

# WITHDRAWN: Sunflower Seed Meal and Probiotics in Short-term Feeding of Laying Hens

**Yasir Ditta**

UC Davis: University of California Davis

**Sadia Naseem**

University of CA, Davis

**Ketwee Saksrithai**

University of CA, Davis

**Annie J. King**

[ajking@ucdavis.edu](mailto:ajking@ucdavis.edu)

Department of Animal Science University of California 1 Shields Avenue Davis, CA 95616 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3000-2157>

---

## Research

**Keywords:** laying hens, probiotics, sunflower seed meal, growth performance, egg quality

**Posted Date:** January 5th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-136873/v1>

**License:** © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

## EDITORIAL NOTE:

The full text of this preprint has been withdrawn by the authors while they make corrections to the work. Therefore, the authors do not wish this work to be cited as a reference. Questions should be directed to the corresponding author.

# Abstract

## Background

Horticultural byproducts may be used to partially or completely replace more expensive soy and corn while providing adequate energy and protein for broilers and laying hens. Probiotics, such as lactic acid bacteria, may aid in digestion of fibrous byproducts such as sunflower seed meal containing complex carbohydrates that along with some amino acids may not be easily digested by monogastric animals. Thus, byproducts and probiotics, when fed to poultry, may improve the production of nutritious meat and eggs.

## Results

White Leghorn Crosses (64 layers at 65- to 74-wk-old) were fed one of four diets for four weeks. Diets were (1) a corn/soy Control, (2) Control + 20% sunflower seed meal (SFM), (3) Control + Probiotics (*Lactobacillus plantarum*, *rhamnosus*, and *paracasei* - each at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g for a total of approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g added in drinking water), and (4) Control + 20% SFM + Probiotics. Significance ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) and trends ( $P \leq 0.10$ ) were determined for production measurements as well as external and internal egg quality parameters. Diet did not significantly affect production measurements. There were trends due to Probiotics\*Week for FCR and SFM\*Probiotics\*Week for feed intake. For external egg quality, SFM significantly increased egg weight, decreased specific gravity, and caused a downward trend for egg shell thickness. SFM\*Week produced a significant effect on specific gravity. Probiotics significantly increased egg weight and egg shell weight while decreasing egg shell thickness; there was a trend due to temporal effects on specific gravity. For internal egg quality, SFM, SFM\*Week, Week, and SFM\*Probiotics\*Week significantly affected yolk color. Week affected all internal measurements and SFM\*Week caused weekly fluctuations, thereby producing a trend for Haugh unit.

## Conclusions

Diet had no effect on production measurements. SFM increased egg weight and decreased specific gravity; Probiotics increased egg weight, shell weight, and shell thickness. Future research is needed to assess production and egg quality parameters when feeding various fiber types, the digestibility of SFM/Probiotic diets, and colonization of varying quantities of probiotics (added in water and feed) in the gut of various types and ages of laying hens.

# Background

Due to the price variation in soybean meal and corn, poultry nutritionists seek partial or complete replacement for these ingredients with nutritious, lower priced horticultural byproducts in least cost formulations to increase profit margins [1]. Sunflower is a high oil-yielding seed crop which can be cultivated two to three times in tropical areas and is highly adaptive to various climates [2]. Sunflower seed meal (SFM), a rendered byproduct from the sunflower oil industry, is an inexpensive alternate source of vegetable protein and, possibly, energy for animals [2, 3]. The crude protein content of SFM, ranging from 29 to 45%, is inversely related to its crude fiber content (14 to 32%) and depends on de-hulling and oil extraction processes [4].

There are limits for use of SFM in feed for poultry and other monogastric animals because its high fiber content is not fully metabolized [5, 6]. As well, a lysine deficiency, a low digestion coefficient for lysine, and a negative correlation between fiber content and total metabolizable energy of SFM were reported [4, 7]. Enzymes could be added to diets to enhance digestibility of SFM; another possibility is inclusion of probiotics, live microbial non-digestible supplements that can colonize the intestine and ceca of poultry [8].

The major genera of bacteria involved in carbohydrate fermentation are *Bacteroides*, *Bacillus Bifidobacterium*, and *Lactobacillus* [9, 10]. Upon consumption, lactic acid bacteria are delivered into the gastrointestinal tract where they modify the intestinal milieu; and, if colonized, they increase the levels of amylase needed for catalysis of starch to sugars [11]. They can improve feed efficiency, productivity of laying hens, and egg quality measurements [12]. Due to recent advancements (solvent extraction and de-hulling techniques [13]) in SFM production and use of *Lactobacillus* probiotics for livestock, we investigated their short-term (four week) use, alone and in combination, to determine their efficacy on performance and external/internal egg quality for older layers.

# Materials And Methods

Sunflower seed meal (SFM, Table 1) was procured from the National Sunflower Association (NSA, Mandan, ND, USA). The nutrient composition of the meal was provided by NSA and used in formulation of diets. Ethoxyquine (150 ppm), an antioxidant, was added to SFM during manufacture of the meal. Upon receipt, the meal was immediately stored at -20 °C until use.

Table 1  
Nutrient composition<sup>1</sup> of sunflower seed meal.

Nutrients	Kcal/kg
ME <sup>2</sup>	318.2
True ME	347.7
	%
Moisture	10.00
Crude fat	1.8
Crude fiber	25.00
Ash	7.15
NF <sup>3</sup>	20.35
Calcium	0.27
Total Phosphorus	1.10
P (Available)	0.32
Inherent Fat	0.30
Sodium + KCl	0.02
Potassium	1.00
Chloride	0.01
Lysine	1.20
Methionine + cysteine	1.24
Leucine	1.96
Threonine	1.29
Isoleucine	1.29
Tryptophan	0.33
Valine	1.57
Choline	1.50
<sup>1</sup> Supplied by the National Sunflower Association (NSA, Mandan, ND, USA). <sup>2</sup> ME, metabolizable energy; <sup>3</sup> NFE, nitrogen free extract; <sup>3</sup> dietary anion/cation difference.	

## Probiotics in Drinking Water

Sources of (1) water for mixing probiotics and (2) the viable count of bacteria added were analyzed by Michelson Laboratories, Inc. (Commerce, CA, USA). Available water was double distilled, distilled, and chlorinated. The manufacturer (Living Streams Mission, Athol, Idaho) of probiotics also advised using chlorinated water with CuSO<sub>4</sub> (1 ppm) for mixing of bacteria. Heavy metals in chlorinated water were analyzed (UC Davis Analytical Laboratory, Davis, CA). As discussed in Results below, probiotics - active *Lactobacillus plantarum*, *rhamnosus*, and *paracasei* - were added daily to chlorinated water at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g, totaling approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g.

### 2.3. Diet

White Leghorn Crosses (64 hens ranging in age from 65- to 74-week-old) were monitored to ensure consistency of weight and egg production. Data was collected for weight (two weeks) and egg production (nine days) prior to beginning the study. Layers of similar weight (1.59 kg, RMS = 0.0804,  $P < 0.05$ ) and egg production of (5.67 eggs per week, RMS = 1.391,  $P < 0.05$ ) were randomly divided into four treatments × four replications × four laying hens/replication and fed either the Control (a corn/soy diet), Control + 20% SFM, Control + Probiotics in drinking water, or Control + 20% SFM + Probiotics in drinking water for four weeks [14, Table 2]. Feed and water were administered *ad libitum*. Layers were singly housed in cages (45.72 cm × 45.72 cm × 53.34 cm). Hens were provided 16 hours of light and 8 hours of darkness throughout the trial, conducted in June and July in Davis, CA. The average temperature in the layer house was 70.19 °C ± 4.8. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (UC Davis, Davis, CA) approved the protocol for feeding and care.

Table 2  
Formulation and nutrients composition of diets containing 20% sunflower seed meal (SFM)<sup>1</sup> and the Control<sup>2</sup>

Feed Ingredients	Nutrients Composition of Feed				
	20% SFM	Control		20% SFM	Control
Corn	52.14	68.48	Moisture	10.79	12.07
SFM	20	0.00	ME <sup>4</sup> (Kcal / lb)	1359.9	1351.14
Limestone	9.652	9.582	True ME (Kcal / lb)	1425	1425
Blended fat	8.684	2.893	Crude protein	14.99	13
Soybean meal	8.001	17.371	Crude fat	10.27	5.01
Nexfos	0.997	1.163	Crude fiber	6.58	2.32
NaCl	0.152	0.149	Ash	12.1	11.48
DL-methionine	0.087	0.163	Arginine	0.9581	0.818
L-lysine HCl	0.086	0.00	Lysine	0.643	0.6432
Vitamin premix <sup>3</sup>	0.075	0.075	Methionine	0.37	0.37
Choline-HCl	0.075	0.075	Methionine and Cysteine	0.58	0.5875
Mineral premix <sup>3</sup>	0.05	0.05	Tryptophan	0.1571	0.1637
Total	100	100	Leucine	1.08	1.14
			Isoleucine	0.5955	0.6204
			Threonine	0.5346	0.4955
			Valine	0.6651	0.6204
			Calcium	4	4
			Available Phosphorus	0.31	0.31
			Phytic Phosphorus	0.5842	0.4931
			Added fat	8.68	2.89
			Sodium	0.152	0.1629
			Chloride	0.15	0.15
			Choline	0.727	0.5653
			Potassium	0.555	0.6108
			Linoleic Acid	3.15	2.04
			<sup>5</sup> Na + K – Cl (mEq / Kg)	162.47	180.55

<sup>1</sup> Sunflower seed meal (Sunflower Association, Mandan, ND); <sup>2</sup>A corn/soy based diet; <sup>3</sup>Vitamin/minerals premix included vitamin A, 2500 IU; vitamin D<sub>3</sub>, 250 IU; vitamin E, 4 IU; vitamin K, 0.4 mg; vitamin B<sub>12</sub>, 0.004 mg; biotin, 0.08; choline, 875 mg; folacin, 0.21 mg; niacin, 8.3 mg; pantothenic acid, 1.7 mg; pyridoxine, 2.1 mg; riboflavin, 2.1 mg; thiamin, 0.6 mg; iodine, 0.029 mg; iron, 38 mg; manganese, 17; selenium, 0.05; and zinc, 29; <sup>4</sup>ME: metabolizable energy; <sup>5</sup>Na + K – Cl, dietary anion-cation balance.

## 2.4. Production and Egg Quality Measurements

Weekly feed intake and body weight were measured and the feed conversion ratio, FCR (feed intake/kg dozen eggs) was determined for each diet. Eggs were collected daily and stored at 4 °C. Weekly egg quality was measured within 6 to 24 hours after collection. External measurements included egg weight; specific gravity (salt bath method), [15]; shape index (egg width/egg length × 1000), [16]; egg shell weight; and egg shell thickness [17].

Internal measurements included egg yolk color (Roche Yolk Color Fan), [18]; egg yolk index (egg yolk height/egg yolk diameter × 100), [19]; albumen index (albumen height/average egg albumen width × 100), [20]; yolk to albumen ratio (egg yolk weight/weight of albumen), [20]; Haugh unit, calculated as 100 × log (albumen height – 1.7 + egg weight<sup>0.37</sup> + 7.57, [21]; and proportional albumen ratio (egg albumen weight/egg weight × 100).

## 2.5. Statistical Analysis

A power analysis was conducted to determine the adequate number of layers for this study. With a confidence interval at 50% (for which one-half of the layers were fed probiotics) and a 95% confidence level, a population of 64 layers was determined to be adequate (22). Data as a 2 × 2 factorial (Probiotics\*SFM, n = 6) in an unbalanced mixed model design with Week as a repeated measure were analyzed using the Proc Mixed Procedure and the PDMIX800SAS Macro [23]. Probiotics (treatment name) was the main effect and SFM (treatment name) became the subplot effect. Pairwise comparisons of treatment means were conducted [23]. The Tukey-Kramer Adjustment was used to assess differences among means at  $P \leq 0.05$ . Significance at  $P \leq 0.10$  was noted.

## Results

### 3.1. Probiotics in drinking water

Table 3. Probiotics in sources of water.

Water (1L)	Lactic acid bacteria in L of water <sup>1</sup>	Probiotics 156 uL/L added and detected <sup>2</sup>
Double distilled water	A < 1	-
Double distilled water	B 270	+
Distilled water	160	+
Chlorinated water	160	+
Chlorinated water + CuSO <sub>4</sub> (1ppm) <sup>3</sup>	13	+

<sup>1</sup> Bacterial count for all sources of water (as is). <sup>2</sup> + denotes presence of Probiotics as added (156 uL/L) in in water = double distilled (B), distilled, chlorinated, and chlorinated + CuSO<sub>4</sub> (<sup>3</sup>Recommended by Living Streams Living Mission, Athol, Idaho), respectively; no probiotics were added to double distilled A.

As noted in Table 3, lactic acid bacteria was 270 count in double distilled water (not readily available at the grow-out facility) and 160 count in both distilled water from the laboratory and chlorinated drinking water in lines at the grow-out facility (Method COM ED.4 19.521, Michelson Laboratories, Inc., Commerce, CA, USA). Probiotics from the manufacturer were analyzed and found to contain the quantities noted (~56.7g at 4 billion CFU). For ease of mixing and to avoid changes in the mineral content of diets, Probiotics were mixed in chlorinated drinking water, each at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g, totaling approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g. Analysis revealed no concentration of heavy metals to affect the viability of probiotics in chlorinated drinking water (Table 4).

Table 4. Soluble minerals analysis<sup>1</sup> of chlorinated drinking water.

	Ca	Mg	Na	K	Zn	Cu	Mn	Fe	Cd	Cr	Pb	Ni	Cl	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-</sup>
	—mEq/L—			—————mg / L—————										
	≤0.88	≤1.64	≤3.16	≤2.51	<0.005	<0.01	<0.005	<0.01	<0.005	≤0.011	≤0.015	<0.005	≤0.45	≤10.1
DL <sup>2</sup>	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.005	0.01	0.005	0.01	0.005	0.005	0.10	0.005	0.1	0.1

<sup>1</sup> Analytical Laboratory, UC (Davis, CA, USA). <sup>2</sup> Detection limit.

### 3.2. Production measurements

Table 5. Major effects<sup>1</sup> of Control<sup>2</sup>, SFM<sup>2</sup>, and Probiotic<sup>3</sup> on production parameters of laying hens during four weeks.

Major Effects	Feed Intake (g/hen/d)	Egg Production (%)	FCR (kg/dozen egg)
<b>SFM</b>			
Control	83.90	65.32	1.60
20% SFM	81.56	61.69	1.63
SE	1.71	1.73	0.05
<i>P</i> value	0.3255	0.1323	0.5909
<b>Probiotic</b>			
Control	81.52	63.19	1.59
156 µL/L	83.94	63.82	1.64
SE	1.79	1.87	0.05
<i>P</i> value	0.3588	0.8207	0.6011
<i>P</i> values			
<b>SFM*Probiotics</b>	0.4448	0.7856	0.4828
<b>Week</b>	0.0011	0.0070	0.0002
<b>SFM*Week</b>	0.9302	0.7391	0.7562
<b>Probiotics*Week</b>	0.1475	0.2034	0.0979
<b>SFM*Probiotics*Week</b>	0.0615	0.5823	0.1063

<sup>1</sup> Means with the same superscript are not significantly different a  $P \leq 0.05$ .

<sup>2</sup> Control (a corn/soy based diet) + 20%, sunflower seed meal, SFM.

<sup>3</sup>Probiotics added to provide each at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g, totaling approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g for all added species (*L. paracasei*, *L. plantarum*, and *L. rhamnosus*) in chlorinated drinking water.

No mortality occurred during the four week study. SFM, Probiotics, and SFM\*Probiotics had no effect on feed intake, egg production, or FCR while Week was significant for all production measurements (Table 5). There were trends due to SFM\*Probiotics\*Week for feed intake ( $p = 0.0615$ ) and Probiotics\*Week for FCR ( $p = 0.0979$ ) caused by fluctuations in measurements over time.

### 3.2. External egg quality

Table 6. Major effects<sup>1</sup> of Control<sup>2</sup>, SFM<sup>2</sup> and Probiotics<sup>3</sup> on external quality of eggs from laying hens during four weeks.

Major Effects	Egg Weight (g)	Specific Gravity	Shape Index	Egg Shell Weight (g)	Egg Shell Thickness (mm)
<b>SFM</b>					
Control	53.40 <sup>b</sup>	1.0842 <sup>a</sup>	0.84	5.04	0.35
20%	54.35 <sup>a</sup>	1.0826 <sup>b</sup>	0.84	5.06	0.34
SE	0.27	4.40 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	3.37 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.02	1.70 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>
<i>P</i> value	0.0242	0.0082	0.3946	0.6331	0.0581
<b>Probiotics</b>					
Control	53.33 <sup>b</sup>	1.0843 <sup>a</sup>	0.84	5.02 <sup>b</sup>	0.35 <sup>a</sup>
156µL/L	54.42 <sup>a</sup>	1.0826 <sup>b</sup>	0.84	5.08 <sup>a</sup>	0.34 <sup>b</sup>
SE	0.28	4.42 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	3.37 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.02	1.72 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>
<i>P</i> value	0.0411	0.0789	0.7799	0.0441	0.0109
	<i>P</i> value				
<b>SFM*Probiotics</b>	0.7356	0.0683	0.1819	0.1002	0.9335
<b>Week</b>	0.0010	<0.0001	0.0540	0.0011	0.0280
<b>SFM*Week</b>	0.7595	0.0301	0.9812	0.6710	0.4270
<b>Probiotics*Week</b>	0.6701	0.8936	0.5354	0.9459	0.1550
<b>SFM*Probiotics*Week</b>	0.8510	0.3411	0.5769	0.6181	0.4075

<sup>1</sup>Means with the same superscripts are not significantly different at  $P \leq 0.05$ .

<sup>2</sup>Control (a corn/soy based diet) + 20% sunflower seed meal (SFM).

<sup>3</sup>Probiotics added to provide each at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g, totaling approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g of each species (*L. paracasei*, *L. plantarum*, and *L. rhamnosus*) in chlorinated drinking water.

SFM significantly increased egg weight ( $p = 0.0242$ ) while decreasing specific gravity ( $p = 0.0082$ ). There was a downward trend ( $p = 0.0581$ ) for eggshell thickness. Temporal fluctuations were observed for SFM\*Week where specific gravity was significantly affected ( $p = 0.0301$ ) as shown in Tables 6 and 7. Due to temporal changes, SFM\*Probiotics produced a trend for specific gravity at  $p = 0.0683$ .

Table 7. Effects<sup>1</sup> of SFM\*Week on specific gravity of eggs from 65- to 74-week-old laying hens.

Diet	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Control	1.084	1.080	1.086	1.087
20% SFM <sup>2</sup>	1.084	1.081	1.083	1.083

<sup>1</sup>Means with the same superscript are not significantly different.

<sup>2</sup>Control (a corn/soy based diet) + 20% sunflower seed meal (SFM).

For Probiotics, there was a significant increase in egg weight ( $p = 0.0411$ ) and egg shell weight ( $p = 0.0441$ ) and a significant decrease in egg shell thickness ( $p = 0.0109$ ). Specific gravity trended downward at  $p = 0.0789$ . Week was significant for egg weight ( $p = 0.0010$ ), egg shell weight ( $p = 0.0011$ ), and egg shell thickness ( $p = 0.0280$ ); it was highly significant for specific gravity ( $p = <0.0001$ ) and there was a temporal effect for shape index ( $p = 0.054$ ). Probiotics\*Week and SFM\*Probiotics\*Week had no effect on external egg quality parameters (Table 6).

### 3.3. Internal egg quality

Table 8. Major effects<sup>1</sup> of Control<sup>2</sup>, SFM<sup>2</sup> and Probiotics<sup>3</sup> on internal quality of eggs from layers fed for four weeks.

Major Effects	Egg Yolk Color	Yolk Index	Albumen Index	Yolk:Albumen	Haugh Unit	Proportional Albumen
<b>SFM</b>						
Control	7.55 <sup>a</sup>	41.84	6.77	55.46	72.99	57.27
20%	7.34 <sup>b</sup>	41.16	6.69	55.63	73.62	57.52
SE	0.05	0.33	0.15	0.56	0.63	0.23
<i>P</i> value	0.0074	0.1521	0.7020	0.8145	0.4943	0.3837
<b>Probiotics</b>						
Control	7.51	41.32	6.73	55.16	73.29	57.53
156μL/L	7.39	41.69	6.74	55.93	73.32	57.26
SE	0.05	0.34	0.15	0.63	0.62	0.25
<i>P</i> value	0.1528	0.4515	0.9503	0.4285	0.9752	0.4723
	<i>P</i> value					
<b>SFM*Probiotics</b>	0.7202	0.3551	0.3994	0.7373	0.1219	0.7304
<b>Week</b>	0.0033	<0.0001	0.0046	0.0347	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b>SFM*Week</b>	<0.0001	0.5676	0.4718	0.0254	0.4646	0.0554
<b>Probiotics*Week</b>	0.7752	0.3029	0.3314	0.7948	0.0843	0.7943
<b>SFM*Probiotics*Week</b>	0.0104	0.5959	0.3240	0.3894	0.1426	0.6207

<sup>1</sup>Means with the same superscript are not significantly different. <sup>2</sup>Control (a corn/soy based diet) + 20% sunflower seed meal (SFM). <sup>3</sup>Probiotics added to provide each at > 23.3 Mil CFU/g, totaling approximately 70,000,000 Mil CFU/g of each species (*L. paracasei*, *L. plantarum*, and *L. rhamnosus*) in chlorinated drinking water.

Table 8 shows internal quality measurements. SFM significantly decreased ( $p = 0.0074$ ) yolk color by 2.78%. SFM\*Week was highly significant ( $p = <0.0001$ ) for yolk color where week 2 (6.97) for 20% SFM was significantly lower when compared to week 1 for the Control (7.64) (Data not shown). SFM\*Week was significant ( $p = 0.0254$ ) for yolk:albumen and caused a trend ( $p = 0.0554$ ) for proportional albumen due to temporal changes. SFM\*Probiotics\*Week significantly affected ( $p = 0.0104$ ) yolk color. Probiotics and SFM\*Probiotics had no effects on internal quality. Week was highly significant ( $p = <0.0001$ ) for yolk index, Haugh unit, and proportional albumen. Also, Week was significant ( $p = 0.0033$ ) for yolk color, albumen index ( $p = 0.0046$ ), and yolk:albumen ( $p = 0.0347$ ).

## Discussion

### 4.1. Production: SFM

Our results are in agreement with those of several investigators who found no effect of SFM on production parameters. Uwayjan *et al* (1983) and Yalcin *et al.*, (2008) reported no effect of 15% SFM in the diet [24, 25]. Shi *et al.*, (2012) found insignificant effects of diets supplemented with a greater quantity of SFM (24.84%, 33% CP) [26]. Laudadio *et al.* (2014) also reported insignificant effects of SFM (IR, 16%; CP, 42.3%; and CF, 10.3%) on laying hens for weight gain, feed consumption, egg production, and FCR [1]. Our findings and those of other investigators suggest that while SFM did not improve production parameters, there were no detrimental effects. Thus, SFM could be substituted for soybean meal in the diets of older layers.

### Production: Probiotics

In our work, there were no effects of Probiotics alone on production parameters while results from other investigators reported improvements. Mohan *et al.* (1995) reported a quadratic increase in egg production for layers consuming diets supplemented with 0, 100, and 150 mg probiotics

(*Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, *Aspergillus*, and *Torulopsis* species at  $27 \times 10^9$  cfu/10 g per kg diet) during the peak laying period [27]. Kurtoglu *et al.*, (2004) fed BioPlus, a commercial multi-stain probiotic, at 250, 500, and 750 mg/kg feed, to 27-week-old Brown Nick layers and showed an increase in egg production [28]. Yörük *et al.* (2004) reported that after 90 days, egg production significantly improved with addition of 0.1% probiotics (*Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, *Streptococcus*, and *Enterococcus* species) in the diet [29].

Investigators reported that the average time for colonization of the gut by various *B. Subtilis* species was three to six weeks in older hens [30]. Our results for *Lactobacillus* species seem to indicate that substantial colonization in the gut of older layers needs a period longer than 4 weeks to affect production measurements. Possibly, on-going competition of the *Lactobacillus* species with established organisms may have caused fluctuations in weekly results as discussed below for external and internal egg quality measurements. Alternatively, the quantity of bacterial species used may not have produced a significant enhancement for production measurements even after colonization in hens fed in our study.

As noted above, a lysine deficiency, a low digestion coefficient for lysine, and a negative correlation between fiber content and total metabolizable energy of SFM were reported [4, 7]. Probiotics (including the *Lactobacillus* species) as live microbial non-digestible supplements can colonize in the intestine of animals as well as in the ceca of poultry [8]. If colonized, they increase amylase, causing catalysis of starch to sugars [11]. Also, due to enhanced digestibility and absorption of nutrients (including amino acids), they can improve feed efficiency, productivity of laying hens, and egg quality measurements [12]. Due to our hypothesis that Probiotics would improve digestion of SFM fibrous material and amino acids, there was no attempt to adjust digestible lysine and other amino acids across diets. No effect for SFM\*Probiotics indicated that *Lactobacillus* species did not greatly enhance production parameters by increasing digestion of lignocellulosic compounds or digestibility of amino acids in SFM. Future work will include results for apparent digestibility of all diets to more accurately measure improvements in amino acid availability caused by *Lactobacillus* species alone and when coupled with SFM.

It was assumed that fluctuations by Week for feed intake and FCR of older layers likely contributed to trends noted for SFM\*Probiotic\*Week. To further investigate the effects of SFM and Probiotics on layer production parameters, investigations for Probiotics used herein and greater quantities should be conducted in drinking water and feed of young and old hens.

## 4.2. External egg quality: SFM

SFM increased egg weight. Karunajeewa *et al.* (1989) also reported that SFM increased egg weight of White Leghorn  $\times$  Australorp hens fed for 24 to 64 weeks [31]. However, Shi *et al.* (2012) reported that feeding diets supplemented with SFM up to 24.84% for 6 weeks did not influence egg weight [26]. Yalcin *et al.* (2008) revealed that egg weight of hens fed a SFM or a soybean meal diet with 0 and 2 g/kg commercial yeast culture product (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) for 16 weeks did not change [25]. Laudadio *et al.*, 2014 noted that egg weight was statistically similar among eggs of hens fed soybean meal or a low-fiber SFM diet (CP, 42.3%; CF, 10.3% and IR, 16%) for 10 week [1]. These contradictory findings suggest that effect of fiber types and quantities on external egg quality should be thoroughly investigated.

In our study, the decrease in specific gravity caused by SFM and SFM\*Week was likely associated with the trend toward a decrease in egg shell thickness and greater egg mass due to age and less calcium deposition [32, 33]. While eggshell thickness for SFM trended downward in the present study, it did not fall below 0.33 mm, indicating that eggs had shells of adequate thickness that could withstand the rigors of marketing [34].

SFM had no effect on shape index. A high shape index indicates more eggs of rounded shape as opposed to more elongated ones [35]. Age by strain and season may have an effect on index with those from older hens and laid in summer and autumn having an elongated shape [35, 36]. However, all eggs in our study had an index of 84. Eggs with an index > 76 can withstand the rigors of processing/packaging and transportation [35, 36].

## 4.3. External egg quality: Probiotics

Our finding for an increase in egg weight produced by Probiotics did not agree with those of Kurtoglu *et al.* (2004) who noted no effect [28]. However, Mohan *et al.* (1995) noted an improvement in egg weight for hens fed diets supplemented with probiotics for 10 weeks during the peak laying period [27].

As Probiotics increased egg weight, eggshell weight increased and eggshell thickness decreased. The decrease in eggshell thickness was validated by the trend toward a decline in specific gravity [33]. SFM\*Probiotics affected specific gravity and eggshell weight; also, this may have been influenced by the age of hens. Investigators suggested that probiotics and SFM promoted growth of intestinal microflora, thereby producing a healthy gut lining causing improved digestion and subsequent deposition of nutrients in yolk (and greater weight) although mechanisms are not understood [37, 38]. More work with younger birds and/or greater quantities of Probiotics may help clarify these findings.

## 4.4. Internal egg quality: SFM

Egg Yolk color was decreased by SFM and affected by Week, SFM\*Week, and SFM\*Probiotics\*Week. The decrease in color caused by SFM and temporal effects were likely due to dilution of dietary pigments in corn, as the major contributor of carotenoids, when 20% SFM was added [38, 39].

Fat at two times more in the SFM diet than in the Control may have caused some dilution of color as well.

The significant effect of SFM\*Week on the yolk:albumen and proportional albumen may have indicated greater internal weight of the egg associated with increasing age. Even though there was greater mass over time, the Haugh unit, the standard for overall internal egg quality, remained low throughout the study. A Haugh unit for young layers is >91; that for older layers in our work was ~73. Fluctuation in Haugh units over time, as with some production and egg quality measurements, may have been related to intermittent colonization of *Lactobacillus* species during the 4-week period.

## Conclusion

For significance at  $P < 0.05$ , neither SFM, Probiotics, nor SFM\*Probiotics affected production measurements. SFM increased egg weight and decreased specific gravity. The increase in egg and shell weight, was accompanied by a decrease in eggshell thickness, likely compounded by less calcium deposition as hens aged. A decrease in yolk color was due to addition of SFM that reduced pigments; increased fat content in SFM diets likely caused a diluting effect as well. SFM\*Probiotics affected some external egg quality measurements at  $P < 0.01$ , but had no effect on internal egg quality. Week (age of hens) affected production and external/internal measurements. More work is needed to clearly establish (1) the effect of various fiber types on production and egg quality parameters, (2) the digestibility of SFM/Probiotic diets, and (3) time needed for colonization of various quantities of probiotics (added in water and feed) in the gut of various types and ages of laying hens.

## Declarations

**Author Contributions:** Project Administration and funding acquisition, AJK; Methodology, Y.A.D.; K.S.; S.N.; Formal analysis, Y.A.D., S.N; Original draft, Y.A.D.; Review and editing, A.J.K.

**Funding:** This research was funding the California Agricultural Experiment Station.

**Acknowledgement:** The authors wish to thank Jackie Pisenti, Ph.D. and staff at the Hopkins Avian Facility, University of CA, Davis, CA (USA).

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Protocol was approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee at the University of California (Davis, CA).

Consent for publication - All authors have given consent to publish.

Availability of data and materials - Data is available from Dr. Yasir Ditta, an author.

Competing interests - There are no competing interests.

Funding - Funding was provided by the CA Agricultural Experiments Station.

Authors' contributions - All authors participated in the design and performance of the study.

Authors Ditta and Naseem performed experimental analysis. Author Saksrithai helped with revision of the manuscript. Author King approved the final design and revised the manuscript.

Acknowledgements - Authors acknowledge the help and advice of personnel at the Hopkins Avian Unit, University of CA (Davis, CA).

## References

Rohrmann S, Overvad K, Bueno-de-Mesquita HB, Jakobsen MU, Egeberg R, Tjønneland A, et al. Meat consumption and mortality - results from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. *BMC Med.* 2013;11:63.

*Article within a journal by DOI*

Slifka MK, Whitton JL. Clinical implications of dysregulated cytokine production. *Dig J Mol Med.* 2000; doi:10.1007/s801090000086.

1. Laudadio V, Ceci E, Lastella NMB, Tufarelli V. Effect of feeding low-fiber fraction of air-classified sunflower (*Helianthus annuus L.*) meal on laying hen productive performance and egg yolk cholesterol. *Poult. Sci.* 2014;93:2864.
2. Ravindran V, Blair R. Feed resources for poultry production in Asia and the Pacific. II. Plant protein sources. *World Poult. Sci. J.* 1992;48:205.
3. Kalmendal R, Elwinger K, Holm L, Tauson R. High fibre sunflower cake affects small intestinal digestion and health in broiler chickens. *Brit. Poult. Sci.* 2011;52: 86.

4. Moghaddam, H.N.; Salari, S.; Arshami, J.; Golian, A.; Maleki, M. Evaluation of the nutritional value of sunflower meal and its effect on performance, digestive enzyme activity, organ weight, and histological alterations of the intestinal villi of broiler chickens. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* 2012;2:293.
5. Brenes A, Centeno C, Viveros A, Arijia I. 2008. Effect of enzyme addition on the nutritive value of high oleic acid sunflower seeds in chicken diets. *J. Poult. Sci.* 2008;87:2300.
6. King, A. J. Removal of Excess Cellulose and associated polysaccharides in fruit and vegetable by-produce - Implication for use in feed for monogastric farm animals. In: **G.M. Van De Ven** TGM, editor. *Cellulose – Fundamental Aspects*. Rijeka: InTech Europe: 2012.p 249-259.
7. Villamide MJ, San Juan LD. Effect of chemical composition of sunflower seed meal on its true metabolizable energy and amino acid digestibility. *J. Poult. Sci.* 1998;77:1884.
8. Gibson GR, Roberffroid MB. Dietary modulation of the human colonic microbiota: introducing the concept of prebiotics. *J. Nutr.* 1995;125:1401.
9. Patterson,JA, Burkholder KM. Application of prebiotics and probiotics in poultry production. *J. Poult. Sci.* 2003;2:627.
10. Zhang ZF, Kim IH. Effects of probiotic supplementation in different energy and nutrient density diets on performance, egg quality, excreta microflora, excreta noxious gas emission, and serum cholesterol concentrations in laying hens. *J. Ani. Sci.* 2013;91:4781.
11. Kabir SLM. The Role of probiotics in the poultry industry. *Fed. EU. Microbiol. Soc.* 2009;10:3531.
12. Ditta YA, King AJ. Recent advances in sunflower seed meal as an alternate source of protein in broilers. *Worlds' Poult. Sci. J.* 2017;73:527.
13. National Research Council. *Nutrient Requirement of Poultry*. 9th Revised Edition. Washington, DC: The National Academic Press. 1994. <https://doi.org/10.17226/214>.
14. Butcher GB, Miles RD. Egg Specific Gravity—Designing a Monitoring Program 1. IFAS Extension, University of Florida. <https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/VM/VM04400.pdf>
15. Stino FKR, Goher NE, Gar K, Hanash NA. The effect of breed and housing system on the egg quality of white baladi and fayoumi hens in the sub tropics. *Egypt. J. Ani. Prod.* 1982;23:91.
16. Rath PK, Mishra PK, Mallick BK, Behura NC. Evaluation of different egg quality traits and interpretation of their mode of inheritance in White Leghorns. *Vet. World.* 2015;8:449.
17. Helena B, Kamila M; Zdenka, P. Evaluation of egg yolk colour. *Czec. J. Food Sci.* 2014;32:213.
18. EL-Wandary AM, Goher LM, Enab AA. Effect of breed, laying period and selection for egg weight on egg quality for two local breeds of chicken. *Egypt. Poult. Sci.* 1994;14:23.
19. Victor H, Carver JS. The albumen index as a physical measurement of observed egg quality. *J. Poult. Sci.* 1936;15:141.
20. Haugh, RR. The Haugh unit for measuring egg quality. *U. S. Egg Poult. Mag.* 1937;43:552.
21. **22. Statistical Power Analysis - Statistics Solutions** [www.statisticssolutions.com](http://www.statisticssolutions.com) > [statistical-power-analysis](http://www.statisticssolutions.com/statistical-power-analysis) SAS/STAT® 14.1 User's Guide The MIXED Procedure. 2015. <https://support.sas.com/documentation/onlinedoc/stat/141/mixed.pdf>
22. Uwayjan MG, Azar EJ, Dagher NJ. Sunflower seed in laying hen rations. *J. Poult. Sci.* 1983;62:1247.
23. Yalcin S, Zsoy BO, Erol H. Yeast culture supplementation to laying hen diets containing soybean meal or sunflower seed meal and its effect on performance, egg quality traits, and blood chemistry. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* 2008;17:229.
24. Shi SR, Lu J, Tong HB, Zou JM, Wang KH. Effects of graded replacement of soybean meal by sunflower seed meal in laying hen diets on hen performance, egg quality, egg fatty acid composition, and cholesterol content. *J. App. Poult. Res.* 2012;21:367.
25. Mohan B, Kadirvel R, Bhaskaran M, Natarajan. A. Effect of probiotic supplementation on serum/yolk cholesterol and on egg shell thickness in layers. *J. Brit. Poult. Sci.* 1995;36:799.
26. Kurtoglu V, Kurtoglu F, Sekery E, Coskuny B, Baleviy T, Polaty ES. Effect of probiotic supplementation of laying hen diets on yield performance and serum and egg yolk cholesterol. *Food Add. Contam.* 2004;21:817.
27. Yörük MA, Gül M, Hayirli A, Macit M. The effects of supplementation of humate and probiotic on egg production and quality parameters during the late laying period in hens. *Poult. Sci.* 2004;83:84.
28. Abdelgader, A.; Irshaid, R.; Al-fataftah A-R. Effect of dietary probiotic inclusion on performance, egg shell quality, cecal microflora composition, and tibia traits of laying hens in the late phase of production. *Trop. Ani. Health Prod.* 2013;45:
29. Karunajeewa H, Than SH, Abu-Serewa S. Sunflower seed meal, sunflower oil and full-fat sunflower seeds, hulls and kernels for laying hens. *Ani. Feed Sci. Technol.* 1989;26:45.
30. Pizzolante CC, Saldanha ESPB, Laganá C, Kakimoto SK, Togashi CK. Effects of calcium levels and limestone particle size on the egg quality of semi-heavy layers in their second production cycle. *Braz. J. Poult. Sci.* 2009;11:79-86.
31. **33. Foster WH, Weatherup STC.** The use of specific gravity of the egg to estimate shell thickness. *Brit. Poult. Sci.* 2007;20:439.
32. Stadelman, W.I.; Cotterill, O.J. *Egg Science and Technology*, AVI Publishing Company, Co., USA, **1995**.
33. Park J-A, Sohn S-H. The Influence of hen aging on eggshell and shell mineral components. *Kor. J. Food Sci.* 2018;38:1080.

34. Sarica M, Onder H, Yamak US Determining the most effective variables for egg quality traits of five hen genotypes. *Internation'l J. Agri. Bio.* 2012;14:235.
35. Mountzouris KC, Tsitsrikos P, Palamidi I, Arvaniti A, Mohnl M, Schatzmayr G, Fegueros K. Effects of probiotic inclusion levels in broiler nutrition on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, plasma immunoglobulins, and cecal microflora composition. *J. Poult. Sci.* 2010;89:58.
36. Slavin J. Fiber and prebiotics: Mechanisms and health benefits. *Nutrs.* 2018;5: Pedroza G, Famula T, King A. Broccoli meal fed to laying hens increases nutrients in eggs and deepens the yolk color. *CA Ag.* 2018;72:243.
37. Kljak K, Grbesa D, Karolyi D. Estimation of carotenoid content from colour analysis of corn grits. *Cro. J. Food Tech., Biotech. and Nutr.* 2009;63:23.