

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.  
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This is an open access article which appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. This article is free for everyone to access, download and read.

Any restrictions on use, including any restrictions on further reproduction and distribution, selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are defined by the user license specified on the article.

For more information regarding Elsevier's open access licenses please visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/openaccesslicenses>

# Effects of an Essential Oil Mixture Added to Drinking Water for Temperature-Stressed Broilers: Performance, Meat Quality, and Thiobarbituric Acid-Reactive Substances

E. Tekce ,<sup>\*</sup><sup>1</sup> K. Çınar,<sup>†</sup> B. Bayraktar,<sup>‡</sup> Ç. Takma,<sup>§</sup> and M. Gül<sup>#</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Faculty of Applied Sciences, Bayburt University, Bayburt 69000, Turkey; <sup>†</sup>Faculty of Engineering, Bayburt University, Bayburt 69000, Turkey; <sup>‡</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Bayburt University, Bayburt 69000, Turkey; <sup>§</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Animal Science, Biometry and Genetics Unit, Ege University, İzmir 35100, Turkey; and <sup>#</sup>Animal Nutrition and Nutrition Disease, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

---

**Primary Audience:** Researchers, Broiler Breeder Companies, Nutritionists, Veterinarians and Food Engineers

---

## SUMMARY

This study investigated the effects of an essential oil mixture (EOM; *Eucalyptus globulus* labill, *Tymus vulgaris*, *Cymbopogon nardus*, and *Syzygium aromaticum*) added to drinking water on temperature-stressed broilers. The performance parameters (body weight, average daily weight, feed intake, and feed conversion ratio), meat quality, and thiobarbituric acid-reactive substances (TBARS) were evaluated. In a 42-d study, 400 Ross-308 male chickens (1-d-old) were randomly assigned to 8 different groups ( $n = 50$ ), each containing 4 subgroups ( $n = 8$ ) (22°C Control (C), C + 250 mL/1,000 L, C + 500 mL/1,000 L, C + 750 mL/1,000 L), 36°C (stress control (SC), SC + 250 mL/1,000 L, SC + 500 mL/1,000 L, SC + 750 mL/1,000 L). Adding 750 mL/1,000 L at 22°C and 250 mL/1,000 L at 36°C was more beneficial to the fattening performance parameters than those in the control group. EOM reduced liver weight but increased abdominal fat in the SEOM-250 groups but did not affect other organ weights. EOM had no effect on the TBARS or the  $b^*$  color parameter while it augmented the  $a^*$  and  $L^*$  coordinates of meat color.

**Key words:** broiler, essential oil mixture, internal organ weight, TBARS

2020 J. Appl. Poult. Res. 29:77–84  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3382/japr/pfz030>

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

Stress causes physical and chemical changes in an organism by affecting the homeostatic balance of the organism [1]. One of the most important stress factors in poultry breeding

is temperature. An increase in the ambient temperature of broilers above 35°C increases mortality and morbidity rates [2]. To this end, various feed additives have been used to prevent stress in poultry and to increase the quantity and quality of the products obtained. Antibiotics have been used for this purpose for over 50 yr. However, antibiotics are now banned from

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: [Vet.emre.tekce@hotmail.com](mailto:Vet.emre.tekce@hotmail.com)

animal feeds by the European Union because their misuse has led to resistant bacteria, which has consequences on animal welfare, environment, food chain, and human health [3]. Consequently, research has begun to investigate new alternative agents that may be helpful to regulate the intestinal microflora in birds, increase fattening performance, and protect animal health. Numerous products have been used, but the increase in consumer preference toward organic products has increased interest in organic feed additives [4, 5].

One of these alternative feed sources is essential fatty acid derived from plants with medical and aromatic characteristics. These are volatile fatty acids. It was reported that there was no accumulation in the tissues of the animals, no drug resistance, or no risk for human health after use [6]. Essential fatty acids have antioxidant effects in monogastric animals [7, 8], as well as anti-microbial [9–11], anti-inflammatory [12, 13], anti-viral [14, 15], anti-tumoural [15], anti-fungal [16, 17] and anti-parasitic [18, 19] effects. In addition, it can be used as growth promoters in poultry by stimulating endogenous digestive secretions (enzymes, bile, and mucus) or by hold on to the intestine to affect epithelial structure in a beneficial way [20–22].

This study investigated the nutritional benefits of an essential oil acidic mixture (EOM) (*Eucalyptus globulus* labill, *Thymus vulgaris*, *Cymbopogon nardus*, and *Syzygium aromaticum*) added at different levels to the drinking water of temperature-stressed broilers (22 and 36°C, respectively). The animals' performance (live weight, daily live weight gain, feed consumption, and feed utilization rate), internal organ weight, and breast meat quality (meat color parameters and thiobarbituric acid-reactive substances [TBARS] values) were investigated.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *Birds, Diets, and Management*

Four hundred 1-d-old Ross-308 male chickens were utilized in this study. The chickens were held in a 110 × 110 × 100 cm pen at the poultry unit of the Bayburt University Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Application and Research Centre for 7 d of exercise and 35 d of fattening. The control, EOM-250, EOM-500,

**Table 1.** Basal Diet Ration Nutrient Content and Analysis (g/kg).

| Raw Material                        | Starter<br>(0–14 d) | Grower<br>(14–28 d) | Finisher<br>(28–42 d) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maize                               | 52.70               | 54.60               | 58.12                 |
| Maize gluten feed                   | 15.21               | 21.20               | 26.14                 |
| Soybean residue                     | 26.35               | 18.90               | 10.65                 |
| Di-calcium phosphate                | 1.95                | 1.70                | 1.60                  |
| Calcium carbonate                   | 1.18                | 1.10                | 1.04                  |
| Sodium chloride                     | 0.31                | 0.31                | 0.31                  |
| Sodium bicarbonate                  | 0.20                | 0.20                | 0.20                  |
| Salt                                | 0.2                 | 0.2                 | 0.2                   |
| Methionine                          | 0.50                | 0.50                | 0.44                  |
| Lysine                              | 1.20                | 1.10                | 1.10                  |
| Vitamin–mineral premix <sup>1</sup> | 0.20                | 0.20                | 0.20                  |
| ME (kcal/kg)                        | 3100                | 3150                | 3225                  |
| Crude protein (%)                   | 24                  | 22                  | 20                    |
| Crude oil (%)                       | 2.61                | 2.30                | 2.50                  |
| Ash (%)                             | 5.19                | 4.63                | 3.85                  |
| Moisture (%)                        | 13.20               | 13.20               | 13.20                 |

<sup>1</sup>The vitamin–mineral premix provided the following (per kg of diet): vitamin A, 12,000 IU; vitamin D3, 1,500 IU; vitamin E, 35 mg; vitamin K3, 5 mg; vitamin B1, 3 mg; vitamin B2, 4 mg; vitamin B6, 4 mg; vitamin B12, 0.03 mg; calcium-D-pantothenate, 15 mg; folic acid, 1 mg; niacin, 25 mg; D-biotin, 0.115 mg; Mg 80 mg; I, 0.15 mg; Co, 0.2 mg; Cu, 5 mg; Fe, 60 mg; Se, 1 mg; Zn, 60 mg.

and EOM-750 groups at 22°C and the SC, SEOM-250, SEOM-500, and SEOM-750 groups at 36°C were used during the study period [23]. The basal diet feeds given in Table 1 were fed at the same time every day, and the new feeds were offered after the animals were weighed. Drinking water was removed at the same time every day and replaced with fresh water containing the EOM, which was provided from a commercial company in Ankara, Turkey. The feed used in this study was analyzed according to standard AOAC methods [24].

### *EOM Composition*

The EOM contained 26.70% durenol, 23.89% eugenol, 16.49% gamma terpinene, 8.35% heptaethylene glycol, 6.42% hexaethylene glycol, 3.31% cymene, 3.08% pentaethylene glycol, 2.87% caryophyllene, 2.30% D-limonene, 2.18% beta-pinene, and 0.95% eucalyptol.

### *Internal Organ Weights*

At the end of the experiment, 20 broilers were randomly selected from each group

**Table 2.** Effect of Essential Oil Mixture (EOM) Added to Drinking Water on Fattening Performance of Groups Fed in Stress Conditions.

|   | N   | Body Weight (g) |                        | Average Daily Weight (g) |                      | Feed Intake (g) |                      | Feed Conversion Ratio (g/g) |                   |
|---|-----|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|   |     | 22°C            | 36°C                   | 22°C                     | 36°C                 | 22°C            | 36°C                 | 22°C                        | 36°C              |
|   |     | Control         | 100                    | 1713.0                   | 1804.2               | 48.94           | 51.55                | 95.22                       | 93.02             |
| EOM 250 mL/L                            | 100 | 1715.2          | 1915.9                 | 49.01                    | 54.74                | 90.99           | 85.95                | 1.86                        | 1.57              |
| EOM 500 mL/L                            | 100 | 1827.8          | 1450.6                 | 52.22                    | 41.45                | 84.79           | 77.54                | 1.63                        | 1.88              |
| EOM 750 mL/L                            | 100 | 1904.6          | 1471.4                 | 54.42                    | 42.04                | 79.72           | 86.51                | 1.47                        | 2.06              |
| Source of variation ( <i>P</i> -values) |     |                 |                        |                          |                      |                 |                      |                             |                   |
| Diet                                    |     |                 | 0.00**                 |                          | 0.00**               |                 | 0.00**               |                             | 0.19              |
| Temperature                             |     |                 | 0.00**                 |                          | 0.00**               |                 | 0.46                 |                             | 0.07              |
| Temperature × Diet                      |     |                 | 0.00**                 |                          | 0.00**               |                 | 0.26                 |                             | 0.00**            |
| Main effect means – Diet                |     |                 |                        |                          |                      |                 |                      |                             |                   |
| Control                                 |     |                 | 1758.60 <sup>a,b</sup> |                          | 50.25 <sup>a,b</sup> |                 | 94.12 <sup>a</sup>   |                             | 1.88 <sup>a</sup> |
| EOM 250 mL/L                            |     |                 | 1815.56 <sup>a</sup>   |                          | 51.87 <sup>a</sup>   |                 | 88.47 <sup>a,b</sup> |                             | 1.72 <sup>a</sup> |
| EOM 500 mL/L                            |     |                 | 1639.19 <sup>c</sup>   |                          | 46.83 <sup>c</sup>   |                 | 81.16 <sup>b</sup>   |                             | 1.75 <sup>a</sup> |
| EOM 750 mL/L                            |     |                 | 1688.00 <sup>b,c</sup> |                          | 48.23 <sup>b,c</sup> |                 | 83.12 <sup>b</sup>   |                             | 1.76 <sup>a</sup> |
| Main effect means – Temperature         |     |                 |                        |                          |                      |                 |                      |                             |                   |
| 22°C                                    |     |                 | 1790.15                |                          | 51.15                |                 | 87.68                |                             | 1.73              |
| 36°C                                    |     |                 | 1660.52                |                          | 47.44                |                 | 85.76                |                             | 1.83              |
| SEM                                     |     |                 | 21.91                  |                          | 0.63                 |                 | 1.85                 |                             | 0.03              |

<sup>a-c</sup>Means within a column showing different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ): least significance difference test was applied to compare means.

\* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, SEM = standard error of the mean.

(total = 160 broilers) and killed at the Laboratory of Bayburt University Food, Agriculture and Livestock Application and Research Centre. The liver, spleen, gizzard, and abdominal fat of the animals were excised and weighed ( $\pm 0.001$  g).

### Meat Quality and Ethanol Antioxidant Properties

At the end of the trial, 160 animals (2 animals/group) were randomly selected, killed, and the breast was removed for analysis at the Bayburt University Department of Food Engineering. Color intensity ( $L^*$ ,  $a^*$ , and  $b^*$ ) was measured in accordance with the specifications depicted by International Commission on Illumination CIELAB (Commission Internationale de L'e Clairage), which specializes in 3-dimensional measuring of color [25, 26]. According to these criteria, the following values signified different color intensities:  $L^*$ ;  $L^* = 0$  black,  $L^* = 100$  white (darkness/fairness);  $a^*$ ;  $a^* = +60$  red,  $a^* = -60$  green and  $b^*$ ;  $b^* = +60$  yellow,  $b^* = -60$  blue. The TBARS values were determined by a method developed by Tarladgis et al. [27] and modified by Lemon [28, 29].

### Statistical Analysis

The parameters were all normally distributed, and the data are expressed as means and standard errors. A univariate general linear model was used to identify differences in feed intake [FI], feed conversion ratio [FCR], body weight [BW], average daily weight gain [ADWG], and meat color between the 2 temperature and 4 diet groups. Duncan's multiple comparison test was applied to compare differences between means. A  $P$  value  $< 0.05$  was considered significant [30].

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The performance data of the groups (BW, ADWG, FI, and FCR) and those of the EOM supplemented groups (250, 500, and 750 mL/1000 L) are given in Table 2. The groups exposed to temperature and diet stress effectively fattened in response to the EOM-750 mL/L and the (BW—ADWG and FCR) in the SEOM-250 mL/L group ( $P < 0.05$ ).

In this study, the effect of the EOM mixture added at different doses (250, 500, and 750 mL/L) to drinking water of broilers under

**Table 3.** Effect of Essential Oil Mixture (EOM) on Meat Color Parameters and TBARS Added to Drinking Water of Groups Fed in Stress Conditions.

|                                    | N  | $L^*$                |       | $a^*$               |      | $b^*$                |       | TBARS               |      |
|------------------------------------|----|----------------------|-------|---------------------|------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|------|
|                                    |    | 22°C                 | 36°C  | 22°C                | 36°C | 22°C                 | 36°C  | 22°C                | 36°C |
| Control                            | 40 | 44.07                | 38.55 | 6.05                | 5.49 | 17.29                | 12.81 | 1.33                | 1.23 |
| EOM 250 mL/L                       | 40 | 40.59                | 39.58 | 6.28                | 5.27 | 14.53                | 12.95 | 1.23                | 1.20 |
| EOM 500 mL/L                       | 40 | 40.26                | 40.94 | 6.68                | 6.37 | 14.65                | 13.96 | 0.95                | 1.02 |
| EOM 750 mL/L                       | 40 | 39.71                | 41.97 | 6.28                | 5.67 | 13.59                | 13.44 | 1.21                | 1.71 |
| Source of variation ( $P$ -values) |    |                      |       |                     |      |                      |       |                     |      |
| Diet                               |    | 0.07                 |       | 0.04*               |      | 0.00**               |       | 0.00**              |      |
| Temperature                        |    | 0.01**               |       | 0.00**              |      | 0.00**               |       | 0.13                |      |
| Temperature × Diet                 |    | 0.00**               |       | 0.71                |      | 0.00**               |       | 0.02*               |      |
| Main effect means – Diet           |    |                      |       |                     |      |                      |       |                     |      |
| Control                            |    | 41.31 <sup>a</sup>   |       | 5.77 <sup>b</sup>   |      | 15.05 <sup>a</sup>   |       | 1.28 <sup>a,b</sup> |      |
| EOM 250 mL/L                       |    | 40.09 <sup>b</sup>   |       | 5.78 <sup>b</sup>   |      | 13.74 <sup>b</sup>   |       | 1.21 <sup>b</sup>   |      |
| EOM 500 mL/L                       |    | 40.60 <sup>a,b</sup> |       | 6.52 <sup>a</sup>   |      | 14.30 <sup>a,b</sup> |       | 0.98 <sup>c</sup>   |      |
| EOM 750 mL/L                       |    | 40.84 <sup>a,b</sup> |       | 5.98 <sup>a,b</sup> |      | 13.51 <sup>b</sup>   |       | 1.46 <sup>a</sup>   |      |
| Main effect means – Temperature    |    |                      |       |                     |      |                      |       |                     |      |
| 22°C                               |    | 41.16                |       | 6.32                |      | 15.01                |       | 1.18                |      |
| 36°C                               |    | 40.26                |       | 5.70                |      | 13.29                |       | 1.29                |      |
| SEM                                |    | 0.23                 |       | 0.15                |      | 0.21                 |       | 0.05                |      |

<sup>a-c</sup>Means within a column showing different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ): least significance difference test was applied to compare means.

\* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, SEM = standard error of the mean.

temperature stress on the performance parameters was investigated. Exercise was effective for fattening the groups supplemented with EOM at a dose of 750 mL/L in the non-stressed groups and in the 250 mL/L stressed groups. According to the data obtained, the highest feed consumption was found in the K (control) group (95.22) and the lowest feed consumption was in the EOM-750 group (79.72) ( $P < 0.00$ ), while 36°C stress group the highest feed consumption in the SK (control) group (93.02) and the minimum feed consumption in the SEOM-500 groups (77.54) was determined to be ( $P < 0.05$ ). The data obtained for the stress-free and stressed groups were similar to some previous studies [31–33] but contrasted with others [34–37]. These discrepancies were likely due to differences in the composition, administration routes, and doses of the essential fatty acid mixture under study.

The rate of utilization of feed decreased as heat stress increased, and these negative effects decreased the benefits of adding the EOM 250 mL/L (1.57) dose to drinking water ( $P < 0.01$ ) and the 750 mL/L (1.47) dose increased the FCR rate compared to the control group ( $P < 0.00$ ). These effects in the stress-free and stressed groups corroborate some studies [32,

37] but not others [34, 36], which may also be explained by the effects of the EOM on the intestinal microflora.

The negative effects of heat stress decreased in the SEOM-250 group (1915.9 g) when ADWG (daily live weight gain) (54.74 g) was added to the drinking water and in the stressed groups when EOM-750 (1904.6 g) and ADWG (54.42 g) were added. These results in the stress-free and stressed groups were similar to some studies [32], but contrasted with others [31, 33, 34, 36]. It is thought that these discrepancies were due to differences in the composition, administration routes, and doses of the essential fatty acid mixture under study.

Tables 3 and 4 show the effects of adding EOM to drinking water of the broilers in the stressed and non-stressed groups. The broilers exposed to heat stress had reduced liver weight but normal gizzard, splenic, and visceral weights. No effects on TBARS or the  $b^*$  color coordinate of breast meat were observed in the heat-stressed animals, whereas  $a^*$  and  $L^*$  color values increased.

The color of meat is affected by lipid oxidation, myoglobin concentration, and hemoglobin pigment within the muscles. The color change in the meat depends on the amount of these

**Table 4.** Effect of Essential Oil Mixture (EOM) on Internal Organ Weights Added to Drinking Water of Groups Fed in Stress Conditions.

|   | N  | Abdominal Fat (g) |       | Gizzard Weight (g) |       | Liver Weight (g) |       | Spleen Weight (g) |      |
|---|----|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|------|
|   |    | 22°C              | 36°C  | 22°C               | 36°C  | 22°C             | 36°C  | 22°C              | 36°C |
| Control                                 | 40 | 27.3              | 35.36 | 26.79              | 29.06 | 33.49            | 41.73 | 1.28              | 1.46 |
| EOM 250 mL/L                            | 40 | 30.22             | 40.08 | 27.41              | 28.70 | 42.38            | 33.11 | 1.55              | 1.21 |
| EOM 500 mL/L                            | 40 | 32.64             | 23.20 | 26.45              | 24.81 | 39.84            | 29.72 | 1.52              | 1.06 |
| EOM 750 mL/L                            | 40 | 27.51             | 25.06 | 25.12              | 26.77 | 44.18            | 28.67 | 1.45              | 1.18 |
| Source of variation ( <i>P</i> -values) |    |                   |       |                    |       |                  |       |                   |      |
| Diet                                    |    | 0.24              |       | 0.42               |       | 0.55             |       | 0.85              |      |
| Temperature                             |    | 0.64              |       | 0.50               |       | 0.00**           |       | 0.01**            |      |
| Temperature × Diet                      |    | 0.13              |       | 0.72               |       | 0.00**           |       | 0.05*             |      |
| Main effect means – Diet                |    |                   |       |                    |       |                  |       |                   |      |
| Control                                 |    | 31.33             |       | 27.92              |       | 37.61            |       | 1.37              |      |
| EOM 250 mL/L                            |    | 35.15             |       | 28.06              |       | 37.74            |       | 1.38              |      |
| EOM 500 mL/L                            |    | 27.92             |       | 25.63              |       | 34.78            |       | 1.29              |      |
| EOM 750 mL/L                            |    | 26.28             |       | 25.94              |       | 36.42            |       | 1.32              |      |
| Main effect means – Temperature         |    |                   |       |                    |       |                  |       |                   |      |
| 22°C                                    |    | 29.41             |       | 26.44              |       | 39.97            |       | 1.45              |      |
| 36°C                                    |    | 30.92             |       | 27.34              |       | 33.30            |       | 1.23              |      |
| SEM                                     |    | 2.24              |       | 0.91               |       | 1.15             |       | 0.06              |      |

\* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, SEM = standard error of the mean.

pigments in the meat. It has been reported that poultry exposed to stress exhibit high post-cutting pH values [38, 39]. Broiler breast meat constitutes 5% of live broiler weight and is very susceptible to color deterioration [40]. In our study, there was an increase in the  $a^*$  color coordinate but no difference in the  $b^*$  color parameter of the breast meat in the stressed groups compared to the control group. Previous studies have reported that this difference is a consequence of reduced myoglobin oxidation by-products resulting from lipid oxidation [38, 39]. The brightness ( $L^*$ ) of the breast meat decreased in the stress-free groups but increased in the stressed groups. This difference is due to the fact that the EOM-containing compounds added to drinking water have antioxidants with lipid oxidation inhibiting properties, which can change the luminal brightness value [41].

Because poultry meat is rich in highly unsaturated fatty acids, it has a higher rate of oxidative deterioration than other types of meat. The TBARS method is used to define the scale of rancidity (souring) that occurs as a result of autoxidation in fat and fatty parts of meat. TBARS values increase in parallel with the accumulation of short-chain fatty acids, which cause rancidity

[42]. In our study, the phenolic compounds in the EOM mixture added to the drinking water have antioxidant properties [43, 44]. The phenolic hydroxyl (OH) groups of these phenolic compounds inhibit oxidation of unsaturated fatty acids leading to the formation of hydrogen peroxide, aldehydes, and ketones in the fatty tissues of the meat. Thus, it is possible to prevent changes in the pungency or taste of meat [45]. Studies have shown that some of the phenolic compounds in the EOM added to drinking water act like synthetic antioxidants [41] and reduce the amount of TBARS in tissues [42], thereby increasing antioxidant enzyme activities and inhibiting lipid oxidation [45]. We determined no difference between the TBARS values in the stressed groups and the control group after adding 750 mL/1000 L EOM to the broiler drinking water of the stressed groups. Although the meat color parameters and TBARS values were similar to some previous data [46], other authors have reported different findings [39, 43], which was thought to be due to the essential fatty acid contents administered to the animals.

Table 4 provides the weights of the internal organs of the chickens used in our study, including the intra-group and inter-group

statistical comparisons. Some studies have evaluated the effect of adding essential fatty acids at different feed concentrations to broilers under heat stress and found no effects [47–50]. In contrast, adding essential fatty acids to the feed of broilers under heat stress increases liver weight [51], highlighting the influence of the different EOM compounds. In our study, the EOM in the broiler drinking water decreased liver weight, but increased the abdominal fat in the 250 mL/1000 L group. The EOM had no effect on gizzard or splenic weights. The reason for this difference is thought to be caused by the effects of different compounds in the EOM mix, which is included in broiler rations.

## CONCLUSION AND APPLICATIONS

1. The EOM had positive effects on the broiler performance parameters (BW, FI, and FCR).
2. Broiler liver weight decreased and abdominal fat increased in the SEOM-250 groups without affecting gizzard or spleen weight.
3. The TBARS and  $b^*$  color parameter of the breast meat were not affected by the added EOM, while it augmented the effect on  $a^*$  and  $L^*$  meat color coordinates.

In order to achieve production at low costs, feed to increase performance and high quality furthers studies are required on anti-stress and antioxidant features carrying EOM for the development of better nutritional strategies.

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Selye, H. 1938. Experimental evidence supporting the conception of “adaptation energy”. *Am. J. Physiol.* 123:758–765.
2. Karşlı, M. A., and H. H. Dönmez. 2007. Effects of plant extract on growth performance and villi of the small bowel in heat stressed broiler, Atatürk Üniversitesi Vet. Bil. Derg. 2:143–148.
3. Dibner, J. J., and J. D. Richard. 2005. Antibiotic growth promoters in agriculture: history and mode of action. *Poult. Sci.* 84:634–643.
4. Burt, S. 2004. Essential oils: their antibacterial properties and potential applications in foods—a review. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 94:223–253.
5. Buğdaycı, K. E., and A. Ergün. 2011. The effects of supplemental essential oil or probiotic on performance, immune system and some blood parameters in broilers. *Ankara Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi.* 58:279–284.
6. Feizi, A., P. Bijanzad, and K. Kaboli. 2013. Effects of thyme volatile oils on performance of broiler chickens. *Eur. J. Exp. Biol.* 3:250–254.
7. Dezsi, S., A. S. Bădărău, C. Bischin, D. C. Vodnar, R. Silaghi-Dumitrescu, A. Gheldiu, A. Mocan, and L. Vlase. 2015. Antimicrobial and antioxidant activities and phenolic profile of *Eucalyptus globulus* Labill. and *Corymbia ficifolia* (F. Muell.) K.D. Hill & L.A.S. Johnson Leaves. *Molecules.* 20:4720–4734.
8. Botsoglou, N. A., E. Christaki, P. Florou-Paneri, I. Giannenas, G. Papageorgiou, and A. B. Spais. 2004. The effect of a mixture of herbal essential oils or  $\alpha$ -tocopheryl acetate on performance parameters and oxidation of body lipid in broilers. *SA J. An. Sci.* 34:52–61.
9. Daroui-Mokaddem, H., A. Kabouche, M. Bouacha, B. Soumati, A. El-Azzouny, C. Bruneau, and Z. Kabouche. 2010. GC/MS analysis and antimicrobial activity of the essential oil of fresh leaves of *Eucalyptus globulus*, and leaves and stems of *Smyrniolum olusatrum* from Constantine (Algeria). *Nat Prod Commun.* 5:1669–1672.
10. Dorman, H. J. D., and S. G. Deans. 2000. Antimicrobial agents from plants: antibacterial activity of plant volatile oils. *J Appl Microbiol.* 88:308–316.
11. Ultee, A., M. H. J. Bennik, and R. Moezelaar. 2002. The phenolic hydroxyl group of carvacrol is essential for action against the food-borne pathogen *Bacillus cereus*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 68:1561–1568.
12. Karpouhtsis, I., E. Pardali, E. Feggou, S. Kokkini, Z. G. Scouras, and P. Mavragani-Tsipido. 1998. Insecticidal and genotoxic activities of oregano essential oils. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 46:1111–1115.
13. Guimarães, A. G., J. S. S. Quintans, and L. J. Quintans-Júnior. 2013. Monoterpenes with analgesic activity—a systematic review. *Phytother. Res.* 27:1–15.
14. Bishop, C. D. 1995. Antiviral activity of the essential oil of melaleuca alternifolia (Maiden & Betche) cheel (tea tree) against tobacco mosaic virus. *J. Essent. Oil Res.* 7:641–644.
15. Silva, C. F., F. C. Moura, M. F. Mendes, and F. L. P. Pessoa. 2011. Extraction of citronella (*Cymbopogon nardus*) essential oil using supercritical  $\text{CO}_2$ : experimental data and mathematical modeling. *Braz. J. Chem. Eng.* 28:343–350.
16. Al-Ja’fari, A. H., R. Vila, B. Freixa, F. Tomi, J. Casanova, J. Costa, and S. Cañigüeral. 2011. Composition and antifungal activity of the essential oil from the rhizome and roots of *Ferula hermonis*. *Phytochemistry.* 72:1406–1413.
17. Fu, Y., Y. Zu, L. Chen, X. Shi, Z. Wang, S. Sun, and T. Efferth. 2007. Antimicrobial activity of clove and rosemary essential oils alone and in combination. *Phytother. Res.* 21:989–994.
18. Kpoviessi, S., J. Bero., P. Agbani, F. Bgaguidi, B. Kpadonou-Kpoviessi, B. Sinsin, G. Accrombessi, M. Frédéric, M. Moudachirou, and J. Quetin-Leclercq. 2014. Chemical composition, cytotoxicity and in vitro antitrypanosomal and antiplasmodial activity of the essential oils of four *Cymbopogon* species from Benin. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 151:652–659.
19. Monzote, L., M. García, A. M. Montalvo, R. Scull, M. Miranda, and J. Abreu. 2007. In vitro activity of an essential oil against *Leishmania donovani*. *Phytother. Res.* 21:1055–1058.
20. Chowdhury, S., G. P. Mandal, A. K. Patra, P. Kumar, I. Samanta, S. Pradhan, and A. K. Samanta. 2018. Different essential oils in diets of broiler chickens: 2. Gut microbes and

morphology, immune response, and some blood profile and antioxidant enzymes. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 236:39–47.

21. Platel, K., and K. Srinivasan. 2000. Influence of dietary spices and their active principles on pancreatic digestive enzymes in albino rats. *Nahrung.* 44:42–46.

22. Jang, I. S., Y. H. Ko, S. Y. Kang, and C. Y. Lee. 2007. Effect of a commercial essential oil on growth performance, digestive enzyme activity and intestinal microflora population in broiler chickens. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 134:304–315.

23. On day 7 of the experiment, the animals were randomly assigned to 8 groups ( $n = 50$ ) (22°C (K (control), EOM-250 (250 mL/1,000 L), EOM-500 (500 mL/1,000 L), EOM-750 (750 mL/1,000 L)), 36°C (SK (Stress Control), SEOM-250 (250 mL/1,000 L), SEOM-500 (500 mL/1,000 L), SEOM-750 (750 mL/1,000 L)), each containing 5 sub-groups ( $n = 10$ ).

24. AOAC. 2005. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International. 18th ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Rockville, MD.

25. The color intensities were scaled CR-400 (Minolta Co, Osaka, Japan) calorimeter device.

26. Ohkawa, H, N. Ohishi, and K. Yagi. 1979. Assay for lipid peroxides in animal tissues by thiobarbituric acid reaction. *Anal. Biochem.* 95:351–358.

27. Tarladgis, B. G., A. M. Pearson, and L. J. R. Dugan. 1962. The chemistry of the 2-thiobarbituric acid test for the determination of oxidative rancidity in foods. I. Some important side reactions. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.* 39:34–39.

28. Lemon, DW. 1975. An improved TBA test for rancidity new series circular. No:51. Halifax-Laboratory, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

29. Six ml of TCA solution (7.5% TCA, 0.1% EDTA and 50.1 1-Propil Gallat) was added to a 1-g ground sample of breast fillet. The mixture was homogenized with an Ultra-turrax for 20–30 s and was filtered through Whatman filter paper. A 1 mL aliquot of 0.02 M thiobarbituric acid was added to the filtered mixture. The mixture was held in a hot water bath for 40 min. Once cooled, the mixture was centrifuged for 5 min at 2,000 rpm, and absorbance values were measured at 532 nm (UV 160; Shimadzu, Tokyo, Japan). The TBARS values were reported in  $\mu\text{mol}$  malondialdehyde/kg.

30. IBM SPSS statistics 20.0 software (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) was used for the analyses.

31. Bozkurt, M., K. Küçükylmaz, A. U. Çatlı, M. Çınar, E. Bintaş, and F. Coven. 2012. Performance, egg quality, and immune response of laying hens fed diets supplemented with mannan-oligosaccharide or an essential oil mixture under moderate and hot environmental conditions. *Poult. Sci.* 91:1379–1386

32. Ghazi, S., T. Amjadian, and S. Norouzi. 2015. Single and combined effects of vitamin C and oregano essential oil in diet, on growth performance, and blood parameters of broiler chicks reared under heat stress condition. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 59:1019–1024.

33. Khosravinia, H., S. Ghasemi, and E. A. Rafiei. 2013. The effect of savory (*Satureja khuzistanica*) essential oils on performance, liver and kidney functions in broiler chickens. *J. Anim. Feed Sci.* 22:50–55

34. Akbarian, A., J. Michiels, A. Golian, J. Buyse, Y. Wang, and S. De Smet. 2014. Gene expression of heat shock protein 70 and antioxidant enzymes, oxidative status, and meat oxidative stability of cyclically heat-challenged finishing broilers fed *Origanum compactum* and *Curcuma xanthorrhiza* essential oils. *Poult. Sci.* 93:1930–1941.

35. Lee, K. W., H. Everts, H. J. Kappert, M. Frehner, R. Losa, and A. C. Beynen. 2003. Effects of dietary essential oil components on growth performance, digestive enzymes and lipid metabolism in female broiler chickens. *Br. Poult. Sci.* 44:450–457.

36. Khosravinia, H. 2015. Effects of *Satureja khuzistanica* essential oils in drinking water on mortality, production performance, water intake, and organ weights in broiler chickens reared under heat stress condition. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 59:1711–1719.

37. Tekce, E., and M. Gül. 2016. Effects of *Origanum syriacum* essential oil added in different levels to the diet of broilers under heat stress on performance and intestinal histology. *Eur. Poult. Science.* 80:1–11.

38. Laçin, E., Ö. Çoban, M. İ. Aksu, N. Sabuncuoğlu, and H. Daş. 2013. The effect of different photoperiod and stocking density on colour, pH and TBARS values in broilers meat. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Veteriner Bilimler Dergisi.* 8:192–201.

39. Sharbati, A., M. Daneshyar, A. Aghazadeh, J. Aliakbarlu, and F. Hamian. 2015. Effects of *Rhus coriaria* on nutrient composition, thiobarbituric acid reactive substances and colour of thigh meat in heat-stressed broilers. *SA J. An. Sci.* 45:49–55.

40. Yetişir, R, M. Karakaya, F. İlhan, M. T. Yılmaz, and B. Özalp. 2008. Effects of different lighting programs and sex on some broiler meat quality properties affecting consumer preference. *Anim. Prod.* 49:20–28.

41. Kanani, P. B., M. Daneshyar, J. Aliakbarlu, and F. Hamian. 2017. Effect of dietary turmeric and cinnamon powders on meat quality and lipid peroxidation of broiler chicken under heat stress condition. *Vet. Res. Forum.* 8:163–169.

42. Gökalp, H. Y., M. Kaya, Y. Tülek, and Ö. Zorba. 2001. Guidelines for quality control and laboratory practice in meat and meat products. 4. Edition. Erzurum, Atatürk University Published, 133–135.

43. Luna, A., M. C. Lábaque, J. A. Zygodlo, and R. H. Marin. 2010. Effects of thymol and carvacrol feed supplementation on lipid oxidation in broiler meat. *Poult. Sci.* 89:366–370.

44. Tarez, M. A., D. D. Boler, K. N. Bess, J. Zhao, Y. Yan, C. Dilger, F. K. Mckeith, and J. Killefer. 2011. Effect of antioxidant inclusion and oil quality on broiler performance, meat quality, and lipid oxidation. *Poult. Sci.* 90:922–930.

45. Nakatani, N. 1997. Antioxidants from spices and herbs. Pages 64–69 in *Natural Antioxidants: Chemistry, Health Effects, and Applications*. 3rd ed. Shahidi F, ed. AOCS, California.

46. Parvar, R., H. Khosravinia, and A. Azarfar. 2013. Effect of *Satureja khuzestanica* essential oils on postmortem pH and antioxidative potential of breast muscle from heat stressed broiler chicken. *Asian J. Poult. Sci.* 7:83–89.

47. Hashemipour, H., H. Kermanshahi, A. Golian, and T. Veldkamp. 2013. Effect of thymol and carvacrol feed supplementation on performance, antioxidant enzyme activities, fatty acid composition, digestive enzyme activities, and immune response in broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.* 92:2059–2069.

48. Berrama, Z., S. Temim, S. Souames, and H. Ainbaziz. 2017. Growth performance, carcass and viscera yields, blood constituents and thyroid hormone concentrations of chronic heat stressed broilers fed diets supplemented with cumin seeds (*Cuminum cyminum* L.). *Kafkas Univ Vet Fak Derg.* 23:735–742.

49. Akbarian, A., A. Golian, H. Kermanshahi, R. Farhoosh, A. R. Raji, S. De Smet, and J. Michiels. 2013.



Growth performance and gut health parameters of finishing broilers supplemented with plant extracts and exposed to daily increased temperature. *Span. J. Agric. Res.* 11:109–119.

50. Habibi, R., G. H. Sadeghi, and A. Karimi. 2014. Effect of different concentrations of ginger root powder and its essential oil on growth performance, serum metabolites and antioxidant status in broiler chicks under heat stress. *Br. Poult. Sci.* 55:228–237.

51. Masouri, B., S. Salari, H. Khosravinia, S. T. Vakili, and T. Mohammadabadi. 2015. Effects of dietary *Satureja khuzistanica* essential oils and  $\alpha$ -tocopherol on productive

performance, organ weights, blood lipid constituents and antioxidative potential in heat stressed broiler chicks. *Eur. Poult. Sci.* 79:1–14.

### ***Acknowledgments***

This study was funded and supported by the scientific research projects commission of Bayburt University, Bayburt, Turkey (Project code: 2017/02–69001-01). This study was approved by the ethics committee of Atatürk University Veterinary Faculty (22.02.2018/2/24).