

4 **INVESTIGATION OF GASTROINTESTINAL PARASITES OF LOCAL CHICKENS**
5 **(*Gallus domesticus*) IN UGEP, YAKURR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, CROSS**
6 **RIVER STATE, NIGERIA.**
7
8
9

10 **ABSTRACT**

11 **Background:** Investigation of gastrointestinal parasites of local chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) was
12 conducted in four council wards of Ugep in Yakurr Local Government Area, between October
13 2017 and June 2018.

14 **Aim:** The aim of this study was to investigate the parasitic load of male and female scavenging
15 chickens.

16 **Materials and methods:** Digestive tracts of scavenging chickens were obtained and processed
17 by parasitological means.

18 **Results:** From a total of 320 local scavenging chickens examined 240 (75.0%) were parasitized
19 by helminthes. Out of the 180 male and 140 female chickens examined, 75 (52.8%) and 120
20 (85.7%) were positive for helminth parasite eggs respectively. There was statistical significant
21 difference ($p < 0.05$) in the prevalence of helminth parasites between male and female chicken.
22 A total of 12 helminth parasite species were recovered in this study, comprising of 7 nematodes
23 and 5 cestodes.

24 **Conclusion:** The high prevalence of helminth parasites among local chickens was attributable to
25 lack of periodic deworming and climatic factors. Local breeds are tastier than exotic breeds and
26 people prefer them more than exotic ones during Christmas celebrations. Occasional deworming
27 exercise is advocated to reduce their worm burden and zoonotic infection.

28

29 **Key words:** Gastrointestinal, helminthes, Local chickens, Ugep, Yakurr

30

31 **INTRODUCTION**

32 In Nigeria, every household owns some form of poultry, but majority of the birds are
33 unimproved local types which are kept mainly as scavengers and managed under the open range
34 system (Ogbaje et al., 2012). An average of 5 to 100 birds per household are kept extensively
35 with little financial or labour input (Mukaratirwa et. al., 2001). They can thrive under adverse
36 conditions, such as poor management, diseases, lack of feeding and parasites, which might cause
37 low productivity (Ohaeri & Okwum, 2013; Akinwumi et al., 1979). Besides being an important
38 source of income and cheap protein to the village/rural people, the free-range poultry is an
39 integral part of village life and has an important social value (Ikpi and Akinwumi, 1981; Ogbaje
40 et al., 2012; Ohaeri & Okwum, 2013). There has been a lot of emphasis placed on modern
41 poultry production using exotic breeds of chicken in Nigeria (Yoriyo et. al., 2008). However,
42 since the inception of commercial poultry in 1956 in Nigeria to bridge the protein deficiency gap,
43 it has been bedeviled by so many problems (Ikpi & Akinwumi, 1981). Helminthiasis was
44 considered to be an important problem of local chicken and helminth parasites have been
45 incriminated as a major cause of ill-health and loss of productivity in different parts of Nigeria
46 (fakae & Paul-Abiade, 2003). Parasitism is one of the major problems which inflict heavy
47 economic loses to the poultry in the form of retard growth, reduced weight gain, emaciation,
48 decreased egg production, diarrhea, obstruction of intestine, poor feathers, anaemia, paralysis,
49 catarrh, morbidity and mortality (Dube et. al., 2010; Sofi et. al., 2016; Nair & Nadakal, 1981;
50 Fatihu et. al., 1991). Despite information on helminthiasis of birds in northern and southern parts
51 of Nigeria (Fatihu et. al., 1991; Riise et. al., 2004), there is paucity of information on infection of

52 indigenous fowl in Cross River State, especially in Ugep. However, in studies by Ruff (1999),
53 100% of rural scavenging chickens examined in Cross River Nigeria were positive for one or
54 more helminthes parasites. Various studies have reported a wide range of helminthes distribution
55 worldwide (Sofi et. al., 2016 40.14 % in Gurez valley of Jammu and Kashmir, India; Ebrahim et.
56 al., 2015 34.8% in Khorramabad, West India; Idika et. al., 2016 96.8% in Nsukka, Nigeria;
57 Mukaratirwa et. al., 2001 64.8% and 64.1% of different species in Zimbzbwe and Adang et. al.,
58 2014 63.3% in Gombe, Nigeria. Despite much work on helminthiasis on scavenging chickens in
59 other parts of the world and Nigeria in particular, there is scarce information on helminth
60 infection of local scavenging chickens in Ugep, Yakurr Local GovernmentArea of Cross River
61 State, Nigeria. The aim of this study is to determine the prevalence of helminthes species in
62 male and female local scavenging chickens in Ugep, Cross River State, Nigeria.

63 **2. Materials and methods**

64 **2.1 The study area.**

65 This study was conducted in four council wards of Ugep, in Yakurr Local Government Area.
66
67 Ugep is one of the largest native towns in Eastern Nigeria, and people of all works of life are
68 resident here, and therefore high demand for poultry products. Ugep lies between latitudes 4^0 and
69 6^0 north of the equator and longitudes 6^0 and 8^0 East of the Greenwich Meridian. The area is in
70 the equatorial rainforest of Nigeria. Subsistence farming is the main occupation of farmers.
71 Household practice local poultry farming with a range of 2 to 40 local scavenge chickens per
72 household.

73 **Sample collection**

74 Digestive tracts of 320 local scavenging chickens were collected from four council wards of
75
76 Ugep in Yakurr Local Government Area between October 2017 and June 2018. These digestive
77

78 tracts were put into labeled plastic vials indicating council ward and sex of the chicken, before
79 transportation to the parasitological laboratory of Cross River University of Technology,
80 Calabar, for processing.

81 **Isolation and identification of parasites.**

82
83 The digestive tract of each chicken was separated by ligation into oesophagus, crop,
84 proventriculus, gizzard, small and large intestines and caecum. Each section was slit open in a
85 separate petri dish, and the content washed thoroughly under running tap water over a 200µm
86 sieve. The mucosae surfaces were rubbed between fingers to remove any parasites on the surface
87 (Fatihu et. al., 1991). Examination of samples for eggs of helminthes was based on the floatation
88 technique (Soulsby, 1982). The preparations were examined under the microscope using x10 and
89 x40 magnifications.

90 **Data analysis**

91
92 Chi-square test (χ^2) was used to compare infection between male and female chickens and
93 council wards.

94 **Results**

95 From a total of 320 local scavenging chickens examined 240 (75.0%) were parasitized by
96 helminthes, comprising of nematodes 155 (48.4%) and cestodes 85 (26.6%) ((Table 1).

97 Table 1. Overall prevalence of helminth eggs.

Parasites	Chickens examined	Parasites recovered	% infection
Nematodes	190	155	48.4%
Cestodes	130	85	26.6%
Total	320	240	75.0%

100 Table 2. Prevalence of helminth egg infection according to sex

Sex	Number examined	Number positive	% prevalence
Male	180	95	52.8
Female	140	120	85.7

101

102 Table 2 reveals prevalence of infection of helminthes according to sex. Out of 180 male and 140
 103 female chickens examined, 95(52.8%) males and 120 (85.7%) females were positive for
 104 helminthes parasites. There was statistical significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in the prevalence of
 105 helminthes between male and female scavenging chickens.

106 In table 3, the number of local scavenging chickens infected, the preferred site of infection and
 107 the council wards are shown. A total of seven (7) species of nematodes and five (5) species of
 108 cestodes were recorded from the various sections of the digestive tracts. Of the 214 local
 109 chickens infected with helminthes, 62 (19,4%) were *Ascaridia galli*, 28 (8.8%) *Heterakis*
 110 *gallinarum*, 11 (3.4%) *Gongylonema congolense*, 25 (7.0%) each for *Tetrameres ameriana* and
 111 *Subulura brumpi*, 24 (7.5%) *Cheilospirura haamulosa*, 14 (4.4%) *Capillaria contorta*, 7 (2.2%)
 112 *Choanotaenia infundulum*, 19 (5.9%) *Raillietina echinobothrida*, 6 (1.9%) *Reillietina tetragonia*,
 113 14 (4.4%) *Hymenoslepis cantaniana* and 5 (1.6%) *Hymenolepis carioca* (Table 3). The most
 114 frequently encountered nematode was *Ascarida galli* in the intestine, while the least was
 115 *Gongylonema congolense* in the crop. Nematodes were prevalent in all sections of the digestive
 116 tract. Cestodes prevalence was restricted to the small intestine and duodenum.

117 Prevalence of helminthes in the four council wards revealed that 88 local scavenging chickens in
 118 Ijom ward were infected by ten species of helminthes. In Bikobiko, Ijiman, and Ikpakapit wards

119 41, 76, and 35 scavenging chickens were parasitized by 7, 6, and 7 species of helminthes
 120 respectively (Table 3).

121 Table 3. No of scavenging chickens infected and site of helminth recovery according to council
 122 wards

Species	Site of recovery	Council Wards				Overall Infection
		Ijom N = 120	Bikobiko N = 65	Ijiman N = 80	Ikpakapit N = 50	
<i>Ascarida galli</i>	Small intestine	22 (18.3)	15 (23.1)	19 (23.8)	6 (12.0)	62 (19.4)
<i>Heterakis gallinarum</i>	Caecum	12 (10.0)	9 (13.8)	0	7 (14.0)	28 (8.8)
<i>Congylyonema congolense</i>	Crop	2 (1.7)	4 (6.2)	0	5 (10.0)	11 (3.4)
<i>Tetrameres americana</i>	Proventriculus	10 (8.3)	0	15 (8.8)	0	25 (7.8)
<i>Subulura brumpti</i>	Caecum	9 (7.5)	0	12 (15.0)	4 (8.0)	25 (7.8)
<i>Cheilospirura hamulosa</i>	Gizzard	5 (4.2)	0	13 (16.3)	6 (12.0)	24 (7.5)
<i>Capillaria contorta</i>	Oesophagus	6 (5.0)	5 (7.7)	0	3 (6.0)	14 (4.4)
Cestodes						
<i>Choanotaenia infundulum</i>	Small intestine	4 (3.3)	3 (4.6)	0	0	7 (2.2)
<i>Reillietina echinobothrida</i>	Small intestine	7 (5.8)	0	12 (15.0)	0	19 (5.9)
<i>Reillietina tetragona</i>	Small intestine	0	2 (3.1)	0	4 (8.0)	6 (1.9)
<i>Hymenolepis cantaniana</i>	Duodenum	11 (9.2)	3 (4.6)	0	0	14 (4.4)
<i>Hymenolepis carioca</i>	Duodenum	0	0	5 (6.3)	0	5 (1.6)
Total number of chickens		88	41	76	35	240
Total species			7	6	7	

123

124 **Discussion**

125 This study revealed that local chicken breed by households in Ugep are heavily parasitized by
126 two classes of helminthes, namely nematodes and cestodes. Similar findings have been reported
127 earlier by different researchers in Africa (Fatihu et. al., 1991; Mukaratirwa and Khumalo, 2010;
128 Idika et. al., 2016; Beruktayet and Marsha, 2016).

129 The overall prevalence of helminthes infection (75.0%) recorded in this study is in
130 agreement with 76.1% reported by Ogbaje et.al., (2012) in Markurdi Township, Benue State,
131 Nigeria. The reported 75.0% prevalence of helminth infection in this study revealed a relative
132 decrease from previously observed prevalence of 100% by Ruff (1999), 95.2% by Fatihu et. al.,
133 (1991), 90.0% by Fabiyi (1972) and 96.8% by Idiki et. al., 2016). The decrease prevalence is
134 attributable to the level of proper management information to most local chicken breeders as
135 earlier reported by Ogbaje et. al., (2012). Domestic chickens have indiscriminate scavenging
136 behavior of seeking food from diverse diets containing infective stages of helminth parasites,
137 which predisposes them to parasitic infections (Smyth, 1976). This gives a clue for the high
138 prevalence rate observed in free-range chickens in this study. The result is in consonance with
139 previous reported work (Permin et. al., 1997, Abubakar and Garba, 2000, and Luka and Ndams,
140 2007). From this study, nematodes have a higher prevalence rate of 48.4% with *Ascaridia galli*
141 having a very reasonable prevalence of 19.4 compared with cestodes having a prevalence of
142 26.6%. This finding buttress the report of several studies (Berhanu et. al., (2010), Beruktayet
143 and Marsha (2016), Ohaeri and Okwum (2013) and Yoriyo et. a., (2008), who agreed that
144 nematodes are always higher in prevalence than cestodes. They reasoned that nematodes do not
145 require intermediate hosts and thus transmitted directly from the soil, while cestodes
146 transmission is dependent on the availability of intermediate hosts.

147 *Ascaridia galli* showed the highest infection rate in this study. This high rate of infection may be
148 due to moist environmental factors around the study area which has enhanced larval
149 development and subsequent transmission (Kenndy, 1975; Audu et. al., 2004). This study
150 reported a higher prevalence rate of helminthes infection in female scavenging chickens (85.7%)
151 than males (52.8%). Explanation to this difference in infection could be that because female
152 chickens dissipates much energy during egg production and incubation, it induces their voracious
153 and indiscriminate feeding habit on diverse diets containing infective stages of the parasites. But
154 male chickens are selective and therefore less infected than females. This observation is in line
155 with the report of Matur et. al., (2010) and Uhuo et. al., (2013), but in sharp contrast with that of
156 Yoriyo et. al., (2008). Nematode parasites were found in all the sections of the digestive tracts,
157 with *Ascaridia galli* frequently encountered in the small intestine. This finding is in agreement
158 with the report of Fatihu et. al., (1991) & Ohaeri and Okwum (2013). The small intestine and
159 duodenum harboured all the cestodes encountered in this study. The reason for their occupation
160 of these sections of the digestive tracts is to acquire the available food nutrients here. This
161 observation conforms to Smyth (1976) who posited that it was to complement their physiological
162 osmotic feeding nature. The overall prevalence of helminth parasites of scavenging chickens
163 showed a significant statistical difference ($p < 0.001$) between council wards. This could be due
164 to variation in climatic factors such as soil moisture and humidity in the council wards, which
165 facilitate development and subsequent transmission. This finding is similar to several studies
166 (Buriro et. al., 1992; Kenndy, 1975; Audu et. al., 2004).

167 **CONCLUSION**

168 In conclusion, this study revealed that local chickens breed from the four council wards of Ugep
169 are heavily parasitized by two classes of helminth parasites, namely nematodes and cestodes. A

170 total of twelve (12) helminth parasites were recovered during the study, that is, seven nematodes
171 and five cestodes. The high prevalence of helminth parasites in the study area is not unconnected
172 with climatic factors and lack of occasional deworming. Periodic deworming of local
173 scavenging chickens to reduce their worm burden is highly recommended.

174 **Conflict of interest.**

175 There was no financial or material contribution by any organization for this investigation, and
176 therefore no conflict of interest.

177 **References**

- 178
- 179 Ogbaje CI, Agbo EO, Ajanus OJ. Prevalence of *Ascaridia galli*, *Heterakis gallinarum* and
180 Tapeworm infections in Birds slaughtered in Markurdi Township. Inter J Poultry Sci. 2012; 11
181 (2): 103 – 107.
- 182 Mukaratirwa S, Hove T, Esmann JB, Hoj CJ, Permin A, Nansen P. A survey of parasitic
183 nematode infections of chickens in rural Zimbabwe. Onderstepoort J Vet Res. 2001; 68: 183 –
184 186.
- 185 Ohaeri CC, Okwum C. Helminthic parasites of domestic fowls in Ikwuano, Abia State Nigeria. J
186 Natural Sci Res. 2013; 3 (11): 2013
- 187 Akinwumi JA, Adegeje AJ, Olayide SO, Ikpi AE. Report on economic analysis of Poultry.
188 Federal Livestock Department Magazine, Lagos. 1979.
- 189 Ikpi A, Akinwumi JA. The future of the poultry industry in Nigeria. 1956; 37 (1): 39 – 43.
- 190 Yoriyo KP, Adang KL, Fabiyi JP, Adamu SU. Helminthes parasites of local chickens in Bauchi
191 State, Nigeria. Sci World J. 2008; 3(3): 35 – 37.
- 192 Fadae BB, Paul-Abiade CU. (2003). Rainy season period prevalence of helminthes in domestic
193 fowl (*Gallus gallus*) in Nsukka, Eastern Nigeria. Nig Vet J. 24(1): 21 – 27.
- 194 Dube S, Zindi P, Mbanga J, Dube C. A study of scavenging Poultry gastrointestinal and ecto-
195 parasites in rural areas of Matebelel Province, Zimbabwe. Department of Applied Biology and
196 biochemistry, Natural University of Science and Technology, Bulawayo. Inter J Poultry Sci.
197 2010; 9 (9): 911- 915.
- 198 Sifi TA, Ahmad F, Sheikh BA. Morphology and prevalence of helminth parasites in *Gallus*
199 *domesticus* from Gurer Valley of Jammu and Kashmir. India J fisheries Livest Prod. 2016; 4:
200 159. Doi: 10.4172/2332-2608.1000159

- 201 Nair KV, Nadakal AM. Haematological changes in domestic fowl infected with cestode
202 *Rallietina tetragona*. Vet Parasitol. 1981; 8: 49 – 59.
- 203 Fatihu MY, Ogbogu ZC, Njoku CO, Saror DI. Comparitive studies of gastrointestinal helminths
204 of poultry in Zaria, Nigeria. Revue D'Elelevage et de Medecin veterinaire des pays Troicavx,
205 1991 ; 44 : 175 -177.
- 206 Ruff KD. "Important parasites in poultry production systems." Vet Parasitol. 1999; 84(3-4) : 337
207 – 347.
- 208 Riise JC, Permin A, McAinsh C, Frederiksen L. Keeping village poultry. A technical manual on
209 small scale poultry production. Network for smallholder poultry development. Denmark. 2004.
- 210 Ebrahim B, Behrouz E, Mehdi A, Masoud B. First report of birds infection by intestinal parasites
211 in Khorram abad, West Iran. J Paraitol dis. 2015; 39(4): 720 – 724.
- 212 Idika IK, Obi CF, Ezeh IO, Iheagwam CN, Njoko IN, Nwosu CO. Gastrointestinal helminth
213 parasites of local chickens from selected communities in Nsukka region of South Eastern
214 Nigeria. J Parasitol. dis. 2016; 40(4): 1376 – 1380. Doi: 10.1007/s12639-015-0694-9.
- 215 Soulsby E JL. Helminths, Arthropods, Protozoans of domesticated animals. 7th edition. Lea and
216 Febiger, Philadelphia, Pa. USA. 1982.
- 217 Calnek BW, Barnes HJ, Beard CU, McDougald LR, Saif YM. Diseases of Poultry. Ames. Iowa:
218 Iowa State University Press. 1997; pp. 1 – 1080.
- 219 Ruff MD. Nematodes and Acanthocephalans. In: Diseases of poultry .Eds. M.B. Hofsafts J,
220 Barnes BW, Calnek BW, Reid WM, Yoder HW. Ames. Iowa State University Press. 1984.
- 221 Beruktayet W, Mersha C. Study on gastrointestinal helminthes of Scavenging chickens in
222 Hawassa and Shashemene Towns. British J Poultry Sci. 2016; 5(3): 32 – 42.
- 223 Mukaretiwa S, Khumalo MP. Prevalence of helminth parasites in free-range chickens from
224 selected rural communities in Kwazulu-Natal province of South Africa. J South African Vet
225 Assoc. 2010; 81(2): 97 – 101.
- 226 Fabiyi JP. Incidence of the helminth parasites of the domestic fowl in the Vom Area of Benue of
227 Benue – Plateau State, Nigeria. Bull. Epizo. Dis. Afri. 1972; 20: 229 – 233.
- 228 Smyth JD. Introduction to animal parasites. 2nd Edn., Hazzel Watson and Viney Limited.
229 Aylesbury bucks. 1976.
- 230 Permin A, Magwisha H, Kassuku AA, Nansen P, Bissqaard M, Frandsn F, etc. A cross-sectional
231 study of helminth in rural scavenging poultry in Tanzania in relation to season and climate. J
232 helminthology. 1997; 71: 233 -240.
- 233 Abubakar U, Garba HS. Prevalence of helminth parasites of Gallus gallus slaughtered at Sokoto
234 Central Market. J Vet Sci. 2000; 2: 11 – 13.
- 235 Luka SA, Ndams IS. Gastrointestinal parasites of domestic chickens *Gallus gallus domesticus*
236 Linnaeus. 1758 in Samaru, Zaria, Nigeria. Sci World J. 2007; 2(1: 27 – 29.

- 237 Berhanu M, Haileyesus D, Desie S. Gastrointestinal helminth of scavenging chickens in out
238 stricts of Hawassa, Southern Ethiopia. *Global Veterinaria*. 2014; 12(4): 557 – 561.
- 239 Kenndy CR. *Ecological Animal Parasitology*. Blackwell Scientific Publications. Oxford,
240 London. Edinburgh, Melbourne. 1975.
- 241 Audu PA, Oniye SJ, Okechuckwu PU. Helminth parasites of domesticated pigeons
242 (*Columbalivia domestica*) in Zaria. *Nig. J Pest Dis. Vector Mgt*. 2004; 5: 356 – 360.
- 243 Matur B, Dawam N, Malann, Y. Gastrointestinal helminth parasites of local and exotic chickens
244 slaughtered in Gwagwalada, Abuja, Nigeria. *New York Sci J*. 2010; 3(5): 96 – 99.
- 245 Uhuo AC, Okafor FC, Odikamnoroo OO, Onwe CS, Abarike MC, Elom JN. Common
246 gastrointestinal parasites of local chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) slaughtered in some selected
247 eatery centres in Abakaliki, Ebony State: "Implicationfor meat quality." *Inter J development and*
248 *sustainability*. 2013; 2(2): 1416 – 1422.
- 249 Buriro SN, Wagan MN, Kumbhar MI. Incidence of helminth parasites in poultry. *Parkistan Vet*
250 *J*. 1992; 12: 25 – 27.

251
252
253
254
255
256

UNDER PEER REVIEW