EFFECT OF CROSSING ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF DUCKS

II .-- Carcass Characteristics

N. E. GOHER, A. MOSTAGRER AND G. A. R. KAMAB

Animal Production Department, Faculty of

Agriculture, Cairo University

This work was carried out on two purebred groups of ducks Pekin and Khaki Cambell and their reciprocal crosses to study the effect of crosing on meat production. The main results arrived at were as follows:

- 1. The eviscerated percentage ranged from 68.69% in P to 76.50% in KP at 12 weeks of age, and from 64.43% in K to 69.41% in P at 24 weeks of age. The crossbreds had higher dressing percentage than the parental breeds in all the ages studied. The crosses KP had higher dressing percentage than its reciprocal crosses.
- Sex proved to be of no effect on dressing percentage at all ages studied.
- 3. The Pekin breed had higher edible parts than K breed. (1.162 vs. 824 Kg at 12 weeks of age and 1.135 vs. 837 Kg. at 24 weeks of age). The crosses PK and KP had almost the same weight of edible parts (1.242 and 1.067 Kg. at 12 weeks of age and 1.147 and 1.117 Kg. at 24 weeks of age).
- 4. With respect to breast ment at the 12th weeks of age the P had the highest weight of breast meat (617 grams) and the K have the lowest (465 grams), the same was true at the 24th weeks of age (685 grams for P and 473 grams for K). The two crosses had almost the same weight of breast meat at 24 weeks of age, (the figures at 12 weeks of age were 683 grams for KP and 599 grams for PK). No sex difference was observed with re pec, to this character.
- 5. The weight of legs was higher in crosses than purebreds at 12 weeks of age; K giving the lowest weight (272) grams. The same was true at 24th weeks of age (331, 381, 337 and 279 grams for P, KP, PK and K respectively).

Meat production from ducks is hindered by the low fecunidty of female ducks bred for meat production. In this tudy, one breed representing meat production ducks was crossed with an egg producing breed to study its effect on meat production.

Horn et al (1952), and Dahnovskii (1961) found that carcass characteristics were better in crossbred than in the purebreds. Rudolph (1965) found that the dressing percentage at 8 weeks of age in crossbred Call drakes (Docoy) with Pekin ducks was slightly higher than the Pekin (70% vs. 69%). Sivicki (1956) noticed that crosses between Barazilian drakes (Muscovy) and Domestic ducks had slightly better carcass percentage than barazilian breed (82% vs. 80%). Pop and Georegescu (1964) found than the two reciprocal crosses between Pekin and Khaki-Campbell produced higher percentage of edible meat as compared with their parental breeds.

Dakhnovsky (1962) found that crosses between Pekin and Ukrianian Grey, Ukrianian Cloy, Ukrianian White and Black gave higher commercial careass quality than the pure breeds. Mauch and Boian (1958) found that crosses between Pekin and Muscovy gave more rounded body and higher percentage of topgrade careasses than either parental strains.

Sex is one of the factors which influence carcass quality. Faber (1961) showed that differences between males and famales become more pronounced with the increase of age. Males attained better carcass quality at an earlier age than females.

Materials and Methods

On December 1965 the following four mating were done using 15 drakes and 50 ducks in each: pure Pekin (P), pure Khaki-Caupball (K), P male K females (PK offspring) and K males XP females (KP offspring). The duckling were brooded and reared under the same managemental conditions.

The ration of the ducklings consisted of 25% corn, 25% rice bran, 10% wheat 10% broad beans, 25% wheat bran, 5% cotton seed meal. The ration, was also supplemented with 1.5% lime stone, 1% sodium cloride, 0.1% Terramycin, 0.2% Vitamin A+D₃ and 3% skim milk or fish meal. The mash was mixed with skim milk when offered to the ducklings at the brooding stage. Green fodder was supplied as Egyptian clover in winter, and green corn leaves in summer. Three females and three males were used to study carcass characteristics at each of the 4 ages 12, 16, 20 and 24 weeks. The carcass characters studied included the eviscerated weight (neck + wings + back + breast + legs + giblets) giblets (liver and gizard) and the weight of edible parts (breast meat, legs meat and giblets).

Analysis of variance was calculated for the different characters to test the differences between the different groups.

Results and Discussion

The average body weights of both purebred and crossbred birds used in this study during the period from 12 to 24 weeks indicated that the Pekin have the highest body weight, the crosses were of intermediate body weights between their parents and the Khaki-Campbell had the lowest weight. (Table 1).

Eviscerated percentage increased for all the groups from 12 weeks until 20 weeks of age. It seems that the body matured at the age period from 12 to 20 weeks of ages when the eviscerated percentage decreased afterwards (Table 1). Also, Harshow and Robert (1940) observed that the percentage of dressed weight to live weight increased with age of chickens. No sex differences were observed in this respect, sex proved to be of no effect as shown also by Rudolph and Fritsche (1955) in ducks. The two crosses had better evisceration than their parents. However, the PK was somewhat of better evisceration than the other cross. Rudolph (1965) found that the crosses have higher dressing percentage than the parental breed.

TABLE 1,-Average body weight eviscenated wrigth and eviscenated percentage

					A	G E	N	WE	E K S				
Breeds	Ítems		12	ļ <u>-</u>		16			82			%	
Besolo		Ä	E4	M.F.	M.	Fi	M.F.	K.	124	M.F.	K	ri	M.F.
P4	Body weight (Kg) Byiscerated weight (Kg) Byiscerated %	2.137 1.444 67.57 6	2.085 1.457 69.88	2.111 1.450 68.69	2.100 1.478 70.81	2.168 1.494 68.91	2.143 1.490 69.82	2.263 1.603 70.84	2.243 1.291 70.93	2,253 1,297 70,88	1.958 1.369 69.91	1.958 2.191 1.369 1.441 69.91 65.76	2.024 1.405 69.41
Ŋ	Body weight (Kg) Eviscertated weight (Kg)	1.858 1.334 71.96	2.040 1.249 1.646 1.491 80.69 76.50	1.249 1.491 6.50	1,981 1,419 71,63	1.750 1.269 72.53	1.865 1.344 72.66	1.868 1.498 74.84	1.865 1.868 1.868 1.863 1.864 1.337 1.338 72.66 74.84 74.65 74.74	1.865 1.332 74.71	2.090 1.386 56.31	1.930 1.415 71.61	2.033 1.402 62.95
₩	Body weight (Kg) Eviscerated weight (Kg)	1.916 1.383 77.18	1.776 1.846 1.815 1.294 1.338 1.291 72.86 72.48 71.13	1.846 1.338 72.48	1.815 1.291 71.13	1.670 1.195 71.56	1.742 1.243 71.35	1,791 1,422 71,42	1.815 1.670 1.742 1.791 1.721 1.291 1.281 1.95 1.243 1.422 1.288 71.13 71.66 71.35 71.42 74.84	1.858 1.355 73.00 (6	1.935 1.346 69.56	1.916 1.238 69.61	1.925 1.292 67.11
м	Body weight (Kg) Eviscerated weight (Kg)	1.243 1.490 1.046 1.068 67.79 71.08		1.216 1.057 69.72	1.686 1.195 70.88	1.264 1.124 71.91	1.624 1.514 71.06	1.511 1.149 76.04	1.264 1.624 1.511 1.265 1.238 1.124 1.514 1.140 1.054 1.101 71.91 71.06 76.04 67.33 71.59 6	1.238 1.101 71.69	1.650 1.097 66.40	1.550 0.966 63.32	1.600 1.031 64.43
M.	= Males F. = Females	_ _	-		M.F. =	Both	Bexes.						

Edible parts:

Although there are significant age differences with respect to edible parts, yet not clear age trend can be detected. This also adds to what war observed in eviscerated percentage that the body of duck matured during the period from 12 to 20 weeks of age. No sex differences were observed in this respect (Table 2).

The different values of the edible parts were highest for P and KP in all ages while the KP had intermediate values and K had the lowest ones (Table 2). This may be due to that the P and KP had also the heavier body weights for all the ages studied. Mulsow (1964) also observed that the birds that have heavier body weight have also larger carcass of good quality than the lighter birds. The differences between breeds and crosses and between ages were significant (Table 5). Also, Pop and Georgescu (1964) observed significant differences between purebred and crossbred ducks with respect to the weight of edible patrs.

Breast Weight:

The lightest breast weight meat weight and percentages of meat in breast was observed at 16 weeks of age and then the values were almost constant in all the 4 groups. The formation of meat on breast seems to attain maturity at this age or the subsequence ages from 12 to 20 weeks of age as previously observed in the carcass in general (Table 3). In the work of Harshow and Robert (1940) on chicken they also observed that quantity of breast meat incressed with the advancement of age.

K birds had the lightest breast, breast meat and meat percentage. Pekin birds had the beavier breast weight. However, the two crosses although having medium weights of breast weight or breast meat, yet, they had the highest values of meat percentage. It seems that crossing encouraged the formation of meat more than the parent purebreeds irrespective to body weight trends. However, Mulsow (1964) observed that breast weight is correlated with body weight. The emales of K P and K had higher breast values than the males and the differences were significant. Mulsow (1964) observed as guificant difference between drakes and ducks in breast meat. Meanwhile P and P K showed the same values in both sexes. Rudolph and Fritsche (1965) found no significant differences between males and females in breast meat in chickens

Legs weight:

Comparing the four breeds and crosses for legs weight at 12 weeks of age the mean of both sexes showed that the two crosses were higher than the two purebreds and K was the lowest (Table 4). Pop and Georges cu (1964) using the same breeds and crosses found similar results. Comparing the weight of legs, legs meat weight and meat percentage at the different ages it is clear that there is no appreciable difference between the ages studied showing that body tissues matured during this period. The trend in legs meat

TABLE 2.—Average weight of edible parts and the percentage of edible parts to live weight and to eviscerated weight

					,	A G E	N	W E	E K	∞				I
Breeds and Crosses	Items		12			16			20			24		1
ļ		M.	F.	M.F.	М.	jar,	M.F.	× .	Eri	M.F.	M.	F4 	M. F.	5.
A.	Edible weight (Kg) Edible/live weight % Edible/eviscorated weight %	1.155 1.169 54.05 56.07 79.94 80.23	1.169 1.162 1.234 1.252 1.243 1.294 56.07 58.67 55.05 58.76 55.52 57.14 80.23 80.14 82.99 83.80 83.42 80.72	1.162 58.67 80.14	1.234 65.06 82.99	1.252 58.76 83.80	1.243 55.52 83.42	1.294 57.14 80.72	1.323 58.98 83.16	1.323 1.308 1.117 1.153 58.98 58.06 57.04 52.62 83.16 81.90 81.58 80.01	1.117 1.163 57.04 52.62 81.58 80.01	1.153 52.62 80.01	1.135 56.07 80.78	8 2 8
- All	Edible weight (Kg) Ediblo/Live weight % Edible/eviseorated weight %	1.065 75.21 79.51 8	1.065 1.422 1.242 1.173 1.028 1.100 1.135 1.126 1.130 10.12 65.21 69.71 63.72 59.21 58.74 58.89 60.76 60.60 60.62 53.82 9.51 86.39 83.30 82.66 81.01 81.85 81.18 81.18 81.18	1.242 63.72 83.30	1.173 59.21 82.66	1.028 58.74 81.01	1.100 58.89 81.85	1.135 60.76 81.19	1.126 60.60 81.18	1.135 1.126 1.130 60.76 60.60 60.62 81.19 81.18 81.18		1.174 59.29 82.51	1.147 56.51 81.95	44 12
PK	Edible weight (Kg) Edible/live weight % Edible/eviseerated weight %	1.106 57.72 79.97	1.029 1.067 57.94 57.52 79.52 79.75		1.063 58.62 82.42	0.988 59.16 82.68	1.026 58.95 82.54	1.149 57.71 80.80	1.030 39.82 79.97	1.063 0.988 1.026 1.149 1.030 1.089 1.1C1 58.62 59.16 58.95 57.71 39.82 58.67 56.89 82.42 82.68 82.54 80.80 79.97 80.37 81.80	1.1CI 56.89 81.80	1.133 59.13 91.52	1.117 58.02 86.46	22.4
M	Ediblo weight (Kg). Faible/live weight %. Edble/eviscerated weight %.	. 805 52.17 76.96 77	5 .843 56.58 54 78.93 77	8 .824 1.011 54.35 59.90 77.96 84.52	1.011	.911 58.29 81.0ŏ	.960 59.11 83.19	.896 .859 59.30 57.89 77.98 81.20		.877 57.02 79.65	.896 54.30 81.68	.778 50.19 80.54	52.31 81.18	2 - 2

M.F. = Both bexes.

M. = Males

TABLE 3G-Average weight of beeast and breast and the percentage of meat in the beeast

					7	A G E	×	WE	8 X 8			į	ļ
Breeds and	Items		12			16			20			24	
		¥.	E4	N. N.		E4	M.F.	M.	Ei Ei	MF.	.	F.	M.F.
A.	Breast weight (grams)	823 613 74.73	823 823 620 617.5 74.73 75.33		925 744 75.63	965 686 80.43	895 716 79.31	966 757 79.89	936 759 78.95	951 798 78.65	905 691 76.24	891 681 76.43	898 665.5 76.34
MA MA	Brosst weight (grams)	808 598 74.01	935 871.6 769 683.5 82.25 78.43	71.5 83.5 78.43	841 659 78.38	741 589 79.49	791 624 78.89	853 655 78.79	806 611 75.81	829.5 633 76.31	850 654 76.94	865 685 78.96	865 837.5 685 668.5 78.96 77.96
$\mathbf{PK} \bigg\{$	Breast weight (grams)	808 600 74.26	791 77 598 75.60	799.5 599 74.92	783 620 79.18	743 585 78.73	763 602.5 3 78.93	865 664 76.76		793 829 595 629.5 75.03 75.93	828 655 78.16	798 702 93.83	793 689.5 85.56
M	Breast weight (grams)	615 445 72.36	626 6 485 77.48	620.5 465 74.94	648 558 79.94	673 685.5 517 537.5 76.82 78.41	885.5 537.5 78.41	621 473 76.17	613 473 77.16	617 473 73.65	656 505 76.98	583 442 75.81	619.5 473.6 76.43

M.F. = Both sexes.

F. = Females

M. = Males

TABLE 4.—Average weight of legs and legs meat and the percentage of meat in legs.

		M.F.	404 331 8I.9	444.5 381 86.71	397 337 84.89	327 279 85.32
	24	- <u></u>	433 44 359 3 6 82.91	461 4 389 3 86.25	388 329 34.79	64
			ÇXU	438 373 85.16 8	406 355 84.98	351 303 302 256 86.04 84
		A	499 375 426.3 303 85.47 80.86		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
502	20	M.F.	499 426.3 85.47	481.5 396.5 85.92	429 364.5 84.97	322.6 322.6 86.23
E K		<u>s.</u>	593 453 11 86.62	473 408 56.26	398 338 84.92	360 305 84.72
WE		K.	C3	450 385 86.56	460 391 85.00	388 340 87.63
A G E I N	16	M.F.	194. 199 85.9	432 363.5 86.14	372 316.5 85.08	370.5 320 86.37
		j.	58.35 86.35	398 343 86.18	353 302 85.55	353 296 83.85
		M	431 363 84.2	446 384 86.10	391 331 84.65	388 344 88.66
		M.F.	490 409.5 83.57	496 435.5 87.80	429 358.9 83.57	272.5 9 82.33
	12	H	500 420 84.00		410 338 82.44	331 281 84.8
		M	480 399 83.13	406 586 343 520 84.48 90.10	448 379 84.60	289 79.76
	Items		Legs weight (grams)	Legs weight (gram)	Legs weight (grams) Legs meat weight (grams) % of meat in legs	Legs weigh (grams) Legs meat weight (grams) % of meat in legs
	Breeds and crosses		à	KP {	PK	

Males

Ŋ.

= Females

M.F. = Both sexes.

weight coincided with the trend in body weight of breeds and crosses studied. K P had the highest value and K had the lowest. Mulsow (1964) also found a significant correlation between body and legs meat weights in chicken.

Comparing the meat percent in legs in the 4 breeds and crosses at 12 weeks of age, it could be seen that apart from KP which ranked the first the other have almost the same percent. The percentages of meat in legs in the three other ages studied were almost the same for all birds. The analysis of variance (Table 5) shows also that there are no significant differences between breeds and crosses with respect to this character.

Sources of variance	d.f.	Eviscorated weight	Edible parts weight	Breast meat weight	Legs most weight
Between ages	3	8.37**	5.98**	5.73**	1.68 NS
Within ages between sexes	. 4	1.53 NS	2.80 NS	2.94*	.74 NS
Within ages between breeds	12	2.48**	2.09*	.72 NS	1.10 NS
Error	76	50-APRILL	_		_

[•] Significant (at 5% level).

NS not significant.

REFERENCES

DAHNOVSKII. N.V., (1961).—Hybrid ducks. Pticevodstvo, 11 (10): 24-2. (A.B.A., 30: 517, 1962).

DAKHNOVSKY, N.V., (1962).—Raising of hybrid ducks. Proc. XIIth world's Poult. Congr. (1962) Sect. Pop: 95-98. (A.B.A., 31:1503, 1963).

FABER, H.V., (1961).—The development and experimental modifications of the extreme sex dimorphism in gorwth shown by the Muscovy ducks. Roux. Arch. Entu. Mech. Organ, 153:32-74. (A.B.A., 29, 2360, (1969).

Harshow, H.M. and Rober, R.R., (1940).—The composition of turkeys as affected by age and sex. *Poult.* Sci., 19:404-411.

Horn, A. Geronger, V. and Tot, G.S., (1952).—Highly productive interspecific duck hybrids Acta. Agron. Hung., 2 (1): 131-148. (A.B.A. 21: 1443, (1952).

MAUCH, A. AND BOIAN, S., (1958).—The Muscovy ducks and its hybrids with the Pekin duck. ANAL Inst Cerc. Zooteh (Bucuresti), 15:751-768. (A.B.A., 27:1061-(1969).

^{**} Highly significant (at 1% level).

EFFECT OF CROSSING ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF DUCKS - 11. 271

- Mulsow, D., (1964).—Investigation on carcass yield in Pekin ducks and drakes. Arch. Geflugelz. Kleintier, 13:348. (A.B.A., 33:3737, 1965).
- Pop. M. and Georgescu, (1964).—Aspects of the productivity of Pekin X Khaki Campbell crossbreds. Rev. Zootech Med: Vet (Buccresti) 14 (5): 34-43 (A.B.A., 32: 3385, 1964).
- Rudolph, W., W., (1965).—The problem of slaughter quality in poultry 4. Comparison of some slaughter characters in Pekin ducks and Owark drake × Pekin duck crosses. Arch. Geffugelz. Kleintierk., 14:241-246.
- RUDOLPH W. AND FRITSORE, H., (1965).—The problem of slaughter quality in Poultry 5- The influence of duration of attening period and sex on some slaughter characters of Pekin duck. Arch. Geflugelz. Kleintierk., 14:353-358. (A.B.A., 34:2499, (1966).
- SIVICKI, B., (1965).—The characters of hybirds obtained from Brazilian drakes and Domestic ducks. Arch. Poljopr. Nauk., 9 (23): 73-84. (A.B.A., 30: 2870 (1962),

تاثير الخلط على انتاج البط ٢ ـ صفات اللبيحة

نجيب الهلائي جوهر ، احمد مستجير ، جمال قمر

اللخص

اجريت هــده التجربة على نوعين من البط هى البكين والكاكى كامبل والخليط بينهما للداســة تأثير عملية الخلط على انتاج اللحم وكانت اهم النتائج المتوصل اليها هى:

ا سه نسبة التصافی کانت تتراوح بین ۲۸۸۸٪ بالنسبة للبکین الی ۵۰۸۰٪ بالنسبة للبکین الی ۵۰ ، ۷۲٫۵۰٪ بالنسبة لخلیط الکاکی کامبل × البکین عند ۱۲ أسبوع من العمر ۵۰ وکذلك کانت تتراوح نسبة التصافی بین ۶۲٫۵۳٪ بالنسبة للکاکی کامبل الی ۱۶٬۵۳٪ بالنسبة للبکین عند ۲۶ أسبوع من العمر ۰

كانت نسبة التصافى بالنسبة للخليط أعلى منها بالنسسبة لكلا نوعى الآباء فى كل أعمار الدراسة ، بالنسبة لخليط الكاكى كامبل × البكين كان يعطى أعلى نسبة تصافى مقارنا بالخليط الآخر ،

٢ سالم يظهر أي تأثير للجنس على نسبة التصافي في كل أعمار الدراسة .

۳ - بالنسبة للجزء الماكول كان البكين يعطى وزنا اعلى من الكاكى كامبل (١٦١١ - ١٨٢٤ كيلو جرام عند عمر ١٢ اسبوع بالنسبة للبكين على التوالى والكاكى كامبل ، ١٣٥ - ٨٣٧ كيلو جرام عند عمر ٢٤ اسبوع بالنسبة للبكين والكاكى كامسل على التوالى) .

کان وزن الجزء الماکول بالنسبة للخليط متساوى تقريبا عند عمر ١١ ، ٢ اسبوع (١٩٤٧ - ١١١٧ - ١٠١٧ اسبوع ١١٤٧ - ١١١٧ کيلوجرام عند ١٤ اسبوع بالنسبة لخليط البکين × الکاکي کامبل ـ خليط الکاکي کامبل - ۱۲ البکين على التوالي) -

٤ - بالنسبة الوزن الجسم في الصدر كان البكين يعطى اعلى وزن. (٦٦٧ جرام) ونفس النتائج (٦٦٧ جرام) - والكاكى كامبل يعطى اقل وزن (٦٥٠ جرام) ونفس النتائج كانت متماثلة تقريبا عند ٢٤ اسبوع (١٨٥ جرام بالنسبة للبكين ، ٤٧٣ جرام بالنسبة للكاكى كامبل) . وبالنسبة للخليط كان يعطى تقريبا نفس الوزن للحم في كلا نوعى الخليط عند عمر ٢٤ اسبوع اما بالنسبة لعمر ١٢ اسبوع فكانت الأوزان كالآتى : ٦٨٣ جرام بالنسبة لخليط الكاكى كامبل × البكين ، ٩٥٥ جرام بالنسبة لخليط الكاكى كامبل ميكن هناك اى تأثير جرام بالنسبة لخليط البكين . الكاكى كامبل كما أنه لم يكن هناك اى تأثير الجنس على وزن اللحم في الصدر .

٥ - كان وزن الأرجل فى الخليط اعلى منه مقارنا بنوعى الآباء عند 1۲ اسبوع من العمر وكان الكاكى كامبل يعطى اقل وزن (٢٧٢ جرام) ونفس النتائج كانت تقريبا عند ٢٤ اسبوع (٣٣١ – ٣٨١ – ٣٣٧ – ٢٧٩) جرام بالنسبة للبكين ـ خليط البكين × الكاكى كامبل × البكين ـ خليط البكين × الكاكى كامبل ـ الكاكى كامبل على التوالى) .