Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

Morphology and Morphometry of Indigenous Ducks of Tamil Nadu

P.Veeramani¹, R.Prabakaran² and S.T.Selvan³

¹ Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University

Received: 7 December 2013 Accepted: 5 January 2014 Published: 15 January 2014

7 Abstract

3

4

5

Duck production in Tamil Nadu is characterised by the traditional enterprise with indigenous 8 ducks, distributed widely. The indigenous duck varieties of Tamil Nadu have evolved over the 9 years with better adaptability and production potentiality. These indigenous ducks are 10 capable of laying 180-200 eggs per annum with an average egg weight ranging from 60-64 g 11 with no additional or special feeding management. The common Indian breeds/genetic groups 12 of ducks are Indian Runner, Nageswari, Sythetmete, Kuttanad, Arni etc. Besides non-descript 13 ducks are also available in large numbers in many states of the country, contributing 14 significantly to the total duck population. The unique nature of this native germplasm has not 15 been properly documented. Hence, the work was proposed to study morphology and 16 morphometric analysis of distinct indigenous ducks of Tamil Nadu. The duck farmers in the 17 northern districts of Tamil Nadu are rearing two predominant varieties of ducks i.e. Sanyasi 18 and Keeri. Among these, Sanyasi female is the popular duck variety reared by the farmers. 19 The Sanyasi female ducks are having saffron coloured plumage and males are with dark brown 20 plumage mixed with black. 21

22

23 *Index terms*— morphology, morphometric traits, indigenous ducks, tamil nadu.

24 1 Introduction

uck production in India is largely a traditional enterprise and has not yet been industrialized as that of chicken. 25 Even though, duck contributes next to chicken, it is still a neglected species. Being the neglected species for 26 many decades, this native poultry species is threatened for existence due to lack of scientific breeding and 27 management practices. The distribution and demographic dynamics of duck population in India revealed that 28 they are mainly concentrated in eastern, north eastern and southern states of the country. The leading states 29 in duck population are West Bengal, Assam, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Bihar and Orissa. The 30 31 common Indian breeds/genetic groups of ducks are Indian Runner, Nageswari, Sythetmete, Kuttanad, Arni 32 etc. In Tamil Nadu, 70 per cent of the duck population is concentrated in six districts namely, Kancheepuram, 33 Thiruvallur, Villupuram, Cuddalore, Vellore and Thiruvannamalai, falling under northern agro-climatic zone of Tamil Nadu (Sivakumar et al., 2009 So far, there is no guided breeding and scientific management practices 34 followed in the country, which would lead to loss of the rich native duck germplasm. There is lack of sufficient 35 scientific information on ducks, either phenotypic or genotypic to differentiate various duck breeds or distinct 36 varieties. The duck germplasm is not properly utilized due to various difficulties in duck rearing in the rural 37 environment. Hence, the work was proposed to study phenotypic character and morphometric analysis of this 38

39 distinct indigenous ducks of Tamil Nadu.

40 **2** II.

41 3 Materials and Methods

The morphology of indigenous ducks was studied as per the breed descriptors of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 1986) and the guidelines given by the National Bureau of Animal Genetic Resources, Karnal,

Haryana, India. The morphological characters studied were plumage pattern, carriage, bill colour and shank
 colour.

46 **4** III.

47 5 Morphometry

Body measurements were taken for ducks of Sanyasi and Keeri variety with a standard measuring tape to the
nearest 0.1 centimetre (cm) for bill length, shank length, neck length and body length. The data collected were
scrutinized, edited and analysed as per standard statistical procedures (Snedecor and Cochran., 1989).

⁵¹ 6 Results and Discussion

The duck farmers in the northern districts of Tamil Nadu are rearing two predominant duck varieties i.e. Sanyasi and Keeri. Among these, Sanyasi female is the popular duck variety being reared by the farmers. Each variety is having different phonotypic character

is having different phenotypic character.V.

56 7 Morphology

The Sanyasi female ducks are having saffron coloured plumage with or without white ring like feathers around the neck and males are with dark brown plumage mixed with black. The head and neck covered with lustrous brown plumage. Males have brown coloured drake feather. The bill colour of females is orange and for males it is vellowish orange. The shank colour is orange for both males and females.

The Keeri female ducks are having mixture of black and brown plumage characteristically in striations with or without white ring like feathers around the neck and males are with mixture of dark black and white plumage.

63 The head and neck covered with lustrous black plumage. The bill colour and shank colour of females is grey / orange. Keeri male duck has dark yellow bill colour and oranged coloured shank. The drake feather is black in

colour. Similar plumage pattern, bill colour and shank colour was observed by Murugan et al., (2009).

66 **8** VI.

67 9 Morphometric Traits

The morphometric traits such as, body length, neck length, bill length and shank length were recorded for 909
 adult ducks comprising of 488 Sanyasi and 421 Keeri varieties of ducks. The least square means with S.E. is
 presented in Table -1

71 10 Body Length

The overall body length for both the varieties recorded was 23.74 ± 0.06 cm. Body length for Sanyasi and Keeri varieties was 23.85 ± 0.09 and 23.64 ± 0.08 cm respectively. The numerical difference in body length between varieties was not statistically significant. The value for male and female ducks was 24.53 ± 0.11 and 22.95 ± 0.06 cm respectively and the difference between the sexes was highly significant (P<0.01). On the contrary, Yakubu (2009) recorded mean values of body length (cm) for male and female African Muscovy ducks as 47.86 and 38.35. The lower valued obtained in this study might be due to the variation in the size and conformation of the distinct variety / breed of ducks.

79 VIII.

80 11 Neck Length

The neck length recorded for Sanyasi and Keeri varieties was 13.47 ± 0.25 and 12.90 ± 0.22 respectively with overall 81 neck length of 13.19 ± 0.17 cm. Among the sexes the difference in neck length was highly significant (P<0.01). 82 83 The value for male and female adult ducks was 13.94 ± 0.29 and 12.43 ± 0.15 respectively. The interaction between 84 variety and sex had no significant effect on neck length. whereas, Yakubu (2009) recorded the mean neck length 85 for male and female African Muscovy ducks as 18.10 and 14.33 cm respectively, while Murugan et al. (2009) 86 recorded the neck length (cm) of 21.10 ± 0.12 and 18.70 ± 0.24 for male and female Sanyasi ducks respectively. The neck length of Volume XIV Issue III Version I Year () $2014 \text{ G} 6.87 \pm 0.01 \text{ cm}$ respectively, while the value for 87 female ducks was 5.75 ± 0.02 and 5.77 ± 0.01 cm respectively. Within the sex the variety had no significant effect 88 on bill length. The bill length for male and female ducks recorded was 6.84 ± 0.02 and 5.76 ± 0.01 cm respectively. 89 This revealed a highly significant variation among the sexes. The overall bill length for two varieties of ducks was 90 6.30 ± 0.01 cm. Similarly, Ajith et al. (??009) recorded significantly higher bill length in males in comparison 91

92 with respective females with regard to Chara and Chemballi ducks of Kerala. Whereas, shorter bill length of 93 4.98 and 3.75 cm was recorded for African Muscovy male and female ducks by Yakubu (2009). The bill length 94 for Sanyasi and Keeri ducks of Tamil Nadu was recorded by Murugan et al. (2009), which is in comparison with 95 the values of this present study. The higher value of bill length in males than female ducks might be attributed 96 to their heavier size and adaptability.

97 X.

⁹⁸ 12 Shank Length

Significantly higher shank length for males than female ducks was recorded in both the varieties $(5.61\pm0.02 \text{ cm})$ 99 for males and 5.56 ± 0.01 cm for females), on the other hand, variety had no significant role on shank length 100 $(5.58\pm0.02 \text{ cm} \text{ for Sanyasi and } 5.59\pm0.02 \text{ cm} \text{ for Keeri variety})$. The overall shank length was $5.58\pm0.01 \text{ cm}$. The 101 interaction between sex and variety also had no significant effect on shank length. While, Renchi et al. (1979) 102 recorded the mean shank length in male and female Desi ducks of Kerala at 12 weeks of age as 6.44 ± 0.04 and 103 6.15 ± 0.02 cm and reported that males had significantly higher shank length than female ducks and similar values 104 were recorded by Ajith et al. (2009) for Chara and Chemballi ducks of Kerala. Whereas, in Nageswari ducks of 105 Assam, Zaman et al. (2007) recorded the mean shank length of male and female as 6.67 ± 0.71 and 6.12 ± 0.68 cm 106 respectively. The difference in the shank length of different varieties of indigenous ducks might be attributed to 107 the variation among indigenous germplasm and adaptability to the rearing environment. 108

109 **13 XI.**

110 14 Conclusion

111 The existence of two distinct indigenous duck varieties namely Sanyasi and Keeri was fully evidenced through this 112 study. These varieties were having different morphology and morphometry with other indigenous duck varieties

113 of the country. Since, the concept of rearing breeder flock and proper selection among the duck varieties are

the biggest lacunas in the study area, necessary steps to address these constraints will throw more light on

these unique germplasm. Moreover, these duck germplasm are known for its prolificacy under nilinput system of management, further studies focusing on large scale survey, characterisation of these ducks at molecular level

117 will be the best approach for proper selection and conservation of these unique germplasm for future use and exploitation.



Figure 1: D

). Existence of different indigenous duck varieties namely Arni, Sanyasi and Keeri (Gajendran and Karthickeyan, 2009; Murugan et al., 2009;

Figure 2:

118

 $^{^1 \}odot$ 2014 Global Journals Inc. (US)

1

		ducks of Tamil Nadu			
Particulars	NumberBody length (cm) Neck length (cm) Bill length (cm) Shank length (cm)				
	of ob-				
	ser-				
	va-				
	tions				
Overall mean	909	$23.74{\pm}0.06$	$13.19{\pm}0.17$	$6.30{\pm}0.01$	$5.58 {\pm} 0.01$
Variety		NS	NS	NS	NS
Sanyasi	488	$23.85{\pm}0.09$	$13.47 {\pm} 0.25$	$6.29{\pm}0.01$	$5.58 {\pm} 0.02$
Keeri	421	$23.64{\pm}0.08$	$12.90{\pm}0.22$	$6.31{\pm}0.01$	$5.59 {\pm} 0.02$
Sex		**	**	**	**
Male	201	$24.53 {\pm} 0.11$	$13.94{\pm}0.29$	$6.84 {\pm} 0.02$	$5.61 {\pm} 0.02$
Female	708	$22.95 {\pm} 0.06$	$12.43 {\pm} 0.15$	$5.76 {\pm} 0.01$	$5.56 {\pm} 0.01$
Sex X Variety		NS	NS	NS	NS
Male					
Sanyasi	81	$24.74{\pm}0.17$	$13.50 {\pm} 0.46$	$6.82{\pm}0.02$	$5.59 {\pm} 0.03$
Keeri	120	$24.33 {\pm} 0.13$	$13.38 {\pm} 0.37$	$6.87 {\pm} 0.01$	$5.65 {\pm} 0.04$
Female					
Sanyasi	407	$22.96 {\pm} 0.07$	$12.45 {\pm} 0.20$	$5.75 {\pm} 0.02$	$5.57 {\pm} 0.02$
Keeri	301	$22.94{\pm}0.09$	$12.42{\pm}0.23$	$5.77 {\pm} 0.01$	$5.56 {\pm} 0.02$
NS-Non-significant (P $<$ 0.05); * -Significant (P $<$ 0.05); ** -Significant (P $<$ 0.01)					
VII.					

Figure 3: Table 1 :

- 119 [Snedecor and Cochran ()], G W Snedecor, W G Cochran. 1989.
- [Yakubu (2009)] 'An assessment of sexual dimorphism in African Muscovy ducks (Cairina. moschata) using
 morphological measurements and discriminant analysis'. A Yakubu . *Proceedings of the IV World Waterfowl Conference*, (the IV World Waterfowl ConferenceThrissur, India) 2009. November, 2009. p. .
- [Veeramani et al. (2009)] 'Duck production for rural livelihood'. P Veeramani , S M K Karthickeyan , A Kannan
 Proceedings of the IV World Waterfowl Conference, (the IV World Waterfowl ConferenceThrissur, India)
 2009. 11-13 November, 2009. p. .
- [Ajith et al. (2009)] 'Evaluation of bill length and shank length in Kuttanad ducks of kerala'. B B Ajith , N P
 Padwal , D Anish , G M Deepa , P A Peethambaran . Proceedings of the IV World Waterfowl Conference,
- (the IV World Waterfowl ConferenceThrissur, India) 2009. 11-13 November, 2009. p. 173.
- [Murugan et al. (2009)] 'Indigenous duck varieties in Uthiramerur block of north eastern agroclimatic zone of
 Tamil Nadu'. M Murugan, A Gopinathan, T Sivakumar. Proceedings of the IV World Waterfowl Conference,
 (the IV World Waterfowl ConferenceThrissur, India) 2009. November, 2009. p. .
- [Sivakumar et al. ()] 'Indigenous feeding technologies prevalent in rural duck farming of Tami Nadu'. T Sivakumar
 , M Murugan , A Gopinathan . Proceedings of the IV World Waterfowl Conference, (the IV World Waterfowl Conference) 2009. p. .
- [Renchi et al. (1979)] 'Relationship between shank length and body weight in desi ducks'. P Renchi , G R George
 , R S Nair , B R K Nair , A K K Nair , Unni . *Indian veterinary Journal* 1979. November. 56 p. .
- 137 [Statistical Methods] Statistical Methods, (Ames, Iowa) Iowa state University Press. p. 503. (8th edn.)
- [Gajendran and Karthickeyan ()] 'Status of indigenous ducks in Tamil Nadu, India: a traditional perspective.
 Livestock Research for Rural Development'. K Gajendran, S M K Karthickeyan . http://www.lrrd.org/
 lrrd21/10/gaje21175.htm Article # 2009. 21.
- [Zaman et al. ()] 'Studies on body weight and shank length of Nageswari duck of Assam'. G Zaman , R N
 Goswami , A Aziz , N Nahardeka , J D Mahanta . *Indian Journal of Poultry Science* 2007. 42 (1) p. .