

Ducks native to Ghana's agro-ecological zones: a morphometric study of diversity

Leo Perrier, Lény Lego, Tristan Cladie`re

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA

Abstract :

The research used a basic phenotypic characterisation technique that included body measurement and observation to describe the indigenous duck populations in three agro-ecological zones (AEZs) of Ghana. Over the course of three AEZs, 414 fully grown ducks (138 from each) had their quantitative traits recorded in a random fashion. In all of the AEZs, the male-to-female selection ratio was 1:2. The morphometric features were analyzed using the General Linear Model, with sex and agro-ecological zone as fixed variables. To quantify the link among morphometric features to predict body weight, a combination of simple and multiple regression analyses were used. All morphometric features were shown to be substantially affected by sex ($p < 0.05$), according to the data. In terms of the morphometric features that were assessed, draughts were noticeably better than ducks ($p < 0.05$). Body length (0.894) was the strongest predictor of body weight, and there was a medium to high positive association across morphometric features (0.593-0.945). Using cross-validation, the discriminant analysis successfully assigned 61.40% of ducks to their correct groups. Compared to the rain forest duck population, the semi-deciduous duck population had a longer Mahalanobis distance of 2.27. A total variance of 80.49% was explained by the first principal component (PC1) extracted from factor analysis for the Semi-deciduous forest, Coastal savanna, and Rain forest, as well as the pooled principal component for all AEZs. The corresponding percentages for the other three populations were 81.35, 82.93, and 80.59%. When compared to other morphometric features, PC1's greater loadings on body weight (0.965) indicate that this one has the most discriminating potential. The morphometric features that were

examined showed a medium to high level of communality, suggesting that they might be utilized to explain the total diversity in duck body dimensions.

Key words: ducks, morphometric diversity, quantitative trait, discriminant analysis, mahalanobis distance, variability

Introduction

When administered in a controlled environment, phenotypic characterisation may identify and classify breed-specific and interbreed variability in response to environmental and social factors (FAO, 2012). According to Hassan *et al.* (2019), Ali *et al.* (2021), Ofori & Hagan (2021), and Botwe *et al.* (2023), it is the first step in characterizing an organism and lays the groundwork for genetic and molecular characterisation. In order to build breeding programs and breed improvement initiatives, it is essential to gather baseline data, which aids the country (Ghana) in obtaining a comprehensive inventory of its AnGR (FAO, 2012). To the rural poor of Ghana, duck genetic resources are culturally significant, economically significant, and a boon to food and agricultural sustainability. At 8 to 9 weeks of age, ducks produce meat that is heavier than that of local chicken and guinea fowl (2.46-2.93 kg), and some duck breeds, such as the Khaki Campbell, lay more eggs and larger eggs than chicken (Ugbomeh, 2002). Compared to chicken, ducks are simpler and cheaper to handle, plus they are robust and excellent scavengers. Tropical adaptation is effortless, they are resistant to several common chicken illnesses (including Newcastle), and they may get by without costly compounded feed (Mantey *et al.*, 2014). Ducks may be raised on a small scale by unskilled individuals using low-quality feed. No matter how impressive ducks are, there is no

data already published on the phenotypic analysis of Ghana's native duck populations. For this reason, a thorough description of the native ducks of Ghana is required in order to facilitate the development of breeding programs. In addition to adding to the body of knowledge, the research will fill a vacuum in the existing literature. The findings of this research might shed light on the ducks' current situation, as well as provide direction for their future conservation efforts, appropriate enhancement, and sustainable usage (FAO, 2012). The research will provide the groundwork for future breed improvement programs, since there is currently no recognized duck development program in Ghana. As a potential future solution to protein insufficiency and malnutrition in Ghana, ducks might be improved to provide a more cost-effective and accessible supply of protein.

Materials and methods

Description of the study area

The study was conducted in three (3) agro-ecological zones of Ghana, namely, the Coastal savanna, Semi-deciduous forest and Rain forest. These three agro-ecological zones have the highest poultry populations in Ghana hence, their inclusion in the study. The Coastal savanna lies between latitude 05⁰07N and longitude 001⁰17W. The average relative humidity, rainfall, and temperature of this AEZ are 70-85%, 600-1200mm, and 24-30⁰C respectively. The Semi-deciduous forest also lies between latitude 06⁰14N and longitude 07⁰36W with annual rainfall, temperature, and humidity range of 1200-1600mm, 24-31⁰C, and 60-80%, respectively. Also, the Rain forest AEZ lies between latitude 04⁰59N and longitude 01⁰29W with annual rainfall, temperature, and humidity of 800-2800mm, 25-29⁰C, and 65- 85%, respectively.

Study approach and sampling

The study adopted the survey approach as well as purposive and snowballing sampling techniques to select households and farms raising ducks. A sample of 414 matured ducks was randomly selected from a population of 1744 ducks found in selected households and farms within the three AEZs (138 from each AEZ)

following the FAO (2012) breed descriptor tool for phenotypic characterization studies. A 1:2 male-to-female selection ratio was used in each AEZ. Different duck farmers practiced different management systems, including intensive, semi-intensive and extensive systems. Those that raised ducks intensively fed the birds twice daily and provided ad libitum potable water, while supplementary feed was offered to ducks raised semi-intensively and extensively. The formula used to estimate the sample size for the respondent households and farms was adopted from FAO (2012) as described below;

Data collection for morphometric traits

The duration of the collection of the data spanned from November 2021 to May 2022. Measurements of morphometric features were recorded as defined by FAO (2012). The body weight and linear body characters were taken with a 10kg digital hanging weighing scale, digital calipers and measuring tape as follows:

Body weight (BW): Live adult ducks were restrained and hanged on a digital measuring scale, and their total body weight was recorded.

Body length (BL): The body length was measured from the tip of the bill over the head through the body trunk to the tip of the caudal tail without feathers with a measuring tape.

Wing span (WS): The length between the wingtips was measured to the nearest centimetres when the wings were outstretched using a tape measure.

Wing length (WL): This was measured to the nearest centimeters from the scapula to the tip of the longest primary feathers using a tape measure.

Shank length (SL): The length between the hock joint and the regio tarsalis was measured to the nearest centimeters on the right limb using a pair of calipers.

Bill length (BLL): Bill length was measured to the nearest centimeters from the base of the bill to the tip using a pair of calipers.

Bill width (BLW): the width of the bill was measured at the base of the bill using a digital caliper.

Breast circumference (BC): The circumference of the breast was measured from the top of the pectus (hind breast) with a measuring tape.

Neck length (NL): The length of the axial skeleton from the first to the last cervical vertebrae was measured using a measuring tape.

Statistical analysis of quantitative (morphometric) traits

Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Morphometric traits were subjected to analysis of variance with sex and agro-ecological zones as fixed factors using the General Linear Model (GLM) of Minitab 19 (Minitab, 2020). The mean separation of traits exhibiting significant differences was done using the Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) test. The sex and agro-ecological zone effect on body weight and other linear body characters were tested using the model used by Yakubu (2011) as follows;

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + S_i + E_j + e_{ij}$$

Y_{ij} = individual observation of each body trait;

μ = overall mean;

S_i = effect of i^{th} sex (i = male, female);

E_j = effect of j^{th} agro-ecological zone (j = Semi-deciduous forest-1, Rain forest-2 and Coastal savannah-3);

e_{ij} = random error associated with each record

A simple and multiple regression analysis were used to estimate the relationship among morphometric traits to predict body weight using SPSS version 25 (IBM SPSS, 2017) statistical package as follows:

$$LW = \beta_0 + \beta X + \varepsilon$$

Where,

LW = live weight,

β_0 = the intercept of the regression equation,

βX = partial regression coefficient of the linear body trait retained in the model (X),

ε is the random error.

Multivariate analysis (discriminant and principal component analysis)

Discriminant analysis was used to classify and differentiate the three duck populations from the three corresponding agro-ecological zones using Minitab 19 (Minitab, 2020) statistical package based on Mahalanobis distance using the model (Ofori *et al.*, 2021):

$$D^2 = (x - m)^T \cdot C^{-1} \cdot (x - m)$$

Where,

D^2 –: the Mahalanobis squared distance

x –: the vector of observation of morphometric trait (row in a dataset)

m –: the vector of mean values of independent morphometric variables (mean of each column)

T –: superscript: Transposed matrix (a new matrix whose rows are the columns of the original)

C^{-1} –: the inverse covariance matrix of independent morphometric variables

The canonical plot depicting a pictorial representation of the distribution of the duck populations was generated by GenStat 12th edition (VSNI, 2012).

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was done by extracting principal components from factor analysis to determine the morphometric trait with the highest discriminatory power. The representation of the linear combination of available data into components or factors was first determined distinctly for each agro-ecological zone and then a pooled component for all three duck populations was determined. The indicators used to determine whether the partial correlations among morphometric traits were low included the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Shrestha, 2021). A KMO value of 0.50 and above was considered suitable (Shrestha, 2021), whereas a non-significant Bartlett’s test of sphericity for morphometric traits for a particular duck population was excluded for PCA. According to Everitt *et al.* (2011), “Principal Component Analysis is a method of transforming variables in a multivariate data set, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p into new uncorrelated variables y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p which account for decreasing proportions of the total variance in the original variables defined as

$$y_1 = a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \dots + a_{1p}x_p.$$

$$y_2 = a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \dots + a_{2p}x_p.$$

$$y_p = a_{p1}x_1 + a_{p2}x_2 + \dots + a_{pp}x_p.$$

The principal components y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p account for decreasing proportions of the total variance in the original variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p . Variance maximizing orthogonal rotation was used in the linear transformation of the factor pattern matrix to make interpreting the extracted principal components easier”. The PCA was done using SPSS version 25 (IBM SPSS, 2017)

Results and discussion

Characterization, correlation and regression analysis of morphometric traits of ducks in Ghana

The descriptive statistics of quantitative (morphometric) traits as affected by sex and agro-ecological zone are presented in Table 1. Generally, sex highly influenced ($p < 0.05$) all the traits and agro-ecological zone significantly affected all the morphometric traits except body length.

Table 1. Means \pm standard deviations of morphometric traits as affected by sex and agro-ecological zone

Traits/Factor	Sex	
	Males ($n=138$)	Females ($n=276$)
BWT (kg)	2.59 \pm 0.01 ^a	1.80 \pm 0.00 ^b
BL (cm)	58.50 \pm 0.16 ^a	46.99 \pm 0.11 ^b
SL (cm)	6.15 \pm 0.03 ^a	5.26 \pm 0.02 ^b

NL (cm)		18.99±0.10 ^a		15.52±0.07 ^b	
BLL (cm)			5.70±0.03 ^a		4.95±0.02 ^b
BLW (cm)			2.54±0.01 ^a		2.29±0.00 ^b
BC (cm)		41.19±0.13 ^a		35.75±0.09 ^b	
WL (cm)		53.51±0.12 ^a		42.31±0.09 ^b	
WS (cm)		116.51±0.26 ^a		93.10±0.19 ^b	
AEZ		Semi-deciduous forest	Coastal savanna	Rain forest	N
BWT (kg)	Male	2.66±0.18 ^a	2.58±0.19 ^{ab}	2.51±0.15 ^b	46
	Female	1.84±0.08 ^a	1.82±0.10 ^a	1.75±0.10 ^b	92
BL (cm)	Male	58.87±1.34 ^a	58.45±1.28 ^{ab}	58.16±1.15 ^b	46
	Female	46.90±2.23 ^a	47.34±1.96 ^a	46.71±2.22 ^a	92
SL (cm)	Male	6.08±0.40 ^a	6.25±0.33 ^a	6.11±0.33 ^a	46
	Female	5.17±0.40 ^b	5.42±0.40 ^a	5.19±0.42 ^b	92
NL (cm)	Male	19.14±1.39 ^{ab}	19.28±1.21 ^a	18.55±1.30 ^b	46
	Female	16.09±1.22 ^a	15.46±1.03 ^b	15.00±1.18 ^c	92
BLL (cm)	Male	5.73±0.33 ^a	5.70±0.35 ^a	5.68±0.29 ^a	46
	Female	5.05±0.30 ^a	4.94±0.36 ^{ab}	4.87±0.41 ^b	92
BLW (cm)	Male	2.53±0.06 ^b	2.53±0.06 ^b	2.57±0.6 ^a	46
	Female	2.30±0.06 ^a	2.26±0.09 ^b	2.31±0.07 ^a	92
BC (cm)	Male	41.75±1.67 ^a	41.27±1.57 ^{ab}	40.53±1.51 ^b	46
	Female	36.49±1.35 ^a	35.66±1.52 ^b	35.10±1.71 ^c	92
WL (cm)	Male	53.59±1.37 ^a	53.26±1.25 ^a	53.70±1.19 ^a	46
	Female	42.50±1.51 ^a	42.02±1.55 ^a	42.40±1.48 ^a	92
WS (cm)	Male	115.32±3.24 ^b	117.57±2.62 ^a	116.66±3.57 ^{ab}	46
	Female	93.17±3.03 ^{ab}	92.28±3.18 ^b	93.86±2.88 ^a	92

BWT=Body weight; BL=Body length; SL=Shank length; NL=Neck length; BLL= Bill length; BLW=Bill width; BC= Breast circumference; WL=Wing length; WS= Wing span. Means within a subclass in a row that does not share common superscripts are significantly different ($p<0.05$); see appendix for actual P values.

Body weight

The average body weight recorded for drakes and ducks from the three agro-ecological zones were 2.59kg and 1.80kg, respectively; however, males from the Semi-deciduous forest (2.66kg) had higher body weight than the Coastal savanna (2.58kg), and then the males from the Rain forest (2.51kg) had the least body weight. The overall body weight of males recorded in the present study agrees with Banerjee (2013), who reported 2.50kg for pied feathered Muscovy drakes in West Bengal State of India. Also, the results from the present study are in close association with the reports from Książkiewicz (2002), Raji *et al.* (2009), Ogah *et al.* (2011), Foluke *et al.* (2020) in addition to Lan & Worowan (2020) who observed a mean body weight of 2.47kg, 2.71kg, 2.41kg, 2.73kg, 2.33kg and 2.73kg respectively for drakes raised in different environments. The average body weight observed in the present study is slightly lower than the 4-7kg (Johnson & Hawk, 2009; Lan, 2020) as well as 3.05kg, 3.38kg, 3.09kg, 3.62kg and 3.16kg reported by Drouilhet *et al.* (2014), Hailu *et al.* (2018), Tamzil *et al.* (2018) and Ewuola *et al.* (2020) respectively. The

current research however, recorded a higher body weight than those reported by Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015), Kamal *et al.* (2019) and Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) who recorded relatively lower body weight in Nageswari ducks in Bangladesh, Desi ducks of Odisha, India and local duck population in South-east ecological zone, Nigeria of 1.66kg, 1.80kg and 1.73kg respectively for drakes. The present study recorded an overall average body weight of 1.80kg for females. In contrast, within the population, body weight followed a similar trend as that of their male counterparts, where the higher body weight was recorded from the Semi-deciduous forest, followed by the Coastal savanna and then the Rain forest in a prevalence of 1.84kg, 1.82kg and 1.75kg respectively. The overall body weight recorded for females in the present research is higher than the findings of Kamal *et al.* (2019), Raji *et al.* (2009), Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015), and Yakubu (2013) who witnessed a live body weight of 1.41kg, 1.44kg, 1.46kg, 1.51kg, 1.52kg and 1.58kg respectively. In contrast, Tamzil *et al.* (2018) recorded a higher body weight of 2.49kg, while Johnson & Hawk (2009), Huang *et al.* (2012) and Lan (2020) also reported a range of 2.6-4.0kg, 2.7-

3.6kg and 5-6kg respectively.

Compared to other studies, the lower body weight recorded in the present study may be attributed to the influence of genetics, the production environment and the differences in management systems and practices (Ofori & Hagan, 2020). Most of the farms and households studied practice semi-intensive and extensive management systems with less or no supplementary feeding, and most of the farms used less veterinary treatment for their birds. However, those studies that recorded higher body weight resulted from the intensive management system and better routine management and veterinary practices.

Body length

The males from the Semi-deciduous forest had a longer body length than their counterparts in the Coastal savanna and the Rain forest with a corresponding mean value of 58.87cm, 58.45cm and 58.16cm. In divergence, the Coastal savanna recorded the longest body length for females, followed by the Semi-deciduous forest and then the Rain forest with values of 47.34cm, 4.90cm and 46.71cm, respectively. The overall mean body length recorded for the present study, 58.50cm for males and 46.99cm for females, finds partial agreement with Raji *et al.* (2009), Hailu *et al.* (2018) and Foluke-Eunice *et al.* (2020), who reported a body length of 59.25cm & 45.51cm; 56.88cm & 47.52cm and 54.59cm & 49.02cm for males and females respectively. The results are however, closely associated with the findings of Kamal *et al.* (2019) and Kadurumba *et al.* (2021), who recorded 47.86cm & 38.35cm, 42.69cm & 41.30cm and 45.04cm & 42.69cm for drakes and ducks respectively. Comparatively, shorter body length of 21.53cm & 17.59cm and 26.27cm & 23.79cm were recorded by Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015) for drakes and ducks, respectively. The variation in the body length between the present study and other previous studies can be attributed to genetic and environmental influence, as the previous studies were conducted on different breeds and ecotypes of ducks raised in different production environments. It can also be due to the measurement accuracy and how the body length was taken, as the present study measured the body length from the tip of the beak to the caudal tail without feathers. Some researchers may have a different approach to measuring body length hence the variations.

Shank length

Drakes had longer shank than ducks in the present study across all the agro-ecological zones (Table 1).

The overall average shank length recorded for drakes (6.15cm) and ducks (5.26cm) is similar to the 6.21cm and 5.89cm reported by Kamal *et al.* (2019). It is however, lower than what was recorded by Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015), who witnessed a shank length of 6.60cm for drakes and 6.09cm for ducks in Bangladesh. Likewise, the recorded shank length in the present work is lower than the overall shank length (6.45cm) reported by Maharani *et al.* (2019); the 7.69cm for drakes and 5.68cm for ducks witnessed by Foluke-Eunice *et al.* (2020) and the 8.42cm for drakes and 7.02cm for ducks reported by Macharia *et al.* (2017). In contrast, the values of the present study are higher than those reported by Ewuola *et al.* (2020), Hailu *et al.* (2018) and Ogah *et al.* (2011). It is also higher than what was reported by Lan and Worowan (2020), who recorded lower shank lengths of chocolate, lavender, silver and white plumage-clouded female Muscovy ducks in PNGUNRE poultry farm in Papua New Guinea in a ratio of 4.86cm, 5.20cm, 4.71cm and 5.05cm respectively.

Neck length

Both sex and agro-ecological zone had a significant influence on neck length. The Coastal savanna recorded the longest neck length of 19.28cm, followed by the Semi-deciduous forest (19.14cm), and then the Rain forest recorded 18.55cm for drakes. On the other hand, the Semi-deciduous forest recorded the longest neck length of 16.09cm, followed by the Coastal savanna (15.46cm) and, finally, the Rain forest (15cm) for ducks. This agrees with Ogah *et al.* (2011), who observed variation in neck length among duck populations raised in Nigeria's dry savanna, guinea savanna and rain forest. The mean neck length recorded across the study area is 18.99cm for drakes and 15.52cm for ducks. The sexual dimorphism in the overall mean length agrees with Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015), Kokoszyński *et al.* (2019), Tamzil *et al.* (2018), Veeramani *et al.* (2014), Kamal *et al.* (2019) and Kadurumba *et al.* (2021), who stressed that there is a sexual dimorphism associated with the trait. However, the values recorded for the present study are lower than the 23.49cm & 21.59cm and, 23.70cm & 19.19cm recorded by Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015) and Susanti *et al.* (2016) for drakes and ducks, respectively. In contrast, the results of the present study are higher than those observed in the work of Kokoszyński *et al.* (2019), and Tamzil *et al.* (2018), who recorded 18.10cm & 14.33cm; 18.30cm & 17.50cm and 18.32cm & 14.87cm for drakes and ducks respectively. Additionally, the values reported by Kamal *et al.* (2019), Veeramani *et al.* (2014) and Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) are also lower than what was

recorded in the present study as they recorded a neck length for drakes and ducks in a relative proportion of 12cm & 10cm, 13.94cm & 12.43cm and 14.14cm & 13.57cm respectively.

Bill length

The current study's findings revealed a significant influence ($p < 0.05$) of sex and agro-ecological zone on the bill length of ducks. Drakes and ducks from the Semi-deciduous forest had the longest bill of 5.73cm and 5.05cm, respectively, followed by the Coastal savanna, recording 5.70cm and 4.94cm, then the Rain forest with 5.68cm and 4.87cm. The current research finds agree with the work of Ogah *et al.* (2011), who documented that location or agro-ecological zones have a significant effect on the bill length of ducks as they found that birds from the guinea savanna had longer bill length, followed by the rainforest and finally the dry savanna in a relative proportion of 5.64cm, 5.42cm and 5.34cm. The present study saw drakes recording longer bills than ducks in a proportion of 5.70cm and 4.95cm correspondingly. This is in harmony with the works of Raji *et al.* (2009), Veeramani *et al.* (2014), Susanti *et al.* (2016), Kamal *et al.* (2019), Maharani *et al.* (2019), Tamzil *et al.* (2018) and Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) who shared a common view that drakes have longer bills than ducks in their various researches. It also falls within the range of drakes (5.12-5.5.98cm) and ducks (4.67-5.54cm) reported by Morduzzaman *et al.* (2015), Maharani *et al.* (2019), Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) and Raji *et al.* (2009). Notwithstanding, the present results are lower than what was previously reported by Kamal *et al.* (2019), Veeramani *et al.* (2014) and Susanti *et al.* (2016) who recorded 6.11cm & 5.60cm, 6.84cm & 5.76cm and 6.20cm & 5.24cm for drakes and ducks respectively. However, it is higher than the range of drakes (4.13-4.98cm) and ducks (3.38-4.10cm) reported by Tamzil *et al.* (2018) and Foluke-Eunice *et al.* (2020).

Bill width

The overall bill width recorded for the present work was 2.54cm for drakes and 2.29cm for ducks. Drakes from the Rain forest recorded the widest bill of 2.57cm, while their counterparts from the Semi-deciduous forest and the Coastal savanna shared a similar bill width of 2.53cm. The widest bill for ducks was also recorded from the Rain forest followed by Semi-deciduous forest and then the Coastal savanna in a proportion of 2.31cm, 2.30cm and 2.26cm, respectively. This slightly agrees with Ogah *et al.* (2011), who also witnessed varying bill width from different agro-

ecological zones; however, the overall mean recorded for drakes and ducks are lower than the earlier findings of Kamal *et al.* (2019), who witnessed 3.70cm and 3.46cm for drakes and ducks respectively. Also, ducks from the present study recorded a lower bill width than their counterparts in Indonesia, who recorded a 2.77cm bill width, as reported by Maharani *et al.* (2019).

Breast circumference

Results from the present study revealed that sex and agro-ecological zone significantly ($p < 0.05$) influenced breast circumference. The mean breast circumference of the indigenous duck populations recorded in the present study is 41.19cm for drakes and 35.75cm for ducks. The results showed that drakes and ducks from the Semi-deciduous forest had the broadest breast (41.75cm & 36.49cm), followed by Coastal savanna (41.27cm & 35.66cm) and then the Rain forest (40.53cm & 35.10cm). The sexual dimorphism in the trait is expected and agrees with the previous findings (Hailu *et al.*, 2018; Tamzil *et al.*, 2018; Foluke-Eunice *et al.*, 2020; Kadurumba *et al.*, 2021; Ewuola *et al.*, 2020; Susanti *et al.*, 2016), who recorded a broader breast for drakes than ducks. Also, the overall mean values recorded for drakes and ducks in the current work concord with Hailu *et al.* (2018), who documented 44.50cm for drakes and 35.70cm for ducks. It also finds harmony with Tamzil *et al.* (2018), who recorded 40.91cm and 35.92cm for drakes and ducks, respectively. The values recorded for the present study, however, are slightly higher than those recorded by Raji *et al.* (2009), Foluke-Eunice *et al.* (2020), Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) and Susanti *et al.* (2016) who discovered a disparity in breast circumference in terms of sex in a relative occurrence of 40.57cm & 31.43cm, 37.46cm & 30.40cm, 33.85cm & 32.01cm, 38.30cm & 30.37cm and 38.83cm & 31.28cm for drakes and ducks respectively. On the contrary, Ewuola *et al.* (2020) recorded values that are relatively lower than the findings of the present study for drakes (25.84cm) and ducks (20.18cm).

Wing length

The mean values of 53.51cm and 42.31cm recorded for wing length in the present study for drakes and ducks, respectively, finds little congruence with the work of Hailu *et al.* (2018), who reported 55.56cm and 47.70cm for drakes and ducks respectively. The values in the current work somehow agree with the earlier findings of Kamal *et al.* (2019), who noticed 42.73cm for drakes and 39.99cm for ducks but disagree with Tamzil *et al.* (2018) who reported higher values of 82.81cm for

drakes and 61.19cm for ducks. Contrariwise, the current research recorded longer wings than the previous findings of Raji *et al.* (2009) and Susanti *et al.* (2016), who witnessed shorter wings of 31.01cm & 23.99cm and 33.64cm & 26.67cm for drakes and ducks correspondingly. The results of the present work are also incongruent with Yakubu (2011), Foluke-Eunice *et al.* (2020), Kadurumba *et al.* (2021), whose reports ranged between 23.65cm and 25.82cm for drakes and 16.43cm and 24.68cm for ducks. Likewise, Ewuola *et al.* (2020) recorded a very short wing length of 13.38cm and 9.94cm for drakes and ducks, respectively, which are not in harmony with the present study. The difference in the wing length can again be attributed to the effect of breed genetics and the production environment. It can also be ascribed to the measurement method as the present study measured the wing length from the scapula to the tip of the longest primary feathers of live birds; other researchers may have measured from the scapula to the tip of the terminal phalanx of slaughtered birds.

Wing span

Pearson correlation among morphometric traits measured

The phenotypic correlations among morphometric traits (body weight and linear body measurements) are presented in Table 2. The results revealed medium to high, statistically significant positive values ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2. Correlation among morphometric traits measured

	BWT	BL	SL	NL	BLL	BLW	BC	WL
BWT								
BL	0.945**							
SL	0.734**	0.731**						
NL	0.815**	0.795**	0.645**					
BLL	0.742**	0.723**	0.593**	0.660**				
BLW	0.802**	0.816**	0.646**	0.685**	0.619**			
BC	0.875**	0.852**	0.689**	0.788**	0.709**	0.744**		
WL	0.925**	0.925**	0.707**	0.781**	0.701**	0.829**	0.831**	
WS	0.920**	0.920**	0.705**	0.781**	0.704**	0.826**	0.828**	0.982**

**Correlation is significant at $p < 0.05$

The results from the present study revealed a higher (0.734-0.945) positive correlation between body weight and morphometric traits such as body length, shank length, neck length, bill length, bill width, breast circumference, wing length and wing span. This indicates that these morphometric traits have a higher contribution to body weight, hence, a good predictor of body weight. Additionally, it implies that the selection for improvement of one of these traits may significantly improve the live body weight of the indigenous duck populations in Ghana, provided these higher correlations result from genetic factors rather than the influence of the production environment. The current work showed that body length (0.945) had the highest correlation with body weight, followed by wing length (0.925), wing span (0.920), breast circumference (0.875), neck length (0.815), bill width (0.802), bill length (0.742) and finally

Sex and agro-ecological zone significantly influenced the wing span. The overall average for the trait favoured drakes more than ducks, as drakes recorded 116.51cm for the trait and ducks recorded 93.10cm. Drakes from the Coastal savanna had the longest wing span of 117.57cm, followed by Rain forest recording 116.66cm, and then drakes from the Semi-deciduous forest measured 115.32cm long for the trait. On the contrary, ducks from the Rain forest recorded the longest wing span of 93.86cm, followed by the Semi-deciduous forest witnessing 93.17cm and the Coastal savanna, recorded 92.28cm. Adenaike *et al.* (2020) and Bhowmik *et al.* (2014) have conducted research to determine the wing span of turkey and Pigeons in Nigeria and Bangladesh, respectively, as influenced by sex and location, whereas Brown *et al.* (2017) have studied the wingspan of both the local chicken and guinea fowl in Ghana and how the trait is influenced by agro-ecological zone and sex. However, there is no information on the wing span of ducks in the literature. Therefore, the present work can help bridge this gap in the literature and serve as the basis for future research.

shank length (0.734). The present findings are consistent with Ewuola *et al.* (2020), who indicated that body length (0.987) had the highest correlation with body weight, followed by wing length (0.984) in Muscovy ducks in the humid zone of Nigeria. It further agrees with Raji *et al.* (2009), who also observed that body length (0.87) had the highest correlation with body weight, followed by chest girth (0.85). It also finds consonance with the reports of Lan (2020), who observed that body length (0.616) strongly correlates with body weight in Muscovy ducks. It is also in congruence with Adenaike *et al.* (2020), whose discriminant analysis of morphostructural parameters in locally adapted turkeys in Nigeria revealed a higher correlation between body length (0.91) and body weight. However, the work of Hailu *et al.* (2018) demonstrated that breast circumference (0.739) had the highest correlation with body weight. Likewise, Kadurumba *et al.* (2021) also observed that breast circumference (0.914) had the highest correlation with body weight in Muscovy ducks. The present study does not agree well with Tamzil *et al.* (2018), who, on the other hand, saw wing length as the highest correlating trait with body weight in both drakes (0.81) and ducks (0.80) in Muscovy ducks raised semi-intensively in Lombok Island, Indonesia. The current work slightly disagrees with Bhowmik *et al.* (2014), whose work on Pigeons revealed that wing span (0.750) had the highest correlation with body weight, followed by body length (0.741).

Simple and multiple regression analysis

The simple and multiple regression analysis for predicting live body weight from morphometric traits of indigenous duck populations in Ghana is presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Table 3. Prediction equations of simple regression analysis

Trait	Prediction Equation	Adj. R ²	Sig.
BL	BWT=-1.212+0.06BL	0.894	***
SL	BWT=-0.688+0.49SL	0.539	***
NL	BWT=-0.516+0.15NL	0.664	***
BLL	BWT=-0.971+0.58BLL	0.550	***
BLW	BWT=-3.325+2.27BLW	0.642	***
BC	BWT=-2.175+0.11BC	0.765	***
WL	BWT=-0.983+0.06WL	0.855	***
WS	BWT=-1.105+0.03WS	0.845	***

*BWT=Body weight; BL=Body length; SL=Shank length; NL=Neck length; BLL= Bill length; BLW=Bill width; BC= Breast circumference; WL=Wing length; WS= Wing span; R²=Coefficient of determination; Adj. =Adjusted; Sig. =Significant*** (p<0.05).*

Table 4. Prediction equations of multiple regression models

Prediction Equation	Adj. R ²	Sig.
BWT=-1.693+0.050BL+0.033BC	0.911	***
BWT=-1.632+0.034BL+0.027BC+0.020WL	0.922	***
BWT=-1.605+0.033BL+0.023BC+0.019WL+0.016NL	0.924	***
BWT=-1.665+0.031BL+0.021BC+0.019WL+0.015NL+0.047BLL	0.926	***

*BWT=Body weight; BL=Body length; NL=Neck length; BLL= Bill length; BC= Breast circumference; WL=Wing length; R²=Coefficient of determination; Adj. =Adjusted; Sig. =Significant*** (p<0.05).*

It is evidenced that linear body measurements of animals could be used to predict body weight by simple and multiple linear regression methods. Numerous researchers on different livestock species have utilized these methods. Among the researchers includes Birteeb and Lomo (2015), Pesmen & Yardimci (2008), Okpeku *et al.* (2011) and Ofori *et al.* (2021). However, their research is skewed towards ruminants than poultry. A simple regression analysis was performed on all the morphometric traits measured to ascertain the most significant trait, which could be used to predict the body weight of the indigenous duck populations in Ghana. The simple regression model revealed medium to high prediction accuracies (0.539-0.894), which were all statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The study indicated that body length with prediction equation ($y = -1.212 + 0.06BL$) is the best predictor of body weight with $R^2 = 0.894$ followed by wing length, wing span, breast circumference, neck length, bill width, bill length and then shank length with $R^2 = 0.855; 0.845; 0.765; 0.664; 0.642; 0.550$ and 0.539 respectively with their corresponding prediction equation in Table 3. The R^2 (coefficient of determination) values indicate that body length alone could explain 89.40% of the total

variance in body weight, whereas 85.5%; 84.5%; 76.5%; 66.4%; 64.2%; 55%, and 53.9% of the variance in body weight could be explained by wing length, wing span, breast circumference, neck length, bill width, bill length and shank length respectively. The current findings are in harmony with the work of Ewuola *et al.* (2020), who revealed a higher coefficient of determination values, which ranged from 0.869 to 0.974 in Muscovy ducks raised in the humid region of Nigeria. Again, the results of the present work further confirms that of Ewuola *et al.* (2020), who indicated that body length is the highest single trait predictor of body weight with R^2 value of 0.974. The present study, however, slightly disagrees with Raji *et al.* (2009), who found the best single trait predictor of body weight to be breast circumference with $R^2 = 0.728$, which was statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. The highest R^2 (coefficient of determination) values reported by the present study, together with the earlier findings of Raji *et al.* (2009) and Ewuola *et al.* (2020), clearly show that body weight can be predicted from a single and easily measurable metric trait for ducks with a higher level of accuracy using a simple regression method. A multiple regression analysis was further performed to determine the pooled predictive ability of the morphometric traits, and the results are presented in Table 4. The results revealed high (0.911-0.926) prediction accuracies, which were all statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). This implies that a combination of two or more morphometric traits in a model can improve the prediction of body weight (see highlighted equation in Table 4).

Differentiation and classification of indigenous duck populations in Ghana using discriminant analysis of morphometric characters

Multivariate analysis is suitable for assessing variability within and between the indigenous duck populations in Ghana when all metric characters are considered simultaneously (Yakubu & Ibrahim, 2011; Ofori *et al.*, 2021; Botwe *et al.*, 2023). In the present study, the degree of differentiation of the indigenous duck population in Ghana was achieved using the Mahalanobis distance, as shown in Table 5 and Figure 1.

Table 5. Matrix of mahalanobis distance between duck populations based on morphometric traits

Population (P)	P1	P2	P3
P1 (Semi-deciduous forest)		1.46	2.27
P2 (Coastal savanna)			1.30
P3 (Rain forest)			




Figure 1. Canonical plot for the three duck populations

From Table 5, the populations were significantly distant ($p < 0.0001$) from each other. The longest (2.27) distance was between the duck populations from the Semi-deciduous forest (P1) and the Rain forest (P3), whereas the shortest (1.30) distance was observed between the duck populations from the Coastal savanna (P2) and Rain forest (P3). The shortest Mahalanobis distance observed between the duck populations from the Coastal savanna and the Rain forest could be attributed to high intermingling or genetic exchange between the two populations over time due to the

ecological closeness of the two populations. As suggested by the shorter Mahalanobis distance, populations P2 and P3 may share similar genes which could lead to inbreeding depression; it is accordingly advisable for farmers to subsequently curb the situation by obtaining new duck breeding stock from different and more expansive geographical areas.

The longer Mahalanobis distance between P1 and P3 might be due to natural and artificial selection and environmental adaptation. Thus, the creation of the variability as observed between P1 and P3 can be caused by geographical isolation, which agrees with Gizaw *et al.* (2007). From the present work, it is imperative to conserve the genetic diversity found between the duck populations from the Semi-deciduous forest (P1) and the Rain forest (P3) and use it as the basis to design a breeding programme to improve on the weight and other traits of economic importance to harness the full potential of indigenous ducks. The findings of the current work are comparable to Ogah (2013), who recorded a Mahalanobis distance in the range of 3.37-4.62 for Nigerian native chicken genotypes. It also agrees with Oguntunji & Ayorinde (2015), who reported a shorter Mahalanobis distance ranging from 2.01 to 3.76 for Nigerian Muscovy duck populations. However, Ogah *et al.* (2011) recorded a long Mahalanobis distance (54.80) between the guinea savanna and the dry savanna, followed by a distance between the dry savanna and the rain forest (35.44) and the least Mahalanobis distance was between guinea savanna and the rain forest (34.12) Muscovy duck ecotypes in Nigeria. Also, Adenaike *et al.* (2020) noticed a longer Mahalanobis distance that ranged between 303.58 and 415.16 for locally adapted Nigerian turkeys.

Classification of duck populations

The relatedness and differences between individuals within the three duck populations are shown in Table 6. The discriminant analysis in the present study was able to classify appropriately 61.4% of individual ducks into their respective populations with cross-validation, as presented in Table 6, based on the Mahalanobis distance (Table 5). The current work revealed the highest relatedness among duck populations from the Semi-deciduous forest (64.49%), followed by duck populations from the Rain forest (62.32%), whereas the slightest similarity was found within the populations in the Coastal savanna (57.25%). The considerable relatedness or similarity within the populations implies that within population selection should be discouraged among duck farmers within the respective agro-ecological zones. The results further showed that 23.19% and 12.32% of P1 (Semi-deciduous forest) were misclassified into P2 (Coastal savanna) and P3 (Rain forest), respectively.

Table 6. Classification matrix with cross-validation of the number of observations and percentage classified (misclassified) into populations of ducks based on morphometric trait

Population (P)	P1	P2	P3
P1 (Semi-deciduous forest)	89	22	26
	64.49	15.94	18.84
P2 (Coastal savanna)	32	79	26
	23.19	57.25	18.84
P3 (Rain forest)	17	37	86
	12.32	26.81	62.32
Error level for populations	35.51	42.75	37.68
Prior probability (Priors)	<u>0.333</u>	<u>0.333</u>	<u>0.333</u>

Also, 15.94% and 26.81% of P2 were misclassified to P1 and P3, respectively. Again, 18.84% of duck populations within the Rain forest were wrongly assigned to the Semi-deciduous forest and the Coastal savanna. Classification of duck populations using this method is rare in the literature. However, some researchers (Dossa *et al.*, 2007; Traore *et al.*, 2008; Yakubu *et al.*, 2010; Batubara *et al.*, 2011; Yakubu & Ibrahim, 2011; Ofori *et al.*, 2021) have used the approach to demonstrate high classification success in sheep and goat populations.

Most discriminating traits by Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

The eigenvalues of the total variance, un-rotated component loadings and communalities for all morphometric traits in the studied duck populations are presented in Table 7. In the current work, the first principal component (PC1) was

extracted from the factor analysis for each of the three duck populations without varimax rotation because PC1 explained maximum variation among the populations. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was found to be 0.933, 0.938 and 0.942 for Semi-deciduous forest, Coastal savanna and Rain forest duck populations respectively, whereas the three agro-ecological zones pooled together had KMO measure of 0.946. The correlation matrices tested with Bartlett's test of sphericity for all morphometric traits were statistically significant ($P < 0.0001$) for all agro-ecological zones with chi-square of $\chi^2 = 1858.87$; $\chi^2 = 1883.30$ and $\chi^2 = 1882.79$ for Semi-deciduous forest, Coastal savanna and Rain forest duck populations respectively. The KMO measurement and the Bartlett's test of sphericity provided validity for the factor analysis of the data sets.

Table 7. Eigenvalue, Percentage of Total Variance, Un-rotated Components Loadings and Communalities of Morphometric Traits Observed in Indigenous Ghanaian Duck Populations

Traits	SDF PCA		CS PCA
	PC1	Comm.	PC1
BWT	0.970	0.940	0.961
BL	0.955	0.913	0.965
SL	0.807	0.651	0.792
NL	0.835	0.698	0.884
BLL	0.779	0.606	0.784
BLW	0.889	0.791	0.856
BC	0.908	0.824	0.913
WL	0.953	0.908	0.966
WS	0.956	0.913	0.971
Eigenvalue	7.244		7.321
% Total variance	80.49		81.35

SDF=Semi-deciduous forest; CS= Coastal savanna; RF= Rain forest; PCA=Principal component analysis; Comm.= Communalities; *BWT*=Body weight; *BL*=Body length; *SL*=Shank length; *NL*=Neck length; *BLL*= Bill length; *BLW*=Bill width; *BC*= Breast circumference; *WL*=Wing length; *WS*= Wing span

The PC1 accounted for 80.49%, 81.35% and 82.93% of the total variances for Semi-deciduous forest, Coastal savanna and Rain forest duck populations respectively with a corresponding eigenvalue of 7.244, 7.321 and 7.464. In Semi-deciduous ducks, PC1 had higher loading on body weight (0.970), wingspan (0.956), body length (0.955) and WL (0.953). A higher loading was identified on WS (0.971), WL (0.966), BL (0.965) and BWT (0.961) for Coastal savanna duck populations whereas in Rain forest ducks, PC1 had higher loadings on BWT (0.971), BL (0.961), WL (0.957) and WS (0.950). The principal component extracted from the pooled agro-ecological zones accounted for 80.59% of

the total variance in the original variables measured with an eigenvalue of 7.253. The PC1 had higher loadings on body weight (0.965) followed by body length (0.959), wing length (0.956), wing span (0.954), breast circumference (0.905), bill width (0.865), neck length (0.861) whereas bill length and shank length shared a similar loading of 0.795. The present results imply that BW had the highest discriminatory power followed by BL, WL, WS, BC, BLW, NL, BLL and SL which agrees with Ogah (2013). This further suggests that body weight and body length are priority traits for discriminating duck populations. The results of the current work are comparable to Maharani *et al.* (2019), who used principal component analysis to determine the degree of discrimination in duck populations in India. However, Maharani *et al.* (2019) extracted two to four principal components. Their results revealed that PC1 accounted for 40.19%, 34.57%, 34.82%, 37.51% and 32.42% for Alabio, Magelang, Pegagan, Pitalah and Rambon duck populations with a corresponding eigenvalue of 3.125, 2.766, 2.786, 3.001 and 2.594, which are relatively lower than what was recorded in the present work. In the work of Maharani *et al.* (2019), PC1 had higher loadings on beak length (0.778), neck diameter (0.758) and foot width (0.797) for Alabio duck populations. The Magelang populations had PC1 recording higher loadings on beak width (0.776) and foot width (0.783). Also, the duck populations from Pegagan recorded higher loadings on all traits measured for PC1. A higher loading was recorded on shank length (0.843) for PC1 in the Pitalah duck populations, whereas in the Rambon duck populations, a higher loading was observed on beak width (0.857) and foot width (0.860) for PC1. The present findings align with Mendes (2011), Udeh & Ugbu (2011) as well as Yakubu *et al.* (2009) who reported that PC1 has higher loadings on morpho-structural traits of poultry. The detected morphometric features loaded in the same principal component were clustered in the same

group suggesting a similar genomic location for their heredity. It also infers a possible underlying biological relationship between the identified morphometric traits.

A medium to high communality (0.632 – 0.931) was also recorded for all traits in the present study, which is comparable to the findings of Egena *et al.* (2014) and Dahloum *et al.* (2016) who worked on chickens and Ogah (2011) on turkeys. The medium to high communalities observed in the current work for all the morphometric characters measured indicate that those traits could be used to explain the overall variability in body dimensions of ducks (Ogah, 2013; Mendes, 2011; Maharani *et al.*, 2019). The consistency of the higher communalities observed for body weight, body length, wing span and wing length which ranged between 0.902 and 0.943 across the three duck populations in the present study shows that these traits could highly explain the diversity of morphological and morphometric dimensions of ducks in Ghana.

Conclusion

The present study revealed that sex had a significant ($p < 0.05$) influence on all the morphometric traits measured, and drakes were significantly ($p < 0.05$) superior to ducks in all the morphometric traits measured. Moreover, agro-ecological zone had a significant ($p < 0.05$) influence on all morphometric traits except body length. The study further revealed a medium to high (0.593-0.945) positive correlation among morphometric traits with body length (0.894) as the best predictor of body weight; hence in the absence of a weighing scale, body length could be used to select birds with highest body weight with much accuracy. The discriminant analysis accurately classified 61.40% of ducks into their respective populations with cross-validation. The Mahalanobis distance showed a longer distance (2.27) between the semi-deciduous duck population and the rainforest duck population, and this was aided by a pictorial representation from a canonical plot. The distance between the two duck populations may suggest a distinction in the indigenous duck populations. The principal component analysis had a higher loading (0.965) on body weight, implying that body weight has the highest discriminatory power among the morphometric traits, hence, a significant trait for discriminating duck populations. Additional investigation could consider using an advanced characterization approach complemented by molecular genetic characterization to validate the identity of the indigenous duck populations in Ghana.

References

- Adenaike, A. S., Jerede, O., Bello-Ibiyemi, A., and Ikeobi, C. O. published a work in 2020. Analyzing morphostructural features in regionally adapted turkeys from Nigeria using multifunctional discriminant analysis. *Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture*, 53(2), 57-62. ACS publication number: 2020-0006
Published in 2021 by Ali, W., Dar, U. S., Javed, I., and Usama, H. M. Sexes of the common quail (*Coturnix coturnix*) in Pakistan's Abbottabad District, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, as compared morphologically. *New X Journal*, 7, 4, 119–124.
- (Banerjee, 2013). West Bengal, India, duck and goose breeds characterized by their morphology. Publication: 52, 1-16. Journal Title: *Animal Genetic Resources/Recursos Genéticos Animales*.
- Sabana Akter and A.H.M. Mahbubur Rahman (2024). Studies on aquatic angiosperms of Rajshahi district, Bangladesh with reference to important medicinal plants. *African Research Journal of Biosciences*. 1(2): 62-71. doi: 10.62587/AFRJBS.1.2.2024.62-71.
- In 2015, Birteeb and Lomo published a paper. Determining the weight of West African dwarf goats raised in Ghana's transitional zone by phenotypic analysis and linear body measurements. Published in Volume 27, Article #175 of *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. Source: <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd27/9/birt27175.htm>
- Botwe, R. A., Ofori, S. A., Hagan, J. K., and Yeboah, B. (2023). Evaluation of phenotypic diversity in Ghanaian quail (*Coturnix coturnix*) populations. Volume 10, Issue 1, pages 26–37, *Journal of Innovative Agriculture*. Web of Science article with DOI: 10.37446/jinagri/rsa/10.1.2023.26-37
- In 2017, Brown, M. M., Alenyorege, B., Teye, G. A., and Roessler, R. published in. The genetic diversity, phenotypic variation, and potential for production of guinea fowl and chickens in the Tamale area of northern Ghana. *Journal of animal sciences in Asia and Oceania*, volume 30, issue 10, pages 1372.
- Karem Ghoneim (2024). Suppressive strategies of entomopathogenic nematodes and their symbiotic

bacteria against the hemocyte-mediated immune defenses of insects: A brief review. African Research Journal of Biosciences. 1(2): 41-61. doi: 10.62587/AFRJBS.1.2.2024.41-61.

This sentence is a citation for a 2014 publication by Drouilhet *et al.*, with authors Bernadet, H.-D., David, I., Gilbert, H., and Marie-Etancelin. Genetic factors and responses to selection in Muscovy duck mule offspring: improving residual feed consumption via changes in carcass composition and fatty liver quality. Vol. 92, No. 10, pages 4287–4296, Journal of Animal Science. In 2014, Egena, Ijaiya, Ogah, and Aya published a paper. A population of indigenous Nigerian hens reared under an elaborate management system was analyzed using

Mohammad Ahmad Ahmad Odah (2024). From the double helix to precision genomics: A comprehensive review of dna and its transformative role in biomedical sciences. African Research Journal of Biosciences. 1(2): 72-88. doi: 10.62587/AFRJBS.1.2.2024.72-88.