

Journal of Advanced Veterinary Research

https://advetresearch.com



Efficacy of Nano-Phytobiotics to Improve Growth Performance of Broiler Chickens: Evidence from a Meta-Analysis

Faizal Andri¹, Nanung Danar Dono², Heru Sasongko³, Zuprizal Zuprizal^{2*}

¹Department of Animal Nutrition and Feed Science, Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, 65145, Indonesia. ²Department of Animal Nutrition and Feed Science, Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia. ³Department of Animal Production, Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Original Research

Received: 10 July 2021

Accepted: 22 September 2021

Keywords:

Antibiotic growth promoters, Nanotechnology, Feed additives, Phytogenics, Poultry The ban of antibiotic growth promoters in many countries necessitate the need for alternatives. This study aimed to assess the growth-promoting potency of nano-phytobiotics (NP) on broiler chickens by using a meta-analysis approach. A systematic search was conducted using online databases. Data of average daily feed intake (ADFI), average daily gain (ADG), and feed conversion ratio (FCR) were pooled using a random-effect model and the overall effect size was quantified using mean difference (MD). Heterogeneity among the studies was checked using I^2 statistics. A total of 11 studies (31 comparisons) using 3,584 broiler chickens were involved in this meta-analysis. Inclusion of NP had no significant effect on ADFI (MD=-1.20 g/bird/d; P=0.157; I^2 =32%). However, NP significantly improved ADG (MD=2.16 g/bird/d; P=0.002; I^2 =90%) and FCR (MD=-0.09; P<0.001; I2=91%). Subgroup analysis revealed that NP significantly improved (P<0.05) ADG when the studies using dose of 45-200 and 1,000-10,000 ppm, as well as 42 d study period. Meta-regression analysis also indicated that ADG improvement significantly associated (P<0.05) with the NP dose and study duration, which could explain 21% and 20% of heterogeneity, respectively. This meta-analysis provides evidence that NP inclusion could improve ADG and FCR without alter ADFI on broiler chickens. However, their efficacy may vary according to the NP dose and study duration.

J. Adv. Vet. Res. (2021), 11 (4), 195-202

Introduction

The indiscriminate use of antibiotics growth promoters (AGP) leads to the incorporation of drug residue in animal products and invasion of resistant microbial that threatens food safety and human health (Davis *et al.*, 2018; Roth *et al.*, 2019; Yang *et al.*, 2019; Younessi *et al.*, 2020; Haque *et al.*, 2021). Realizes that hazard situation, many countries are then voluntarily phase out AGP from animal production (Bacanlı and Başaran, 2019; Coyne *et al.*, 2019). Consequently, the search for suitable alternatives to AGP is highly demanded.

One of the potential AGP alternatives is plant-derived bioactive compounds, which is commonly termed as phytobiotics. A body of knowledge indicated that phytobiotics had antimicrobial and antioxidant actions (Yashin *et al.*, 2017; Anand *et al.*, 2019; Reyes-Jurado *et al.*, 2020; Valdivieso-Ugarte *et al.*, 2019), which may support animal productivity and products quality (Andri *et al.*, 2016; Andri *et al.*, 2018; Edi *et al.*, 2018; Gheisar and Kim, 2018; Kothari *et al.*, 2019; Pliego *et al.*,

2020; Deminicis *et al.*, 2021). However, the use of phytobiotics is still encounter some limitation such as low chemical stability and poor water solubility (Prakash *et al.*, 2018; Das *et al.*, 2019; Park *et al.*, 2019; Sharifi *et al.*, 2020).

The use of nanotechnology is recently proposed as a gold standard for the preparation of phytobiotics. Nanotechnology could provide protection against various harsh condition as well as enhancement of solubility and bioactivity (Fan *et al.*, 2017; Ong *et al.*, 2017; Lee *et al.*, 2019; Shetta *et al.*, 2019; Osama *et al.*, 2020; Salehi *et al.*, 2020). Moreover, the inclusion of nano-phytobiotics (NP) in broiler chickens diet *als*o reported to have higher growth promoting effects as compared to the free-phytobiotics (Nouri, 2019; Ibrahim *et al.*, 2021; Amiri *et al.*, 2021).

Meta-analysis is a valuable statistical tool to evaluate the efficacy of certain intervention (Cipriani *et al.*, 2013). Through meta-analysis, data from multiple independent studies were integrated so that it could resolve seemingly contradictory results (Gurevitch *et al.*, 2018) and ultimately could provide more robust evidence. This study was carried out to evaluate the effects of NP inclusion on the average daily feed intake (ADFI), average daily gain (ADG), and feed conversion ratio (FCR) of broiler chickens by using a meta-analysis approach.

^{*}Corresponding author: Zuprizal Zuprizal *E-mail address*: zuprizal@ugm.ac.id

Materials and methods

Study search and selection

This meta-analysis adopted the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page *et al.*, 2021). A systematic search was conducted using three online databases (Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar). The keywords used were "nano" AND "growth OR performance" AND "broiler OR chick". The last search was performed on May 2, 2021. The studies were included in this meta-analysis when met the following criteria: 1) using broiler chickens, 2) using NP intervention, 3) have control group (without any feed additives or AGP), 4) reporting ADFI, ADG, and FCR, and 5) using randomized design.

The phase of study search and selection process is presented on PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 1). A total of 125 records were identified from database searching. Twenty nine records were removed before screening due to the duplication. Evaluation on the title and abstract resulting in the removal of 80 studies due to the irrelevance issue. One report was also removed because the full text not accessible. Four reports were further removed because ineligible data and study design. Finally, only 11 studies met the inclusion criteria and used in this meta-analysis.

The following information were extracted from each of the included studies: 1) author name and publication year, 2) number of NP treatments, 3) number of birds per treatment, 4) birds strain, 5) birds sex, 6) NP type, 7) NP dose, and 8) study duration. Moreover, number of replicates, mean values, and variation measures (standard deviation, standard error, or standard error of mean) of ADFI, ADG, and FCR were also included in the database. When the studies presenting standard error or standard error of mean, it was converted into the standard deviation (Greig *et al.*, 2012; Andri *et al.*, 2020a). In the case of more than one NP dose or NP type used in a study, each treatment was compared with control individually.

Meta-analysis procedure

Meta-analysis was performed using R version 4.0.5 (R Core Team, 2021) equipped with 'meta' package version 4.18-0 (Balduzzi et al., 2019), 'metafor' package version 2.4-0 (Viechtbauer, 2010), and 'dmetar' package (Harrer et al., 2019). The effect size was guantified as a mean difference (MD). The overall effect was pooled using a random-effect model with Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman adjustment (Harrer et al., 2021). A statistical significance was declared when the overall effect had P<0.05. Heterogeneity was checked using I² statistic, with I²>50% was considered as an existence of substantial heterogeneity among the studies. Forest plot was constructed to visualize the effect of NP inclusion on ADFI, ADG, and FCR. The effect size of each study was showed in a point with its 95% confidence interval (CI). The weighted contribution of each study also showed in the forest plot. The overall effect size was figured out with diamond shape below the included studies.

Subgroup and meta-regression analysis were used to further explore the source of heterogeneity. Subgroup analysis was specified with categorical data, namely NP dose (45-200 ppm, 360-800, and 1,000-10,000 ppm), and study duration (28-35 d and 42 d). In addition, meta-regression was conducted with continuous data (NP dose and study duration). To test the robustness of meta-analysis result, sensitivity analysis was performed by using a leave-one-out method (Harrer *et al.*, 2021).

Results

Study characteristics

The included studies were published between 2014 and 2021. There were 31 comparisons derived from the included studies (Table 1). The number of broiler chickens involved in



Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram illustrating the study search and selection.

this meta-analysis were 3,584 birds. Ross was the most frequent strain in the included studies (64%), followed by Lohmann (27%) and Cobb (9%). About 45% of the included studies using both male and female chicken, while another 36% studies using male chicken. Two studies (18%) did not provide details about sex of the birds. Plant extracts were used to develop nano-phytobiotics in the 45% of the included studies, while plant essential oils used in another 36% studies. About 18% of the included studies using nano-phytobiotics with purified bioactive compounds. The dose of nano-phytobiotics inclusion ranged widely from 0 to 10,000 ppm. Nanophytobiotics treatment ranged from 28 to 42 days.

Primary analysis

Figure 2 shows that nano-phytobiotics inclusion had no significant effect (P>0.05) on ADFI, with no substantial heterogeneity among the studies (t^2 <50%). On the other hand, nanophytobiotics intervention significantly improved (P<0.05) ADG (Figure 3) and FCR (Figure 4). However, heterogeneity among

Table 1. Main characteristics of the included studies.

the studies of ADG and FCR was substantial, as indicated by $P^2 > 50\%$.

Subgroup analysis

As can be seen on Table 2, nano-phytobiotics significantly improved (P<0.05) ADG when the studies using dose of 45-200 and 1,000-10,000 ppm, as well as 42 d study period. Nano-phytobiotics dose at 45-200 and 360-800 ppm significantly improved (P<0.05) FCR. Whereas 1,000-10,000 ppm nano-phytobiotics had no significant effect (P>0.05) on FCR. Both study duration (28-35 d and 42 d) significantly improved (P<0.05) FCR.

Meta-regression analysis

Table 3 indicates that ADG improvement had significant association (P<0.05) with nano-phytobiotics dose and study duration. These covariates could explain about 21% and 20% of heterogeneity, respectively. However, FCR improvement was

Author	n^1	n birds ²	Strain	Sex	Nano-phytobiotics type	Dose (ppm)	Duration (d)
Amiri et al. (2021)	2	150	Ross	Male	Nano-garlic EO ³	0, 100, 200	42
Hidayat et al. (2021)	4	60	Lohmann	Both	Nano-guava leaf extract	0, 45, 90, 135, 180	33
Ibrahim et al. (2021)	3	300	Ross	Male	Nano-thymol	0, 2,500, 5,000, 10,000	42
Amiri et al. (2020)	2	150	Ross	Male	Nano-cumin EO	0, 100, 200	42
Baskara et al. (2020)	3	40	Lohmann	Both	Nano-cinnamon EO	0, 200, 400, 800	28
El-Gogary et al. (2019)	2	28	Cobb	Both	Nano-garlic extract	0, 500, 1,000	42
Nouri (2019)	3	75	Ross	Both	Nano-mint EO, nano-thyme EO, nano-cinnamon EO	0, 440, 440, 440	42
Barbarestani et al. (2017)	1	80	Ross	Both	Nano-peppermint extract	0, 200	42
Meimandipour et al. (2017)	3	30	Ross	NA ³	Nano-Aloe vera extract, nano-dill extract, nano-nettle root extract	0, 360, 360, 360	42
Rahmani et al. (2017)	4	50	Ross	Male	Nano-curcumin	0, 200, 400, 200, 400	42
Sundari et al. (2014)	4	12	Lohmann	NA	Nano-turmeric extract	0, 2,000, 4,000, 6,000, 8,000	35

¹Number of comparison, ²Number of birds per treatment, ³Essential oil, ⁴Not available

Table 2. Subgroup analysis of the effect of nano-phytobiotics inclusion on growth performance of broiler chickens

Variable	Subgroup	n	MD	95% CI	р	I^2	p subgroup
ADG	Dose (ppm)						0.317
	45-200	12	1.42	[0.16; 2.69]	0.028	23%	
	360-800	11	0.89	[-0.90; 2.67]	0.329	0%	
	1,000-10,000	8	3.79	[0.48; 7.10]	0.025	95%	
	Duration (d)						< 0.001
	28-35	11	-0.1	[-1.23; 1.04]	0.865	0%	
	42	20	3.38	[1.73; 5.04]	< 0.001	92%	
FCR	Dose (ppm)						0.051
	45-200	12	-0.1	[-0.13; -0.07]	< 0.001	0%	
	360-800	11	-0.05	[-0.08; -0.03]	< 0.001	0%	
	1,000-10,000	8	-0.08	[-0.16; 0.01]	0.068	97%	
	Duration (d)						0.158
	28-35	11	-0.06	[-0.10; -0.03]	< 0.001	1%	
	42	20	-0.1	[-0.14; -0.07]	< 0.001	93%	

ADG: Average daily gain; FCR: Feed conversion ratio

Table 3. Meta-regression of the effect of nano-phytobiotics inclusion on growth performance of broiler chickens

Variable	Covariate	n	Coefficient	95% CI	р	\mathbb{R}^2
ADG	Dose (ppm)	31	0.0007	[0.0003; 0.0012]	0.001	21%
	Duration (d)	31	0.3328	[0.0976; 0.5680]	0.007	20%
FCR	Dose (ppm)	31	0	[-0.0000; 0.0000]	0.15	0%
	Duration (d)	31	-0.0022	[-0.0072; 0.0029]	0.388	0%

ADG: Average daily gain; FCR: Feed conversion ratio

Author	N	Interve Mean	ention SD	N	C Mean	ontrol SD	Mean Difference	MD	95% CI	Weight
1	-	00.00	0.40	-	04.00	0.40	=1	0.77	1 40 07 4 001	0.00/
Amiri 2021-1	5	88.23	6.13	5	91.00	6.13		-2.11	[-10.37; 4.83]	3.8%
Amiri 2021-2	5	86.37	6.13	5	91.00	6.13		-4.63	[-12.23; 2.97]	3.8%
Hidayat 2021-1	5	62.93	8.67	5	65.58	8.67		-2.65	[-13.40; 8.10]	2.3%
Hidayat 2021-2	5	67.75	8.67	5	65.58	8.67		2.17	[-8.58; 12.92]	2.3%
Hidayat 2021-3	5	62.22	8.67	5	65.58	8.67		-3.36	[-14.11; 7.39]	2.3%
Hidayat 2021-4	5	56.10	8.67	5	65.58	8.67		-9.48	[-20.23; 1.27]	2.3%
Ibrahim 2021-1	10	93.90	5.92	10	91.62	5.92	1	2.28	[-2.91; 7.47]	5.6%
Ibrahim 2021-2	10	96.07	5.92	10	91.62	5.92	1	4.45	[-0.74; 9.64]	5.6%
Ibrahim 2021-3	10	101.33	5.92	10	91.62	5.92		9.71	[4.52; 14.90]	5.6%
Amiri 2020-1	5	86.41	9.29	5	91.00	9.29		-4.59	[-16.11; 6.93]	2.1%
Amiri 2020-2	5	84.31	9.29	5	91.00	9.29	<u> </u>	-6.69	[-18.21; 4.83]	2.1%
Baskara 2020-1	5	88.36	4.62	5	96.04	4.62		-7.68	[-13.41; -1.95]	5.1%
Baskara 2020-2	5	90.04	4.62	5	96.04	4.62		-6.00	[-11.73; -0.27]	5.1%
Baskara 2020-3	5	89.14	4.62	5	96.04	4.62		-6.90	[-12.63; -1.17]	5.1%
El-Gogary 2019-1	4	90.86	3.95	4	89.86	3.95		1.00	[-4.47; 6.47]	5.3%
El-Gogary 2019-2	4	88.79	3.95	4	89.86	3.95		-1.07	[-6.54; 4.40]	5.3%
Nouri 2019-1	5	112.90	10.81	5	109.40	10.81		3.50	[-9.90; 16.90]	1.7%
Nouri 2019-1	5	112.80	10.81	5	109.40	10.81		3.40	[-10.00; 16.80]	1.7%
Nouri 2019-1	5	108.10	10.81	5	109.40	10.81		-1.30	[-14.70; 12.10]	1.7%
Barbarestani 2017	4	83.67	6.09	4	87.88	6.09		-4.21	[-12.65; 4.23]	3.3%
Meimandipour 2017-1	3	116.36	8.39	3	112.86	8.39		3.50	[-9.93; 16.93]	1.6%
Meimandipour 2017-2	3	116.19	8.39	3	112.86	8.39		3.33	[-10.10; 16.76]	1.6%
Meimandipour 2017-3	3	111.52	8.39	3	112.86	8.39		-1.34	[-14.77; 12.09]	1.6%
Rahmani 2017-1	5	99.90	4.67	5	103.50	4.67		-3.60	[-9.39; 2.19]	5.1%
Rahmani 2017-2	5	101.90	4.67	5	103.50	4.67		-1.60	[-7.39; 4.19]	5.1%
Rahmani 2017-3	5	108.19	4.67	5	108.02	4.67		0.17	[-5.62; 5.96]	5.1%
Rahmani 2017-4	5	105.93	4.67	5	108.02	4.67		-2.09	[-7.88; 3.70]	5.1%
Sundari 2014-1	3	98.18	20.05	3	95.57	11.54		2.61	[-23.57; 28.79]	0.5%
Sundari 2014-2	3	100.63	10.13	3	95.57	11.54		5.06	[-12.32; 22.44]	1.1%
Sundari 2014-3	3	97.59	14.20	3	95.57	11.54	x	2.02	[-18.69; 22.73]	0.8%
Sundari 2014-4	3	96.50	29.51	3	95.57	11.54		- 0.93	[-34.93; 36.79]	0.3%
Overall effect								-1.20	[-2.89; 0.49]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 32\%$										
Test for overall effect: p	= 0	157					-30 -20 -10 0 10 20 30			

Fig. 2. Forest plot of the effect of nano-phytobiotics inclusion on ADFI of broiler chickens.

	Intervention Control													
Author	N	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD		Mea	n Differ	ence		MD	95% CI	Weight
Amiri 2021-1	5	53.87	4.38	5	48.12	4.38			H			5.75	[0.32; 11.18]	2.8%
Amiri 2021-2	5	49.74	4.38	5	48.12	4.38						1.62	[-3.81; 7.05]	2.8%
Hidayat 2021-1	5	39.70	3.22	5	38.09	3.22			-	-		1.61	[-2.38; 5.60]	3.5%
Hidayat 2021-2	5	40.97	3.22	5	38.09	3.22			-	_		2.88	[-1.11; 6.87]	3.5%
Hidayat 2021-3	5	38.15	3.22	5	38.09	3.22						0.06	[-3.93; 4.05]	3.5%
Hidayat 2021-4	5	35.64	3.22	5	38.09	3.22		-		_		-2.45	[-6.44; 1.54]	3.5%
Ibrahim 2021-1	10	53.95	1.38	10	49.50	1.38						4.45	[3.24; 5.66]	5.0%
Ibrahim 2021-2	10	57.10	1.38	10	49.50	1.38						7.60	[6.39; 8.81]	5.0%
Ibrahim 2021-3	10	61.43	1.38	10	49.50	1.38					1.0	11.93	[10.72; 13.14]	5.0%
Amiri 2020-1	5	50.14	3.40	5	48.12	3.40				-		2.02	[-2.19; 6.23]	3.4%
Amiri 2020-2	5	51.51	3.40	5	48.12	3.40			+			3.39	[-0.82; 7.60]	3.4%
Baskara 2020-1	5	60.86	2.84	5	62.14	2.84						-1.28	[-4.80; 2.24]	3.8%
Baskara 2020-2	5	61.21	2.84	5	62.14	2.84						-0.93	[-4.45; 2.59]	3.8%
Baskara 2020-3	5	60.75	2.84	5	62.14	2.84						-1.39	[-4.91; 2.13]	3.8%
El-Gogary 2019-1	4	46.74	1.75	4	45.93	1.75			+++			0.81	[-1.62; 3.24]	4.4%
El-Gogary 2019-2	4	45.81	1.75	4	45.93	1.75						-0.12	[-2.55; 2.31]	4.4%
Nouri 2019-1	5	66.30	8.92	5	60.70	8.92				iii	-	5.60	[-5.46; 16.66]	1.1%
Nouri 2019-1	5	70.10	8.92	5	60.70	8.92						9.40	[-1.66; 20.46]	1.1%
Nouri 2019-1	5	63.70	8.92	5	60.70	8.92		_				3.00	[-8.06; 14.06]	1.1%
Barbarestani 2017	4	44.64	3.73	4	45.21	3.73		-	- <u></u>			-0.57	[-5.74; 4.60]	2.9%
Meimandipour 2017-1	3	65.67	6.28	3	60.48	6.28			-++	<u> </u>		5.19	[-4.86; 15.24]	1.3%
Meimandipour 2017-2	3	68.33	6.28	3	60.48	6.28			-			7.85	[-2.20; 17.90]	1.3%
Meimandipour 2017-3	3	63.64	6.28	3	60.48	6.28		-	200			3.16	[-6.89; 13.21]	1.3%
Rahmani 2017-1	5	60.52	2.05	5	59.71	2.05						0.81	[-1.73; 3.35]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-2	5	58.60	2.05	5	59.71	2.05						-1.11	[-3.65; 1.43]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-3	5	59.48	2.05	5	55.71	2.05				+		3.77	[1.23; 6.31]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-4	5	55.64	2.05	5	55.71	2.05			-			-0.07	[-2.61; 2.47]	4.4%
Sundari 2014-1	3	57.69	4.04	3	53.29	3.42				-		4.40	[-1.59; 10.39]	2.5%
Sundari 2014-2	3	52.42	3.83	3	53.29	3.42		-				-0.87	[-6.68; 4.94]	2.6%
Sundari 2014-3	3	52.31	0.28	3	53.29	3.42						-0.98	[-4.86; 2.90]	3.6%
Sundari 2014-4	3	54.00	4.38	3	53.29	3.42				_		0.71	[-5.58; 7.00]	2.4%
Overall effect									\$			2.16	[0.84; 3.48]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 90\%$						Г		1	1					
Test for overall effect: p	= 0	.002				-21	0	-10	0	10	20			

Fig. 3. Forest plot of the effect of nano-phytobiotics inclusion on ADG of broiler chickens.

Author	lr N	nterver Mean	ntion SD	N	Co Mean	ntrol SD	Mean Difference	MD	95% CI	Weight
Amiri 2021-1	5	1.64	0.16	5	1.89	0.16	÷ [-0.25	[-0.45; -0.05]	1.8%
Amiri 2021-2	5	1.73	0.16	5	1.89	0.16		-0.16	[-0.36; 0.04]	1.8%
Hidayat 2021-1	5	1.58	0.09	5	1.67	0.09		-0.09	[-0.20; 0.02]	3.6%
Hidayat 2021-2	5	1.64	0.09	5	1.67	0.09		-0.03	[-0.14; 0.08]	3.6%
Hidayat 2021-3	5	1.56	0.09	5	1.67	0.09		-0.11	[-0.22; 0.00]	3.6%
Hidayat 2021-4	5	1.57	0.09	5	1.67	0.09		-0.10	[-0.21; 0.01]	3.6%
Ibrahim 2021-1	10	1.74	0.01	10	1.85	0.01	+	-0.11	[-0.12; -0.10]	6.4%
Ibrahim 2021-2	10	1.68	0.01	10	1.85	0.01	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-0.17	[-0.18; -0.16]	6.4%
Ibrahim 2021-3	10	1.65	0.01	10	1.85	0.01		-0.20	[-0.21; -0.19]	6.4%
Amiri 2020-1	5	1.72	0.19	5	1.89	0.19		-0.17	[-0.41; 0.07]	1.4%
Amiri 2020-2	5	1.63	0.19	5	1.89	0.19	<u>x</u>	-0.26	[-0.50; -0.02]	1.4%
Baskara 2020-1	5	1.45	0.04	5	1.55	0.04		-0.10	[-0.15; -0.05]	5.6%
Baskara 2020-2	5	1.47	0.04	5	1.55	0.04		-0.08	[-0.13; -0.03]	5.6%
Baskara 2020-3	5	1.47	0.04	5	1.55	0.04	*	-0.08	[-0.13; -0.03]	5.6%
El-Gogary 2019-1	4	1.94	0.06	4	1.95	0.06	÷	-0.01	[-0.09; 0.07]	4.5%
El-Gogary 2019-2	4	1.93	0.06	4	1.95	0.06	÷	-0.02	[-0.10; 0.06]	4.5%
Nouri 2019-1	5	1.70	0.19	5	1.80	0.19		-0.10	[-0.34; 0.14]	1.4%
Nouri 2019-1	5	1.61	0.19	5	1.80	0.19		-0.19	[-0.43; 0.05]	1.4%
Nouri 2019-1	5	1.70	0.19	5	1.80	0.19		-0.10	[-0.34; 0.14]	1.4%
Barbarestani 2017	4	1.87	0.04	4	1.94	0.04		-0.07	[-0.13; -0.01]	5.4%
Meimandipour 2017-1	3	1.67	0.29	3	1.62	0.29		0.05	[-0.41; 0.51]	0.4%
Meimandipour 2017-2	3	1.64	0.29	3	1.62	0.29		0.02	[-0.44; 0.48]	0.4%
Meimandipour 2017-3	3	1.70	0.29	3	1.62	0.29		- 0.08	[-0.38; 0.54]	0.4%
Rahmani 2017-1	5	1.65	0.07	5	1.73	0.07		-0.08	[-0.17; 0.01]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-2	5	1.73	0.07	5	1.73	0.07		0.00	[-0.09; 0.09]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-3	5	1.81	0.07	5	1.93	0.07		-0.12	[-0.21; -0.03]	4.4%
Rahmani 2017-4	5	1.90	0.07	5	1.93	0.07	14	-0.03	[-0.12; 0.06]	4.4%
Sundari 2014-1	3	1.71	0.19	3	1.79	0.09		-0.08	[-0.32; 0.16]	1.4%
Sundari 2014-2	3	1.93	0.12	3	1.79	0.09	- 	0.14	[-0.03; 0.31]	2.3%
Sundari 2014-3	3	1.88	0.24	3	1.79	0.09		0.09	[-0.20; 0.38]	1.0%
Sundari 2014-4	3	1.80	0.21	3	1.79	0.09		0.01	[-0.25; 0.27]	1.2%
Overall effect								-0.09	[-0.12; -0.06]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 91\%$										
Test for overall effect: p < 0.001							-0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4			

Fig. 4. Forest plot of the effect of nano-phytobiotics inclusion on FCR of broiler chickens.

not significantly associated (P>0.05) with nano-phytobiotics dose and study duration.

Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis showed that omitting of each of single study at a time did not substantially change the overall effect of ADFI, ADG, and FCR.

Discussion

In the last decade, the use of nano-phytobiotics in poultry nutrition become popular as an alternative to AGP. This study is the first meta-analysis reporting the efficacy of nano-phytobiotics to improve growth performance of broiler chickens. Data synthesis from this study indicate that nano-phytobiotics inclusion in broiler chickens' diet could effectively improve ADG and FCR with comparable ADFI. This finding again strengthens the previous evidence showing the efficacy of phytobiotics to improve growth performance of broiler chickens (Andri *et al.*, 2020b; Irawan *et al.*, 2020; Ogbuewu and Mbajiorgu, 2020; Ogbuewu *et al.*, 2020a; Prihambodo *et al.*, 2021).

The growth promoting effect of nano-phytobiotics in broiler chickens probably related with antimicrobial and antioxidant properties as their main mechanism of actions. Previously, it has been reported that bioactive compounds in phytobiotics had antimicrobial activity against common poultry pathogens such as *Escherichia coli*, Salmonella sp., and Clostridium perfringens (Sugiharto, 2016; Kiczorowska *et al.*, 2017; Gheisar and Kim, 2018; Filazi and Yurdakok-Dikmen, 2019; Abd El-Ghany, 2020; Alagawany *et al.*, 2021). The use of nanotechnology also provides better antimicrobial action of phytobiotics (Correa-Pacheco *et al.*, 2019; Sahyon and Al-Harbi, 2020; Ahmadi *et al.*, 2021). In the intestinal environment, there is always a competition of nutrient utilization between the pathogenic bacteria and the host. For that reason, the reduction in the pathogenic bacteria will benefit the host with the higher nutrient availability (Dittoe *et al.*, 2018; Fancher *et al.*, 2020; Feye *et al.*, 2020). Additionally, the use of phytobiotics also associated with the lower gut pH but higher digestive enzyme secretion and activity, which further followed by the improvement in the nutrient digestibility (Olukosi and Dono, 2014; Purwanti *et al.*, 2015; Zeng *et al.*, 2015; Mohamed *et al.*, 2021).

The use of nano-phytobiotics also served as antioxidant sources. Nano-phytobiotics supplementation could improve antioxidant status by improving superoxide dismutase and reduced glutathione but decreasing malondialdehyde concentrations (Heidary *et al.*, 2020; Reda *et al.*, 2020). The higher antioxidant status may promote better villi development as indicated by the higher villi height (Song *et al.*, 2018; Abolfathi *et al.*, 2019; Tang *et al.*, 2019; Barbarestani *et al.*, 2020), which consequently led to the higher absorptive surface area and increased in the nutrient absorption (Ur Rahman *et al.*, 2017; Omar *et al.*, 2020; Kikusato, 2021). Together, the higher nutrient availability, digestion, and absorption will ultimately be followed by the improvement in ADG and FCR.

It should be underlined that nano-phytobiotics dose and study duration resulting varying degree of growth-promoting effect of nano-phytobiotics. In line with this finding, other studies also observed that the efficacy of feed additives inclusion was varied across treatment dose and study duration (Ogbuewu *et al.*, 2020b; Ogbuewu *et al.*, 2021). Moreover, it also should be mentioned that the robustness of this current finding is warranted because the overall effect size remained stable after sensitivity analysis test.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis provides evidence that nano-phytobiotics inclusion could improve average daily gain and feed conversion ratio without alter average daily feed intake of broiler chickens. However, their efficacy may vary according to the nano-phytobiotics dose and study duration. The use of nanophytobiotics is desirable as an alternative to antibiotic growth promoters.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledged financial support from Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest associated with this study.

References

- Abd El-Ghany, W.A., 2020. Phytobiotics in poultry industry as growth promoters, antimicrobials and immunomodulators–A review. J. World Poult. Res. 10, 571-579.
- Abolfathi, M.E., Tabeidian, S.A., Shahraki, A.F., Tabatabaei, S.N., Habibian, M., 2019. Effects of ethanol extract of elecampane (*Inula helenium* L.) rhizome on growth performance, diet digestibility, gut health, and antioxidant status in broiler chickens. Livest. Sci. 223, 68-75.
- Ahmadi, S., Hivechi, A., Bahrami, S.H., Milan, P.B., Ashraf, S.S., 2021. Cinnamon extract loaded electrospun chitosan/gelatin membrane with antibacterial activity. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 173, 580-590.
- Alagawany, M., Elnesr, S.S., Farag, M.R., Abd El-Hack, M.E., Barkat, R.A., Gabr, A.A., Foda, M.A., Noreldin, A.E., Khafaga, A.F., El-Sabrout, K., Elwan, H.A., 2021. Potential role of important nutraceuticals in poultry performance and health-A comprehensive review. Res. Vet. Sci. 137, 9-29.
- Amiri, N., Afsharmanesh, M., Salarmoini, M., Meimandipour, A., Hosseini, S.A., Ebrahimnejad, H., 2021. Nanoencapsulation (*in vitro* and *in vivo*) as an efficient technology to boost the potential of garlic essential oil as alternatives for antibiotics in broiler nutrition. Animal 15, 100022.
- Amiri, N., Afsharmanesh, M., Salarmoini, M., Meimandipour, A., Hosseini, S.A., Ebrahimnejad, H., 2020. Effects of nanoencapsulated cumin essential oil as an alternative to the antibiotic growth promoter in broiler diets. J. Appl. Poult. Res. 29, 875-885.
- Anand, U., Jacobo-Herrera, N., Altemimi, A., Lakhssassi, N., 2019. A comprehensive review on medicinal plants as antimicrobial therapeutics: potential avenues of biocompatible drug discovery. Metabolites 9, 258.
- Andri, F., Huda, A.N., Marjuki, M., 2020a. The use of essential oils as a growth promoter for small ruminants: a systematic review and meta-analysis. F1000Res. 9, 486.
- Andri, F., Dono, N.D., Sasongko, H., Zuprizal, Z., 2020b. The effects of dietary seaweed inclusion on growth performance of broiler chickens: a systematic review and meta-analysis. F1000Res. 9, 1087.
- Andri, F., Sukoco, A., Hilman, T.,Widodo, E., 2016. Effect of adding tomato powder to fish oil-containing diet on performance and egg quality of native laying hens. Livest. Res. Rural Dev. 28, 221.
- Andri, F., Widodo, E., Djunaidi, I.H., 2018. Effects of dietary sardine oil and tomato powder supplementation on laying performance and egg quality of Mojosari duck. Livest. Res. Rural Dev. 30, 32.

Bacanlı, M., Başaran, N., 2019. Importance of antibiotic residues in an-

200

imal food. Food Chem. Toxicol. 125, 462-466.

- Balduzzi, S., Rücker, G., Schwarzer, G., 2019. How to perform a metaanalysis with R: a practical tutorial. Evid.-Based Ment. Health. 22, 153-160.
- Barbarestani, S.Y., Jazi, V., Mohebodini, H., Ashayerizadeh, A., Shabani, A., Toghyani, M., 2020. Effects of dietary lavender essential oil on growth performance, intestinal function, and antioxidant status of broiler chickens. Livest. Sci. 233, 103958.
- Barbarestani, S.Y., Samadi, F., Hassani, S., Asadi, G., 2017. Effects of encapsulated nano-and microparticles of peppermint (*Mentha piperita*) alcoholic extract on the growth performance, blood parameters and immune function of broilers under heat stress condition. Irani. J. Appl. Anim. Sci. 7, 669-677.
- Basit, M.A., Kadir, A.A., Loh, T.C., Abdul Aziz, S., Salleh, A., Zakaria, Z.A., Idris, S.B., 2020. Comparative efficacy of selected phytobiotics with halquinol and tetracycline on gut morphology, ileal digestibility, cecal microbiota composition and growth performance in broiler chickens. Animals. 10, 2150.
- Baskara, A.P., Ariyadi, B., Dono, N.D., Martien, R., Zuprizal, Z., 2020. Effect of self-nanoemulsifying drug delivery system (SNEDDS) of cinnamon bark essential oil on broiler chicken performance. Livest. Res. Rural Dev. 32, 91.
- Cipriani, A., Higgins, J.P., Geddes, J.R., Salanti, G., 2013. Conceptual and technical challenges in network meta-analysis. Ann. Intern. Med. 159, 130-137.
- Correa-Pacheco, Z.N., Bautista-Baños, S., de Lorena Ramos-García, M., del Carmen Martínez-González, M., Hernández-Romano, J., 2019. Physicochemical characterization and antimicrobial activity of edible propolis-chitosan nanoparticle films. Prog. Org. Coat. 137, 105326.
- Coyne, L., Arief, R., Benigno, C., Giang, V.N., Huong, L.Q., Jeamsripong, S., Kalpravidh, W., McGrane, J., Padungtod, P., Patrick, I., Schoonman, L., 2019. Characterizing antimicrobial use in the livestock sector in three South East Asian countries (Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam). Antibiotics. 8, 33.
- Das, S., Gazdag, Z., Szente, L., Meggyes, M., Horváth, G., Lemli, B., Kunsági-Máté, S., Kuzma, M., Kőszegi, T., 2019. Antioxidant and antimicrobial properties of randomly methylated β cyclodextrin–captured essential oils. Food Chem. 278, 305-313.
- Davis, G.S., Waits, K., Nordstrom, L., Grande, H., Weaver, B., Papp, K., Horwinski, J., Koch, B., Hungate, B.A., Liu, C.M., Price, L.B., 2018. Antibiotic-resistant *Escherichia coli* from retail poultry meat with different antibiotic use claims. BMC Microbiol. 18, 1-7.
- Deminicis, R.G.d.S., Meneghetti, C., de Oliveira, E.B., Júnior, A.A.P.G., Farias Filho, R.V., Deminicis, B.B., 2021. Systematic review of the use of phytobiotics in broiler nutrition. Rev. Ciênc. Agrovet. 20, 98-106.
- Dittoe, D.K., Ricke, S.C., Kiess, A.S., 2018. Organic acids and potential for modifying the avian gastrointestinal tract and reducing pathogens and disease. Front. Vet. Sci. 5, 216.
- Edi, D.N., Habsari, I.K., Andri, F., 2018. Effects of supplementing Mojosari ducks diet with fish oil or fish oil in combination with tomato powder on hatching egg quality during storage. Livest. Res. Rural Dev. 30, 29.
- El-Gogary, M.R., El-Khateeb, A.Y., Megahed, A.M., 2019. Effect of physiological and chemical nano garlic supplementation on broiler chickens. Plant Arch., 19, 695-705.
- Fan, Y., Yi, J., Zhang, Y., Yokoyama, W., 2017. Improved chemical stability and antiproliferative activities of curcumin-loaded nanoparticles with a chitosan chlorogenic acid conjugate. J. Agric. Food Chem. 65, 10812-10819.
- Fancher, C.A., Zhang, L., Kiess, A.S., Adhikari, P.A., Dinh, T.T., Sukumaran, A.T., 2020. Avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* and *Clostridium perfringens*: challenges in no antibiotics ever broiler production and potential solutions. Microorganisms 8, 1533.
- Feye, K.M., Baxter, M.F.A., Tellez-Isaias, G., Kogut, M.H., Ricke, S.C., 2020. Influential factors on the composition of the conventionally raised broiler gastrointestinal microbiomes. Poult. Sci. 99, 653-659.
- Filazi, A., Yurdakok-Dikmen, B., 2019. Nutraceuticals in poultry health and disease. In: Nutraceuticals in Veterinary Medicine. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 661-672.
- Gheisar, M.M., Kim, I.H., 2018. Phytobiotics in poultry and swine nutrition–a review. Ital. J. Anim. Sci. 17, 92-99.
- Greig, J.D., Waddell, L., Wilhelm, B., Wilkins, W., Bucher, O., Parker, S., Rajić, A., 2012. The efficacy of interventions applied during primary processing on contamination of beef carcasses with

Escherichia coli: A systematic review-meta-analysis of the published research. Food Control. 27, 385-397.

- Gurevitch, J., Koricheva, J., Nakagawa, S., Stewart, G., 2018. Metaanalysis and the science of research synthesis. Nature 555, 175-182.
- Haque, A.R., Sarker, M., Das, R., Azad, M.A.K., Hasan, M.M., 2021. A review on antibiotic residue in foodstuffs from animal source: global health risk and alternatives. Int. J. Environ. Anal. Chem. https://doi.org/10.1080/03067319.2021.1912334
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T., Ebert, D.D., 2019. dmetar: Companion R Package For The Guide 'Doing Meta-Analysis in R'. R package version 0.0.9000. http://dmetar.protectlab.org/ (accessed May 5, 2021).
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T.A., Ebert, D.D., 2021. Doing Meta-Analysis with R: A Hands-On Guide. Chapmann & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL and London. ISBN 978-0-367-61007-4.
- Heidary, M., Hassanabadi, A., Mohebalian, H., 2020. Effects of in ovo injection of nanocurcumin and vitamin E on antioxidant status, immune responses, intestinal morphology and growth performance of broiler chickens exposed to heat stress. J. Livest. Sci. Technol. 8, 17-27.
- Hidayat, C., Sumiati, S., Jayanegara, A., Wina, E., 2021. Supplementation of dietary nano Zn-phytogenic on performance, antioxidant activity, and population of intestinal pathogenic bacteria in broiler chickens. Trop. Anim. Sci. J. 44, 90-99.
- Ibrahim, D., Abdelfattah-Hassan, A., Badawi, M., Ismail, T.A., Bendary, M.M., Abdelaziz, A.M., Mosbah, R.A., Mohamed, D.I., Arisha, A.H., Abd El-Hamid, M.I., 2021. Thymol nanoemulsion promoted broiler chicken's growth, gastrointestinal barrier and bacterial community and conferred protection against Salmonella Typhimurium. Sci. Rep. 11, 1-20.
- Irawan, A., Hidayat, C., Jayanegara, A., Ratriyanto, A., 2020. Essential oils as growth-promoting additives on performance, nutrient digestibility, cecal microbes, and serum metabolites of broiler chickens: A meta-analysis. Anim. Biosci. https://doi.org/ 10.5713/ab.20.0668
- Kiczorowska, B., Samolińska, W., Al-Yasiry, A.R.M., Kiczorowski, P., Winiarska-Mieczan, A., 2017. The natural feed additives as immunostimulants in monogastric animal nutrition-a review. Ann. Anim. Sci. 17, 605.
- Kikusato, M., 2021. Phytobiotics to improve health and production of broiler chickens: functions beyond the antioxidant activity. Anim. Biosci. 34, 345.
- Kothari, D., Lee, W.D., Niu, K.M., Kim, S.K., 2019. The genus Allium as poultry feed additive: A review. Animals. 9, 1032.
- Lee, K.H., Lee, J.S., Kim, E.S., Lee, H.G., 2019. Preparation, characterization, and food application of rosemary extract-loaded antimicrobial nanoparticle dispersions. LWT. 101, 138-144.
- Meimandipour, A., Emamzadeh, A.N., Soleimani, A., 2017. Effects of nanoencapsulated aloe vera, dill and nettle root extract as feed antibiotic substitutes in broiler chickens. Arch. Anim. Breed. 60, 1-7.
- Mohamed, R.I., Mosaad, G.M., Abd El-wahab, H.Y., 2018. Effect of feeding propolis on growth performance of broilers. J. Adv. Vet. Res. 8, 66-72.
- Mohamed, S.H., Attia, A.I., Reda, F.M., Abd El-Hack, M.E., Ismail, I.E., 2021. Impacts of dietary supplementation of Boswellia serrata on growth, nutrients digestibility, immunity, antioxidant status, carcase traits and caecum microbiota of broilers. Ital. J. Anim. Sci. 20, 205-214.
- Nouri, A., 2019. Chitosan nano-encapsulation improves the effects of mint, thyme, and cinnamon essential oils in broiler chickens. Br. Poult. Sci. 60, 530-538.
- Ogbuewu, I.P., Mbajiorgu, C.A., 2020. Meta-analysis of the effect of ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) on health status, production indices and semen quality in chickens. Agric. Res. 9, 640-651.
- Ogbuewu, I.P., Okoro, V.M., Mbajiorgu, C.A., 2020a. Meta-analysis of the influence of phytobiotic (pepper) supplementation in broiler chicken performance. Trop. Anim. Health Prod. 52, 17-30.
- Ogbuewu, I.P., Okoro, V.M., Mbajiorgu, C.A., 2020b. Probiotic-yeast improves performance indicators in broiler chickens: evidence from meta-analysis. Appl. Ecol. Environ. Res. 18, 2823-2843.
- Ogbuewu, I.P., Okoro, V.M., Mbajiorgu, C.A., 2021. Meta-analysis of the responses of laying hens to garlic (*Allium sativum*) supplementation. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 275, 114866.

Olukosi, O.A., Dono, N.D., 2014. Modification of digesta pH and in-

testinal morphology with the use of benzoic acid or phytobiotics and the effects on broiler chicken growth performance and energy and nutrient utilization. J. Anim. Sci. 92, 3945-3953.

- Omar, A.E., Al-Khalaifah, H.S., Mohamed, W.A., Gharib, H.S., Osman, A., Al-Gabri, N.A., Amer, S.A., 2020. Effects of phenolic-rich onion (*Allium cepa* L.) extract on the growth performance, behavior, intestinal histology, amino acid digestibility, antioxidant activity, and the immune status of broiler chickens. Front. Vet. Sci. 7, 728.
- Ong, T.H., Chitra, E., Ramamurthy, S., Siddalingam, R.P., Yuen, K.H., Ambu, S.P., Davamani, F., 2017. Chitosan-propolis nanoparticle formulation demonstrates anti-bacterial activity against Enterococcus faecalis biofilms. PloS One. 12, e0174888.
- Osama, E., El-Sheikh, S.M., Khairy, M.H., Galal, A.A., 2020. Nanoparticles and their potential applications in veterinary medicine. J. Adv. Vet. Res. 10, 268-273.
- Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C., Mulrow, C.D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J.M., Akl, E.A., Brennan, S.E., Chou, R., 2021. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 372, n71.
- Park, H.R., Rho, S.J., Kim, Y.R., 2019. Solubility, stability, and bioaccessibility improvement of curcumin encapsulated using 4-α-glucanotransferase-modified rice starch with reversible pH-induced aggregation property. Food Hydrocoll. 95, 19-32.
- Pliego, A.B., Tavakoli, M., Khusro, A., Seidavi, A., Elghandour, M.M., Salem, A.Z., Márquez-Molina, O., Rene Rivas-Caceres, R., 2020. Beneficial and adverse effects of medicinal plants as feed supplements in poultry nutrition: A review. Anim. Biotechnol. https://doi.org/10.1080/10495398.2020.1798973
- Prakash, A., Baskaran, R., Paramasivam, N., Vadivel, V., 2018. Essential oil based nanoemulsions to improve the microbial quality of minimally processed fruits and vegetables: A review. Food Res. Int. 111, 509-523.
- Prihambodo, T.R., Sholikin, M.M., Qomariyah, N., Jayanegara, A., Batubara, I., Utomo, D.B., Nahrowi, N., 2021. Effects of dietary flavonoids on performance, blood constituents, carcass composition and small intestinal morphology of broilers: a metaanalysis. Anim. Biosci. 34, 434.
- Purwanti, S., Zuprizal, Z., Yuwanta, T., Soepadmo, S., 2015. Phytobiotic utilization as feed additive in feed for pancreatic enzyme activity of broiler chicken. Anim. Prod. 17, 154-160.
- R Core Team. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/ (accessed May 5, 2021).
- Rahmani, M., Golian, A., Kermanshahi, H., Bassami, M.R., 2017. Effects of curcumin and nanocurcumin on growth performance, blood gas indices and ascites mortalities of broiler chickens reared under normal and cold stress conditions. Ital. J. Anim. Sci. 16, 438-446.
- Reda, F.M., El-Saadony, M.T., Elnesr, S.S., Alagawany, M., Tufarelli, V., 2020. Effect of dietary supplementation of biological curcumin nanoparticles on growth and carcass traits, antioxidant status, immunity and caecal microbiota of Japanese quails. Animals. 10, 754.
- Reyes-Jurado, F., Navarro-Cruz, A.R., Ochoa-Velasco, C.E., Palou, E., López-Malo, A., Ávila-Sosa, R., 2020. Essential oils in vapor phase as alternative antimicrobials: A review. Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nut. 60, 1641-1650.
- Roth, N., Käsbohrer, A., Mayrhofer, S., Zitz, U., Hofacre, C., Domig, K.J., 2019. The application of antibiotics in broiler production and the resulting antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli*: A global overview. Poult. Sci. 98, 1791-1804.
- Sahyon, H.A., Al-Harbi, S.A., 2020. Antimicrobial, anticancer and antioxidant activities of nano-heart of Phoenix dactylifera tree extract loaded chitosan nanoparticles: In vitro and in vivo study. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 160, 1230-1241.
- Salehi, F., Behboudi, H., Kavoosi, G., Ardestani, S.K., 2020. Incorporation of Zataria multiflora essential oil into chitosan biopolymer nanoparticles: A nanoemulsion based delivery system to improve the in-vitro efficacy, stability and anticancer activity of ZEO against breast cancer cells. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 143, 382-392.
- Sharifi, S., Fathi, N., Memar, M.Y., Hosseiniyan Khatibi, S.M., Khalilov, R., Negahdari, R., Zununi Vahed, S., Maleki Dizaj, S., 2020. Anti-microbial activity of curcumin nanoformulations: New trends and future perspectives. Phytother. Res. 34, 1926-1946.

- Shetta, A., Kegere, J., Mamdouh, W., 2019. Comparative study of encapsulated peppermint and green tea essential oils in chitosan nanoparticles: Encapsulation, thermal stability, in-vitro release, antioxidant and antibacterial activities. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 126, 731-742.
- Song, Z.H., Cheng, K., Zheng, X.C., Ahmad, H., Zhang, L.L., Wang, T., 2018. Effects of dietary supplementation with enzymatically treated Artemisia annua on growth performance, intestinal morphology, digestive enzyme activities, immunity, and antioxidant capacity of heat-stressed broilers. Poult. Sci. 97, 430-437.
- Sugiharto, S., 2016. Role of nutraceuticals in gut health and growth performance of poultry. J. Saudi Soc. Agric. Sci. 15, 99-111.
- Sugiharto, S., 2020. The potentials of two underutilized acidic fruits (Averrhoa bilimbi L. and Phyllanthus acidus L.) as phytobiotics for broiler chickens. J. Adv. Vet. Res. 10, 179-185.
- Sundari, Zuprizal, Yuwanta, T., Martien, R., 2014. Effect of nanocapsule level on broiler performance and fat deposition. Int. J. Poult. Sci. 13, 31-35.
- Tang, D., Wu, J., Jiao, H., Wang, X., Zhao, J., Lin, H., 2019. The development of antioxidant system in the intestinal tract of broiler chickens. Poult. Sci. 98, 664-678.
- Ur Rahman, S., Khan, S., Chand, N., Sadique, U., Khan, R.U., 2017. In vivo effects of Allium cepa L. on the selected gut microflora and intestinal histomorphology in broiler. Acta Histochem. 119, 446-450.

- Valdivieso-Ugarte, M., Gomez-Llorente, C., Plaza-Díaz, J., Gil, Á., 2019. Antimicrobial, antioxidant, and immunomodulatory properties of essential oils: A systematic review. Nutrients. 11, 2786.
- Viechtbauer, W., 2010. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metaphor package. J. Stat. Softw. 36, 1-48.
- Yang, Y., Ashworth, A.J., Willett, C., Cook, K., Upadhyay, A., Owens, P.R., Ricke, S.C., DeBruyn, J.M., Moore Jr, P.A., 2019. Review of antibiotic resistance, ecology, dissemination, and mitigation in US broiler poultry systems. Front. Microbiol. 10, 2639.
- Yashin, A., Yashin, Y., Xia, X., Nemzer, B., 2017. Antioxidant activity of spices and their impact on human health: A review. Antioxidants. 6, 70.
- Younessi, N., Safari Sinegani, A.A., Khodakaramian, G., 2020. Comparison of antibiotic resistance of coliforms and *Escherichia coli* strains in industrial and antimicrobial-free poultry manure. Arch. Agron. Soil Sci. https://doi.org/10.1080/036503 40.2020.1831692
- Zeng, Z., Zhang, S., Wang, H., Piao, X., 2015. Essential oil and aromatic plants as feed additives in non-ruminant nutrition: a review. J. Anim. Sci. Biotechnol. 6, 7.