

# HERBAL DRUGS AND THEIR EFFECT ON BIOCHEMICAL ATTRIBUTES OF CROSSBRED CALVES

# RAM NIWAS\*, D. P. SINGH, V. K. PASWAN, BRIJPAL BISEN<sup>1</sup> AND M. ABED ALBIAL

Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, U. P., INDIA <sup>1</sup>SMS, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, J. N. K. V. University, Jabalpur e-mail: ramniwasbhu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

# **KEY WORDS**

Herbstone Herbal drugs Biochemical attributes Calves

**Received on :** 23.07.2012

Accepted on : 07.11.2012

\*Corresponding author

# INTRODUCTION

Formulation of different indigenous herbs like Pudina (Mentha piperita Linn), Ajwain (Trachyspermum ammi (Linn) Sprague), Harada (Terminalia chebula), Kalmegh (Andrographis paniculata), Amla (Phyllanthus emblica), Chiravita (Swertia chirata Buch Ham), Dry Zinger (Zingiber officinale) and Black Salt known for its various effects in the animal system which induced the phagocytic activity of leukocytes, potentiating the reticulo endothelial system and formation of antibodies. These herbs are a potent immune- stimulator by activating the natural killer (NK) cell activity (Suresh and Vasudevan, 1994), as well as an adaptogen that can increase tolerance to stress due to potent antioxidant property. Present emphasis is directed towards the search for herbal formulations that can be helpful in the rumen fermentation, growth performance and methane mitigation. Calves represent half of the progeny hence, reproductive efficiency of both indigenous and crossbred cattle irrespective of breed can be adjudged by the number of live calves produced. Compounded herbal drugs have positive effects on growth, feed intake and digestibility (Yadav et al., 2009). Supplementation of marketed herbal drug (Ruchamax) significantly improved rumen liquor profile, physical properties of rumen liquor and rumen biochemical parameters (Kolte et al., 2009). Supplementation of self formulated herbal drug and marketed herbal products significantly improved liver function, feed assimilation and digestibility of ration ultimately leading to gain in body weight as compared to untreated control group (Hadiya et al., 2009). The effect of neem oil and other herbal drugs on blood glucose

of the biochemical attributes of crossbred calves. Those crossbred calves of 4 to 6 months of age having similar body weights were divided in to three groups comprising three calves in each. Three different trials were conducted in Rainy, winter and summer seasons and each trial was continued for 2 months excluding preexperimental period. During each trial blood sample were collected directly from the jugular vein in the morning hr at the interval of 0, 30 and 60 days. It was observed that blood glucose level was significantly (p<0.05) higher in self compounded herbal drug (T2) group than marketed herbal drug (T3) and control groups (T1). A higher (p<0.05) level of cholesterol was observed in group fed with self formulated herbal drug as compared to marketed herbal drug and control groups. No significant (p<0.05) change was observed in total urea at day 0 and 30 but significant between 60 and 30 and 60 and 0 days of experiment. The SGOT was found significantly (p<0.05) higher in self compounded herbal drug treated calves than marketed herbal drug treated and control groups at 0, 30 and 60 days of trials. A significant (p<0.05) higher level of SGPT was observed due to administration of self formulated herbal drug as compared to marketed herbal drug and control groups. There was no significant (p<0.01) changes in SGOT and SGPT level at 0, 30 and 60 days of experiment.

The present investigation was planned to see the efficacy of self compounded and marketed herbal drugs on some

level (Bombik et *al.*, 2002; Jain, 2005; Islam et *al.*, 2006), total protein level (Bombik et *al.*, 2002; Ahmed et *al.*, 2009; Sarker et *al.*, 2010), cholesterol level (Hosoda et *al.*, 2006) and SGOT and SGPT level (Ahmed et *al.*, 2009) have significantly affected the aforementioned biochemical attributes. The immuno-modulating effects of several herbal formulations have been studied and a number of clinical and experimental trials have been conducted to evaluate the therapeutic properties of such herbal formulations. Thus, the present article deals with the comparative effects of self formulated herbal drug and marketed drugs in young calves on blood biochemical profiles.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Twenty seven crossbred calves with body weight ranging from

Table <sup>·</sup>	1:	Composition	of	marketed	herbal	drug	(Herbstone)
--------------------	----	-------------	----	----------	--------	------	-------------

S.No.	Name of Herbs	Ratio used	
1	Chirayita (Swertia	10%	
	chirata Buch Ham)		
2	Anola	10%	
3	Harad Wadi	10%	
4	Baheda	10%	
5	Ajwain (Trachys	05%	
	permum ammi)		
6	Black salt	15%	
7	Hara Kasis	02%	
8	Khana Soda	03%	
9	Comman Salt	05%	
10	Base	30%	
	Total	100%	

58 to 65Kg were divided into 3 groups in three different seasons. The Table 1 shows the composition of marketed herbal drug; while in case of self formulated herbal drug, slight modification were brought in the composition of marketed herbal drug (Herbstone) i.e. Baheda, Hara Kasis, Khana Soda, and Comman Salts were replaced by Pudina, Kalmegh and Dry Zinger. Both drugs were administered @ 20g/kg ration for 60 days in each season. Pre experimental feeding of fifteen days was also done before starting the trial in each season. The blood samples were collected on 0, 30<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> day. Blood sampling on 0 day was done in growing calves to find the level of various biochemicals attributes at the start of each trial. In the experimental studies serum as well as plasma was harvested and stored at - 20°C until analyzed. The physiological responses were recorded routinely in the morning hours before blood collection till 60 days as per standard procedure. Blood glucose concentration was estimated by Trinder's method (Pileggi and Szustkiewicz. 1974) using diagnostic kits and concentration was expressed in mg of glucose per 100mL of blood. Total plasma protein was estimated by Biuret method (Tietz, 1986) and concentration was expressed as g per 100mL. SGPT (ALT) and SGOT (AST) were estimated by 2, 4-DNPH method given by Frankel and Reitman (1957). The total urea and cholesterol were measured by enzymatic methods and the values were expressed as mmol/L and mg/dL respectively.

# Statistical analyses

The data were statistically analyzed using GLM procedure of SAS (1992). Duncan's test (1955) was applied in experiment to test differences. The following model was used:

 $Y = \mu + Ti + Pn + TPin + eins$ 

Where:

Y = observed trait;  $\mu$  = overall mean; Ti = effect of ith treatments (i th = T1, T2, T3) e = random error; Pn = effect of nth periods (nth = 0, 30, 60) TPin = interaction between Ti and Pn

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

During the trials significant changes were observed in blood glucose levels of crossbred calves subjected to the treatments of self formulated herbal drug and marketed herbal drug as compared to control group and highest blood glucose level was observed at day 30 followed by day 60 (Table 2). Present results are in conformity with the findings of Bombik et al. (2002) and Islam et al. (2006) reported higher blood glucose level in herbal treated groups of calves than control one during early stage which subsequently reduced with advancement of age. These findings could be further substantiated from the fact that the thyroid hormones and cortisol level remain at peak during early period and they contributes towards the higher levels of blood glucose (Jain, 2005). Significantly (p < 0.05) higher level of total protein was observed in self formulated herbal drug treated group as compared to marketed herbal drug and control groups during experiment. Similar results about total protein levels were also reported by Bombik et al. (2002) and Sarker et al. (2010). Serum cholesterol level was observed to be significantly (p < 0.05) higher in self

Table 2: Biochemica	l attributes of cross	bred calves at dif	ferent interval amon	gst different treatn	nent groups {Mea	ns with different supers	cript in a row differ sigr	nificantly $(p < 0.05)$	
Parameters	1st Trial (Rainy 5	season)		2nd Trial (Winte	er Season)		3rd Trial (Summe	er Season)	
	0 Day	30 Day	60 Day	0 Day	30 Day	60 Day	0 Day	30 Day	60 Day
Control group (T,)									
Glucose (mg%)	$49.63 \pm 0.95$ <sup>cd</sup>	$49.35 \pm 0.90^{cd}$	$48.19 \pm 0.63^{d}$	$53.76 \pm 0.94^{\rm bc}$	$53.47 \pm 0.94^{\rm bc}$	$52.78 \pm 0.96^{\circ}$	$49.24 \pm 1.26^{ab}$	$48.65 \pm 1.20^{\rm bc}$	47.93 <sup>bcd</sup>
Proteins (g%)	$7.17 \pm 0.32^{\circ}$	$7.06\pm0.24^{\circ}$	$7.01 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$	$6.60 \pm 0.23$	$6.50 \pm 0.26$	$6.97 \pm 0.22$	$6.79 \pm 0.20$	$7.00 \pm 0.12d$	$7.06 \pm 0.21^{d}$
Cholest (mg/dL)	$69.48 \pm 2.77^{a}$	$64.96 \pm 2.80^{a}$	$68.27 \pm 2.06^{a}$	$43.82 \pm 18.41^{\rm b}$	$67.31 \pm 2.12^{a}$	$66.66 \pm 0.95^{a}$	$75.14 \pm 0.72^{\circ}$	$72.81 \pm 2.66^{\circ}$	$71.48 \pm 1.44^{\circ}$
Urea (mmol/I)	$5.03\pm0.04^{a}$	$5.26 \pm 0.28^{a}$	$5.21 \pm 0.11^{a}$	$4.70 \pm 0.23^{ab}$	$4.74\pm0.16^{\rm ab}$	$5.22\pm0.06^{a}$	$4.75 \pm 0.26^{ab}$	$3.89 \pm 0.10^{\rm b}$	$5.19 \pm 0.11^{a}$
SGOT (U/I)	$41.69 \pm 1.65^{ab}$	$40.00 \pm 1.01^{ab}$	$41.00 \pm 2.00^{ab}$	$39.11 \pm 0.51^{a}$	$41.04 \pm 0.82^{a}$	$40.23 \pm 0.89^{a}$	$45.40 \pm 1.35^{\circ}$	$45.18 \pm 3.07^{\circ}$	$47.56 \pm 0.40^{\circ}$
SGPT (U/I)	$13.49 \pm 0.88^{\rm b}$	$13.66 \pm 0.50^{ab}$	$13.67 \pm 0.56^{ab}$	$12.63 \pm 0.48^{\rm b}$	$13.46 \pm 0.34^{ab}$	$13.40 \pm 0.32^{ab}$	$14.30 \pm 0.20^{cd}$	$14.15 \pm 0.22^{d}$	$14.40 \pm 0.15^{cd}$
Self Compounded F	Herbal drug (T <sub>3</sub> )								
Glucose (mg%)	$53.32 \pm 1.20^{ab}$	$53.60 \pm 1.64^{ab}$	$52.37 \pm 1.52^{abc}$	$55.35 \pm 0.39^{ab}$	$56.09 \pm 0.06^{a}$	$53.95 \pm 0.47^{\text{abc}}$	$48.70 \pm 0.71^{\rm bc}$	$50.22 \pm 0.64^{a}$	$47.31 \pm 0.78^{cd}$
Proteins (g%)	$9.00 \pm 0.01^{a}$	$9.01 \pm 0.03^{a}$	$9.16\pm0.04^{\mathrm{a}}$	$8.95 \pm 0.09^{a}$	$9.02 \pm 0.07^{a}$	$9.31 \pm 0.03^{a}$	$9.10 \pm 0.11^{\rm b}$	$9.17 \pm 0.13^{\rm b}$	$9.72 \pm 0.02^{a}$
Cholest (mg/dL)	$69.93 \pm 5.09^{a}$	$72.81 \pm 1.90^{a}$	$74.37 \pm 5.19^{a}$	$79.16 \pm 0.54^{a}$	$71.68 \pm 3.39^{a}$	$70.50 \pm 2.77^{a}$	$83.17 \pm 1.30^{a}$	$79.94 \pm 1.33^{ab}$	$82.36 \pm 2.33^{a}$
Urea (mmol/I)	$3.79 \pm 0.16^{b}$	$4.14 \pm 0.25^{b}$	$4.43 \pm 0.28^{ab}$	$4.49 \pm 0.36^{b}$	$4.35 \pm 0.33^{\rm b}$	$4.28 \pm 0.24^{ m b}$	$4.08 \pm 0.26^{ab}$	$4.37 \pm 0.34^{ab}$	$4.35 \pm 0.35^{ab}$
SGOT (U/I)	$30.68 \pm 1.02^{\rm b}$	$45.46 \pm 2.10^{a}$	$47.00 \pm 2.19^{a}$	$50.90 \pm 0.95^{a}$	$35.04 \pm 15.06^{a}$	$50.33 \pm 1.12^{a}$	$51.77 \pm 1.74^{ab}$	$50.77 \pm 1.48^{ab}$	$53.33 \pm 0.44^{a}$
SGPT (U/I)	$14.68 \pm 0.33^{ab}$	$14.82 \pm 0.30^{a}$	$14.71 \pm 0.23^{ab}$	$13.71 \pm 0.49^{ab}$	$14.01 \pm 0.29^{ab}$	$14.17 \pm 0.28^{a}$	$15.05 \pm 0.07^{abc}$	$15.23 \pm 0.19^{ab}$	$15.56 \pm 0.22^{a}$
Marketed herbal dr	ug (T <sub>3</sub> )								
Glucose (mg%)	$51.98 \pm 1.02^{abcd}$	$54.36 \pm 0.79^{a}$	$50.33 \pm 1.26^{bcd}$	$54.36 \pm 0.76^{abc}$	$55.19 \pm 0.61^{ab}$	$53.20 \pm 0.24^{\rm bc}$	$47.82 \pm 0.61^{\text{bcd}}$	$48.51 \pm 0.33^{\rm bc}$	$46.43 \pm 0.50^{d}$
Proteins (g%)	$7.96 \pm 0.03^{\rm b}$	$7.95 \pm 0.02^{\rm b}$	$8.11\pm0.06^{\mathrm{b}}$	$8.06 \pm 0.07^{\rm b}$	$8.16\pm0.07^{ m b}$	$8.22 \pm 0.01^{\rm b}$	$8.17\pm0.07^{c}$	$8.22 \pm 0.10^{\circ}$	$8.55 \pm 0.03^{\circ}$
Cholest (mg/dL)	$73.66 \pm 1.20^{a}$	$71.51 \pm 0.90^{a}$	$63.09 \pm 7.79^{a}$	$65.18 \pm 0.55^{a}$	$69.92 \pm 0.65^{a}$	$67.54 \pm 1.54^{a}$	$81.21 \pm 0.54^{a}$	$78.87 \pm 1.95^{ab}$	$78.00 \pm 1.73^{ab}$
Urea (mmol/l)	$4.03 \pm 0.07^{\rm b}$	$3.99 \pm 0.56^{b}$	$4.10 \pm 0.12^{b}$	$5.03 \pm 1.14^{ab}$	$4.24\pm0.40^{ m b}$	$4.29\pm0.38^{ m b}$	$4.62 \pm 0.51^{ab}$	$4.56 \pm 0.26^{ab}$	$4.97 \pm 0.43^{ab}$
SGOT (U/I)	$43.48 \pm 2.19^{ab}$	$43.83 \pm 1.59^{ab}$	$43.25 \pm 2.68^{ab}$	$32.81 \pm 13.90^{a}$	$48.77 \pm 0.77^{a}$	$48.15 \pm 1.95^{a}$	$49.87 \pm 0.84^{\text{abc}}$	$52.32 \pm 1.74^{ab}$	$50.89 \pm 1.96^{ab}$
SGPT (U/I)	$13.95 \pm 0.56^{a}$	$14.68\pm0.26^{\rm ab}$	$14.06 \pm 0.55^{ab}$	$13.61 \pm 0.41^{ab}$	$14.41 \pm 0.41^{a}$	$13.61 \pm 0.50^{ab}$	$14.90 \pm 0.43^{abcd}$	$14.72\pm0.25^{bcd}$	$14.82\pm0.43^{\mathrm{abcd}}$

formulated herbal drug treated group as compared to marketed herbal drug and control groups. However, no change was observed in cholesterol level at 0, 30th and 60th days. Hosoda et al. (2006) reported similar levels of blood cholesterol in their study. The level of total urea was significantly (p < 0.05)higher in control group followed by marketed herbal drug and self formulated herbal drug treated calves. The level of total urea remained similar (p>0.05) between 0 and 30th days but these levels were significantly differs during 60 and 0 day and 60 and 30 day. There was not much alteration (p < 0.05) in the SGOT and SGPT concentration at 0, 30<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> days. The findings of present investigation on total protein, SGOT and SGPT were in accordance to Ahmed et al. (2009). The level of SGOT and SGPT were higher in self formulated herbal drug treated calves followed by marketed herbal drug treated group and then control group's calves, which indicates the normal hepatic functions. Lastly, it can be concluded that self formulated and marketed herbal drugs influenced the biochemical parameters of blood under normal range which ultimately indicates that visceral organ like pancreas, liver and kidneys are normally functioning.

# REFERENCES

Ahmed, A. A., Neamat and Bassuony, I. 2009. Adding natural juices of vegetables and fruitage to ruminants diets (B) Nutrients utilization, microbial safety and immunity, effect of diets supplemented with lemon, onion and garlic juice fed to growing buffalo calves. *World J. Agr. Sci.* **5**(4):456-465.

Bombik, T., Bombik, A. and Saba, L. 2002. Effect of herb extract on the level of selected biochemical indicators in the blood of calves. *Medycyna Weterynaryjna*. **58(6)**: 464-466.

**Duncan, D. B. 1955.** Multiple Range and Multiple - Test. *Biometrics*. **11:** 142.

Frankel, S. and Reitman, S. 1957. A colorimetric method for determination

of glutamic oxaloacetic transamins. Amer. J. Clin. Path. 28: 56.

Hadiya, K., Maini, S., Rekhe, D. S. and Ravikanth, K. 2009. Accelerated Growth Programme with Polyherbal Formulations for Dairy Calves. *Veterinary World*. **2(2):** 62-64.

Hosoda, K., Kuramoto, K., Eruden, B., Nishida, T. and Shioya, S. 2006. The Effects of Three Herbs as Feed Supplements on Blood Metabolites, Hormones, Antioxidant Activity, IgG Concentration and Ruminal Fermentation in Holstein Steers. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* **19(1)**: *35-41*.

Islam, R., Sapcota, D. and Upadhyay, T. N. 2006. Assessment of immune competence of buffalo and cow calves and roles of neem oil as immunomodulator. *Indian Vet. J.* 83(8): 865-868.

Jain, A. K. 2005. Assessment of immune competence of buffalo and cow calves and roles of neem oil as immunemodulator. *M.V. Sc. Thesis JNKVV, Jabalpur.* 

Kolte, A., Ravikanth, K., Rekhe, D. and Maini, S. 2009. Role of Polyherbal formulation in modulating rumen biochemical and growth performance parameters in Calves. *Internet J. Veterinary Medicine*. 6: 2, unpaginated.

**Pileggi, V. and Szustkiewicz, J. 1974.** Carbohydrates In: Henry Richard J., C. Canon Donald and Winkelman James W. (Eds.) *Clinical Chemistry*. Principles and Techniques. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. *Harper and Row Publishers, New York*. pp. 1265-1325.

Sarker, M. S. K., Ko, S. Y., Lee, S. M., Kim, G. M., Choi, J. K. and Yang, C. J. 2010. Effect of Different Feed Additives on Growth Performance and Blood Profiles of Korean Hanwoo Calves. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 23(1): 52 – 60.

SAS 1992. User's guide: Statistics, SAS Inst., Inc., Cary, Nc.

Suresh, K. and Vasudevan, D. M. 1994. Augmentation of murine natural killer cell and antibody. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 44: 55-60.

Tietz, N. W. 1986. Textbook of Clinical Chemistry. Publ., W. B. Saunder Co., Philadelphia PA. p 1374.

Yadav, R. P. and Singh, D. P. 2009. The effect of herbal drug on growth performance of cross bred calves. *Asian J. Anim. Sci.* 3(2): 210-214.