

Original Research Article

Study on Carcass Characteristics of two improved chicken breeds reared under intensive management system in Tanzania

ABSTRACT

The effect of breed on the carcass characteristic of two dual-purpose chickens reared under the intensive management system was studied. A total of 40 birds from Sasso and Kuroiler breeds (20 per breed) were randomly taken as a representative sample and were slaughtered and carcass dissected manually. The parameters for all breeds included bodyweight at slaughter (BW_s), carcass weight (CW), dressing percentage (DP %), parts yield including breast, drumsticks, thighs, wings, back and neck. With regard to all parameters collected, the two breeds were found to be significantly ($P < 0.05$) different for all carcass characteristics. The BW_s, CW and all carcass parts weight were significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher for Sasso than Kuroiler. In addition, Sasso had higher proportions of breast, back and wings than Kuroiler but the two breeds were comparable on thighs, drumsticks and neck. There were significant and positive phenotypic correlations between BW_s and all carcass traits studied.

Keywords: Carcass traits, Correlation, Kuroiler bird, Sasso bird

1. INTRODUCTION

The poultry meat industry has experienced rapid expansion, particularly in the last 30 years which has been accompanied by the genetic development of genotypes that allow for greater meat yield [1]. Similarly, the demand for poultry and livestock products has increased significantly which leads most poultry-related development agencies to promote the intensification of improved poultry systems. When considering the improvements in the poultry industry in terms of new genotypes, it is imperative to provide information that helps producers and consumers to make informed decisions about the genetic potential of those genotypes in different production systems and environments. Sasso and Kuroiler are genetically improved dual-purpose breeds which have been introduced in Tanzania to support poverty reduction, productivity growth and increased household's animal protein intake [2]. The advantage of these breeds and other dual-purpose birds over the commercial egg or meat-type chickens is their duality where males are used for meat production and

20 females for egg production [3]. Performance test in terms of growth, egg production and
21 survivability of these breeds has been done, and the results have been documented [4, 5, 6].
22 In the production chain, carcass and parts yields provide valuable information to guide
23 producers on which breed to keep or when to slaughter the birds. Some studies have shown
24 carcass yield and proportions of carcass parts in chickens to be affected by several factors
25 among which is the genotype. While investigating the slaughter characteristics of male dual-
26 purpose chickens under the intensive management system, Biazen *et al.* [7] showed that the
27 Kuroiler had heavier slaughter weight, dressed carcass weight, eviscerated carcass weight,
28 breast weight, thigh weight, and drumstick weight than other breeds. Similarly, studies by
29 Ibrahim *et al.* [8] and Mueller *et al.* [3] have shown differences among different dual-purpose
30 chicken breeds on carcass yields as well as proportions of carcass parts. In more recent
31 carcass evaluations, Sanka *et al.* [9] did not find significant differences between Sasso and
32 Kuroiler on carcass weight and carcass parts when chickens were subjected to varying
33 levels of feed supplementation under semi-scavenging conditions. Thus, knowledge of
34 carcass parameters between and among different genetic groups is important in the
35 formulation of breeding plans under different management systems. Therefore, this study
36 intended to evaluate the carcass traits of male chickens of Sasso and Kuroiler breeds under
37 the intensive management system.

38

39 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

40 **2.1 Location of the study area**

41 The study was conducted at the Poultry farm of Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA). The
42 University is located at the foothills of the Uluguru Mountains in Morogoro, Eastern Tanzania
43 between latitude 06° 50"S and longitude 37° 39"E about 550 meter above sea level. The
44 highest mean maximum temperature is above 31°C during the months of November,
45 December, January and February and mean minimum temperature is around 16°C in June,
46 July and August. The relative humidity is 70% on average.

47

48 2.2 Management of the birds

49 A total of 240 (120 Kuroiler and 120 Sasso) male chickens were raised under the intensive
50 deep litter management system using rice husk as litter material. The house was open-sided
51 built using concrete blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheet. The adjacent pens were
52 partitioned with wire mesh which allowed good air circulation within the house. Spot
53 brooding was done using artificial heat (electric bulb). The chicks were randomly assigned to
54 six deep litter pens (3 for each breed), each having 40 birds. Following six weeks of
55 brooding, the same pens were used for grower birds. Each pen was equipped with enough
56 feeders and drinkers; kept under the same management conditions like space, light,
57 temperature, ventilation and relative humidity. The birds were offered commercial diets
58 produced by the Silverland Company located in Iringa region. During the brooding, birds
59 were provided with a starter diet in form of crumbles containing 2941 Kcal ME/kg and 21.2%
60 CP (0 - 2 weeks) and chick mash containing 3049 Kcal ME/kg and 20.3% CP (3 - 6 weeks).
61 A grower ration containing 15.5% CP and 2762 Kcal ME/kg was provided from the 7th to the
62 end of the 16th week of the age. Clean water was provided in ad-libitum throughout the
63 experimental period. The chemical compositions for starter and grower rations are
64 summarized in table 1.

65

66 **Table 1. Chemical Composition for starter and grower rations**

| Constituent | Starter ration | | Grower ration |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------|---------------|
| | Crumble | Mash | Mash |
| Crude Protein (%) | 21.2 | 20.3 | 15.5 |
| Metabolizable Energy (Kcal/ KgDM) | 2941 | 3049 | 2762 |
| Crude Fat (%) | 3.4 | 1.9 | 3.8 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------|------|------|
| Crude Fiber (%) | 2.7 | 2.9 | 6.8 |
| Ash (%) | 7.2 | 4.1 | 3.7 |
| Dry Matter (%) | 89.4 | 87.4 | 87.1 |
| Starch (%) | 42.4 | 49.2 | 42.3 |
| Total Sugar (%) | 3.49 | 2.99 | 3.82 |

67

68 **2.3 Carcass traits measurements**

69 At the end of the 16 weeks of age a sample of 40 birds, i.e.20 birds/breed were randomly
70 selected and slaughtered to determine carcass weight as well as carcass parts yield.
71 Sampled birds were starved for 12 hours but had free access to drinking water until
72 slaughter. The birds were slaughtered by cutting the jugular vein, bled for 120 seconds and
73 then scalded at about 55 – 60 °C for 60 seconds and manually de-feathered. The carcass
74 weight was taken after de-feathering and removal of feet, head and the viscera (gizzard,
75 heart, spleen, liver and intestine). The eviscerated carcass, breast, thighs, drumsticks,
76 wings, back and neck were weighed using a digital balance. Carcass weight data were used
77 to calculate the dressing percentage and carcass part composition (%) by taking the weight
78 of the individual parts as the percentage of the body weight at slaughter (BW_s) of the
79 chicken.

80

81 **2.4 Statistical data analysis**

82 The General Linear Models (GLM) procedure of SAS software [10] was used to analyze the
83 data for body weight at slaughter, carcass weight, and parts yield with the MANOVA option
84 for calculating partial correlation coefficients among the carcass trait variables. The breed
85 was considered as the fixed effects while individual bird was taken as a random effect. The
86 following Model was used

87 $Y_{ij} = \mu + B_i + E_{ijk} \dots \dots \dots (1)$

88 Where:

89 Y_{ijk} = observation (Bodyweight at slaughter, carcass weight, and carcass parts yield) from
90 the i th breed.

91 μ = General mean common to all observations in the study;

92 B_i = Effect of the i th breed (i = Kuroiler, Sasso);

93 E_{ijk} = Random effect peculiar to each bird.

94

95 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

96 3.1 Effect of breed on carcass characteristics

97 Carcass characteristics of Sasso and Kuroiler male chickens slaughtered at 16 weeks are
98 presented in Table 2. Significant ($P < 0.05$) differences were observed between the two
99 breeds on body weight at slaughter, carcass weight and carcass parts weight. Sasso
100 chickens presented heavier body weight at slaughter (2340.8 g) than Kuroiler (2000.8 g).
101 Likewise, Sasso had significant ($P < 0.05$) higher carcass weight and Dressing percentage
102 (DP %) than Kuroiler which implies existence of genetic differences between the two breeds
103 in growth rate and muscle deposition.

104

105 **Table 2. Least square mean values for the effects of breed on carcass yield of dual-**
106 **purpose male chickens slaughtered at 16th week of age.**

| Variable | Breed | | SEM | P-value |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|---------|
| | Kuroiler | Sasso | | |
| BW at slaughter (g) | 2000.80 ^b | 2340.80 ^a | 57.52 | 0.0001 |
| Carcass weight (g) | 1346.60 ^b | 1622.50 ^a | 39.90 | <.0001 |
| Dressing % | 67.56 ^b | 69.20 ^a | 0.51 | 0.0299 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|
| Breast weight (g) | 335.10 ^b | 419.00 ^a | 12.42 | <.0001 |
| Thigh weight (g) | 247.70 ^b | 271.90 ^a | 7.34 | 0.0252 |
| Drumstick weight (g) | 221.40 ^b | 252.50 ^a | 6.96 | 0.0031 |
| Back weight (g) | 257.20 ^b | 335.40 ^a | 9.25 | <.0001 |
| Wing weight (g) | 188.00 ^b | 212.30 ^a | 5.09 | 0.0017 |
| Neck weight (g) | 87.60 ^b | 115.70 ^a | 3.35 | <.0001 |

107 ^{a-b} Means with different superscripts within a row differed significantly (P<0.05), SEM =

108 Standard error of the mean; BW= Bodyweight

109

110 This observation agrees with the reports of Mueller *et al.* [3], Ibrahim *et al.* [8] and Biazen *et*
111 *al.* [7] who also revealed the existence of breed/genotype differences in the slaughter weight
112 of chickens. As expected, birds with higher growth potentials (i.e., higher BWs) will present a
113 higher meat production capacity (carcass yield). In the present study, the Sasso breed also
114 had a heavier (P < 0.05) carcass than Kuroiler. The carcass weight (1622.50 g) for Sasso
115 chickens observed in the present study was higher than 1400.6 g for Koekoek chickens and
116 1415.4 g for Lohman Dual reported by Ibrahim *et al.* [8] but comparable to 1677 g and
117 1684.4 g for Sasso 51 and Novo Brown chickens reported by Mueller *et al.* [3] and Ibrahim *et*
118 *al.* [8] respectively. Similarly, the carcass weight for Kuroiler chickens observed in the
119 present study (1346.60 g) was comparable to 1400.6 g for Koekoek chickens reported by
120 Ibrahim *et al.* [8] but lower than 1677 g for Sasso 51 reported by Mueller *et al.* [3]. Moreover,
121 the mean carcass weights of both Kuroiler and Sasso in the present study were lower than
122 the report of Mueller *et al.* [3] and Siekmann *et al.* [11] for carcass weight of fast-growing
123 commercial broiler lines of Ross PM3 (1760 g) and Ross 308 (2182.5 g) respectively.
124 Generally, the BWs and CW observed in the present study for both Sasso and Kuroiler at 16
125 weeks are comparable to the market weight i.e. 2kg for fast-growing chickens kept for less
126 than 8 weeks. This supports the suggestion by Biazen *et al.* [7] that despite the longer
127 growing period required for dual-purpose chicken breeds than the fast-growing broiler, males

128 of the two breeds can still be utilized as alternative meat-type chicken in places where
129 specialized broilers are not accessible or where the local types are considered to be un-
130 economical given their slow growth and lower body weight at slaughter.

131 The dressing percentage (DP %) was higher for Sasso (70.63%) than Kuroiler (68.54%)
132 which is likely the result of higher bodyweight of Sasso chickens. The observed dressing
133 percentages for Sasso and Kuroiler in the present study were higher than (66.75%) for
134 Kuroiler chickens reported by Aline [12] in Uganda, but lower than the range 71.02 – 72.97%
135 for various broiler strains reported by Fernandes *et al.* [13]. The difference in dressing
136 percentage between this study and those reported by other authors might be associated with
137 several factors including genotype, sex, length of feed withdrawal before processing, length
138 of starvation before slaughtering and the birds rearing system [14].

139

140 The carcass parts including the breast, thighs, drumsticks, back, wings and neck were also
141 heavier for Sasso than Kuroiler (Table 2). The breast, thighs, drumsticks are considered the
142 most valuable carcass parts in broiler and dual-purpose male chickens kept for meat
143 production while the back, wings and neck are regarded as less valuable carcass parts [7].
144 The higher performance of Sasso in these traits might be directly related to the carcass
145 weight, whereby Sasso had higher proportions than Kuroiler. This observation is supported
146 by the reports of Katekhaye [15], Rezaei *et al.* [16], Biazen *et al.* [7] and several authors who
147 have also indicated higher carcass parts weight for heavier birds.

148

149 The data for carcass parts expressed as a percentage of the BWs are presented in Table 3.
150 The proportions of breast, back and neck were higher ($P < 0.05$) for Sasso than for Kuroiler.
151 The proportions of thighs, drumsticks and the wings did not differ ($P > 0.05$) between the two
152 breeds, suggesting that although the two breeds differed in body weight at slaughter and
153 carcass weights, yet the share of thighs, drumsticks and wings to the total weight were
154 similar. This observation is in agreement with that of Lichovníková *et al.* [17] who also found

155 insignificant differences for the proportion of leg muscle (thigh and drumstick) between fast-
 156 growing chickens and layer male chickens. The highest carcass part observed was the
 157 breast (17.86 and 16.77 % for Sasso and Kuroiler respectively), while the lowest was the
 158 neck (4.93 and 4.38% for Sasso and Kuroiler respectively). A higher proportion of breast to
 159 the total BWs might be related to the effect of selection for meat production where more
 160 attention is placed on the breast proportion [14]. Though the breeds used are not pure meat
 161 birds, by being dual-purpose birds, they thus carry genes from meat breeds. Thus, the
 162 higher carcass weight and breast proportion of the Sasso males is an indication that the
 163 breed is relatively better for meat production under intensive management than Kuroiler.

164
 165

166 **Table 3. Least square mean values for the effects of breed on carcass yield of dual-**
 167 **purpose male chickens slaughtered at 16th week of age (carcass parts expressed as a**
 168 **percentage of the BWs).**

| Variable | Breed | | SEM | P-value |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------|---------|
| | Kuroiler | Sasso | | |
| Breast weight | 16.77 ^b | 17.86 ^a | 0.28 | 0.0096 |
| Thigh weight | 12.38 | 11.83 | 0.13 | 0.0562 |
| Drumstick weight | 11.12 | 10.75 | 0.14 | 0.0806 |
| Back weight | 12.92 ^b | 14.28 ^a | 0.22 | 0.0001 |
| Wing weight | 9.48 | 9.06 | 0.16 | 0.0788 |
| Neck weight | 4.38 ^b | 4.93 ^a | 0.08 | <.0001 |

169 ^{a-b} Means with different superscripts within a row differed significantly (P<0.05), SEM =
 170 Standard error of the mean, BWs = Body weight at slaughter.

171

172 However, the choice of breed type for meat production is influenced not only by bird growth
173 but also by the cost of production. Indeed, it would be useful and practical to undertake a
174 study aimed at comparing carcass and parts yield for these breeds when slaughtered at
175 different ages under different management systems to determine their cost-effectiveness
176 and the ultimate quality of the final product i.e. meat. For example, local chickens have lower
177 carcass weight as well as low yield of carcass parts, moreover, in terms of consumer
178 preference, such meat scored better compared to broiler [18]. This may imply a tradeoff
179 between time to slaughter and final product quality based on the market preference.

180

181 **3.2 Correlation coefficients of carcass characteristics**

182 Correlation coefficients (r) between BWs and CW and parts yield of Sasso and Kuroiler
183 chickens are shown in Table 4. Significant positive correlations were obtained between BWs,
184 CW and other carcass traits of the two breeds except for the relationship between wing and
185 neck weight for Sasso, which was positive but not significant (0.36). The highest correlation
186 was observed between body weight at slaughter (BW_s) and carcass weight (0.99) in both
187 breeds, while the lowest was between wing weight and neck weight (0.36 and 0.68 for Sasso
188 and Kuroiler respectively). With regard to the correlation between BW_s and carcass parts,
189 the breast had the highest correlation (0.98 and 0.95 for Sasso and Kuroiler respectively)
190 while the neck had the lowest (0.73 and 0.80 for Sasso and Kuroiler respectively).

191 The positive correlation values recorded in this study for all carcass traits and BW_s of the
192 two breeds suggest that there are genetic relationships between and among carcass traits
193 and hence, the BW_s of chicken can be used to predict the carcass weight as well as parts
194 yield from live body weight before slaughter. This observation is in accordance with the
195 finding of Olawumi [19] on Arbor and Acre chickens in Nigeria.

196

197 **Table 4. Correlation coefficients (r) between body weight at slaughter, carcass weight,**
 198 **and carcass traits of Sasso and Kuroiler chickens**

| Breed | Trait | Slaughter weight | Carcass weight | Breast | Thigh | Drumstick | Back | Wing | Neck |
|----------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sasso | Slaughter weight | 1 | 0.99 ^{***} | 0.98 ^{***} | 0.88 ^{**} | 0.92 ^{***} | 0.90 ^{***} | 0.85 ^{**} | 0.73 [*] |
| Kuroiler | | 1 | 0.99 ^{***} | 0.95 ^{***} | 0.82 ^{**} | 0.93 ^{***} | 0.92 ^{***} | 0.90 ^{***} | 0.80 ^{**} |
| Sasso | Carcass | | 1 | 0.98 ^{***} | 0.90 ^{***} | 0.92 ^{***} | 0.91 ^{***} | 0.85 ^{**} | 0.74 [*] |
| Kuroiler | | | 1 | 0.95 ^{***} | 0.83 ^{**} | 0.92 ^{***} | 0.93 ^{***} | 0.91 ^{***} | 0.82 ^{**} |
| Sasso | Breast | | | 1 | 0.93 ^{***} | 0.96 ^{***} | 0.91 ^{***} | 0.84 ^{**} | 0.73 [*] |
| Kuroiler | | | | | 1 | 0.91 ^{***} | 0.92 ^{***} | 0.96 ^{***} | 0.88 ^{***} |
| Sasso | Thigh | | | | 1 | 0.85 ^{**} | 0.86 ^{**} | 0.67 [*] | 0.75 [*] |
| Kuroiler | | | | | | 1 | 0.72 [*] | 0.87 ^{***} | 0.65 [*] |
| Sasso | Drumstick | | | | | 1 | 0.84 ^{**} | 0.87 ^{***} | 0.60 [*] |
| Kuroiler | | | | | | | 1 | 0.86 ^{**} | 0.90 ^{***} |
| Sasso | Back | | | | | | 1 | 0.62 [*] | 0.89 ^{***} |
| Kuroiler | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.86 ^{**} |
| Sasso | Wing | | | | | | | 1 | 0.36 ^{ns} |
| Kuroiler | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Sasso | Neck | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Kuroiler | | | | | | | | | |

199 ^{***}(P < 0.0001); ^{**}(P < 0.001); ^{*}(P < 0.05); ^{ns}(P > 0.05).

200

201 **4. CONCLUSION**

202 Based on the results of the present study, it is concluded that Sasso males showed higher
 203 body weight at slaughter, higher carcass weight and higher parts weight than Kuroiler. The

204 correlation between body weight at slaughter with carcass weight and carcass parts were
205 high and positive.

206

207 **ETHICAL APPROVAL**

208 National and institutional procedures for the care and use of animals were followed. The
209 study was approved by International Livestock Research Institute Institutional Animal Care
210 and Use Committee (ILRI IACUC) with reference number: IACUC-RC2016.26.

211 **DISCLAIMER**

212 This paper is an extended version of a thesis document of the same author.

213 **THE THESIS DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE IN THIS LINK:**

214 [http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/bitstream/handle/123456789/4655/FADHILI%20SAID%](http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/bitstream/handle/123456789/4655/FADHILI%20SAID%20GUNI%20THESIS%202021.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1)
215 [20GUNI%20THESIS%202021.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1](http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/bitstream/handle/123456789/4655/FADHILI%20SAID%20GUNI%20THESIS%202021.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1)

216

217 [as per journal policy, thesis article can be published as a journal article, provided it
218 is not published in any other journal]

219

220 **REFERENCES**

- 221 1. OECD. Market examinations in Mexico: Case study of the chicken meat
222 market.2018.
- 223 2. Ringo EJ, Mwenda V. Poultry subsector in Tanzania: A quick scan. Embassy of the
224 Kingdom of the Netherlands. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 2018; 31 pages
- 225 3. Mueller S, Kreuzer M, Siegrist M, Mannale K, Messikommer RE, Gangnat IDM.
226 Carcass and meat quality of dual-purpose chickens (Lohmann Dual, Belgian
227 Malines, Schweizerhuhn) in comparison to broiler and layer chicken types. Poultry
228 Science. 2018; 97: 3325-3336.
- 229 4. Sanka YD, Mbaga SH, Mutayoba SK, Katule AM, Goromela SH. Evaluation of
230 growth performance of Sasso and Kuroiler chickens fed three diets at varying levels

- 231 of supplementation under semi-intensive system of production in Tanzania. *Tropical*
232 *Animal Health and Production*. 2020; 52: 3315–3322.
- 233 5. Guni FS, Mbaga SH, Katule AM. Performance Evaluation of Kuroiler and Sasso
234 Chicken Breeds Reared under On-farm and On-station Management Conditions in
235 Tanzania. *European Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences*. 2021; 3(2): 53-59.
236 <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejfood.2021.3.2.254>.
- 237 6. Guni FS, Mbaga SH, Katule AM, Goromela EH. Performance evaluation of Kuroiler
238 and Sasso chicken breeds reared under farmer management conditions in highland
239 and lowland areas of Mvomero district, Eastern Tanzania. *Tropical Animal Health*
240 *and Production*. 2021; 53: 245. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-021-02693-4>.
- 241 7. Biazen A, Mengistu U, Negassi A, Getenet A, Solomon A, Tadelle D. Comparative
242 Growth Performance, Carcass Characteristics and Meat Quality of Local Horro and
243 Exotic Cockerels of Tropical Origin Fed Growers Diet. *Open Journal of Animal*
244 *Sciences*. 2021; 11: 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojas.2021.111006>.
- 245 8. Ibrahim D, Goshu G, Esatu W, Cahaner A. Dual-purpose production of genetically
246 different chicken crossbreeds in Ethiopia. 2. Egg and meat production of the final
247 crossbreed females and males. *Poultry Science*. 2019; 98: 3405–3417.
248 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-020-00328-w>.
- 249 9. Sanka YD, Mbaga SH, Mutayoba SK, Mushi DE. Performance of Sasso and Kuroiler
250 Chickens under Semi-Scavenging System in Tanzania: Carcass and Meat Quality.
251 *Asian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2021; 15: 1-12.
252 <https://scialert.net/abstract/?doi=ajpsaj.2021.1.12>.
- 253 10. SAS, Statistical Analytical System. User Guide for Personal Computers, Statistical
254 Programme. Windows Version 9.2, SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC, USA 2009.
- 255 11. Siekmann L, Meier-Dinkel L, Janisch S, Altmann B, Kaltwasser C, Sürle C, Krischek
256 C. Carcass quality, meat quality and sensory properties of the dual-purpose chicken
257 Lohmann Dual. *Foods*. 2018; 7(10): 156.

- 258 12. Aline K. Management Systems and Location Effects on Growth and Carcass Traits
259 of Kuroiler and Local Chickens. MSc. Thesis, Makerere University, Kampala 2015.
- 260 13. Fernandes JIM, Bortoluzzi C, Triques GE, Fróes A, Neto G, Peiter DC. Effect of
261 strain, sex and age on carcass parameters of broilers. *Acta Science*. 2013; 35: 99–
262 105.
- 263 14. Marapana RAUJ. Effect of Different Dress Weight Categories on Yield Part
264 Percentage and Relationship of Live and Dress Weight of Broiler Carcasses
265 Slaughter at Different Condition. *Journal of Food Science and Technology Nepal*.
266 2016; 9 (31-38): DOI:10.3126/jfstn.v9i0.14760.
- 267 15. Katekhaye AF. Comparative Study on Carcass Characteristics of Shrinidhi and
268 Vanaraja Chicken Varieties. Ph.D. Dissertation, P.V. Narsimha Rao Telangana
269 Veterinary University, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad 2017.
- 270 16. Rezaei M, Yngvesson J, Gunnarsson S, Jönsson L, Wallenbeck A. Feed Efficiency,
271 Growth Performance, and Carcass Characteristics of a Fast- and a Slower-Growing
272 Broiler Hybrid Fed Low- or High-Protein Organic Diets. *Organic Agriculture*. 2018;
273 8:121-128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-017-0178-6>.
- 274 17. Lichovníková M, Jandásek J, Jůzl M, Dračková E. The meat quality of layer males
275 from free range in comparison with fast growing chickens. *Czech Journal of Animal
276 Science*. 2009; 54: 490-497. <https://doi.org/10.17221/3/2009-CJAS>.
- 277 18. Kyarisiima CC, Nagujja FA, Magala H, Kwizera H, Kugonza DR, Bonabana-Wabbi J.
278 Perceived Tastes and Preferences of Chicken Meat in Uganda. *Livestock Research
279 for Rural Development*. 2011; 23 (11). www.Irrd.org/Irrd23/11/kyar23242.htm.
- 280 19. Olawumi SO. Phenotypic correlations between live body weight and Carcass traits in
281 arbor acre breed of broiler chicken. *International Journal of Science and Nature*.
282 2013; 4(1): 145-149
- 283
- 284

UNDER PEER REVIEW