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ABSTRACT This study was to determine the effects of rapeseed oil on production performance, egg quality, and serum parameters in laying hens. A total of 1,080 hens (33-wk-old) were randomly divided into a 1 plus 4 × 2 factorial design including four different rapeseed oil sources [high erucic acid of Mianyang city (MH); high erucic acid of Deyang city (DH); low erucic acid of Mianyang (ML); low erucic acid of Deyang (DL)] at two levels (2% and 4%) for 12 wk. The egg production and egg weight were decreased (P < 0.05) during 9 to 12 wk and 1 to 12 wk, while the average daily feed intake (ADFI) and feed conversion ratio were decreased (P < 0.01) in all phases compared to the control group. Adding ML as oil source had higher (P < 0.05) egg weight compared to DH in all periods in spite of levels. Meanwhile, layers fed 4% rapeseed oil decreased (P < 0.01) egg production compared with 2% in all phases except 1 to 4 wk. Regardless of rapeseed oil sources, hens fed 4% oil decreased (P < 0.05) egg weight in contrast to 2% during the whole experiment except 5 to 8 wk. The ADFI was lower (P < 0.01) in 4% oil inclusion groups compared with 2% during overall phase. Rapeseed oil decreased the yolk color (P < 0.01) and yolk ratio (P = 0.02) and increased (P < 0.01) the albumen height and Haugh unit at 12 wk. Dietary rapeseed oil supplementation resulted in a decreased total triglyceride (TG; P < 0.01) and increased high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (P = 0.02). Regardless of rapeseed oil levels, layers fed MH had higher TG (P < 0.01), TC (P < 0.05), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (P < 0.05), alanine transaminase (P < 0.01) than those fed other sources. Taken together, the addition of rapeseed oil decreased laying performance, reduced TC and TG in the serum, and increased Haugh unit, with low erucic acid or 2% group showed more pronounced results among all treatments.
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INTRODUCTION

Rapeseed oil is a major domestic oil in China, accounting for 17.4% of the total consumption of domestic vegetable oil (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2017). The Sichuan province is a major source of cabbage-type and mustard-type rapeseed oil (Feng, 2012). Rapeseed oil is the only vegetable oil that contains erucic acid (Muhammad et al., 2017). China National Standards suggest that the content of erucic acid is not more than 5% in a diet that includes no more than 45.0 μmol/g glucosinolate (GB 1536-2004). Levels of glucosinolates in rapeseed meal can be defined at four levels: very low glucosinolate rapeseed meal (1 to 5 μmol/g glucosinolate), low glucosinolate rapeseed meal (10 to 30 μmol/g glucosinolate), moderate glucosinolate rapeseed meal (30 to 60 μmol/g glucosinolate), and high glucosinolate rapeseed meal (≥60 μmol/g glucosinolate), respectively (Mawson et al., 1993; Tripathi and Mishra, 2007). Different sources of rapeseed oils contain differing levels of the various fatty acids, for example, the content of erucic acid is 38% to 45% in Chinese cabbage, and 43% to 53% in Brassica napus (Muhammad et al., 2017). Compared to the other levels of glucosinolate, the low level of rapeseed oil has a high oleic acid content and low erucic acid content, which is easier to be digested and more beneficial to human health (Crowe et al., 2008). In recent years, there have been
## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Rapeseed Oil Preparation

Rapeseed of four typical different sources was selected and purchased from represented farms in city of Mianyang and Deyang (Sichuan, China). Rapeseed without peeling was processed by spiral hot extrusion to obtain rapeseed oil of four varieties (MH, high erucic acid of Mianyang; DH, high erucic acid of Deyang; ML, low erucic acid of Mianyang; DL, low erucic acid of Deyang).

### Chemical Analysis of Rapeseed Oils

The chemical composition of these four rapeseed oil was shown in Table 2. Acid value, iodine value, refractive index, and specific gravity of four different rapeseed oils were measured by the official methods of the AOCS (American Oil Chemists’ Society 1998; cd 3d-63, cd 1d-92, Cc 7-25, and Cc 10b-25, respectively).

Fatty acids were analyzed by gas chromatography at the Institute of Chengdu Grain and Oil Quality Supervision and Inspection Testing Center. Lipids (0.15 to 0.20 g) were extracted by ether from each sample (total of two) and saponified with 5 mL NaOH in methanol for 10 min. Five milliliter BF3-methanol was added and refluxed for 2 min. Then 5 mL of heptane was added to the mixture and boiled for 1 min. The final mixture was transferred into 25 mL volumetric flasks and the

---

**Table 1.** Composition and nutrient level of the basal diets (air dry basis).

| Item                      | Control | 2%   | 4%   |
|---------------------------|---------|------|------|
| Ingredients, %            |         |      |      |
| Corn                      | 63.88   | 56.62| 49.35|
| Soybean meal              | 21.84   | 23.95| 26.07|
| Wheat bran                | –       | 4.80 | 9.60 |
| Corn gluten meal          | 3.30    | 1.65 | –    |
| Rapeseed oil              | –       | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| Calcium carbonate         | 8.35    | 8.35 | 8.34 |
| Dicalcium phosphate       | 1.20    | 1.16 | 1.11 |
| NaCl                      | 0.40    | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Vitamin premix1           | 0.03    | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Mineral premix2           | 0.50    | 0.05 | 0.50 |
| L-Lysine HCl              | 0.11    | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| DL-Methionine             | 0.08    | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| L-Threonine               | –       | –    | 0.01 |
| Choline chloride          | 0.10    | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Unite bran                | 0.21    | 0.29 | 0.38 |
| Total                     | 100     | 100  | 100  |

1Provided per kilogram of diet: vitamin A, 6,875 IU; vitamin D3, 1,640 IU; vitamin E, 30.01 mg; thiamine, 1 mg; riboflavin, 3.9 mg; pyridoxine, 3.375 mg; vitamin B12, 0.01 mg; calcium pantothenate, 8.85 mg; folate, 0.5 mg; biotin, 0.1 mg; niacin, 49.25 mg.

2Provided per kilogram of diets: Fe (FeSO4·H2O) 60 mg, Cu (CuSO4·5H2O) 10 mg, Mn (MnSO4·H2O)100 mg, Zn (ZnSO4·H2O) 80 mg, I (KI) 1 mg, Se (Na2SeO3) 0.35 mg.

3Four different sources: high erucic acid of Mianyang (MH), high erucic acid of Deyang (DH), low erucic acid of Mianyang (ML), low erucic acid of Deyang (DL).

1Abbreviation represented: MH = high erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = high erucic acid of Deyang, ML = low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = low erucic acid of Deyang.

2“–” means below the detection limit.
Table 3. The fatty acid composition of the diets (% total fatty acids).

| Items                  | Control       | MH 2% | 4% | DH 2% | 4% | ML 2% | 4% | DL 2% | 4% |
|------------------------|---------------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|
| Palmitic acid C16:0    | 16.85         | 9.51  | 7.43| 10.04 | 7.73| 10.27 | 8.37| 11.01 | 8.44|
| Palmitoleic acid C16:1 | –             | –     | 0.19| –     | 0.22| –     | 0.2 | –     | 0.22|
| Stearic acid C18:0     | 1.78          | 1.31  | 1.08| 1.61  | 1.3 | 1.69  | 1.61| 1.71  | 1.57|
| Oleic acid C18:1       | 22.13         | 17.9  | 16.24| 28.86 | 31.12| 40.53 | 45.47| 41.3  | 49.12|
| Linoleic acid C18:2    | 56.4          | 33.98 | 27.07| 34.77 | 27.06| 36.33 | 31.7 | 38.25 | 30.48|
| Linolenic acid C18:3   | 2.84          | 6.16  | 7.1 | 6.33  | 7.42 | 6.36  | 7.28 | 8.31  | 8.31|
| Eicosanoic acid C20:1  | –             | 2.5   | 3.26| 6.96  | 10.21| 1.45  | 1.6 | 0.84  | 1.11|
| Erucic acid C22:1      | –             | 28.63 | 37.62| 11.43 | 14.94| 3.18  | 3.98| 0.76  | 0.76|
| ∑ Saturated            | 83.63         | 80.16 | 78.52| 80.92 | 79.88| 81.89 | 82.85| 83.51 | 83.63|
| ∑ Unsaturated          | 81.37         | 89.17 | 91.48| 88.35 | 90.97| 88.05 | 90.03| 87.29 | 90.03|
| ∑ Polyunsaturated      | 59.24         | 40.14 | 34.17| 41.1  | 34.48| 42.69 | 38.98| 44.95 | 38.79|

a–fMeans with different superscripts in the same column differ significantly (P < 0.05).

Abbreviation represented: MH = high erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = high erucic acid of Deyang, ML = low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = low erucic acid of Deyang.

Table 4. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on production performance of laying hens.1

| Item                  | Egg production, % | Egg weight, g | ADFI, g | FCR |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|-----|
| Source                | 1 to 4 wk | 5 to 8 wk | 9 to 12 wk | 1 to 4 wk | 5 to 8 wk | 9 to 12 wk | 1 to 4 wk | 5 to 8 wk |
| Control               | 87.93     | 84.76     | 81.24     | 85.13    | 81.24    | 85.13    | 85.13    | 81.24    | 85.13 |
| MH 2%                 | 87.54     | 82.33     | 81.97     | 83.42-c  | 81.97-c  | 83.42-c  | 83.42-c  | 81.97-c  | 83.42-c |
| MH 4%                 | 88.32     | 79.20     | 71.27     | 79.75     | 79.75     | 79.75     | 79.75     | 79.75     | 79.75 |
| DH 2%                 | 88.33     | 82.95     | 76.22     | 82.27-c  | 76.22-c  | 82.27-c  | 82.27-c  | 76.22-c  | 82.27-c |
| DH 4%                 | 87.74     | 78.36     | 73.72     | 79.61     | 79.61     | 79.61     | 79.61     | 79.61     | 79.61 |
| ML 2%                 | 86.55     | 81.23     | 79.69     | 82.83-b  | 82.83-b  | 82.83-b  | 82.83-b  | 82.83-b  | 82.83-b |
| ML 4%                 | 87.20     | 79.79     | 75.76     | 80.75-c  | 80.75-c  | 80.75-c  | 80.75-c  | 80.75-c  | 80.75-c |
| DL 2%                 | 91.31     | 84.17     | 79.76     | 84.88-b  | 84.88-b  | 84.88-b  | 84.88-b  | 84.88-b  | 84.88-b |
| DL 4%                 | 87.89     | 80.43     | 72.85     | 80.32-c  | 80.32-c  | 80.32-c  | 80.32-c  | 80.32-c  | 80.32-c |
| SEM                   | 1.31      | 1.68      | 1.77      | 1.44      | 0.33      | 0.35      | 0.28      | 0.29      | 0.51      |
| F-value               | 0.36      | 0.08      | <0.01     | 0.04      | <0.01     | <0.01     | <0.01     | <0.01     | <0.01     |

Main effect

| Source | MH 2% | 4% | DH 2% | 4% | ML 2% | 4% | DL 2% | 4% | SEM |
|--------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| P-value| 0.06  | 0.26| 0.12  | 0.11| 0.07  | 0.06| 0.05  | 0.01| 0.03|

contrast: control vs other rapeseed oil groups.

volume was adjusted with saturated NaCl to 25 mL of which 1 mL of the heptane phase within the volumetric flasks was used to determine the fatty acids composition. Fatty acids were analyzed with gas chromatography (Agilent 6890 N, Hewlett Packard, Palo Alto, CA) using a capillary column (supel covax 10,60 m × 0.25 mm ID). The chromatographic conditions were: detector temperature 280°C; injector temperature 200°C; initial condition temperature 100°C for 8 min and programmed to increase at a rate of 5°C per 5 min up to 200°C and then at 4°C per minute up to the final temperature of 250°C. The helium carrier gas flow was set at 1.2 mL/min, hydrogen at 30 mL/min, and air at 300 mL/min. Injection of the 1 μL samples was performed with a split ratio of 20:1. Identification of individual fatty acids was based on comparisons of retention times of unknown peaks to authentic fatty acid methyl ester standards.

**Birds, Diets, and Management**

The experimental procedures were approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of Sichuan Agricultural University (No. SYXK2014-197). At 33 wk of age, a total of 1,080 Lohman pink shelled hens were randomly divided into nine treatment groups, including 1 plus 4 × 2 design experiment in which hens were fed a diet without rapeseed oil or diets containing four
### Table 5. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on egg quality of laying hens at 12 wk.\(^1\)

| Item                  | Source          | Level | Egg shell color | Eggshell strength, kg/cm\(^2\) | Eggshell thickness, mm | Albumen height, mm | Yolk color, HU | Yolk ratio, % | Shell ratio, % | Alumnum ratio, % |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
|                      | Control         |       |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      |                 |       |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | MH              | 2%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | MH              | 4%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DH              | 2%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DH              | 4%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | ML              | 2%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | ML              | 4%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DL              | 2%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DL              | 4%    |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | SEM             |       |                 |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |

\(*\) *Means with different superscripts in the same column differ significantly (P < 0.05).

\(^{1}\) Each mean represents 24 cages, with 1 layers/cage. Abbreviation represented: MH = high erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = high erucic acid of Deyang, ML = low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = low erucic acid of Deyang.

### Table 6. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on storage egg quality of laying hens (stored for 7 d.).\(^1\)

| Item                  | Source          | Level | Eggshell strength, kg/cm\(^2\) | Eggshell thickness, mm | Albumen height, mm | Yolk color, HU | Yolk ratio, % | Shell ratio, % | Alumnum ratio, % |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
|                      | Control         |       |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      |                 |       |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | MH              | 2%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | MH              | 4%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DH              | 2%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DH              | 4%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | ML              | 2%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | ML              | 4%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DL              | 2%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | DL              | 4%    |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |
|                      | SEM             |       |                             |                        |                  |              |               |                |                 |

\(*\) *Means with different superscripts in the same column differ significantly (P < 0.05).

\(^{1}\) Each mean represents 24 cages, with 1 layers/cage. Abbreviation represented: MH = high erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = high erucic acid of Deyang, ML = low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = low erucic acid of Deyang.

\(^{2}\) Contrast: control vs other rapeseed oil groups.
Table 7. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on storage egg quality of laying hens (stored for 14 d)\(^1\).

| Item      | Source | Level | Eggshell strength, kg/cm\(^2\) | Eggshell thickness, mm | Albumen height, mm | Yolk color | HU | Yolk ratio, % | Shell ratio, % | Albumen ratio, % |
|-----------|--------|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Source    |        |       |                                |                        |                   |            |     |               |                |                  |
| Control   | 0      |       | 4.057                          | 31.74                  | 5.19\(^{b}\)       | 9.75\(^{a}\) | 70.22\(^{b}\) | 29.56          | 12.28           | 58.16            |
| MH        | 2%     |       | 4.138                          | 31.82                  | 5.76\(^{a}\)       | 9.61\(^{a}\)  | 74.33        | 28.67          | 12.16           | 59.17            |
| MH        | 4%     |       | 4.241                          | 31.71                  | 5.40\(^{b}\)       | 8.50\(^{b}\)  | 74.50\(^{b}\) | 28.64          | 12.24           | 59.12            |
| DH        | 2%     |       | 4.140                          | 33.43                  | 5.29\(^{b}\)       | 9.25\(^{a}\)  | 73.16\(^{b}\) | 29.57          | 11.85           | 58.58            |
| DH        | 4%     |       | 4.265                          | 31.35                  | 5.36\(^{b}\)       | 8.25\(^{b}\)  | 75.71        | 29.95          | 11.85           | 58.20            |
| ML        | 2%     |       | 4.480                          | 33.28                  | 4.60\(^{a}\)       | 9.36\(^{a}\)  | 68.94        | 29.11          | 12.21           | 58.69            |
| ML        | 4%     |       | 4.294                          | 32.58                  | 5.36\(^{b}\)       | 8.41\(^{b}\)  | 73.75\(^{b}\) | 29.00          | 12.36           | 58.64            |
| DL        | 2%     |       | 3.867                          | 32.36                  | 5.43\(^{b}\)       | 9.18\(^{b}\)  | 74.69\(^{b}\) | 29.10          | 12.20           | 58.69            |
| DL        | 4%     |       | 4.034                          | 31.63                  | 4.79\(^{a}\)       | 8.21\(^{b}\)  | 68.75        | 28.81          | 12.01           | 59.18            |
| SEM       |        | 0.190 | 0.80                           | 0.19                   |                  | 0.12          | 1.16         | 0.43           | 0.22            | 0.51             |
| P-value   |        | 0.50  | 0.54                           | <0.01                  |                  | <0.01         | <0.01       | 0.39           | 0.71            | 0.81             |

\(^{a}\) Means with different superscripts in the same column differ significantly (\(P < 0.05\)).

\(^{1}\)Each mean represents 24 cages, with 1 layers/cage. Abbreviation represented: MH = High erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = High erucic acid of Deyang, ML = Low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = Low erucic acid of Deyang, L = Light, M = Medium, H = High.

\(^{2}\)Contrast: control vs other rapeseed oil groups.

different rapeseed oil sources (MH, DH, ML, and DL). Basal diet containing no rapeseed oil was considered as a control group. Each group included eight replicates with 15 hens per replicate. The composition and calculated nutrient levels of all diets are presented in Table 1. The basal diet was formulated to meet or exceed nutrient requirements of laying hens according to the NRC recommendations (1994). All diets were isoenergetic and iso-nitrogenous and formulated on a digestible amino acid basis. The hens were randomly assigned to cages (38.1 cm-width \(\times\) 50 cm-length \(\times\) 40 cm-height) of three hens per cage. The hens were housed in stainless steel cages, and room environment was controlled at 22\(^\circ\)C with a daily lighting schedule of 16 h light and 8 h dark, and were allowed ad libitum access to experimental diets and water. All diets were provided in mash form.

**Egg Quality**

Hen-day egg production, egg weight, and hen mortality were recorded daily. Feed consumption was recorded per week. The feed conversion ratio was expressed as the kilogram of feed consumed per kilogram of egg produced. Three eggs for each replicate (24 eggs per treatment) were collected to assess egg quality parameters at 4, 8, and 12 wk. At the end of the experiment, 48 eggs from each treatment was collected and egg quality were also determined after 7 d and 14 d (24 egg for each time point) storage at room temperature (22~24\(^\circ\)C), respectively.

The eggshell color [\(L^\ast\) (lightness), \(a^\ast\) (redness), and \(b^\ast\) (yellowness)] value was measured by a color meter (Minolta CR410 chroma meter, Konica Minolta Sensing Inc., Osaka, Japan). Eggshell strength was evaluated using an egg shell force gauge model II (Robotmation Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Eggshell thickness was measured on the large end, equatorial region, and small end, respectively, using an eggshell thickness gauge (Robotmation Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). The egg weight, egg yolk color, and Haugh unit (\(HU\)) were evaluated using an egg multi tester (EMT-7300, Robotmation Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Egg white and yolk were separate carefully, and the weight of yolk and albumen (calculated by total egg weight minus weight of yolk and eggshell) was also measured. The yolk ratio and albumen ratio were calculated by the weight of yolk and albumen to the egg weight, respectively.

**Blood Collection and Analysis**

At the end of 12 wk, a total of 72 blood samples (eight samples per group) were taken from the sub-wing vein and placed in non-additives blood collection tubes to produce serum after feed withdrawal for 12 h. After coagulation, the blood was centrifuged at 3,000 rpm for 10 min. Serum was collected and stored at \(-20^\circ\)C until certain biochemical parameters were assayed. The serum parameters [\(TC^\ast\) (total cholesterol), \(TG^\ast\) (triglyceride),...
Table 8. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on serum parameters of laying hens.

| Item          | TG   | LDL-C | ALT  | AST  | TC   | HDL-C |
|---------------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Source        | Level|       |      |      |      |       |
| Control       | 0    | 15.04 | 0.81 | 5.03 | 158.91 | 2.53  |
| MH            | 2%   | 14.32 | 0.93 | 5.78 | 141.55 | 2.45  |
|               | 4%   | 11.78 | 0.76 | 5.19 | 153.94 | 2.48  |
| DH            | 2%   | 10.43 | 0.87 | 5.80 | 175.18 | 2.40  |
|               | 4%   | 6.28  | 0.69 | 4.17 | 155.52 | 2.13  |
| ML            | 2%   | 10.12 | 0.74 | 3.03 | 141.63 | 2.03  |
|               | 4%   | 9.75  | 0.75 | 3.78 | 174.80 | 1.93  |
| DL            | 2%   | 12.24 | 0.71 | 3.92 | 161.13 | 2.05  |
|               | 4%   | 8.95  | 0.66 | 3.03 | 156.76 | 1.93  |
| SEM           |      | 0.72  | 0.05 | 0.43 | 4.80   | 0.20  |
| P-value       |      | <0.01 | <0.01| <0.01| <0.01 | <0.01 |
| Main effect   | Source|       |      |      |      |       |
| MH            | 3.97*| 0.75* | 4.63 | 154.87 | 2.12  |
| ML            | 4%   | 10.11 | 0.72 | 4.79 | 160.26 | 2.12  |
| SEM           |      | 0.38  | 0.02 | 2.26 | 3.34   | 0.13  |
| P-value       |      | <0.01 | <0.01| <0.01| <0.01 | <0.01 |
| Source        | Level|       |      |      |      |       |
| DL            | 2%   | 11.78 | 0.81 | 4.63 | 154.87 | 2.23  |
| ML            | 4%   | 9.10  | 0.72 | 4.79 | 160.26 | 2.12  |
| SEM           |      | 0.38  | 0.02 | 2.26 | 3.34   | 0.13  |
| P-value       |      | <0.01 | <0.01| <0.01| <0.01 | <0.01 |
| Contrast1     |      | <0.01 | <0.01| <0.01| <0.01 | <0.01 |

*Means with different superscripts in the same column differ significantly (P < 0.05).
1Contrast: control vs other rapeseed oil groups.
Abbreviation represented: MH = High erucic acid of Mianyang, DH = High erucic acid of Deyang, ML = Low erucic acid of Mianyang, DL = Low erucic acid of Deyang.

HDL-C* (high-density lipoprotein cholesterol), LDL-C* (low-density lipoprotein cholesterol), ALT* (alanine transaminase), AST* (aspartate transaminase), which were important indices to evaluate lipid metabolism and liver function, were analyzed using a commercial biochemistry analyzer (Yellow Springs Instrument Co., Inc., Yellow Springs, OH, USA).

Statistical Analysis

All data were analyzed as one-way ANOVA using the GLM procedure in SAS software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). Data excluding the control were further analyzed as a 2 × 4 (levels × sources) factorial arrangement of treatments by two-way ANOVA with a model that included the main effects of rapeseed oil levels and sources, as well as their interaction. Data are expressed as means and standard error of the mean (SEM). When an effect was significant (P < 0.05), means were compared by Tukey’s test to determine specific differences between means.

RESULTS

Chemical Analysis and Fatty Acid Composition

The MH had the highest acid value; however, the DH had the lowest. The DL had much higher iodine value compared to other sources (Table 2). The biggest difference between the four varieties of rapeseed oil is the content of erucic acid, followed by oleic acid; the other fatty acid profiles are roughly the same. The fatty acid profiles of dietary treatments were consistent with source and levels of four different rapeseed oil (Table 3). Particularly, the erucic acid content of MH (4%) diet is up to 37.62%, whereas the DL (2%) diet is below the limit detection.

Production Performance

The data showed that the egg production and egg weight were decreased (P < 0.05) during 9 to 12 wk and 1 to 12 wk, while the average daily feed intake (ADFI) and feed conversion ratio were decreased (P < 0.01) in all phases compared to the control treatment (Table 4). Layers fed 4% rapeseed oil decreased (P < 0.01) egg production compared with 2% during 5 to 8 wk, 9 to 12 wk, and 1 to 12 wk. Meanwhile, adding ML as source had higher (P < 0.05) egg weight compared to DH in all periods in spite of inclusion levels. Regardless of rapeseed oil sources, hens fed 4% oil decreased (P < 0.05) egg weight in contrast to 2% during the whole experiment except 5 to 8 wk. Layers fed ML had the higher (P < 0.01) ADFI than MH and DL during 9 to 12 wk in spite of levels. The ADFI was lower (P < 0.01) in 4% oil inclusion groups compared with supplementing oil at 2% overall phases. Otherwise, ADFI decreased (interaction, P < 0.01) more obviously in 4% MH oil added group during 9 to 12 wk.

Egg Quality

Supplementation of rapeseed oil decreased the yolk color (P < 0.01) and yolk ratio (P = 0.02) and increased (P < 0.01) the albumen height and HU at 12 wk (Table 5). A main effect of source was observed for b value, eggshell thickness, albumen height, HU (P < 0.01) at 4 wk and yolk ratio (P < 0.05), albumen ratio (P < 0.01) at 8 wk (Figure 1). The effect of oil supplementation level was observed to increase eggshell b value at 4 wk and yolk color at 8 wk (Figure 2). Regardless of oil sources, yolk color and yolk ratio were decreased (P < 0.01) but albumen ratio was increased (P < 0.01) as rapeseed oil supplementation levels increased. Supplementation of rapeseed oil decreased (P < 0.01) the yolk color and yolk ratio and increased (P < 0.01) the albumen ratio. After stored for 7 d, egg quality results showed a similar pattern to 12 wk except that there was a source effect for yolk color (Table 6). MH oil added group had the higher (P < 0.01) yolk color compared to DL. After stored for 14 d, there was an effect of source × level and a source effect on albumen height and HU. Meanwhile, when DL oil was added at 4%, the HU showed opposite result in contrast to 12 wk (Table 7).
Figure 1. Effect of different rapeseed oil sources and levels on eggshell color b value, eggshell thickness, albumen height, and Haugh unit at 4 wk. A, The b value was higher ($P = 0.015$) in DH and ML treatments than MH and DL groups at 4 wk. B, The eggshell thickness was lower ($P < 0.01$) in ML group than other groups at 4 wk. C and D, Supplementation of MH decreased ($P < 0.01$) albumen height and Haugh unit than other sources at 4 wk. E, The b value was higher ($P = 0.04$) in 4% level than 2% level groups at 4 wk. Values are means ± SEM (n = 8). The a, b, and c means every bars without same letter differ significantly ($P < 0.05$).

Serum Parameters

Dietary rapeseed oil supplementation resulted in a decreased TG ($P < 0.01$) and increased HDL-C ($P = 0.02$). Regardless of rapeseed oil levels, layers fed MH had higher TG ($P < 0.01$), TC ($P < 0.05$), LDL-C ($P < 0.05$), and ALT ($P < 0.01$) than those fed other sources. A significant decrease ($P < 0.01$) in HDL-C was found in the serum from the hens receiving the diets containing DL as compared with other sources. The TG ($P < 0.01$) and LDL-C ($P = 0.01$) in the group containing 4% rapeseed oil was lower than 2% group.

DISCUSSION

As stated in National standards, the content of oleic acid is 8.0% to 60.0% in general rapeseed oil and 51% to 70% in low erucic acid rapeseed oil; the content of linoleic acid is 11% to 23% in general rapeseed oil and 15% to 30% in low erucic acid rapeseed oil; the content of eicosenoic acid is 3% to 15% in general rapeseed oil and 0.1% to 4.3% in low erucic acid rapeseed oil; the content of erucic acid is 3% to 60% in general rapeseed oil, and $\leq 3.0\%$ in low erucic acid rapeseed oil (GB 1536-2004). In our study, the DL source belongs to the low erucic acid rapeseed oil sources, while ML, DH, and MH are of high erucic acid rapeseed oil sources. Acid value is a measurement of the amount of free fatty acids in fat. The presence of free fatty acids makes it vulnerable to lipid peroxidation, thus greatly reducing the quality of fat. So the MH was inferior to other sources of rapeseed oil. The DL had the highest iodine value, which indicated its higher unsaturated fatty acid content and may be also associated with its lower erucic acid content.

In the current study, we found that supplementation of rapeseed oil led to a reduction in feed intake, egg production, and egg weight. The data obtained from the present study were consistent with previous findings that reported a decrease in egg weight (Mazalli et al., 2004; Cherian, 2008; Nobakht et al., 2011), egg production (Agah et al., 2012), and feed intake (Shafey et al., 2003; Celebi and Ulu, 2006) when canola oil was supplemented into laying hens’ diet. This may because the crude protein level of 4% MH and 4% DH groups was decreased by 3.04 g (9 to 12 wk), 2.54 g (1 to 12 wk), 2.90 g (9 to 12 wk), and 2.50 g (1–12 wk), respectively. Ceylan et al. (2011) reported that feeding 1.5% and 3.0% rapeseed oil had no effect on egg
production, egg weight, feed intake, and feed conversion. Similarly, egg weight was not significantly different between 3% and 5% canola oil addition groups (Rowghani et al., 2007). However, Vogtmann et al. (1974) showed that feeding Leghorn hens with 15% high (26.2%) erucic acid rapeseed oil decreased feed intake and egg production in comparison with 15% low (4.1%) erucic acid soybean oil. In a similar study, the effects of different levels of canola oil (0, 2.0, 4.0 and 6.0%) on the performance of laying hens were investigated and it was observed that the use of increasing levels of canola oil decreased egg production, egg weight, and daily feed intake but did not affect the feed conversion (Gul et al., 2012). It has been demonstrated that supplementation of different oils levels into diet decreased feed intake (Fouladi et al., 2008; Agah et al., 2012) and egg weight (Grobas et al., 2001), whereas the feed conversion was not affected (Shafey et al., 2003; Lelis et al., 2009). This can also be explained that the shortage of linoleic acid in the diet might be the limiting factor contributing to the decrease in egg weight (Nobakht et al., 2011; Rasoulpour et al., 2011). These results indicated that the content of erucic acid might influence the production of laying hens.

In a present study, supplementation of rapeseed oil led to a lower yolk color. Similarly, Gul et al. (2012) reported a similar decline in yolk color compared to the control when layers fed different levels of canola oil (2.0%, 4.0%, and 6.0%). The yellow color of the egg yolk depends on the dietary carotenoids that may varied according to the source and level of natural pigment precursor in the diet (An et al., 2010). The rapeseed oil groups contained less corn than the control treatment in this study, which may account for the different color we observed here. In our study, supplementation of rapeseed oil decreased yolk ratio and increased albumen ratio. However, in a previous study, Horniakova (1997) reported that yolk and albumen weight were not changed by adding 2% or 6% canola oil in the diets (Shaver Starcross 288). However, it was observed that the supplementation of 3% canola oil in the diets had no effect on yolk weight of Hy-line but 5% increased yolk weight (Rowghani et al., 2007). The discrepancy may be associated with the genetic background of different laying hens in above researches. The oil sources had no effect on egg quality, but the IU showed opposite result when DL oil was added at 4%. It may be related to the difference of fatty acid composition, especially the unsaturated fatty acids and its resistance to oxidation in experimental diets.

It also found that the high levels of serum TG, TC, and LDL-C were obtained from group that was fed MH containing low proportion n-3 PUFA (polyunsaturated fatty acid). Generally, saturated fatty acids increase plasma LDL (Grundy, 1987). Dietary n-3 PUFA can reduce TG synthesis and chylomicron secretion from intestinal cell and suppress hepatic fatty acid synthesis on TG production (Harris, 1989). Diet enrich in linoleic acid and oleic acid also suppress LDL concentration, but n-3 PUFA appear to be more effective (Nestel et al., 1984). Dietary PUFA may promote lipoprotein metabolism by altering the activity of certain lipolysis and transfer enzymes function in the plasma. Dietary PUFA of vegetable oils, containing mostly linoleic acid, are effect in counter-acting the effects of dietary saturated fatty acids (Grundy, 1987). In the present study, ML had the lower n-3 PUFA and DL had higher oleic acid; therefore, the results of our study were consistent.
with above findings. As is shown current study, erucic acid and oleic acid have a certain inverse relationship, so the difference in erucic acid content may be one of the causes of changes in serum lipid composition.

CONCLUSION

Supplementation of rapeseed oil decreased laying performance, reduced TC and TG in the serum, and increased HU, with low erucic acid content rapeseed oil such as ML and DL or 2% group showed more pronounced results among all treatments.
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