

Phytochemical feed ~~additives~~ ~~additives~~, gGarlic, ginger and their mixture on ~~meat~~ physical quality parameters and sensory attributes of broiler chicken meats

ABSTRACT

The meat quality and sensory attributes of broilers fed diets containing garlic, ginger and their mixtures was determined. Four dietary treatments: T₁- no garlic or ginger; T₂- garlic only; T₃ – ginger only and T₄- garlic + ginger respectively were utilized in a completely randomized design (CRD). On the last day of the 70-day feeding and growth trial, 3 birds were decapitated per treatment. The slaughtered birds were singed in warm water, de-feathered, eviscerated, cut into parts and deboned. Meat cuts of about 800g ~~each were~~ taken from the thigh and breast muscles of each of the representative birds per treatment were tested for meat quality (water holding capacity, cook loss, pH and fat binding capacity) ~~analysis-parameters~~ and sensory ~~evaluation~~ attributes. The meat parts were later cut into 2.5 cm – 3.0cm pieces and mixed in 0.4% of iodized common salt before boiling in a pot at a cooking temperature range above 100°C for 20 minutes. The pieces of the boiled meat were placed according to the four (4) feed treatments. Twelve (12) consumer panelists (6 for the thigh and 6 for the breast muscles respectively) within the age range of 20 – 26 years were used for the sensory evaluation. The meat quality and overall acceptability results depicted by the panelists on the sensory parameters (colour, flavour, tenderness, juiciness and toughness) revealed that meat (thigh and breast) of broilers fed T₂- garlic only were better preferred by consumers and was recommended.

Formatted: Highlight

Key words: Garlic, ginger, meat quality and sensory attributes.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the ~~time~~ past, antimicrobial compounds such as antibiotics have usually been added to poultry diets for growth improvement and the control of disease at lower therapeutic prescriptions [1]. Consequently, it was reported that the misguided use of antibiotic drugs could cause drug resistant bacteria and antibiotic deposits in animal products, such as meat, egg and milk which could be detrimental to consumers [2]. Therefore, the use of natural antimicrobial products has been recommended as indispensable resources [3]. Further reports revealed that the use of antibiotic growth promoters or enhancers as additives in poultry feed formulations ~~have has~~ been banned since 2006 in most parts of the world, although they play a useful role in growth performance and disease prevention among ~~the broiler chickens~~ ~~by the development of resistance in bacteria and presence of drug residues in meat~~ [4]. Thus, to avert the problems associated with the use of antibiotics in poultry feed formulations, natural products of plant origin often described as phytochemicals like spices, herbs, and many plant ~~extracts-parts~~ like ginger and garlic can be used as ~~alternative-alternatives~~ to antibiotics. In addition they enhance for growth, and promotion to improve broiler performance, carcass characteristics, meat quality and sensory properties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

The rhizome or root parts of ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) has extensively been employed in medicine for the management of different diseased conditions such as nausea, vomiting, motion

sickness, gastrointestinal ulcers, diabetes, fever, arterial tension, rheumatoid arthritis, dry mouth/ xerostomia, cancer, migraine headache, sore throat, and minor respiratory ailments in human??? [5]. Similarly, the use of the bulb of garlic (*Allium sativum*) has been proven, since ~~#~~ acts as an agent that destroys bacteria. It has been used as an antibiotic that destroys or stops the growth of micro-organisms. It serves as an anthelmintic agent that destroys or expels intestinal worms and/or parasites such as vermicide and vermifuge as well as it has been used as an antioxidants-antioxidant that can contribute to the oxidation of free radicals which are believed to contribute to premature aging and dementia (ref). It also acts as an antispasmodic agent which relieves or eases muscular spasms, cramps or convulsions. They act as natural blood thinners, play anti-cancerous activities, serve as anticoagulants that prevents the formation of clots in blood, serve and as antiseptic agents for inhibiting that inhibit the growth of microorganism on living tissue or destroying pathogenic or putrefactive bacteria, prevent the formation of tumor cells, serve as anti-viral agents that destroys-destroy viruses, serve as cholagogue agents responsible for increasing the flow of bile into the intestines, serve as diaphoretic agents that promotes perspiration, serve as-as diuretic agents that increases the volume and flow of urine which cleanses the urinary system, as well as acts as stimulants that excites or quickens the functional activity of the tissues giving it more energy [6].

Commented [SS1]: Reference is about chicken

Commented [SS2]: Again related humans, thus provide a reference.

The quality of meat can be directly or indirectly influenced by diet composition and this can lead to changes in the consumption or marketing of the meat [7]. Furthermore, diet composition and the quality of meat are closely related with-to consumers² behaviour as well as with some sensory characteristics such as colour, texture, odour, and acceptability of the meat and the correct determination of the relationships between these variables play an important role in meat marketing and consumption [8]. The sensory evaluation of meat utilizing trained panelists could be the most appropriate means to explain differences between ‘treatments’ as perceived by humans [9]. Therefore, the objective of this study was to assess the effects of phytochemical feed additives (garlic, ginger and their mixtures) on the meat quality and sensory parameters of broiler chickens in Nigeria.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS need to rewrite with details.

Formatted: Highlight

2.1. Site of the research

The experiment was conducted at the Teaching and Research Farm of Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Ndele Campus, Rivers State (Latitude 4^o 58’ N and Longitude 6^o 48’ E), Nigeria [10].

2.2. Processing of garlic and ginger used as feed test ingredients

The garlic and ginger used as test ingredients for the study was obtained fresh from the depot designated for sale of these ingredients at Mile 3 market in Port Harcourt. The outer coverings (rinds and husks) of the garlic and ginger were peeled off using a simple kitchen knife. The peeled materials were washed and sun dried properly for a duration of 2 weeks. They were later put into a motorized electric blender and grounded into a fine powder. The required quantities of these ingredients were added into the composite broiler finisher diets made up of other feed ingredients (Table 1).

Table 1: Composition of the Experimental broiler finisher diets used for the study

Feed Ingredients	Feed treatments			
	T ₁ Control (No Garlic or Ginger)	T ₂ 100% Garlic only	T ₃ 100% Ginger only	T ₄ 50%Garlic + 50% Ginger
Maize	40.00	39.00	39.00	39.00
Palm Kernel Cake	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
Groundnut Cake	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Palm Oil	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Soya bean Meal	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
Wheat Bran	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Garlic	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.50
Ginger	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50
Bone Meal	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Lime stone	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Lysine	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Methionine	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Salt	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Mineral/Vitamin premix	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Total	100.00kg	100.00kg	100.00kg	100.00kg

Commented [SS3]: Need to give the units – kg?

Commented [SS4]: Did you balance for crude protein and energy?????

Premix contained the following: (Univit 15 Roche) 1500 I.U, Vit A: 1500 I.U, Vit D: 3000 I.U, Vit E: 3.0g, Vit K: 0.3g, Vit B2: 8.0g, Vit B6: 0.3g, Vit B12: 3.0g, Nicotinic Acid: 5.0g, Ca-Pantothenate: 10.00g, Fe: 0.2g, AL: 3.5g, Cu: 0.15g, Zn: 0.02g, I: 0.01g, Co: 0.01g Se.

2.3. Experimental birds and management

A total of one hundred and fifty (150) unsexed broiler day-old chicks weighing 40g each from Zartech hatchery farm were collectively brooded together throughout their starter phase with a commercial proprietary feed for four (4) weeks alternating with electricity and charcoal as sources of heat. At the end of the brooding period one hundred and twenty (120) grower broilers were balanced for their weights and ten (10) grower broilers were randomly allotted to three (3) pens (replicates) each ~~pen having~~ four (4) different dietary experimental feed treatments in a Complete Randomized Design (CRD). Give details of the treatments and replicates.

Routine and periodic management practices was carried when appropriate. The feeders and drinkers were cleaned and fresh feed and water were supplied on daily basis. The bedding materials on the floor (wood shavings) were changed when they ~~are~~ were dirty to maintain hygienic conditions to avoid diseases among the broilers. Recommended vaccination and medication were applied. Sanitation of the environment was maintained throughout the experimental period.

Commented [SS5]: State what they were.

Commented [SS6]: State the amount per bird.

Commented [SS7]: Better say the duration you changed

Commented [SS8]: State what they were and against what disease.

2.4. Determination of meat quality attributes

Commented [SS9]: Physical quality only

Meat samples (chunk of breast and thigh) were collected from the slaughtered broilers (3 birds per treatment of 1 bird per replicate) and physical meat quality attributes (water holding capacity, cook loss, pH and fat binding capacity) were determined at the Food Science Laboratory, Rivers State University according to the give details of the laboratory analysis and procedures taking to the Food Science Laboratory of Rivers State University for the determination of some physical meat quality attributes such as water holding capacity, cook loss, pH and fat binding capacity.

Commented [SS10]: Reference ???

Commented [SS11]: State details of the experiments/name of the procedures

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

2.5. Sensory evaluation

2.5.1. Meat preparation for sensory evaluation

After slaughtering and processing of the broilers the thigh and breast muscles (meat) from the broilers fed with the test feeds were deboned and washed thoroughly. Eight hundred grams (800g) each of the meat samples per treatment was utilized...for what??. The bulk of the 800g meat were thoroughly mixed in 0.4% of iodized common salt. They were then cut into 2.5 – 3.0cm pieces before boiling. Boiling of the meat samples was done in a pot at a cooking temperature range above 100°C for 20 minutes using a “camp” gas cooker. After cooking the pieces of meat (3 replicates per treatment) were put in properly sealed plastic containers labeled according to the meat samples and placed in a cooler for about one hour to permit the internal temperature cooled to room temperature (20 – 25°C) [11].

Commented [SS12]: Reference??

Commented [SS13]: What is the range??

2.5.2. Data collection on sensory attributes of meat

The sensory evaluation test on the boiled meat of broilers fed the different test diets: T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄ were carried out at the open Animal Science and Fisheries Laboratory, Department of Agriculture, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Ndele campus. The Laboratory was well arranged to accommodate the taste panelists.

Commented [SS14]: This topic is not relevant to the para.

Commented [SS15]: Is this the same meat as in 2.5.1? if so indicate it.

Commented [SS16]: Now this is the first time these letters appear. Indicate them in the methods earlier.

2.5.3. Evaluation to ascertain sensory attributes of meat

Each pieces of the boiled meat (thigh and breast) were placed according to the four (4) feed treatments: T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄. Twelve (12) consumer untrained or trained ??? panelists (students) within the age range of 20 – 26 years were used for the sensory evaluation of the meat. The panelists were served the samples as soon as possible after preparation to prevent changes that may occur during holding since the samples can dry out or develop off-flavour. The panelist evaluated each sample for colour, flavor, tenderness, juiciness and toughness, based on the 4 – point scale, where: 4 = very desirable, 3 = slightly acceptable, 2 = unacceptable and 1 = very unacceptable with the help of copies of questionnaire.

Commented [SS17]: Pl state the reference

Commented [SS18]: In the abstract it says 6 panelists were for thigh and 6 were for breast muscle. Explain further here. Why not all 12 for both? Can you combine both results and come to a conclusion?

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [SS19]: Is there a reason for selecting this age group in this sensory evaluation? If there is pl state what is the reason.

Commented [SS20]: Prepared in 2.5.1????

Commented [SS21]: How far away??? Not in the same room?

The consumer panelists were seated far away from each other in a well-lit room during the session to avoid conversation and communication. At each successive chewing, the panelists were instructed to rinse their mouth with water to prevent the taste bud of the carry over effect from the previous sample-tasted.

2.5.4. Data analysis on sensory attributes of meat

At the end of the sensory evaluation, the questionnaires were retrieved from the consumer panelists and a comprehensive collation of scores based on their responses were made for preference rankings and overall acceptability of the ~~meat per~~ treatment meat.

2.6. Chemical analysis met quality????

Proximate chemical analyses of what (feed and meat????) what were the data dry matter, crude protein.....??? of the feed and meat samples per treatment were carried out according to the standard methods of [12].

Commented [SS22]: Indicate what and also give details of the equipment used.

2.7. Statistical analysis

The data obtained on meat quality attributes (.....) of the broilers from each treatment group were compared statistically on the basis of the different dietary treatments using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure for a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) using the SPSS version 20.0. Significant means were separated using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test [13]. Proximate analysis data.....

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Proximate composition of experimental diets

The proximate composition results of the broiler finisher diets (t1, t2...) containing garlic, ginger and their mixtures as phytochemical feed additives for the different experimental birds is presented in Table 2.

The results in Table 2 of proximate analysis of the experimental broiler finisher diets revealed that significant differences ($P < 0.05$) occurred among the nutritional compositions of the broiler finisher diets. Correspondingly, the range of nutrient compositions in the experimental broiler finisher diets were: (14.75 – 18.32%) for crude protein (CP), (8.00 – 11.00) for ash, (4.05 – 5.00%) for ether extract (EE), (7.50 – 10.25) for crude fibre (CF), (58.14 – 64.05%) for nitrogen free extract (NFE) and (2,974.86 – 3,223.51 kcal/kg) for metabolizable energy (ME). Not needed as the table shows them. Instead talk about what nutrient is significantly different and similar.....

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

The differences in the nutrient composition of the various experimental broiler finisher diets may be attributed to the variations in addition of the feed additives (garlic and ginger). For instance, the nutrient composition as presented by the proximate analysis of the formulated diets (T₁- no garlic or ginger - control; T₂- 100% garlic only; T₃ – 100% ginger only and T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger) is a reflection of the individual nutrients (especially, CP and NFE). It was however, noticed that, the range of CP content (14.75 – 18.32%) for the formulated experimental broiler finisher diets was lower than the average CP content (19.00%) recommended by [14] while determining the minimum crude protein level of broiler finisher rations in the tropics. Furthermore, the metabolizable energy (ME) values of 2,974.86 – 3,223.51 kcal/kg for the experimental finisher diet was within the values of 3,200kcal/kg metabolizable energy for finisher broilers recommended by [14].

Commented [SS23]: Why did not you balance for the broiler requirement? In addition to the treatment effect on birds there can be an effect due to lack of proteins too. How can you differentiate both effects?

Table 2: Proximate composition (g/100g dry matter) of broiler finisher diets containing Garlic, Ginger and their mixtures as phytochemical feed additives.

Parameters	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	Mean	SEM±
	Control (No Garlic or Ginger)	100% Garlic only	100% Ginger only	50%Garlic + 50%Ginger		
Crude protein (CP)	15.45 ^b	14.75 ^c	18.32 ^a	16.56 ^b	16.27	1.52
Ash	8.00 ^b	10.5 ^a	8.55 ^b	11.00 ^a	9.51	0.75
Ether extracts (EE)	5.00 ^a	4.55	4.75	4.05	4.59	0.25
Crude fibre (CF)	7.50 ^c	9.50 ^b	10.00 ^{ab}	10.25 ^a	9.31	1.07
Nitrogen free extracts (NFE)	64.05 ^a	60.70 ^a	58.38 ^b	58.14 ^b	60.32	2.05
**ME (kcal/kg DM)	3223.51 ^a	3043.29 ^b	3102.24 ^b	2974.86 ^c	3,085.98	101.04

^{a,b&c}Means bearing different superscripts along the same row are significantly different ($P < 0.05$); **ME (kcal/kg) = (35 × % CP) + (81.8 × % EE) + (35.5 × % NFE) [15].

Commented [SS24]: Is there a difference?? Superscripts missing?

Formatted: Highlight

3.2. Meat quality attributes of broilers fed different experimental diets

Table 3 shows the quality attributes of the thigh and breast meat of broilers fed diets containing garlic, ginger and their mixtures as phytochemical feed additives. ~~The feed treatments and their designations are: T₁—no garlic or ginger; T₂—100% garlic only; T₃—100% ginger only and T₄—50% garlic + 50% ginger respectively. The results of the thigh and breast meat of broilers fed these feed revealed that significant differences ($P < 0.05$) occurred among the meat quality parameters in terms of their Water Holding Capacity (WHC), pH, Fat Binding Capacity (FBC) and Cook Loss (CL).~~

Commented [SS25]: Quality included nutritional quality too. Did you measure them?

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [SS26]: This should go to methods section

in the text you have to explain the data. WHC was highest ($P < 0.05$) in T₂ compared to T₄ which in turn was higher ($P < 0.05$) than T₁ and T₃.....

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The Water Holding Capacity (WHC) of the thigh meat of the broilers fed the different experimental diets were in the decreasing order of 64.52 > 63.57 > 61.53 > 61.20 for the broilers fed T₂—100% garlic only; T₄—50% garlic + 50% ginger; T₃—100% ginger only and T₁—no garlic or ginger respectively of the experimental diets. However, the highest ($P < 0.05$ or $P > 0.05$) value of WHC of thigh meat of the meat from the thighs of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₂—garlic only diets, while the lowest value of WHC of the meat from the thighs of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁—no garlic or ginger

Commented [SS27]: Significantly or not????

experimental diets. Similarly, the WHC of the breast meat of the broilers fed the different experimental diets were in the decreasing order of 60.62 > 60.40 > 58.49 > 54.08 for the broilers fed T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger; T₃ - 100% ginger only; T₂- 100% garlic only and T₁- no garlic or ginger respectively of the experimental diets. However, the highest value of WHC of breast meat of the meat from the breast of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed with the T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger diets, while the lowest value of WHC of the meat from the breast of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁- no garlic or ginger experimental diets. Therefore, for both the thigh and breast meat from the broilers fed with the diets containing the feed additives in their various combinations exhibited meats with higher WHC. The graphical presentation of the effects of the different experimental diets on the WHC of the thigh and breast meat of broilers is presented in Fig 1.




Figure 1: Water Holding Capacity (WHC) of thigh and breast meat of broilers

The pH of the thigh meat of broilers were in the decreasing order of 5.86 > 5.73 > 5.67 > 5.49 for the broilers fed T₃ - 100% ginger only, T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₂- 100% garlic only for the different experimental diets respectively. However, the highest value of pH of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₃ - 100% ginger only experimental diets, while the lowest value of pH of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₂ - 100% garlic only experimental diets. Similarly, the pH of the breast meat of broilers fed the different experimental diets were in the decreasing order of 5.82 > 5.59 > 5.39 > 5.21 for the broilers fed T₃ - 100% ginger only, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger, T₂ - 100% garlic only and T₁- no garlic or ginger respectively of the experimental diets. However, the highest value of pH of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₃ - 100% ginger only experimental diets, while the lowest value of pH of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁- no garlic or ginger experimental diets. Consequently, judging the meat quality based on pH, the meat of broilers fed T₂ - 100% garlic only revealed a better quality. This is in agreement with the reports of [16] who explained that meat of high quality has ultimate pH at the range of 5.4–5.6. The graphical presentation of the effects of the different experimental diets on the pH thigh and breast meat of broilers is shown in Fig 2.

Commented [SS28]: This sentence and the one above are discussing the same thing. You can leave one and remove the other.


Commented [SS29]: No need to repeat/explain the treatments again as it is in the table and methods. Again say significantly or not.

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [SS30]: You need to compare your results and comment here.

Commented [SS31]: Significant levels on bars?????


Commented [SS32]: Rewrite as shown in WHC section



Commented [SS33]: Significant level on bars??

Figure 2: pH of thigh and breast meat of broilers.

The Fat binding capacity (FBC) of the thigh meat of broilers were in the decreasing order of $9.68 > 9.32 > 9.28 > 9.14$ for the broilers fed T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger, T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₂- 100% garlic only and T₃ – 100% ginger only for the different experimental diets respectively. However, the highest value of FBC of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger experimental diets, while the lowest value of PS of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₃ – 100% ginger only experimental diets. Similarly, the FBC of the breast meat of broilers fed the different experimental diets were in the decreasing order of $9.82 > 8.05 > 5.66 > 5.49$ for the broilers fed T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₂- 100% garlic only, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₁- no garlic or ginger respectively of the experimental diets. However, the highest value of FBC of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₃ – 100% ginger only experimental diets, while the lowest value of FBC of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁- no garlic or ginger experimental diets. The graphical presentation of the effects of the different experimental diets on the FBC of the thigh and breast meat of broilers is presented in Fig 3.



Commented [SS34]: Significant level on bars?

Figure 3: Fat binding capacity (FBC) of thigh and breast meat of broilers.

The Cook loss (CL) of the thigh meat of broilers were in the decreasing order of 21.86 > 20.35 > 20.24 > 19.56 for the broilers fed T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger, T₃ – 100% ginger only and T₂- 100% garlic only for the different experimental diets respectively. However, the highest value of CL of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁- no garlic or ginger experimental diets, while the lowest value of CL of the meat from the thigh of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₂- 100% garlic only experimental diets. Similarly, the CL of the breast meat of broilers fed the different experimental diets were in the decreasing order of 21.44 > 20.67 > 20.01 > 19.71 for the broilers fed T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₂- 100% garlic only respectively of the experimental diets. However, the highest value of CL of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₁- no garlic or ginger experimental diets, while the lowest value of CL of the meat from the breast meat of the broilers was reported for the broilers fed the T₂- 100% garlic only experimental diets. The graphical presentation of the effects of the different experimental diets on the CL of the thigh and breast meat of broilers is shown in Fig 4.




Figure 4: The cooking loss (CL) of the thigh and breast meat of broilers

3.3. Sensory evaluation of boiled (thigh and breast) meat of broilers fed the experimental diets by taste panelist

The results of the sensory evaluation scores and overall acceptability ranking of the boiled (thigh and breast) meat of broilers fed the experimental diets: ~~T₁- no garlic or ginger (control), T₂- 100% garlic only, T₃- 100% ginger only and T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger respectively as given~~ by taste panelists based on the sensory parameters: colour, flavour, tenderness, juiciness and toughness is presented in **Table 4 and Figure 5** respectively. The studies on the sensory analysis of boiled broiler meat (thigh and breast) was carried out to ascertain the influence the incorporation of phytochemical feed additives (garlic only, ginger only and garlic + ginger) in broiler diets will impact on the sensory qualities (colour, flavour, tenderness, juiciness and toughness) and how these parameters may influence the preference and acceptability of meat by consumers.

The sensory analysis score (Table 4) by the taste panelists based on visual appraisal in assessing the preferred colour of the boiled meat for the thigh in **ascending** order was 9 > 14 > 18 and > 19 for T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger, T₂- 100% garlic only and T₃ – 100% ginger only respectively. Similarly, the sensory analysis score by the taste panelists based on visual appraisal in assessing the preferred colour of the boiled meat for breast in ascending order was 10 > 13 > 15 and > 22 for T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- garlic + ginger, T₃ – ginger only and T₂- garlic only respectively. The meat of the broilers fed with the phytochemical feed additives had the tendency of having a better eye appeal (yellow-skinned colour) for the thighs and breast with the increasing amounts of maize in the diets as recorded by the taste panelist. The **yellow-skinned colour** of the meat samples (thigh and breast) may be as a result of the use of yellow maize in the experimental diet formulations. Yellow maize has been reported to possess β- carotene [17] which may have resulted the yellowish skin colour that would have influenced the choice of the taste panelist and their preference rankings [18].

The sensory analysis score (Table 4) by the taste panelists based on the preferred flavour of the boiled meat for thigh in ascending order was 10 > 11 > 19 > 20 for T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₂- 100% garlic only respectively. Similarly, the sensory analysis score by the taste panelists based on preferred flavour of boiled meat for breast in ascending order was 11 > 13 > 15 > 21 for T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₂- garlic only respectively. Based on the sensory scores of the taste panellists the meat samples (thigh and breast) T₂- 100% garlic only

Commented [SS35]: Give one type only

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [SS36]: State statistically.

Commented [SS37]: Are you sure it is due to maize?? Support your results with others' work.

portrayed the best flavour. This may be attributed to the crude proteins in the composite experimental broiler finisher diets and type of diet [19] as well as the additional presence of vitamins and β - carotene in the yellow maize. This is agreement with the findings of [20], who explained that the availability of additional protein source and provision of some necessary vitamins, minerals and oxycarotenoids in supplemental leaf meals and spices will have an impact on the flavour of meat.

Commented [SS38]: In your diets, CP was not enough for broiler growth. You did not balance it to the requirement. Use other references to support your findings.

Commented [SS39]: Not relevant to your study???

The sensory analysis score (Table 4) by the taste panelists based on the preferred tenderness of the boiled meat for thigh in ascending order was 12 > 14 > 16 > 18 for T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger, T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₂- 100% garlic only and T₃ – 100% ginger only respectively. Similarly, the sensory analysis score by the taste panelists based on preferred tenderness of boiled meat for breast in ascending order was 13 > 14 > 16 > 17 for T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₁- no ginger or garlic, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₂- garlic only respectively.

From the results obtained (Table 4), there were no clear patterns or relationships and explanations for the disparities in the tenderness, juiciness and toughness of the meat samples for the thigh and breast meat as scored by the panellists.

Furthermore, sensory analysis score (Table 4) based on the overall acceptability or preference of the thigh and breast meat of broilers as presented in Table 4, are in the descending order of 89 > 83 > 68 > 60 for T₂- 100% garlic only, T₃ – 100% ginger only, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₁- no garlic or ginger for the thigh and 84 > 80 > 72 > 64 for T₂- 50% garlic only, T₁- no garlic or ginger, T₄- 50% garlic + 50% ginger and T₃ – 100% ginger only for the breast meat respectively. The overall acceptability or preference of the thigh and breast meat by the panelists is the revelation of their cumulative sensory score (responses) to all the sensory parameters (colour, flavour, tenderness, juiciness and toughness). Thus, meat samples of **T₂** the thigh and breast for T₂- garlic only were most acceptable judging when considering by the responses of the panelists (Fig 5).

Commented [SS40]: Significant levels??




Figure 5: Overall acceptability of thigh and breast of broilers by taste panelists.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 3: Meat quality parameters of thigh and breast meat of broilers fed diets containing garlic, ginger and their mixtures as phytochemical feed additives

Parameters	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	Mean	SEM±
	Control (No Garlic or Ginger)	100% Garlic only	100% Ginger only	50% Garlic + 50% Ginger		
Thigh Muscle						
Water Holding Capacity (WHC)	61.20 ^c	64.52 ^a	61.53 ^c	63.57 ^b	62.71	0.54
Ph	5.73 ^b	5.49 ^c	5.86 ^a	5.67 ^b	5.69	0.08
Fat Binding Capacity (FBC)	9.32 ^{bc}	9.28 ^c	9.14 ^d	9.68 ^a	9.36	0.05
Cooking Loss (CL)	21.86 ^a	19.56 ^d	20.24 ^c	20.35 ^b	20.50	0.04
Breast Muscle						
Water Holding Capacity (WHC)	54.08 ^c	58.49 ^b	60.40 ^a	60.62 ^a	58.40	0.62
Ph	5.21 ^d	5.39 ^c	5.82 ^a	5.59 ^b	5.50	0.06
Fat Binding Capacity (FBC)	5.49 ^d	8.05 ^b	9.82 ^a	5.66 ^c	7.26	0.05
Cooking Loss (CL)	21.44 ^a	19.71 ^d	20.67 ^b	20.01 ^c	20.46	0.04

^{a-d} Means bearing different superscripts along the same row are significantly different ($P < 0.05$). SEM = Standard Error of Mean.

in the text you have to explain the data. WHC was highest ($P < 0.05$) in T₂ compared to T₄ which in turn was higher ($P < 0.05$) than T₁ and T₃.....

Table 4: Sensory evaluation scores and overall acceptability rankings of thigh and breast meat of boiled meat of broilers fed diets supplemented with phytochemical feed additives.

Meat samples	Sensory parameters							Sensory parameters						
	Thigh							Breast						
	Col	Flav	Tend	Juice	Tough	Total	Acceptability Ranking	Col	Flav	Tend	Juice	Tough	Total	Acceptability Ranking
T ₁	18	10	14	9	9	60	4 th	22	13	14	14	17	80	2 nd
T ₂	19	20	16	17	17	89	1 st	15	21	17	13	18	84	1 st
T ₃	14	11	18	20	20	83	2 nd	13	11	13	17	10	64	4 th
T ₄	9	19	12	14	14	68	3 rd	10	15	16	16	15	72	3 rd
Total	60	60	60	60	60	300		60	60	60	60	60	300	

T₁ = no garlic or ginger (control); T₂ = garlic only; T₃ = ginger only and T₄ = garlic + ginger; Col = colour; Flav = flavour; Tend = tenderness; Tough = toughness.

Commented [SS41]: Not given in the text. Better to give either the table or figure. Not needed of both

Commented [SS42]: Overall results???
Significant levels????
Did you do any statistical analysis?

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The meat quality water holding capacity (WHC), pH, fat binding capacity (FBC), cooking loss (CL), sensory (colour, flavour, tenderness, juiciness and toughness) attributes, consumers' preference and overall acceptability of the thigh and breast meat from broilers fed diets containing garlic, ginger and their mixtures as phytochemical feed additives was very positive.

REFERENCES

1. Elagib, H. A., Abbas, S. A., & Elamin, K. M. (2013). Effect of different natural feed additives compared to antibiotic on performance of broiler chicks under high temperature. *Bulletin of Environmental and Pharmacological Life Sciences*, 2, 139-144.
2. Costa, L.B., Tse, M.L.P., & Miyada, V.S. (2007). Extratos vegetais como alternativas aos antimicrobianos promotores de crescimento para leitões recém-desmamados. *Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia*, 36, 589-595.
3. Ferrini, G., Baucells, M.D., Esteve-Garcia, E., & Barroeta, A.C. (2008). Dietary polyunsaturated fat reduces skin fat as well as abdominal fat in broiler chickens. *Poultry Science*, 87, 528-535.
4. Gilani, S.M.H., Zehra, S., Galani, S., & Ashraf, A. (2018). Effect of natural growth promoters on immunity, and biochemical and haematological parameters of broiler chickens. *Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 17, 627-633.
5. Hayajneh, F.M.F. (2019). Natural feed additives for broiler chickens. *South African Journal of Animal Science*, 49 (5), 867 – 873.
6. Tyagi, S., Chirag J.P., Poonam, D., Dhruv, M., Ishita, S., Labu, Z.K., Gupta, A.K., & Pate, K.N. (2013). Importance of garlic (*Allium sativum*): An exhaustive review. *Journal of Drug Discovery and Therapeutics*, 1(4), 23-27.
7. Tsao, S.M. & Yin, M.C. (2001). *In vitro* antimicrobial activity of four diallyl sulphides occurring naturally in garlic and Chinese leek oil. *Journal of Medical Microbiology*, 50, 646-649.
8. Keskin, S., Kor, A., & Karaca, S. (2012). Evaluation of sensory characteristics of sheep and goat meat by Procrustes Analysis. *Czech Journal of Animal Science*, 57(11), 516 -521.
9. Rodrigues, S., & Teixeira, A. (2009) Effect of sex and carcass weight on sensory quality of goat meat of Cabrito Transmontano. *Journal of Animal Science*, 87,711–715.
10. Kalio, G.A., Okafor, B.B., & Legbara, K.P. (2009). Multipurpose trees and shrub foliage as valuable feed resources for integration into commercial snail farming. *Journal of Vocational Education and Technology*, 6 (1 & 2), 143 – 150.
11. Fabiyi, E.F. (2005). Proposed cooking method for satisfactory flavor of Nigerian broiler consumers. *Nigerian Food Journal*. 23, 248 – 251.
12. AOAC. (1990). *Official Method of Analysis*.15th Edition. (Association of Official Analytical Chemist. Washington, DC, USA).

13. Obi, I.U. (2001). *Statistical Method of Detecting between Treatment Means*. SNAAP Press Nigeria Limited, Enugu, Nigeria.
14. Benerjee, G.C. (2004). *A textbook of animal husbandry*, (8th Edition). Oxford and IBH Pub., Co., PVT, LTD.
15. Pausenga, U. (1985). Feeding Parent Stock. *Zootechnica International*. 22-24pp.
16. Węglarz, A. (2010). Meat quality defined based on pH and colour depending on cattle category and slaughter season. *Czech Journal of Animal Science*, 55 (12), 548–556.
17. Sirri, F., Petracci, M., Bianchi, M., & Meluzzi, A. (2010). Survey of skin pigmentation of yellow-skinned broiler chickens. *Poultry Science*, 89, 1556 – 1561.
18. Egesel, C.O., Wong, J.C., Lambert, R.J., & Rocheford, T.R. (2003). Combining ability of maize inbreds for carotenoids and tocopherols. *Crop Science Journal*, 43,818 – 823.
19. Imafidon, G.I., & Spanier, A.M. (1994). Unveiling the secret of meat flavour. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*. 5, 315 – 321.
20. Fasuyi, A.O., & Nonyerem, A.D. (2007). Biochemical, nutritional and haematological implications of *Telfairia occidentalis* leaf meal as protein supplement in broiler starter diets. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 6(8), 1055 -1065.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

