



Evaluation of native medicinal plants as feed additives in the Sheep ration

DILSHAD KOUR¹, VIJAY KUMAR SHARMA^{1✉}, RAMESH KUMAR SHARMA¹,
 ANAND KUMAR PATHAK¹ and ANKUR RASTOGI¹

Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir 181 102 India

Received: 2 November 2022; Accepted: 11 September 2023

Supplementary Table 1. Effect of addition of different dose level of herbs on *in vitro* DMD and *in vivo* OMD

Herb	Level of Herb					
	3%		3.5%		4%	
	DMD	OMD	DMD	OMD	DMD	OMD
Control (No Herb)	42.45 ^a ±1.21	61.70 ^a ±1.28	50.39 ^a ±1.67	56.60 ^a ±1.38	56.34 ^a ±1.11	59.51 ^a ±1.18
<i>Allium sativa</i>	64.09 ^a ±1.12	74.54 ^a ±1.34	48.13 ^a ±1.82	57.56 ^a ±1.65	54.12 ^a ±1.52	57.25 ^a ±1.35
<i>Cuminum cyminum</i>	56.02 ^a ±1.34	59.21 ^a ±1.76	52.03 ^a ±1.32	61.72 ^a ±1.48	48.03 ^a ±1.23	51.05 ^a ±1.42
<i>Emblica officinalis</i>	64.16 ^a ±1.91	70.97 ^a ±1.34	50.22 ^a ±1.45	59.76 ^a ±1.32	58.19 ^a ±1.62	64.75 ^a ±1.47
<i>Murraya koenigii</i>	58.06 ^a ±1.06	61.28 ^a ±1.23	56.07 ^a ±1.34	59.25 ^a ±1.30	54.07 ^a ±1.35	57.21 ^a ±1.68
<i>Pimpinella anisum</i>	76.23 ^{ab} ±1.73	79.79 ^{ab} ±1.46	56.42 ^a ±1.27	59.58 ^a ±1.38	56.42 ^a ±1.28	59.58 ^a ±1.53
<i>Sapindus trifoliatus</i>	60.11 ^a ±1.21	63.37 ^a ±1.56	56.12 ^a ±1.64	62.60 ^a ±1.74	46.14 ^a ±1.62	49.12 ^a ±1.16
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	62.28 ^a ±1.38	65.57 ^a ±1.36	54.34 ^a ±1.52	57.47 ^a ±1.18	52.36 ^a ±1.42	55.44 ^a ±1.52
<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i>	60.09 ^a ±1.56	66.74 ^a ±1.42	48.12 ^a ±1.83	51.13 ^a ±1.42	56.10 ^a ±1.72	59.28 ^a ±1.18
<i>Zingiber officinale</i>	60.27 ^a ±1.43	66.90 ^a ±1.55	56.30 ^a ±1.25	59.47 ^a ±1.08	46.37 ^a ±1.32	58.32 ^a ±1.19
<i>Curcuma longa</i>	66.27 ^a ±1.67	69.64 ^a ±1.35	56.35 ^a ±1.34	59.52 ^a ±1.48	40.48 ^a ±1.47	46.29 ^a ±1.18
<i>Ocimum tenuiflorum</i>	60.03 ^a ±1.54	66.69 ^a ±1.28	50.03 ^a ±1.36	59.60 ^a ±1.65	46.04 ^a ±1.34	55.35 ^a ±1.14
<i>Azadirachta indica</i>	44.08 ^a ±1.83	67.49 ^a ±1.64	54.06 ^a ±1.72	60.47 ^a ±1.43	54.06 ^a ±1.28	60.47 ^a ±1.12

^{ab}Means with different superscript differ significantly at 5% level of significance.

Supplementary Table 2. Periodic live weight of the animals during *in vivo* trial

Particular	Control	Treatment
Day 0	26.80±1.01	26.72±1.11
Week 1	27.04±1.18	27.20±1.10
Week 2	27.19±1.32	27.50±1.41
Week 3	27.40±1.08	27.80±1.30
Week 4	27.40±1.15	27.98±1.23

Supplementary Table 3. Effect on calcium and phosphorus balance during *in vivo* trial

Particular	Control		Treatment		Significance
	Calcium	Phosphorus	Calcium	Phosphorus	
Intake (g/animal/day)	4.75±0.22	2.98±0.17	4.86±0.28	3.10±0.22	NS
In faeces (g/animal/day)	1.71±0.18	1.82±0.20	1.74±0.24	1.87±0.16	NS
In Urine (g/animal/day)	0.82±0.11	0.30±0.07	0.93±0.14	0.32±0.10	NS
Total out go (g/animal/day)	2.53±0.52	2.12±0.34	2.67±0.64	2.19±0.47	NS
Calcium balance (g/animal/day)	2.22±0.25	0.86±0.06	2.19±0.28	0.91±0.07	NS
Retention % intake	46.72±5.10	24.50±2.67	44.10±5.15	26.10±2.97	NS
Retention % absorbed	73.14±7.52	67.52±3.65	69.95±8.16	71.45±3.89	NS

NS, Non-significant; *, Significant at 5% level.