



**Naked oats: metabolisable energy yield from a range of varieties in broilers, cockerels and turkeys**

Journal:	<i>British Poultry Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	CBPS-2007-033.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Mar-2008
Complete List of Authors:	MacLeod, Murdo; Roslin Institute, Genetics and Genomics
Keywords:	Broilers, Feedstuffs, Metabolisable energy, Nutrition, Turkeys



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 **Naked oats: metabolisable energy yield from a range of varieties in broilers,**  
11 **cockerels and turkeys**  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 M.G. MACLEOD, J. VALENTINE<sup>1</sup>, A. COWAN<sup>1</sup>, A. WADE<sup>2,3</sup>, L. MCNEILL AND K.  
25  
26 BERNARD  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 *Roslin Institute, Roslin, Scotland, <sup>1</sup>Institute of Grassland and Environmental Research,*  
32 *Aberystwyth, Wales and <sup>2</sup>ADAS, Rosemaund Research Centre, Hereford, England*  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Short title: NAKED OATS FOR POULTRY**  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Correspondence to Dr M. G. Macleod, Roslin Institute, Roslin, EH25 9PS, Midlothian, UK.  
47

48 Tel: +44 (0)131 527 4311  
49

50 Fax: +44 (0)131 440 0434  
51

52 Email: [murdo.macleod@bbsrc.ac.uk](mailto:murdo.macleod@bbsrc.ac.uk)  
53

54 Accepted for publication 18 March 2008  
55  
56

57 <sup>3</sup>Present address: Hillhampton Technical Services, Hillhampton Farm, Shobdon, Leominster,  
58 Herefordshire, HR6 9NE, UK.  
59  
60

1 **Abstract** 1. Naked oats belong to the same species as “common oats”, *Avena sativa*, but  
2 have a non-lignified husk which readily becomes detached during harvesting. The absence  
3 of the indigestible husk can be predicted to give an increased metabolisable energy (ME)  
4 content for poultry.

5 2. Measurements of true metabolisable energy (TME<sub>N</sub>) were performed on 3-week-old  
6 broiler chicks (Cobb males), adult cockerels (IsaBrown, >1 year) and 7-week-old turkeys  
7 (BUT T8 males). The measurements were repeated in 2000, 2001 and 2002, with some  
8 measurements on a sub-set of varieties in 2004.

9 3. High-oil naked oat lines yielded 12% more energy (TME<sub>N</sub>) than wheat. Naked oats,  
10 excluding the experimental high-oil lines, yielded 8.5% more energy than simultaneously  
11 assayed wheat samples.

12 4. In samples from the 2004 harvest, conventional oats gave TME<sub>N</sub> values about 13%  
13 lower than those of wheat.

14 6. The addition of  $\beta$ -glucanase produced an increase of about 4% in the apparent  
15 metabolisable energy (AME) of oats for broiler chickens. This effect was associated with  
16 a 70% decrease in the jejunal viscosity of broilers receiving a 500 g/kg naked-oat diet.

17 7. The oil content of naked oats was about 5 times greater than that of wheat, with the high  
18 oil lines rising to more than 6 times greater. Naked oats had a lower starch content than  
19 wheat but not sufficiently lower to negate the energy benefits of the higher oil content.  
20 The crude protein (CP) contents of naked oats were similar to those of wheat, with the  
21 high-oil varieties tending to be higher in CP also.

## 22 INTRODUCTION

23 Naked oats are a cultivar of the same species as “common oats”, *Avena sativa*, but have a  
24 dominant gene which gives rise to a phenotype with a non-lignified husk (Ougham *et al.*,  
25 1996). This becomes detached during harvesting. The absence of the indigestible husk can

1  
2  
3  
4 1 be predicted to give increased metabolisable energy (ME) content for poultry; apart from  
5  
6 2 the low intrinsic nutritional value of the husk, it is also a major source of variability among  
7  
8 3 batches of grain. The potential of naked oats in poultry nutrition has been increased still  
9  
10 4 further by selection for high oil content (Valentine *et al.*, 2003). The high oil lines used in  
11  
12 5 the present work (“Chris” 91-229Cn234 and “Fatso” 91-229Cn253) resulted from a cross  
13  
14 6 between Pendragon (a naked oat bred at IGER) and N313-2. N313-2 was obtained from a  
15  
16 7 recurrent selection programme for high groat oil content based on germplasm from the  
17  
18 8 wild relative *Avena sterilis* at the University of Iowa (Branson and Frey, 1989). Racoon  
19  
20 9 (95-240 Cn) is a commercially-available naked oat combining an intermediate  
21  
22 10 concentration of oil with higher yield than Chris or Fatso. It derives from a complex cross  
23  
24 11 involving 12% of its genes from N 361-3, another selection from the same cycle of the  
25  
26 12 Iowa recurrent selection programme. The present paper describes part of a collaborative  
27  
28 13 project assessing the energy yield from a number of commercial and experimental lines  
29  
30 14 originating from IGER and grown at ADAS, Rosemaund.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 15 Oats are increasingly recognised as having a number of valuable nutritional and  
37  
38 16 agronomic characteristics. Naked oats are higher in essential amino-acids than wheat or  
39  
40 17 barley. This offers the possibility of replacing some imported soya and animal proteins  
41  
42 18 over and above the value of oats an energy source. Further advantages of naked oats  
43  
44 19 include a high concentration of polyunsaturated oils (40% of oil is monounsaturated, 40%  
45  
46 20 polyunsaturated) and significant antioxidant activity. The latter two characteristics confer  
47  
48 21 benefits on egg and meat quality. The health benefits of polyunsaturated fatty acids could  
49  
50 22 make eggs and meat from oat-fed hens more attractive to consumers. The effects on meat  
51  
52 23 quality have been shown to include enhanced sensory evaluation and properties such as  
53  
54 24 low drip loss and longer shelf life (Lopez-Bote *et al.*, 1998*a,b*). Oats enhanced the  
55  
56 25 oxidative stability of broiler meat and also reduced cholesterol oxidation during cooking.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Evidence is accumulating on the suitability of naked oats for inclusion in poultry  
2 diets up to a high concentration (Cave and Burrows, 1993; Hsun and Maurice, 1992;  
3 MacLean *et al.*, 1993) with or without enzyme supplementation (Brenes *et al.*, 1993). Oats  
4 are high in  $\beta$ -glucans, which are seen as a negative feature of barley. However,  $\beta$ -glucans  
5 vary in properties such as degree of branching and molecular weight, both of which  
6 influence anti-nutritive effects. Realisation of the beneficial nutritional qualities of oat  
7 products is already increasing demand for oats in human nutrition and knowledge on the  
8 biologically-active constituents is increasing rapidly (Lasztity, 1998).

9 Metabolisable energy (ME = gross energy - [faecal + urinary energy]) is a key  
10 measurement when including an ingredient in commercial diets. Accurate measurement of  
11 ME is necessary for formulating a diet with the appropriate energy concentration. It is also  
12 essential for determining the concentration of other diet components, since they should be  
13 included in proportion to energy content. This is because food intake by weight is  
14 governed largely by energy content, so the intake of other nutrients is determined by their  
15 ratio to energy content. Early in the analysis of results, it became clear that the values for  
16 conventional oats were higher than expected. Our hypothesis to explain this was that some  
17 oat hulls may have been retained in the gizzard beyond the end of the experimental period,  
18 since particles do not leave the gizzard until they are ground below a certain size. This  
19 would have the effect of reducing the measurement of total faecal energy, which would  
20 give an elevated ME estimate. The test of this hypothesis is described in the Materials and  
21 Methods section.

## 22 MATERIALS AND METHODS

23 Measurements of TME were performed in each of three harvest years (2000, 2001, 2002)  
24 on 3-week-old broiler chicks (Cobb males), adult cockerels (IsaBrown, >1 year) and 7-  
25 week-old turkeys (BUT T8 males). Each year, the evaluations were performed within 6

1 months of harvest. The grain samples were stored at room temperature in natural-fibre  
2 bags. The varieties labelled “Chris” and “Fatso” are experimental high-oil lines. Two feed  
3 wheats were built into a randomised-block experimental design to give simultaneous  
4 comparison with the oat varieties. A feed wheat (Consort) was assayed every year, for  
5 comparison with the oat varieties. Annual measurements on a subset of varieties  
6 recommenced in 2004 and are expected to continue until 2009; some results from 2004 are  
7 included for comparison.

8 Slightly different bioassay techniques (McNab and Blair, 1988; MacLeod *et al.*,  
9 1997) were adopted for each class of stock (Tables 1, 2, 3). All materials were ground  
10 through a 2.5 mm screen before feeding. The bioassays were done as soon as possible  
11 after each harvest. Results were corrected to zero nitrogen retention, which makes the  
12 simplification that the feedingstuff evaluated is used entirely as an energy source. The  
13 justification for this correction is that ME is purely an energy evaluation system, so  
14 materials should be assessed only for their energy value. The correction involves  
15 calculating (by the following equation) the additional energy which would appear in the  
16 excreta if any nitrogen retained were instead to be catabolised and excreted:

$$17 \text{ ([faecal+urinary] energy)}_N = \text{([faecal+urinary] energy)} + 34.4(\text{N intake} - \\ 18 \text{ [faecal+urinary]N})$$

19 where 34.4 kJ/g is the mean gross energy of the nitrogenous excretory products.

20 Nitrogen correction was applied to endogenous energy losses (EEL) also. Because the  
21 “glucose control” birds used to measure EEL are temporarily on a nitrogen-free diet,  
22 nitrogenous matter makes up a large proportion of endogenous losses.  $EEL_N$  is, therefore,  
23 lower than EEL (McNab and Blair, 1988).

24 Six replicate cockerels and 8 replicate broilers and turkeys were used for each raw  
25 material. Results were analysed by GENSTAT, using a REML method.

### 1 **Test for effect of hull retention**

2 A separate experiment was carried out to test whether any oat hulls from hulled varieties  
3 were retained in the gut beyond the 48 h collection period and the effect of this on the  
4 TME estimate. A conventional oat (Gerald), a thin-hulled oat (Millennium) and a naked  
5 oat (Grafton) were compared. Each variety was precision-fed to 5 replicate cockerels in a  
6 randomised-block design. After the TME measurement procedure shown in Table 1, the  
7 birds were killed by intravenous pentobarbitone injection and the contents of the gizzard,  
8 ileum, caeca and rectum were collected in pre-weighed containers. The container and  
9 contents were then weighed, frozen and vacuum dried. The proportions of hulls retained  
10 were calculated from measurements of the hull content of representative samples of the  
11 corresponding oat variety.

### 12 **Enzyme ( $\beta$ -glucanase) effects**

13 An apparent metabolisable energy ( $AME_N$ ) technique was used to measure the effect of  $\beta$ -  
14 glucanase on energy yield from naked oats (variety *Harpoon*) (Table 4). Jejunal viscosity  
15 was also measured. A commercial enzyme preparation, produced by the fungus  
16 *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* (ATCC 74 252), was used. It was added to the test diet to  
17 provide the following activities per kg of diet, based on the manufacturer's declared  
18 specification: endo-1,4- $\beta$ -glucanase, 400 U; endo-1,3(4)- $\beta$ -glucanase, 900 U; endo-1,4- $\beta$ -  
19 xylanase, 1300 U. To permit stabilisation of the gut environment, the birds were kept on  
20 the test diets for 16 d before measurements were performed. The oats were substituted for  
21 50% of a basal diet based on maize and soya (Table 5) and the AME of oats estimated by  
22 comparison of the 50% oat diet with the basal diet. Maize was used in the basal diet to  
23 give the most similar nutrient:energy ratio to the oat test material. A total of 4 diets were  
24 tested: basal diet control; basal diet +  $\beta$ -glucanase; mixed diet (50% oats) control; mixed  
25 diet +  $\beta$ -glucanase. The 4 diets were each given to 8 replicate groups of 3 Ross broiler

1 males. On d 1-4, the birds were fed on a standard broiler starter diet. The experimental  
2 diets were given from d 5-21. Droppings were collected for analysis from d 18-21.  
3 Titanium dioxide was added to allow the use of a marker ratio technique in estimating  
4 AME. In this technique, apparent metabolisability is calculated from the equation below  
5 and multiplied by the gross energy of the diet to give AME.

$$\text{Apparent metabolisability} = 1 - (\text{GE}_{\text{droppings}} / \text{TiO}_2_{\text{droppings}}) / (\text{GE}_{\text{feed}} / \text{TiO}_2_{\text{feed}})$$

7 The substitution method uses the equation below for calculation of the AME of the test  
8 ingredient (oats) from the AME of the basal diet and the AME of the diet made up of 50%  
9 oats and 50% basal diet.

$$\text{AME}_{\text{oats}} = \text{AME}_{\text{basal}} + (\text{AME}_{\text{test}} - \text{AME}_{\text{basal}}) / (\text{proportion of oats in test diet})$$

### 11 **Chemical analysis**

12 Sub-samples of each variety were analysed for crude protein, oil (acid ether extract), starch  
13 and  $\beta$ -glucan by Eurofins Laboratories Ltd (Wolverhampton, England), using standard  
14 AOAC methods.

## 15 **RESULTS**

16 ME values are summarised in Tables 6 and 7.  $\text{TME}_N$  is true metabolisable energy adjusted  
17 to zero nitrogen balance. A dry matter basis gives a better standard of comparison but an  
18 as-fed basis is typically used in commercial feed formulation. The coefficients of variation  
19 in TME were low, typically about 3%. Excluding the experimental high-oil lines, naked  
20 oats on average yielded a  $\text{TME}_N$  8.5% higher than that of wheat assayed simultaneously.  
21 The high-oil lines yielded 12% more energy than wheat. These relative differences have  
22 been repeated in grain from the 2004 harvest (Table 8). In the 2004 samples, conventional  
23 oats gave TME values about 13% lower than those of wheat. Naked oats and the high-oil  
24 naked oats gave values respectively 9% and 13% higher than wheat. There was a highly  
25 significant interaction between cereal species and bird species, turkeys appearing to extract



1 more TME from oats (especially husked oats) than did broilers, although there was no  
 2 difference between bird species in the amount of TME obtained from wheat. The oil  
 3 contents (acid ether extract) of the cereal samples were as follows (g/kg): wheats, 30;  
 4 Gerald, 90; Millennium, 70; Expression, 120; 95-240-Cn, 150.

### 5 **Comparison of bird types**

6 There were significant and consistent differences between bird types, with the mature  
 7 cockerels giving the highest value (17.7 MJ/kg dry matter), the broilers lowest (17.0  
 8 MJ/kg) and the turkeys intermediate (17.2 MJ/kg). There was a close linear relationship  
 9 between TME<sub>N</sub> measured in broilers and cockerels, although there was a tendency for  
 10 broiler TME<sub>N</sub> to be about 3% lower. Broiler and turkey values were in closer agreement.

### 11 **Comparison of harvest years**

12 There were significant differences between years (2000, 17.0 MJ/kg dry matter; 2001, 17.3  
 13 MJ/kg; 2002, 17.6 MJ/kg).

### 14 **Relationships between TME and chemical composition**

15 There was a significant positive relationship between TME<sub>N</sub> and acid ether extract in all  
 16 types of poultry examined. The relationships were as follows:

17 **Broilers:**  $TME_N = 15.7 (SEM 0.36) + 0.11 (SEM 0.030^{***}) (\% \text{ fat})$

18 **Cockerels:**  $TME_N = 16.3 (SEM 0.41) + 0.12 (SEM 0.034^{***}) (\% \text{ fat})$

19 **Turkeys:**  $TME_N = 15.9 (SEM 0.40) + 0.11 (SEM 0.033^{***}) (\% \text{ fat})$

20 There was a significant negative relationship between TME<sub>N</sub> and β-glucan in all types of  
 21 poultry examined. This is likely to have been due to the increased gut viscosity produced  
 22 by soluble non-starch polysaccharides. The relationships were as follows:

23 **Broilers:**  $TME_N = 18.9 (SEM 0.42) - 0.46 (SEM 0.10^{***}) (\% \beta\text{-glucan})$

24 **Cockerels:**  $TME_N = 18.9 (SEM 0.48) - 0.28 (SEM 0.12^*) (\% \beta\text{-glucan})$

25 **Turkeys:**  $TME_N = 18.1 (SEM 0.45) - 0.22 (SEM 0.11^*) (\% \beta\text{-glucan})$

1 The oil content of naked oats was about 5 times greater than that of wheat (Table 9), with  
2 the high oil varieties more than 6 times greater. Oats had a lower starch content but not  
3 sufficiently lower to negate the energy benefits of the higher oil content. Crude protein  
4 (CP) contents of naked oats were broadly similar to those of wheat, with the high oil  
5 varieties tending to be high in CP also. The proportions by weight of the major energy-  
6 yielding nutrients are shown in Table 10. The proportions in terms of energy contribution  
7 were estimated from the coefficients of the EU ME equation for oil, starch and CP. The  
8 proportional contribution of oil varied from 6% in wheat to 30% in high-oil naked oat  
9 varieties, with the proportion from starch decreasing from 80% in wheat to 57% in high-oil  
10 naked oats. If dietary energy were to be expressed in terms of net energy, naked oats  
11 would have an added advantage over wheat in energy yield.

## 12 **Chemical composition**

13 Table 9 shows key ME-related chemical analyses (g/kg dry matter) of oats from the 2000,  
14 2001 and 2002 harvests and wheats from the 2002 harvest. The most noticeable difference  
15 in terms of energy yield is that naked oats had about 4 times as much oil as wheat, rising to  
16 6-7 times as much in the high-oil naked oat lines. The crude protein content of most naked  
17 oat varieties was similar to that of wheat, with high-oil varieties tending to have a greater  
18 crude protein content also. The relative contributions of oil, starch and crude protein in  
19 terms of energy yield (Table 10) were calculated from the EC equation estimating AME  
20 from a multiple regression on protein, oil, starch and sugars:

21  $AME_N \text{ (MJ/kg)} = 0.34 \text{ (\%fat)} + 0.16 \text{ (\%CP)} + 0.13 \text{ (\% total sugar [expressed as}$   
22  $\text{sucrose])} + 0.17 \text{ (\%starch)}.$

23 The proportion of energy contribution as oil was 4-5 times that in wheat, with the  
24 contribution as protein quite similar between species and the contribution as starch being  
25 about 20% less in oats

## 1 **Enzyme effects**

2 The addition of  $\beta$ -glucanase produced an increase of about 4% in the apparent  
3 metabolisable energy (AME) of oats for broilers (Tables 11 and 12).  $\beta$ -glucanase had a  
4 very large effect on jejunal viscosity in broilers fed on a high-oat diet (Table 13) but the  
5 relatively modest effect on AME is typical of enzyme effects on metabolisability.

## 6 **Technical error with hulled oats**

7 Dissection of cockerels 48 h after feeding on Gerald conventional oats indicated that  
8 enough oat hulls were retained in the gizzard to give an overestimate of about 1 kJ/g or  
9 about 7.4% (Table 14). There was insufficient material in other parts of the gut to give a  
10 large enough sample for energy determination and the amount was also similar between all  
11 varieties, suggesting that the material in the lower gut could not be ascribed only to hulled  
12 varieties. In the thin-hulled variety, Millennium, retained hulls gave an overestimate of  
13 6.3%. In the naked oat, Grafton, the corresponding overestimate was only 0.7%.

## 14 **DISCUSSION**

15 Excluding the experimental high-oil lines, naked oats on average yielded a  $TME_N$  8.5%  
16 higher than that of wheat assayed simultaneously. The high-oil lines yielded 12% more  
17 energy than wheat. These relative differences in TME were been repeated in the 2004  
18 harvest. The ME yield from naked oats was comparable with that of maize rather than  
19 wheat. The values obtained for wheat may be seen as high by some commercial users but  
20 it is important to note that our values are TME, which can be up to 5% higher than AME.  
21 It should also be noted that wheat has been included in each year and gives similar values  
22 from year to year. If there are doubts about absolute TME values, the oat varieties can  
23 accordingly be assessed relatively to the simultaneous measurements for wheat. The high  
24 ME results largely from the combined effects of the absence of husks and the high oil  
25 content. Digestibilities of the major nutrients are similar to those found in wheat. TME

1 increased by about 0.11 MJ for every 1% increase in oil content; this is the increase that  
2 would be expected if oil is replacing other energy-yielding materials such as starch.  
3 Unpublished work by McNab (1987) gave dry matter TME<sub>N</sub> values of 16.5 MJ/kg (about  
4 14.5 MJ/kg as fed) for the first naked oat varieties, the spring variety Rhiannon and the  
5 winter variety Kynon, released by IGER. The winter naked oat Expression and the winter  
6 dwarf naked oat Hendon, from two further cycles of hybridisation and selection, were used  
7 in the present study. These contain about 30% more oil than the Rhiannon and Kynon,  
8 which helps to explain their increased mean dry matter TME<sub>N</sub> values of 17.1 MJ/kg (about  
9 15.0 MJ/kg as fed). Continuity between the techniques used in 1987 and in 2000-2003 was  
10 assured in that one of the authors of the present paper (Bernard) also assisted with the 1987  
11 work.

#### 12 **Technical error with hulled oats**

13 The positive error of 6% in the ME value obtained for hulled oats would be of significant  
14 practical importance in feed formulation. Dissecting the birds in order to measure the  
15 retention of material in the gizzard would not be the method of choice for dealing with this  
16 error. Later work (MacLeod *et al.*, 2006) has shown that the error became negligible when  
17 the hulls were ground through a 1 mm screen. Even where it does occur, the error is one of  
18 evaluation only, because the passage of hulls through the gizzard would reach a steady  
19 state under normal feeding conditions.

#### 20 **Future research and commercial implications**

21 The nutritional profiles obtained for oats and naked oats demonstrated that earlier  
22 published nutritional data significantly under-estimated the value of oats and naked oats in  
23 poultry diets. Further research is needed to assess any beneficial effects of oat hulls  
24 (MacLeod and Bernard, 2005). The development of higher yielding 'high oil' varieties, of  
25 which Racoon is the first example, should enhance the use of naked oats in poultry rations.

1 Naked oats have been demonstrated to be nutritionally viable as a wheat alternative within  
2 poultry rations. The values measured for Harpoon and Grafton were used to formulate  
3 diets by the commercial partners and gave the predicted results in terms of bird  
4 performance.

#### 5 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

6 This work was supported by DEFRA as part of the AFENO Project. The authors gratefully  
7 acknowledge discussion with partners in the project: Cark Maunsell (Oat Services); Cliff  
8 Nixey (British United Turkeys Ltd); Chris Green (Senova [formerly SWSeed] Ltd);  
9 Richard Mason (GB Seeds Ltd); Anthony Waller (Bernard Matthews Ltd); John Reed (Sun  
10 Valley Ltd); Peter Woodward and Stewart Easdon (formerly of Sun Valley Ltd). Caroline  
11 McCorquodale, Roslin Institute, is acknowledged for advice on and assistance with  
12 statistical analysis.

#### 13 REFERENCES

- 14 BRANSON, C.V. & FREY, K.J. (1989). Recurrent selection for groat oil content in oats.  
15 *Crop Science* **29**: 1382-1387.
- 16 BRENES, A., GUENTER, W., MARQUARDT, R.R. & ROTTER, B.A. (1993). Effect of beta-  
17 glucanase pentosanase enzyme supplementation on the performance of chickens and  
18 laying hens fed wheat, barley, naked oats and rye diets. *Canadian Journal of*  
19 *Animal Science*, **73**: 941-951.
- 20 CAVE, N.A. & BURROWS, V.D. (1993). Evaluation of naked oat (*Avena nuda*) in the broiler  
21 chicken diet. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, **73**: 393-399.
- 22 HSUN, C.L. & MAURICE, D.V. (1992). Nutritional value of naked oats (*Avena nuda*) in  
23 laying hen diets. *British Poultry Science*, **33**: 355-361.
- 24 LASZTITY, R. (1998). Oat grain – a wonderful reservoir of natural nutrients and  
25 biologically active substances. *Food Reviews International* **14**: 99-119.

- 1  
2  
3 1 LOPEZ-BOTE, C.J., SANZ, M., REY, A., CASTANO, A. & THOS, J. (1998a). Lower lipid  
4 oxidation in the muscle of rabbits fed diets containing oats. *Animal Feed Science*  
5 *and Technology* **70**: 1-9.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 4 LOPEZ-BOTE, C.J., GRAY, J.I., GOMAA, E.A. & FLEGAL, C.J. (1998b). Effect of dietary oat  
11 administration on lipid stability in broiler meat. *British Poultry Science* **39**: 57-61.  
12  
13  
14  
15 6 MACLEAN, J., WEBSTER, A.B. & ANDERSON, D.M. (1993). Naked oats in grower and  
16 finisher diets for male chicken and female turkey broilers. *Canadian Journal of*  
17 *Animal Science*, **74**: 135-140.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 9 MACLEOD, M.G., BERNARD, K. & KNOWLES, H. (1997). A comparison of the true  
23 metabolisable energy of wheat and soya bean meal in 28-day-old turkeys and  
24 broilers. *British Poultry Science*, **38**: S32-33.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 12 MACLEOD, M.G., MCNEILL, L., BERNARD, K & VALENTINE, J. (2006). Oats: metabolisable  
30 energy yield from husked and naked varieties and an experimental naked high-oil  
31 line compared with wheat in broilers and turkeys. *British Poultry Abstracts* **2**: 10-11.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 15 MCNAB, J.M. & BLAIR, J.C. (1988). Modified assay for true and apparent metabolisable  
37 energy based on tube feeding. *British Poultry Science*, **29**: 697-707.  
38  
39  
40  
41 17 OUGHAM, H.J., LATIPOVA, G. & VALENTINE, J. (1996). Morphological and biochemical  
42 characterization of spikelet development in naked oats (*Avena sativa*). *New*  
43 *Phytologist*, **134**: 5-12.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 20 VALENTINE, J., COWAN, S., HOWARTH, C. & LANGDON, T. (2003). One hundred years of  
49 progress in cereal breeding from Mendel to molecular selection. *Proceedings of the*  
50 *EUCARPIA Cereal Section Meeting "From Biodiversity to Genomics: Breeding*  
51 *Strategies for Small Grain Cereals in the Third Millennium"* (Eds: Faccioli, P; Marè,  
52 C; Stanca, A M), Salsomaggiore, Italy, 21-25 November, 2002 .  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**TABLE 1.** *Protocol for cockerel TME measurement*

Day 1	Birds to individual cages, no food, free access to water
Day 2	50 ml of 50% glucose solution administered to all birds
Day 3	50 g of test material or 50 g of glucose tube fed to birds Clean tray placed under each cage Feeding time recorded
Day 4	50ml of water administered to all birds
Day 5	Excreta collected 48 h after feeding

**TABLE 2.** *Protocol for broiler chicken TME.  
Birds used when 21 d old*

Day 1	Birds to individual cages, no food, free access to water
Day 2	No procedures
Day 3	9 g of test material or 9 g of glucose tube fed to birds (am) Clean tray placed under each cage 9 g of test material or 9 g of glucose tube fed to birds (pm)
Day 4	9 g of test material or 9 g of glucose tube fed to birds (am) 9 g of test material or 9 g of glucose tube fed to birds (pm) Feeding time recorded
Day 5	10 ml of water administered to all birds If necessary, water again pm
Day 6	Excreta collected 48 h after last feeding

**TABLE 3.** *Protocol for turkey TME measurement.  
Birds used when 7 weeks old*

Day 1	Birds to individual cages, no food, free access to water
Day 2	No procedures
Day 3	50 g of test material or 50 g of glucose tube fed to birds Clean tray placed under each cage Feeding time recorded
Day 4	50 ml of water administered to all birds
Day 5	Excreta collected 48 h after feeding

**TABLE 4.** *Protocol for 14-d AME measurement*

Day 1	Wing band and weigh birds Allocate 5 one-d-old birds per brooder section
Days 1- 4	Standard diet
Day 5	Remove standard diet and replace with experimental diets
Day 7	Weigh birds and food
Day 14	Weigh birds and food
Day 18	Clean paper on trays
Day 21	Weigh birds and food Collect excreta sample Kill birds, collect ileal contents



**TABLE 5.** *Diets for enzyme trial*

	<b>Test diet (g/kg)</b>	<b>Basal diet (g/kg)</b>
<b>Naked oats (meal)</b>	<b>500.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Maize meal	228.0	456.0
Soya bean meal	216.0	432.0
Fish meal	22.0	44.0
Soya oil	0.8	1.6
DL-methionine	1.0	2.0
Sodium chloride	3.5	3.5
Dicalcium phosphate	13.4	13.4
Limestone flour	10.0	10.0
Choline chloride	0.3	0.3
Vitamins and minerals <sup>1</sup>	5.0	5.0
Cellulose	0.0	32.2

<sup>1</sup>Vitamins and minerals were provided to meet or exceed NRC recommendations for broiler diets.

**TABLE 6.** *Metabolisable energy values (TME<sub>N</sub> MJ/kg dry matter) of oats and reference wheat in cockerels, growing chicks and growing turkeys (2000, 2001, 2002 harvests)*

Variety	Bird type	2000	2001	2002	Mean across harvests and bird types
"Chris" <i>91-229Cn234</i> (high oil)	cockerel	17.78*	18.07	18.60	17.85
	chick	17.28	16.85	18.34	
	turkey	17.18	18.08	18.41	
"Fatso" <i>91-229Cn253</i> (high oil)	cockerel	18.04	17.97	*	17.65
	chick	16.85	17.13	*	
	turkey	17.18	18.03	*	
Hendon (dwarf)	cockerel	17.39	17.53	18.14	17.23
	chick	16.78	16.27	17.78	
	turkey	16.55	17.97	16.97	
Icon (dwarf)	cockerel	17.03	16.97	*	17.06
	chick	16.62	16.39	*	
	turkey	16.64	17.88	*	
Grafton	cockerel	17.37	17.78	17.89	17.05
	chick	16.35	16.62	16.74	
	turkey	16.46	17.61	17.04	
Harpoon	cockerel	17.17	17.17	*	17.00
	chick	16.54	16.57	*	
	turkey	16.33	17.39	*	
Krypton	cockerel	17.45	18.24	18.27	17.78
	chick	18.10	17.27	18.29	
	turkey	16.46	18.15	17.50	
Lexicon	cockerel	17.45	17.79	17.92	17.38
	chick	17.05	16.40	17.76	
	turkey	16.61	18.83	16.99	
Expression	cockerel	*	17.27	17.78	16.92
	chick	*	16.51	17.56	
	turkey	*	17.13	16.40	
<i>Consort</i> (feed wheat)	cockerel	16.19	15.56	16.83	15.91
	chick	15.55	14.67	16.11	
	turkey	15.55	16.06	16.53	
<i>Equinox</i> (feed wheat)	cockerel	*	15.26	16.80	15.81
	chick	*	14.73	16.42	
	turkey	*	15.88	15.78	

\* SEM of individual values = 0.248

**Statistical differences (oats only)**

	SEM	P
Variety effect	0.119	<0.001
Bird type effect	0.063	<0.001
Year effect	0.067	<0.001
Variety x bird		<0.002

TABLE 7. Metabolisable energy values ( $TME_N$  MJ/kg adjusted to 88% dry matter) of oats and reference wheat in cockerels, growing chicks and growing turkeys (2000, 2001, 2002 harvests)

Variety	Bird type	2000	2001	2002	Mean across harvests and bird types
"Chris" <i>91-229Cn234</i> (high oil)	cockerel	15.65*	15.90	16.37	15.71
	chick	15.21	14.83	16.14	
	turkey	15.12	15.91	16.20	
"Fatso" <i>91-229Cn253</i> (high oil)	cockerel	15.88	15.81	*	15.53
	chick	14.83	15.07	*	
	turkey	15.12	15.87	*	
Hendon (dwarf)	cockerel	15.30	15.43	15.96	15.16
	chick	14.77	14.32	15.65	
	turkey	14.56	15.81	14.93	
Icon (dwarf)	cockerel	14.99	14.93	*	15.01
	chick	14.63	14.42	*	
	turkey	14.64	15.73	*	
Grafton	cockerel	15.29	15.65	15.74	15.00
	chick	14.39	14.63	14.73	
	turkey	14.48	15.50	15.00	
Harpoon	cockerel	15.11	15.11	*	14.96
	chick	14.56	14.58	*	
	turkey	14.37	15.30	*	
Krypton	cockerel	15.36	16.05	16.08	15.65
	chick	15.93	15.20	16.10	
	turkey	14.48	15.97	15.40	
Lexicon	cockerel	15.36	15.66	15.77	15.29
	chick	15.00	14.43	15.63	
	turkey	14.62	16.57	14.95	
Expression	cockerel	*	15.20	15.65	14.89
	chick	*	14.53	15.45	
	turkey	*	15.07	14.43	
<i>Consort</i> (feed wheat)	cockerel	14.25	13.69	14.81	14.00
	chick	13.68	12.90	14.18	
	turkey	13.68	14.13	14.55	
<i>Equinox</i> (feed wheat)	cockerel	*	13.43	14.78	13.91
	chick	*	12.96	14.45	
	turkey	*	13.97	13.89	

\* SEM of individual values = 0.218

<i>Statistical differences (oats only)</i>		
	SEM	P
Variety effect	0.105	<0.001
Bird type effect	0.055	<0.001
Year effect	0.059	<0.001
Variety x bird		<0.002

**TABLE 8.** *Metabolisable energy values of oats and reference wheats (2004 harvest) in growing broilers and growing turkeys*

Variety	Bird species	TME <sub>N</sub> MJ/kg as fed		TME <sub>N</sub> MJ/kg dry matter (DM)	
		Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
<b>Expression</b> <i>(naked oat)</i>	broiler	15.6	0.40	17.7	0.46
	turkey	15.5	0.64	17.6	0.72
<b>Hendon</b> <i>(dwarf naked oat)</i>	broiler	15.7	0.37	17.8	0.42
	turkey	16.5	0.26	18.5	0.08
<b>95-240-Cn</b> <i>(high oil naked oat)</i>	broiler	16.1	0.38	18.5	0.44
	turkey	16.8	0.45	19.0	0.52
<b>Gerald</b> <i>(covered oat)</i>	broiler	12.4	0.42	14.1	0.48
	turkey	14.0	0.46	15.9	0.53
<b>Millennium</b> <i>(thin husk covered oat)</i>	broiler	12.4	0.49	14.2	0.56
	turkey	14.0	0.70	16.0	0.80
<b>Consort</b> <i>(wheat)</i>	broiler	14.3	0.41	16.5	0.47
	turkey	14.1	1.06	16.3	1.23
<b>Robigus</b> <i>(wheat)</i>	broiler	14.2	0.37	16.1	0.42
	turkey	14.5	1.09	16.4	1.24

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	<i>P</i>
Cereal "species"	2	< 0.001
Cereal variety	6	< 0.004
Bird species	1	< 0.001
Cereal*bird	2	< 0.001
Variety*bird	6	NS

**TABLE 9.** Selected chemical analyses (g/kg dry matter) of oats from 2000, 2001 and 2002 harvests and wheats from 2002. The analyses were carried out on duplicate samples each year.

	Harvest	Dry matter	Crude protein (6.25 N)	Oil (acid ether extract)	Starch	$\beta$ -glucan
“Chris”	2000	890	158	156	557	46.1
<i>91-229Cn234</i>	2001	884	134	152	637	41.1
(high oil)	2002	861	140	158	545	39.0
	Mean	878	144	155	580	42.1
“Fatso”	2000	900	150	146	645	53.3
<i>91-229Cn253</i>	2001	885	129	162	608	41.1
(high oil)	2002	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	893	140	154	627	47.2
Hendon	2000	886	130	104	635	49.9
(dwarf)	2001	880	114	109	727	40.6
	2002	857	111	97	554	24.6
	Mean	874	118	103	639	38.4
Icon	2000	896	135	109	634	46.4
(dwarf)	2001	879	112	105	697	45.5
	2002	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	888	124	107	666	46.5
Grafton	2000	893	136	102	591	49.0
	2001	878	116	115	649	46.0
	2002	853	119	108	504	36.5
	Mean	875	124	108	581	43.8
Harpoon	2000	889	143	105	627	39.4
	2001	876	121	86	648	40.0
	2002	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	883	132	96	638	39.7
Krypton	2000	885	124	112	569	37.0
	2001	882	103	117	748	32.8
	2002	858	103	118	630	36.2
	Mean	875	110	116	649	35.3
Lexicon	2000	891	140	110	634	39.6
	2001	876	115	102	700	37.9
	2002	856	116	121	576	37.0
	Mean	874	124	111	637	38.2
Expression	2000	-	-	-	-	-
	2001	874	114	108	751	44.1
	2002	856	122	130	611	47.0
	Mean	865	118	119	681	45.6
<b>Wheats</b>						
Charger	2002	871	140	23	691	-
Claire	2002	882	123	23	703	-
Consort	2002	870	129	24	693	-
Equinox	2002	870	126	25	672	-
Savannah	2002	872	125	23	703	-

**TABLE 10.** *Oil, starch and crude protein (CP); relative proportions of total (oil+starch+CP) in terms of weight and energy yield*

	Proportions by weight			Proportions by energy contribution		
	Oil	Starch	CP	Oil	Starch	CP
<b>High-oil naked oats</b>	0.16	0.67	0.16	0.30	0.57	0.13
<b>Naked oats</b>	0.13	0.74	0.14	0.23	0.66	0.12
<b>Wheat</b>	0.03	0.82	0.15	0.06	0.80	0.14

For Peer Review Only

**TABLE 11.** *Effects of a commercial beta-glucanase preparation on AME (kJ/g as fed; n=8)*

	Control diet		Oat-containing diet		Oat result	
	mean	sem	mean	sem	mean	sem
No enzyme	10.64	0.12	11.55	0.13	12.46	0.13
$\beta$ -glucanase	10.80	0.10	11.86	0.17	12.92	0.17

**TABLE 12.** *Effects of a commercial beta-glucanase preparation on AME<sub>N</sub> (kJ/g as fed; n=8)*

	Control diet		Oat-containing diet		Oat result	
	mean	sem	mean	sem	mean	sem
No enzyme	9.83	0.09	10.48	0.12	11.13	0.12
$\beta$ -glucanase	10.01	0.09	10.74	0.16	11.47	0.16

**TABLE 13.** *Enzyme effects on jejunal viscosity (centipoise; n=8)*

	Control diet (maize-soya)	Oat diet (50% oats)
No enzyme	2.62	11.70
$\beta$ -glucanase	2.30	3.26
<b>Significance of effects</b>		
Oats	$P < 0.001$	
Enzyme	$P = 0.01$	
Interaction	$P = 0.02$	
SEM	1.391	
Least significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ )	3.980	

**TABLE 14.** Covered oats with naked oat (Grafton) for comparison: error due to hulls remaining in gizzard 48 h after feeding (mean  $\pm$  SD; n=5)

	% hulls retained in gizzard after 48h	TME <sub>N</sub> kJ/kg as fed (standard method)	TME <sub>N</sub> kJ/kg as fed (corrected for gizzard contents)	Error kJ/g	Error %
Gerald (conventional)	24.8 $\pm$ 14.8	14.6 $\pm$ 0.89	13.6 $\pm$ 0.50	1.0	+7.4
Millennium (thin-hulled)	30.6 $\pm$ 8.89	15.3 $\pm$ 0.88	14.4 $\pm$ 1.09	0.9	+6.3
Grafton (naked)	0.0 $\pm$ 0.00	15.3 $\pm$ 0.53	15.2 $\pm$ 0.45	0.1	+0.7*

\*Other residues in gizzard