

Replacement value of water soaked Sweet orange (Citrus sinensis) peel meal in Broiler Chicken Diet

ABSTRACT

A ten-week two stage experiment consisting of starter and finisher broiler feeding trials was conducted with one hundred and eighty Marshal broiler chicks to determine the replacement value of water soaked Sweet orange (Citrus senensis) fruit peel meal as a substitute for maize. Sweet orange peels were divided into five equal parts, and a part each soaked in water for a duration of 0, 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours, sundried and milled to formulate five (5) test diets T_2 , T_3 , T_4 , T_5 , and T_6 , respectively, in which the peel replaced maize in the control diet (T_1) at 40% inclusion levels one hundred and eighty birds were randomly allocated to the six dietary treatments each of which had three replicates of ten birds each in a completely randomised design. Significant increases ($P<0.05$) were observed in feed intake, live weight, body weight gain, water intake while, significant decreases ($P<0.05$) were observed in feed conversion ratio, water: feed ratio and mortality of starter broiler as duration of soaking of orange peels increased from 0 to 96 hours. In the finisher phase, significant increases ($P<0.05$) were observed in feed intake, live weight, body weight gain, whereas, water: feed ratio decreased significantly ($P<0.05$) as duration of soaking of sweet orange peel increased from 0 to 96 hours. The study has shown that sweet orange peel when soaked for 96 hour can be used as a replacement for maize in broiler chicken diet at 40% levels while, longer soaking duration is further investigated.

Keyword: Sweet orange peel meal, broiler chicken, growth performance

1. INTRODUCTION

The unpredictable increase in the cost of conventional ingredients such as maize used in compounding livestock feeds has necessitated intensive investigations in the use of agricultural and agro-based industrial products. The solution to high cost of poultry feed lies in the discovery, processing, and harnessing of non-convectional sources of poultry feedstuffs for which there is little competition from humans (1). The knowledge of alternative feedstuffs and their levels of inclusion into animal feeds without deleterious effects will go a long way in solving the problem of high cost in poultry production with consequent increase profit margin, increase scale of production, thereby achieving protein availability, improve sustainable intake and high food security (2). Large quantities of agricultural by-products which are regarded non-conventional feed resources are produced in Nigeria (3). Some agricultural and agro-industrial by-products available in Nigeria are: cassava peel meal (4),

38 sweet orange peels (5), mango kernel meal (6) and sweet orange fruit pulp (7).
39 Unconventional feedstuffs such as cassava root meal, rice bran, sweet potato meal, and
40 sorghum could be used as energy sources to substitute maize, the conventional source, in
41 poultry diets (8). Sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) production in Nigeria is significant (9).
42 Nigeria produces 3% of fresh citrus in the world, and Africa produces 3,741, 000 tons of
43 different varieties of citrus fruits of which Nigeria contributes 3, 240,000 tons. In Nigeria
44 sweet orange fruit peel is obtained after the exocarp is peeled off and the fruit juice extracted
45 or sucked. Orange fruit peel is available throughout the year even though high production of
46 the fruit is from October through March, and because it is not being put into any productive
47 use and it constitutes environmental challenge pollution because they are indiscriminately
48 disposed. About 30% of the production of citrus fruits (and 40% of orange production) is
49 processed (10), principally to make juice, and results in large quantities of by-products. The
50 main producer of citrus fruit for processing is Brazil (47% of the production), followed by
51 29% for the USA (10). In a research work (11), citrus by-products feedstuffs were reported as
52 sources of dietary energy, and use as high energy feed rations that support the growth and
53 lactation in ruminant. It has also been observed that sun-dried peels can replace dietary maize
54 in broiler chicken diet at 20% (12), and 15% (5) without any adverse effect on performance.

55 **1.1 Objective**

56 The objective of this study was to evaluate the effect of replacement of maize with sweet
57 orange peel meal (SOPM) in the diet of broiler chickens on growth performance.

58

59

60

61 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

62 2.1 Experimental site

63 The experiment was carried out at the Poultry unit of the Plateau State College of
64 Agriculture, Garkawa. Garkawa town is located on latitude $8^{\circ} 58'E$ and longitude $9^{\circ} 45'N$,
65 with an elevation of 240m above sea level determined using Global positioning System
66 (GPS) according to (13). Garkawa is characterized by six months of raining season (May to
67 October) and six months of dry season (November to April).

68 69 2.2 Test Ingredient, Collection and Processing

70 Sweet orange peels were collected from sellers of peeled sweet orange fruit in Garkawa town.
71 They were sun-dried, divided into five (5) equal portions and, soaked in water for 0, 24, 48,
72 72, and 96 hours. Thereafter, they were each sun-dried and milled to obtain sweet orange peel
73 meals SOP_0 , SOP_{24} , SOP_{48} , SOP_{72} and SOP_{96} , respectively. These meals were used to replace
74 40% maize in the control diet (T_1) both in the broiler starter (Table 1) and finisher (Table 2)
75 to obtain diets T_2 , T_3 , T_4 , T_5 and T_6 , respectively.

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87 Table 1: Ingredients and nutrient composition of starter broiler chick diets containing Sweet
88 orange (*Citrus sinensis*) peel meal.

Ingredients	Starter broiler diets					
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆
Maize	54.01	32.41	32.41	32.41	32.41	32.41
SOPM	0	21.60	21.60	21.60	21.60	21.60
SBM	32.41	32.41	32.41	32.41	32.41	32.41
BDG	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
Blood meal	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58
Bone meal	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95
Oyster shell	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Methionine	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Lysine	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Common Salt	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Premix*	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<i>Calculated nutrients</i>						
Metabolisable energy (kcal/kg)	2874.69	2819.28	2824.20	2807.05	2813.12	2798.90
Crude protein (%)	22.88	23.28	23.43	23.59	23.66	23.76
Crude fibre (%)	4.36	8.29	8.61	9.02	9.07	9.43
Ether extract (%)	3.79	3.47	3.52	3.58	3.65	3.56
Lysine (%)	1.44	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39
Methionine (%)	0.62	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57
Calcium (%)	1.48	1.69	1.75	1.71	1.69	1.75
Phosphorus (%)	0.77	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71

90 T₁ = Control diet, T₂ = Broiler starter containing un-soaked sweet orange peels. T₃ = Broiler starter containing SOP soaked in
91 water for 24 hours, T₄ = Broiler starter containing SOP soaked in water for 48 hours, T₅ = Broiler starter containing SOP
92 soaked in water for 72 hours, T₆ = Broiler starter containing SOP soaked in water for 96 hours, SOP = Sweet orange peel,
93 BDG = Brewers dried grain, SBM = Soybean meal, SOPM = Sweet orange peel meal, ME = Metabolisable energy.
94 *Vitamin-Mineral premix (BIOMIX^(R)) will supply per kg diet; Vit. A 500IU; Vit. D₃ 888, IU; Vit. E₁₂, 000mg; Vit.
95 K₃15000mg; Niacin 12000mg; Pantothenic acid 2000mg, Biotin 1000mg; Vit b12 3000mg; Folic acid 15000mg; Choline
96 chloride 6000mg, Manganese 1000mg; Vit. Iron 15000mg; Zinc 800mg; Copper 400mg; Iodine 80mg; Cobalt 400mg;
97 Selenium 8000mg.

Table 2: Ingredients and nutrient composition of finisher broiler chickens diets containing Sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) peel meal.

Ingredients	Finisher broiler diets					
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆
Maize	61.52	36.91	36.91	36.91	36.91	36.91
SOPM	0	24.61	24.61	24.61	24.61	24.61
SBM	23.40	23.40	23.40	23.40	23.40	23.40
BDG	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Blood meal	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.58
Bone meal	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.95
Oyster shell	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Methionine	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Lysine	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Common Salt	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Premix*	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<i>Calculated nutrients</i>						
Metabolisable energy(kcal/kg)	2952.09	2888.95	2894.56	2875.02	2881.94	2865.74
Crude protein (%)	20.00	20.46	20.63	21.82	20.89	21.01
Crude fibre (%)	4.16	8.63	8.99	9.46	9.52	9.93
Ether extract (%)	3.89	3.52	3.58	3.64	3.72	3.63
Lysine (%)	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17
Methionine (%)	0.59	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54
Calcium (%)	1.47	1.71	1.77	1.74	1.70	1.75
Phosphorus (%)	0.75	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68

T₁ = Control diet; T₂= Broiler finisher containing un-soaked sweet orange peel; T₃ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 24 hours; T₄ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 48 hours; T₅ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 72 hours; T₆ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 96 hours. BDG = Brewers dried grain, SBM = Soybean meal, SOPM= Sweet orange peel meal, ME = Metabolisable energy *Vitamin-Mineral premix (BIOMIX^(R)) will supply per kg diet; Vit. A 500IU; Vit. D₃ 888, IU; Vit. E₁₂, 000mg; Vit. K₃15000mg; Niacin 12000mg; Pantothenic acid 2000mg, Biotin 1000mg; Vit b12 3000mg; Folic acid 15000mg; Choline chloride 6000mg, Manganese 1000mg; Vit. Iron 15000mg; Zinc 800mg; Copper 400mg; Iodine 80mg; Cobalt 400mg; Selenium 8000mg.

2.3 Experimental Animals and Management

One hundred and eighty day-old Marshal Broiler chicks bought from Obasanjo farms, Ogun

State were used for the study. They were randomly allocated to six groups with 30 broiler

chicks each divided into three replicates with 10 birds per replicate, in a completely randomised design (CRD). The birds were weighed in groups and average weight made similar before they were assigned to their respective dietary treatment groups. The birds were raised on a deep litter system, fed broiler starter *ad libitum* for 5 weeks. At the end of the starter phase the chickens were all mixed together, regrouped into 6 as in the starter phase and fed the broiler finisher *ad libitum* for 5 weeks. The birds were allowed access to water of acceptable quality and routine management procedures were followed. The Performance indices determined for both broiler starter and finisher phases were feed intake, body weight, water intake, whereas, feed conversion ratio (FCR), body weight gain (BWG), water: feed ratio, protein efficiency ratio (PER) and protein intake were calculated. The cost of every operation was recorded while, feed cost/bird, operational cost and total cost of production per bird were determined as recommended by (14). The current selling price of lean meat per kilogramme was used and profitability index which shows the net return per Naira (N1.00) invested calculated as:

$$\text{Profitability index (N)} = \frac{\text{Income} - \text{Expenditure}}{\text{Expenditure}}$$

2.4 Statistical analysis

All the data collected were subjected to analysis of variance (14). Means were separated where applicable using the Duncan Multiple Range Test (15).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Starter Broiler chicks performance

The growth response of starter broiler chicks to the experimental diets is presented in Table 3. The result obtained showed that the diets produced significant effect ($P < 0.05$) on the performance of the chicks in all growth indices evaluated. The mean daily feed intake increased significantly as the duration of soaking sweet orange peels in water increased from

0 to 96 hours and at 96 hours of soaking the feed intake of the starter broiler was not significantly different ($P>0.05$) from the control. Sweet orange peel meal has been reported to have some amounts of saponin and tannin (16) which by nature confer bitter and astringent taste on feed materials, but processing methods like soaking and its duration cause reduction.

Table 3: Effect of experimental diets on growth performance of starter broiler chicks

Performance indices	Experimental Diets						SEM
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆	
Initial live weight (g/)	42.67	43.00	42.67	42.67	42.67	43.00	0.10
Final body weight (g/bird)	660.33 ^a	394.44 ^d	483.33 ^c	505.00 ^{bc}	500.00 ^{bc}	550.00 ^b	20.12
Daily body weight gain (g/bird)	17.65 ^a	10.04 ^d	12.59 ^c	13.21 ^{bc}	13.07 ^{bc}	14.49 ^b	0.58
Daily Feed intake (g/bird)	49.13 ^{ab}	34.44 ^c	45.64 ^b	49.58 ^a	47.40 ^{ab}	49.90 ^a	1.36
Feed conversion ratio	2.78 ^a	3.44 ^b	3.62 ^b	3.77 ^b	3.67 ^b	3.44 ^b	0.09
Daily water intake (ml/bird)	98.30 ^c	106.35 ^b	118.08 ^a	113.00 ^a	114.45 ^a	118.76 ^a	1.87
Water: feed ratio (ml/g)	2.00 ^d	3.10 ^a	2.59 ^b	2.28 ^c	2.41 ^{bc}	2.38 ^{bc}	0.09
Protein efficiency ratio	1.71 ^a	1.34 ^{bc}	1.19 ^c	1.19 ^a	1.40 ^a	1.35 ^{bc}	0.05
Protein intake (g/bird)	10.32 ^a	7.54 ^c	10.59 ^a	11.06 ^a	9.33 ^b	10.70 ^a	0.03
Mortality (%)	8.79 ^c	13.33 ^{ab}	16.67 ^a	10.00 ^b	6.67 ^c	6.67 ^c	0.98

^{a, b, c, d} Means on the same row with different superscripts are significantly different ($P<0.05$), SEM = Standard error of mean. T₁ = Control diet; T₂ = Broiler finisher containing unsoaked sweet orange peel; T₃ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 24 hours; T₄ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 48 hours; T₅ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 72 hours; T₆ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 96 hours.

It appears that soaking of sweet orange peel for long duration improved its feed value with a consequent palatability enhancement reflected in the feed intake of the birds at longer soaking duration of peels. The decreased final body weight of the chicks fed sweet orange peel meal diets compared to the starter broiler on the control group may be due to the higher

161 fibre levels in the sweet orange peel meal based diets which can impose a limitation on
162 nutrient utilization. However, among the orange peel based diets, it was observed that the
163 chicks became heavier as duration of soaking of orange peels increased. The increased mean
164 body weights of the chicks on diets containing the orange peel as duration of soaking
165 increased in spite of increased fibre level can be attributed to higher protein content of these
166 diets. Significant trend in body weight gain of broiler chicks in the sweet orange peel based-
167 diet groups was observed to be similar to that of the final weight, as the duration of soaking
168 increased from 0 to 96 hours. This is an evidence of consistent growth rate of the birds in
169 these diet groups during the broiler starter phase. The feed conversion ratio of the birds on the
170 SOPM based diets was significantly higher ($P<0.05$) than the feed conversion ratio of the
171 birds in the control. This suggests reduced utilization of dietary nutrients, even though the
172 feed conversion ratio values were within the acceptable range of 2.00-5.00 for chicks as
173 recommended by (17). The water consumption pattern of the broiler chicks showed that
174 replacement of maize with sweet orange peel stimulated higher water consumption. This may
175 be partly due to higher protein levels in the SOP diets which may stimulate higher water
176 intake for its utilization. Higher dietary fibre in the sweet orange peel based diets may also
177 have contributed to this pattern of water intake. Water:feed ratio tended to reduce as the
178 duration of soaking the SOP increased. Broiler chicks in SOP-based diets had significantly
179 higher ($P<0.05$) rate of water consumption than chicks in the control partly as a requirement
180 to mitigate the effect of bitter taste of saponin, which has been found to be present in orange
181 peels. The protein efficiency ratio showed that the birds fed the maize-based diet utilized
182 dietary protein more efficiently than those in the groups fed SOP-based diets. Mortality
183 recorded during the starter phase was significant ($P<0.05$) across the treatment groups. This
184 was observed when there was a sudden sharp change in weather condition from dry cold
185 harmattan to dry hot weather. This mortality is thus attributed to the inability of the broiler
186 chicks to contain the adverse inclemency of weather.

187

188 **3.2 Finisher Broiler chickens performance**

189 The effect of experimental diets containing water soaked sweet orange peel meal on the
190 performance of broiler finisher chickens is shown on Table 4. Means of final live weight,
191 daily feed intake, daily body weight gain, water to feed ratio, protein efficiency ratio, protein
192 intake and mortality varied significantly ($P<0.05$) among the experimental groups, while feed
193 conversion ratio and daily water intake did not vary significantly ($P>0.05$) as the duration of
194 soaking of the SOP incorporated in the diets increased. Daily feed intake per bird
195 progressively increased from 101.70 to 148.05g. Soaking is likely to have enhanced the
196 nutritive potential of SOP and consequently its maize replacement value which was
197 transferred into the test diets. The least feed intake of 101.70g/day recorded by the birds fed
198 diet T₂ which contained the un-soaked sweet orange peel shows that processing beyond sun-
199 drying is required for SOP to optimally exploit its potential as a feed resource in broiler
200 chicken production.

201 The average final body weight of 2287.50g for the finisher chickens fed diet T₁ (control) was
202 significantly ($P<0.05$) higher than the average final body weight of chickens fed diets T₂, T₃,
203 T₄, T₅, and T₆ which varied from 1327.50g to 1866.67g. However, it was observed that, the
204 longer the soaking duration of the orange peels the significantly ($P<0.05$) heavier the
205 chickens. It is thus apparent that soaking could be a viable option to biochemically
206 manipulates the internal environment of SOP to make it a valuable feed resource for maize
207 replacement feeding programme development in broiler production.

208 The body weight gain of the birds was observed to follow a similar pattern as the final body
209 weight. Soaking for up to 96 hours seems beneficial because the mean daily body weight gain
210 of 35.76g for chickens fed diet T₆ (diet containing orange peel soaked in water for 96 hours)
211 was significantly ($P<0.05$) higher than for others SOP-based diets groups containing SOP
212 soaked for lesser time duration. Irrespective of the treatment groups, feed conversion ratio

and daily mean water intake did not differ significantly ($P>0.05$). The observation in the later is opposite of the variation in water consumption in the starter phase. As the birds advanced in age as in finisher phase, their physiology matures and is better able to adapt to and accommodate the chemical constituents of the sweet orange peel.

Table 4: Effects of experimental diets on performance of finisher broiler chickens

Performance Indices	Experimental Diets						SEM
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆	
Initial live weight (g/bird)	616.67	615.00	615.00	623.33	620.00	615.00	1.36
Daily feed intake (g/bird)	126.71 ^{bc}	101.70 ^d	121.10 ^c	128.00 ^{bc}	133.84 ^b	148.05 ^a	3.53
Final live weight (g/bird)	2287.50 ^a	1327.20 ^c	1578.89 ^c	1589.72 ^c	1563.89 ^c	1866.67 ^b	79.34
Daily BWG (g/bird)	47.74 ^a	20.35 ^c	27.54 ^c	27.61 ^c	26.97 ^c	35.76 ^b	2.27
Feed conversion ratio	2.67	3.99	4.41	4.67	4.88	4.27	0.25 ^s
Daily water intake (ml/bird)	394.53	380.23	391.87	395.39	378.88	391.91	2.67
Water:feed ratio (ml/g)	3.11 ^{bc}	3.75 ^a	3.24 ^b	3.09 ^{bc}	2.83 ^c	2.65 ^d	0.09
Protein efficiency ratio	1.83 ^a	0.90 ^c	1.24 ^b	1.07 ^{bc}	1.07 ^b	1.13 ^{bc}	0.08
Protein intake (g/bird)	26.05 ^b	22.69 ^c	22.26 ^c	25.76 ^b	25.17 ^b	31.74 ^a	0.78
Mortality (%)	10.00 ^{ab}	10.00 ^{ab}	13.33 ^a	10.00 ^{ab}	3.33 ^c	6.67 ^b	0.93

^{a, b, c, d} Means on the same row with different superscripts are significantly different ($P<0.05$), SEM = Standard error of mean. T₁ = Control diet; T₂ = Broiler finisher containing unsoaked sweet orange peel; T₃ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 24 hours; T₄ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 48 hours; T₅ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 72 hours; T₆ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 96 hours.

The result of water-to-feed ratio of finisher broiler chickens significantly decreased as the duration of soaking of the orange peels increased. This is similar to the water:feed ratio for starter broiler chicks. The result showed that less water is consumed per gram feed intake at higher soaking duration of the peels. The study revealed that the birds on the SOP treatment groups were unable to utilize the protein in their feed as efficiently as the birds in the control group (T₁) even though the feed intake by the birds fed diets T₅ and T₆ SOP based diets were significantly higher. A possible reason for this may be the higher dietary crude fibre in the SOP based diets which could have impaired the utilization of the dietary protein. Mortality recorded was significantly different ($P<0.05$) among treatment groups. Except for T₃, mortality did not exceed 10% in any other group. The mortality may have been caused by heat stress since the finisher phase overlapped with the month of March which is usually the peak of the hot season, during which maximum temperature can rise up to 39 °C.

3.3 ECONOMIC COST OF BROILER CHICKEN PRODUCTION

The cost of production of broiler chickens using sweet orange peel meal based diets is presented in Table 5. The cumulative feed intake increased steadily as duration of soaking sweet orange peels increased. The control diet had higher feed cost over the SOP based diets while, increase in cumulative feed intake also caused increase in feed cost per bird as the soaking duration increased. However, it was observed that the control diet (T₁) and the sweet orange peel meal diet group (T₆) containing peel soaked for 96 hours were not significantly different ($P>0.05$). Total cost of production chicken fed sweet orange peel meal based diets ranged from N676.80 to N849.14 which is lower compared to the control diet with N875.86.

Broiler chicken fed the control diet had the highest selling price. The selling price/bird in the sweet orange peel meal based diets increased as the duration of soaking increased. This was also reflected in the profitability index of ₦1.15 for the control group and, ₦0.57 to ₦0.72 for the sweet orange peel meal based diets.

Table 5: Economic analysis of broiler chicken fed sweet orange peel meal diets

Indices	Diets						SEM
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
Cumulative feed intake/bird (kg)	6.15 ^b	4.76 ^d	5.84 ^c	6.22 ^{bc}	6.34 ^b	6.93 ^a	0.17
Final live weight/bird (g)	2287.50 ^a	1327.20 ^c	1578.89 ^c	1589.72 ^c	1563.89 ^c	1866.67 ^b	79.34
Fed cost/bird (₦)	533.12 ^a	334.06 ^c	419.03 ^b	446.16 ^b	424.25 ^b	506.40 ^a	
Operational cost (₦)	152.74	152.74	152.74	152.74	152.74	152.74	-
Cost of DOC/bird (₦)	190.00	190.00	190.00	190.00	190.00	190.00	-
Total cost of production/bird (₦)	875.86	676.80	761.77	788.90	766.99	849.14	-
Selling price/live bird (₦)	1883.33 ^a	1062.67 ^c	1226.67 ^c	1253.33 ^c	1233.33 ^c	1460.00 ^b	63.71
Profitability index (₦)	1.15	0.57	0.61	0.59	0.61	0.72	-

^{a,b,c,d} Means on the same row with different superscripts are significantly different (P<0.05). SEM=standard error of mean. T₁ = Control diet; T₂ = Broiler finisher containing unsoaked sweet orange peel; T₃ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 24 hours; T₄ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 48 hours; T₅ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 72 hours; T₆ = Broiler finisher containing sweet orange peels soaked in water for 96 hours. ₦ = Naira, DOC = day old chick

4. CONCLUSION

The study showed that water can be applied to soak sweet orange peels for the biochemical manipulation of the peels to improve the nutritional value of this potential maize replacement feed ingredient in broiler chicken feeding.

5. RECOMMENDATION

There is need for longer durations than 96 hours, experimented in this study to be investigated on the growth rate of broiler chickens.

REFERENCES

- 1 Ogundipe SO, Sa`adu G, Bale JO, Aduku AO, Balogun TF. Utilization of Animal manure in poultry diets. Paper presented at National Animal Production Research Institute, Shika-Zaria. Nigeria. 1992.
- 2 Bello KO, Fanimi AO, Oduguwa OO, Biobaku WO. Growth response and economic benefits of broiler chicken on groundnut husks diets supplemented with yeast. International Poultry Summit. Proceedings World Poult. Sci. Assoc. (WPSA) Nig. Branch. Abeokuta, Nigeria. Feb. 19-22. 2007;105.
- 3 Hamzat RA, Adejinmi OO, Babatunde BB, Olubamiwa O. Effect of dietary inclusion of Kolapod husk on performance and carcass characteristics of cockerels. Proceedings 30th Ann. Conf. Nig. Soc. Anim. Prod., University of Nigeria Nsukka, Nigeria. March 18-22. 2005;224-227.
- 4 Sonaiya EB, Omole TA. Cassava meal and Cassava peel meal for growing and finishing Pigs. Anim. Feed Sci. Tech. 1982; 32(2):187-194.
- 5 Oluremi OI A, Ojighen VO, Ejembi EH. The Nutritive potentials of Sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) rind in broiler production. Inter. J. Poult. Sci. (2006); 5: (7):613-617.
- 6 Diaara SS, Kwarri ID, Asheikh LG, Muhammad G, Igwebuike JU. Growth performance of broiler chicken fed raw or boiled mango (*Mangifera indica*) kernel meal as source of dietary energy. Proceedings 13th Ann. Conf. of Anim. Sci. Assoc. Nig. (ASAN). September 15-19, 2008. ABU, Zaria. Nigeria. 2008;311-313.
- 7 Hon MF, Oluremi OIA, Anugwa FOI. The effect of dried Sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) fruit pulp meal on the growth performance of rabbit. Pak. J. Nutr. 2009;8(8): 1150-1155.
- 8 Sinurat AP. Recent development in Poultry nutrition and Feed technology and suggestions for topics of researches. Indonesian Agric. Res. and Development J. 1999;21(3):37-45.
- 9 FAO. Commodity Review and Outlook. UNCTAD from FAO data. Rome, Italy. 2004.
- 10 USDA/FAS. Citrus: World Markets and Trade. July 2010. Citrus Update. Foreign Agriculture Service - USDA. 2010

- 300 11 Bampidis VA, Robinson PH. Citrus by-products as animal feeds: A review. Anim.
301 Feed Sci. and Tech. 2006;128:175-217.
- 302 12 Agu PN, Oluremi OIA. Tuleun CD. Nutritional evaluation of Sweet orange (*Citrus*
303 *sinensis*) fruit peel as a feed resource in Broiler Production. Inter. J. of Poult. Sci.
304 2010; 9 (7): 684-688.
- 305 13 NRS. Global Positioning System. National Remote Sensing Jos. Nigeria. 2012.
- 306 14 Ogundipe SO, Sanni SA. Economics of Poultry Production in Nigeria. Poultry
307 Production in Nigeria. 2002. Pp.27-45.
- 308
- 309 15 SPSS. Statistical package for Social Science. Release 15.0. User Manual. Microsoft
310 Corp. U. S. A. 1999.
- 311 16 Duncan DB. Multiple range and F-test. Biometric. 1955;11:1-42.
- 312 17 Oluremi OIA, Ngi J, Andrew IA. Phytonutrients in citrus fruit peel meal and
313 nutritional implication for livestock production. Livestock Research for Rural
314 Development. 2007;19 (7).
- 315 18 Oluyemi JA, Roberts FA. Poultry Production in warm wet Climates, 2nd Edn.
316 Spectrum Books Limited, Ibadan. Nigeria. 2000;244.

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326