

AAAS and AAAP 2024 REVIEW PROCESS

1. Log in (If you have trouble remembering your log in details please do not hesitate to contact me!) -<u>https://kamevents.currinda.com/register/event/1301</u>. Please use your previous login details (please email <u>animalscience2024@kamevents.com.au</u> if you have issues).

Register or submit to this event Create a Currinda profile to register for this event or submit an abstract.	Register or submit with your Currinda profile Login to your Currinda profile to register or submit to this event. You may have a Currinda profile if you have registered for an event using Currinda before. or are a member of an association managed using Currinda. Image:		
Begin here			
	a •••••		
	Login Forgotten password?		

If you did not have a Currinda profile, then I have created one for you. Username: (your email address)

Password: your first name with a capital first letter.

2. Click on 'Reviews' tab across the top of the page



3. Then click the blue 'Edit Review' button and it will take you to your first abstract. After each review you will be taken back to the main page and you click on the next abstract.

	ζ	Embracing disruption as an opportunity for animal science Joint AAAP and AAAS Animal Production Congress COMENTION CONGRESS	-12 July 2024 tre www.aaap2024.com
=	Abstracts		
	Short Papers	/ Initial Review	
	0 Reviews	4 Pending Reviews	
	*	The impact of dietary probiotic Lacticaseibacillus paracasei NSMJ56 on gut immunity and microbiome in laying hens #11088 Review submitted:	
	*	Effect of different levels of fibrolytic enzyme on feed digestibility and production performance in lactating dairy cows #10948 Review submitted:	
	*	Solid state fermentation of wheat bran by Ganoderma spp. applied in the broiler diet #10949 Review submitted: Cell Cell Cell Cell Cell Cell Cell Cell	
	*	High-voltage Electrostatic Field: A New Technique to Replace Phosphate in Emulsified Meat Products #11014 Review submitted:	

4. Please read the paper and answer the following questions. Please ensure you not the authors preference for oral etc, not everyone who has selected oral will be given an oral, however those that have only selected poster, if good enough could be offered an elevator pitch but in most cases they don't want to speak.



Society: Short Papers

Category: Poultry Science

Keywords: probiotic Lacticaseibacillus paracasei gut immunity gut microbiome laying hen

Presentation preference: Poster Presentation

The impact of dietary probiotic Lacticaseibacillus paracasei NSMJ56 on gut immunity and microbiome in laying hens (11088) Link

Yoo Bhin Kim¹, Jina Park¹, Hyun-Gwan Lee¹, Ju-Yong Song¹, In-Sook Ahn¹, <u>Da-Hye Kim</u>¹, Minji Kim², Woonhak Ji³, Sang Seok Joo³, Myunghoo Kim³, Kyung-Woo Lee¹

- 1. Department of Animal Science and Technology, Sanghuh College of Life Sciences, Konkuk University, Seoul, South Korea
- 2. Animal Nutrition and Physiology Division, National Institute of Animal Science, Rural Development Administration (NIAS-RDA), Wanju, South Korea 3. Department of Animal Science, College of Natural Resource & Life Sciences, Pusan National University, Miryang, South Korea

Corresponding author: Kyung-Woo Lee. Email: kyungwoolee@konkuk.ac.kr

Introduction Probiotics are defined as live microorganisms that confer health benefits upon consumption and have been used as the alternative to antibiotics in poultry production. Locticaseibacillus paracasei as a potent probiotic strain has been documented to have stress relieving, antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and immune-modulatory activities. Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine the modulatory effect of dietary supplementation of L. paracasei strain NSMJ56 on laying performance, egg quality, intestinal histology, antioxidant status, and gut immunity and microbiota of laying hens.

Material and methods A total of 96 laying hens of Hy-Line Brown, aged 21 weeks, were randomly assigned to one of two dietary groups with eight replicates per group. Two hens were raised in cage (45 cm × 45 cm) in a windowless, fan-ventilated house, and the adjacent three cages were considered a replicate (n = 6 birds/replicate). These replicates were assigned in the two treatments: the control (CON) treatment, which involved a basal diet, without supplementation, and a probiotic *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* (NSMJ56) treatment involving the control diet supplemented with 1 g of *L. paracasei* NSMJ56. The trial lasted for 4 weeks. Egg production and egg weight were daily recorded and used to calculate the egg mass. At 4 weeks, eggs per replicate were collected for egg quality assessment. The remainder of the jejunum was used for lamina propria cell subpopulation measurements. An ileal segment and a pair of ceca were used to measure antioxidant markers. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 software.

Results Egg weight was increased (P < 0.05) in laying hens fed probiotic-fed diet compared with the control group. Dietary probiotics did not affect egg quality except for Haugh unit, which was improved (P < 0.05) in the probiotic-fed group (Table 1).

Table 1. Effect of supplementation	of probiotic Lacticaseibacill	us paracasei NSMJ56	on egg quality in laying hens.
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------------

ltems	CON	NSMJ56	P-value		
Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Yolk color	7.488	0.351	7.423	0.192	0.655
Haugh unit	94.15	2.346	96.55	1.085	0.034
Eggshell strength, kg/cm ²	5.595	0.567	5.349	0.405	0.334
Eggshell thickness, mm	0.422	0.013	0.414	0.009	0.234
Eggshell color, unit	23.775	1.300	23.500	1.888	0.739

¹CON, control diet; NSMJ56, CON + 5 × 10⁸ CFU/kg L. paracasei NSMJ56

²SD, standard deviation.

None of jejunal histology parameters including villus height, crypt depth, and villus height : crypt depth (VH:CD) ratio was affected by dietary NSMJ56 in laying hens. Dietary supplementation of *L. paracosei* NSMJ56 significantly increased the activity of catalase of ileal mucosa in laying hens compared with the control group. Flow cytometry analysis revealed that dietary probiotics elevated the CD4⁺ T cells, but not CD8⁺ T cells, in jejunal lamina propria. Based on the LEfSe analysis at the phylum and genus levels, *Erysipelotricholes, Erysipelotrichia, Flintibater, Dielma, Hespellia, Coprobacter, Roseburia, Anaerotignum,* and *Coprococcus* were enriched in the probiotic group compared with the control group (Figure 1).



5. You will have the list of questions in your reviewer information pack.

Initial Review

Section 1. Structure, quality and formatting 1a. Does the one-page paper contain original information or findings that progresses knowledge on this

subject?	
Select an option	~
1b. Overall do you find the methodology appropriate for the subject matter being examined (if applicable)?	
Select an option	~
1.c Where results are presented, do they directly realte to the key topic of the paper & are they meaningful?	
Results presented in these submissions may be preliminary or limited in nature which is ok. Please also keep in mind that there may not be traditional 'results' for some submissions, particularly those not dealing with quantitative data.	
Select an option	~
1.d Does the paper contain all the required sections?	
Papers should include: Full title, authors and affiliations, corresponding author, Introduction, Material and methods (including statistical analysis method), Results, Conclusion and implications, Acknowledgements (including financial support statement and ethics approval), and References.	
Select an option	~
1.e Does the paper contain an adequate hypothesis/objective AND conclusion/implications statement?	
All papers submitted should include a Conclusion and Implications statement at the end of the paper	
Select an option	~
1f. Are there an excessive number of figures and tables included for a one-page paper?	
Reminder: Authors were asked to prepare a one-page paper with maximum word count of 1000 words with no tables or figures. Suggested word counts were: 900 word with one (average size) figure Size) figure OR table and 850 words with one (average size) figure and one (average size) table	S
Select an option	~



- 6. Once completed click on the submit Initial Review button and you will be taken back to the main screen.
- 7. Repeat above for all of your allocated abstracts.
- 8. Abstracts that you have reviewed will appear in a list in the 'Review Abstracts' section

If you have to abstain/conflict of interest, please email us and advise who will review this abstract, as we do require a minimum of 2 reviewers per abstract.

Any questions/issues please email <u>animalscience2024@kamevents.com.au</u> or call +61 (0)7 5419 3851