

# Mitigating Ammonia Emissions and Enhancing Litter Quality in Commercial Broiler Chickens using Chemically Treated Litter during the Winter Season

Jigar V. Patel<sup>1\*</sup>, Manoj M. Trivedi<sup>2</sup>, Rakesh J. Modi<sup>3</sup>, Rais M. Rajpura<sup>4</sup>, Mahesh P. Madhavatar<sup>5</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted to mitigate ammonia emissions and enhance litter quality in commercial broiler chickens using chemically treated litter during the winter season (December-January, 2020-2021) in Anand, Gujarat. A total of 144 straight-run, day-old commercial broiler chicks were randomly distributed into six treatment groups. Each treatment group consisted of four replicates, each with six chicks, leading to 24 chicks per treatment. The six treatments used were: T<sub>1</sub> - rice husk litter material (control group); T<sub>2</sub> - husk treated with alum @ 90 g/sq.ft.; T<sub>3</sub> - husk treated with boric acid (H<sub>3</sub>BO<sub>3</sub>) @ 24 g/sq.ft.; T<sub>4</sub> - husk treated with sodium bisulfate (NaHSO<sub>4</sub>) @ 25 g/sq.ft.; T<sub>5</sub> - husk treated with a commercially available probiotic product @ 1 g/sq.ft.; T<sub>6</sub> - husk treated with a commercially available *Yucca schidigera* liquid solution @ 1.0 mL/sq.ft. The litter treatment (T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>6</sub>) was applied on the 1<sup>st</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, and 29<sup>th</sup> days of the experiment. The study evaluated litter pH, moisture (%), nitrogen, and ammonia emissions (ppm) at the 6<sup>th</sup> week of age across different treatments in experiments. Results showed significantly lower pH, moisture, and ammonia emissions in T<sub>2</sub>, with the lowest ammonia levels observed in T<sub>2</sub> (P<0.01). Litter nitrogen was significantly higher in T<sub>2</sub> compared to other treatments (p<0.05). Based on the overall results of the experiment, it can be concluded that broiler birds reared on rice husk litter treated with alum (@ 90 g/sq.ft) exhibited reduced ammonia emissions and improved litter quality.

**Key words:** Ammonia emission, Broiler chicken, Commercial, Litter treatment, Litter quality

*Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech* (2025): 10.48165/ijvsbt.21.5.17

## INTRODUCTION

The Indian poultry industry has emerged as the most dynamic and fast-expanding segment of the agro-animal-based sector. After China, India ranks second in total egg production and fourth in chicken production globally. Litter quality is a key factor in broiler production, directly affecting bird health, growth, and environmental conditions. Accumulation of moisture and nitrogenous waste in the litter increases ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) emissions, which can impair respiratory health, reduce performance, and contribute to environmental pollution (Miles *et al.*, 2004; Nagaraju *et al.*, 2007). Managing litter through chemical or biological supplements can help control these emissions and improve overall litter conditions. Rice husk is commonly used in India due to its availability and moderate absorbency (Mahmoud *et al.*, 2020). However, it often requires amendments to enhance performance. Acidifying agents like alum, boric acid and sodium bisulfate are known to lower litter pH and reduce ammonia volatilization (Liang *et al.*, 2005). Natural products such as *Yucca schidigera* and probiotics have also been used to improve microbial balance and bind ammonia (Patterson and Burkholder, 2003; Al-Mashhadani and Al-Saadi, 2009). Despite these options, limited studies in Indian conditions addressed the seasonal effects on litter management efficacy. Therefore, this study evaluated the impact of different litter treatments on

<sup>1</sup>Department of Livestock Production Management, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, Kamdhenu University, Navsari-396450, Gujarat, India

<sup>2</sup>Director of Extension Education, Kamdhenu University, Gandhinagar-382010, Gujarat, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Livestock Farm Complex, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, Anand-388001, Gujarat, India

<sup>4</sup>Department of Animal Science, BA College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand-388001, Gujarat, India

<sup>5</sup>Pashu Vigyan Kendra, Waghai, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, Kamdhenu University, Navsari-396450, Gujarat, India

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. J.V. Patel, Assistant Professor, Department of Livestock Production Management, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, Kamdhenu University, Navsari-396450, Gujarat, India, e-mail: jvpatel@kamdhenuuni.edu.in

**How to cite this article:** Patel, J. V., Trivedi, M. M., Modi, R. J., Rajpura, R. M., & Madhavatar, M. P. (2025). Mitigating Ammonia Emissions and Enhancing Litter Quality in Commercial Broiler Chickens using Chemically Treated Litter during the Winter Season. *Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech*, 21(5), 88-92.

**Source of support:** Nil

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Submitted** 14/05/2025 **Accepted** 10/06/2025 **Published** 10/09/2025

litter pH, moisture, nitrogen, and ammonia emissions in broiler houses during winter season under Anand, Gujarat climate.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Total 144 day-old commercial straight run broiler chicks from a single hatch acquired from commercial hatcheries, Anand, Gujarat (India) were used for the experiment. Chicks were weighed individually, wing banded, and distributed randomly into six treatment groups; each of four replicates with six chicks in each replicate. The treatments included: T<sub>1</sub> (Control, Rice husk as litter material), T<sub>2</sub> (rice husk mixed with Alum @ 90 g/sq.ft.), T<sub>3</sub> (husk with Boric acid (H<sub>3</sub>BO<sub>3</sub>) @ 24 g/sq.ft.), T<sub>4</sub> (husk with Sodium bisulphate (NaHSO<sub>4</sub>) @ 25 g/sq.ft.), T<sub>5</sub> (husk with commercially available probiotic product @ 1 g/sq.ft.), and T<sub>6</sub> (husk with commercially available *Yucca schidigera* liquid solution @ 1.0 mL/sq.ft). The birds were raised in a deep litter type of housing system with the fresh rice husk as litter (bedding) material. The chemical treatment of litter (T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>6</sub>) was done on the 1<sup>st</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> days of the experimental period. The feed was prepared as per the nutrient specification for the broiler recommended by BIS (2007) standard. The experiment was conducted in the winter season (December 2020-January 2021) for six weeks duration. The average minimum and maximum temperatures during the winter season were 14.40 and 27.08 °C, with minimum and maximum relative humidity of 49.03 and 84.31 %, respectively. The floor space per bird given was @ 0.5 ft<sup>2</sup> for 1-2 weeks of age, 1.0 ft<sup>2</sup> for 3-4 weeks of age, and 1.5 ft<sup>2</sup> for 5-6 weeks of age. All six groups were raised under similar environmental and management conditions, except for the litter treatment/alteration. A digital hanging balance was used to calculate the weight of the litter, and the same amount of litter was used in each replicate. A thickness of 5 to 7 centimeters was maintained throughout the experiment. Proper spreading and timely stirring of the litter material was done to keep the thickness uniform. Vaccination was done at timely intervals to maintain healthy flocks. Biosecurity measures were strictly observed throughout the experimental period. At the entrance of the experimental shed, liquid phenyl solution was added daily as biosecurity measures.

### Parameter Studied

Litter quality was evaluated through weekly sampling, with litter collected from five randomly selected points within each replicate pen - four from the corners and one from the center. The samples were thoroughly mixed to obtain a representative composite for each pen. Key parameters assessed included litter pH, moisture content, nitrogen percentage, and ammonia emission. For pH measurement, 10 grams of litter were mixed with 50 mL of distilled water, stirred for 15 min, and filtered; the pH of the filtrate was then measured using a digital pH meter (APHA, 2000). Moisture content was determined by drying the litter samples at 100 °C for 18 h (APHA, 2000). Nitrogen content was estimated weekly using the standard Kjeldahl method. Ammonia emission was assessed on the 42<sup>nd</sup> day using Hydrion ammonia

measurement strips (Dewey *et al.* 2000). The strips were first activated by dipping in distilled water, then placed on the litter surface for one min, and the resulting color change was matched to a standardized scale to determine ammonia levels. The data generated was analyzed statistically using one way ANOVA and Duncan's *post hoc* test.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Litter pH

The pH of litter is a key indicator of its quality, as it directly influences ammonia release. Ideally, the pH should remain below 7 to minimize ammonia volatilization. In the present study, weekly pH is depicted in Table 1. At the 6<sup>th</sup> week, litter pH was significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) lower in the T<sub>2</sub> group, followed by T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, and T<sub>1</sub> (control), which recorded the highest pH. A similar trend was observed throughout the experimental period.

Overall, litter pH ranged from 4 to 10, and it increased over period in all groups. The alum-treated group (T<sub>2</sub>) consistently showed lower pH values, compared to other groups, attributed to the sulfuric acid content in alum (pKa ~3.0). This acidic environment helped reduce ammonia emissions, moisture levels, and microbial activity, consistent with the findings of Smith *et al.* (2001) and Fries *et al.* (2005). During the early weeks, pH remained acidic in T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>5</sub>, while the untreated group (T<sub>1</sub>) exhibited an alkaline pH. These results aligned with previous studies by Sims and Luka (2002) and Oliveira *et al.* (2004), who reported significant pH reductions using alum and similar amendments. However, contradictory findings were noted by Onbasilar *et al.* (2013), Avçilar *et al.* (2018), and Toppel *et al.* (2018), who observed no significant pH changes with treatments such as *Yucca schidigera*, sepiolite, or sodium bisulfate.

### Litter Moisture Content

Litter condition significantly affects bird performance, directly influencing the profitability of farmers and integrators. Maintaining dry litter is essential for controlling ammonia levels, ensuring bird welfare, and preventing issues like hock and footpad burns, and breast blisters. Therefore, litter management is a vital component of poultry production. Weekly litter moisture percentages up to six weeks of age are presented in Table 2. At the 1<sup>st</sup> week, the mean litter moisture was significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) lower in T<sub>2</sub>, followed by T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, and highest in T<sub>1</sub> (control). At the 6<sup>th</sup> week, T<sub>2</sub> again recorded significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) lower moisture, followed by T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, and T<sub>1</sub>. However, differences among T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, and T<sub>1</sub>, and between T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> were statistically non-significant. Overall, litter moisture ranged from 11% to 34% during the experiment. By the 6<sup>th</sup> week, values exceeded the acceptable limit of 25% in most groups, leading to wet litter conditions associated with footpad sores and reduced growth (Garrido *et al.*, 2004). Factors such as diet, water intake, ventilation,

drinker type, and ambient temperature influenced litter moisture levels (Oliveira *et al.*, 2004).

Alum treatment (T<sub>2</sub>) significantly reduced litter moisture, supporting dry litter conditions and improving bird health by reducing hock burns, footpad lesions, and breast blisters, in agreement with Younis *et al.* (2016) and Lonkar *et al.* (2018). However, these findings contradicted with the observations of Sims and Luka (2002), Oliveira *et al.* (2003), and Onbasilar *et al.* (2013), who reported no significant effect of alum on litter moisture.

### Litter Nitrogen (%)

Poultry litter is an excellent source of nitrogen for crop production. However, recent modifications in poultry litter management practices and the increased use of chemical amendments/treatments may influence nitrogen availability. In the present study, litter nitrogen percentage estimated on a weekly basis up to six weeks of age is presented in Table 3. During the experiment, from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> week and at the 6<sup>th</sup> week, the mean litter nitrogen percentage was highest in treatment T<sub>2</sub>, followed by T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>, and T<sub>5</sub>; however, the differences among treatments were not statistically significant. At the 5<sup>th</sup> week, the nitrogen content in the litter

was significantly higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) in T<sub>2</sub>, followed by T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>, and T<sub>5</sub>.

In the current study, the litter nitrogen content ranged from 2.24% to 3.41%, which is in agreement with the findings of Lonkar *et al.* (2018), Sahoo *et al.* (2017), and Younis *et al.* (2016). The acidic nature of the litter, particularly in alum-treated groups, likely inhibited the conversion of ammonium ions to ammonia, thereby enhancing nitrogen retention. This is consistent with the findings of Burgess *et al.* (1998), who reported that alum treatment increased nitrogen concentrations in litter by reducing ammonia volatilization. Improved nitrogen retention enhances the fertilizer value of poultry litter, as nitrogen in the ammonical form is more readily absorbed by plants (Rashid *et al.*, 2020). These results aligned with those reported by Sims and Luka (2002), Younis *et al.* (2016), Sahoo *et al.* (2017), and Chakravati *et al.* (2019), all of whom observed significantly higher nitrogen concentrations in alum-treated litter compared to untreated controls. However, the present findings are in contrast with the observations of Karamanlis *et al.* (2008), Madrid *et al.* (2012), and Atapattu *et al.* (2017), who did not report significant differences in nitrogen content between treated and control groups.

**Table 1:** Effect of different litter treatment on mean ( $\pm$  SE) weekly litter pH of broilers at different ages of broilers

Treatments	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	5 <sup>th</sup> week	6 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	7.41 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	7.73 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.11	8.02 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.06	9.06 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	9.59 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.19	10.35 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.19
T <sub>2</sub>	4.13 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	4.70 <sup>e</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	5.28 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.18	5.83 <sup>e</sup> $\pm$ 0.26	6.88 <sup>e</sup> $\pm$ 0.21	7.88 <sup>e</sup> $\pm$ 0.23
T <sub>3</sub>	6.13 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.32	6.63 <sup>cd</sup> $\pm$ 0.33	7.13 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.36	7.80 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.35	8.40 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.22	9.15 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.10
T <sub>4</sub>	5.85 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.13	6.20 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.11	6.55 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.12	7.15 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.13	7.50 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	8.48 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.09
T <sub>5</sub>	6.78 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.14	7.18 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	7.53 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	7.98 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	8.75 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.22	9.65 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.17
T <sub>6</sub>	7.00 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	7.48 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.17	7.98 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	8.55 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.13	9.08 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.15	9.79 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.20
SEm	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.19	0.17
CD at 5%	0.56	0.56	0.57	0.63	0.57	0.51
CV%	6.12	5.68	5.46	5.48	4.59	3.75

Means bearing with different superscripts within a column differ significantly ( $p < 0.01$ )

**Table 2:** Effect of different litter treatment on mean ( $\pm$  SE) weekly litter moisture (%) of broilers at different ages

Treatments	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	5 <sup>th</sup> week	6 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	13.75 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.75	16.25 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.63	20.00 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.91	24.00 $\pm$ 1.41	28.00 $\pm$ 1.47	34.25 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 1.31
T <sub>2</sub>	10.75 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.48	12.00 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.41	15.50 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	20.50 $\pm$ 0.65	24.50 $\pm$ 0.65	29.25 <sup>d</sup> $\pm$ 0.48
T <sub>3</sub>	12.25 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.48	13.25 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.85	16.50 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	21.50 $\pm$ 0.87	25.25 $\pm$ 0.85	30.25 <sup>cd</sup> $\pm$ 0.85
T <sub>4</sub>	11.50 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	15.50 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	18.75 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.75	22.75 $\pm$ 0.75	26.25 $\pm$ 0.85	31.25 <sup>bcd</sup> $\pm$ 0.85
T <sub>5</sub>	13.50 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	15.50 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.65	19.75 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.48	22.75 $\pm$ 0.48	26.50 $\pm$ 0.65	32.25 <sup>abc</sup> $\pm$ 0.45
T <sub>6</sub>	13.50 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.87	15.75 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 1.31	19.75 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 1.31	23.50 $\pm$ 1.32	27.25 $\pm$ 1.49	33.25 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 1.49
SEm	0.65	0.80	0.83	0.98	1.05	0.99
CD at 5%	1.96	2.38	2.48	NS	NS	2.94
CV %	10.51	10.90	9.09	8.67	8.03	6.23

Means bearing with different superscripts within a column differ significantly ( $p < 0.01$ )



**Table 3:** Effect of different litter treatment on mean ( $\pm$  SE) weekly litter nitrogen (%) of broilers at different ages of broilers

Treatments	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	5 <sup>th</sup> week	6 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	2.25 $\pm$ 0.14	2.29 $\pm$ 0.08	2.35 $\pm$ 0.13	2.44 $\pm$ 0.08	2.62 <sup>c</sup> $\pm$ 0.09	2.73 $\pm$ 0.13
T <sub>2</sub>	2.35 $\pm$ 0.10	2.39 $\pm$ 0.06	2.42 $\pm$ 0.09	2.61 $\pm$ 0.12	3.04 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.05	3.13 $\pm$ 0.11
T <sub>3</sub>	2.29 $\pm$ 0.09	2.33 $\pm$ 0.06	2.40 $\pm$ 0.10	2.54 $\pm$ 0.21	2.80 <sup>abc</sup> $\pm$ 0.11	2.84 $\pm$ 0.12
T <sub>4</sub>	2.28 $\pm$ 0.04	2.32 $\pm$ 0.08	2.40 $\pm$ 0.05	2.59 $\pm$ 0.07	2.75 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.08	2.92 $\pm$ 0.10
T <sub>5</sub>	2.24 $\pm$ 0.07	2.30 $\pm$ 0.09	2.35 $\pm$ 0.14	2.48 $\pm$ 0.08	2.64 <sup>bc</sup> $\pm$ 0.09	2.74 $\pm$ 0.15
T <sub>6</sub>	2.31 $\pm$ 0.11	2.35 $\pm$ 0.06	2.39 $\pm$ 0.13	2.59 $\pm$ 0.11	2.88 <sup>ab</sup> $\pm$ 0.05	2.91 $\pm$ 0.10
SEm	0.09	0.07	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.12
CD at 5%	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
CV %	8.54	6.27	9.42	9.44	5.81	8.36

Means bearing with different superscripts within a column differ significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### Litter Ammonia (ppm)

High levels of ammonia in poultry houses have detrimental effects on bird health and performance. In the present study, litter ammonia concentration was estimated at the end of the experiment (42<sup>nd</sup> day), and the results are presented in Table 4. The mean litter ammonia emission was significantly lower ( $p < 0.01$ ) in treatment T<sub>2</sub> compared to T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>1</sub>, however, there was no statistically significant difference among the latter groups.

Ammonia levels in the present study ranged from 6 to 20 ppm, which is consistent with the findings of Karamanlis *et al.* (2008), Madrid *et al.* (2012), Rashid *et al.* (2017), and Lonkar *et al.* (2018). Ammonia volatilization is influenced by several factors, including temperature, litter pH, moisture content, and air movement (Li *et al.*, 2013). The alum treated litter group (T<sub>2</sub>) exhibited lower pH and moisture levels followed by boric acid (T<sub>3</sub>) and sodium bisulphate (T<sub>4</sub>) groups, with reduced ammonia emissions compared to the control and other probiotics groups. These results supported the findings of Oliveira *et al.* (2003), who reported reduced ammonia emissions in gypsum-treated litter, and Choi and Moore (2008), who found significantly decreased ammonia volatilization with aluminum chloride. Similar reductions in ammonia emissions due to litter treatments were reported by Karamanlis *et al.* (2008) and Purswell *et al.* (2013). However, the present findings contradict those of Onbasilar *et al.* (2013), who observed no significant effect on ammonia levels with *Yucca schidigera* supplementation.

Overall, the alum-treated group (T<sub>2</sub>) exhibited significantly lower ammonia emissions compared to the untreated control, indicating the efficacy of alum as a litter treatment for ammonia mitigation.

**Table 4:** Mean  $\pm$  SE of litter ammonia emission (ppm) of broilers in different treatments at the end of the experiment

Treatments	Ammonia (ppm)
T <sub>1</sub>	20.00 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.00
T <sub>2</sub>	6.25 <sup>b</sup> $\pm$ 1.25
T <sub>3</sub>	17.50 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 2.50
T <sub>4</sub>	17.50 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 2.50
T <sub>5</sub>	20.00 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 0.00
T <sub>6</sub>	15.00 <sup>a</sup> $\pm$ 2.89
SEm	1.93
CD at 5 %	5.74
CV %	24.09

Means bearing with different superscripts within a column differ significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### CONCLUSION

Based on the overall findings of the present study, it can be concluded that broiler birds reared on rice husk litter treated with alum at 90 g/sq.ft. experienced significant mitigating effect on ammonia emissions and enhanced litter quality, contributing to a more favourable rearing environment.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Principal, College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, Kamdhenu University, Anand, for extending the necessary facilities to undertake this research.

### REFERENCES

- Al-Mashhadani, E.H., & Al-Saadi, J.Q. (2009). Effect of *Yucca schidigera* extract on broiler performance and ammonia level. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 8(6), 553-556.

- APHA (2000). Total solids dried at 103-105°C, Method 2540B. In: *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*. 20<sup>th</sup> Edn., American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.
- Atapattu, N.S., Lakmal, L.G., & Perera, P.W. (2017). Effects of two litter amendments on air NH<sub>3</sub> levels in broiler closed-houses. *Asian-Australian Journal of Animal Science*, 30(10), 1500-1506.
- Avcilar, O.V., Kocakaya, A., Onbasilar, E.E., & Pirpanahi, M. (2018). Influence of sepiolite additions to different litter materials on performance and some welfare parameters of broilers and litter characteristics. *Poultry Science*, 97(9), 3085-3091.
- BIS. (2007). Bureau of Indian Standards (IS 1374: 2007). *Poultry Feeds – Specification. (Fifth Revision)*.
- Burgess, R.P., Carey, J.B., & Shafer, D.J. (1998). The impact of pH on nitrogen retention in laboratory analysis of broiler litter. *Poultry Science*, 77, 1620-1622.
- Chakravati, R.K., Pramanik, P.S., Singh, K.D., Singh, M.K., & Manoj, J. (2019). Effect of litter treatment on growth, carcass traits, and immunity status of broiler chickens. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*, 54(2), 151-154.
- Choi, I.H., & Moore, P.A. (2008). Effects of liquid aluminum chloride additions to poultry litter on broiler performance, ammonia emissions, soluble phosphorus, total volatile fatty acids, and nitrogen contents of litter. *Poultry Science*, 87(10), 1955-1963.
- Dewey, C. E., Cox, B. D., Straw, B. E., Bush, E. J., & Hurd, H. S. (2000). Use of pHydration™ ammonia test strips to evaluate ammonia concentrations in a 700-sow farrow-to-finish swine facility in the Midwestern United States. *Journal of Swine Health and Production*, 8(3), 127-130.
- Fries, R., Akcan, M., Bandick, N., & Kobe, A. (2005). Microflora of two different types of poultry litter. *British Poultry Science*, 46, 668-672.
- Garrido, N.M., Skjervheim, M., Oppegaard, H., & Sorum, H. (2004). Acidified litter benefits the intestinal flora balance of broiler chickens. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 70 (9), 5208-5213.
- Karamanlis, X., Fortomaris, P., Arsenos, G., Dosis, I., Papaioannou, D., Batzios, C., & Kamarianos, A. (2008). The effect of a natural zeolite (clinoptilolite) on the performance of broiler chickens and the quality of their litter. *Asian-Australian Journal of Animal Science*, 21(11), 1642-1650.
- Li, H., Lin, C., Collier, S., Brown, B.W., & White-Hansen, S. (2013). Assessment of frequent litter amendment application on ammonia emission from broilers operations. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 63(4), 442-452.
- Liang, Y., Xin, H., & Wheeler, E.F. (2005). Ammonia production and emission rate from laying-hen houses in Iowa. *Journal of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers*, 48(5), 1927-1941.
- Lonkar, V.D., Ranade A.S., Kulkarni, V.R., Pathak, C.B., Yenge, G.D., & Daware, A.G. (2018). Effect of organic acid-treated corn cob bedding material on broiler performance, hock burn incidence, and litter quality. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology*, 7(2), 397-409.
- Madrid, J., Lopez, M.J., Orengo, J., Martínez, S., Valverde, M., Megias, M.D., & Hernandez, F. (2012). Effect of aluminum sulfate on litter composition and ammonia emission in a single flock of broilers up to 42 days of age. *Animal*, 6(8), 1322-1329.
- Mahmoud, U.T., Soliman, M.M., & El-Shazly, K.D. (2020). Evaluation of different litter materials on broiler performance, litter quality, and ammonia emission. *Poultry Science Journal*, 8(2), 115-125.
- Miles, D.M., Branton, S.L., & Lott, B.D. (2004). Atmospheric ammonia is detrimental to the performance of modern commercial broilers. *Poultry Science*, 83(10), 1650-1654.
- Nagaraju, M., Ramesh Gupta, B., & Reddy, V.R. (2007). Effect of ammonia emission on performance of broilers. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*, 42(1), 63-66.
- Oliveira, M.C., Ferreira, H.A., & Chancherini, L.C. (2004). Effect of chemical conditioners on poultry litter quality. *Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia*, 56(4), 536-541.
- Oliveira, M.C., Almeida, C.V., Andrade, D.O., & Rodrigues, S.M.M. (2003). Dry matter content, pH and volatilized ammonia from poultry litter treated or not with different additives. *Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia*, 32(4), 951-954.
- Onbasilar, E.E., Erdem, E., Unal, N., Kocakaya, A., & Torlak, E. (2013). Effect of *Yucca schidigera* spraying in different litter materials on some litter traits and breast burn of broilers at the fifth week of production. *Kafkas Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(5), 749-753.
- Patterson, J.A., & Burkholder, K.M. (2003). Application of prebiotics and probiotics in poultry production. *Poultry Science*, 82(4), 627-631.
- Purswell, J.L., Davis, J.D., Kiess, A.S., & Coufal, C.D. (2013). Effects of frequency of multiple applications of litter amendment on litter ammonia and live performance in a shared airspace. *Journal of Applied Poultry Research*, 22(3), 469-473.
- Rashid, A., Bandy. M.T., Adil. S., Khan, A.A., Saim Qureshi, S., Madeeha Untoo, M., & Ashraf, P. (2017). Effect of chemically treated litter on ammonia emission, performance and carcass characteristics of broiler chicken. *Journal of World Poultry Research*, 7(2), 88-93.
- Sahoo, S.P., Kaur, D., Sethi, A.P.S., Sharma, A., Chandra, M., & Chandahas, (2017). Effect of chemically amended litter on litter quality and broiler performance in winter. *Journal of Applied Animal Research*, 45(1), 533-537.
- Sims, J.T., & Luka-McCafferty, N.J. (2002). On-farm evaluation of aluminum sulfate (alum) as a poultry amendment: effects on litter properties. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 31(6), 2066-2073.
- Smith, D.R., Moore, P.A., Maxwell, C.V., & Daniel, T.C. (2001). Dietary phytase and aluminum chloride manure amendments to reduce phosphorus and ammonia volatilization from swine manure. Addressing Animal Production and Environmental Issues. Sheraton Imperial, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, pp. 502-507.
- Toppel, K., Kaufmann, F., Schon, H., Gauly, M., & Andersson, R. (2018). Effect of pH-lowering litter amendment on animal-based welfare indicators and litter quality in a European commercial broiler husbandry. *Poultry Science*, 98(3), 1181-1189.
- Younis, M., Bazh, E., Ahmed, H.A., & Elbestawy, A.R. (2016). Growth performance, carcass characteristics and litter composition of broilers raised on used litter managed by two types of acidifier amendments. *Journal of Animal Science Advances*, 6(9), 1756-1765.

