

Drinking Water Temperature Effects on Laying Hens Subjected to Warm Cyclic Environments

H. Xin,^{*,1} R. S. Gates,[†] M. C. Puma,^{*} and D. U. Ahn[‡]

^{*}Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Department, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3080;

[†]Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering Department, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40546;

and [‡]Animal Science Department, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3150

ABSTRACT Two experiments were conducted to evaluate the effects of drinking water temperature (T_w) on laying hens subjected to warm cyclic air temperature (T_a) conditions. Each experiment consisted of a 1-wk acclimation under thermoneutrality (TN) ($T_a = T_w = 21$ C), a 4-wk heat exposure or treatment period, and a 2-wk recovery under TN. Each experiment involved 24 individually caged hens at the initial age of 29 wk (Experiment 1) or 30 wk (Experiment 2). In Experiment 1, T_w of 18 or 27 C was provided to 12 birds per T_w regimen under a diurnal T_a of 27 to 35 C (daily mean of 31 C). In Experiment 2, T_w of 15, 19, 23, or 27 C was provided to six birds per T_w regimen under a diurnal T_a of 27 to 38 C (daily mean of 32.5 C). Experiment 1 showed that T_w of 18 C enhanced hourly and daily feed and water intake during the first 2 wk of heat exposure, as compared with T_w of 27 C. Experiment 2 showed that daily feed and water intake

were greatest for hens in the 23 C T_w regimen and least for hens in the coolest or warmest T_w regimens. Reduction in daily feed intake with increase in daily mean T_a ranged from 2.0 ~ 3.2 g/C-day (first week of heat exposure) to 1.1 ~ 1.9 g/C-day (fourth week of heat exposure). Water to feed intake ratio was 1.8 ~ 2.0 during acclimation and recovery, but increased to 3.0 ~ 3.4 during heat exposure. Internal egg quality parameters were in general unaffected by T_w . The two warmer T_w regimens in Experiment 2 had less reduction in egg size than did the two cooler T_w . In both experiments, hens displayed anticipatory increase in feed and water intake 2 to 3 h prior to lights-off. However, the stimulus of lights-on did not elicit a strong return to feed and water consumption as typically seen in broilers. The results revealed the potential existence of an optimal T_w range (near 23 C) for heat-challenged laying hens. Larger-scale tests are warranted to further verify the findings.

(*Key words:* laying hen, production performance, heat stress relief, hen well-being)

2002 Poultry Science 81:608–617

INTRODUCTION

Factors influencing feed and water consumption and, thereby, meat and egg production of poultry are of economic importance. Although ample information exists in the literature about environmental effects on feed and water intake of broilers (May and Lott, 1992a,b, 1994; Xin et al., 1993, 1994; May et al., 1997), less information is available for modern laying hens. Daily feed use of White Leghorn chickens has been reported to decrease from 130 to 70 g/bird when the maximum house air temperature (T_a) increased from 4.4 to 37.8 C, yielding a daily feed-use reduction rate of 1.8 g/bird per C in-

crease in T_a (Poultry Times Supplement, 1999). At the same time, daily water use increased from 182 to 590 mL/bird for these T_a , or 12.2 g/bird per C increase in T_a . Decreased feed consumption during hot weather affects the intake of calcium and other nutrients essential for strong shells. High T_a results in reduced shell quality and decreased shell thickness (North and Bell, 1990; Yamamoto et al., 1997).

The benefit of providing cooled drinking water to birds, in terms of body heat loss used to warm the water, is insignificant (less than 0.2 W assuming 10 C cooler water and 300 g daily water intake). Yet, if cool water can induce additional water intake, thereby ensuring ample moisture supply for respiratory (panting) heat loss, the benefit can be substantial (Brody, 1945). Further, we hypothesize that providing cooler drinking water promotes feed consumption and thus eggshell quality.

Abbreviation Key: BM = body mass of the hen; DFI = daily feed intake; DWI = daily water intake; ES = egg size; EP = egg production; FC = feed conversion ratio; HFI = hourly feed intake; HU = Haugh unit; HWI = hourly water intake; T_a = air temperature; T_w = water temperature; TN = thermoneutrality; WFR = water to feed ratio.

©2002 Poultry Science Association, Inc.

Received for publication June 11, 2001.

Accepted for publication December 21, 2001.

Journal paper No. J-19368 of the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station, Ames, IA 50011, Project No. 3311. Mention of vendor or product names is for presentation clarity and does not imply endorsement by the authors or their affiliations or exclusion of other suitable products.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed: hxin@iastate.edu.

Largely unknown is the relationship between feed and water consumption over the course of diurnal heat stress. For example, if birds could be induced to drink more during the hottest portion of a day, they may alter their feeding behavior as well.

Puma et al. (2001), using a newly developed feeding and drinking monitoring system, reported that when provided cooler drinking water (20, 22, or 27 C vs. 32 C), broilers tended to maintain feed and water intake under a warm (35 C) environment. Little published information is available regarding the effects of drinking water temperature on modern layers during heat exposure, even though flushing water lines during hot weather has been practiced by some commercial poultry operations. Scientific studies to quantify the effects and operational strategies of controlling drinking water temperature are warranted.

The objectives of this research were (1) to evaluate the effects of drinking water temperature (T_w) on production responses of laying hens subjected to warm/hot cyclic air temperature (T_a), (2) to determine whether an optimal T_w or range exists during heat exposure, and (3) to determine if or how T_w affects dynamic feeding and drinking patterns of the heat-challenged hen.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental Hens and Procedure

Two experiments were conducted at the Livestock Environment and Animal Physiology Laboratory at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. For each experiment, 30 Hy-line W-36 laying hens with similar body masses (BM) were obtained from a commercial egg facility in Iowa and transported to the laboratory. The hens had an initial age of 29 wk (Experiment 1) or 30 wk (Experiment 2) and BM of 1.57 to 1.58 kg or 1.61 to 1.67 kg, respectively. The hens were housed in individual wire-mesh cages (25-cm width $\times$ 46-cm depth $\times$ 46-cm height) that were located in two adjacent environmental chambers (2.4-m width $\times$ 2.4-m depth $\times$ 3.0-m height), 12 hens per chamber. They were provided with a photoperiod of 16 h (0500 to 2100 h) light and 8 h darkness, as practiced on the commercial farm, feeding ad libitum of a commercial diet containing 19% CP, 4.2% Ca, and 0.8% P. Feed and water were replenished daily.

Hens were held for 5 d under thermoneutrality (TN), followed by selection of 24 hens with similar BM and egg production histories for further testing. A 1-wk acclimation (Week 0) was then initiated with T_a and T_w at 21 C. After acclimation, a warm diurnal T_a was applied to both chambers, and T_w was controlled to achieve respective target values. In Experiment 1, 12 hens (six in each chamber) were randomly assigned to a warm T_w of 27 C and the other 12 to a cool T_w of 18 C; T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 35 C (mean of 31 C). In

Experiment 2, four T_w of 15, 19, 23, and 27 C were randomly assigned to six hens per regimen (three per chamber); T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 38 C (mean of 32.5 C). Selection of the four T_w levels in Experiment 2 was based on the positive effects of cooler T_w on hens as revealed in Experiment 1, and was to evaluate the potential existence of an optimal T_w or range during the heat exposure. In both experiments, T_a was programmed to reach the highest at 1800 h and the lowest at 0600 h. Hens were subjected to this environment for 4 wk, followed by a 2-wk recovery period during which both T_a and T_w returned to the acclimation TN condition of 21 C. The target values were maintained within 0.3 to 0.5 C for T_a and 0.1 to 0.2 C for T_w . Humidifiers were used to maintain relative humidity between 45 and 60% in the environmental chambers.

Measurement of Response Variables

Each individual birdcage was equipped with a feeding and drinking station whose signal outputs were transmitted to a central data acquisition personal computer. The specially designed drinking devices achieved the target T_w by controlling the temperature of a water jacket surrounding the water reservoir column. Puma et al. (2001) provided a detailed description on the design and operation of the measurement and control system. Monitoring of feeding and drinking started with the acclimation period and continued throughout the experiment. Data for the transition days, i.e., from acclimation to treatment (Days 13 and 14) and from treatment to recovery (Day 41), were excluded from the analysis because of the time required for T_w to reach stabilized target values.

Eggs were collected and recorded daily, cleaned, weighed and stored at 4 C, and analyzed weekly for the following parameters: yolk, albumen, shell weight, yolk to white ratio, and Haugh units. Yolk was weighed after separating albumen and chalaza from the yolk. Chalaza was removed with a pair of forceps. For Experiment 1, shell weight was measured after removing any residual albumen from the inner eggshell surface with a vacuum. For Experiment 2, shell weight, including that of the membrane, was determined after drying for 24 h at 85 C. Albumen weight was calculated by subtracting yolk and shell weights from total egg weight. Albumen heights (to nearest 0.1 mm) were measured with a dial caliper device.² In both experiments, feed conversion (FC)—the ratio of feed intake to egg production—was determined for each hen for various periods.

Data Processing and Statistical Analysis

Feed and Water Consumption. Feed and water intake were determined from the time-series recordings (4 or 30 s intervals) of feeder and waterer weight for each hen. These data were checked for spurious readings and synthesized into hourly and daily values for each hen. Daily feed intake (DFI) and daily water intake

²Ames, Co., Waltham, MA.

(DWI) were also directly measured from the feeder and waterer weight readings at the start and end of each 24 h cycle. Daily values for each hen were further averaged into weekly intervals.

Egg Production. Egg size (ES, g/hen), egg production (EP, eggs/hen-day), and FC were determined on weekly basis. In Experiment 1, eggs were pooled by treatment, whereas in Experiment 2, hen identity was preserved. Each egg was weighed to the nearest 0.1 g.

Internal Egg Quality Parameters. In Experiment 1, eggs were pooled by T_w treatment each week. In Experiment 2, eggs were analyzed on a per hen basis each week, with four eggs/hen used for yolk/white ratio determination and the remaining eggs for Haugh unit (HU) determination.

HU was calculated according to the following equation (Stadelman and Cotterill, 1977):

$$HU = 100 \log [H - 32.2^{1/2} (30 EW^{0.37} - 100) / 100 + 1.9] \quad [1]$$

where H = albumen height (mm), and EW = egg weight (g).

Egg weighing and measurement of albumen height were done just after taking the eggs from the cold storage (4 C). The temperature of the eggs during sampling was slightly higher than 4 C.

Statistical Analysis. Response variables were tested for treatment effects as follows. For Experiment 1, an independent *t*-test was performed, using means by treatment for each week, with hen as the experimental unit. For Experiment 2, some differences between treatment groups during acclimation were observed; thus, means of bird responses for each week were subtracted from values for the acclimation period, and a percentage change with respect to the acclimation value was computed. Treatment effects were tested with analysis of variance, using weekly periods as repeated measures (SAS, 1999). Significant main effects were separated by least-squares means. A significance level of $P < 0.1$ was used for testing treatment effects in both experiments. Although the significance level of $P < 0.1$ is greater than the typical level of $P < 0.05$, it was considered to be adequate for this study because of the inherent nature of variation among the individual birds and the relatively small sample sizes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Feed and Water Consumption

For Experiment 1, DFI of hens on the T_w regimens was similar at 105 and 106 g/hen-day during acclimation (Table 1) and decreased significantly during heat exposure. During the first 2-wk heat exposure, DFI for the cool T_w (82 g for Week 1 and 86 g for Week 2) were significantly higher than those for the warm T_w (77 g for Week 1 and 81 g for Week 2). During the last 2-wk heat exposure and the recovery period, DFI appeared

unaffected by treatment. DFI for both T_w regimens showed a similar compensatory gain during the recovery period, and stabilized at 114 g/hen-day. The rate of DFI reduction, with increase in daily mean T_a on a weekly basis, averaged 2.8 g/C-d for Week 1 to 1.6 g/C-d for Week 4 of the warm T_w regimen; and 2.4 g/C-d for Week 1 to 1.9 g/C-d for Week 4 of the cool T_w regimen. These values compared well with the literature report of 1.8 g/C-d reduction rate (Poultry Times Supplement, 1999). The gradual rebound of the DFI reduction rate was presumably the result of adaptation of the hens to the increased temperature.

DWI for both T_w regimens were similar (194 and 193 g/hen-day for the warm and cool T_w , respectively) during the acclimation period, and increased to 262 and 278 g/hen-day, respectively, during the first week of the treatment period. During the recovery period, DWI returned to almost the same levels as during the acclimation period, and there was no significant difference between the two regimens. As expected, DWI during the heat exposure was significantly higher than that during TN condition (i.e., acclimation or recovery), being 33% higher for the warm T_w and 44% higher for the cool T_w .

Water to feed ratio (WFR) was not significantly different between the two T_w regimens during the acclimation period (1.9 vs 1.8 for the warm and cool T_w , respectively). WFR increased during heat exposure, averaging 3.1 and 3.2, respectively, but showed no treatment effect (Table 1). WFR returned to the acclimation levels during the recovery period.

Suppression of DFI during 4-wk heat exposure was also noted in Experiment 2, averaging 31, 25, 23, and 17 g/hen-day across T_w regimens for Weeks 1 to 4, respectively (i.e., mean weekly DFI increased 4.4 g/hen-day as birds acclimated to the temperature increase) (Table 2). As in Experiment 1, DFI in Experiment 2 also showed a compensatory gain during the recovery period (102 g/hen-day during acclimation vs. 109 and 111 g/hen-day for recovery Weeks 1 and 2, respectively). Hens in the 23 C T_w regimen had a significantly lower percentage reduction in DFI than hens in the other three T_w regimens during the first and second weeks of heat exposure (Figure 1). These hens also had significantly lower percentage reduction in DFI than hens in 19 C and 27 C T_w regimens during the third week, and hens in 15 C and 27 C T_w regimens during the fourth week of heat exposure. The rates of DFI reduction with increase in daily mean T_a for 15, 19, 23, and 27 C T_w regimens were, respectively, 2.6, 3.2, 2.0, and 2.8 g/C-d during the first week of heat exposure, and 1.7, 1.5, 1.1, and 1.6 g/C-d during the fourth week of heat exposure.

The temporal increase in overall DWI during the 4-wk heat exposure in Experiment 2 averaged 44, 41, 53, and 58 g/hen-day for Weeks 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Upon return to TN, hens maintained an elevated water intake (190 g/hen-day during acclimation vs. 211 and 207 g/hen-day for recovery Weeks 1 and 2, respectively). Treatment effects on DWI were noted during heat exposure and recovery periods (Figure 2 and Table 2). During




FIGURE 1. Effect of drinking water temperature (T_w) on change in daily feed intake (DFI), with reference to DFI during acclimation at thermoneutrality (T_a and $T_w = 21$ C), during 4 wk of heat exposure (HE) and 2 wk of recovery (R) at thermoneutrality. Means for each week with different letters were significantly different ($P < 0.1$).

the heat exposure period, hens receiving the 23 C T_w had the highest percentage increase in DWI. Hens receiving the cooler T_w (15 and 19 C) were intermediate, and those receiving the warmest T_w (27 C) had the lowest percentage increase in DWI (Figure 2). During the recovery period, birds receiving 23 C T_w maintained a significantly greater DWI.

WFR increased from 1.9 during acclimation to 3.4 during the first week of heat exposure, and then declined slightly to 3.0 by end of the fourth week of heat exposure. No treatment effects on WFR were observed during heat exposure. WFR returned to the acclimation level during recovery, 2.0 and 1.8, respectively, for Weeks 1 and 2 of recovery.

Hourly Feeding and Drinking Patterns

Hourly feeding and drinking patterns of the hens for Experiment 1, during acclimation and the first and fourth weeks of heat exposure, are illustrated in Figures 3 and 4. The profiles are pooled hourly feed (HFI) and water (HWI) intakes over the 12 replicates and 1-wk period.

HFI or HWI was similar in patterns for both cool and warm T_w regimens but different in magnitude. During the acclimation period, HFI remained quite constant from morning until late afternoon (Figure 3). HFI then increased during 3 h prior to lights off, suggesting anticipation of darkness by the hens. An implication of this

TABLE 1. Daily feed and water intake (DFI, DWI, respectively), water to feed intake ratio (WFR), and body mass (BM) of W-36 laying hens for Experiment 1 (starting age = 29 wk) during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods^{1,2}

Trial week	DFI (g/hen-day)		DWI (g/hen-day)		WFR		BM (kg)	
	$T_w = 27$ C	$T_w = 18$ C	$T_w = 27$ C	$T_w = 18$ C	$T_w = 27$ C	$T_w = 18$ C	$T_w = 27$ C	$T_w = 18$ C
Acclimation								
0	105 ^a (4)	106 ^a (3)	194 ^a (7)	193 ^a (7)	1.9 ^a (0.1)	1.8 ^a (0.1)	1.64 ^a (0.02)	1.65 ^a (0.02)
Treatment								
1	77 ^b (2)	82 ^c (3)	262 ^b (13)	278 ^b (24)	3.4 ^b (0.2)	3.4 ^b (0.2)	1.56 ^b (0.02)	1.58 ^b (0.02)
2	81 ^d (1)	86 ^e (1)	260 ^b (13)	277 ^b (24)	3.2 ^b (0.2)	3.2 ^b (0.3)	1.53 ^b (0.02)	1.56 ^b (0.02)
3	90 ^f (3)	91 ^f (3)	257 ^b (15)	274 ^b (24)	2.9 ^b (0.2)	3.0 ^b (0.3)	1.54 ^b (0.02)	1.56 ^b (0.02)
4	89 ^f (2)	91 ^f (3)	264 ^b (13)	287 ^b (27)	3.0 ^b (0.1)	3.2 ^b (0.3)	1.54 ^b (0.02)	1.56 ^b (0.02)
1-4	84 (1)	87 (1)	261 (13)	279 (23)	3.1 (0.2)	3.2 (0.3)	1.54 (0.02)	1.56 (0.02)
Recovery								
5	107 ^a (2)	108 ^a (2)	196 ^a (4)	195 ^a (8)	1.8 ^a (0.04)	1.8 ^a (0.08)	1.57 ^b (0.02)	1.59 ^b (0.02)
6	114 ^b (2)	114 ^b (2)	204 ^a (6)	201 ^a (6)	1.8 ^a (0.04)	1.8 ^a (0.05)	1.62 ^a (0.02)	1.63 ^a (0.02)

^{a-g}Row means for each response variable with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$). Column means under each T_w during different trial weeks with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$).

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 18 or 27 C, and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 35 C.

²Values in parentheses are standard errors of the means.

TABLE 2. Daily feed and water intake (DFI, DWI, respectively), water to feed intake ratio (WFR), and body mass (BM) of W-36 laying hens for Experiment 2 (starting age = 30 wk) during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods^{1,2}

Trial week	DFI (g/hen-day)					DWI (g/hen-day)					WFR	BM (kg)
	15	19	23	27	Overall	15	19	23	27	Overall	Overall	Overall
Acclimation												
0	103 ^a	101 ^a	101 ^a	102 ^a	102 (4)	205 ^a	181 ^a	188 ^a	185 ^a	190 (8)	1.9 (0.09)	1.67 (0.01)
Treatment												
1	73 ^b	64 ^c	78 ^d	70 ^b	71 (4)	246 ^b	216 ^c	257 ^c	218 ^b	234 (15)	3.4 (0.28)	
2	77 ^b	74 ^b	81 ^c	74 ^b	77 (4)	244 ^{bc}	223 ^{bc}	248 ^d	209 ^c	231 (13)	3.1 (0.20)	1.56 (0.02)
3	80 ^{bc}	77 ^b	83 ^c	78 ^b	79 (3)	258 ^b	234 ^{bc}	255 ^c	226 ^b	243 (1)	3.1 (0.18)	
4	84 ^b	84 ^b	89 ^c	84 ^b	85 (3)	264 ^{bc}	239 ^{bc}	267 ^d	228 ^c	248 (13)	3.0 (0.18)	1.56 (0.02)
Recovery												
5	109 ^{ad}	106 ^{ad}	113 ^d	108 ^{ad}	109 (3)	220 ^b	204 ^{bc}	223 ^c	202 ^b	211 (8)	2.0 (0.09)	1.62 (0.02)
6	112 ^{ad}	109 ^{ad}	114 ^d	111 ^{ad}	111 (3)	213 ^b	203 ^{bc}	216 ^c	198 ^b	207 (8)	1.8 (0.08)	1.63 (0.02)

^{a-e}Row means with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$) as determined by percentage change from acclimation level. Column means under each T_w during different trial wk with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$).

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 15, 19, 23, or 27 C, T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 38 C.

²Values in parentheses are standard errors of the means.

anticipatory behavior is the importance of sufficient feed supply to meet this increased feed intake before lights go off. The anticipatory ingestion behavior before the dark period exhibited by the hens had been reported also for 36-wk-old laying hens provided with a 14-h photoperiod (0400 to 1800) (Hughes and Black, 1977) and for broilers (May and Lott, 1994, 1992b; Savory, 1976). Broilers maintained on 12L:12D photoperiod anticipated darkness by increasing their feed consumption during the period preceding darkness (Savory, 1976). May and Lott (1992b) demonstrated that broilers were able to anticipate the period of feed unavailability when it coincided with darkness. They showed that periodically lighted broilers consumed more feed at the end

than at the onset of the feeding period (which coincided with the light period).

During the treatment period, HFI gradually increased from the early morning cooler hours and peaked about 2 h before noontime. Feed intake then decreased as T_a further increased during late afternoon. Minimum feed intake occurred just before the onset of maximum T_a , and increased again until the onset of dark period. Upon lights on at 0500 h, feed consumption resumed at a lower rate during the first hour and then increased. This behavior of hens differed from that of broilers in that onset of light generally stimulates HFI of broilers (Xin et al., 1993; May and Lott, 1994). HFI of the hens was much lower during heat exposure than during acclimation,




FIGURE 2. Effect of drinking water temperature (T_w) on change in daily water intake (DWI), with reference to DWI during acclimation at thermoneutrality (T_a and $T_w = 21^\circ\text{C}$), during 4 wk of heat exposure (HE) and 2 wk of recovery (R) at thermoneutrality. Means for each week labeled with different letters were significantly different ($P < 0.1$).




FIGURE 3. Hourly feed intake of laying hens in Experiment 1, at starting age of 29 wk, and during acclimation, and the first and fourth weeks of the treatment period. Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 °C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 18 °C (cool) or 27 °C (warm) and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 35 °C.

indicating the suppressing effect of warmer T_a on feed intake. Also during the heat exposure, HFI for the cool T_w hens was somewhat higher than HFI for the warm T_w hens, although no significant difference was detected. The lack of measurable treatment effect could have resulted from the small number of hens involved.

HWI of the hens during acclimation and heat exposure shared similar patterns, with HWI during heat exposure being higher (Figure 4). Patterns of HWI generally coincided with those of HFI. As seen in HFI, HWI was highest during 3 h prior to lights off, indicating anticipation of darkness by the birds. HWI was similar for the two T_w regimens during acclimation, but was numerically higher for the cooler T_w regimen during heat exposure. However, differences in HWI between the two regimens during heat exposure were not significantly different. Again, the lack of significant treatment effect could have been due to the small number of hens used in the experiment.

BM

For Experiment 1, average BM at the end of the acclimation period was 1.64 and 1.65 kg for the warm T_w and cool T_w , respectively (Table 1). BM decreased by 6 to 7% (1.54 and 1.56 kg for warm and cool T_w , respectively) during the heat exposure period. It returned to nearly

the acclimation period level during the recovery period (1.62 and 1.63 kg for the warm and cool T_w , respectively).

For Experiment 2, BM decreased from a mean value of 1.67 to 1.56 kg, a 6.6% reduction, during the heat exposure (Table 2). After 2-wk recovery, BM remained 42 g lower than that prior to the heat exposure. This result suggests that more than 2 wk would be necessary for full BM recovery from extended heat exposure episodes. The seemingly longer BM recovery period for Experiment 2 compared with Experiment 1 might have arisen from the higher T_a (32.5 vs. 31.0 °C daily mean) exposure.

ES, EP, and FC

ES (g), EP (g/hen-day), and FC for Experiment 1 were not affected by T_w during the heat exposure period (Table 3). Overall EP during the first 3 wk of the treatment period was lower than that during the acclimation period, but rebounded during the fourth week. There was a trend of increasing ES from the acclimation period until the recovery period. This progressive increase in ES may have been due to hens becoming older and thereby producing larger eggs. For Experiment 2, there was also no treatment effect on EP (Table 3). Compared with Experiment 1, EP for Experiment 2 became more suppressed during the heat exposure period. This

TABLE 3. Overall means of egg production (EP), feed conversion (FC), and egg size (ES) of W-36 laying hens for Experiment 1 (starting age = 29 wk), and EP of laying hens for Experiment 2 (starting age = 30 wk) during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods^{1,2}

Response variable	Trial week						
	Acclimation	Treatment				Recovery	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Experiment 1							
EP (SE), g/hen-day	52.0 (1.1)	51.9 (1.6)	48.6 (1.8)	49.4 (1.8)	53.0 (1.8)	52.0 (1.6)	52.8 (2.2)
FC (SE)	1.90 (0.05)	1.45 (0.03)	1.50 (0.02)	1.64 (0.04)	1.64 (0.04)	1.90 (0.04)	1.99 (0.62)
ES (SE), g	54.6 (0.7)	54.8 (0.8)	55.1 (0.7)	55.0 (0.7)	55.2 (0.8)	56.6 (0.6)	57.3 (0.7)
Experiment 2							
EP (SE), g/hen-day	52.8 (1.6)	37.4 (2.9)	46.6 (2.7)	49.9 (2.9)	49.2 (2.9)	50.9 (2.2)	56.8 (2.0)

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods.

²Values in parentheses are standard errors of the means.

greater suppression might have resulted from the higher T_a in Experiment 2. EP then rebounded during the recovery period.

Significant effects of the heat exposure on FC and ES were noted for hens of Experiment 2 (Table 4). During the first 2-wk heat exposure, there were significant differences in the percentage change of FC for hens in the cooler T_w (15 and 19 C) and those with the warmer T_w (23 and 27 C). During the first 3-wk heat exposure, ES remained larger ($P < 0.1$) for hens in 23 and 27 C T_w than that for hens in 15 and 19 C T_w . Significant differences in ES between the T_w regimens during acclimation were

observed. It should be noted also that during the treatment and recovery periods, hens in the cooler T_w (15 and 19 C) laid fewer eggs than those in the warmer T_w (23 and 27 C).

Internal Egg Quality Parameters

For Experiment 1, yolk-to-white ratio and HU were unaffected by T_w (Table 5). For Experiment 2, there were significant differences in percentage change in yolk-to-white ratio during the second and fourth weeks of the heat exposure period and the second week of the recovery




FIGURE 4. Hourly water intake of laying hens in Experiment 1, at starting age of 29 wk, and during acclimation, and the first and fourth weeks of the treatment period. Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 18 C (cool) or 27 C (warm) and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 35 C.

TABLE 4. Weekly means of feed conversion (FC) and egg size (ES, g) and percentage change from acclimation level of W-36 laying hens for Experiment 2 (starting age = 30 wk) during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods¹

T _w (C) and change (%) from acclimation									
Trial week	15	Change	19	Change	23	Change	27	Change	SE
FC									
Acclimation 0	2.06		1.98		1.83		1.87		0.09
Treatment 1	1.45	-29.6 ^{ab}	1.22	-38.4 ^a	1.67	-8.7 ^b	1.31	-29.9 ^{ab}	0.20
2	1.64	-22.4 ^a	1.54	-22.2 ^a	1.67	-8.7 ^{ab}	1.83	-2.1 ^b	0.08
3	1.66	-19.4	1.59	-19.7	1.69	-7.6	1.51	-19.2	0.09
4	1.74	-15.5	1.79	-9.6	1.72	-6.0	1.68	-10.2	0.08
Recovery 5	2.27	10.2	2.14	8.1	2.19	19.7	2.05	9.6	0.12
6	2.13	3.4	1.94	2.0	1.90	3.8	1.93	3.2	0.09
ES									
Acclimation 0	57.1 ^a		56.7 ^a		58.1 ^{ab}		60.0 ^b		1.1
Treatment 1	55.6	-2.63 ^a	55.0	-3.0 ^a	58.4	0.5 ^b	60.0	0.0 ^b	1.2
2	54.9	-3.8 ^a	54.5	-3.9 ^a	57.7	-0.7 ^b	59.7	-0.5 ^b	1.1
3	54.9	-3.8 ^a	54.4	-4.1 ^a	57.5	-3.0 ^b	59.2	-1.3 ^{ab}	1.2
4	55.0	-3.5	55.0	-3.0	57.1	-1.7	58.5	-0.3	1.3
Recovery 5	55.6	-2.6 ^a	56.5	-0.3 ^{ab}	59.2	1.9 ^b	59.8	-0.3 ^{ab}	1.4
6	56.9	-0.4 ^a	58.3	2.8 ^{ab}	60.3	3.8 ^b	61.1	1.8 ^a	1.2

^{a-d}Row means with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$).

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 15, 19, 23, or 27 C, and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 38 C.

ery period (Table 6). Generally, yolk-to-white ratio for hens in the cooler T_w (15 and 19 C) was significantly higher than that for hens in the warmer T_w (23 and 27 C). For Experiment 2, HU for eggs from hens in 23 C T_w was significantly different from that for hens in 15 and 27 C T_w but not from hens in 19 C T_w. There were significant differences in percentage change of shell dry weight during the second week of the heat exposure and during the recovery period (Table 6). During the second week of the heat exposure period, percentage reduction in eggshell weight for hens in 23 C T_w was significantly lower than that for hens in 19 C T_w but not for hens in 15 and 27 C T_w. During the first week of recovery, percentage increase in eggshell weight of hens in 23 C T_w was significantly higher than that for hens

in other T_w. Eggshell weight for hens in 15 and 27 C T_w was still lower than the acclimation level during that period. Rebound of eggshell weight for hens in 23 C T_w continued until the second week of the recovery period, although percentage change was not significantly different from that of hens in 19 and 27 C T_w.

Results from the two experiments suggest that certain cooler T_w tended to enhance feed and water intake of laying hens during early stage of heat exposure. An optimal range of T_w (near 23 C), especially in terms of DFI and DWI, seems to exist for hens challenged by heat exposure. However, large variations among the individual hens were noted. Further tests involving a larger number of birds are warranted to verify the potential merits of supplying heat-challenged hens with certain

TABLE 5. Overall means of internal egg quality parameters of W-36 laying hens in Experiment 1 (starting age = 29 wk) during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods^{1,2}

Response variable	Trial week						
	Acclimation	Treatment				Recovery	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yolk/white, %	39.7 (0.4)	40.8 (0.5)	41.0 (0.6)	39.7 (0.8)	40.3 (0.4)	41.0 (0.3)	42.3 (0.2)
Haugh unit	82.0 (1.0)	89.0 (1.5)	82.4 (1.6)	81.6 (1.2)	84.0 (1.4)	82.2 (0.9)	81.0 (0.7)

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 18 or 27 C, and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 35 C.

²Values in parentheses are standard errors of the means.

TABLE 6. Weekly means of internal egg quality parameters and percentage change from acclimation level of W-36 laying hens in Experiment 2, at starting age of 30 wk, and during acclimation, treatment, and recovery periods¹

	T _w (C) and change (%) from acclimation								
Trial week	15	Change	19	Change	23	Change	27	Change	SE
Yolk/white ratio (%)									
Acclimation 0	39.4		38.8		37.6		37.1		0.9
Treatment 1	41.8	6.1	42.7	10.0	40.0	6.4	40.0	7.8	1.1
2	39.2	-0.5 ^a	40.8	5.2 ^b	39.0	3.7 ^{ab}	38.8	4.6 ^b	0.9
3	39.5	0.25	40.2	3.6	39.0	3.7	37.7	1.6	0.8
4	39.8	1.0 ^{ac}	40.0	3.1 ^{ac}	39.6	5.3 ^a	36.9	-0.5 ^{bc}	0.9
Recovery 5	37.9	-3.8	37.2	-4.1	35.8	-4.8	36.3	-2.2	1.0
6	37.9	-3.8 ^{ac}	39.0	0.5 ^a	33.5	-5.6 ^{ac}	35.6	-4.0 ^{bc}	0.9
Haugh unit									
Acclimation 0	87.7		89.5		87.7		88.1		2.1
Treatment 1	88.2	0.4	90.3	0.9	86.0	-1.9	88.5	0.4	1.5
2	88.2	0.4 ^a	88.4	-1.2 ^{ab}	83.9	-4.3 ^b	88.7	0.7 ^{ac}	1.6
3	87.9	0.2	91.3	2.0	87.7	0.0	91.6	4.0	2.0
4	88.1	0.4	87.7	-2.0	87.0	-0.8	87.3	-0.9	1.8
Recovery 5	89.9	2.5	90.0	0.6	90.4	3.1	89.3	1.4	1.6
6	88.7	1.1	90.9	1.6	89.9	2.5	86.7	-1.6	1.6
Shell dry weight (g)									
Acclimation 0	5.51		5.39		5.26		5.80		0.14
Treatment 1	5.08	-7.8	4.79	-11.1	4.86	-7.6	5.32	-8.3	0.14
2	5.19	-5.8 ^{ab}	5.00	-7.2 ^a	5.05	-4.0 ^b	5.46	-5.9 ^{ab}	0.14
3	5.20	-5.6	4.96	-8.0	5.00	-4.9	5.47	-5.7	0.15
4	5.20	-5.6	5.05	-6.3	4.98	-5.3	5.44	-6.2	0.14
Recovery 5	5.44	-1.2 ^a	5.42	0.6 ^a	5.47	4.0 ^b	5.76	-0.7 ^a	0.13
6	5.45	-1.1 ^a	5.43	0.7 ^{ab}	5.42	3.0 ^b	5.80	0.0 ^{ab}	0.13

^{a-d}Row means with different superscripts are significantly different ($P < 0.10$).

¹Drinking water temperature (T_w) and air temperature (T_a) were 21 C during the acclimation and recovery periods. During the treatment period, T_w was 15, 19, 23, or 27 C, and T_a varied diurnally from 27 to 38 C.

cooled drinking water to enhance their production performance and well-being.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this study was provided in part by the Iowa Egg Council, the USDA NRI Competitive Grants Program, the USDA Multi-state Project NE-127 "Biophysical Models for Poultry Production Systems," and the USDA Multi-state Project S-291 "Systems for Controlling Air Pollutant Emissions and Indoor Environment of Poultry and Livestock Facilities" and is acknowledged with gratitude. Cooperation of the Farmegg Products Company in providing the experimental hens and feed is also sincerely appreciated.

REFERENCES

- Brody, S. 1945. Basal metabolism and body weight. Pages 352–387 in *Bioenergetics and Growth*. (1964 Reprint). Hafner Publishing Co., Inc. New York, NY.
- Hughes, B. O., and A. J. Black. 1977. Diurnal patterns of feeding and activity in laying hens in relation to dietary restriction and cage shape. *Br. Poult. Sci.* 18:353–360.
- May, J. D., and B. D. Lott. 1994. Effects of light and temperature on anticipatory feeding by broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 73:1398–1403.
- May, J. D., and B. D. Lott. 1992a. Feed and water consumption patterns of broilers at high environmental temperatures. *Poult. Sci.* 71:331–336.
- May, J. D., and B. D. Lott. 1992b. Effect of periodic feeding and photoperiod on anticipation of feed withdrawal. *Poult. Sci.* 71:951–958.
- May, J. D., B. D. Lott, and J. D. Simmons. 1997. Water consumption by broilers in high cyclic temperatures: Bell vs. nipple waterers. *Poult. Sci.* 76:944–947.
- North, M. O., and D. D. Bell. 1990. *Commercial Chicken Production Manual*. 4th ed. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY.
- Poultry Times Supplement. 1999. Know your bird's water intake. (June 14):1A–2A.
- Puma, M. C., H. Xin, R. S. Gates, and D. J. Burnham. 2001. An instrumentation system for measuring feeding and drinking behavior of individual poultry. *Appl. Eng. Agric.* 17:365–374.
- Savory, C. J. 1976. Broiler growth and feeding behavior in three different lighting regimes. *Br. Poult. Sci.* 17:557–560.

- SAS. 1999. PC SAS Version 8.0. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- Stadelman, W. J., and O. J. Cotterill. 1977. *Egg Science and Technology*. AVI, Westport, CT.
- Xin, H., I. L. Berry, T. L. Barton, and G. T. Tabler. 1993. Feeding and drinking patterns of broilers subjected to different feeding and lighting programs. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* 2:365–372.
- Xin, H., I. L. Berry, T. L. Barton, and G. T. Tabler. 1994. Feed and water consumption, growth, and mortality of male broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 73:610–616.
- Yamamoto, T., L. R. Juneja, H. Hatta, and M. Kim. 1997. *Hen eggs: Their Basic and Applied Science*. T. Yamamoto, L. R. Juneja, H. Hatta, and M. Kim, ed. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL.