



Haščík et al. 2013 : 3 (2) 118-121

MEAT PERFORMANCE OF CHICKENS HUBBARD JV AFTER APPLICATION OF PROPOLIS EXTRACT

Peter Haščík¹, Jozef Garlík¹, Ibrahim Omer Elamin Elimam¹, Vladimíra Kňazovická¹, Miroslava Kačániová², Milan Šimko³, Martin Mellen⁴

Address(es): doc. Ing. Peter Haščík, PhD.

¹ Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences, Department of Animal Products Evaluation and Processing, Tr. A. Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovak Republic.

² Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences, Department of Microbiology, Tr. A. Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovak Republic.

³ Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Agrobiology and Food Resources, Department of Animal Nutrition, Tr. A. Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovak Republic.

⁴ Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences, Department of Food Hygiene and Safety, Tr. A. Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovak Republic.

*Corresponding author: peter.hascik@uniag.sk

ARTICLE INFO

Received 4. 6. 2013

Revised 9. 9. 2013

Accepted 16. 9. 2013

Published 1. 10. 2013

Regular article



ABSTRACT

Influence of propolis extract on meat performance of chickens' hybrid combination Hubbard JV was evaluated in this experiment. The feed mixture has been made without addition antibiotic preparation and coccidiostats. However, propolis extract was added to the feed mixtures of experimental groups during the whole fattening period in followed amounts: 150 mg kg⁻¹ (1st experimental group – E1) and 450 mg kg⁻¹ (2nd experimental group – E2). Fattening lasted 42 days. Live body weight increased by 7.63 g in E1 and by 14.13 g in E2 compared with control group (1507.37 g). Carcass body weight was higher in experimental groups (1022.37 g – E1 and 1019.75 g – E2) compared with control group (1005.12 g). The weight of giblets was lower in experimental groups (117.79 g – E1 and 117.16 g – E2) compared with control group (119.06 g). The carcass yield of chickens was higher in E1 (75.27%) compared with control group (74.92%), Carcass yield of chickens was higher in E1 (75.27%) compared with control group (74.92%) but E2 (74.76%) was lowest. and there were no significant differences ($P \geq 0.05$) among the groups.

Propolis extract did not influence the meat performance. Slight increase of live body, resp. of carcass body weight at the end of fattening can have a positive effect on the overall economics of chicken meat production. Based on the results, propolis extract is available supplement for chickens fattening.

Keywords: Meat performance, propolis extract, Hubbard JV, broiler

INTRODUCTION

Poultry meat and products from poultry meat are generally popular, because they are no subjects of cultural or religious limitations and they are perceived as healthy and nutritive matters for their relatively low fat content and higher content of unsaturated fatty acids in comparison with other meat. Van Horne (2002) states, advantages of poultry meat are availability for wide range of population and price acceptability. Poultry meat is suitable material for production of functional foods determined to human consumption; nowadays, agricultural and food research is centred on functional foods (Berri et al., 2001; Straková et al., 2003; Guéye, 2009). Instead of poultry meat production, quality composition of poultry meat is important in the food industry, too and the composition is influenced by various intravital and extravital factors, where the main role has quality of feed mixture and supplements used in poultry nutrition (Pesti et al., 1986; Koelkebeck et al., 1993; Gonzalez-Alcorta et al., 1994; Haščík et al., 2005a, 2012).

During the last decades, various supplements for feed mixtures were evaluated as a substitution for expensive components or as supplements affecting the quality of meat and egg (Haščík et al., 1994; Angelovičová, 1999; Polák, 2003; Pokorná, 2003; Arpášová et al., 2009ab and others). Entry of Slovakia into the European Union was associated with important changes in production of poultry meat and eggs. Then, a new era of the conditions and regulations of the European Community (EC) has begun. One of the basic EC measures was removing of animal meals and growth stimulators or antibiotics from poultry feed mixtures, where upon new possible supplements has started to apply in poultry nutrition and verify their positive effects to microorganisms of poultry gastrointestinal tract (Corrier et al., 1995; Kačániová et al., 2005, 2006ab, 2007; Nováková et al., 2008) and of carcass body (Carazzoni et al., 1998; Demeterová, 2004; Marcin et al., 2004; Angelovičová et al., 2005, 2006; Mudroňová et al., 2005; Haščík et al., 2005b, 2007, 2008, 2009; Tuberoso et al., 2005; Basile et al.,

2006; Bozin et al., 2006; Opletal, 2006; Singh et al., 2006; Trevisan et al., 2006; Liptaiová et al., 2009 and others).

Natural material with possible positive properties to ensuring the production of safety foodstuffs is one of the bee products – propolis (Prytzky et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2004; Shalmany and Shivazad, 2006; Seven et al., 2008; Haščík et al., 2012 and others). Propolis is a resinous material and mixture of sugars, wax and plant exudates collected by bees from different plant sources, which directly influence the propolis composition, because more than 300 components were identified in propolis (Ghisalberti, 1979; Mochida et al., 1985; Amoros et al., 1992; Markham et al., 1996; Valle, 2000; Banskota et al., 2001). Propolis may be used in animal nutrition in dried and milled form or as a propolis extract, since it is characterized by: antibacterial properties (Ghisalberti, 1979; Mochida et al., 1985; Pepelnjak et al., 1985; Nowotnick, 1995; Velikova et al., 2000), anticarcinogenic properties (Burdock, 1998), fungicide properties (Dimov et al., 1991; Murad et al., 2002; Ota et al., 2001), antiviral properties (Amoros et al., 1992; 1994), local-anaesthetic properties (Paintz and Metzner, 1979), anti-inflammatory properties (Strehla et al., 1993; Miyataka et al., 1997), antioxidant properties (Sun et al., 2000; Isla et al., 2001), hepatoprotective properties (Gonzales et al., 1995), immunostimulatory properties (Dimov et al., 1991), cytostatic properties (Frenkel et al., 1993; Banskota et al., 2001). And finally, propolis may be a part of therapy in veterinary or human medicine. Application of propolis in animal nutrition has had many positive impacts on their health state, increase of feed intake, body weight and on the improvement of antioxidant and antimicrobial properties (Kimoto et al., 1999; Prytzky et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2004).

Based on these findings, the aim of the experiment was to evaluate and verify the influence of feed mixtures with propolis extract on meat performance of Hubbard JV chickens. Propolis extract was applied into the normally produced commercial feed mixtures without antibiotic preparations and coccidiostats.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was performed in testing station Zámostie Company with broiler chickens of Hubbard JV hybrid combination. The study enrolled 400 chicks in one day old, which were divided into 4 groups ($n=100$): control (C) and experimental groups (E1, E2). The fattening duration was 42 days. Chickens were bred on the deep litter (sawdust). Feed was served using tubular feeders. Feed mixtures used in this experiment were mixed and prepared by company Biofeed Company with seat in Kolárovo in accordance with Gazette of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2004). Feed mixtures were analysed in term of basic nutrients and energy value at the Department of animal nutrition (Faculty of Agrobiology and Food Resources, Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra). Feed mixture was served manually at periodic intervals each day and chickens were fed by the system *ad libitum*. In all evaluated groups of experimental, starter feed mixture HYD-01 (powder form) was served to 21st day of age and HYD-02 (powder form) was served from 22nd days to 42nd day of age. Feed mixtures were made without antibiotic preparations and coccidiostats. Nutritional value of feed mixtures (Table 1) was uniform in each group during the experiment, but the propolis extract was added to feed mixtures HYD-01 and HYD-02 in experimental groups in dose of 150 mg kg⁻¹ (E1) and 450 mg kg⁻¹ (E2). Propolis originated in the Slovak Republic. Propolis extract was prepared from milled propolis, which was subsequently mixed to 80% ethanol (Krell, 1996). Propolis solution was extracted in water bath at 80 °C under reflux for 1 hour. The solution was centrifuged after extracting and cooling. Obtained supernatant was evaporated using a rotary vacuum evaporator at temperature of water bath of 40–50 °C and then a residue was weighted. The evaporation residue at amounts of 15 g (E1) and 45 g (E2) were separately dissolved in 1000 cm³ of 80% ethanol and applied into the 100 kg of each feed mixture intended for evaluated group of Hubbard JV chickens. Water was available *ad libitum* by self-powered system using nipple drinkers with drip tray. At the end of the fattening (42nd day), 60 pieces from each group were selected for carcass analysis (30 male pieces and 30 female pieces). We evaluated the live body weight, carcass body weight, weight of giblets and carcass yield. Obtained data were statistically assessed using programme Statgraphics Plus version 5.1 (AV Trading, Umex, Dresden, Germany). Basic variation-statistical values (arithmetic average, standard deviation) were calculated. Analysis of variance followed by Duncan test was used to determine significance of differences between the groups.

Table 1 Composition of the diets

Ingredients (%)	Starter (from 1 st to 21 st day of age)	Grower (22 nd to 42 nd day of age)
Wheat	34.00	37.00
Maize	33.92	37.52
Soybean meal (48% N)	23.00	18.00
Fish meal (71% N)	5.00	3.00
Dried blood	-	1.00
Ground limestone	1.00	0.95
Monocalcium phosphate	0.80	0.70
Fodder salt	0.10	0.10
Sodium bicarbonate	0.15	0.20
Lysine	0.13	0.08
Methionine	0.18	0.20
Clinacox 0.5%	0.02	-
Palm kernel oil Bergafat	1.20	0.70
SACOX 12%	-	0.05
Premix Euromix BR 0.5	0.50	0.50
% ¹		
Analysed composition [g kg ⁻¹]		
Crude protein	212.40	191.62
Fibre	30.51	29.68
Ash	27.01	20.90
Ca	8.23	7.18
P	6.56	5.87
Na	1.77	1.71
Linoleic acid	13.53	14.06
ME _N [MJ kg ⁻¹] by calculation	12.07	12.16

Legend: ¹ active substances per kilogram of premix: vitamin A 2 500 000 IU; vitamin E 50 000 mg; vitamin D3 800 000 IU; niacin 12 000 mg; d-pantothenic acid 3 000 mg; riboflavin 1 800 mg; pyridoxine 1 200 mg; thiamine 600 mg; menadiolone 800 mg; ascorbic acid 50 000 mg; folic acid 400 mg; biotin 40 mg; vitamin B12 10 mg; choline 100 000 mg; betaine 50 000 mg; Mn 20 000 mg; Zn 16 000 mg; Fe 14 000 mg; Cu 2 400 mg; Co 80 mg; I 200 mg; Se 50 mg

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of basic parameters in meat performance of Hubbard JV chickens (without gender separation) are recorded in the Table 2.

Table 2 Meat performance of Hubbard JV chickens (without gender separation) without and with propolis extract in their diet

Parameter	Control	E1 (150 mg kg ⁻¹)	E2 (450 mg kg ⁻¹)
Live body weight [g]	1507.37±158.66	1515.00±152.14	1521.50±117.50
Carcass [g]	1005.12±115.77	1022.37±103.74	1019.75±74.66
Giblets [g]	119.06±11.10	117.79±9.12	117.16±8.51
Carcass yield [%]	74.92±2.36	75.27±1.17	74.76±0.75

Legend: C – control group, E – experimental group

Live body weight of chickens increased ($P \geq 0.05$) after propolis extract application in experimental groups (1515.00 g – E1, 1521.50 g – E2) compared with control group (1507.37 g). Our results are in agreement with Shalman and Shivazad (2006), Seven et al. (2008) and Tekeli et al. (2011), who applied propolis extract into the feed mixture in amount of 150 mg, 250 mg, 0.5 g and 3 g or 1000 ppm, as well as Haščík et al. (2010), who used propolis extract for the nutrition of Ross 308 chickens in amount 200 mg kg⁻¹, 300 mg kg⁻¹ and 400 mg kg⁻¹. Also our study confirms by Bonomi et al. (1976) and Ghisalberti (1979) who they state that propolis application may increase the body weight and the values may increase by 20%. Values of carcass body weight showed a similar trend as values of live body weight. The higher values of carcass body weight were found in experimental groups (1022.37 g – E1, 1019.75 g – E2) compared with control group (1005.12 g). Achieved results concerning higher values of the carcass body weight of Hubbard JV chickens in experimental groups with application of propolis extract in their diet is consistent with findings of Seven et al. (2008) and Haščík et al. (2010), who found that the carcass body weight was increased in Ross 308 chickens groups which was fed by propolis. The weight of giblets slightly decreased ($P \geq 0.05$) in experimental groups (117.79 g – E1,

117.16 g – E2) compared with control group (119.06 g), similarly as described by Haščík et al. (2010). Carcass yield was highest ($P \geq 0.05$) in E1 (75.27%), lower value was found in the control group (74.92%) and the lowest value was found in E2 (74.76%), but all values met the requirements of the normative carcass yield of chickens (72%) and it is convenient with results by Straková et al. (2002) and Haščík et al. (2009).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the work, propolis extract, applied in the feed mixtures HYD-01 and HYD-02 for Hubbard JV chickens during the whole period of fattening (42 days), had an influence on slight increase the live weight and carcass body weight at the end of fattening compared with control group and there were no significant differences ($P \geq 0.05$) among the groups. Propolis extract may be used as suitable supplementary in chicken nutrition, since it does not influence the meat performance and slight increase of live body weight at the end of fattening and of carcass weight can positively affect on economics of chicken meat production related to chickens of Hubbard JV hybrid combination.

Acknowledgments: The work was financially supported by project VEGA 1/0129/13 and by European Community under project no 26220220180: Building Research Centre „AgroBioTech".

REFERENCES

- AMOROS, M., SIMOES, C.M.O., GIRRE, L., SAUVAGER, F., CORMIER, M. 1992. Synergistic effect of flavonoids and flavonols against Herpes Simplex Virus Type 1 in cell culture. Comparison with the antiviral activity of propolis. *Journal of Natural Products*, 55, 1732-1740.
- AMOROS, M., LURTON, E., BOUSTIE, J., GIRRE, L., SAUVAGER, F., CORMIER, M. 1994. Comparison of the anti-Herpes Simplex Virus activities of propolis and 3-methyl-but-2-enyl caffeate. *Journal of Natural Products*, 57, 644-647.
- ANGELOVIČOVÁ, M. 1999. Výživa a kŕmenie vysokoúžitkovej hydiny. Nitra: SPU, p. 39-41, ISBN 80-7137-60.
- ANGELOVIČOVÁ, M., MELEN, M., TURIANICA, I., ANGELOVIČ, M. 2005. Použitie jódovaného oleja vo výžive výkrmových kurčiat. 6. Kabrtový dietetické dny. Brno: FVU, p. 74-82.
- ANGELOVIČOVÁ, M., MELLEN, M., ANGELOVIČ, M. 2006. Uplatnenie biotechnologického postupu náhrady kŕmneho antibiotika premixom škoricovej silice vo výžive výkrmových kurčiat. Biotechnológie 2006, JU: České Budějovice, p. 134-136. ISBN 8085-645-53-X.
- ARPÁŠOVÁ, H., PETROVIČ, V., MELLEN, M., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., ČOBANOVÁ, K., LENG, I. 2009a. The effects of supplementing sodium selenite and selenized yeast to the diet for laying hens on the quality and mineral content of eggs. *Journal of Animal and Feed Science*, 18(1), 90-100.
- ARPÁŠOVÁ, H., MELLEN, M., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., HAŠČÍK, P., PETROVIČ, V., ČOBANOVÁ, K., LENG, I. 2009b. Effects of dietary supplementation of sodium selenite and selenized yeast on selected qualitative parameters of laying hens eggs. *Slovak Journal of Animal Science*, 42(1), 27-33.
- BANSKOTA, A. H., TEZUKA, Y., KADOTA, S. 2001. Recent progress in pharmacological research of propolis. *Phytotherapy Research*, 15, 561-571.
- BASILE, A., SENATORE, F., GARGANO, R. 2006. Antibacterial and antioxidant activities in *Sidertia italicica* (miller) Greuter and Burdet essential oils. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 107, 240-248.
- BERRI, C., WACREINIER, N., MILLET, N., LE BIHAN-DUVAL, E. 2001. Effect of selection for improved body composition on muscle and meat characteristics of broilers from experimental and commercial lines. *Poultry Science*, 80, 833-838.
- BONOMI, A., MORLETTI, F., BINACHI, M. 1976. Propolis in feeds for laying hens. *Avicoltura*, 54, 43-54.
- BOZIN, B., MIMICA-DUKIC, N., SIMIN, N. 2006. Charakterization of the volatile composition of essential oils of some lamiaceae spices and the microbial and antioxidant activities of the entire oils. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 54, 1822-1828.
- BURDOCK, G. A. 1998. Review of the biological properties and toxicity of bee propolis (propolis). *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 36, 347-363.
- CARAZZONI, V., ADAMI, A., CASTROVILLI, C. 1998. Performance of broiler chicken supplemented with *Bacillus coagulans* as probiotic. *British Poultry Science*, 39, 526-529.
- CORRIER, D. E., NISBET, D. J., SCANLAN, C. M., HOLLISTER, A. G., CALWELL, D. J., THOMAS, L. A., HARGIS, B. M., TOMKINS, T., DELOACH, J. R. 1995. Treatment of commercial broiler chickens with a characterized culture of cecal bacteria to reduce salmonellae colonization. *Poultry Science*, 74(6), 1093-1101.
- DEMETEROVÁ, M. 2004. Súčasné trendy vo výžive hydiny. *Slovenský veterinársky časopis*, 29(5), 38-40.
- DIMOVS, V., IVANOVSKA, N., MANOLOVA, N., BANKOVA, V., NIKOLOV, N., POPOV, S. 1991. Immunomodulatory action of propolis. Influence on anti-infectious protection and macrophage function. *Apidologie*, 22, 155-162.
- FRENKEL, K., WEI, H., BHIMANI, R., YE, J., ZADUNAISKY, J.A., HUAG, T., CONNEY, A.H., GRUNBERGER, D. 1993. Inhibition of tumor promote rmediated processes in some skin and bovinelens by caffecacidphenethyl ester. *Cancer Research*, 53, 1255-1261.
- GHISALBERTI, E. L. 1979. Propolis: a review. *Bee World*, 60, 59-84.
- GONZALEZ-ALCORTA, M. J., DORFMAN, J. H., PESTI, G. M. 1994. Maximizing profit in broilers production as prices change: A simple approximation with practical value. *Agribusiness*, 10, 389-399.
- GONZALES, R., CORCHO, I., REMIREZ, D., RODRIGUEZ, S., ANCHETA, O., MERINO, N., GONZALES, A., PASCUAL, C. 1995. Hepatoprotective effects of propolis extract on carbon tetrachloride-induced liver injury in rats. *Phytotherapy Research*, 9, 114-117.
- GUEYE, E. F. 2009. The role of networks in information dissemination to family poultry farmers. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 65, 115-123.
- HAŠČÍK, P., KOVÁČ, M., HANZLÍK, K. 1994. Náhrada sójového extrahovaného šrotu repkovými výliskami v druhej fáze výkrmu brojlerových kurčiat. *Živočíšna výroba*, 12, 1041-1048.
- HAŠČÍK, P., ČUBOŇ, J., HORNIAKOVÁ, E., KRIVÁNEK, L., KULÍŠEK, V. 2005a. Relationship between probiotic preparation application and abdominal fat amount in chicken. *Agriculture*, 51, 574-579.
- HAŠČÍK, P., WEIS, J., ČUBOŇ, J., KULÍŠEK, V., MAKOVICKÝ, P., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M. 2005b. Vplyv probiotického preparátu v KKZ brojlerových kurčiat ROSS 308 na chemické zloženie mäsa. *Acta fytotechnica et zootechnica*, 8(1), 20-24.
- HAŠČÍK, P., ČUBOŇ, J., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., UBREŽIOVÁ, I. 2007. Vplyv nových trendov na ekonomiku výroby hydinového mäsa. *Acta oeconomica erinformatica*, 10(1), 17-20.
- HAŠČÍK, P., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., ČUBOŇ, J., KULÍŠEK, V., VAVRIŠINOVÁ, K., ARPÁŠOVÁ, H. 2008. Probiotiká ako možný vektor pri tvorbe bielkovín v mäse výkrmových kurčiat. In: Proteiny 2008: sborník príspěvků V. ročníku mezinárodní konference, Univerzita Tomáše Bati, Zlín, p. 45-49, ISBN 978-80-7318-706-4.
- HAŠČÍK, P., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., ČUBOŇ, J., BOBKOVÁ, M., VAVRIŠINOVÁ, K., ARPÁŠOVÁ, H., MIHOK, M., PAVLIČOVÁ, S. 2009. Effect of *Lactobacillus fermentum* application by water to chicken Ross 308 at meat chemical composition. *Potravinářstvo*, 3(2), 22-27.
- HAŠČÍK, P., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., MIHOK, M., POCHOP, J., BENCZOVÁ, E. 2010. Performance of Various Broiler Chicken Hybrids Fed with Commercially Produced Feed. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 9, 1076-1082.
- HAŠČÍK, P., GARLÍK, J., ELIMAM E.O.I., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., KROČKO, M., ČUBOŇ, J., BOBKOVÁ, M., ARPÁŠOVÁ, H. 2012. Meat performance of chickens after application of propolis extract in their diet. In: *Zborník príspevku z V. mezinárodní vedecké konference (Šlechtení na masnou užitkovost a aktuální otázky produkce jatečných zvířat)*, Brno, p. 190-197.
- ISLA, M. I., MORENO, M. I. N., SAMPIETRO, A. R., VATTUONE, M. A. 2001. Antioxidant activity of Argentina propolis extracts. *Journal Ethnopharmacology*, 76, 165-170.
- KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., ČUBOŇ, J., HAŠČÍK, P., PAVLIČOVÁ, S. 2005. Effect of *Enterococcus faecium* on some characteristic in the intestine of chickens and its typisation by PCR. *Acta fytotechnica et zootechnica*, 8(1), 17-20.
- KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., KMEŤ, V., ČUBOŇ, J. 2006a. The Effect *Enterococcus faecium* to the Digestive Tract of Poultry as a Probiotic. *Turkish Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences*, 30, 291-298.
- KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., PETROVÁ, J., HAŠČÍK, P., ČUBOŇ, J., PAVLIČOVÁ, S. 2006b. Colonization of gastrointestinal tract of turkeys after probiotics and prebiotics application. *Slovak Journal of Animal Science*, 39(3), 155-159.
- KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., FIKSELOVÁ, M., PAVLIČOVÁ, S., SUDZINA, M., SUDZINOVÁ, J., HAŠČÍK, P. 2007. Rody *Sporolactobacillus*, *Bacillus* a *Brevibacillus* používané ako probiotiká. *Agromagazín*, 8(10), 34-35.
- KIMOTO, N., HIROSE, M. H., KAWABE, M., SATOH, T., HIDEKI, M., SHIRA, T. 1999. Post-initiation effect of a super critical extract of propolis in a rat two-stage carcinogenesis model in female F344 rats. *Cancer Lett.*, 147, 221-227.
- KOELKEBECK, K. W., PARSONS, C. M., LEEPER, R. W. 1993. Effect of early feed withdrawal on subsequent laying hen performance. *Poultry Science*, 72, 2229-2235.
- KRELL, R. 1996. Value-Added products from beekeeping. *FAO Publications*, 395 p., ISBN 92-5-103819-8.
- LIPTAIKOVÁ, D., HAGAROVÁ, M., KLIMENT, M., MRÁZOVÁ, L., ANGELOVIČOVÁ, M., ANGELOVIČ, M., MOČÁR, K., ŠTOFAN, D. 2009. Obohatenie kŕmnych zmesí so *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* vo vzťahu k ich bielkovinovej a produkčnej účinnosti v výkrmových kurčiat. *Acta fytotechnica et zootechnica*, mimoriadne číslo, Nitra: SPU, p. 369-375.
- MARCIN, A., MOLNÁROVÁ, I., VALIJA, J. 2004. Využitie kŕmnych aditív rastlinného pôvodu, modifikujúcich metabolickú aktivitu v gastrointestinálnom trakte, vo výžive hospodárskych zvierat. Správa za účelovú činnosť, Michalovce: Oblastný výskumný ústav agroekológie.
- MARKHAM, K.R., MITCHELL, K.A., WILKINS, A. L., DALDY, J.A., LU, Y. 1996. HPLC and GC-MS identification of the major organic constituents in New Zealand propolis. *Phytochemistry*, 42, 205-211.
- MIYATAKA, H., NISHIKI, M., MATSUMOTO, H., FUJIMOTO, T., MATSUKA, M., SATOH, T. 1997. Evaluation of propolis. 1. Evaluation of Brazilian and Chinese propolis by enzymatic and physico-chemical methods. *Biological Pharmaceutical Bulletin*, 20, 496-501.
- MOCHIDA, S., HAGA, M., TAKINO, Y. 1985. Chemical constituents and antimicrobial activity of Japanese propolis. Apimondia. The xxx th Internet. *Apicultural Congr. Nagoya-Japan*, p. 455-456.
- MUDROŇOVÁ, D., NEMCOVÁ, R., GANCARČÍKOVÁ, S., JONECOVÁ, Z., BOMBA, A. 2005. Alternatíva antibiotík v odchove mláďat HZ. *Slovenský chov*, 11(1), 33-35.
- MURAD, J. M., CALVI, S. A., SOARES, A. M., BANKOVA, V. C., SFORCIN, J. M. 2002. Effect of propolis from Brazil and Bulgaria on fungicidal activity of macrophage against *paracoccidioides brasiliensis*. *Journal Ethnopharmacology*, 79, 331-334.
- NOVÁKOVÁ, I., KAČÁNIOVÁ, M., HAŠČÍK, P., FIKSELOVÁ, M., MOČÁR, K., LIPTAIKOVÁ, D., ŠTOFAN, D., PAVLIČOVÁ, S., TRAKOVICKÁ, A. 2008. Účinok podávania probiotík na podporu mikroflóry gastrointestinálneho

- traktu výkrmových kurčiat. Bezpečnosť a kvalita surovín a potravín, SPU, Nitra, p. 398-402, ISBN 978-80-8069-996-3.
- NOWOTTNICK, K. 1995. Propolis: získavanie – recepty – použitie. Bratislava: Slovo, s. r. o. 1995. p. 91, ISBN 80-85711-04-4.
- OPLETAL, L. 2006. Performing nature – aplikovaná príroda. *Slovenský chov*, 11(6), 44.
- OTA, C., UNTERKICHER, C., FANTINATO, V., SHIMIZU, M. T. 2001. Antifungal activity of propolis on different species of Candida. *Mycoses*, 44, 375-378.
- PAINTZ, M., METZNER, Y. 1979. Zur lokalanasthetischen wirkung von propolis und einigen inhaltsstoffen. *Pharmazie*, 34, 839-841.
- PEPELJNJK, S., JALSENJAK, I., MAYSSINGER, D. 1985. Flavonoid content in propolis extracts and growth inhibition of *Bacillus subtilis*. *Pharmazie*, 40, 122-123.
- PESTI, G. M., ARRAES, R. A., MILLER, B. R. 1986. Use of the quadratic growth response to dietary protein and energy concentrations in least-cost feed formulation. *Poultry Science*, 64, 1040-1051.
- POKORNÁ, V. 2003. Lliv enzymových preparátu 3, fytázy a endo - xylanázy v krmených směsích BR 1 – 3 na ukazovatele výkru mu brojlerových kuřat. *Krmivářství*, 7(3), 21-24.
- POLÁK, R. 2003. Vplyv použitia enzýmu 3 – fytáza na úžitkové parametre vo výkru me brojlerov. *Slovenský chov*, 7(7), 30-31.
- PRYZYK, E., DANTAS, A. P., SALOMAO, K., PEREIRA, A. S., BANKOVA, V. S., DE CASTRO, S. L., AQUINO NETO, F. R. 2003. Flavonoids and trypanocidal activity of bulgarian propolis. *Journal Ethnopharmacology*, 88, 189-193.
- SEVEN, T. P., SEVEN, I., YILMAZ, M., SIMSEK, G. Ü. 2008. The effect of Turkish propolis on growth and carcass characteristics in broilers under heat stress. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 146, 137-148.
- SHALMANY, S., SHIVAZAD, M. 2006. The effect of diet propolis supplementation on Ross broiler chicks performance. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 5, 84-88.
- SINGH, G., MARIMUTHU, P., DE HELUANI, C. S. 2006. Antioxidant and biocidal activities of *Carum nigrum* essential oil, oleoresin, and their selected components. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 54, 174-181.
- STRAKOVÁ, E., SUCHÝ, P., PANOUT, V. 2002. Efekt výkru mu brojlerových kuřat do vyššího věku a hmotnosti. *Technologické systémy v chovu drůbeže*, Brno, MZLU, p. 165-168, ISBN 80-7157-579-8.
- STRAKOVÁ, E., VEČEREK, V., SUCHÝ, P., VITULA, F., 2003. The comparison of carcass quality in fattening chicks and pheasants. *Současnost a perspektivy chovu drůbeže*. Praha, p. 83-87, ISBN 80-213-1037-5.
- STREHLA, E., VOLPERT, R., ELSTNER, E. F. 1993. Biochemical activities of propolis extracts 111. Inhibition of dihydrofolate reductase. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung*, 49, 39-43.
- SUN, F., HAYAMI, S., HARUNA, S., OGIRI, Y., TANAKA, K., YAMADA, Y., IKEDA, K., YAMADA, H., SUGIMOTO, H., KAWAI, N., KOJO, S. 2000. In: vivo antioxidative activity of propolis evaluated by the interaction with vitamin C and vitamin E and the level of lipid hydroperoxides in rats. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 48, 1462-1465.
- TEKELİ, A., KUTLU RÜSTÜ, H., CELIK, L. 2011. Effects of *Z. officinale* and Propolis Extracts on the Performance, Carcass and Some Blood Parameters of Broiler Chicks. *Current Research Poultry Science*, 1, 12-23.
- TREVISAN, M. T., VASCONCELOS, SILVA, M. G., PFUNDSTEIN, B. 2006. Charakterization of the volatil pattern and antioxidant capacity of essential oils from different species of the genus Ocimum. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 52, 4378-4382.
- TUBEROSO, C. I., KOWALCZYK, A., CORONEO, V. 2005. Chemical composition and antioxidant, antimicrobial and antifungal activities of the essential oils of *Achillea ligustica* all. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 53, 10148-10153.
- VALLE, M. L. 2000. Quantitative determination of antibacterian capacities of propolis. *Apicta*, 35, 152-161.
- VAN HORNE, P. L. M. 2002. Production cost development of broiler meat. *Archiv für Geflügelkunde*, 66, 26-27.
- VELIKOVA, M., BANKOVA, V. S., TSVETKOVA, I., KUJUMGIEV, A., MARCUCCI, M. C. 2000. Antibacterial-kaurene from Brazilian propolis of natives stingless bees. *Fitoterapia*, 71, 683-690.
- VESTNÍK MP SR, 2004. Výnos Ministerstva pôdohospodárstva Slovenskej republiky z 23. augusta 2004 č.2145/2004-100, ktorým sa mení a dopĺňa výnos Ministerstva pôdohospodárstva Slovenskej republiky zo 7. októbra 1997 č. 1497/1997-100 o úradnom odbere vzoriek a o laboratórnom skúšaní a hodnotení krmív v znení výnosu Ministerstva pôdohospodárstva Slovenskej republiky z 12. februára 2003 č. 149/2/2003-100, roč. 36, 2004, čiastka 22.
- WANG, B. J., LIEN, Y. H., YU, Z. R. 2004. Supercritical fluid extractive fractionation—study of the antioxidant activities of propolis. *Food Chemistry*, 86, 237-243.