

Turkish Journal of Agriculture - Food Science and Technology

Available online, ISSN: 2148-127X | www.agrifoodscience.com | Turkish Science and Technology

Macro-anatomical and Morphometric Investigation of the Tongue and Lingual Papillae in the Guinea fowl (*Numida meleagridis*)[#]

Ramazan İlgün^{1,a,*}, Nilgün Kuru^{2,b}, Ferhan Bölükbaş^{3,c}, Fatih Mehmet Gür^{4,d}

¹Department of Anatomy, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Aksaray, 68100 Aksaray, Turkey ²Department of Anatomy, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cumhuriyet, 58140 Sivas, Turkey

³Department of Histology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Aksaray, 68100 Aksaray, Turkey

⁴Department of Histology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Niğde Ömer Halis Demir, 51240 Niğde, Turkey *Corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT #This study was presented as an oral The aim of this study was to investigate the macroanatomy and morphometric of the tongue of the presentation at the Ereğli International guinea fowl. Six chicks (6-7 weeks), six layer hens (9-13 weeks) and six studs guinea fowl were Science and Academic Congress (Ereğli used to study and determine the anatomical features of the tongue of the guinea fowl. Papillae of the INSAC 2019). tongue were examined photos of the general anatomic structures were taken. Morphometry was calculated by statistical analysis. The tongue was triangular shaped, and consisted of apex, corpus, Research Article and radix sections. The papillae linguales caudales were on both sides of the corpus and radix linguae. Conical papillae were found to be sequentially V shaped at the radix. Thus, in this study, Received : 17/05/2019 the anatomy and morphometric of the tongue of the guinea fowl tongue were examined in details Accepted : 01/07/2019 and the similarities and differences between the tongue of the guinea fowl and the tongue of other poultry species were investigated. Keywords: Conical papillae Numida meleagridis Papillae linguales caudales Tongue Lingual (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2778-6181 🔕 rilgun1980@hotmail.com bttps://orcid.org/0000-0003-0150-3008 b 🔁 nilgun_kuru@hotmail.com do histolog44@gmail.com 🔊 🔊 🗠 🗠 🗠 🗠 🗠 Eachard Strain S (D) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9744-0242 (D) https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7748-3272



Introduction

Numida meleagridis is part of the order Galliformes (Monroe and Sibley, 1993; Kristin, 2001; Dyke et al., 2003; Haaroma, 2003). In certain parts of the world, guinea fowl are used as experimental animals in biomedical research (Igwebuike, 2013; Pourlis, 2014). The avian tongue exists at the beginning of the digestive system and is located inside beak. It is reported that the tongues's anatomical structure varies widely between species and is based upon the animal's eating habits (Getty, 1975; Nickel et al., 1977; Dursun, 2014; Elsheikh and Al-Zahaby, 2014; Erdogan and Iwasaki 2014). The tongues of gallinaceous birds, which are located at the base of the oral cavity, have features that vary according to the shape and function of the bird; for example, the tongue is large and wide in swimming species, shoveled in ducks, folded in birds such

as the woodblock (King and Mclelland, 1984; Karadağ and Nur, 2002). In poultry, the tongue consists of the apex, corpus, and radix linguae sections. The tongue is attached to the base of the cavum oris by the radix linguae with the frenulum linguae,

There have been many studies on the morphological structures, histology, and SEM images of the tongues of different poultry species. Studies of this nature have been completed on domestic chicken (Haaroma, 2003), Onuk et al. (2015) on seagull and common buzzard, Igwebuike and Eze (2010) on African pied crow, Erdoğan et al. (2012) on the red-head partridge, and Liman et al. (2001) and Pourlis (2014) on the Japanese quail. There have also been studies on the oral cavity and tongue of the guinea fowl (2013).

The aim of this study is to add new information to existing macro-anatomical on the tongue of the guinea fowl, and to provide resources for the scientific research to be done in relation to other morphological structures of the guinea fowl.

Materials and Methods

Protocols used in this research are approved by SUVEK, with the decision of the ethics commitee dated 30/12/2014, and numbered 2014/81. Six guinea fowl chicks (6-7 weeks), six layer hens (9-13 weeks) and six studs from an Aksaray guinea fowl breeder were weighed. Anaesthetic was injected intramuscularly, at dose rate of 5 mg/kg xylazine for premedication and 30 mg/kg for anaesthesia, into guinea fowl held in special cages. Tongue length and width of examined materials were measured with digital calipers. Macroanatomical findings were photographed with light microscope (40X) and a camera (Figure 2). Nomina Anatomica Avium (NAV) (1993) was used in the writing of terminological expressions.

Results

Macroscopic Measurements and Findings

The research material showed that the average weight of the first group of animals was 331.83 ± 53.98 g for 6-7 week-old chicks, 1127.66 ± 77.37 g for 9-13 week-old layer hens, and 1.592 ± 87.93 g for studs. This weight gain was statistically significant at P<0.01 In general, it is seen that the shape of the tongue of domestic poultry takes shape according to the feeding type. In guinea fowl, the anatomical structure of the tongue was flattened, pointed, flat, and triangular at the edges in accordance with the diet. While the apex sections of the tongues of the 6-7 week-old guinea fowl were thin, the apex sections of the studs were thicker. The tongue was extending rostrally to caudally. The average tongue length (apex-radix distance) was between 11.27 ± 0.87 mm for the 6-7 week-old chicks, 15.20 ± 1.24 mm for the 9-13 week-old layer hens, and 18.21 ± 0.68 mm for the stud group. This change in length was statistically significant at P<0.01 (Table 1). The tongue of the guinea fowl was divided into the apex, corpus, and radix sections (Figure 1, 2). Light microscope images showed that the dorsum lingua was flat, but sulci and tori linguae formations could not be detected (Figure 2).

The longest cross-sectional area of the tongue was between $3,5 \pm 0,39$ mm for the 6-7 week-old chicks, $6,03 \pm 0,69$ mm for 9-13 week-old layer hens, and $8,64\pm0,56$ mm for the stud group. It was observed that this cross-sectional area change was statistically significant at P<0.01. Thin, weak papillae were observed in the 6-7 week-old chicks weak and 9-13 week-old layer hens, and were observed to be harder and thicker in the studs. In the dorsal area, there were thorn-like papilla linguales caudales between the corpus and radix sections (Figure 2). It was determined that the section near to the radix was longer. In this sequence, the length of the papilla increased from the medial to the lateral position.

Statistical Analyses and Findings

SPSS 20.0 was used for the statistical analysis of data (Büyüköztürk,2011). It was determined whether there was a significant relationship between the three sample groups given the quantitative scale observations in the study. A non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used. Data were shown with mean and standard error (Büyüköztürk,2011), (Table 1).

Table 1 The average measurements of structures in the guinea fowl. (mm) (n:6)

	Guinea fowl									
	6-7 weeks			9-13 weeks			Studs			Р
	Min	Max	$Mean \pm SE$	Min	Max	$Mean \pm SE$	Min	Max	$Mean \pm SE$	
Va	269	425	331.83±53.98	1025	1250	1127.66±77.37	1500	1750	1592±87.93	P<0.01
Du	10.02	12.36	11.27-0.87	13.23	16.63	15.20 ± 1.24	17.23	19.01	18.21 ± 0.68	P<0.01
Dek	3.12	4.17	3.5 ± 0.39	5.22	6.91	6.03 ± 0.69	8.05	9.58	8.64 ± 0.56	P<0.01

 $Ort\pm SH$: Mean \pm SE, (range; P<0.01); Va: Total weight of the body (g). Du: Lenght of the tongue (apex-radix distance) (mm), Dek: Cross-sectional length of the tongue (mm).



Figure 1 (A) Dorsal views of the tongue of guinea fowl, (1) 6-7 weeks, (2) 9-10 weeks, (3) studs, (B) Dorsolateral view of the tongue of guinea fowl, (1) Apex, (2) Lingual body (Corpus), (3) Radix.



Figure 2 Light microscopic view of the dorsal surface of the tongue (40X), (Dl) Dorsum linguae, (Plc): Papilla linguales caudales, (Pc) Papilla conicae, (1) Apex, (2) Corpus, (3) Radix

Discussion

Dursun (2014) on poultry and Mentis et al. (1975) on Guinea fowls are reported that tongues can be various colours and shapes depending on the animal's feeding habits. In adapting to its dietary preferences, the guinea fowl was determined to have a light light-red, pointed, flat, long, and triangular tongue.

Through Emura and Chen (2008) on fowl, and Crole and Soley (2010) on ostriches, as well as other literature (Getty, 1975; Nickel, 1977; Baumel et al., 1993; Dursun, 2014) it can be determined that the avian tongue consists of apex, corpus and radix sections and attaches to the frenulum linguae and the surface of the oral cavity. In the present study, the tongue structure of the guinea fowl was found to possess these characteristics, in accordance with the literature.

Rossi et al. (2005), reported that in partridges, the dorsum lingua is flat state, and sulci and torus linguae did not form. We observed similar results in guinea fowl.

In the literature (Getty, 1975; Baumel et al., 1993; Crole abd Soley, 2009; El Bakary, 2011; Dursun, 2014; Aytekin, 2016), papillae are named papillae linguales caudales in the papillae of the dorsolateral tongue, which are flatter and fewer in number poultry species. Papilla linguales caudales are therefore named as such in the present report, to be in agreement with the literature. Papilla linguales caudales were found in two pairs of right and left horns in the dorsal apex, while those in the corpus and radix sections were found to be pointed spikes, with the radix examples being longer and more pointed.

In the literature (Igwebuike and Eze, 2010), papilla conica was the given name for the papillae on the tip of the lingual radix, showing a cone-shaped, pointed, longitudinal sequence. The present study has therefore named the papilla conicae similarly in guinea fowl.

It is reported that in the literature (Crole and Soley, 2009; Jackowiak et al., 2010; Erdoğan and Iwasaki, 2014), the papilla conicae, which is arranged caudally in the majority of the radix in the poultry species, is involved in the transmission and regurgitation of food transported to the oesophagus. Erdoğan et al. (2012) reports that the

number of conical papillae in partridges changes between 12-14 weeks old. The papilla conicae were found in all of the poultry chickens examined, and the numbers ranged from 16-18 week.

As with reports by Erdoğan et al. (2012) and Rossi et al. (2005) on partridges, Parchami et al. (2010) on quails, and Hassan et al. (2010) on geese, Igwebuike and Anagor (2013) reported that Nigerian guinea fowl's papilla conicae are arranged in a V-shaped sequence on the radix linguae. In the guinea fowl that examined in this study, a similar pattern was displayed in the same section.

As a result, the anatomy, and morphometric findings of the tongue and lingual papillae of the guinea fowl were examined, and their similarities and differences with other poultry species were determined.

Acknowledgements

This study was prepared using the project of "Light and Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) Study of Anatomy and Histology of Tongue and Tongue Papillae" in "Guinea fowl (*Numida meleagridis*)" funded by the Aksaray University Scientific Researches Projects Unit of 2015-053.

References

- Aytekin Ö. 2016. Systema digestorium. In: Girgin, A., Alabay, B., Liman, N., Özer, A. (eds): Veterinary Special Histology. 4stedn., İstanbul. Nobel Publication. pp.151-156.
- Baumel JJ, King SA, Breazile JE, Evans, HE, et al. 1993. Handbook of Avian anatomy. Nomina Anatomica Avium, 2nd ed., Cambridge, MA: Publications of Nuttall Ornithological Club. pp. 257-299.
- Büyüköztürk S. 2011. Data Analysis Handbook in Social Sciences. Ankara. Pegem publication. pp.145-166.
- Crole MR, Soley JT. 2009. Morphology of the tongue of the Emu (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*). I. Gross Anatomical Features and Topography. The Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research., 76: 335-345, DOI: 10.4102/ojvr.v76i3.39, indexed in Pubmed: 21105602.
- Crole MR, Soley, JT. 2009. Morphology of the tongue of the Emu (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*). II. Histological features. The Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research., 76: pp.347-361, DOI: 10.4102/ojvr.v76i4.18, indexed in Pubmed: 21344785.
- Crole MR, Soley JT. 2010. Surface morphology of the tongue of the Emu (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*) tongue. Anatomia Histologia Embryologia., 39: pp. 355-365, DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0264.2010.01002.x, indexed in Pubmed: 20491751.
- Dursun N. 2014. Anatomy of Domestic Birds. Ankara. Medisan Publication. pp. 12-45.
- Dyke GJ, Gulas BE, Crowe TM. 2003. Suprageneric relationships of galliform birds (Aves, Galliformes): a cladistic analysis of morphological characters. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society., 137: pp. 227-244. DOI:10.1046/j.1096-3642.2003.00048.x.
- El-Bakary NER. 2011. Surface morphology of the tongue of the hoopoe (*Upupa Epops*). ACS Combinatorial Science., 7 (1): pp.394-399.
- Elsheikh EH, Al-Zahaby Sh. 2014. A. Light and scanning electron microscopial studies of the tongue in the Hooded crow (*Aves: Corvus corone cornix*). The Journal of Basic & Applied Zoology., 67: 83-90, DOI:org/10.1016 /j.jobaz.2014.08.004.

- Emura S, Chen, H. 2008 Scanning electron microscopic study of the tongue in the owl (*Strix uralensis*). Anatomia Histologia Embryologia., 37: pp.475-478, DOI:10.1111/j.1439-0264.2008.00871.x, indexed in Pubmed: 19032633.
- Erdoğan S, Sağsöz H, Akbalık ME. 2012. Anatomical and histological structure of the tongue and histochemical characteristics of the lingual salivary glands in the chukar partridge (*Alectoris chukar, Gray 1830*). British Poultry Science., 53: pp.307–315, DOI: 10.1080/00071668.2012.700507, indexed in Pubmed: 22978586
- Erdoğan S, Iwasaki S. 2014. Function-related morphological characteristic and specialized structures of the avian tongue. Annals of Anatomy., 196: pp.75-87, DOI: 10.1016/j.aanat.2013.09.005, indexed in Pubmed: 24219998
- Getty R. 1975. Sisson and Grossman's the Anatomy of the Domestic Animals, 5th edn. W. B. Saunders Co. London. Pp.1857-66.
- Haaroma M. 2003. Mikko's phylogeny archives, field museum of natural history. Helsinki, Finland.
- Hassan SM, Moussa EA, Cartwright AL. 2010. Variations by sex in anatomical and morphological features of the tongue of Egyptian Goose. (*Upupa epops*),Cell Tissues Organs., 91 (2): 161-165, DOI: 10.1159/000223231, indexed in Pubmed:19494477.
- Igwebuike UM, Eze UU. 2010. Anatomy of the oropharynx and tongue of the African Pied Crow (*Corvus albus*). Veterinarski Archiv., 80: (4), pp.523-31.
- Igwebuike UM, Anagor TA. 2013. Gross and histomorphological assessment of the oropharynx and tongue of the guinea fowl (*Numida meleagris*). Animal Research International., 10: (2), pp.1739-46.
- Jackowiak H, Skieresz-Szewczyk K, Kwiecin' ski Z. et al. 2010. Functional morphology of the tongue in the Nutcracker (*Nucifraga caryocatactes*). Zoological Science., 27: pp.589– 94, DOI:10.2108/zsj.27.589, indexed in Pubmed: 20608848.
- Karadağ H, Nur İH. 2002. Systema digestorium. In, Dursun N (Ed): Anatomy of Domestic Birds. Ankara. Medisan publication. pp. 55-56.

- King AS, McLelland J. 1984. Birds, their structure and function. 2nd edn. Bailliere Tindall. London. pp. 89-90.
- Kristin A. 2001. Family Upupidae (*Hoopoes*). In, del Hoyo J, Elliott A; Jordi S (Eds): Handbook of the Birds of the World, Barcelona Lynx Edicions, Vol 6. pp.396-411.
- Liman N, Bayram G, Koçak M. 2001. Histological and Histochemical Studies on the Lingual, Preglottal and Laryngeal Salivary Glands of the Japanese quail (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*) at the post-hatching period. Anatomia Histologia Embryologia., 30(6): pp. 367-73, DOI: 10.1046/j.1439-0264.2001.00353.x, indexed in Pubmed:11820407.
- Mentis MT, Poggenpoealn B, Maguire DRK. 1975. Food of helmeted guinea fowl in highland Natal. Journal South Africa Manag. Association. pp.23-25.
- Monroe B, Sibley C. 1993. A world checklist of birds. Ann arbor: Edwards Brothers Inc.
- Nickel R, Schummer A, Seiferle E. 1977. Anatomy of the domestic Birds, Verlag Paul Parey, Berlin. pp.45-46.
- Onuk B, Tütüncü S, Kabak M, et al. 2015. Macroanatomic, light microscopic, and scanning electron microscopic studies of the tongue in the seagull (*Larus fuscus*) and common buzzard (*Buteo buteo*). Acta Zoologica., 96 (1): 60-66. DOI:10.1111/azo.12051.
- Parchami A, Dehkordi RAF, Bahadoran S. 2010. Fine structure of the dorsal lingual epithelium of the common quail (*Coturnix coturnix*). World Applied Sciences Journal., 10: 1185-1189.
- Pourlis AF. 2014. Morphological features of the tongue in the quail.(*Coturnix coturnix japonica*). Journal of Morphological Sciences., 31(3): 177-181. DOI: 10.4322/jms.061113.
- Rossi JR, Baraldi-Artoni SM, Oliveira D, et al. 2005. Morphology of beak and tongue of partridge Rhynchotus rufescens, Ciencia Rural. 35(5): 1098-1102, DOI: 10.1590/S0103-84782005000500017.