



*Original Research*

## Effect of Feeding Corn Distiller's Dried Grains with Solubles (cDDGS) on Egg Quality Traits in Commercial Layers

Ekta D. Sedmake, K. K. Khose\*, S. J. Manwar, M. A. Gole, M. R. Wade and S. M. Wankhede<sup>1</sup>

Department of Poultry Science, Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Akola, Maharashtra Animal and Fishery Sciences University, Nagpur, Maharashtra, INDIA

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Nutrition

\*Corresponding author: [drkhosekk@gmail.com](mailto:drkhosekk@gmail.com)

Rec. Date:	Jan 04, 2018 06:28
Accept Date:	Mar 17, 2018 16:13
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.5455/ijlr.20180104062855">10.5455/ijlr.20180104062855</a>

### Abstract

The present experiment was conducted involving 180 layer chickens (BV- 300) for period of 10 weeks. The birds were randomly distributed into 5 treatment groups T1 (Control), T2, T3, T4 and T5 having 4 replicates of 9 layer birds each. The birds in treatment group T1 fed basal ration as per the recommendation of BV-300 layer strain and treatment groups T2, T3, T4 and T5 were offered diets containing 5, 10, 15 and 20% corn DDGS replacing soybean meal. Egg weight in control group T1 was significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher compared to all other groups. The shape index of eggs from treatment group T5 was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher as compared to control group. The control group T1 was recorded significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) higher egg surface area as compared to all other DDGS supplemented groups. The albumin index from control group T1 was recorded significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) highest as compared to treatment group T2 receiving diet at 5% corn DDGS. There was non-significant difference in all treatment groups for the yolk index, haugh unit and percent egg shell weight. The treatment groups from T2, T3, T4 and T5 recorded significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased yolk colour score as compared to control group. The egg shell thickness from treatment group T5 was significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased as compared to control group. It may be concluded that the inclusion of corn DDGS at 20 % in layer diets found to improve egg quality parameters such as shape index, yolk colour score and egg shell thickness which is beneficial for egg processing industry.

**Key words:** Corn DDGS, Layers, External Egg Quality, Internal Egg Quality

**How to cite:** Sedmake, E., Khose, K., Manwar, S., Gole, M., Wade, M., & Wankhede, S. (2018). Effect of Feeding Corn Distiller's Dried Grains with Solubles on Egg Quality Traits in Commercial Layers. International Journal of Livestock Research, 8(8), 273-284. doi: 10.5455/ijlr.20180104062855



## Introduction

Use of unconventional feed ingredients is one of the alternatives to reduce the cost of production by replacing the conventional feed ingredients. But the choice of these alternative ingredients depends on many factors and the important ones are availability, absence of toxic principle, nutrient availability, quality composition, cost of product and economical feasibility. Different types of cereals are used for the production of biofuel. Distiller's dried grains with solubles (DDGS) is a by-product of the distilling industry, which is recovered after the condensing and drying of stillage from dry mill ethanol production. It is source of energy, protein, water soluble vitamins and minerals (Jensen, 1978; Waldroup *et al.*, 1981; Parsons *et al.*, 2006). It is also a good source of xanthophylls (Runnels, 1957) and linoleic acid (Scott, 1965) and as well as riboflavin and thiamine (D'Ercole *et al.*, 1939). The total metabolizable energy content of corn distiller's dried grains with solubles (cDDGS) is 2827 kcal/kg (Lumpkins *et al.*, 2005) and 2906 kcal/kg (Batal and Dale, 2006). DDGS contains CP in the ranged 23 % and 32 % (Batal and Dale, 2006). The phosphorus in DDGS ranges from 0.59 to 0.95 % (Spiehs *et al.*, 2002). The studies showed that DDGS can be fed to laying hens up to 20% inclusion rates without negatively affecting egg production or other production parameters (Robertson *et al.*, 2005, reviewed by Batal and Bregendahl, 2012). Distiller's dried grains with solubles is a valuable source of protein and sulphur amino acids and was used at 50–200 g/kg inclusion concentrations in layer diets without affecting performance (Swiatkiewicz *et al.*, 2013; Abd El-Hack *et al.*, 2015 a, b; Sun *et al.*, 2015). A favorable effect on some egg quality parameters had been seen by distiller's dried grains with solubles (Jensen *et al.*, 1978). Many of the research finding observed that use of 10% DDGS in laying hens had not produced any adverse effect on egg production, egg quality parameter, Haugh unit, as well as egg composition and specific gravity (Roberts *et al.*, 2007). While some of the studies recorded lower egg weight when diet containing more than 20% DDGS was fed in layer diets. Moreover, the addition of 15 to 20% DDGS in the diet has improved yolk colour, yolk colour index and shell thickness (Shalash *et al.*, 2009; Roberson *et al.*, 2005; Roberts *et al.*, 2007; Pineda *et al.*, 2008). With the increase in DDGS production and based on its nutritional value, DDGS could be an attractive low cost ingredient to replace soybean meal and corn in poultry rations (Masa'deh *et al.*, 2012; Swiatkiewicz *et al.*, 2014). Therefore, the present experiment was carried out to evaluate the effect of feeding corn DDGS on egg quality traits in commercial layers.

## Materials and Methods

### Experimental Design and Management

The experiment was conducted on 180 layer birds (BV 300 strain) for period of 10 weeks from 22<sup>nd</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> weeks of age of the layer birds at Poultry Research Centre, Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary and Animal

Sciences, Akola, Maharashtra, India. The experimental layer birds were randomly distributed into 5 equal treatments T1 (control), T2, T3, T4 and T5 with 36 layer birds in each group having 4 replicates of 9 layer birds each. The diets were formulated as per strain recommendation. The dietary treatment groups were the control diet control – basal diet (T1), basal diet with 5% level of cDDGS replacing soyabean meal (T2), basal diet with 10% level of cDDGS replacing soyabean meal (T3), basal diet with 15% level of cDDGS replacing soyabean meal (T4), basal diet with 20% level of cDDGS replacing soyabean meal (T5). The birds were reared on three tier California cage housing system with three birds per compartment. All the groups were provided with similar environmental and management conditions. The total 16 hours of light and eight hours of darkness was provided to the birds throughout the experimental period of 10 weeks. The replicates were distributed in such a manner so as to nullify the row and tier effect. The birds were having free access to ample fresh, clean and wholesome water throughout experimental period.

### Procurement of Ingredients and Feed Formulation

The good quality feed ingredients were procured from local market for preparation of experimental diets. The corn DDGS was procured from M/s. Grainotch Industries Ltd., Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India. The chemical analysis of corn DDGS was carried out as per A.O.A.C. (1995) and presented in Table 1. Lumpkins *et al.* (2005) reported metabolizable energy in corn DDGS was 2827 kcal/kg and same was considered for the feed formulation.

**Table 1:** Chemical composition of corn DDGS (%DM)

Nutrient	Corn DDGS
Moisture (%)	11.34
Crude protein (%)	38.59
Crude fat (%)	8.65
Total ash (%)	4.41
Acid insoluble ash (%)	0.63
Salt (NaCl) (%)	0.16
Total phosphorus (%)	0.78
Calcium (%)	0.23
Crude fiber (%)	4.47

The experimental diets were prepared as per the recommendation of BV-300 layer strain. All the layer diets were balanced isocaloric and iso-nitrogenous. The ingredients and nutrient composition of layer mash for different treatment groups is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Ingredients (%) and nutrient composition of layer mash**

Ingredients (%)	Treatment Groups				
	T1 (Control)	T2 (5% cDDGS)	T3 (10% cDDGS)	T4 (15% cDDGS)	T5 (20% cDDGS)
Maize	57.95	56.5	54.485	52.905	51.24
De-oiled rice bran	10	10.77	12.51	13.41	14.5
Soyabean meal	19	14.7	10	5.5	1
Corn DDGS	-	5	10	15	20
Marble grit	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.5	8.6
Limestone powder	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Dicalcium phosphate	1.05	0.95	0.85	0.75	0.65
L-Lysine	-	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
DL-Methionine	0.16	0.14	0.12	0.095	0.07
Trace mineral mixture*	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Vitamin premix**	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Salt Pure	0.28	0.25	0.22	0.19	0.17
Sodium bicarbonate	0.1	0.11	0.125	0.14	0.13
Choline chloride 60%	0.1	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.18
Phytase 5000	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Livertonic	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Electrolytes	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Toxin binder	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Probiotics	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Acidifier	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Nutrient Composition (%DM)</b>					
Metabolizable energy (kcal/kg)	2570	2576	2571	2570	2570
Crude protein (%)	15.3	15.36	15.35	15.34	15.34
Ether extract (%)	2.62	2.97	3.3	3.65	3.99
Crude fiber (%)	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.46
Calcium (%)	4.07	4.05	4.03	4.07	4.07
Available phosphorus (%)	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42
Dig. Lysine (%)	0.659	0.662	0.66	0.659	0.659
Dig. Methionine (%)	0.37	0.36	0.36	0.35	0.34
Dig. Cystine (%)	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.24
Dig. Methionine + Cystine (%)	0.580	0.584	0.587	0.585	0.583
Calcium: avail. Phosphorus ratio	9.76	9.68	9.61	9.7	9.71

\*Trace Mineral Mineral mixture: each 1kg contains Cu-10g, Fe-80g, Mn-12g, Zn-92g, Se-1g, I-1g.

\*\* Vitamin premix: each 1kg contains Vitamin A-12.5 MIU, Vitamin B3-3.3 MIU, Vitamin E-40 g, Vitamin K- 2 g, Vitamin B1-4g, Vitamin B2-10g, Vitamin B6- 5g, Vitamin B12- 0.016 g, Niacin- 33g, Folic acid-1 g, Biotin- 0.1 g.

### Data Collection

For studying external and internal quality of egg, two eggs were randomly collected from each replicate i.e. total eight eggs from each treatment were collected at 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> weeks. The egg quality parameters were calculated as follows-

### Egg Weight (g)

Egg weight was measured by using a 0.0g sensitive digital scale during every interval of egg quality parameters.

### Shape Index

Length and width of the egg were measured with electronic digital vernier caliper. The shape index was calculated using the following formula as Shape index = width of egg/ Length of egg x 100 (Anderson *et al.*, 2004).

### Egg Surface Area (cm<sup>2</sup>)

Egg surface area was calculated by using following formula-

Egg surface area (S) =  $4\pi r^2$ . Radius (r) was calculated as  $\frac{1}{4}$  (length + breadth) of egg,  $\pi=3.14159$ .

### Albumin Index

Height of albumen (mm) was measured by spherometer and length of albumen (mm) was measured by vernier caliper. Albumen index was calculated with the following formula (Doyon *et al.*, 1986).

$$AI = AH / (AL+AW) \times 100$$

(Where, AI = albumen index, ah = albumen height, al = albumen length, aw = albumen width, mm= millimeter)

### Yolk Index

Height of yolk (mm) was measured by spherometer and diameter of yolk (mm) was measured by vernier caliper. Yolk index calculated using the following formula as described by Doyon *et al.*, 1986.

$$\text{Yolk Index} = \text{Yolk Height} / \text{Yolk Width} \times 100$$

### Haugh Unit

$$\text{Haugh Unit} = 100 \times \log (h - 1.7w^{0.37} + 7.6)$$

(Whereas, h = Average height of albumen in mm, w = Weight of egg in grams)

### Yolk Color Score

Colour of yolk was directly assessed by comparing with Roche Yolk Colour Fan (RYCF) standard (Vulleumier, 1969).

### Percent Egg Shell Weight

Egg shell weight calculated after breaking of an egg and the weight of egg shell with shell membrane was expressed as a percentage of the whole egg.

### Egg Shell Thickness (mm)

Egg shell thickness was measured with shell membrane by the micro screw gauge.

### Statistical Analysis

The differences among treatments, within treatment groups were determined by analyzing the data generated by using the factorial Randomized Block Design for egg quality parameters as per described by Snedecor and Cochran (1994).

### Results and Discussion

The results pertaining to egg weight, shape index and egg surface area are presented in Table 3. The results related to albumin index, yolk index and haugh unit are presented in Table 4 and the data on yolk colour score, percent egg shell weight and egg shell thickness have been presented in Table 5.

### Egg Weight

The treatment means for egg weight obtained from the birds from control group T1 recorded significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) higher egg weights as compared to other treatments groups (Table 3). However, the differences in egg weights obtained from groups T3, T4 and T5 were statistically non-significant with each other. Egg weight decreased as DDGS increased in the diets, with a trend for linear response. The present investigation was in agreement of Shalash *et al.* (2010) who reported that increasing DDGS up to 15 to 20 in laying hen diets significantly decreased egg weight as compared with other levels at 0, 5 and 10%. Roberson *et al.* (2005) also reported that the linear decreased in egg weight as DDGS level increased in layer diet. Abousekken (2014) observed that the average egg weight of laying *Japanese quails* was significantly decreased as dietary inclusion of corn DDGS was increased. The reason for decreased egg weight was due to the potential bioavailability of amino acid.

### Shape Index

The shape index of eggs from treatment group T5 was significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher as compared to control group T1 (Table 3). However, the differences in shape index of eggs from groups T1, T2, T3 and T4 were statistically non-significant with each other. The findings of the present study are in accordance with the work of Zile and Sajjan (2014) who reported that inclusion of DDGS with or without multienzyme supplementation in layer diet recorded significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) difference in shape index of egg.

### Egg Surface Area (cm<sup>2</sup>)

The control group T1 was recorded significantly (P<0.01) higher egg surface area as compared to all other DDGS supplemented groups i.e. T2, T3, T4 and T5 (Table 3).

**Table 3:** Effect of different cDDGS levels on egg weight, shape index and egg surface area

Weeks	Treatment Groups				
	T1 (Control)	T2 (5% cDDGS)	T3 (10% cDDGS)	T4 (15% cDDGS)	T5 (20% cDDGS)
<b>Egg weight (g/egg)</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	55.44±0.72	53.40±1.64	53.20±1.08	50.47±1.09	52.37±1.35
4 <sup>th</sup>	56.83±0.97	55.63±0.77	55.48±1.53	55.57±0.86	53.72±0.77
6 <sup>th</sup>	59.20±0.85	58.18±0.59	57.45±0.72	55.11±0.47	58.67±1.04
8 <sup>th</sup>	58.35±0.99	57.25±0.49	58.28±0.42	56.07±0.61	56.11±0.63
10 <sup>th</sup>	58.32±0.67	55.66±0.91	55.08±0.93	54.79±0.96	54.42±0.70
<b>Mean</b>	<b>57.63±0.42<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>56.02±0.49<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>55.90±0.51<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>54.40±0.48<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>55.06±0.53<sup>ab</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>1.502<sup>**</sup></b>				
<b>Shape Index</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	75.71±0.72	76.89±1.59	75.22±0.74	75.68±0.63	75.31±0.65
4 <sup>th</sup>	74.89±0.50	75.09±0.48	75.55±0.61	75.52±0.70	76.44±1.02
6 <sup>th</sup>	74.74±0.85	74.85±0.47	75.84±0.90	75.52±0.54	76.01±1.02
8 <sup>th</sup>	75.34±0.83	75.40±0.48	75.95±0.39	76.24±0.62	75.99±0.45
10 <sup>th</sup>	75.92±0.67	76.58±0.68	77.56±0.66	76.96±0.73	77.69±0.47
<b>Mean</b>	<b>75.32±0.32<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>75.77±0.39<sup>a</sup><sub>b</sub></b>	<b>76.02±0.32<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>75.98±0.29<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>76.29±0.35<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>0.923<sup>*</sup></b>				
<b>Egg Surface Area (cm<sup>2</sup>)</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	74.80±0.74	71.84±1.61	73.59±1.25	70.70±1.10	72.70±1.34
4 <sup>th</sup>	77.16±0.91	76.38±0.71	75.84±1.53	76.05±0.72	73.49±0.70
6 <sup>th</sup>	79.74±0.84	78.08±0.74	77.14±0.99	75.11±0.65	79.24±1.20
8 <sup>th</sup>	78.56±1.20	77.36±0.63	77.99±0.39	76.26±0.48	75.35±0.71
10 <sup>th</sup>	77.92±0.60	75.37±0.92	74.20±0.62	73.88±0.81	73.59±0.68
<b>Mean</b>	<b>77.64±0.46<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>75.80±0.55<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>75.75±0.52<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>74.40±0.46<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>74.87±0.56<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>1.532<sup>**</sup></b>				

The means bearing different superscripts within a row differ significantly. \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01.

### Albumin Index

The albumin index from control group T1 was recorded significantly (P<0.05) highest as compared to treatment group T2. Whereas, there was a numerical increase in the values for albumen index of eggs in groups T3, T4 and T5 as compared to treatment group T2 but the statistical difference was non-significant with each other (Table 4). Similarly, Zile and Sajjan (2014) reported that inclusion of DDGS with or without multi-enzyme supplementation in layer diet recorded similar albumin index in all treatment groups.

### Yolk Index

The differences in the yolk index of eggs between the groups were statistically non-significant. However, there was a numerical increase in the values for yolk index of eggs in treatment group T5 as compared to control group, which is beneficial for the value addition in the egg quality (Table 4). The findings of the present study are in accordance with the work of Zile and Sajjan (2014) who reported that the inclusion DDGS at 0, 2, 4, 6 and 8% in the basal diet by replacing 0, 10, 20, 30 and 40% soyabean meal and supplemented with multi-enzyme recorded similar yolk index in all treatment groups.

### Haugh Unit

It was revealed that the mean haugh units of eggs obtained from the birds from different groups were statistically non-significant. The haugh unit of eggs obtained from the birds from T5 group was recorded numerically higher haugh unit as compared to control group. Whereas, the treatment groups T2, T3, T4 and T5 recorded numerically lower haugh unit as compared with control group T1, but the differences was found to be non-significant (Table 4).

**Table 4:** Effect of different cDDGS levels on albumin index, yolk index and haugh unit

Weeks	Treatment Groups				
	T1 (Control)	T2 (5% cDDGS)	T3 (10% cDDGS)	T4 (15% cDDGS)	T5 (20% cDDGS)
<b>Albumin index</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	12.81±0.61	11.11±0.34	12.19±0.70	12.24±0.62	11.54±0.39
4 <sup>th</sup>	15.01±0.59	11.44±0.49	12.31±0.78	11.71±0.74	12.54±0.82
6 <sup>th</sup>	15.06±0.85	15.42±0.58	15.81±0.95	15.87±0.83	16.62±0.24
8 <sup>th</sup>	10.52±0.62	10.44±0.68	10.34±0.71	10.75±0.68	11.67±0.64
10 <sup>th</sup>	12.21±0.65	12.64±0.25	12.01±0.47	12.16±0.59	12.35±0.60
<b>Mean</b>	<b>13.12±0.40<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>12.21±0.35<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>12.53±0.42<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>12.55±0.41<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>12.95±0.39<sup>ab</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>0.801*</b>				
<b>Yolk Index</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	47.76±0.60	45.95±1.11	48.12±0.65	47.15±2.13	47.90±1.07
4 <sup>th</sup>	47.86±0.74	46.46±0.48	46.69±1.09	49.38±0.97	47.42±0.63
6 <sup>th</sup>	51.25±0.43	49.79±0.46	48.21±0.59	50.04±0.87	50.10±0.89
8 <sup>th</sup>	45.91±1.66	46.55±1.17	47.44±1.11	46.61±0.96	47.57±0.53
10 <sup>th</sup>	47.26±0.58	47.47±0.96	48.30±0.61	46.11±0.96	47.81±0.92
<b>Mean</b>	<b>48.01±0.48</b>	<b>47.24±0.44</b>	<b>47.75±0.37</b>	<b>47.86±0.59</b>	<b>48.16±0.39</b>
<b>Haugh unit</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	96.81±1.78	93.59±0.64	95.71±1.94	95.87±1.16	93.74±0.50
4 <sup>th</sup>	100.82±1.85	93.99±1.45	94.85±1.81	93.63±2.04	96.07±2.09
6 <sup>th</sup>	102.39±1.91	104.11±1.09	103.42±2.08	103.25±1.96	106.26±0.68
8 <sup>th</sup>	90.38±2.27	91.11±2.23	89.36±2.35	92.35±2.94	94.80±1.76
10 <sup>th</sup>	95.71±1.65	97.22±0.77	94.88±1.14	95.18±1.53	95.27±1.70
<b>Mean</b>	<b>97.22±1.05</b>	<b>96.00±0.92</b>	<b>95.64±1.08</b>	<b>96.06±0.99</b>	<b>97.23±0.97</b>

The means bearing different superscripts within a row differ significantly.  $P < 0.05$

The findings of the present study are in accordance with the work of Cheon *et al.* (2008) who reported that the haugh unit was not affected by the addition of corn DDGS up to 20% in the layer diets. Similarly, Rew *et al.* (2009) also reported that haugh unit was not influenced by the supplementation of corn DDGS at 0, 10 and 20% inclusion levels in the layer diets.

### **Yolk Colour Score**

It was revealed that the treatment groups T2, T3, T4 and T5 recorded significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased yolk colour score as compared to control group. However, the treatment groups T4 and T5 was recorded significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased yolk colour score as compared to treatment groups T1 and T2 (Table 5). The similar findings are in accordance with Cheon *et al.* (2008) who reported that the yolk colour was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) increased by corn DDGS supplementation in laying hens. Krawczyk *et al.* (2012) also reported that dietary inclusion of corn DDGS increased yolk colour intensity. This indicates that xanthophylls in the DDGS were highly available. Dried distillers grains with solubles provide more xanthophylls than corn with approximately 34 mg/kg (Sauvant and Tran, 2004), which is 3 times the corn xanthophyll content (10.62 mg/kg; NRC, 1981). This further improves the yolk colour which is beneficial for the value addition in the eggs and poultry product processing industry.

### **Percent Egg Shell Weight**

The percent egg shell weight from all the groups was statistically non-significant. It is revealed that the percent egg shell weight from treatment group T4 was numerically increased as compared to all other groups (Table 5). Similarly, Rew *et al.* (2009) who reported that egg shell weight was not affected by the supplementation of corn DDGS in laying diets. Swiatkiewicz and Korelski (2006) revealed that feeding of 0, 10, 15 or 20% corn DDGS of rye DDGS had no effect on egg shell percent. Khose *et al.* (2017) reported that inclusion of corn DDGS up to 15% with or without enzyme did not affect the nutrient utilization in broilers.

### **Egg Shell Thickness (mm)**

The egg shell thickness from treatment group T5 was recorded significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) increased as compared to control group (Table 5). However, the egg shell thickness from treatment groups T1, T2, T3 and T4 was statistically non-significant with each other. The finding are in accordance with Shalash *et al.* (2009) and Pineda *et al.* (2008) reported that the addition of 15 to 20% DDGS in the diet has improved yolk colour, yolk colour index and shell thickness. However, Swiatkiewicz and Koreleski (2006) reported that the level of DDGS in the diet had no negative effect on eggshell thickness. Similarly, Rew *et al.* (2009) reported that egg shell thickness was not affected by DDGS feeding in laying hens.

**Table 5:** Effect of dietary cDDGS levels on yolk colour score, percent egg shell weight and egg shell thickness (mm)

Weeks	Treatment Groups				
	T1 (Control)	T2 (5% cDDGS)	T3 (10% cDDGS)	T4 (15% cDDGS)	T5 (20% cDDGS)
<b>Yolk Color Score</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	6.00±0.33	6.13±0.30	6.75±0.25	6.88±0.23	7.00±0.00
4 <sup>th</sup>	5.63±0.18	6.25±0.16	6.63±0.26	7.13±0.13	7.75±0.16
6 <sup>th</sup>	5.88±0.13	6.75±0.25	7.00±0.27	7.38±0.26	7.50±0.27
8 <sup>th</sup>	4.88±0.30	6.13±0.23	6.88±0.13	7.13±0.23	7.38±0.18
10 <sup>th</sup>	5.88±0.23	6.50±0.33	6.88±0.23	7.13±0.23	7.25±0.25
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.65±0.12<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>6.35±0.12<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>6.83±0.10<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>7.13±0.10<sup>dc</sup></b>	<b>7.38±0.09<sup>d</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>0.376**</b>				
<b>Percent Egg Shell Weight</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	10.81±0.22	10.49±0.33	11.09±0.28	10.94±0.20	10.62±0.27
4 <sup>th</sup>	10.58±0.12	10.37±0.14	10.28±0.13	10.54±0.26	10.86±0.27
6 <sup>th</sup>	10.42±0.21	11.24±0.20	10.99±0.12	10.72±0.23	10.79±0.22
8 <sup>th</sup>	10.75±0.21	10.69±0.20	10.51±0.24	10.81±0.18	10.48±0.31
10 <sup>th</sup>	11.26±0.25	10.68±0.27	10.77±0.30	11.13±0.13	10.54±0.17
<b>Mean</b>	<b>10.76±0.10</b>	<b>10.70±0.10</b>	<b>10.73±0.11</b>	<b>10.83±0.09</b>	<b>10.66±0.11</b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>0.017**</b>				
<b>Egg Shell Thickness (mm)</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup>	0.41±0.01	0.39±0.01	0.41±0.01	0.39±0.01	0.41±0.01
4 <sup>th</sup>	0.37±0.01	0.38±0.01	0.39±0.01	0.40±0.01	0.41±0.01
6 <sup>th</sup>	0.35±0.01	0.40±0.02	0.39±0.01	0.39±0.01	0.40±0.01
8 <sup>th</sup>	0.38±0.01	0.37±0.01	0.36±0.01	0.38±0.01	0.39±0.01
10 <sup>th</sup>	0.40±0.01	0.40±0.01	0.40±0.01	0.40±0.01	0.38±0.01
<b>Mean</b>	<b>0.38±0.0<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.39±0.0<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>0.39±0.00<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>0.39±0.00<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>0.40±0.00<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>CD</b>	<b>0.017**</b>				

The means bearing different superscripts within a row differ significantly. \* $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P < 0.01$ .

## Conclusion

It may be concluded that the inclusion of corn DDGS at 20 % in layer diets found to improve egg quality parameters such as shape index, yolk colour score and egg shell thickness which is beneficial for egg processing industry.

## Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Director of Research, MAFSU, Nagpur and Associate Dean, Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Akola for providing necessary facilities. The authors are also thankful to Dr. B. V. Rao Poultry Research Foundation, Pune, Maharashtra, India for awarding Dr. B. V. Rao, WPC'1996-Research Grants for this study.

## References

1. Abd El-Hack ME, Alagawany M, Farag MR and Dhama K. 2015a. Use of maize distiller's dried grains with solubles (DDGS) in laying hen diets: trends and advances. *Asian J. Anim. Vet. Adv.* 10: 690–707.
2. Abd El-Hack ME, El-Hindawy M, Attia A and Mahrose KM. 2015b. Effects of feeding dried distillers grains with solubles with or without enzyme or vitamin E supplementation on productive performance of Hisex Brown laying hens. *Zagazig J. Agriculture Res.* 42: 71–79.
3. Abousekken MSM. 2014. Use of corn distillers dried grains with soluble (DDGS) in laying quail diets. *Egypt. Poult. Sci.* 34 (3): 681-703.
4. Anderson KE, Tharrington JB, Curtis PA and Jones FT. 2004. Shell characteristics of eggs from historic strains of single comb white leghorn chickens and the relationship of egg shape to shell strength. *International Journal of Poultry Sci.* 3: 17-19.
5. AOAC. 1995. Official methods of analysis, Association of officials' analytical chemist (16th Edition). 1: 31-65.
6. Batal AB and Bregendahl K. 2012. Feeding ethanol coproducts to poultry Distillers Grans: Production, Properties and Utilization Liu K. Rosentrater K. A. CRC Press Boca Raton, FL, USA 317 338.
7. Batal AB and Dale NM. 2006. True metabolizable energy and amino acid digestibility of distillers dried grains with solubles. *J. Applied Poult. Res.* 15: 89-93.
8. Cheon YJ, Lee HL, Shin MH, Jang A, Lee SK, Lee JH, Lee BD and Son CK. 2008. Effects of corn distiller's dried grains with solubles on production and egg quality in laying hens. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 21(9): 1318-1323.
9. D'Ercole AD, Esselen WB Jr and Fellers CR. 1939. The nutritive value of distiller's by-products. *Poult. Sci.* 18: 89-95.
10. Doyon GM, Bernier-Cardou R, Hamilton MG, Castalgne F and Randall CJ. 1986. Egg quality: Albumen quality of eggs from five commercial strains of white leghorn hens during one year of lay. *Poultry Sci.* 65: 63-66.
11. Jensen LS. 1978. Distillers feeds as source of unidentified factors for laying hens. Distillers Feed Research Council Conference, Louisville. Kentucky, 33: 17-22.
12. Khose K, Manwar S, Dhore R, Kuralkar S and Waghmare S. 2017. Effect of feeding corn distillers dried grains with solubles and enzyme supplementation on immune response and nutrient utilization. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology.* 6(6): 3460–3468.
13. Krawczyk J, Sokolowicz Z, Swiatkiewicz S, Koreleski J and Szefer M. 2012. Performance and egg quality of hens from conservation flocks fed a diet containing maize distillers dried grains with solubles (DDGS). *Ann. Anim. Sci.* 12(2): 247–260.
14. Lumpkins BS, Batal A and Dale N. 2005. Use of distillers dried grains plus solubles in laying hen diets. *J. Applied Poult. Res.* 14: 25-31.
15. Masa'deh MK, Purdum SE and Hanford KJ. 2012. Distillers dried grains with solubles in pullet diets. *J. Applied Poult. Res.* 21: 531-539.
16. NRC (National Research Council). 1981. Feeding Value of Ethanol Production By-Products. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
17. Parsons CM, Martinez C, Singh V, Radhadkrishman S and Noll S. 2006. Nutritional value of conventional and modified DDGS for performance of broiler chickens grown in floor pens. *Poultry. Proc. Multi-State Poult. Nutr. Feeding Conf., Poult. Sci.* 84: 1031-1044.
18. Pineda L, Roberts S, Kerr B, Kwakkel R, Verstegen M and Bregendahl K. 2008. Maximum dietary content of corn dried distiller's grains with solubles in diets for laying hens: effects on nitrogen balance, manure excretion, egg production and egg quality. A. S. Leaflet R2334. Iowa State University Animal Industry Report, Ames, IA. Research Council Conference, Louisville. Kentucky. 33: 17-22.
19. Rew HJ, Shin MH, Lee HR, Jo C, Lee SK, and Lee BD. 2009. Effects of corn distiller's dried grains with solubles on production performance and economics in laying hens. *Korean Journal of Poultry Sci.* 36(1): 15-21.



20. Roberson KD, Kalbfleisch JL, Pan W and Charbeneau RA. 2005. Effect of corn distiller's dried grains with solubles at various levels on performance of laying hens and egg yolk color. *Int. J. Poult. Sci.* 4: 44-51.
21. Roberts SA, Xin H, Kerr BJ, Russell JR and Bregendahl K. 2007. Effects of dietary fiber and reduced crude protein on nitrogen balance and egg production in laying hens. *Poult. Sci.* 86: 1716-1725.
22. Runnels TD. 1957. Corn distillers dried solubles as a growth promoting and pigmenting ingredient in broiler finishing diets. *Proc. Distillers Feed Research Council Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio.* 12: 54-60.
23. Sauvant D and Tran G. 2004. Corn distillers. Page 118 in *Tables of composition and nutritional value of feed materials*. D. Sauvant, J.-M. Perez, and G. Tran, ed. Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, the Netherlands.
24. Scott ML. 1965. Distillers dried solubles for maximum broiler growth and maximum egg size. *Distillers Feed Research Council Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio.* 25: 55-57.
25. Shalash SMM, Abou El-Wafa S, Hassan RA, Ramadan NA, Mohamed MS and El-Gabry HE. 2010. Evaluation of distillers dried grains with solubles as feed ingredient in laying hen diets. *International Journal of Poultry Science.* 9(6): 537-545.
26. Shalash SMM, Ali MN, Sayed MAM, El-Gabry HE and Shabaan M. 2009. Novel method for improving the utilization of corn dried distillers grains with solubles in broiler diets. *Int. J. Poult. Sci.* 8: 545-552.
27. Snedecor GW and Cochran WG. 1994. *Statistical methods*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics.* 19(3): 304-307.
28. Spiels MJ, Whitney MH and Shurson GC. 2002. Nutrient database for distiller's dried grains with solubles produced from new ethanol plants in Minnesota and South Dakota. *J. Anim. Sci.* 80: 2639-2645.
29. Sun H, Lee EJ, Persia ME and Ahn DU. 2015. Effects of increasing concentrations of corn distiller's dried grains with solubles on chemical composition and nutrients content of egg. *Anim. Indust. Rep.* 661, pp. 52.
30. Swiatkiewicz S and Koreleski J. 2006. Effect of maize distillers dried grains with solubles and dietary enzyme supplementation on the performance of laying hens. *J. Anim. Feed Sci.* 15(2): 253-260.
31. Swiatkiewicz S, Arczewska-Wlosek A and Jozefiak D. 2014. Bones quality indices in laying hens fed diets with a high level of DDGS and supplemented with selected feed additives. *Czech J. Anim. Sci.* 59: 61-68.
32. Swiatkiewicz S, Arczewska-Wlosek A, Krawczyk J, Puchala M and Jozefiak D. 2013. Effects of selected feed additives on the performance of laying hens given a diet rich in maize dried distiller's grains with solubles (DDGS). *Br. Poultry Sci.* 54: 478-485.
33. Vuilleumier JP. 1969. The "Roche Colour Fan"- an instrument for measuring yolk color. *Poultry Sci.* 48: 226-227.
34. Waldroup PW, Owen JA, Ramsy BE and Whelchel DL. 1981. The use of high levels of distillers dried grains plus solubles in broiler diets. *Poult. Sci.* 60: 1479-1484.
35. Zile S and Sajjan S. 2014. Effect of replacement of soybean meal with distillers dried grains with solubles in the diets with or without multienzyme supplementation on the performance of layers. *Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition.* 31(3): 297- 301.

