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**ABSTRACT**

In the current investigation, 36 nos of Assam Hill goat were selected and divided randomly into three groups. Polyherbal feed was supplemented in treatment groups @ 1 and 2g/Kg body weight from 4 month of age till 12 month of age, respectively. Data on various parameters were analysed at fortnightly interval for a period up to 9 months**.** The average body weight at 19th fortnight *i.e*., at 12 months of age were 13.84 ± 0.032, 14.47 ± 0.021 and 16.24 ± 0.040 kg in control and the two treatment groups, T1 and T2, respectively. The overall body weight (kg) of two treatment groups were significant higher (*p*<0.01) than that of control group. In respect of sex, the male animals attained higher body weight than that of female animals at all the stages of experiment. Significant differences *(p*<0.01) among control and two treatment groups were observed for body length and chest girth of the animals. The study indicated that polyherbal feed supplementation improve the overall growth of the Assam Hill goats.
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# Introduction

Currently,India has a total livestock population of 536.76 million out of which 148.88 million are genetically diverse goats, accounting for approximately 27.8% of the total livestock. The goat population has seen a growth of 10.14 % compared to the previous livestock census conducted in 2012. India recognizes 34 officially registered goat breeds as per NBAGR including one from Assam namely the Assam Hill goat. All the goats are well adapted to their respective home tract. According to the 20th Livestock census by DAHD, Government of India., the goat population in Assam is 4.315 million. *i.e*., 24% of the Assam’s total livestock population of 18.092 million.

Goat farming is a crucial livelihood activity in rural Assam and across the nation, playing a key role in supporting the national and rural economy. It serves as a crucial source of income for farming families, particularly for those without land. Goats also offer essential dietary protein through their meat and milk. However, many Indian farmers, especially those living below the poverty lines struggle to adequately feed their goats and other animals under traditional, low-input systems. This results in poor nutritional intake and reduced productivity. There is a need to improve goat production system in the villages as it was usually the poorest farmers who own goats. It is nicely termed as - poor man‘s cow by our father of the nation Mahatma Gandhi.The supply of quality feed together with proper hygiene, potable water and management can ensure the production of nutritious animal products with desired organoleptic properties (Saxena, 2008).

Studies on animals have shown that many herbal supplements help in improving growth and production in goats and supporting their overall health and well-being (Langeroudi et al., 2008; Hashemi and Davoodi, 2010; Sanchez et al., 2009). In developing countries, including India, medicinal plants are easily accessible to get than manufactured drugs. Some of these herbs are known to have positive effects on the animals’ growth, breeding, and health (Mirzaei, 2012). Many herbs and plant extracts have antimicrobial activities against a wide range of bacteria, yeasts, and molds (Thompson, 1986; Voda *et al.*, 2003). In the current study, it was hypothesized that herbal feed supplement may greatly enhance these performances of the goat population in Assam. The present research work was taken to investigate the effect of feeding Assam Hill goat with a polyherbal feed supplement consist of Shatavari, Methi and Ajwain on their growth performance.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

* 1. **PLACE OF EXPERIMENT**

The experiment was carried out in Goat Research Station, Assam Agricultural University, Burnihat, Assam.The geographical location of Goat Research Station, Burnihat is 2001/ to 2605/ 1// N latitude and 8504/9// to 9205/2// E longitude.

## 2.2.EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

A total of 36 healthy weaned Assam Hill kids (18 male and 18 female) of similar body weight were taken from the farm flock of GRS, Burnihat and were utilized for the experiment. The kids were divided randomly into three equal groups with 12 kids each (6 male and 6 female) and constituted the three experimental groups, viz. Group- I (control group-C0), Group-II (treatment group-T1) and Group-III (treatment group-T2). The kids of all the three groups were raised on similar feeding regimes under semi-intensive management system while the two treatment groups were fed polyherbal feed supplementdailyattherateof1g/kgBody weight (bwt) and 2 g/kg bwt. respectively T1 and T2 (Table 1). The polyherbal supplement wasconstitutedofShatavariroot(*Asparagus racemosus*),Fenugreekseed(*Trigonella foenum- graecum*) and Ajwain seed (*Trachyspernum ammi*) powder mixed at 1:1:1 ratio (Figure 1).

## TABLE1:EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS AND FEEDING SCHEDULE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental group** | **No. of animal** | **Feeding treatment** |
| Group I (C0) | 12 (6male+6 female) | Routine feeding and managemental regime |
| Group II (T1) | 12 (6male+6 female) | Routine feeding and managemental regime plus poly herbal feed supplement @1g/kg bwt. |
| Group III(T2) | 12 (6male+6 female) | Routine feeding and managemental regime plus poly herbal feed supplement @2g/kg bwt. |

1. **3. PRE-CONDITIONING OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS**

After selection of the healthy kids, 10-day adjustment period was given to help them adjust to the new environment. Each goat was weighed, checked for health, and given identification to each animal by ear tagging. Thereafter, all the experimental kids were dewormed by an oral dewormer (Panacur suspension 2.5 % (Fenbendazole) @ 5 mg/kg) to eliminate endoparasitic infestation before the onset of experiment.The experimental kids were

reared in semi-intensive system in elevated conventional slatted wooden floor shed which had provision of natural cross ventilation with proper feeding amenities.



**FIGURE 1:SHATAVARI ROOT POWDER,FENUGREEK SEED POWDER AND AJWAIN SEED POWDER**

## 2.4.FEEDING MANAGENENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS

The routine ration was prepared with roughage and concentrate mixture (Table 2), where1/3rd was concentrate ration and 2/3rd was roughage on a DM basis to fulfil the nutrient requirement of kids as per ICAR, (2013). The grasses fed to the animal were constituted of Para (*Brachari amutica*) and Napier (*Pennisetum purpureum*) grass in a ratio of 50:50 on a DM basis. The control group (C0) received only the concentrate, while the two treatment groups were given a polyherbal supplement along with the concentrate. Fresh, clean water was also provided to all the goats in the experiment.

## TABLE 2:FEEDING INGREDIENTS OF CONCENTRATE RATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **INGREDIENTS** | **PARTS** |
| Maize crush | 40 |
| Wheat bran | 12 |
| Rice polish | 10 |
| Groundnut cake | 35 |
| Mineral mixture | 2 |
| Salt | 1 |
| **Total** | **100** |

* 1. **PARAMETERS FOR GROWTH PERFORMANCE**

### Body weight at fortnightly interval

Individual body weights of the kids were measured initially and then at fortnightly intervals. The weighing was done in the morning before feeding, using a 25 kg capacity spring balance and expressed in kilogram (kg).

* + 1. **Body length**: Body length was measured between point of shoulder and point of hip.
    2. **Chest girth**: The measurement was taken as the circumference of the chest immediately behind the shoulder joint.
    3. **Neck girth**:Circumference of neck was measured at the middle position of neck.

## RESULTS AND DISCUUSION

* 1. **GROWTH PERFORMANCE**

### Body weight

The means of the overall body weight at 12 months (i.e., 19th fortnight of the experiment) was 13.84± 0.032, 14.47±0.021 and 16.24±0.040 kg for control (C0), treatment T1,and T2 groups, respectively. During initiation of the experiment, the mean value of initial body weight of kids in different treatment groups were almost similar.The results showed significant difference (*P*<0.01) in overall average values of body weight (kg) of treatment groups than that of control group. The highest body weight was found in T2 group, followed by T1 than that of C0 throughout the period of this study. In respect of sex, the male animals were found to have higher body weight than that of female animals at all the stages of experiment (Table 3).

A noticeable gain in body weight (kg) was seen from the fourth fortnight and continued until the nineteenth fortnight. Both treatment groups grew faster than the control group. The graph (Fig. 3) showed that by the end of the study, the difference in average body weight among the three groups (C0, T1, and T2) became clearer, likely due to different levels of polyherbal supplements (0g, 1g, and 2g per kg body weight). This increase in weight agrees with findings by Mirzaei and Prasad (2011), who also saw higher weaning weights in goats with polyherbal supplements. Similarly, Muralidhar et al. (1993) found that rats fed a Shatavari-based herbal mix gained more weight than those in the control group. Mader et al.(1987) also reported better weight gain in pigs and steers fed saponin,a part of Shatavari. On the other hand, Kumar(2018) found no effect on buffalo growth from feeding Ajwain, and noted that weight changes over time could also be due to environmental factors like temperature, fodder quality, and nutrient use.

In this study, the better growth rate was found in group T2, followed by T1 with supplementation of polyherbal preparation (Shatavari root powder, Fenugreek seed powder, Ajwain seed powder at ratio 1:1:1) in basal ration at the dose rate of 2 gm and 1gm per kg body weight for 9 months was responsible for better growth due to digestive, hepatoprotective, antibacterial, antistressor, antioxidant, anthelmintic and immunomodulatory property of the supplement.These findings were in close conformity with Puri *et al*.(1993),Sethi *et al*.(2004), Ankita (2010), Mondal *et al*. (2011) and Pandit *et al*. (2013).

## TABLE 3: FORTNIGHTLY BODY WEIGHT (MEAN±SE) OF ASSAM HILL GOAT OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT GROUPS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fortnight** | **Bodyweight (kg)** | | | | |
| **C0** | **T1** | **T2** | **M** | **F** |
| Initial | 4.79 ± 0.022 | 4.78 ± 0.022 | 4.79 ± 0.021 | 4.80 ± 0.022 | 4.78 ± 0.021 |
| 1 | 5.26 ± 0.022 | 5.26 ± 0.022 | 5.27 ± 0.021 | 5.29 ± 0.023 | 5.24 ± 0.021 |
| 2 | 5.73 ± 0.021 | 5.74 ± 0.021 | 5.77 ± 0.020 | 5.79 ± 0.022 | 5.71 ± 0.019 |
| 3 | 6.22 ± 0.023 | 6.23 ± 0.024 | 6.29 ± 0.021 | 6.31 ± 0.022a | 6.19 ± 0.023b |
| 4 | 6.72 ± 0.022a | 6.74 ± 0.024a | 6.88± 0.022b | 6.86 ± 0.022a | 6.71 ± 0.023b |
| 5 | 7.23 ± 0.024a | 7.25 ± 0.025a | 7.50± 0.020b | 7.42 ± 0.024a | 7.23 ± 0.023b |
| 6 | 7.74 ± 0.025a | 7.77 ± 0.022a | 8.14± 0.020b | 8.00 ± 0.022a | 7.77 ± 0.023b |
| 7 | 8.24 ± 0.024a | 8.29 ± 0.022a | 8.82± 0.025b | 8.60 ± 0.021a | 8.30 ± 0.026b |
| 8 | 8.73 ± 0.021a | 8.82 ± 0.022a | 9.53± 0.026b | 9.22 ± 0.021a | 8.84 ± 0.024b |
| 9 | 9.21 ± 0.022a | 9.36 ± 0.021b | 10.26±0.030c | 9.84 ± 0.023a | 9.38 ± 0.026b |
| 10 | 9.68 ± 0.023a | 9.90 ± 0.022b | 10.95±0.029c | 10.44± 0.022a | 9.91 ± 0.027b |
| 11 | 10.15± 0.023a | 10.44±0.024b | 11.62±0.028c | 11.04± 0.022a | 10.44±0.028b |
| 12 | 10.62± 0.023a | 10.97±0.024b | 12.29±0.026c | 11.63± 0.022a | 10.96±0.027b |
| 13 | 11.08± 0.024a | 11.49±0.022b | 12.95±0.025c | 12.21± 0.020a | 11.48±0.028b |
| 14 | 11.55± 0.024a | 12.01±0.022b | 13.59±0.023c | 12.79± 0.020a | 11.98±0.026b |
| 15 | 12.01± 0.026a | 12.52±0.023b | 14.19±0.019c | 13.34± 0.019a | 12.48±0.027b |
| 16 | 12.47± 0.027a | 13.02±0.021b | 14.74±0.022c | 13.86± 0.020a | 12.97±0.027b |
| 17 | 12.93± 0.028a | 13.51±0.023b | 15.26±0.027c | 14.37± 0.022a | 13.43±0.030b |
| 18 | 13.39± 0.031a | 14.00±0.022b | 15.76±0.032c | 14.88± 0.022a | 13.88±0.034b |
| 19 | 13.84± 0.032a | 14.47±0.021b | 16.24±0.040c | 15.37± 0.023a | 14.33±0.039b |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall | 9.05 ± 0.024a | 9.69 ±0.022b | 11.45±0.025c | 10.57± 0.022a | 9.55 ± 0.026b |

Means with similar superscript in a row or column do not differ significantly among themselves

**FIGURE 2:FORTNIGHTLY BODY WEIGHT OF ASSAM HILL GOAT OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT GROUPS**
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### Body length

During initiation of the experiment, the mean body length of animals in different treatment groups was almost similar. At the end of experiment (19th fortnight) group T2 (45.77±0.259) showed significantly highest (P<0.01) body length (cm) followed by groups T1 (45.10 ± 0.259) than Co(42.56 ± 0.222). Similarly, the male goat has higher body length than female animals. Similar findings were observed by Park et al. (2000) who reported a positive effect of herb mixture on growth performance in weaned pigs.

## TABLE 4: AVERAGE (MEAN±SE) FORTNIGHTLY BODY LENGTH OF ASSAM HILL GOAT OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT GROUPS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fortnight** | **Body length(cm)** | | | | |
| **C0** | **T1** | **T2** | **M** | **F** |
| Initial | 30.43 ± 0.194 | 30.56 ± 0.212 | 30.62 ± 0.196 | 30.57 ± 0.193 | 30.50 ± 0.208 |
| 1 | 31.4 0± 0.185 | 31.65 ± 0.204 | 31.71 ± 0.194 | 31.60 ± 0.179 | 31.55 ± 0.209 |
| 2 | 32.36 ± 0.182 | 32.40 ± 0.190 | 32.50 ± 0.192 | 32.43 ± 0.163 | 32.41 ± 0.213 |
| 3 | 33.35 ± 0.167 | 33.43 ± 0.182 | 33.52 ± 0.195 | 33.46 ± 0.148 | 33.42 ± 0.214 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 34.33 ± 0.161 | 34.52 ± 0.171 | 34.62 ± 0.196 | 35.50 ± 0.134 | 35.48 ± 0.218 |
| 5 | 35.30 ± 0.176 | 35.41 ± 0.159 | 35.62 ± 0.201 | 35.45 ± 0.132 | 35.43 ± 0.225 |
| 6 | 36.28 ± 0.181 | 36.30 ± 0.153 | 36.41 ± 0.201 | 36.33 ± 0.131 | 36.31 ± 0.226 |
| 7 | 37.32 ± 0.177 | 37.62 ± 0.177 | 37.70 ± 0.239 | 37.55 ± 0.155 | 37.55 ± 0.241 |
| 8 | 37.83 ± 0.176 | 38.15 ± 0.170 | 38.20 ± 0.229 | 38.05 ± 0.152 | 38.04 ± 0.231 |
| 9 | 38.32 ± 0.179 | 38.56 ± 0.170 | 38.70 ± 0.218 | 38.55 ± 0.151 | 38.49 ± 0.227 |
| 10 | 38.83 ± 0.179 | 39.00 ± 0.172 | 39.20 ± 0.214 | 39.10 ± 0.150 | 38.94 ± 0.227 |
| 11 | 39.33 ± 0.189 | 39.70 ± 0.171 | 39.73 ± 0.219 | 39.60 ± 0.159 | 39.55 ± 0.227 |
| 12 | 39.84 ± 0.199a | 40.19 ± 0.173a | 40.20 ± 0.223a | 40.50 ± 0.164a | 39.65 ± 0.233b |
| 13 | 40.37 ± 0.209a | 40.71 ± 0.172a | 40.75 ± 0.239a | 41.00 ± 0.176a | 40.19 ± 0.237b |
| 14 | 41.03 ± 0.214a | 41.38 ± 0.180a | 41.40 ± 0.243a | 42.00 ± 0.187a | 40.56 ± 0.238b |
| 15 | 41.68 ± 0.218a | 42.00 ± 0.186a | 42.00 ± 0.249a | 42.50 ± 0.199a | 41.27 ± 0.236b |
| 16 | 42.33 ± 0.220a | 42.7 0± 0.205a | 42.71 ± 0.247a | 42.91 ± 0.209a | 42.24 ± 0.239b |
| 17 | 42.99 ± 0.225a | 43.50 ± 0.219b | 43.80 ± 0.256b | 44.21 ± 0.220a | 42.65 ± 0.246b |
| 18 | 43.66 ± 0.227a | 44.12 ± 0.236b | 44.90 ± 0.259c | 45.26 ± 0.236a | 43.20 ± 0.246b |
| 19 | 42.56 ± 0.222a | 45.10 ± 0.259b | 45.77 ± 0.259c | 45.55 ± 0.253a | 43.40 ± 0.240b |
| Overall | 37.98 ± 0.194a | 40.09 ± 0.188b | 40.18 ± 0.223c | 38.61 ± 0.175a | 38.04 ± 0.229b |

Means with similar superscript in a row or column donot differ significantly among themselves

### Chest Girth

The average mean value of fortnightly measurement of chest girth of the goats (cm) showed that there were significant differences among Co, T1and T2 were observed from 10th fortnight. During early fortnights of the experiment, the mean chest girth of all the animals in different treatment groups were almost similar. At the end of experiment (19thfortnight) group T2(58.47±0.283) showed significantly highest (P<0.01)chest girth followed by groups T1 (58.31

± 0.347) and Co(53.68 ± 0.334) which may be due to different growth rates in the different treatment groups. These results were in agreement with the result of (Chowdhury and Faruque, 2001) who shown that chest girth of male and female above 12 months of age is 73.2±1.33 and 71.0±1.13 cm, respectively. Similar findings were observed by Park et al. (2000) in weaned pigs.

## TABLE 5: AVERAGE (MEAN±SE) FORTNIGHTLY CHEST GIRTH OF ASSAM HILL GOAT OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT GROUPS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fortnight** | **Chest Girth (cm)** | | | | |
| **C0** | **T1** | **T2** | **M** | **F** |
| Initial | 36.61±0.275 | 36.43±0.260 | 36.55±0.242 | 36.70±0.274 | 36.36±0.254 |
| 1 | 37.75±0.268 | 37.57±0.276 | 37.70±0.246 | 37.84±0.271 | 37.50±0.254 |
| 2 | 38.88±0.271 | 38.72±0.274 | 38.84±0.243 | 38.99±0.272 | 38.64±0.257 |
| 3 | 40.02±0.264 | 39.87±0.263 | 39.99±0.234 | 40.13±0.268 | 39.78±0.255 |
| 4 | 41.15±0.273 | 41.01±0.256 | 41.14±0.238 | 41.28±0.268 | 40.92±0.257 |
| 5 | 42.29±0.282 | 42.16±0.278 | 42.29±0.247 | 42.42±0.270 | 42.07±0.259 |
| 6 | 43.42±0.276 | 43.30±0.265 | 43.44±0.254 | 43.57±0.269 | 43.21±0.259 |
| 7 | 44.58±0.284 | 44.45±0.263 | 44.59±0.258 | 44.72±0.274 | 44.35±0.263 |
| 8 | 45.51±0.272 | 45.59±0.268 | 45.74±0.264 | 45.82±0.272 | 45.41±0.263 |
| 9 | 46.44±0.254 | 46.74±0.276 | 46.89±0.257 | 46.91±0.253 | 46.47±0.273 |
| 10 | 47.37±0.237a | 47.89±0.291ab | 48.04±0.253b | 48.00±0.272a | 47.53±0.254a |
| 11 | 48.30±0.228a | 49.03±0.293b | 49.19±0.268b | 49.10±0.270a | 48.58±0.246b |
| 12 | 49.23±0.214a | 50.18±0.302b | 50.34±0.262b | 50.19±0.269a | 49.64±0.255b |
| 13 | 50.18±0.213a | 51.32±0.314b | 51.49±0.259b | 51.29±0.265a | 50.70±0.252b |
| 14 | 50.76±0.234a | 52.47±0.323b | 52.63±0.274b | 52.25±0.273a | 51.66±0.264b |
| 15 | 51.34±0.239a | 53.62±0.326b | 53.78±0.279b | 53.21±0.273a | 52.61±0.273b |
| 16 | 51.92±0.258a | 54.76±0.325b | 54.93±0.268b | 54.17±0.274a | 53.57±0.288b |
| 17 | 52.49±0.286a | 55.91±0.336b | 56.08±0.284b | 55.13±0.285a | 54.52±0.303b |
| 18 | 53.07±0.312a | 57.05±0.341b | 57.23±0.287b | 56.09±0.289a | 55.48±0.313b |
| 19 | 53.68±0.334a | 58.31±0.347b | 58.47±0.283b | 57.13±0.292a | 56.50±0.328b |
| Overal | 46.25±0.274a | 47.32±0.294b | 47.47±0.261c | 47.25±0.278a | 46.77±0.271b |

Means with similar superscript in a row or column donot differ significantly among themselves

### Neck Girth

The average mean value of fortnightly measurement of neck girth of goats (cm) were calculated and significant differences among overall values at Co (24.36 ±0.086), T1(25.68 ± 0.047) and T2(26.11 ± 0.028) were observed.

## TABLE 6: AVERAGE (MEAN±SE) FORTNIGHTLY NECK GIRTH OF ASSAM HILL GOAT OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT GROUPS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fortnight** | **Neck girth(cm)** | | | | |
| **C0** | **T1** | **T2** | **M** | **F** |
| Initial | 20.09 ± 0.047 | 20.22 ± 0.057 | 20.13 ± 0.037 | 20.28 ± 0.048 | 20.01 ± 0.047 |
| 1 | 20.54 ± 0.046 | 20.79 ± 0.056 | 20.76 ± 0.035 | 20.85 ± 0.046 | 20.54 ± 0.045 |
| 2 | 20.98 ± 0.045 | 21.36 ± 0.053 | 21.39 ± 0.033 | 21.42 ± 0.045 | 21.07 ± 0.043 |
| 3 | 21.44 ± 0.047 | 21.94 ± 0.051 | 22.01 ± 0.031 | 22 ± 0.045 | 21.6 ± 0.041 |
| 4 | 21.88 ± 0.050 | 22.51 ± 0.050 | 22.64 ± 0.029 | 22.57 ± 0.046 | 22.13 ± 0.039 |
| 5 | 22.33 ± 0.053 | 23.09 ± 0.049 | 23.27 ± 0.027 | 23.14 ± 0.048 | 22.66 ± 0.038 |
| 6 | 22.79 ± 0.056 | 23.66 ± 0.047 | 23.8 ± 0.025 | 23.71 ± 0.049 | 23.19 ± 0.036 |
| 7 | 23.23 ± 0.060 | 23.84 ± 0.045 | 24.13 ± 0.023 | 24.28 ± 0.051 | 23.72 ± 0.035 |
| 8 | 23.69 ± 0.064 | 24.31 ± 0.047 | 24.56 ± 0.022 | 24.86 ± 0.054 | 24.25 ± 0.034 |
| 9 | 24.14 ± 0.068 | 24.79 ± 0.046 | 25.19 ± 0.021 | 25.43 ± 0.057 | 24.78 ± 0.033 |
| 10 | 24.59 ± 0.074 | 25.26 ± 0.048 | 25.42 ± 0.024 | 26 ± 0.060 | 25.31 ± 0.036 |
| 11 | 25.04 ± 0.080 | 25.74 ± 0.043 | 26.05 ± 0.020 | 26.57 ± 0.064 | 25.84 ± 0.032 |
| 12 | 25.49 ± 0.084 | 25.8 ± 0.046 | 26.38 ± 0.019 | 27.15 ± 0.066 | 26.37 ± 0.037 |
| 13 | 25.94 ± 0.088 | 25.99 ± 0.047 | 27.01 ± 0.020 | 27.72 ± 0.069 | 26.91 ± 0.033 |
| 14 | 26.39 ± 0.095 | 26.56 ± 0.046 | 27.24 ± 0.021 | 28.3 ± 0.074a | 27.44 ± 0.034 b |
| 15 | 26.84 ± 0.101 | 27.14 ± 0.047 | 27.87 ± 0.022 | 28.87 ± 0.078 a | 27.97 ± 0.036 b |
| 16 | 27.29 ± 0.108 | 27.72 ± 0.049 | 28.2 ± 0.024 | 29.44 ± 0.084 a | 28.50 ± 0.037 b |
| 17 | 27.74 ± 0.114 | 28.29 ± 0.050 | 28.83 ± 0.026 | 30.01 ± 0.088 a | 29.03 ± 0.039 b |
| 18 | 28.19 ± 0.120 | 28.87 ± 0.051 | 29.26 ± 0.027 | 30.59 ± 0.092 a | 29.56 ± 0.040 b |
| 19 | 28.65 ± 0.127 | 29.44 ± 0.053 | 29.69 ± 0.029 | 31.16 ± 0.097 a | 30.09 ± 0.042b |
| Overall | 24.36 ±0.086a | 25.68 ±0.047b | 26.11 ± 0.028c | 25.72 ± 0.056a | 25.05±0.0324b |

Means with similar superscript in a row or column donot differ significantly among themselves

## CONCLUSION

In the present study 36 Assam Hill goat were selected and divided randomly into three groups. Polyherbal feed was supplemented in treatment groups @ 1 and 2 g/Kg body weight from 4 month of age till 12 month of age, respectively. Data on various parameters were analyzed at fortnightly interval for a period up to 9 months. Supplementation of polyherbal (Shtavari root, Fenugreek and Ajwain seed powder) @ 1 g/kg and 2 g/kg live body weight respectively, along with routine basal diet from weaning improved growth performances of Assam Hill goat. It may be concluded that it could serve as potential management tool to improve growth performances in goats. It is also recommended that further studies on combination of different polyherbal constituent and their effect on different glands and their hormone secretion are needed.
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