American Journal of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering
2022; 6(1): 21-26
http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/ajcbe
doi: 10.11648/j.ajcbe.20220601.13
ISSN: 2639-9970 (Print); ISSN: 2639-9989 (Online)

Control of Aflatoxins in Poultry Feed by Using Yeast

Nosheen Afzal[1], Syeda Mona Hassan[1], Shahzad Sharif Mughal[1], Alejandro Pando[2], Alvina Rafiq[1]

[1]Department of Chemistry, Lahore Garrison University, Lahore, Pakistan

[2]Center for Biomedical Engineering, Brown University, Providence, USA

Email address:

shezi1130@gmail.com (S. S. Mughal)

To cite this article:

Nosheen Afzal, Syeda Mona Hassan, Shahzad Sharif Mughal, Alejandro Pando, Alvina Rafiq. Control of Aflatoxins in Poultry Feed by Using Yeast. *American Journal of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering*. Vol. 6, No. 1, 2022, pp. 21-26.
doi: 10.11648/j.ajcbe.20220601.13

Received: December 27, 2021; **Accepted**: May 16, 2022; **Published**: May 24, 2022

Abstract: The present study aimed to determine the detoxification potential of the food industry by-products such as yeast sludge against the harmful effects of aflatoxins on broilers. The objective of this study was to compare the binding capacity of yeast sludge fractions i.e. yeast sludge cell wall (YSCW) and yeast sludge cell solubles (YSCS) against different levels of AFB1 and AFG1. Yeast sludge was sonicated into yeast sludge cell walls and yeast sludge cell soluble. A total of 300 one-day-old chicks were randomly divided into 10 treatments with three replicates per treatment and ten chicks per replicate. The 10 treatments included negative control, three positive control with different levels of AFB1 and AFG1, and three different adsorbents with different levels of combinations of AFB1 and AFG1. AFB1 and AFG1 treatments were offered with different levels of AFs (50, 100, and 150 µg/kg) without toxin binder in the feed while the remaining treatments included 0.5% YSCW and 0.5% YSCS as toxin binders at different levels of AFB1 and AFG1 in a factorial arrangement. Feed and water were provided timely with great accuracy. The Aflatoxins showed a significant effect on production, slaughtering, and serum chemistry parameters. The yeast sludge cell wall exhibited significant effects on the production and slaughtering parameters of chicks. Yeast sludge cell wall also showed a significant effect on the biochemical and mineral profile of chicks. The results confirmed that natural binders are economically effective in commercial poultry production.

Keywords: Aflatoxin, Yeast Sludge, Adsorption, Glucomannan

1. Introduction

Feeds from plants are typically more often infected with mycotoxins than feed from animals. Food sustainability is accomplished where there are standards that provide both people direct as well as financial accessibility to accessible and healthy nutritional foodstuffs at all times, which include food supply, quality, food intake, and sustainability of foods. Until one of these foundations decreases, the food protection of an organization is impaired. In addition to impacting human health and wellbeing, demographic, economic, and cultural influences influence food poverty as well as starvation. Regarding older designs, pre-and post-harvest failures through mycotoxin are reported as one of the motivating forces of food poverty, since these compounds exist in the majority of food sources [1].

"Mycotoxins" applies to fungi, and toxicants of biological origin to the word "mycotoxin." These were all organic secondary plant metabolites generated with particular fungi that contaminate feeding stuff derived from plants and constitute is among the most serious food safety intimidation [2].

Mycotoxins contaminate at minimum 25 percent of the world cereal supply, the Nutrition, as well as Agricultural Organization, has reported. Aflatoxins cause significant human and animal complications, so management measures are important [3]. Such management methods not only should reduce the volume of aflatoxins under regulation thresholds, they really should bring an end to the production of new to alter derivatives as they are depleted and naturally stabilize their nutrient benefit. The process to shield pathogens from negative impacts, including carcinogenic effects, teratogenicity as well as mutagenicity, as well needs to be identified [4].

The WHO recognized herbal remedies and began to popularize herbal remedies around twenty years ago. Even so,

in developed nations, these herbal medicines have been around for many hundreds and hundreds of years by now. Phyto medicines nowadays are better and much friendlier. Therefore, separately or in combination medicinal herbs rather than as the main component of raw resources are being used for medicinal products [5].

Pakistan lies in the northwestern region of the South Asian subcontinent. Pakistan is located between 24° and 40° north latitudes. The weather in various regions of Pakistan is varied, including warm, cold and moist. The climate is favorable for fungal growth in this country. In Pakistan, the presence of aflatoxins has already been reported in poultry feed. Free-range chickens seem to be usually very sensitive than hens [6].

Yeast loams are manufactured in bulk as a by-product of the Pakistani alcohol manufacturing sectors but tossed as waste material. It is indeed a beneficial yeast cellular soluble component (protein, complicated vitamin B, high availability ionic compounds as well as enzymes) as well as a special cell that is insoluble under the shape of a yeast cell wall. The whole process is unique. It appears to contain mannan oligosaccharides and organic sorbents for aflatoxins. Even then, for optimal use, the adsorptive capacity of any component even the yeast sludge must be explored such that every co-product can sometimes be marketed in compliance with its usefulness as a feed additive for poultry and livestock food supplies [7].

The study currently demonstrates the prognostic significance of supernatants yeast sludge as toxin binding materials in broiler feed to inhibit the development of aflatoxins. Consequently, the adsorption efficiency of a segment of yeast sludge needs to be analyzed to ensure that every other by-product was being used as a feed additive however according to their usefulness for animal and poultry supplies [8].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Collection of Yeast Sludge

Yeast sludge was collected from Sugar mill and to exclude total traces of molasses, yeast sludge was washed with purified water and then dried. A mixture of dry yeast sludge and purified water samples are used to create various suspension fractions between two layers. By using a cooling bath the solution of leaven sludge was preserved at constant temperature. The blend was centrifuged to extract surfactant and residue.

2.2. Production of Aflatoxins

Fungal strains *Aspergillus flavus* as well as *Aspergillus paraciticus* were developed using the aflatoxins B1, B2, G1 and G2 and isolated with the aid of potato dextrose agar (PDA) from grains such as maize and wheat. Sterilizing, drying up and powdering the fermented rice grains then mixture then was centrifuged. The AFB1 and AFG1 were then based [28].

2.3. Effect of Antiaflatoxigenic Additives to Control Aflatoxicosis in Chicks

In first week, the chicks were categorized into ten groups. The chicks were fed starter diet until 21 days of age. From 22 day of age, the chicks were switched to grower diet. The chicks were given different dietary treatments. Tables 1 to 8 showed that control group was fed the basal diet (G1), while positive control (G2, G3 and G4) were fed on aflatoxins contaminated diet. G5, G6 and G7 were fed with aflatoxins contaminated diet with yeast sludge cell wall. However, the G8, G9 and G10 were fed on aflatoxins contaminated diet with yeast sludge cell soluble [10].

2.4. Analysis of Production and Slaughtering Parameters

During 28 days of the experimental period, the feed intake and body weight were recorded to derive feed conversion ratio. Blood specimens have been obtained by cardiac puncture when slaughtered. In the research kits, the blood samples were used separately for serum albumin, serum cholesterol, serum uric acid, glucose (GOD-PAP method), ASAT (GOT IFCC mod) and (GPTIFC mod) ALAT). Biuret method determined the total serum protein with minor modifications [9].

For mineral determination, the serum was analysed for potassium, chloride, magnesium, sodium, phosphorus, calcium and zinc. The atomic absorption spectrophotometer was used to analyze calcium, magnesium, zinc, sodium, potassium and serum chloride (Perkin-Elmer, AA400). Spectrophotometer study of phosphorus.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Triplicate (n=3) experiments were all carried out and the results were recorded as mean ± SD data. LSD determined Significant mean difference.

3. Results and Discussions

The major flora for the synthesis of aflatoxins are fungi and, in particular, *Aspergillus parasiticus* and *Aspergillus flavus*. Aflatoxin-producing fungi are primarily cereal grains, which quickly contaminate [24]. Fungus needs vital nutrients that lead to feed degradation and a decrease in quality for its success and maintenance. The polluted feed from aflatoxins therefore enhances bird performance [11].

While a great deal has been done to find a safe and inexpensive way to suppress aflatoxicosis in our sample. Some binders are known to prevent fungal growth of *Aspergillus* and reduce development of aflatoxins. In this study, the effectiveness of natural binders to control aflatoxicosis in kids was evaluated [11, 12].

In our study, the mean FCR values of G5 supplemented with yeast sludge cell wall, contaminated with low dose of aflatoxins showed significantly lower FCR as compared to untreated feed in Table 2. This can be because the presence of the contents of glucomannan in YSCW can reverse the harmful effects of aflatoxins [13].

3.1. Effect of Natural Binders on Slaughtering Parameter

The nutritional processes displayed considerably higher relative liver weight than negative control (Table 3), matching results [26], aflatoxins contamination impacted mostly with liver weight. This also correlates with the rise in relative liver weight of aflatoxins inoculation reported by younus et al., 2009 [14].

The current research shows a major impact on relative liver weight of the aflatoxins levels and of various toxin binders [25]. The YSCS applied at 0.5 percent was observed to have less liver weight than the positive control. However, Yeast sludge cell soluble exhibited less effectiveness to control liver weight in chicks in contrast with YSCW. Aflatoxins can inhibit the formation of hepatic proteins as well as lipid metabolism exposure to lipids in the liver. This disease mechanism progresses to a swollen liver fatty [15].

3.2. Serum Biochemistry

The effect of different fractions of natural additives on serum components of chicks at different levels of aflatoxins contamination are demonstrated in Table 4. Data regarding biochemical composition (serum cholesterol, gross serum protein, ASAT and ALAT serum hives) of chicks after treatment with different fractions of natural additives result depicted that the aflatoxins contamination decreases the cholesterol level. Since several researches have shown that aflatoxins influence the role of hepatocytes, cholesterol biosynthesis is hindered [22-24]. In current study, the data showed lower serum concentrations of glucose, uric acid, total serum protein, ASAT and ALAT with contaminated feed [16].

Our findings have led to a major predictor of mild to serious liver toxicity, with improved plasma membrane fluidity, impacting the tests of liver function contributing to the rise of ASAT and ALAT. Serum ASAT and ALAT activities represent essential liver function physiological indexes [17].

Level of serum total protein was significantly improved by the supplementation of 0.5% YSCW and YSCS, at 50, 100 & 150 ug/kg aflatoxins level. The present study was in line with the findings of Oguz and Parlat (2004) and they observed that supplementation of YSCW and YSCS in the chick ration had significantly reduced the adverse effects of aflatoxicosis [27].

Further data revealed a remarkable effect on serum uric acid at various levels of aflatoxins [23]. The contaminated feed decreased serum uric acid concentration, however supplementation of YSCW controlled the concentration of uric acid as compared to positive control [18].

3.3. Mineral Analysis

The effect of different fractions of yeast sludge on the mineral profile of serum of chicks at different levels of aflatoxins contamination is presented in Table 5. Data revealed that different toxin binders, 0.5% YSCW and 0.5% YSCS, showed significant effects on the concentration of potassium, chloride, magnesium, zinc, sodium, calcium and phosphorus [21]. Moreover current study revealed that chicks fed with 0.5% YSCW with 50ug/kg of aflatoxins showed significant effect to control the mineral contents of serum as compared to positive control. The findings of this study also fit the former studies which indicated that aflatoxins affected the workings of hepatocytes thereby preventing different minerals from biosynthesizing [19].

In current study, toxin binders were able to improve mineral level (Table 6) and the AFB1+AFG1 concentration tremendously lowered tibial minerals. Moreover, treatments with 0.5% YSCW and 0.5% YSCS significantly improved minerals in chicks as compared to positive control [20].

Table 1. *The Ingredients Composition o / Experimental Diet (%).*

Ingredients%	Starter	Grower
Corn	43	53
Rice Tips	13.73	12.1
Rice Polish	2.0	--
Wheat Bran	4.0	--
Canola Meal	13.65	11.65
Soybean Meal	18.07	18.07
Molasses	1.4	1.4
$CaCO_3$	1.06	0.96
DCP	2.0	1.8
Lysine-HCl	0.34	0.28
DL-Methionine	0.15	0.12
NaCl	0.3	0.3
$NaHCO_3$	0.1	0.2
Vitamin	0.2	0.2

Table 2. *Experimental Treatments.*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	Level of AFB1 (ug/kg)	Level of AFG1 (ug/kg)	Level of YSCW (%)	Level of YSCS (%)
1	G1	Feed (NC)	0	0	0	0
2	G2	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC 1)	50	50	0	0
3	G3	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC 2)	100	100	0	0
4	G4	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC 3)	150	150	0	0
5	G5	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	50	50	0.5	0
6	G6	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 +YSCW (YSCW 2)	100	100	0.5	0
7	G7	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 +YSCW (YSCW 3)	150	150	0.5	0
8	G8	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 +YSCS (YSCS 1)	50	50	0	0.5
9	G9	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 +YSCS (YSCS 2)	100	100	0	0.5
10	G10	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 +YSCS ((YSCS 3)	150	150	0	0.5

Table 3. *Effect of natural binders on FCR at different levels of Aflatoxins (B1+G1).*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	Intake of Feed	Gain in Weight	FCR
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	1766.9±12.91	1235.59±18.98	1.43±0.02
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	1470.1±28.52	610.41±39.25	2.40±0.24
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	1330.7±95.87	505.18±12.24	2.63±0.25
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	1256.8±132.75	470.78±36.74	2.66±0.61
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	1559.0±34.66	1039.33±57.43	1.5±0.20
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	1490.29±58.04	827.93±24.41	1.80±0.17
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	1525.5±50.98	794.21±16.89	1.92±0.19
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	1468.6±61.13	858.61±34.67	1.72±0.28
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	1475.5±30.38	795.9±56.68	1.85±0.02
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS ((YSCS 3)	1469.6±95.23	699.01±31.96	2.10±0.21

Table 4. *Effect of natural binders on slaughtering parameters at different levels of Aflatoxins (B1+G1).*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	Dressing percentage	Liver weight (%)
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	55.83±2.19	1.72±0.16
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	54.44±1.22	2.70±0.12
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	52.05±2.07	3.46±0.24
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	52.93±2.04	3.77±0.21
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	54.69±1.87	2.01±0.12
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	53.94±1.09	2.38±0.07
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	54.02±1.55	2.15±0.11
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	55.06±1.78	2.94±0.20
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	53.40±2.09	2.65±0.22
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS ((YSCS 3)	53.69±1.18	3.64±0.13

Table 5. *Effect of natural binders on serum biochemistry at different levels of Aflatoxins (B_1 + G_1).*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	Cholesterol mg / dL	Glucose mg / dL	Uric acid mg / dL
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	134.16±3.58	140.88±2.21	5.58±0.07
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	121.05±4.62	137.17±3.02	4.81±0.06
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	111.63±4.91	135.63±3.40	4.55±0.13
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	104.08±3.36	135.54±3.38	4.11±0.15
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	126.68±3.26	139.23±5.25	5.22 ±0.04
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	125.86±3.89	138.11±7.81	5.12±0.13
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	123.76±3.72	137.76±4.76	5.01±0.06
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	124.53±2.71	138.66±5.55	4.91±0.20
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	115.21±3.69	136.79±2.22	4.60±0.12
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS ((YSCS 3)	108.91±4.51	136.72±4.36	4.31±0.09

Table 6. *Effect of different natural binders on serum parameters at different levels of Aflatoxins (B_1 +G_1).*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	ALAT IU/L	ASAT IU/L	Total protein serum g / dL
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	23.2±1.50	126.33±8.78	2.55±0.05
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	27.62±4.81	179.18±6.54	2.04±0.08
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	31.01±1.80	196.55±5.54	1.67±0.04
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	32.81±31	225.13±8.70	1.44±0.06
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	23.33±1.90	131.86±9.78	2.11±0.07
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	24.19±1.31	162.52±5.71	2.08±0.07
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	25.51±1.77	173.85±4.21	2.01±0.05
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	25.28±2.09	140.75±8.04	2.03±0.10
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	26.07±1.53	169.74±8.96	1.90±0.27
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS ((YSCS 3)	30.12±1.94	200.36±7.33	1.57±0.31

Table 7. *Effect of different natural binders on serum minerals profile at different levels of Aflatoxins (B_1 +G_1).*

	Groups	Treatments	Potassium (ppm)	Chloride (ppm)	Magnesium (ppm)	Sodium (ppm)	Phosphorous (ppm)	Calcium (ppm)	Zinc (ppm)
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	34.96±1.93	368.29±2.64	2.39±0.16	348.72±5.06	6.86±0.26	10.28±0.46	0.61±0.08
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	31.48±1.85	359.81±3.11	2.26±0.18	300.60±3.29	6.55±0.14	9.27±0.21	0.58±0.05
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	30.55±1.58	355.96±4.21	2.10±0.21	261.42±11.39	6.52±0.12	9.50±0.24	0.30±0.06

	Groups	Treatments	Potassium (ppm)	Chloride (ppm)	Magnesium (ppm)	Sodium (ppm)	Phosphorous (ppm)	Calcium (ppm)	Zinc (ppm)
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	20.25±1.76	345.13±3.01	1.91±0.26	210.56±4.41	6.51±0.15	9.18±0.19	0.14±0.05
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	33.68±0.86	363.26±3.01	2.30±0.18	341.38±8.38	6.69±0.21	10.29±0.15	0.53±0.10
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	32.01±1.11	361.54±8.61	2.27±0.25	334.61±8.51	6.65±0.41	9.85±0.38	0.48±0.06
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	31.18±1.38	360.04±2.60	2.26±0.13	324.43±3.68	6.60±0.15	9.65±0.18	0.42±0.05
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	30.99±1.62	360.96±8.91	2.28±0.21	320.86±8.37	6.58±0.25	9.61±0.26	0.51±0.10
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	28.25±1.23	358.69±2.71	2.20±0.14	270.57±5.77	6.55±0.14	9.67±0.23	0.34±0.05
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS ((YSCS 3)	27.65±1.68	353.73±8.51	2.14±0.16	260.82±9.23	6.50±0.61	9.27±0.42	0.20±0.10

Table 8. *Effect of different natural binders on Tibial Minerals Profile at different levels of Aflatoxins (B_1 + G_1).*

Sr. No	Groups	Treatments	Tibial Phosphorous (ppm)	Tibial calcium (ppm)
1	$G1^{A}$	Feed (NC)	9.83±0.24	17.06±0.29
2	$G2^{GH}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC1)	9.26±0.25	15.53±0.25
3	$G3^{HI}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1 (PC2)	9.09±0.13	14.84±0.17
4	$G4^{I}$	Feed+AFB1 + AFG1 (PC3)	8.47±0.21	14.06±0.15
5	$G5^{AB}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 1)	9.63±0.13	16.95±0.57
6	$G6^{CD}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 2)	9.27±0.44	16.83±1.34
7	$G7^{EF}$	Feed+AFB1+AFG1+YSCW (YSCW 3)	9.57±0.15	16.79±0.15
8	$G8^{BC}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 1)	9.47±0.59	16.87±0.75
9	$G9^{DE}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 2)	9.15±0.21	15.13±0.19
10	$G10^{FG}$	Feed+AFB1 +AFG1+YSCS (YSCS 3)	9.50±0.37	14.88±0.93

4. Conclusion

Precisely, yeast sludge supplemented natural binders resulted in beneficial effects of healthy feed on the performance of chicks. These sound effects may be due to the glucomannan compound presence. The yeast sludge cell solubles, without glucomannan compounds were not able to minimize the effects of aflatoxins extensively. In view of the fact that toxins free feed should be chosen for most advantageous results in poultry feed. Yeast sludge cell wall fractions can be a great positive feature to detoxify the harmful effects of aflatoxins comparatively to the any commercial natural toxin binder products.

References

[1] Adjou, E. S., Kouton, S., Dahouenon-Ahoussi, E., Soumanou, M. M., & Sohounhloue, D. C. (2013). Effect of essential oil from fresh leaves of Ocimum gratissimum L. on mycoflora during storage of peanuts in Benin. *Mycotoxin research, 29* (1), 29-38.

[2] Bennett JW and Klich M. 2003. Mycotoxins. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 16: 497-516.

[3] Ditta, Y. A., Pasha, T. N., Akram, M., Iqbal, Z. M., & Naseem, S. (2016). BINDING EFFICACY OF YEAST SLUDGE FRACTIONS AND COMMERCIAL GLUCOMANNAN AGAINST AFLATOXINS IN BROILERS. JAPS: Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences, 26 (5).

[4] FAO. Data, (2020): F. A. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[5] Gowda, N., Suganthi, R., Malathi, V., & Raghavendra, A. (2007). Efficacy of heat treatment and sun drying of aflatoxin-contaminated feed for reducing the harmful biological effects in sheep. *Animal Feed Science and Technology, 133* (1-2), 167-175.

[6] HaseenabiShaik. (2019). Comparative Studies of the Protein Content of Probiotic and Nonprobiotic Treated Chicken Meat. International Journal of Health Sciences and Research, 9 (12), 169-173.

[7] Huma. Mujahid, (2019). Protective Effect of Yeast Sludge and Whey Powder against Ochratoxicosis in Broiler Chicks. Pakistan Veterinary Journal. 39. 588-592.

[8] Khan, B., Abdukadir, A., Qureshi, R., & Mustafa, G. (2011). Medicinal uses of plants by the inhabitants of Khunjerab National Park, Gilgit, Pakistan. Pak J Bot, 43 (5), 2301-2310.

[9] Marke's et al; (2011). Aflatoxins: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Ch-14, Pg 285-293.

[10] Maurice OM. 2002. Risk assessment for afatoxins in foodstuffs. Int. Biodeterior. Biodegrad. 50: 137-142.

[11] Méndez-Albores, A., Del Río-García, J. C., & Moreno-Martinez, E. (2007). Decontamination of aflatoxin duckling feed with aqueous citric acid treatment. Animal Feed Science and Technology, 135 (3-4), 249-262.

[12] Monson, M. S., R. A. Coulombe and K. M. Reed (2015). Aflatoxicosis: Lessons from toxicity and responses to aflatoxin B1 in poultry. Agric 5 (3): 742-777.

[13] Morgan, N. K., & Choct, M. (2016). Cassava: Nutrient composition and nutritive value in poultry diets. *Animal Nutrition, 2* (4), 253-261.

[14] Moricz, A. M., Ott, P. G., Billes, F., Otta, K. H., & Tyihák, E. (2007). The influence of l-ascorbic acid on the antibacterial-toxic activity of aflatoxins on adsorbent layer. Journal of applied microbiology, 103 (6), 2525-2532.

[15] Nam, I. S., Garnsworthy, P. C., & Ahn, J. H. (2009). Effects of freeze-dried citrus peel on feed preservation, aflatoxin contamination and in vitro ruminal fermentation. Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences, 22 (5), 674-680.

[16] Oguz, Halis & Parlat, SS. (2004). Effects of dietary mannanoligosaccharide on performance of Japanese quail affected by aflatoxicosis. South African Journal of Animal Science. 34.

[17] Pereyra De La Iglesia, M. T., Domenech, J., & Gutiérrez Mañero, F. J. (2008). Systemic disease protection elicited by plant growth promoting rhizobacteria strains: relationship between metabolic responses, systemic disease protection, and biotic elicitors. Phytopathology, 98 (4), 451-457.

[18] Quezada, T., Cuellar, H., Jaramillo-Juarez, F., Valdivia, A., & Reyes, J. (2000). Effects of aflatoxin B1 on the liver and kidney of broiler chickens during development. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Pharmacology, Toxicology and Endocrinology, 125* (3), 265-272.

[19] Rashid, N., Bajwa, M. A., Rafeeq, M., Tariq, M. M., Abbas, F., Awan, M. A., & Ahmad, Z. (2013). Prevalence of aflatoxicosis in broiler chickens in Quetta, Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Zoology, 45 (4).

[20] Safameher, A. (2008). Effects of clinoptilolite on performance, biochemical parameters and hepatic lesions in broiler chickens during aflatoxosis. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances, 7* (4), 381-388.

[21] Salgado, J., Cabral, H. N., & Costa, M. J. (2011). Food web structure and habitat connectivity in fish estuarine nurseries—impact of river flow. Estuaries and Coasts, 34 (4), 663-674.

[22] Santin, E., Paulillo, A., Nakagui, L., Alessi, A., & Maiorka, A. (2006). Evaluation of yeast cell wall on the performance of broiles fed diets with or without mycotoxins. *Brazilian Journal of Poultry Science, 8* (4), 221-225.

[23] Sawant, S., & Gawai, D. (2011). Biochemical changes in banana fruits due to postharvest fungal pathogens. *Current Botany, 2* (1).

[24] Sohail, Muhammad Umar & Ahmad, Ijaz & Younus, Muhammad & Shabbir, Muhammad Zubair & Kamran, Zahid & Ahmad, DrShakeel & Anwar, Haseeb & Yousaf, Muhammad Shahbaz & Ashraf, Kamran & Shahzad, Abid&Rehman, Habib. (2013). Effect of supplementation of mannan oligosaccharide and probiotic on growth performance, relative weights of viscera, and population of selected intestinal bacteria in cyclic heat-stressed broilers. The Journal of Applied Poultry Research. 22. 485-491.

[25] Suksombat W, Suksombat P and Mirttanaphari R. 2011. Effect of commercial or bovine yeasts on the performance and blood variables of broiler chickens intoxicated with aflatoxins. World.

[26] Valchev, I., Kanakov, D., Hristov, T., Lazarov, L., Binev, R., Grozeva, N., & Nikolov, Y. (2014). Investigations on the liver function of broiler chickens with experimental aflatoxicosis. *Bulgarian Journal of Veterinary Medicine, 17* (4).

[27] Yunus, A. W., Razzazi-Fazeli, E., & Bohm, J. (2011). Aflatoxin B1 in affecting broiler's performance, immunity, and gastrointestinal tract: A review of history and contemporary issues. *Toxins*, *3* (6), 566-590.

[28] Zafar, M., Khan, M. A., Ahmad, M., Jan, G., Sultana, S., Ullah, K., & Ullah, Z. (2010). Elemental analysis of some medicinal plants used in traditional medicine by atomic absorption spectrophotometer (AAS). Journal of Medicinal Plants Research, 4 (19), 1987-1990.