

1 **The effect of bone choice on quantification of mineralization in broiler chickens up to**
2 **six weeks of age**

3

4 D. V. Scholey¹ and E. J. Burton¹

5

6 *¹School of Animal, Rural and Environmental Science, Nottingham Trent University,*
7 *Southwell, Nottinghamshire, NG25 0QF, UK*

8

9

10 Running head: Bone type and bird age affects bone mineralization

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Corresponding author: Dawn Scholey. Email: Dawn.Scholey@ntu.ac.uk

18

19

20

SUMMARY

21 An experiment was conducted to assess the most appropriate bone type for measuring bone
22 mineralization in male broiler chicks up to 42 days. A total of 72 male broilers were raised in
23 0.64m² pens on a litter floor. The study design included two dietary treatments (Control and
24 Low) containing differing levels of total phosphorus (7.8 and 4.4g/kg for Control and Low
25 diets respectively) and calcium (22.7 and 13.1g/kg for Control and Low diets respectively) with
26 each fed to six replicate pens of 6 birds. Each week, six birds per diet were euthanized and leg
27 bones removed to measure ash percentage. Foot, toe, tibia and femur ash were compared using
28 the mean of both legs from each bird, via t tests to separate Control and Low diets. At the end
29 of week 1, diets could not be separated using any of the bone ash measures. From week 2 to
30 week 5, both tibia and foot ash differentiated between the control and low diets, and tibia
31 continued to show significant differences between the diets into week 6. Femur ash did not
32 show any dietary differences until week 3, but then showed significant differences between the
33 diets until week 6. Toe ash only differentiated between diets at week 2, and variation both
34 within and between birds was high, particularly with younger birds. These results suggest that
35 bird age has implications when choosing a bone for assessing possible differences in dietary
36 phosphorus and calcium uptake. Femur ash may be more appropriate for showing differences
37 in broilers aged 6 weeks and older. Foot ash provides a comparable alternative to tibia ash in
38 birds aged 2 to 5 weeks of age, providing a labor and time saving alternative.

39

40

DESCRIPTION OF PROBLEM

41 Skeletal development in broilers is a key factor both in terms of welfare and production with
42 strong evidence that over- or under-supply of dietary phosphorus substantially impacts on bird
43 growth performance [1, 2]. Typically, broiler diets are supplemented with vitamin D, calcium

44 and phosphorus in order to improve skeletal development. However, phosphorus is expensive
45 and in limited supply globally, and oversupply leads to increased soil run off and eutrophication
46 of water sources [3]. It is therefore essential to accurately quantify both the total and available
47 phosphorus in poultry diets so bird requirements are precisely matched.

48 Dietary available phosphorus content is often measured indirectly by quantifying bone
49 mineralization. There are several methods which are routinely used based around the
50 comparison of ashed bone to dry bone weight. Bone ash is a critical measure as chicks with
51 bone disorders usually have lower percentage ash content. Commonly, toe or tibia ash are used,
52 with tibia ash the most frequently used criteria for assessment of commercial calcium and
53 phosphorus content [4, 5, 6]. Other possible measurements are whole foot and femur ash, but
54 there is little consensus between research groups with respect to methodology.

55 Tibia ash is time consuming and labor intensive, both in terms of collection of material and
56 preparation, and differences in methodology can affect results [7]. Toe ash has been shown to
57 have a linear relationship with tibia ash up to 21 days post-hatch and may be more sensitive to
58 dietary changes [8]. However, toe ash allows a certain amount of subjectivity when collecting
59 the material and the sample size can be so small that any errors are disproportionately large.
60 Foot ash has been shown to give comparable results to toe and tibia ash up to two weeks of age
61 [9] and has been shown to reflect dietary phosphorus levels [10], but its value as a measure in
62 older chicks is not fully established. Shastek *et al.* [11] investigated two age periods (11-21 and
63 25-35 days post hatch) and found the sensitivity of foot ash was comparable to tibia ash when
64 evaluating mineral sources of phosphorus but there is no information on weekly foot ash
65 measures and how they compare to other bone ash measures. The advantages of foot ash as a
66 measure of bone mineralization are speed of sample collection and reproducibility due to larger
67 sample weight.

68 It is important to consider which bone ash measure will accurately reflect dietary phosphorus
69 differences in birds of different ages. Several historical studies have suggested that the femur
70 is more representative of total skeletal mineralization than the tibia, and suggested that it may
71 be more sensitive than the tibia to dietary changes [12, 13].

72 The objective of this study was to establish whether, tibia, toe, foot or femur ash would
73 differentiate between diets formulated with low and control phosphorus and calcium levels
74 over a six-week period.

75

76 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

77 A total of 72 male Ross 308 broiler chicks were fed one of two wheat/soya based mash diets
78 from day of hatch to 42 days. The chicks were housed in groups of six, in 0.64 m² floor pens
79 bedded on fresh wood shavings. Six pens of birds were fed each dietary treatment and feed and
80 water were available *ad libitum*, and provided with age-appropriate supplemental heating and
81 ventilation. A dark period of 6 hours was provided from 6d onwards including an unbroken 4-
82 hour period of darkness as required by EU legislation. The study was approved by the
83 Nottingham Trent University ethics committee and all animal care met the guidelines approved
84 by the institutional animal care and use committee (IACUC).

85 Diets were formulated to be as nutritionally similar as possible, with the exceptions of total
86 analyzed phosphorus (P) and calcium (Ca) content. Mineral levels were chosen in order to
87 produce a measureable difference in bone mineralization in the birds. The Low Diet was
88 formulated at a low but nutritionally adequate level of P and Ca, and the Control Diet contained
89 double these inclusion levels. Both diets had common ingredients, and levels of other nutrients
90 were formulated to conform to NRC (1994) recommendations (Table 1). Diets were analyzed

91 for crude protein content (calculated as nitrogen multiplied by 6.25) by the AOAC standard
92 method [14] and gross energy via bomb calorimetry [15]. Phosphorus and calcium content of
93 the diets were analyzed by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-
94 OES) following an aqua regia digestion step [16].

95 One bird per pen was euthanized weekly by cervical dislocation. Feet were removed from each
96 bird at the tibial-tarsal joint prior to dissection of tibia and femur bones from both legs. Tibias
97 and femurs were immediately frozen at -20°C. The middle toe of each foot was removed at the
98 joint between the second and third toe bones. Feet and toes were also stored at -20°C until
99 analysis. All bones were labelled so the individual bird and leg could be identified for
100 comparison purposes.

101 Toes and feet were dried at 105°C until constant weight (minimum 5 days) prior to ashing
102 individually at 650°C for 13 hours. Toe weights were added back to the corresponding foot to
103 calculate whole foot ash.

104 Individual legs were autoclaved at 121°C for 15 minutes, and the flesh, including cartilage caps,
105 carefully removed by hand. The stripped bones were then dried to constant weight for a
106 minimum of 3 days at 105°C, prior to ashing at 650°C for 13 hours. The ash weight of each
107 bone, foot or toe was expressed as a percentage of dry weight.

108 Statistical analysis was performed using independent sample t tests to compare the control and
109 low diets for each bone type each week, using SPSS v19 (IBM statistics), with means deemed
110 to be significantly different at $P < 0.05$. Interactions between week and diet were not included
111 in the analysis as the profound and well established effect of age on bone mineralization over-
112 emphasizes the effect of bird age. The relationship between the four different ash sources was
113 investigated using Pearson product- moment correlation coefficients after preliminary analysis
114 to ensure normality and linearity. Interpretations of the strength of the relationships between

115 the factors were based on guidelines by Cohen (1988) [17]; weak relationship $r = 0.10$ to 0.29 ,
116 medium relationship $r = 0.30$ to 0.49 and strong relationship $r = 0.50$ to 1.0 . Statistical
117 significance was declared at $P < 0.05$. Coefficients of variation was determined by dividing
118 standard deviation values by their associated mean and expressed as a percentage. Root mean
119 square error (RMSE) for each bone type was obtained using SPSS as a measure of variability
120 between bone types spanning all bird ages.

121 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

122 Table 1 shows the analyzed values for the test diets which closely reflect the formulated values,
123 with some variation in both phosphorus and calcium content. Analysis of the study diets
124 presented substantial differences in dietary calcium and phosphorus, which translated into
125 measureable differences in bone mineralization between the Control and Low diets in some
126 bones. Although the calcium to phosphorus ratios of the diets was higher than formulated, the
127 ratios for both the Control and Low diets were very similar.

128 Table 2 shows percentage bone ash results separated into toe, foot, tibia and femur ash for each
129 diet on a weekly basis and broadly confirms increased bone mineralization in birds fed the
130 Control diet. The foot and toe ash have substantially lower percentage ash values, which is due
131 to the inclusion of skin and tissue in the dry weight. The statistical comparisons between the
132 two diets are also shown in table 2. Dietary differences for each bone type individually (toe,
133 foot, tibia and femur) were compared for each week of the study, in order to monitor which
134 bone type was recording a statistical difference in bone mineralization between the two diets
135 at each age. Table 2 shows no bone produced statistically significant differences between diets
136 in week 1 but, from week two onwards, an overall pattern emerged with smaller bones
137 differentiating between diets early post hatch, and larger bones not differentiating between diets
138 until later on. The apparent lack of difference in bone mineralization between treatments at

139 week 1 sampling is in agreement with the findings of Itoh and Hatano [12], who also found no
140 significant differences when measuring bone minerals in chicks at 7 days of age, suggesting
141 week 1 is too early in the lifetime of the bird for dietary treatments to have had any measurable
142 effect on bone mineralization unless nutrient intervention begins in ovo [18].

143 The RMSE values and inter bird coefficients of variation (week 1 - 28.5%; weeks 2 through 6
144 - 10%) show that the toe ash measurements were highly variable; particularly in young chicks
145 where the low weight of the toe makes small variations in sampling technique result in a
146 relatively large standard deviation. This is confirmed by the intra bird coefficients of variation,
147 which were over 10% in week 1 for toe ash and although reduced to 4.7% in weeks 2 through
148 6, were notably higher than for the other bone sources. Toe ash showed a significant difference
149 between diets only when the birds were 2 weeks old, suggesting that toe ash may be an
150 inappropriate measure of bone mineralization, particularly in older chicks (from 21 days old).
151 Ravindran [8] however found that toe ash was a sensitive measure of phosphorus availability
152 in chicks of 21 days old, and found a strong correlation between toe and tibia ash, which was
153 not reflected in this study, where no relationship was observed (see table 3), although a
154 relationship was seen between toe and foot ash. In some studies, all the toes on each foot have
155 been pooled in order to increase the sample weight and thereby reduce variation [9]. However,
156 this method would increase the time required for the collection of the toes, when compared
157 with foot ash collection.

158 Pearson correlations found between all bone types are shown in table 3, with correlations
159 between all bone types with the exception of toe ash, which was only correlated with foot ash.
160 The correlation plot for foot and tibia ash is shown in Figure 1.

161 Overall, foot ash appears to be comparable with tibia and femur ash for reproducibility across
162 the study: little difference was found within bird, with variation of 2.7, 2.8% and 1.3% for tibia,

163 femur and foot ash respectively. Foot and tibia ash were significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher in birds
164 fed the Control diet than the low diet for weeks 2 through 5 but in week 6, foot ash did not
165 differentiate between the diets, whereas tibia ash still showed a significant difference. This
166 suggests that the foot bones were approaching full mineralization by 6 weeks of age, and were
167 therefore less effective at showing differences between dietary treatments. These results
168 suggest that foot ash is comparable with tibia ash at showing dietary mineral differences up to
169 5 weeks of age. Yan *et al.* [9] extended variation in dietary phosphorus levels beyond those
170 seen in commercial practice and found a strong correlation between tibias and foot ash
171 ($R^2 = 0.92$) which was not shown as strongly in this trial, although it is clear from Figure 1 that
172 there is some relationship between the two methods ($R^2 = 0.455$). This may be due to the small
173 number of replicates in this study (6 birds per diet per week), restricted range of dietary
174 phosphorus levels and increased variation caused by analysis at a range of ages, in contrast to
175 the single age used by Yan *et al.* [9]. However, even with the small number of replicates,
176 differences in sensitivity were still observed between bone types.

177 Tibia ash, with an ether pre extraction, is recommended by the AOAC [19] for the measurement
178 of vitamin D activity and as a method for bone mineralization analysis. Although the bones in
179 this study were not ether extracted, the average inter-bird coefficients of variation for tibia ash
180 were lower than for any other leg bone type, which evidences the precision of the method.
181 Ether extraction can reduce variation via fat removal and therefore sensitivity could be
182 expected to improve further if bones were pre extracted. Previous authors have assessed
183 percentage tibia ash over the same time period as this study and presented the same trend to
184 increasing tibia ash content as the birds age [4].

185 Femur ash has been reported to be the most similar bone in terms of mineralization to whole
186 skeletal values. It has been reported to be more responsive to dietary changes than the tibia
187 [12], and more sensitive to differing ratios of Ca: P in older birds [13]. In this study, the femur

188 ash showed no differences between the control and low diet in birds up to 3 weeks of age, but
189 was significantly greater for the control diet compared with the low diet in weeks 4 to 6. At
190 week 6, the differences between the diets were highly significant ($P > 0.001$) for femur ash,
191 contrasting with the results for foot and tibia ash, which resulted in less significant differences
192 between treatments with increasing bird age. This suggests that the femur bone is still
193 mineralizing at 6 weeks of age and may be a more appropriate bone to use when making dietary
194 comparisons in older chicks (over 6 weeks of age). Percentage femur ash was found to correlate
195 with tibia ash and, to a lesser extent, with foot ash (Table 3). The regression coefficients are
196 comparatively modest, which is likely to be due to the small replicate size and narrow range of
197 ash values achieved with only two phosphorus levels.

198 Variability in organic matter and lipid content may have reduced the sensitivity of foot ash and
199 tibias as a measure in older birds. A potential solution to this problem is to extract the fat from
200 larger feet prior to ashing [10]. Hall *et al.* [7] found that fat extraction improved the power of
201 the tibia ash method. However, the un-extracted tibia ash coefficients in this study averaged
202 less than 5%, compared to that study, where un-extracted, autoclaved tibias had high
203 coefficients of variation (21.53%) [7]. This suggests that it may not be necessary to extract fat
204 from bones prior to mineralization analysis, which would be advantageous because fat
205 extraction is labor intensive and uses harmful chemicals, but this requires further investigation.

206 The current global drive to reduce lameness in poultry requires robust, efficient measures.
207 Whilst bone mineralization is not the only factor to be considered, this study demonstrates that
208 the age of the bird needs to be taken into account when monitoring this aspect of lameness.
209 Foot ash provides a rapid and simple measure which can be considered as an alternative to tibia
210 ash in chicks 5 weeks of age and younger. In birds 6 weeks of age and above, this study shows
211 that femur ash may be the most appropriate measure for assessing bone mineralization. Further
212 investigations based on corn-soy diets that included examination of the impact of bird weight

213 alongside age on optimum bone sampling for ash determination would provide further insight
214 in this area.

215

216 **CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATIONS**

- 217 1. Percentage foot ash is an efficient and comparable alternative to percentage tibia ash
218 for assessing bone mineralization in birds between 2 and 5 weeks of age
- 219 2. Percentage femur ash may be a more appropriate measure for use in birds aged 6 weeks
220 and older than tibia ash.
- 221 3. Operator care needs to be taken when using toe ash measures to ensure consistency of
222 sampling.

223

224 **References**

225

- 226 1. Driver, J. P., G. M. Pesti, R. I. Bakalli, H. M. Jr Edwards. 2006. The effect of feeding
227 calcium- and phosphorus-deficient diets to broiler chickens during the starting and
228 growing-finishing phases on carcass quality. *Poult. Sci.* 85:1939-1946
- 229 2. Catalá-Gregori, P., V. Garcia, F. Hernández, J. Madrid and J. J. Cerón. 2006. Response
230 of broilers to feeding low-calcium and phosphorus diets plus phytase under different
231 environmental conditions: body weight and tibiotarsus mineralization. *Poult. Sci.*
232 85:1923-1931
- 233 3. Sharpley A., and B. Moyer. 2000. Phosphorus forms in manure and compost and their
234 release during simulated rainfall. *J. Environ. Qual.* 29:1462-1469

- 235 4. Skinner, J. T. and P. W. Waldroup. 1992. Effects of Calcium and phosphorus levels in
236 starter and grower diets on broilers during the finisher period. *J. Appl. Poultry Res.*
237 1:273-279
- 238 5. Boling-Frankenbach, S. D., J. L. Snow, C. M. Parsons, and D. H. Baker. 2001. The
239 effect of citric acid on the calcium and phosphorus requirements of chicks fed corn-
240 soybean meal diets. *Poult. Sci.* 80:783-788.
- 241 6. Huff, W. E. 1980. Discrepancies Between Bone Ash and Toe Ash During Aflatoxicosis.
242 *Poultry Science* 59:2213-2215.
- 243 7. Hall, L. E., R. B. Shirley, R. I. Bakalli, S. E. Aggrey, G. M. Pesti and H. M. Jr. Edwards.
244 2003. Power of two methods for the estimation of bone ash. *Poult. Sci.* 82:414-418
- 245 8. Ravindran, V., E. T. Kornegay, L. M. Potter, B.O. Ogunabameru, M. K. Welten, J. H.
246 Wilson and M. Potchanakorn. 1995. An evaluation of various response criteria in
247 assessing biological availability of phosphorus for broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 74:1820-1830
- 248 9. Yan, F., C. A. Keen, K. Y. Zhang and P. W. Waldroup. 2005. Comparison of methods
249 to evaluate bone mineralization. *J. Appl. Poultry Res.* 14:492-498.
- 250 10. Garcia, A. R. and N. M. Dale. 2006. Foot ash as a means of quantifying bone
251 mineralization in chicks. *J. Appl. Poultry Res.* 15:103-109.
- 252 11. Shastek, Y., M. Witzig, K. Hartung, W. Bessei and M. Rodehutsord. 2012.
253 Comparison and evaluation of bone measurements for the assessment of mineral
254 phosphorus sources in broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 91:2210-2220
- 255 12. Itoh, H. and T. Hatano. 1964. Comparison of calcium metabolism in various bones of
256 growing chicks in varying states of vitamin D supplementation. *Poult. Sci.* 43:70-76
- 257 13. Moran, E. T. Jr. and M.C. Todd. 1994. Continual submarginal phosphorus with broilers
258 and the effect of preslaughter transportation: carcass defects, further-processing yields,
259 and tibia-femur integrity. *Poult. Sci.* 73:1448-1457

- 260 14. Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC). 1990. Crude protein. Method
261 990.03. Pages 1094-1095 in Official Methods of Analysis. 15th ed. AOAC, Arlington,
262 VA.
- 263 15. Robbins DH and Firman JD 2006. Evaluation of the metabolizable energy of poultry
264 by-product meal for chickens and turkeys by various methods. Japanese Poultry
265 Science 5, 753-758.
- 266 16. Leytem, A.B., B.P. Willing and P.A. Thacker. 2008. Phytate utilization and phosphorus
267 excretion by broiler chickens fed diets containing cereal grains varying in phytate and
268 phytase content. Anim. Feed. Sci. Tech.146: 160-168.
- 269 17. Cohen, J. 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences. 2nd ed. Erlbaum,
270 Hilssdale, NJ.
- 271 18. Oliveira, T. F. B., A. G. Bertechini, R. M. Bricka, P. Y. Hester, E. J. Kim, P. D. Gerard
272 and E. D. Peebles. 2015. Effects of in ovo injection of organic trace minerals and post-
273 hatch holding time on broiler performance and bone characteristics. Poult. Sci.
274 94:2677-2685.
- 275 19. Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC). 1990. Vitamin D₃ in poultry feed
276 supplements. Method 932.16. Pages 1094-1095 in Official Methods of Analysis. 15th
277 ed. AOAC, Arlington, VA.

278

279

280

281

282

283

Ingredient / Analyses	Control Diet (g/kg)	Low Diet (g/kg)
Wheat ¹	663.5	677.5
High protein soya bean meal ²	250.0	250.0
Lysine ³	3.0	3.0
Methionine ³	2.5	2.5
Soya Oil	40.0	40.0
Limestone ⁴	20.0	10.0
Monocalcium Phosphate ⁵	8.0	4.0
Sodium Chloride	2.5	2.5
Sodium Bicarbonate	1.5	1.5
Vitamin E/Biotin 75/125 Premix	1.0	1.0
Vitamin Mineral Premix ⁶	2.5	2.5
Choline Chloride	0.5	0.5
Titanium Dioxide	5.0	5.0
Calculated Composition		
Phosphorus g/kg	5.14	4.30
Calcium g/kg	10.81	6.19
Non phytate phosphorus g/kg	2.94	2.04
Calculated Poultry ME kcal/kg	3066.3	3109.8
Analyzed Composition		
Phosphorus g/kg	7.8	4.4
Calcium g/kg	22.7	13.1
Protein g/kg	208	204

Gross energy kcal/kg

4,610

4,750

285 ¹ Wheat: Ca 0.04%; P 0.24%; non phytate P 0.06%

286 ² Soya bean meal: protein 48.7%; Ca 0.31%; P 0.72%; non phytate P 0.32%

287 ³ Lysine and Methionine sourced from Evonik

288 ⁴ Limestone: Ca 38%; P 0%

289 ⁵ Monocalcium phosphate: Ca 16%; P 25.3%

290 ⁶ Premix content (volume/kg diet): Mn 100mg, Zn 80mg, Fe 20mg, Cu 10mg, I 1mg, Mb
291 0.48mg, Se 0.2mg, Retinol 13.5mg, Cholecalciferol, 3mg, Tocopherol 25mg, Menadione
292 5.0mg, Thiamine 3mg, Riboflavin 10.0mg, Pantothenic acid 15mg, Pyroxidine 3.0mg, Niacin
293 60mg, Cobalamin 30µg, Folic acid 1.5mg, Biotin 125mg

294

Table 2 Mean values for percentage ash for each bone type for weeks 1 through 6 for low and control dietary groups with statistical differences between diets.

Week	Toe ash (%)		Foot ash (%)		Tibia ash (%)		Femur ash (%)	
	Low	Control	Low	Control	Low	Control	Low	Control
1	10.04	10.08	12.93	12.99	35.97	37.26	36.32	37.12
2	9.93*	10.82*	12.30**	13.50**	38.89*	41.63*	39.03	40.68
3	10.01	11.10	13.22**	14.97**	42.95**	45.42**	42.93	45.34
4	11.46	12.22	13.76*	15.40*	41.07**	44.22**	41.70*	44.56*
5	11.59	12.09	13.84*	15.09*	40.58*	43.62*	40.33*	44.43*
6	10.59	10.88	14.47	15.48	43.57*	47.83*	41.50**	45.06**
RMSE ¹	1.525		0.823		2.052		2.767	

¹RMSE Root mean square error for each bone type obtained using SPSS

Statistical comparisons of dietary treatments by t test. Significant differences denoted by * P<0.05; ** P<0.01;

Table 3 Pearson product moment correlations between different bone types

	Toe ash	Foot ash	Tibia ash	Femur ash
Foot ash	0.623 ¹	0.632	0.132*	0.315
Tibia ash	-	-	0.675	0.644
Femur ash	-	-	-	0.687

¹n=141; all other data sets, n=144

*correlation not significant at P<0.05