 1.6^{b}$   $50.59 \pm 1.4^{b}$   $51.92 \pm 1.6^{b}$	$50.59 \pm 1.4^{b}$	$51.92 \pm 1.6^{b}$	$48.48{\pm}1.6^{\rm b}$
Probiotic (%)						
0.05	$47.54{\pm}1.7^{b}$	$47.89 \pm 0.8^{a}$	$51.42 \pm 1.2^{a}$	$52.55{\pm}1.2^{a}$	$53.44{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$50.57 \pm 1.2^{a}$
0.1	$49.89{\pm}1.7^{a}$	$49.26{\pm}1.1^{a}$	$52.04{\pm}0.6^{a}$	$53.19{\pm}0.4^{a}$	$54.97 \pm 1.1^{a}$	$51.87 \pm 0.9^{a}$
0.15	$48.77 \pm 1.1^{a}$	$45.94{\pm}1.7^{b}$	$51.03{\pm}0.8^{a}$	$52.79 \pm 0.8^{a}$	$52.60 \pm 1.2^{ab}$	$50.23 \pm 1.1^{a}$
Fenugreek (%)						
0.05	$49.16{\pm}1.2^{a}$	$49.68{\pm}1.9^{a}$	$52.27{\pm}0.8^{a}$	$52.96 \pm 0.7^{a}$	$55.57 \pm 1.1^{a}$	$51.93 \pm 1.14^{a}$
0.1	$47.98{\pm}2.2^{a}$	$47.29 \pm 1.9^{a}$	$49.67{\pm}1.7^{b}$	$50.91 \pm 1.6^{b}$	$52.09 \pm 1.3^{b}$	49.75±1.7 <sup>ab</sup>
0.15	$49.59{\pm}1.3^{a}$	$47.79 {\pm} 0.8^{a}$	$51.21{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$52.25 \pm 0.8^{a}$	$53.26 {\pm} 0.8^{a}$	$50.82{\pm}0.9^{a}$
Black seed (%)						
0.05	$48.50{\pm}1.7^{a}$	$48.35{\pm}1.7^{a}$	$51.29{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$53.08{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$54.70{\pm}1.4^{a}$	$51.18 \pm 1.3^{a}$
0.1	$48.92{\pm}1.1^{a}$	$47.53{\pm}1.2^{a}$	$50.95 {\pm} 0.7^{ab}$	$52.28 \pm 0.6^{a}$	$53.98 {\pm} 0.3^{a}$	$50.73 \pm 0.8^{a}$
0.15	$48.29{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$50.08{\pm}1.1^{a}$	$52.22{\pm}0.9^{\mathrm{a}}$	$53.84{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$54.11 \pm 1.2^{a}$	$51.71 \pm 1.0^{a}$
ab Mana with in a column with no common community different contraction of back on Decomposition of manage		1:00		L		

<sup>an</sup> Means within a column with no common superscripts differ significantly ( $P \le 0.05$ ) based on Duncan's separation of means.

Table (6): Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on feed consumption         (g/hen/day) during the intervals and overall experimental periods (40-59 weeks).	èeding laying l ) during the int	nens different le ervals and overa	Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and blac (g/hen/day) during the intervals and overall experimental periods (40-59 weeks).	c, fenugreek an periods (40-59 v	id black seed of veeks).	n feed consumption
Trait			Feed consu	Feed consumption (g/day)	y)	
/			Ag	Age (wks)		
Treatment	40-43	44-47	48-51	52-55	56-59	Overall mean
Control	$110.3 \pm 3.2$	$107.5 \pm 3.0$	$100.2{\pm}2.8$	$100.1 \pm 2.9$	$99.0{\pm}2.0$	$103.42 \pm 2.8$
Probiotic (%)						
0.05	$105.3 \pm 3.0$	$103.1{\pm}2.9$	$99.9 \pm 2.5$	$99.8{\pm}2.8$	$98.6 \pm 2.1$	$101.34\pm2.7$
0.1	$100.5 \pm 3.1$	$100.5 {\pm} 2.8$	$98.6{\pm}2.0$	98.7±1.9	$98.1 \pm 1.9$	$99.28 \pm 2.3$
0.15	99.3±2.8	$99.0{\pm}1.9$	98.7±1.8	$98.0{\pm}2.0$	$98.0{\pm}1.9$	$98.6 \pm 2.1$
Fenugreek						
(%)						
0.05	$100.9 \pm 2.3$	$100.0\pm2.4$	$100.0 \pm 2.3$	$100.0{\pm}2.0$	99.7±1.9	$100.12 \pm 2.2$
0.1	$100.0{\pm}1.9$	$99.3 \pm 2.3$	$99.1{\pm}2.0$	$100.6 {\pm} 2.1$	$99.5 \pm 2.1$	99.7±2.1
0.15	99.7±1.8	$99.0{\pm}2.4$	$99.5 \pm 1.9$	$100.0{\pm}1.9$	99.7±2.0	$99.58 \pm 2.0$
<b>Black seed</b>						
(%)						
0.05	$100.0\pm2.2$	$100.1{\pm}2.1$	$99.5 \pm 2.0$	$100.0{\pm}2.0$	$99.3 \pm 1.9$	$99.78 \pm 2.1$
0.1	99.7±2.1	$100.0{\pm}2.0$	$99.6{\pm}1.9$	$99.7{\pm}1.9$	$99.0{\pm}1.8$	$99.6{\pm}2.0$
0.15	$99.2{\pm}2.0$	$100.3{\pm}2.1$	$99.1{\pm}1.8$	$99.5{\pm}1.8$	$98.9{\pm}2.0$	$99.4{\pm}1.9$

Probiotic, fenugreek, black seed, performance, laying hens

rait			Feed conversion (g/day)	ersion (	(g/day)	(g/day)
/			Age	Age (wks)		
/	40-43	44-47	48-51	ç	52-55	52-55 56-59
Treatment						
Control	$2.38{\pm}0.4^{\mathrm{a}}$	$2.41\pm0.4^{a}$	$2.10{\pm}0.3^{a}$	2.	$2.01{\pm}0.2^{a}$	$01\pm0.2^{a}$ 1.91±0.2 <sup>a</sup>
Probiotic (%)						
0.05	$2.21{\pm}0.3^{ab}$	$2.20{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$1.90{\pm}0.2^{b}$	<u>!</u>	$1.91 \pm 0.1^{b}$	$91\pm0.1^{b}$ $1.92\pm0.2^{a}$
0.1	$2.01{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$2.04{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$1.89{\pm}0.1^{b}$		$1.86 \pm 0.2^{b}$	
0.15	$2.04{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$2.15 \pm 0.2^{b}$	$1.93{\pm}0.1^{b}$	<u> </u>	$1.86{\pm}0.1^{b}$	$.86 \pm 0.1^{b}$ $1.86 \pm 0.1^{ab}$
Fenugreek (%)						
0.05	$2.05\pm0.2^{b}$	$2.01{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$1.91{\pm}0.1^{b}$		$1.89 {\pm} 0.1^{b}$	$1.89 \pm 0.1^{b}$ $1.79 \pm 0.1^{b}$
0.1	$2.10{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$2.10{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$2.00{\pm}0.2^{ab}$	1	$1.98{\pm}0.1^{a}$	
0.15	$2.01 \pm 0.1^{b}$	$2.07{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$1.94{\pm}0.2^{b}$		$1.91 \pm 0.2^{b}$	
Black seed (%)						
0.05	$2.06\pm0.2^{b}$	$2.07 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$1.94{\pm}0.2^{b}$		$1.88 \pm 0.1^{b}$	
0.1	$2.04{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$2.10{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$1.95{\pm}0.3^{b}$	1	$1.91 \pm 0.2^{b}$	
0 15	0 0 1 2 0 C		1 00 0 1b	7	1 05 1 0 1 b	

Table (7): Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on feed

956

(8): Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on egg weight (Egg w.) (g), egg sha index (SI), yolk color (YC), yolk index (YI), Haugh units (HU), shell thickness (ST) and shell weight per unit of surfa area (SWUSA) at 52 weeks of age.	Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on egg wei index (SI), yolk color (YC), yolk index (YI), Haugh units (HU), shell thickness (ST) and shell area (SWUSA) at 52 weeks of age.	different levels yolk index (YI) f age.	s of probiotic, ), Haugh units	fenugreek and s (HU), shell th	black seed on e ickness (ST) ar	gg weight (Egg 1d shell weight	ght (Egg w.) (g), egg sha weight per unit of surf?
Tunatmont				Traits			
reaument	Egg w.	IS	YC	IA	HU	ST	SWUSA
Control	63.17±1.6 <sup>b</sup>	$74.90{\pm}1.2^{b}$	$7.50 \pm 0.8^{b}$	$41.63 {\pm} 0.8^{b}$	$103.43 \pm 6.2^{a}$	$0.34{\pm}0.01^{ab}$	96.72±2.2 <sup>b</sup>
Probiotic (%)							
0.05	$64.97{\pm}1.9^{a}$	$75.21 \pm 1.5^{ab}$	$7.17 \pm 0.6^{b}$	$42.46 \pm 1.2^{b}$	$93.76{\pm}1.6^{b}$	$0.32{\pm}0.01^{b}$	89.87±2.6 °
0.1	$64.78{\pm}1.1^{a}$	$77.39{\pm}0.8^{a}$	$7.83{\pm}0.5^{a}$	$44.19{\pm}0.9^{ab}$	$95.17 \pm 2.1^{b}$	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	$95.63 \pm 3.1^{b}$
0.15	$65.02{\pm}1.8^{a}$	$73.99 \pm 1.2^{b}$	$7.67 {\pm} 0.2^{ab}$	$45.65 \pm 2.2^{a}$	$94.92{\pm}2.9^{b}$	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	91.07±2.0°
Fenugreek (%)							
0.05	$65.59 \pm 0.91^{a}$	$74.36 \pm 0.8^{b}$	$7.50 \pm 0.6^{b}$	43.99±1.1 <sup>ab</sup>	$89.82{\pm}4.2^{\circ}$	$0.34{\pm}0.02^{ m ab}$	$99.39 \pm 3.4^{a}$
0.1	$63.98{\pm}1.04^{a}$	$75.77{\pm}0.6^{ab}$	$7.17 \pm 0.7^{b}$	$41.33 \pm 3.2^{b}$	$97.86{\pm}2.4^{a}$	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	$101.52\pm2.3^{a}$
0.15	$63.20{\pm}1.50^{a}$	$75.18{\pm}0.8^{ab}$	$8.00{\pm}0.6^{\mathrm{a}}$	$42.88{\pm}1.0^{ab}$	$87.96{\pm}1.3^{\circ}$	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	$92.44{\pm}3.8^{\circ}$
Black seed (%)							
0.05	$65.07{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$74.98 \pm 0.9^{b}$	$7.90{\pm}0.4^{a}$	$43.24{\pm}0.6^{ab}$	$93.79{\pm}4.7^{b}$	$0.34{\pm}0.01^{ab}$	$88.04{\pm}2.9^{\circ}$
0.1	$63.34{\pm}1.5^{a}$	$75.34{\pm}1.5^{ab}$	$7.98{\pm}0.7^{a}$	$43.17{\pm}0.9^{ab}$	$90.89 \pm 1.2^{\circ}$	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	$98.91 \pm 3.6^{a}$
0.15	$64.68{\pm}0.9^{a}$	$74.08{\pm}1.4^{b}$	$8.00{\pm}0.6^{\mathrm{a}}$	$46.79 \pm 0.4^{a}$	89.99±1.0c	$0.35{\pm}0.01^{a}$	$95.61 \pm 2.5^{b}$
<sup>abc</sup> Means within a column with no common superscripts differ significantly (P $\leq$ 0.05) based on Duncan's separation of means.	olumn with no commo	on superscripts differ	r significantlv (P≤(	0.05) based on Dunca	an's separation of me	ans.	

D 1	C 1	11 1 1	C	1 . 1
Problofic	tennoreek	black seed	performance,	laving hens
11001000,	ionugrook,	bluck beeu,	periornance,	ia y mg nomo

Trait	Т	Total cholesterol	lc		Total lipids	
/	51 wk	59 wk	Overall	51 wk	59 wk	Overall
Treatment			mean			mean
Control	$17.56 \pm 0.5^{a}$	$17.56\pm0.5^{a}$ 16.78±0.7 <sup>a</sup>	$17.17{\pm}0.6^{a}$	$2.73 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$2.62 \pm 0.2^{b}$	$2.68{\pm}0.3^{a}$
Probiotic (%)						
0.05	$14.83 \pm 0.1^{b}$	$14.49{\pm}0.6^{b}$	$14.66 \pm 0.35^{b}$	$2.91{\pm}0.1^{b}$	$2.59 \pm 0.1^{b}$	$2.75\pm0.1^{a}$
0.1	$14.50 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$14.04{\pm}0.5^{b}$	$14.27 \pm 0.25^{b}$	$2.65 {\pm} 0.1^{b}$	$2.22{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$2.44{\pm}0.1^{a}$
0.15	$14.16 \pm 0.6^{b}$	$14.49{\pm}0.3^{b}$	$14.33 {\pm} 0.5^{b}$	$2.05 {\pm} 0.2^{b}$	$1.84{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$1.95 {\pm} 0.1^{b}$
Fenugreek (%)						
0.05		$14.94{\pm}0.1^{b}$	$14.94{\pm}0.1^{b}$	$3.05{\pm}0.3^a$	$2.73 \pm 0.3^{a}$	$2.89{\pm}0.3^{a}$
0.1		$14.30 \pm 0.5^{b}$	$14.44{\pm}0.4^{b}$	$3.13{\pm}0.3^a$	$2.83 \pm 0.2^{a}$	$2.98\pm0.3^{\mathrm{a}}$
0.15	$13.90 \pm 0.2^{b}$	$13.80{\pm}0.4^{b}$	$13.85 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$3.11{\pm}0.2^{a}$	$2.60{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$2.90{\pm}0.2^{\mathrm{a}}$
Black seed (%)						
0.05	$14.63 \pm 0.5^{b}$	$14.59\pm0.1^{b}$	$14.61 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$3.18{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$2.86{\pm}0.1^{a}$	$3.02\pm0.1^{a}$
0.1	$14.44\pm0.4^{b}$ 14.74±0.2 <sup>b</sup>	$14.74{\pm}0.2^{b}$	$14.59 {\pm} 0.3^{b}$	$3.22{\pm}0.2^{a}$	$3.21{\pm}0.2^{a}$	$3.22\pm0.2^{a}$
0.15	$14.12{\pm}0.4^{b}$	$14.12 \pm 0.4^{b}$ $14.70 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$14.41 \pm 0.3^{b}$	$3.28{\pm}0.2^{a}$	$2.98{\pm}0.1^{\mathrm{a}}$	$3.13{\pm}0.2^{a}$
0.10	1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 3			U.10-10.1	1.20-0.1	

**Table (9)**: Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and black seed on yolk total cholesterol and total lipids at 51.59 weeks of age.

acids	s component (	acids component (%) at 59 week of age.	or age.				
Troit			Fatty	Fatty acids component (%)	ent (%)		
Treatment	14:0	16:0	16:1	18:0	18:1	18:2	20:0
Control	$0.278 {\pm} 0.0^{\circ}$	$30.513{\pm}0.0^{a}$ 2.714 ${\pm}0.0^{a}$	$2.714{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$8.668 {\pm} 0.5^{\circ}$	$46.847{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$29.865{\pm}0.0^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.616{\pm}0.0^{d}$
Probiotic (%)							
0.05	$0.391{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$25.672 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$2.495{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$8.606 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$36.913{\pm}0.0^{d}$	$24.943 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$0.983{\pm}0.0^{\rm b}$
0.1	$0.473 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$28.503 {\pm} 0.0^{ m b}$	$1.828{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$11.492{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$36.572 \pm 0.0^{d}$	$19.947 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$1.187{\pm}0.0^{a}$
0.15	$0.365 {\pm} 0.0^{ m b}$	$25.316 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$1.753{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$9.642{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$36.824{\pm}0.0^{d}$	$24.84{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$1.262{\pm}0.0^{ m a}$
Fenugreek (%)							
0.05	$0.397{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$20.822 \pm 0.0^{d}$	$2.867{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$11.638 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$38.124{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$25.355 {\pm} 0.0^{b}$	$0.798{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$
0.1	$1.123 \pm 0.0^{a}$	$29.49{\pm}0.0^{ab}$	$1.749\pm0.0^{\circ}$	$10.302 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$38.203 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$18.662 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$0.467{\pm}0.0^{d}$
0.15	$0.477{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$25.551 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$ $2.187 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$2.187 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$11.492{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$35.571 \pm 0.0^{d}$	$23.539 {\pm} 0.0^{b}$	$1.182{\pm}0.0^{a}$
Black seed (%)							
0.05	$0.317 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$25.493 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$2.144{\pm}0.0^{b}$	$8.656 {\pm} 0.0^{\circ}$	$40.676 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$21.637 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$1.079{\pm}0.0^{a}$
0.1	$0.563 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$32.593{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$1.842{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$9.089 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$36.954{\pm}0.0^{d}$	$18.395 \pm 0.0^{\circ}$	$0.566{\pm}0.0^{d}$
0.15	$0.401{\pm}0.0^{ m b}$	$0.401\pm0.0^{\circ}$ 24.903±0.0° 2.001±0.0° 12.133±0.0°	$2.001{\pm}0.0^{\circ}$	$12.133{\pm}0.0^{a}$	$35.195{\pm}0.0^{d}$	$24.268 \pm 0.0^{b}$	$1.102{\pm}0.0^{\mathrm{a}}$
abed Means within a column with no common superscripts differ significantly (P≤0.05) based on Duncan's separation of means	mn with no comme	on superscripts differ	significantly (P≤0.)	05) based on Dunca	n's separation of mea	ns.	
14:0 Myrestic acid	16:0 Palmitic acid		16:1 Palmitoleic acid	18:0 Stearic acid	acid		
18:1 Oleic acid	18:2 Linoleic acid		20.0 Arachidic acid				

Probiotic, fenugreek, black seed, performance, laying hens

seed on the economic return.	seed on the economic return	eturn.	F	Ċ	
Treatments	Egg mass/	Feed	Total feed	Feeding	Relative
	hen/day(kg)	consumptionh	cost/hen (LE)	cost /kg	feed*
		en/day(kg)		egg mass	cost/egg
Control	0.04848	0.10342	0.1055	2.18	100.00
Probiotic (%)					
0.05	0.05057	0.10134	0.1059	2.94	95.41
0.1	0.05187	0.09928	0.1062	2.05	94.03
0.15	0.05023	0.09860	0.1080	2.15	98.62
Fenugreek (%)					
0.05	0.05193	0.10012	0.1023	1.97	90.37
0.1	0.04975	0.09970	0.1021	2.05	94.03
0.15	0.05082	0.09958	0.1022	2.01	92.20
Black seed (%)					
0.05	0.05118	0.09978	0.1022	2.00	91.74
0.1	0.05073	0.0996	0.1024	2.02	99.08
0.15	0.05171	0.0994	0.1026	1.98	90.82

	Table
	(11)
seed on	Effect
the	of
econom	feeding
seed on the economic return.	laying
1.	hens
	different
	levels
	of
	probiotic
	Table (11): Effect of feeding laying hens different levels of probiotic, fenugreek and blacl
	and
	l blacl

# REFERENCES

- Abd El-Aal, M. H.; and Rahma, E. H. (1986). Changes in gross chemical composition with emphasis on lipid and protein fractions during germination of fenugreek seeds. Food Chemistry, 22 : 193 -207.
- Abd El-Latif, S. A.; Faten Ahmed, A.; and El-Kaiaty, A.M. (2002). Effect of feeding dietary thyeme, black cumin, dianthus and fennel on productive and some metabolic responses of growing Japanese Quail. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 22:109-125.
- **Abd El-Rahman, S.A.(1988).***Influence of pronifer with a decreased crude protein in the feeding of laying hens. Univ. Agric. Vein, Austria.*
- Abdo, Z. M. A. (1998). The effect of using some natural growth promoters and fats on broiler performance and immunity. Ph.D.Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo, Univ., Giza, Egypt.
- Bougon, M.; Lounay, M.; and Menec, M. L. E. (1988). Effect of a probiotic, Biocroissance on the performance of laying hens. Nutr. Abst. And Rev. (Series B) 989,59:4583.
- **Carter, T. C. (1975).** The hens egg. Estimation of shell superficial area and egg volume using measurements of fresh egg weight and shell length and breadth alone or in combination. Br. Poult. Sci., 16 : 541-543.
- Cavazzoni, V.; Adami, A.; and Castrovill, C. (1998). Performance of broiler chickens supplemented with bacillus coagulans as probiotic. Br. Poult. Sci., 39:526-529.
- Cerniglia, G. J.; Goodling, A. C.; and Hebert, J.A.(1983). The response of layers to feeding lactobacillus fermentation products. Poult. Sci., 62:1399.
- Duncan, D. B. (1955). Multiple range and multiple F-test, Biometrics, 11:1-42.
- El-Husseiny, O.; Shalash, S. M.; and Azouz, H. M. (2002). Response of broiler performance to diets containing hot pepper, and/ or fenugreek at different metabolizabl energy levels. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 22:387-406.
- El-Kaiaty, A. M.; Soliman, A. Z. M.; and Hassan, M. S. H. (2002). The physiological and immunological effects of some natural feed additives in layer hen diets. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 22: 175-203.
- El-Shayeb, N. M. A.; and Mabrouk, S. S. (1984). Utilization of some edible and medicinal plants to inhibit aflatoxin formation. Nutrition Reports International, 29 (2) : 273-282.

- Endo, T.; Nakano, M.; Shimizu, S.; Fukushima, M.; and Miyoshi, S. (1999). Effects of a probiotic on the lipid metabolism of cocks fed on a cholesterol-enriched diet. Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem., 63 : 1569-1575.
- Fisher,H.; and Leveille, G.A. (1957). Observations on the cholesterol, linoleic and linolenic acid content of eggs as influenced by dietary fats.J. Nutr.,63: 119-129.
- Ghazalah, A. A.; and Faten, A. A.Ibrahim (1996). The possibility of using some edible and aromatic oils in the nutrition of Moscovi ducks. Egypt. Poult.Sci., 16:305-328.
- Goldin, B. R.; and Gorbach, S.L. (1984). The effect of milk and lactobacillus feeding on human intestinal bacterial enzyme activity. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 39:756-761.
- Hamid, A.; Zkham, F.; Munid, A.; and Qadeer, M. A. (1994). Probiotic in poultry production. Bangladesh Journal of Scientific and Industrial Researcher, 29: 1-12.
- Hentges, D. J. (1983). Role of the intestinal microflora in host defense against infection. In human intestinal microflora in Health and Diseases ed. Hentges, D. J. Ch. 14, pp. 311-331. New York : Academic Press.
- Khodary, R. M.; El-Azzawy, M. H.; and Hamdy, I. R. (1996). Effect of Nigella sativa on egg production, hatchability percentage and some biochemical values in laying hens with reference to fertility in cockerels. 7<sup>th</sup> Sci., Cong., Fac., Vet., Med., Assuit Univ., 17-19 Nov., 1996 Ass. Egypt, 91-106.
- Lanksy, P. S.; Schilcher, H.; Philipson, J. D.; and Loew, D. (1993). Plants that lower cholesterol. First world congress on medicinal and aromatic plants for human welfare (WOCMAP), Mastricht, Netherlands, 19-25 July 1992. Acta-Horticulturae. 1993, No. 332, 131-136 (Abst).
- Mahdy, H.E.A. (1993). Effect of Nigella sativa L. on the immune system in cirrhotic patients. MD. Thesis in Internal Medicine, Fac. Med. Al-Azhar Univ., Cairo, Egypt.
- Mandour, A. A.; Mahmoud, K.; Abou El-Wafa, A.; El-Agamy, E.; and Ragab, O. (1995). Effect of aflatoxin and Nigella sativa seeds on serum protein and its electrophoretic patterns in White Pekin ducklings. 1st Egyption Hungarian Poultry Conf., 17-19Sep., Alexandria Egypt.
- Mazur, W. M.; Duke, J. A.; Wahala, K.; Rasku, S.; and Adlercreutz, H. (1998). Isoflavonoids and Lignins in Legumes: Nutritional and health aspects in human, J. Nutr. Biochemistry, 9 : 193-200.

- Mervat, S. Yossef; Mervat, A.Breaka; Nazla, Y. Abou-El-Ella; and Abdalla, A. A. (2001). Performance of Gimmizah laying hens fed various levels of phosphorus and dry yeast (Saccharomyces cerevisiae). Egypt. Poult. Sci., 21 : 977-996.
- Mohan, B.; Kadirvel, R.; Bhaskaran, M.; and Natarajan, A. (1995). Effect of probiotic supplementation serum / yolk cholesterol and on egg shell thickness in layers. Br. Poult. Sci., 36 (5) : 799-803.
- Mona Osman (2003). The influence of probioic inclusion on the productive performance of commercial layers. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 23 (II) : 283-297.
- Morsy, M. M. A. (1995). The use of fenugreek (Trigonella Foenum greacam) clove (Syzygium Aromaticum) and cinnamon (Cinnamonum Zeylamion) in broiler nutrition as feed additives. M. Sc.Thesis, Faculty of Agric., Alexandria Unive., Egypt.
- Murray, R.K.; Granner, D.K.; Mayes, P.A.; and Rodweel, V.W. (1991). The text book of Harper's Biochemistry, twenty-second edition, Appleton & Large, Norwalk, Connecticut, Las Altos, California.
- Nadia, L. Radwan (2004). Effect of using some medicinal plants on performance and immunity of broiler chicks. PhD.Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo, Univ., Giza, Egypt.
- NRC (1994).Nutrient Requirements of poultry 9<sup>th</sup> Ed., National Academy of Science, National Research Council. Washington, D.C., USA.
- Onifade, A. A.; Odunsi, A. A.; Babatunde, G. M.; Olorede, B. R.; and Muma, E. (1999). Comparison of the supplemental effects of saccharomyces cerevisiae and antibiotics in low-protein and highfiber diets fed to broiler chickens. Arch Tierernahr, 52:29-39.
- **Parker, R.B. (1974).** Probiotics, the other half of the antibiotics story. Animal Nutrition and Health, 29 : 4-8.
- Petit, P.; Sauvaire, Y.; Ponsin, G.; Manteghetti, M.; Fave, A.; and Ribes, G. (1993). Effects of a fenugreek seed extract on feeding behavioure in the rat: Metabolic-Endocrine correlates. Fharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior, 45:369-374.
- Rantala, M.; and Nurmi, E. (1973). Prevention of the growth of salmonella infantis in chicks by the flora of the alimentary tract of chickens.Br. Poult. Sci. 14: 627-630.
- **SAS Institute, (1990).** SAS Users Guide: Statistics. Version 6, Fourth Edition. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.

- Stadleman, W. J. (1977). Quality identification of shell egg in: Egg science and technology. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed by W. J. Stadleman and O. J. Cotterill pub by AVI publishing company. Inc. Connecticut USA.
- Tollba, A. A. H.; and Hassan, M. S. H. (2003). Using some natural additives to improve physiological and productive performance of broiler chicks under high temperature condition-2. black cumin (Nigella sativa) or garlic (Allium sativum). Egypt. Poult. Sci., 23:327-340.
- **Tollba, A. A. H.; Abd El-Galyl,M.A.; and Abd El-Samad, M.H. (2005).** *The effect of using some herbal additives on physiological and productive performance of two Egyptian chicken strains during winter and summer seasons. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 25:107-123.*
- Umesb, P. C. P. (1999). Probiotics benefits. Poultry International, 38 (12): 40-44.
- Watkins, B. A. (1981). In vivo inhibitory effects of L.acidophilus against pathogenic E.coli in gnotobiotic chicks. M. S. Thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Co. USA.
- Watkins, B. A.; Miller, B. F.; and Neil, D. H. (1982). In vivo inhibitory effects of lactobacillus acidophilus against pathogenic Escherichia coli in gnotobiotic chicks. Poult. Sci., 61: 1298-1308.
- Zeweil, H. S. (1996). Evaluation of substituting Nigella seed oil meal for soybean meal on the performance of growing and laying Japanese quails. Egypt. Poult. Sci., 16:451-477.

الملخص العربى

تأثير إستخدام منشطات النمو التجارية و الطبيعية على الأداء الانتاجي للدجاج البياض

د. قوت القلوب مصطفي السيد مصطفي قسم بحوث تغذية الدواجن - معهد بحوث الانتاج الحيواني

تهدف الدراسة الى بحث تأثير البروبايوتيك (كمنشط نمو تجارى) والحلبة وحبة البركة ( كمنشطات نمو طبيعية ) على الأداء الانتاجى والكفاءة الاقتصادية للدجاج البياض عند إستخدام هذه المواد بمستويات 0.05 ، 0.1 ، 0.15% لكل منهم على التوالى فى العلائق وذلك على سلالة الهاى لاين الابيض من عمر 40 – 59 اسبوع .

استخدم فى الدر اسة 240 دجاجة وزعت الى 10 مجموعات متساوية بكل مجموعة 24 طائر . غذيت المجموعة الاولى على عليقة المقارنه (بدون اضافة) أما المجموعاتالأخر ىفغذيت على العليقه الأساسيه مضاف اليها البروبايوتيك، الحلبة، حبة البركة كل بمستويات 0.05 ، 0.10 ، 0.15 على الترتيب.

ويمكن تلخيص النتائج فيما يلى :-

- 1- تم الحصول علي اعلى وزن للجسم عند عمر 59 اسبوع بإستخدام مستوى 0.05 % لكل من البروبايونيك والحلبة وحبة البركة ، وقد تفوقت الحلبة على جميع المعاملات
- 2- تم الحصول علي اعلى انتاج بيض من مستوى 0.1 % بروبايوتيك ، 0.05 و 0.0% حلبة ، 0.1 % و 0.15 % حبة البركة ، وقد تفوقت الحلبة وحبة البركة على البروبايوتيك في انتاج البيض .
- 3- زاد وزن البيض عند كل المستويات للبروبايوتيك ، 0.05 % حلبة ، 0.05 و 0.15% حبة البركة .
  - 4- زادت كتلة البيض بكل مستويات البروبايونيك وحبة البركة وكذلك مستوى 0.05 و 0.15% حلبة.
- 5- لا توجد فروق معنوية في الغذاء الماكول ( لجميع المعاملات) ، بينما ز اد معدل تحويل الغذاء عند مستوى 0.1% بروبايوتيك ، 0.05 % حلبة ، 0.15% حبة البركة .
- 6- هناك زيادة غير معنوية في دليل الشكل ودليل الصفار وسمك القشرة وزيادة معنوية في وحدات HU لكل المعاملات كذلك كانت هناك زيادة معنوية في لون صفار البيض عند مستوى 0.1 % بروبايوتيك ، 0.15 % حلبة وكل مستويات حبة البركة .
- 7- كان هناك تاثير معنوى لجميع المعاملات بكل المستويات المستخدمة فى تقليل كوليسترول صفار البيض بينما لم يكن هناك تاثير للمعاملات على لدهون الكليه فى صفار البيض .
- 8- لم يكن هناك تاثير للبروبايونيك او الحلبة او حبة البركة على الدهون الغير مشبعة في صدفار البيض ولكن كان هناك تاثير ايجابي على بعض الدهون المشبعة مثل حمض البالميتك .
- 9- تحسنت الكفاءة الاقتصادية باستخدام كل المعاملات و كانت افضل المعاملات اقتصاديا هى . 0.05% حلبة ، 0.15% حبة البركة ، 0.1 بروبايوتيك على الترتيب.