

Effect of corn stover silages inoculated with effective microorganisms (EM®) on digestibility of sheep

Pérez P. M., Márquez M. C. C., Romero P. A., Avilés N. J., Corona L.*

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia. Mexico City.



INTRODUCTION

- The annual availability of corn stover (CS) is approximately 25.5 and 75 million tons in Mexico and USA respectively.
- The CS contains > 46% of ADF, 70% NDF and low digestibility (less than 55%), the availability of nutrients and energy is very low.
- The sugar cane molasse (SCM) and acid milk whey (AMW) are agroindustrial by-products sources of carbohydrates widely used in animal feeding.
- The effective microorganisms (EM®) is a mixture of *Lactobacillus spp.*, *Actinomycetes*, *Rhodospseudomona palustris* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* which have shown the capacity of degrade organic matter and in a previous study we observed increase ($P < 0.05$, 11%) in the *in vitro* dry matter degradation of CS adding 1mL/kg of EM®.
- We hypothesized that inoculation with EM in the silage process of corn stover could improve the *in vivo* digestibility and ruminal fermentation in sheep

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Treatments: Silages were made in plastic containers (150kg), 30 days of fermentation (Table 1 shown the composition). ME® (EM México), was adding at 1 ml/kg feed (dry matter).

Animals: Six male sheep with canula in the rumen were used in a 6 x 6 Latin square design. Each period had 11d for adaptation to the diet followed by 5d for sample collection. Were taken samples of feces and ruminal content and feed for analysis.

The sheep were housed in a metabolic cages and feed twice a day with a diet consisted of concentrate (55% DM) and corn stover or corn stover silage (45% DM).

Feed and feces were analyzed to determinate DM, AM, CP, NDF, ADF, GE. Ruminal content was analyzed to VFA, N-NH₃, pH and methane (stoichiometry).

The results were analyzed with PROC MIXED procedures of SAS.



Table 1. Composition of the silages

Identification ^a	Corn Stover (CS)(%)	Urea (%)	Acid milk whey (%)	Sugar cane molasses (SCM) (%)	Effective Microorganisms (EM®) (mL/kg)
CS-AMW	88	3	15	0	0
CS-SCM	88	3	0	15	0
SIL-AMW	88	3	15	0	0
SIL-SCM	88	3	0	15	0
SIL-AMW-EM	88	3	15	0	150
SIL-SCM-EM	88	3	0	15	150

^aCS-AMW= Corn stover with acid milk whey, CS-SCM= Corn stover with sugar cane molasses, SIL-AMW= Corn stover silage with acid milk whey, SIL-SCM= Corn stover silage with sugar cane molasses, SIL-AMW-EM= Corn stover silage with acid milk whey and effective microorganisms and SIL-SCM-EM= Corn stover silage with sugar cane molasses and effective microorganisms.
^bDose of Effective Microorganisms at 1 mL/kg mix feed

Table 3. Volatile fatty acids concentration, ammoniacal nitrogen, CH₄ and pH of the ruminal liquor of the treated sheeps.

Ruminal liquor	Treatments ^a						SEM
	CS-AMW	CS-SCM	SIL-AMW	SIL-SCM	SIL-AMW-EM	SIL-SCM-EM	
Total VFA, mol/dm ³	125.47	124.01	112.79	109.97	101.94	103.67	3.25
Acetic, (%) ^b	67.80	66.73	65.85	66.25	65.25	66.82	0.365
Propionic, (%)	21.63	23.32	23.18	22.4	24.2	22.25	0.414
Isobutiric, (%) ^a	0.32	0.23	0.35	0.32	0.32	0.35	0.013
Butiric, (%) ^a	7.55	7.78	8.3	8.8	7.65	8.28	0.190
Isovaleric, (%) ^a	1.53	1.43	1.45	1.45	1.52	1.53	0.042
Valeric, (%) ^a	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.052
A:P ratio	3.14	2.97	2.96	2.98	2.73	3.02	0.062
N-NH ₃ , mg/dm ³	5.82	6.21	13.98	7.08	9.13	16.55	1.36
pH ^a	5.90	5.70	6.03	5.73	5.88	5.95	0.034
CH ₄ , g/day	445.87	436.89	432.79	442.29	419.55	442.92	4.44

^aTreatments: (Table 1)
^bCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.10)
^cCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.10)
^dCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.05)
^eCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.05)
^fSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.10)
^gSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.05)
^hSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.01)
ⁱCS-AMW AND CS-CM VS SIL-AMW AND SIL-CM AND SIL-AMW-EM AND SIL-CM-EM (P<0.01)
^jCS-AMW AND CS-CM VS SIL-AMW AND SIL-CM AND SIL-AMW-EM AND SIL-CM-EM (P<0.10)
^kCS-AMW AND CS-CM VS SIL-AMW AND SIL-CM AND SIL-AMW-EM AND SIL-CM-EM (P<0.05)
^lMethane was estimated using stoichiometry

OBJECTIVE

Evaluate the effect of corn stover silages, with two sources of energy (cane molasses or milk whey) and EM (effective microorganisms, 1 mL/kg DM), on the digestibility of nutrients and rumen fermentation.

RESULTS

The inoculation of corn stover silages with EM increased ($P < 0.05$) the content of CP in both sources of carbohydrates respect the corn stover without silage with molasses (Table 2).

The use of the silages with EM and molasses increased ($P < 0.05$) the concentration of N-NH₃ and rumen pH (Table 3) but no effect was observed for digestibility (Table 4).

The silage with acid milk whey improved (5.8%, $P < 0.05$) the OM digestion compared with corn stover without silage.

CONCLUSIONS

The use of Effective microorganisms (EM) improve the CP content in CSS with AMW or SCM

The use of EM in combination with SCM increased the ammoniacal nitrogen content and decreased the pH with AMW

A diet with 45% corn stover silage with EM was not sufficient to improve *in vivo* digestibility of nutrients in sheep.

Table 2. Composition of the diets of corn stover silages with sugar cane molasses or acid milk whey, urea and EM® used in the *in vivo* test on cannulated sheeps.

Components	Treatments ^a						SEM
	CS-AMW	CS-SCM	SIL-AMW	SIL-SCM	SIL-AMW-EM	SIL-SCM-EM	
Dry matter, %	28.33	28.33	28.17	31.5	29.33	27.83	0.45
Organic matter, %	85.79	86.52	87.69	86.75	87.01	84.48	0.26
Crude protein, %	11.45 ^a	9.53 ^b	12.49 ^a	11.77 ^a	14.31 ^a	13.54 ^a	0.38
Gross energy, Mcal/kgDM	4.02	3.99	3.96	4	3.95	3.97	0.02
Acid detergent fiber, %	44.01	40.42	42.01	41.91	42.31	40.26	0.67
Neutro detergent fiber, %	67.33	63.90	63.65	62.43	63.58	60.99	0.87

^aTreatments: (Table 1)

^{a,b}Different letters superscripts in the same row are different ($P < 0.05$)
SEM= Standard error of the mean

Table 4. Effect of EM® in corn stover silages with molasses or acid milk whey and urea on the digestibility of cannulated sheeps.

Variable	Treatments ^a						SEM
	CS-AMW	CS-SCM	SIL-AMW	SIL-SCM	SIL-AMW-EM	SIL-SCM-EM	
Intake, g/day							
DM	1.098	1.103	1.120	1.168	1.126	1.090	
OM	1.046	1.052	1.070	1.116	1.072	1.033	
NDF	394.33	382.83	383.83	395.50	386.00	364.67	
ADF	254.17	239.83	248.83	262.17	250.83	237.50	
N	17.3	16.2	18.9	19	20	18.8	
GE	4.91	4.81	4.86	5.11	4.90	4.75	
Excretion, g/day							
DM ^b	298.83	281.67	257.17	290.50	297.33	287.83	13.19
OM ^b	264.17	249.83	230.17	259.33	264.50	253.83	12.12
NDF	179.67	169.67	160.83	178.00	178.67	163.83	8.64
ADF	109.50	109.17	98.33	110.50	109.17	103.33	5.32
N	5.66	5.50	5.16	5.83	5.83	5.66	0.44
GE ^c	1.24	1.17	1.09	1.23	1.25	1.19	0.057
Total digestibility on tract, %							
DM	72.78	74.23	77.03	75.02	73.83	73.45	0.92
OM ^d	74.80	76.02	78.53	76.69	75.62	75.32	0.87
NDF	54.24	55.13	58.26	54.20	54.14	54.00	1.96
ADF	56.97	53.66	60.66	57.10	56.96	54.66	2.00
N	67.34	64.92	71.00	69.13	71.21	69.93	1.30
DE, Mcal/Kg ^e	3.06	3.15	3.20	3.32	3.17	3.28	0.47
DE, Mcal/Kg ^f	74.38	75.43	77.71	75.81	74.82	74.69	0.91

^aTreatments: (Table 1)
^bCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.05)
^cCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.10)
^dCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.10)
^eCS-AMW VS SIL-AMW (P<0.10)
^fSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.05)
^gSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.10)
^hSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.01)
ⁱCS-AMW AND CS-CM VS SIL-AMW AND SIL-CM AND SIL-AMW-EM AND SIL-CM-EM (P<0.10)
^jSIL-AMW VS SIL-AMW-EM (P<0.05)
^kCS-AMW AND CS-CM VS SIL-AMW AND SIL-CM AND SIL-AMW-EM AND SIL-CM-EM (P<0.10)

Acknowledgements

The project was supported by UNAM, DGAPA, PAPIIT (IT202120)