

Original Research Article

**Environmental Effects of Poultry Production
in Edo State, Nigeria**

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the environmental hazards associated with poultry production among poultry farmers in Edo State. To carry out the investigation, a total of 366 respondents made up of 122 poultry owners, 122 poultry farm workers and 122 poultry farm neighbours were randomly selected. Multiple regression and chi-square tests were the statistical tools used for the analyses. The results of the study revealed that only 12.3% of the farms were located at least 500 metres away from living houses as recommended by Environmental Protection Agency. The major complaint about poultry farms by neighbours (74.6%) were bad odour with majority of the farmers (55.7%) and workers (51.6%) adopting the use of covering of nose for protection from bad odour. The regression analysis indicated that age of the complainant had negative and significant relationship with frequency of environmental hazard complaint ($b = 0.387$, $P < 0.05$). The relationship between distance of poultry farms and living houses on hazard complaint was also negative and significant ($b = -0.418$, $P < 0.05$). The significance and negative relationship between the poultry farms and number of complaint was also confirmed by chi-square test ($\chi^2_{cal} = 121.3 \geq \chi^2_{tab} = 15.1$). The study concludes that the environmental hazard posed by the establishment of poultry farming is high in Edo due to the fact commercial poultry houses are located too close to residential houses. The study then recommends the need for Edo State Ministries of Health and Environment to ensure that the poultry farms are located at least about half a kilometer far from the living houses. The huge waste generated by the poultry farms in Edo State can also be converted to inorganic manure using modern recycling facilities.

INTRODUCTION

Poultry production in Nigeria consists of local (backyard) and exotic breeds which are reared under the free range conditions and the intensive systems. The backyard poultry constitutes about 84% of total poultry production, while the exotic contributes about 14% to the total poultry production in Nigeria (Adene and Oguntade, 2006) [1]. According to Adene and Oguntade (2006) [1], Edo state contributes about 1% to the total poultry production in Nigeria. In Edo state, backyard and exotic poultry contributes about 1129350 and 112290

Comment [O1]: Citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets, e.g. [1]. Read the General Guideline for Authors. Change all.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

35 | respectively. Obioha ~~(1996)~~[1] observed that of all the poultry species, the fowls are the most
36 | common and important in the tropics as they are elsewhere. Okoli, et al. ~~(2007)~~[12] noted that
37 | poultry production in Nigeria is essentially categorized into extensive, semi-intensive and
38 | intensive production systems. The intensive system usually involves commercial production
39 | of high performance exotic breeds of livestock. The relative success of commercial poultry
40 | production in the tropics has made the business very attractive in most developing countries.

41 | Oluyemi and Roberts ~~(2000)~~[14] observed that the commercialization of poultry
42 | production involving the emergence of large units in urban centres has transformed poultry
43 | manure or droppings from an asset to a problem of a complete nuisance in an age where there
44 | is much concern with pollution of the environment. It was noted that a layer is estimated to
45 | produce about 63—70 kg manure per bird in a year and that every week, 1,000 layers in
46 | cages produce 1 ton of manure while on deep litter, they are estimated to produce 30 tons of
47 | faecal matter mixed with litter of variable fibre and moisture contents (Oluyemi and
48 | Roberts[14], ~~2000~~). Ray ~~(1994)~~[16] noted that unlike most other livestock, poultry reared
49 | intensively produces large amount of waste capable of polluting the environment if not
50 | properly handled.

51 | Waste generated in poultry production according to ~~HFC (2007)~~[9] includes waste
52 | food, animal waste or faeces, carcasses, sediments and sludge from on-site waste water
53 | treatment facilities, various kinds of packaging for feed and pesticides, used ventilation
54 | filters, unused/spoilt medications and used cleaning materials. It was noted that air emission
55 | from poultry production include ammonia, odour and dust which are generated primarily due
56 | to denitrification of manure and can be released directly into the atmosphere. Potential
57 | Environmental Risks ~~(2008)~~[15] reported that rice hulls or litter spread over the ground in
58 | poultry houses become contaminated with droppings of the chickens. Disposing this
59 | contaminated rice hull or litter poses some environmental threat as improper disposal lead to
60 | breeding of flies and unpleasant odour and water pollution. It was observed that water drops
61 | over the litter on the flows while chicken drink water from the troughs and when the litter
62 | becomes wet, it give rise to an unpleasant odour which can be a source of annoyance for the
63 | workers and nearby communities (~~Potential Environmental Risks, 2008~~)[15]. Environmental
64 | Protection Agency ~~(2008)~~[7] noted that to manage the nuisance of odour created by poultry
65 | industry, the farms are to be located at least 500 metres away from human settlements. Wyatt
66 | and Annapolis ~~(2008)~~[18] reported that pollution associated with poultry production has been
67 | of great concern and many authorities have argued for more pollution control which would

68 require large poultry farms to get pollution permits from the state and would allow fines or
69 even jail time for non-complaint farmers.

70 Sharply ~~(1998)~~[17] reported that the concentration of poultry production and increase
71 in operational size in several parts of the United States of America would lead to some
72 consequences on the environment. To avoid this, International Finance Corporation ~~IFC~~
73 ~~(2007)~~[9] advised that poultry wastes should be managed and disposed off in accordance with
74 rules and regulation to avoid hazardous situation and achieve environmental balance and
75 safety. This study is therefore designed to determine the environmental hazards associated
76 with poultry production and identify the methods of waste management among the poultry
77 farmers in the study area.

78 Methodology **Material and Methods**

79 The data for this study were collected from three hundred and sixty six (366)
80 respondents in Edo State made up of 122 poultry farm owners, 122 poultry workers and 122
81 poultry farm neighbours. Edo State was created from the Former Bendel State in Nigeria on
82 27th August, 1991. It has a total of eighteen (18) Local Government Areas and is divided into
83 three Agricultural zones, namely: Edo South, Edo Central and Edo North. The State lies
84 between longitudes 05° 04' E and 06° 43' E and latitudes 05° 44' N and 07° 34' N of the
85 equator. The land area is about 19,794 square kilometres. Edo State is bounded on the north
86 and northeast by Kogi State, on the west by Ondo State, on the south and southeast by Delta
87 State. The population of Edo State based on 2006 census exercise is 3,218,332 people and
88 consists of 1,640,461 males and 1,577,871 females (NPC, 2006). The population of the
89 study consists of two hundred and twenty (220) commercial poultry farms keeping domestic
90 fowls in the area. This was made up of one hundred and seventy four (174) poultry farms as
91 identified by the Poultry Association of Nigeria, Edo State Branch and the Ministry of
92 Agriculture and Natural resources, Benin City, Edo State, and forty six (46) unregistered
93 poultry farms identified by the researcher. One hundred and twenty two (122) poultry farms
94 were randomly selected from population of 220 commercial poultry farms in Edo State. To
95 collect primary data for the study, the instrument used was the questionnaire and three sets
96 were constructed and used. The set one was used to generate data from poultry farmers which
97 included personal characteristics, experience in poultry keeping, waste management methods
98 and hazards associated with poultry production. The set two questionnaire was designed and
99 administered to poultry farm workers. The information gathered included personal
100 characteristics, hazards of poultry employment and measures to minimise the hazards. The set
101 three of the questionnaire was constructed and administered to people living in the vicinity of

Comment [02]: Methodology is the systematic, theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a field of study. It is wrong name. You presented a method - the type (way) of research. The section name: Material and methods.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Comment [03]: Way space?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Comment [04]: Is it correct expression of number? Why do you use a comma? Use better a space.

Comment [05]: ?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

the poultry farms. It was designed to gather information on personal characteristics and environmental effects of poultry production in the area. The three sets of questionnaire were administered by the researcher and trained enumerators. The different information provided in the three sets of questionnaire were coded and analysed using tables and percentage distribution. ~~The distance between the poultry houses were physically measured by the trained enumerators. The enumerators used tape rule to measure the distances in metres.~~

Results and Discussions

Table 1 shows that majority of the respondents were married. Married men and women are most likely to be more dedicated to their jobs than workers who are single. The neighbours of poultry farms and the farm workers who were respondents of the study were youths while the farm owners were adults. The presence of young men and women in their productive and active years of life in farming has also been observed by ~~Agbamu and Fabusoro (2001)[2]~~. Young men tend to be progressive and innovative in what they engage in. The table also reveals that the respondents possessed good educational background as the mean educational level was 12 years for neighbours and 11.5 years for farm workers and 15 years for farm owners. In terms of experience in poultry keeping, the poultry farm workers had mean experience of 5.5 years while the poultry farm owners had mean experience of 14 years.

Table 1: Demographic Information of the Respondents

Characteristics	Neighbours	Farm workers	Farm owners
Sex:			
Male	67.2%	54.9%	90.2%
Female	32.8%	45.1%	9.8%
~~Age:~~			
Mean <u>Age</u>	38 years	30 years	49 years
Marital status:			
Single	41.8%	36.9%	6.6%
Married	55.7%	55.7%	91.0%
Divorced	2.5%	4.1%	2.4%
Separated	-	3.3%	-
Educational Level(<u>Mean Years</u>):	<u>12.0</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>15.0</u>

Comment [O6]: This is not way of measurement. It is to dodge the information.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Comment [O7]: Should be the same accuracy. Check all data in text and tables.

Mean ~~(years)~~	~~12.0 years~~	~~11.5 years~~	~~15.0 years~~
Experience:			
Mean <u>Years of Experience</u>	=	5.5 ~~years~~	14.0 ~~years~~

Comment [O8]: corrected this table in this way, and below too.

Comment [O9]: Should be the same accuracy. Check all data in text and tables.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Source: Computed from **Field Data, 2012**

The distance between living houses and poultry farms in the study area is shown in Table 2. Table 2 shows that majority (60.7 Percent%) of the poultry farms were located between one metre to 100 metres away from living houses while only 12.3 Percent% were located above 500 metres from living houses. It implies that only 12.3 Percent% of the farms in the study area met the rules guiding poultry farm location as stipulated by Environmental Protection Agency (2008)[7]. The mean distance between the living houses and poultry farms in Edo State is 153 metres. Environmental Protection Agency (~~2008~~)[7] indicated that in order to manage nuisance of odour created by poultry industry, the farms are to be located at least 500 metres away from human settlements. It means that the 87.7 Percent% of the sampled poultry farms located between one metre and 500 metres away from living houses are therefore likely to have conflict with neighbours as a result of the nuisance of odour and others associated with intensive poultry production.

Table 2: Distance between Living Houses and Poultry Farms in the Study Area

Distance <u>Range in (metres)</u>	Frequency	<u>Percentage</u> ~~Percent~~
<u>1 -to 100</u>	74	60.7
101 <u>-to</u> 200	16	13.1
201 <u>-to</u> 300	11	9.0
301 <u>-to</u> 400	1	0.8
401 <u>-to</u> 500	5	4.1
<u>≥ Greater than</u> 500	15	21.1
Total	122	100.0

Comment [O10]: Why do you use full name and in text too.

Comment [O11]: It is a unit of measure, but what. Check all.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Comment [O12]: Why space?

Comment [O13]: And here. Check all and in text.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Source: Computed from **Field Data, 2012**

The poultry farmers in the study area adopted different management systems to rear poultry birds. Table 3 reveals that 36.1 Percent% of the poultry farmers adopted deep litter system only, 16.4 Percent% the battery cage system only while 47.5 Percent% adopted both deep litter and battery cage systems in the rearing of their birds. This findings show that the commercial poultry farmers used only the intensive system of poultry management which according to Banerjee (2007)[5] is the system where birds are confined to the house entirely

with no access to land outside and it is usually adopted where land is limited and expensive. The type of intensive management system of poultry adopted has implication for the immediate environment. This is because, Oluyemi and Roberts (2000)[14] observed that the same number of birds kept on deep litter is estimated to produce more faecal matter mixed with litter and moisture contents than when kept in battery cages.

Table 3: Poultry Management Systems Used by the Respondents

Management System	Frequency	Percentage%
Deep litter only	44	36.1
Battery cage only	20	16.4
Deep litter and battery cage	58	47.5
Total	122	100.0

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

The complaints against poultry farms were of different types are shown in Table 4. Table 4 shows that 78.7 Percent% of the poultry farmers, 69.7 Percent% of the poultry workers and 74.6 Percent% of the neighbours of poultry farms indicated that bad odour from poultry farms was the major complaint against poultry farms. Only 1.6 Percent% of the workers and 3.3 Percent% of the neighbours indicated that rats/vermins constituted the type of complaint while 4.1 Percent% of the workers and 5.7 Percent% of the neighbours complained against noise from poultry houses. The findings imply that bad odour from poultry farms constituted the major types of complaint against poultry farms. This agrees with Bough (1992)[6] and Environmental Protection Agency (2008)[7] observations that wet contaminated litter in poultry houses give rise to unpleasant odour which can be a source of annoyance for the workers and nearby communities.

Table 4: Types of Complaint of Against the Poultry Farms as Indicated by Farm Owners, Workers and Neighbour.

Type of Complaint	Farm Owners		Farm Workers		Neighbours	
	Frequency	Percent%	Frequency	Percent%	Frequency	Percent%
Bad Odour	96	78.7	85	69.7	91	74.6
Rats/Vermins	0	0	2	1.6	4	3.3

Noise	0	0	5	4.1	7	5.7
None	26	21.3	36	24.6	20	16.4
Total	122	100	122	100	122	100

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

Table 5 shows that of the 102 respondent neighbours who complained of odour and other hazards, 72.6 Percent% lived within zero to 100 metres away from poultry farms. Of the neighbours who did not complain of hazard exposure, 75.0 Percent% of them lived above 500 metres distance away from poultry farms. For the poultry farm owners that received complaint about hazards, 78.1 Percent% had their farms within zero to 100 metres away from living houses. Out of the 26 poultry farm owners that did not received complaint, 76.9 Percent% had their farms above 500 metres distance from living houses. The Chi-square test value for of the null hypothesis that the complaint of environmental hazard by neighbours was independent of the distance of poultry farms from living houses was ($\chi^2_{cal} = 121.3$ which is greater than the Chi-square test tabulated value of $\chi^2_{tab} = 15.1$) when tested at significant at 1 Percent% level of significance. This implies distance between the poultry and living house can influence the environmental hazard significantly. That the The test of null hypothesis that the number of complaint of environmental hazards received by poultry farms owners was independent of the distance of poultry farms from living houses was yielded Chi-square test value of ($\chi^2_{cal} = 141.22$ >> χ^2_{tab} which is greater than the tabulated value of $\chi^2_{tab} = 15.1$) at 1 Percent level of significancesignificant at 1% level. This implies that complaint of environmental hazard from poultry farms can be attributed to small distance between poultry farms and living houses in Edo state.

Comment [O14]: ?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Table 5: The Level of Complaints Levied by Neighbours and Complaint Received by Poultry Farm Owners.

Distances Range (metres)	Complaint by neighbours		No complaint by neighbours		Compliant received by farm owners		No compla	Formatted Table
	Frequency	Percent%	Frequency	Percent%	Frequency	Percent%	by farm owners	
<u>≤100 and below</u>	74.0	72.6	-	-	75.0	78.1	-	Comment [O15]: ?
101 – 200	16.0	15.6	-	-	18.0	18.7	-	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt
								Comment [O16]: ?
								Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

201 – 300	11.0	10.8	-	-	3.0	3.2	-	-
301 – 400	1.0	1.0	-	-	-	-	1.0	3.9
~~401 – 500~~ 401- 500	-	-	5.0	25.0	-	-	5.0	
≥ 500	-	-	15.0	75.0	-	-	20.0	
Total	102.0	100.0	20.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	26.0	

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

The frequency of complaint of hazards from poultry farms is a measure of the awareness of such problems by neighbours with a view to finding solution to the problem as shown in Table 6. Table 6 shows that 36.9 Percent% of the neighbours of poultry farms complained 1 – 2 times about environmental hazards, 22.7 Percent% complained 3 – 4 times while 19.7 Percent% made more than 10 complaints of hazards exposure from poultry farms in their neighbourhood to concerned authorities. However, 16.4 Percent% of the neighbours indicated no complaint. The fact that as much as 83.6 Percent% of the neighbours made complaint is in confirmation of findings of Alabi, et al. (2008)[3] that majority of the people living close to poultry farms are aware of the environmental hazards associated with living in poultry farm vicinities.

Table 6: Frequency Distribution of Complaint of Environmental Hazard from Poultry Farms by Neighbours.

Number of Compliant Per Year	Frequency	<u>Percent%</u>
1 – 2	45	36.9
3 – 4	27	22.7
5 – 6	4	3.3
7 – 8	1	0.8
9 – 10	1	0.8
≥ 10	24	19.7
None	20	16.4
Total	122	100.0

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

Table 7 shows the test results of the null hypothesis that demographic characteristics of respondents, including distance from poultry farms have no significant influence on the level of environmental hazard complaint. The results showed that age of the respondents and

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

Comment [O17]: correct

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Red

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Red

Comment [O18]: Sort table. Justify.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Comment [O19]: This is not frequency, but distribution.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Comment [O20]: What?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

distance from poultry farms are significant at 5 Percent% level. Age of the neighbours was negative and significant at 5 Percent% level, which implies that older respondents complained less about hazards caused by the closeness of the poultry farms than younger respondents. The distance between poultry farms and living houses was negative and significant at 5 Percent%. This suggests that the less the distance between living houses and poultry farms, the more the complaint from neighbours. The fact that constant is significant and positive ($t = 3.377$) implies that there are other explanatory variables that influence number of complaint which are not captured in the model. Such variables may ~~include too~~ subjective ~~variables to be captured in this econometric model and such variables include~~ ~~as~~ the personal relationship of neighbours with the poultry farm owners ~~and gift or price discount from the farmers to the neighbours~~ as indicated in Alabi et al[3]. (2008).

Comment [O21]: But we need know assessment of regression and you should be removed insignificant variables and evaluate new mode.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Table 7: Linear Regression Results of Determinants of Complaint by Neighbours Living Close to Poultry Houses in the Study Area

Variable	Co-efficient	T-Ratio	Probability ~~level~~ <u>Level</u>
Constant	3.191	3.377*	.001
Sex	-0.574	1.439	.153
Age	-0.387	2.067*	.041
Education	0.081	0.385	.701
Distance	-0.418	7.910*	.000

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

*Significant at 5%

The different poultry farms adopted different methods to minimize the occurrence of odour in their poultry farms because of the potential hazards. Table 8 showed that majority (64.8 Percent%) of the farm owners adopted regular removal of wet faeces to minimized

odour while 23.2 Percent % adopted the use of deep litter system of management. The adoption of different methods to minimized odour by the poultry farmers is an indication of awareness of the need to prevent the hazards of odour to neighbours and workers alike.

Table 8: Methods to Minimize Occurrence of Odour by Farm Owners

S/N	Methods	Frequency	<u>Percent%</u>
1	Regular removal of net faeces	81	64.8
2	Use of deep litter system	29	23.2
3	Spray chemicals to reduce odour	10	8.0
4	Avoid spill of water and feed on floor	5	4.0
	Total	125*	100

Comment [O22]: ?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012 * (Multiple Responses)

Table 9 shows that to protect the workers from the effect of odour, 55.7 Percent% of the farm owners and 51.6 Percent% of the poultry workers used cover their noses while 20.5 Percent% and 24.6 Percent% of both respectively used disinfectants. At the same time, 23.8 Percent% and 20.5 Percent% of both farmers and workers did not use any measure. The finding that majority of poultry workers covered their nose **against odour from poultry** farms is an indication of the awareness of the effect of odour on the health of the workers.

Table 9: Methods Used to Protect Workers from the Effects of Odour

Method	Farmers		Workers	
	Frequency <u>%</u>	<u>(Percent)</u>	Frequency <u>%</u>	<u>(Percent)</u>
Provision of special nose cover	68	55.7	63 <u>.0</u>	51.6
Use of disinfectant	25	20.5	30 <u>.0</u>	24.6
Use of handkerchief to cover nose	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	3.3
No measure	29 <u>.0</u>	23.8	25 <u>.0</u>	20.5
Total	122 <u>.0</u>	100.0	122 <u>.0</u>	100.0

Formatted Table

Comment [O23]: ?

Comment [O24]: ?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

243 The poultry farmers in the study area adopted different methods to manage waste and
 244 carcasses generated from their farms. Table 10 shows that majority (72.1 Percent%) of the
 245 farms disposed off their poultry waste through heap and burning during the dry season while
 246 22.1 Percent% adopted the disposal to farmland to increase soil fertility. The finding that
 247 majority of the poultry farms burnt their waste is confirmed by the report of ~~Alabi and Abu~~
 248 ~~(2008)[3]~~ who found out that majority of the poultry in Akure metropolis, Ondo state used
 249 burning to dispose off poultry waste. ~~However, Asch and Seneca (1978) noted that burning~~
 250 ~~poultry waste has been associated with air pollution and that the decreased air quality will~~
 251 ~~affect the wellbeing of the people living around the burning points.~~ Table 10 also reveals that
 252 majority (86.1 Percent%) of the farms buried carcasses or dead birds from their farms while
 253 8.2 Percent% of them sold them to customers. However, Archie ~~(1996)[4]~~ suggested that the
 254 dead bird should be properly buried to prevent the risk of contaminating the environment.

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267 **Table 10: Poultry Waste and Carcass Disposal Methods Used in the Study Area**

Method	Frequency	Percentage
A: poultry waste		
Heap waste and burn	88. <u>0</u>	72.1
Disposal to farmland	27. <u>0</u>	22.1
Dig and bury waste	4. <u>0</u>	3.3
Sale of waste	3. <u>0</u>	2.5
Total	122. <u>0</u>	100.0
B: Carcass		

Comment [O25]: ?

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Sold cheap to customers	10.0	8.2
Workers consumed them	4.0	3.3
They were buried	105	86.1
Sold some and worker consume some	3.0	2.4
Total	122.0	100.0

Source: Computed from Field Data, 2012

Conclusion and recommendations

The establishment of poultry farms close to human settlement has created environmental problems based on the level of complaint by neighbours in Edo State. Odour from poultry houses constituted the major complaint because of the low average distance between poultry farms and living houses. The study then recommends the need for Edo State Ministries of Health and Environment to ensure that the poultry farms are located at least about half a kilometer far from the living houses. The huge waste generated by the poultry farms in Edo State can also be converted to inorganic manure using modern recycling facilities.

REFERENCES

- Adene, D. F., and Oguntade, A. E. (2006). *FAO Animal Production and Health Division, Poultry Sector Country Review*. FAO, Italy, Rome, 2006.
- Agbamu, J. U., and Fabusoro, E. (2001). *Economic analysis of rice-rice farming*. Farming in Ogun state of Nigerian and the implications for Agricultural extension service. *Journal of Agricultural extension*, 2001; 5: 54-66.
- Alabi, R. A., Alabi, O. F., and Abu, S. O. (2008). *Economic and Environmental effects of poultry production in Akure metropolis*. Ondo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 2008; 21 (3): 500 – 506.
- Archie, H. (1996). *The Tropical Agriculturist, Animal Health General Principles*. Volume 1, London: Macmillan Education Limited, 1996: 52p.
- Banerjee, G. O. (2007). *A textbook of Animal Husbandry*. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH publishing Co. PVT Limited, 2007: 837p.

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Comment [O26]: The first you read the General Guideline for Authors and improve references and all text too. Each editorial office has differ requirements.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

6. Bough, J. (1992). Is waste a nuisance? *Farm management* Management, 1992; 8; (4): 163 – 171

7. Environmental Protection Agency (2008). Environmental Assessment assessment Checklist checklist and Guidelines guidelines; 2008. Available: <http://www.epa.ie/pubs/advice/ea/SEA%20Process%20Checklist.pdf> Google: file //pc2/JKJJ(H)/ NWEP Environmental Protection Agency htm. Accessed 12th January, 2008

8. Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) (2007). A synopsis-Synopsis of the laws Laws and regulations-Regulations on the environment-Environment in Nigeria, FEPA office Office, Abuja, Nigeria; 2007. Accessed from internet February 2, 2004.

9. International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2007). Environmental Health-health and safety safety Guidelines-guidelines for poultry-poultry production production, Accessed April 30, 2007 12, Available: [www.ifc.org/cert/enviro.nsf/content/Environmental guidelines](http://www.ifc.org/cert/enviro.nsf/content/Environmental%20guidelines). Accessed April 30, 2007

10. National Population Commission (NPC) (2006). National Population (Census) figure Figure, 2006 Abuja, Nigeria; 2006-15p

11. Obioha, F. C. (1996). A guide-Guide to poultry-Poultry production-Production in the tropics Tropics, Enugu: Africana Educational Publishers Limited; 1996-67p

12. Okoli, I. C., Aiahie, D. A., Okoli, C. G., Akano E. C., Ogundie, U. E., Akuyobi, C. T., Onyicha, C. And and Chunweze, E. (2007). Aerial pollutant gases concentration in tropical pig pen. Environmental in Nigeria, Research Journal of Environmental Sciences, 2007; (3) 110 – 115

13. Okpoechi, C. U. (2007). Municipal solid waste management and its implications for sustainable development in Nigeria, International journal-Journal of Environmental Issues, 2007; 5 (1): 127 – 133

14. Oluyemi, J. A. And and Roberts, F. A. (2000). Poultry production-Production in warm Warm wet Wet climates Climates, 2nd edition, London: Macmillan press limited; 2000 2 – 113p

15. Potential Environmental Risks (2008). Potential Environmental environmental Risks-risks and nuisance associated with poultry production. 2008; Accessed 15th March; 2012. Google: file/poultry 2.P and F. Accessed 12th January, 2008. Available : http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/home/events/bangkok2007/docs/part2/2_2.pdf

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Polish (Poland)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

329 16.Ray, V. H. (1994). The Science of Animal Agriculture, New York: Delmar Publishers
330 Inc, 1994. 42–46p

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

331 17.Sharply, A. (1998). Reducing the environmental impact of poultry production focus on
332 phosphorus, ~~Agricultural~~ agricultural phosphorus, water quality and poultry
333 production: are they compatible? Poultry Science, 1998, 78:660 – 673.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

334 18. Wyatt K and Annapolis M. Who is responsible for that manure. 2008, Accessed 12th
335 January, 2012. Available: [http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/poisonedwaters/themes/c](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/poisonedwaters/themes/chicken.html)
336 [hicken.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/poisonedwaters/themes/chicken.html)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt