

Thymus vulgarise

/ /

0

Ab (T₃ , T₂ T₁ , C % 0.6 , 0.4 , 0.2 ,
) / 150

. 47 7

T₁ 21-7

T₁ , Ab , C T₂ T₂

Ab 35-22

T₃ , Ab , C T₁ T₃ , T₂ , T₁
47-36

Belanger ; 2002 WHO)

(2008 Hughes ; 2007 Thomas

Bunyan (1996 Swick) (Chlortetracycline)

(2001) Tong (1984) Lawton Stutz (1977)

Shi

/ 50 (2005)

. 2010 / 3 / 24

. 2010 / 5 / 10

(1999)

(Thyme)

.(2009 ; 2005 ; 1998 ; 1996)

300 ,
 / 42 Ross
 , / 93 7
 20
 , 0.4 , 0.2 , 0 47 7
 T₃ , T₂ , T₁ , C % 0.6
 / 150 Ab
 ,
 ,1
 2
 47 35 21

(Complete Randomized Design)
 (1996 SAS)
 (1955 Duncan)

.1

(%)	
54	(%44) *
10	
29	
5	
1	
1	
20.75	**
2982	(/)
143.4	C/P ratio
0.388	%
1.094	%
0.7376	% +
0.3499	%
0.2915	%

%2. 8 %5() %25 %12 %40() *

kcal %09 %2. 7 %2. 4 + %1. 7()

/ 10B1 / 37500D3 , / 125000A 2800

/ 200E / 150B12 / 15B6 / 50B2

/ 100 , / 280 / 0.5 , / 20K3

820 / 240 , / 23,5 , / 6

, / 1.1 / 500 , / 14.2 / 2 , /

0.002() / 0.001(B.H.T) / 0.77

. /

.(1994) NRC **

% * .2

%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
54.14	8.97	10.65	2.74	10.5	87	13	

(1999) *

21

(p<0.05)

% 0.4

T₂

.3

C

T₂

35

% 0.6

% 0.4

T₃

(C)

(3)

47

(1999)

.3

(/)			*
47	35	21	
2197.5	1366.6 ^a	496.6 ^{a**}	C
2186.8	1354.0 ^{ab}	476.8 ^{ab}	Ab ^{**}
2160.6	1262.4 ^{ab}	480.8 ^{ab}	T ¹
2146.3	1240.2 ^b	446.6 ^b	T ²
2121.0	1240.0 ^b	457.5 ^{ab}	T ³
N.S ^{***}	P<0.05	P<0.05	

% 0.6 0.4 0.2 0

T₃, T₂, T₁, C

*

/ 150 Ab

**

(2004)

Hernandez

5 ppm

. 10 ppm

Avilamycin

4

T₂

% 0.2

T₁

35-22

21-7

47-36

, (C)

T₃ T₁

Thakare

35-22

21-7

(2004)

Hernandez

(2004)

21-7

100/ 580

/ 50

Bacitracim

.4

47-7

47-36	35-22	21-7	*	
830.6	869.9 ^{ab}	403.6 ^{ab} **	C	(/)
831.7	886.1 ^a	374.8 ^{ab}	Ab	
898.1	781.6 ^c	421.1 ^a	T ₁	
906.1	793.5 ^{bc}	353.6 ^b	T ₂	
881.3	781.5 ^c	364.5 ^{ab}	T ₃	
N.S	P<0.05	P<0.05		
1776.5	1541.6	760.0	C	(/)
1815.8	1558.6	732.2	Ab	
1788.3	1601.5	775.0	T ₁	
1849.0	1511.6	824.1	T ₂	
1760.8	1430.8	762.5	T ₃	
N.S	N.S	N.S ^{***}		

Ab

% 0.6 0.4 0.2 0

T₃, T₂, T₁, C

*

/ 150

**

(4)

(2004) Thakare

47-36 35-22 21-7

(2004)

Hernandez

(5)

Ab C

% 0.4

T₂

35-22

21-7

T₁

% 0.2

T₁

.T₃ Ab C

47-36

(2004)

Hernandez

.5

47-7

(47-35)	(35-21)	(21-7)	*	
2.138	1.772 ^b	1.883 ^{b**}	C	
2.183	1.758 ^b	1.953 ^b	Ab	
1.991	2.049 ^a	1.840 ^b	T ₁	
2.040	1.904 ^{ab}	2.330 ^a	T ₂	/
1.997	1.830 ^b	2.091 ^{ab}	T ₃	
N.S ^{***}	P<0.05	P<0.05		
1.67	0.0	0.0	C	
0.0	1.67	0.0	Ab	
0.0	0.0	0.0	T ₁	
0.0	0.0	0.0	T ₂	%
0.0	0.0	0.0	T ₃	
N.S	N.S	N.S		

Ab

% 0.6 0.4 0.2 0

T₃ T₂ T₁ C

*

/ 150

**

= N.S ***

(5)

47-36 35-22 21-7

(T₃ T₂ T₁)

(2004 Thakare ; 1996) Tannin Thymol
(2009)

ppm 55
84

(2008) Lee

. 84-0 56-0 28-0

- - . 1996 .
()

. 2009 .

. 1999 .

/ . 1998 .

- . 2005 .

Belanger , A. E. and R. S. Thomas. 2007. Macrolide – resistant
Campylobacter : The meat of the matter (Review). Journal of
Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 60(4): 715 – 723.

Bunyan J., L. Jeffries, J. R. Sayers, A. L. Gulliver and K. Coleman.1977.
Antimicrobial substances and chick growth promotion: The
growth-promoting activities of antimicrobial substances, including
fifty-two used either in therapy or as dietary additives . British,
Poultry Science Volume 18 (3) : 283 – 294.(Abs).

Duncan , B.D.1955. Multiple range and multiple F - test. Biometrics,11:1-42.

- Hernandez , F.J., V. Madrid., J. Garcia , J. Orengo and M.D. Megias. 2004. Influence of two plant Extracts on Broiler performance, Digestibility and Digestive organ Size. Poultry Science , 83 : 169-174.
- Hughes , L., H. Patrick and M. Kenton. 2008. Risk factor For the use of prescription antibiotics on UK broiler farms. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 61(4): 947 – 952.
- Lee D. w. Ching-feng, L. Shiau-Ru, W. Ruo-chi, W. hen- wei and C. Bao-Ji .2008 . Growth performance ,immune response and gastrointestinal health of Taiwan red-feathered native chickens fed diets supplemented with growth-promoting antibiotics .J. Chin. Soc . Anim. Sci. 37(4);233-247.
- National Research Council.1994. Nutrient Requirement of poultry. 9th ed., National Academy press, Washington.
- Swick R.A. 1996.role of growth promotants in poultry and swine feed. ASA Technical Bulletin vol. ANO 4.
- SAS , Institute. 1996. SAS Users Guide: Statistics version 6th ed., SAS Institute , Inc. ,Gary , NC.
- Shi B.L., D.F. Li , X.S. Piao, S.M. Yan. 2005. Effects of chitosan on growth performance and energy and protein utilization in broiler chickens .British Poultry Science ,46 (4):516 -519.(Abs.).
- Stutz, M. W, and G.C. Lawton. 1984. Effects of diet and perfringens, and earlier weight of broiler chicks. Poult. Sci. 63;2036-2042.Cited by Lee *et.al.* (2008).
- Thakare, M. 2004. pharmacological Screening of some Medicinal plants As Antimicrobial and feed additives. Master of Science in Animal and poultry Science (pharmacology). Virginia. Polytechnic Institute and state university. USA.

Tong, J. M, R.J. Zhang, R.N. Sa. S. Y. pan, and y. Huang. 2001.
immunosuppressant effect of long term and sub therapeutic
chlortetracycline in broiler. Sci. Agric. Sin. 34200-204.Cited by Lee
et. al. (2008).

WHO. 2002. Evaluation of Certain veterinary Drug Residues in food.
Technical Report Series ; 911.

**EFFECTS OF ADDING CHLORTETRACYCLIN ANTIBIOTIC AND
DIFFERENT LEVELS OF THYME LEAVES POWDER *Thymus Vulgaris*
IN THE RATION IN SOME PRODUCTIV CHARACTIRESTICS OF
BROILER.**

Mohammed Ahmed Shwyel

* Dept. Of Animal Resources- College of Agriculture - Diyala University

ABSTRACT

This experiment was conducted to study the effect of adding different levels of thyme leaves powder to the ration at levels 0 , 0.2 , 0.4 , 0.6 % for C,T₁, T₂, T₃ treatments respectively and one does which is 150 gm / tone of feed from chlortetracycline antibiotic (does to stimulate growth) for treatment AB to show the effect of these treatments on the productive performance of broilers. With continuous *adlibitum* feeding of this ration from 7 – 47 day of age.

The results showed that there was no significant differences in final body weight and feed intake during the experiment period. During the period 7-21 days a significant increase occurred in weight gain for treatment T₁ compared with treatment T₂ and in feed efficiency for treatment T₂ compared with C, Ab ,T₁ treatments. Period 22-35 days significant increase occurred in weight gain for treatment Ab compared with T₁,T₂,T₃ treatment while in feed efficiency for T₁ treatment compared with C ,Ab , T₃ treatments. Period 36-47 days there was no significant difference between treatments in weight gain and feed efficiency. No significant different between treatments in mortality.