Efficacy of polyherbal feed additives on nutrient digestibility, milk yield and composition of lactating crossbred goats

F MIRZAEI¹, S PRASAD², A K DANG³ and J P SEHGAL⁴

National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, Haryana 132 001 India

Received: 19 January 2011; Accepted: 25 April 2011

Key words: Digestibility, Goat, Milk yield and Composition, Natural feed additives

One of the most successful attempts accomplished in the last decade is using feed additives such as natural additives (medicinal plants as its seeds, leaves and roots). These additives help in improving animal productivity and increasing milk production (Campanile et al. 2008, Wang et al. 2009), however, most studies have been conducted with lactating cows. In the last decade, natural additives such as Asparagus racemosus, Trigonella foenum graecum seeds, Carum carvi, Nigella sativa and chamomile flower have attracted the attention of scientists as useful resource for treating diseases and improving animal productivity. Medicinal plant seeds improved the productivity of lactating animals and its hormonal alert effect on animals resulted into increasing prolactin and growth hormone release and in activating udder tissues in line with increasing glucose concentration with a reduction in cholesterol concentration in blood (Drackley et al. 2001, Abo El-Nor et al. 2007).

Natural additives have been used to improve animal productivity from milk that depends on direct manipulation in rumen environment. The remarkable effect was, increasing propionate level in the rumen with maintaining the acetate to propionate ratio to be constant to maintain fat concentration in milk. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to see the effect of natural additives in combination on milk yield and composition of lactating goats.

This study was conducted at the experimental farm in goat section of National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India during January to April 2009.

Preparation of herbal supplements: Individual herb was procured from local market after assessing their quality in

Present address: ¹Scientist (e mail: farmir2003203 @yahoo.com), Livestock Production and Management Division, ASRI, IRAN.

²Principal Scientist and Head (e mail: shiv_kimothi @rediffmail.com), Livestock Production and Management Division; ³Senior Scientist (e mail: ajaydang @rediffmail.com), Dairy Cattle Physiology Division; ⁴Senior Scientist (e mail: jpsehgal@rediffmail.com), Dairy Cattle Nutrition Division. consultation with ayurvedic practitioners and drug manufacturers. Each herb was pulverized separately. The polyherbal biostimulator feed additive was prepared after mixing powderized herbs in specific proportion. The polyherbal supplementation contained; *Asparagous* racemosous (shatavari), Leptadenia reticulata (jivanti), Nigella sative (kolonji), Cuminum cyminum (jeera) and Pueraria tuberosa (vidarikand).

Lactation trial: Two levels of polyherbal combination with concentrate mixture and *ad lib.* green fodder were chosen to be used in the lactation trial.

Feeding and management: Lactating Alpine × Beetal crossbred goats (30), 2–3 year-old, weighting on average of 42±3.25 kg (at the second and third season of lactation), after 2 weeks of kidding were randomly assigned into 3 groups (10 each) using complete random block design. The experimental period was extended to 12 weeks. The animals were introduced to the following treatments; (i) control group without polyherbal supplement as T₁, (ii) treatment 1 with 125 mg/kg body weight polyherbal supplement as T₂, (iii) treatment 2 with 250 mg/kg body weight polyherbal supplement as T₃.

Experimental additives were mixed with 1 kg of concentrate mixture and introduced to animals in daily morning meal. Diet was formulated to meet the animal's requirements (N R C2 1981). Animals were fed grouply with concentrate mixture and green fodder (berseem) were offered twice daily at 9:00 AM and 2:00 PM respectively. Dry matter intake (DMI) was recorded every 2 weeks by weighing feeds offered and refused by the animals. Freshwater was made available to the animals all the time. Chemical composition of ingredients is shown in Table 1.

Apparent digestibility: Digestibility trial was applied during the last week of experiment using 6 animals from each group. Offered, residuals and faecal samples were collected after 24 h and were taken 100 g of each samples for further achievements, then were dried at 55 °C for 48 h, and then ground to pass a 1 mm sieve in a feed mill for

Table 1. Chemical composition of concentrate, polyherbal supplement and green fodder (% on DM basis)

| Item | Concentrate | Polyherbal supplement | Berseem- mustard mix | Lucerne | Berseem |
|------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|
| DM | 89.57 | 91.26 | 10.59 | 18.36 | 15.44 |
| Ash | 8.09 | 5.20 | 21.31 | 12.73 | 13.47 |
| OM | 91.91 | 94.80 | 78.69 | 87.27 | 87.53 |
| СР | 20.85 | 15.75 | 19.42 | 22.09 | 18.86 |
| EE | 2.83 | 13.80 | 2.81 | 3.8 | 3.9 |
| CF | 9.65 | 21.21 | 13.64 | 19.82 | 21.11 |
| NFE | 58.57 | 44.04 | 39.87 | 41.56 | 42.66 |

chemical analysis. The digestibility coefficient of certain nutrient was calculated according to the formula used by Ferret *et al.* 1999.

Feed and fecal analysis: Feedstuffs and fecal samples were analyzed according to the AOAC (1995) methods to determine crude protein (CP), ether extract (EE), crude fibre (CF) and ash contents. Organic matter (OM), nitrogen free extract (NFE) contents and total digestible nutrients (TDN) were calculated by related formula.

Sampling and analysis of milk: Individually, milk samples were collected daily along the experimental period (12 weeks). The animals were hand milked (twice/day) and milk yield was recorded. Milk samples were analyzed for total solids, solids not fat, fat, protein by infrared spectrophotometry according to AOAC (1997) procedures. Fat corrected milk (4% fat) was calculated by using the following equation according to Gaines (1928), i.e.

4%FCM = $0.4 \times$ milk yield (kg) + $15 \times$ fat yield (kg)

Blood parameters: Blood samples were collected from the jugular vein of each animal at the last day of each fortnight (1 h before the 07:00 h feeding). The collected blood samples were centrifuged at 4000 r p m/20 min to separate the plasma. The obtained plasma was stored at -18°C till analysis. Total leukocyte count (TLC) was determined by the haemocytometer as described by Schalm (1981) and glucose by end point o-Toluidine method (Dubowski 1962).

Statistical analysis: Data were analyzed using the SYSTAT Software to account for effects of treatment, period, interactions between treatment and period and animal within treatment. The treatment was considered a fixed effect period and animals within treatment were considered random effects. The Duncan's multiple range test was used to test the significance between means (Duncan 1955).

Apparent digestibility: It is well established that, all combination additives slightly increased (P>0.05) the values of apparent nutrient digestibility coefficients than that in control (Table 2). Animals fed T_2 and T_3 showed higher (P>0.05) digestion coefficients for dry matter and crude protein than those fed T_1 (control). Also, all additives showed higher (P>0.05) digestion coefficients for organic matter,

Table 2. Apparent nutrient digestibility and nutritive value of the experimental rations

| | T ₁ (Control |) T ₂ | T ₃ | SEM | Р | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Apparent nutrients digestibility (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| DM | 65.32 | 69.00 | 71.20 | 2.25 | NS | | | | |
| OM | 69.80 | 74.52 | 74.52 | 1.89 | NS | | | | |
| EE | 51.14 | 61.04 | 59.64 | 6.37 | NS | | | | |
| CF | 50.94 | 52.42 | 54.23 | 3.42 | NS | | | | |
| СР | 72.48 | 75.57 | 75.73 | 1.62 | NS | | | | |
| NFE | 75.22 | 76.72 | 79.59 | 1.52 | NS | | | | |
| Nutritive value (g/h/day) | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP | 366.49 ^b | 366.63 ^b | 344.78 ^a | 2.32 | 0.001 | | | | |
| TDN | 1251.48 ^b | 1251.95 ^b | 1177.35 ^a | 7.93 | 0.001 | | | | |

Each value is an average of 7 samples; TDN,total digestible nutrients; T_1 , control ration with any supplementation; T_2 , ration with 125 mg/head/day of polyherbal supplement; T_3 , ration with 250 mg/head/day of polyherbal supplement; means in the same line with different superscripts are significantly different.

crude fiber and nitrogen free extract than control. However, all additives showed higher (P>0.05) digestion coefficients of ether extract than control. Moreover, Alam *et al.* (2005) also did not find significant difference in DM, OM and N digestibility when *Albizia* were offered to growing goats untreated or treated with calcium hydroxide. Bayssa (2006),found digestibility coefficient of EE significantly higher (P<0.05) in treatment groups than control.

Experimental additives in T_2 slightly improved nutritive values as total digestible nutrients and digestible crude protein of rations compared with T_3 and T_1 (Table 2). Results obtained with polyherbal biostimulants in low level might indicated the stimulation of rumen micro-flora activity through saving some micro factors to rumen micro-flora such as micro elements, vitamins, hormones and enzymes which are required to the efficient digestion, absorption and metabolism (Aboul-Foutouh *et al.* 2000) and/or minimizing effectively hazards of mycotoxins by inhibition of fungi

 Table 3. Effect of different additives on some blood parameters of lactating goats

| | T ₁ (Control) |) T ₂ | T ₃ | SEM | Р |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|-------|
| Glucose (mg/dl |) | | | | |
| First month | 72.40 | 82.70 | 76.60 | 4.69 | NS |
| Second month | 69.20 | 69.70 | 72.30 | 1.64 | NS |
| Third month | 55.70 | 54.40 | 60.10 | 3.58 | NS |
| Overall | 65.77 | 68.93 | 69.67 | 2.04 | NS |
| Total leukocyte | count (cells | /ml) | | | |
| First month | 11350.00 | 9570.00 | 12065.00 | 1057.80 | NS |
| Second month | 10515.00 ^a | 11835.00 ^a | 14470.00 ^b | 1004.04 | 0.03 |
| Third month | 10205.00 | 10360.00 | 12715.00 | 970.34 | NS |
| Overall | 10690.00 ^a | 10588.33 a | 13083.33 b | 583.91 | 0.004 |
| | | | | | |

Means in the same line with different superscripts are significantly different.

growth and aflatoxins production (Allam *et al.* 1999 and Mohamed *et al.* 2003). Aboul-Foutouh *et al.* (2000), Ali *et al.* (2005) and El-Ashry *et al.* (2006) observed similar results when they added polyherbal supplements or other medicinal plants to dairy buffaloes or growing lambs.

Blood parameters: Animals fed supplemented rations had higher (P<0.01) TLC concentrations than control (Table 3). These results may be due to the improvements occurred in metabolic process as a response to the experimental additives. The concentrations of glucose were in the normal range for healthy animals and were higher in supplemented groups than control. These results are parallel with values of Ali *et al.* (2005) who found that chamomile supplemented goats ration increased blood glucose values (P<0.05). Stella *et al.* (2007) found no significant effect of yeast culture supplementation on plasma glucose of lactating goats. These results indicated that tested additives to lactating goat's rations did not negatively affected liver activity or animal's health.

Dry matter intake: Total dry matter intake (DMI) was not significantly affected by experimental additives (Table 4). Values of DMI calculated as proportion from metabolic body size (MBS) (kgW^{0.75}/day) showed a slightly increase (P>0.05) with experimental additives compared to control. Kholif and Khorshed (2006), Campanile *et al.* (2008) and Wang *et al.* (2009) suggested that DMI was not affected by additives to animal rations while, Abo El-Nor and Kholif (2005) reported that DMI was not affected by additives to dairy goat's rations.

Milk yield and composition: The productive performance data and milk analysis are shown in Table 4. Milk and 4% FCM yields in the present study were slightly higher (P>0.05) in low level supplemented group compared to high level supplemented and control groups and were found in agreement with Kholif and Khorshed (2006), Abo El-Nor et al. (2007) and Campanile et al. (2008). The addition of polyherbal combination increased the net energy of milk for dairy goat, according to higher organic matter digestibility, thus leading to an increase in milk yield. The relative improvement of milk production of T₂ might be due to the healthy effect of polyherbal additives and the associated effect between acetate and succinate on rumen microflora, which lead to improvement of feed efficiency and milk production (Abo El-Nor and Kholif 2005). In this study, levels of serum energy indicators (glucose) of treated goats was higher (Table 3) suggesting that higher dry matter utilization of treated goats provided enough energy to support the increased milk production (Stella et al. 2007).

Milk protein, fat, TS and SNF contents were higher (P>0.05) in animals fed experimental additives than control. Kholif and Khorshed (2006) found that rations supplemented with yeast, significantly increased milk protein and lactose contents compared with control. In the other studies, milk fat, protein and lactose contents were not affected by polyherbal supplementation (Erasmus *et al.* 2005 and

| Table 4. Effect of different additives on milk yield, FCM, |
|--|
| milk composition % and feed and economic efficiencies |
| in lactating goats |

| | T_1 | T ₂ | T ₃ | SEM | Р |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|------|
| | (Control | .) | | | |
| Live body weight (kg) | 42.85 | 42.30 | 43.50 | 2.06 | NS |
| DMI (kg/h/d) | 56.65 | 52.22 | 51.69 | 9.32 | NS |
| MBS (W ^{0.75} /kg) | 142.01 | 134.56 | 131.88 | 22.86 | NS |
| Milk yield (kg/h/d) | 2.20 ^b | 2.27 ^b | 2.00 ^a | 0.07 | 0.01 |
| Fat corrected milk (kg/h/d) | 1.98 | 2.14 | 1.84 | 0.12 | NS |
| Milk composition | | | | | |
| Protein (%) | 2.97 | 2.99 | 3.00 | 0.01 | NS |
| Fat (%) | 3.32 | 3.38 | 3.40 | 0.06 | NS |
| Lactose (%) | 4.51 | 4.47 | 4.47 | 0.02 | NS |
| Solids not fat (%) | 8.24 | 8.23 | 8.30 | 0.04 | NS |
| Total solids (%) | 11.56 | 11.54 | 11.68 | 0.08 | NS |
| Feed and economic efficien | cies | | | | |
| DMI / milk yield (kg) | 1.05 | 0.98 | 1.32 | 0.17 | NS |
| DMI / 4% FCM (kg) | 1.19 | 1.05 | 1.47 | 0.19 | NS |
| Overall cost of diet/h/d(\$) | 0.32 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.02 | NS |
| Return milk sale/h/d(\$) | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.04 | NS |
| Net return over feed cost/h/ | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.29 | 0.04 | NS |
| d(\$) | | | | | |

Means in the same line with different superscripts are significantly different

Campanile *et al.* 2008) fed lactating goats on polyherbal supplemented rations and found that treatments slightly increased milk TS and SNF.

In general, feed efficiency calculated as milk yield/DMI and 4% FCM/DMI were significantly improved in T_2 followed by T_3 and T_1 . Also, economic efficiency of these additives followed the same trend of feed efficiency (Tables 4,5). The highest relative efficiency was recorded with T_2 whereas groups T_1 and T_3 showed the lower efficiencies in that order.

Milk yield and 4% FCM increased (P>0.05) gradually with periods advancement up to eighth week of lactation period and decreased gradually thereafter (Table 5). Also, feed efficiency (milk yield/DMI) and (FCM/DMI) were taking the same trend of milk yield. Milk constituents showed significant variations among different weeks in different groups. These results clearly indicated that highest milk production and feed efficiency were recorded in T₂ group as compared to T₃ and T₁. Kumar (2009) and Beyan (2009) found similar trend of milk yield in different phase of lactation of lactating cows and goats respectively.

It could be concluded that lactating goat's ration supplemented with combination of polyherbal supplements showed improvement of nutrients digestibility, milk production, milk composition and economic efficiency compared to animals fed the control diet. Also, no deleterious effects on general health of the treated animals were observed. However, polyherbal supplementation of diet improved their August 2011]

| Table 5. Weekly means | of DM intake, milk | yield, milk con | nposition and feed | efficiency in | treatment g | groups |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|--------|
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|--------|

| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | Periods (week) | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------|-------|
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Item | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | SEM | Р |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | $\overline{T_{l}}$ | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | DMI (kg/h/d) | 1.38 ^a | 1.43 ^b | 1.93 ^c | 1.94 ^c | 2.08 ^e | 1.99 ^d | 0.02 | 0.001 |
| 4% FCM (kg/hd) 1.99 2.08 2.15 2.11 1.97 1.87 0.17 NS Milk composition | MY (kg/h/d) | 2.46 | 2.41 | 2.35 | 2.45 | 2.05 | 2.32 | 0.22 | NS |
| Milk composition Protein (%) 3.00^{c} 2.91^{a} 2.88^{a} 2.88^{a} 2.96^{b} 0.03 0.05 Fat (%) 10.92 11.05 11.04 11.10 10.70 11.36 0.17 NS SNF (%) 8.34^{c} 8.07^{ab} 8.08^{ab} 8.00^{a} 8.00^{a} 8.20^{bc} 0.08 0.04 Feed efficiency (kg) U U U U 0.07^{a} 0.99^{a} 1.16^{b} 0.09 0.001 $4\% FCM/DMI$ 1.42^{c} 1.46^{c} 1.24^{b} 1.26^{b} 0.99^{a} 1.16^{b} 0.09 0.001 M' (kg/h/d) 1.39^{a} 1.42^{a} 1.94^{b} 1.92^{b} 2.17^{c} 1.91^{b} 0.03 0.001 MY (kg/h/d) 2.23 2.19 2.43 2.42 2.22 2.08 0.17 NS Milk composition 0.94^{a} 1.02^{b} 2.17^{c} 3.02^{c} 0.02 0.001 St (%) 3.19^{c} 3.20^{c} 3.13^{c} 2.28^{c} | 4% FCM (kg/h/d) | 1.99 | 2.08 | 2.15 | 2.11 | 1.97 | 1.87 | 0.17 | NS |
| Protein (%) 3.00^{c} 2.90^{a} 2.91^{a} 2.88^{a} 2.88^{a} 2.96^{b} 0.03 0.05 Fat (%) 2.98 2.97 3.11 2.70 3.17 2.83 0.15 NS SNF (%) 8.34^{c} 8.07^{ab} 8.08^{ab} 8.00^{a} 8.00^{a} 8.20^{bc} 0.08 0.04 Feed efficiency (kg) Milk yield/DMI 1.78^{c} 1.69^{c} 1.24^{b} 1.09^{b} 0.99^{a} 1.16^{b} 0.09 0.001 $4\% FCM/DMI$ 1.42^{c} 1.46^{c} 1.12^{b} 1.09^{b} 0.94^{a} 0.11 0.05 T_{2} T T T T 0.94^{a} 0.11 0.05 T_{2} T T 1.94^{b} 1.92^{b} 2.17^{c} 1.91^{b} 0.03 0.001 MY (kg/h/d) 1.91 1.72 2.41 2.22 2.08 0.17 NS Milk composition T T 2.43 2.42 2.22 2.68 0.20 0.001 </td <td>Milk composition</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | Milk composition | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Protein (%) | 3.00 ^c | 2.90 ^a | 2.91 ^a | 2.88 ^a | 2.88 ^a | 2.96 ^b | 0.03 | 0.05 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Fat (%) | 2.98 | 2.97 | 3.11 | 2.70 | 3.17 | 2.83 | 0.15 | NS |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | TS (%) | 10.92 | 11.05 | 11.04 | 11.10 | 10.70 | 11.36 | 0.17 | NS |
| Feed efficiency (kg) Milk yield/DMI 1.78^{c} 1.69^{c} 1.24^{b} 1.26^{b} 0.99^{a} 1.16^{b} 0.09 0.001 4% FCM/DMI 1.42^{c} 1.46^{c} 1.12^{b} 1.09^{b} 0.95^{a} 0.94^{a} 0.11 0.05 7_{2} T T T 0.19^{b} 0.17^{c} 1.91^{b} 0.03 0.001 MY (kg/h/d) 2.23 2.19 2.43 2.42 2.22 2.58 0.20 NS 4% FCM (kg/h/d) 1.91 1.72 2.41 2.22 2.02 2.08 0.17 NS Milk composition T T $2.99d^{c}$ $2.98d$ 2.80^{a} 2.84^{b} 2.89^{c} 3.02^{c} 0.02 0.001 S (%) 10.66^{a} 10.97^{ab} 11.01^{b} 10.76^{ab} 11.84^{c} 0.26 0.04 Step of ficiency (kg) 3.16^{c} 1.54^{c} 1.55^{c} 1.60^{c} 1.64^{c} 1.81^{c} 0.26^{c} 0.03 0.001 NS< | SNF (%) | 8.34 ^c | 8.07 ^{ab} | 8.08 ^{ab} | 8.00 ^a | 8.00 ^a | 8.20 ^{bc} | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Feed efficiency (kg) | | | | | | | | |
| 4%FCM/DMI 1.42° 1.46° 1.12 ^b 1.09 ^b 0.95 ^a 0.94 ^a 0.11 0.05 T_2 | Milk yield/DMI | 1.78 ^c | 1.69 ^c | 1.24 ^b | 1.26 ^b | 0.99 ^a | 1.16 ^b | 0.09 | 0.001 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 4%FCM/DMI | 1.42 ^c | 1.46 ^c | 1.12 ^b | 1.09 ^b | 0.95 ^a | 0.94 ^a | 0.11 | 0.05 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | T_2 | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | ĎMI (kg/h/d) | 1.39 ^a | 1.42 ^a | 1.94 ^b | 1.92 ^b | 2.17 ^c | 1.91 ^b | 0.03 | 0.001 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | MY $(kg/h/d)$ | 2.23 | 2.19 | 2.43 | 2.42 | 2.22 | 2.58 | 0.20 | NS |
| Milk compositionProtein (%) $2.99d^e$ 2.98^d 2.80^a 2.84^b 2.89^c 3.02^e 0.02 0.001 Fat (%) 3.19^c 3.20^c 3.13^c 2.72^b 3.52^d 2.49^a 0.12 0.001 TS (%) 10.66^a 10.97^{ab} 10.94^{ab} 11.01^b 10.76^{ab} 11.84^c 0.26 0.04 SNF (%) 8.33 7.78 7.74 7.88 8.04 8.32 0.21 NSFeed efficiency (kg)Milk yield/DMI $1.60c$ $1.54c$ $1.25b$ $1.26b$ $1.03a$ $1.35b$ 0.11 0.03 $4\%FCM/DMI$ 1.37 1.21 1.24 1.16 0.93 1.09 0.11 NS T_3 T_3 T_2 1.24 1.76^c 0.03 0.001 MY (kg/h/d) 1.59 1.81 2.14 2.16 0.28^e 1.72^c 0.03 0.001 MY (kg/h/d) 1.59 1.50 2.04 2.14 1.68 2.12 0.23 NSMilk composition T_3 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_3 T_2 T_2 0.03 0.001 Fat (%) 3.04^d 2.95^{bc} 2.84^a 2.91^b 2.99^c 3.06^d 0.03 0.001 Fat (%) 3.14^c 2.78^b 3.15^c 3.11^c 3.31^c 2.46^a 0.17 0.007 Sterior T_1 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_2 T_2 </td <td>4%FCM (kg/h/d)</td> <td>1.91</td> <td>1.72</td> <td>2.41</td> <td>2.22</td> <td>2.02</td> <td>2.08</td> <td>0.17</td> <td>NS</td> | 4%FCM (kg/h/d) | 1.91 | 1.72 | 2.41 | 2.22 | 2.02 | 2.08 | 0.17 | NS |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Milk composition | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Protein (%) | 2.99d ^e | 2.98 ^d | 2.80 ^a | 2.84 ^b | 2.89 ^c | 3.02 ^e | 0.02 | 0.001 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Fat (%) | 3.19 ^c | 3.20 ^c | 3.13 ^c | 2.72 ^b | 3.52 ^d | 2.49 ^a | 0.12 | 0.001 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | TS (%) | 10.66 ^a | 10.97 ^{ab} | 10.94 ^{ab} | 11.01 ^b | 10.76 ^{ab} | 11.84 ^c | 0.26 | 0.04 |
| Feed efficiency (kg)Milk yield/DMI1.60c1.54c1.25b1.26b1.03a1.35b0.110.034%FCM/DMI1.371.211.241.160.931.090.11NS T_3 1.77cd1.78d2.08e1.72c0.030.001MY (kg/h/d)1.951.812.142.151.942.460.26NS4%FCM (kg/h/d)1.591.502.042.141.682.120.23NSMilk compositionProtein (%)3.04d2.95bc2.84a2.91b2.99c3.06d0.030.001Fat (%)3.14c2.78b3.15c3.11c3.31c2.46a0.170.007TS (%)11.60cd11.33bc10.64a11.24b11.40bc11.76d0.180.001SNF (%)8.43d8.19bc7.86a8.08b8.30c8.45d0.070.001Feed efficiency (kg)Milk yield/DMI1.51.261.211.210.931.430.22NS | SNF (%) | 8.33 | 7.78 | 7.74 | 7.88 | 8.04 | 8.32 | 0.21 | NS |
| Milk yield/DMI1.60c1.54c1.25b1.26b1.03a1.35b0.110.034% FCM/DMI1.371.211.241.160.931.090.11NS T_3 DMI (kg/h/d)1.31a1.44b1.77cd1.78d2.08e1.72c0.030.001MY (kg/h/d)1.951.812.142.151.942.460.26NS4% FCM (kg/h/d)1.591.502.042.141.682.120.23NSMilk compositionNN1.31c2.78b3.15c3.11c3.31c2.46a0.170.007Fat (%)3.14c2.78b3.15c3.11c3.31c2.46a0.170.0070.001SNF (%)8.43d8.19bc7.86a8.08b8.30c8.45d0.070.001Feed efficiency (kg)Milk yield/DMI1.51.261.211.210.931.430.22NS4% FCM/DMI1.261.051.141.200.811.230.21NS | Feed efficiency (kg) | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Milk vield/DMI | 1.60c | 1.54c | 1.25b | 1.26b | 1.03a | 1.35b | 0.11 | 0.03 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 4%FCM/DMI | 1.37 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 0.93 | 1.09 | 0.11 | NS |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | T_{3} | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | DMI (kg/h/d) | 1.31 ^a | 1.44 ^b | 1.77 ^{cd} | 1.78 ^d | 2.08 ^e | 1.72 ^c | 0.03 | 0.001 |
| 4% FCM (kg/h/d) 1.59 1.50 2.04 2.14 1.68 2.12 0.23 NS Milk composition Protein (%) 3.04 ^d 2.95 ^{bc} 2.84 ^a 2.91 ^b 2.99 ^c 3.06 ^d 0.03 0.001 Fat (%) 3.14 ^c 2.78 ^b 3.15 ^c 3.11 ^c 3.31 ^c 2.46 ^a 0.17 0.007 TS (%) 11.60 ^{cd} 11.33 ^{bc} 10.64 ^a 11.24 ^b 11.40 ^{bc} 11.76 ^d 0.18 0.001 SNF (%) 8.43 ^d 8.19 ^{bc} 7.86 ^a 8.08 ^b 8.30 ^c 8.45 ^d 0.07 0.001 Feed efficiency (kg) Milk yield/DMI 1.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS 4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | MY $(kg/h/d)$ | 1.95 | 1.81 | 2.14 | 2.15 | 1.94 | 2.46 | 0.26 | NS |
| Milk compositionProtein (%) 3.04^{d} 2.95^{bc} 2.84^{a} 2.91^{b} 2.99^{c} 3.06^{d} 0.03 0.001 Fat (%) 3.14^{c} 2.78^{b} 3.15^{c} 3.11^{c} 3.31^{c} 2.46^{a} 0.17 0.007 TS (%) 11.60^{cd} 11.33^{bc} 10.64^{a} 11.24^{b} 11.40^{bc} 11.76^{d} 0.18 0.001 SNF (%) 8.43^{d} 8.19^{bc} 7.86^{a} 8.08^{b} 8.30^{c} 8.45^{d} 0.07 0.001 Feed efficiency (kg) $Nilk$ yield/DMI 1.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | 4%FCM (kg/h/d) | 1.59 | 1.50 | 2.04 | 2.14 | 1.68 | 2.12 | 0.23 | NS |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Milk composition | | | | | | | | |
| Fat (%) 3.14^{c} 2.78^{b} 3.15^{c} 3.11^{c} 3.31^{c} 2.46^{a} 0.17 0.007 TS (%) 11.60^{cd} 11.33^{bc} 10.64^{a} 11.24^{b} 11.40^{bc} 11.76^{d} 0.18 0.001 SNF (%) 8.43^{d} 8.19^{bc} 7.86^{a} 8.08^{b} 8.30^{c} 8.45^{d} 0.07 0.001 Feed efficiency (kg)Milk yield/DMI 1.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | Protein (%) | 3.04 ^d | 2.95 ^{bc} | 2.84 ^a | 2.91 ^b | 2.99 ^c | 3.06 ^d | 0.03 | 0.001 |
| TS (%) 11.60 ^{cd} 11.33 ^{bc} 10.64 ^a 11.24 ^b 11.40 ^{bc} 11.76 ^d 0.18 0.001 SNF (%) 8.43 ^d 8.19 ^{bc} 7.86 ^a 8.08 ^b 8.30 ^c 8.45 ^d 0.07 0.001 Feed efficiency (kg) 11.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS 4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | Fat (%) | 3.14 ^c | 2.78 ^b | 3.15 ^c | 3.11 ^c | 3.31 ^c | 2.46 ^a | 0.17 | 0.007 |
| SNF (%) 8.43 ^d 8.19 ^{bc} 7.86 ^a 8.08 ^b 8.30 ^c 8.45 ^d 0.07 0.001 Feed efficiency (kg) Nilk yield/DMI 1.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS 4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | TS (%) | 11.60 ^{cd} | 11.33 ^{bc} | 10.64 ^a | 11.24 ^b | 11.40 ^{bc} | 11.76 ^d | 0.18 | 0.001 |
| Feed efficiency (kg) 1.5 1.26 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS 4%FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | SNF (%) | 8.43 ^d | 8.19 ^{bc} | 7.86 ^a | 8.08 ^b | 8.30° | 8.45 ^d | 0.07 | 0.001 |
| Milk yield/DMI 1.5 1.26 1.21 1.21 0.93 1.43 0.22 NS 4% FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | Feed efficiency (kg) | | | | | | | | |
| 4%FCM/DMI 1.26 1.05 1.14 1.20 0.81 1.23 0.21 NS | Milk vield/DMI | 1.5 | 1.26 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 0.93 | 1.43 | 0.22 | NS |
| | 4%FCM/DMI | 1.26 | 1.05 | 1.14 | 1.20 | 0.81 | 1.23 | 0.21 | NS |

Means in the same line with different superscripts are significantly different.

milk production. Further studies are needed to determine the exact ratio of these combinations and respective mechanisms that elicit positive effects on milk production on high yielding goats.

SUMMARY

This study was carried out to evaluate the effect of dried mixture of 5 herbal plants, viz. *Asparagus racemosus*, *Trigonella foenum graecum* seeds, *Carum carvi*, *Nigella sativa* and chamomile flower, as natural additives on milk yield and composition of crossbred dairy goats. Results clearly indicated that combination of herbal supplementation in different treatments recorded the lowest rate of dry matter digestibility (DMD) compared to control group. Lactating goats (30) after 2 weeks of kidding were divided into 3 groups (10 animals each) using complete random block design to evaluate the effect of herbal mixture supplement on the productivity of lactating goats. Treatment 2 (T_2) and treatment 3 (T_3) were supplemented with polyherbal combination @ 125 and 250 mg/kg body weight respectively. Goats without polyherbal combination served as control group (T_1). Animals were fed on 40% concentrate feed mixture and green fodder *ad lib*.

Dry matter intake (DMI) slightly increased for animals fed on T_2 ration compared to T_1 and T_3 . Apparent nutrients digestibility and total digestible nutrients (TDN) were significantly improved by treatments. Milk yield, 4% fat corrected milk (FCM),milk protein, fat, total solids, feed

efficiency (DMI/milk yield and DMI/4% FCM) and economic efficiency were significantly higher for animals in T_2 followed by T_3 and T_1 (control). Glucose contents and total leukocyte count (TLC) were higher in animals which received experimental additives than those received control. It may be concluded that adding the combination of polyherbal supplementation to rations improves the productivity of lactating goats with no deleterious effects on general health.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research was conducted under the NDRI Ph D Program, financed by National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal. The authors are highly indebted to Director and Vice Chancellor of NDRI for facilitating the experimental trials.

REFERENCES

- A O A C. 1997. 16th edn. *Official Methods of Analysis* AOAC International, Gaithersburg, M D.
- A O A C. 1995. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, 16th edn. *Agriculture Chemicals Contaminants and Drugs* Vol.1. Washington, D C, USA.
- Abo El-Nor S A H, Khattab H M, Al-Alamy H A, Salem F A, Abdou M M. 2007.Effect of some medicinal plants seeds in the rations on the productive performance of lactating buffaloes. *International Journal of Dairy Science* 2 (4): 348–55.
- Abo El-Nor S A H, Kholif S M. 2005. Impact of sodium acetate and sodium succinate supplemental to rations of lactating goats on milk production, milk composition and some ruminal and blood parameters. *Egyptian Journal of Nutrition and Feeds* **8** (1): 15–25.
- Aboul-Foutouh G E, Allam S M, Shehata E I, Abd El-Azeem S N. 2000. Effect of some medicinal plants as feed additives on milk production and composition of lactating buffaloes. *Egyptian Journal of Nutrition and Feeds* **3** (1): 31–41.
- Ali M F, Saleh S, Eweedah N M, Mahmoud S A. 2005. Effect of using chamomile (*Mtricaria chamomilla*) flowers as feed additives on performance of growing lambs under desert farming systems. *Egyptian Journal of Nutrition and Feeds* 8 (2): 127– 37.
- Allam S M, El-Hosseiny H M, AbdelGawad A M, Elsaadany S A, Zeid A M M. 1999. Medicinal herbs and plants as feed additives for ruminant. 1. Effect of using some medicinal herbs and plants as feed additives on Zaraibi goat performance. *Egyptian Journal* of Nutrition and Feeds (Special issue) 1: 349–65.
- Bayssa M. 2006. 'Detoxification of tannins in Acacia nilotica pods on *in vitro* nutrient digestibility and milk production in lactating goats.' M Sc. Thesis submitted to NDRI (Deemed University), Karnal, Haryana.

- Campanile G, Zicarelli F, Vecchio D, Pacelli C, Neglia G, Balestrieri A, Di Palo R. Infascelli F. 2008. Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on *in vivo* organic matter digestibility and milk yield in buffalo cows. *Livestock Science* **114**: 358–61.
- Dalvi S S, Nadkarni P M, Gupta K C. 1990. Effect of Asparagus racemosus (Shatavari) on gastric emptying time in normal healthy volunteers. Journal of Postgraduate Medicine **36**: 91–4.
- Dubowski K M. 1962. An o-Toluidine method for body-fluid glucose determination. *Experimental Cell Research* 42: 136– 56.
- Drackley J K, Overton T R, Douglas G N. 2001. Adaptations of glucose and long chain fatty acid metabolism in liver of dairy cows during the periparturient period. *Journal of Dairy Science* 84: E,100 - E112.
- Duncan D B. 1955. Multiple range and multiple F tests. *Biometrics* **11**: 1.
- El-Ashry M A, El-Bordeny N E, Khattab H M, El-Sayed H M. 2006. Effect of dietry supplemented with medicinal herbs on nutrient digestibility and some blood metabolites of buffalo calves. *Egyptian Journal of Nutrition and Feeds* 9 (2): 179–91.
- Ferret A, Plaixats J, Caja G, Gasa J, Prió P. 1999. Using markers to estimate apparent dry matter digestibility, faecal output and dry matter intake in dairy ewes fed Italian ryegrass hay or alfalfa hay. *Small Ruminant Research* 33: 145–52.
- Kholif A M, Abd El-Gawad M A M. 2001. Medicinal plant seeds supplementation of lactating goats diets and its effect on milk and cheese quantity and quality. *Egyptian Journal of Dairy Science* 2229: 139.
- Kholif S M, Khorshed M M. 2006. Effect of yeast or selenized yeast supplementation to rations on the productive performance of lactating buffaloes. *Egyptian Journal of Nutition and Feeds* 9 (2): 193–205.
- Kumar S. 2009. 'Effect of herbal feed supplement *shatavari* (*Asparagus racemosus*) on productive performance of crossbred cows'. Ph D. Thesis submitted to National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India.
- Mohamed, A H, El-Saidy B, El-Seidi I A. 2003. Influence of some medicinal plants supplementation. 1. On digestibility, nutritive value, rumen fermentation and some blood biochemical parameters in sheep. *Egyptian Journal of Nutition and Feeds* 6: 139.
- Stella A V, Paratte R, Valnegri L, Cigalino G, Soncini G, Chevaux E, Dell'Orto V, Savoini G. 2007. Effect of administration of live *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on milk production, composition, blood metabolites, and faecal flora in early lactating dairy goats. *Small Ruminant Research* 67 (1): 7–13.
- SYSTAT. 12 © Copyright 2007, SYSTAT Software, Inc.
- Wang C, Liu Q, Yang W Z, Dong Q, Yang X M, He D C, Zhang P, Dong K H, Huang Y X. 2009. Effects of selenium yeast on rumen fermentation, lactation performance and feed digestibilities in lactating dairy cows. *Livestock Science* **126** (1–3): 239–344.