Animal Science Journal (2014) 85, 853-860

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Effect of increasing levels of seven tree species extracts added to a high concentrate diet on in vitro rumen gas output

Abdelfattah Z. M. SALEM, 1,2 Ahmed E. KHOLIF, 3 Mona M. Y. ELGHANDOUR, 1 Saul R. HERNANDEZ, 4 Ignacio A. DOMÍNGUEZ-VARA¹ and Miguel MELLADO⁵

¹Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Estado de México, ⁴Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Carretera Altamirano, Guerrero, ⁵Department of Animal Nutrition, Autonomous Agrarian University Antonio Narro, Saltillo, Mexico, ³Dairy Science Department, National Research Centre, Cairo and ²Faculty of Agriculture, Alexandria University, Alexandria, Egypt

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate the effects of increasing levels of extracts of Byrsonima crassifolia, Celtis pallida, Enterolobium cyclocarpum, Fraxinus excelsior, Ficus trigonata, Phoradendrom brevifolium and Prunus domestica on in vitro gas production (GP) and ruminal fermentation of a high concentrate diet. Plant extracts were prepared at 1 g dry matter (DM)/8 mL of solvent mixture (methanol: ethanol: water, 1:1:8) and added at levels of 0, 0.6, 1.2 and 1.8 mL/g DM of a high concentrate diet. In vitro GP was recorded at 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 24, 48 and 72 h of incubation. Increasing addition of extracts linearly increased (P < 0.001), the GP_{24} , GP_{48} and GP_{72} (mL/g DM), and linearly decreased (P < 0.001), the discrete GP lag time. Moreover, increasing extract doses linearly increased (P < 0.001) the asymptotic GP and decreased (P < 0.001) the rate of GP. GP₆ was not impacted by treatments and GP₁₂ increased linearly (P = 0.01) with increasing addition of extracts. Rumen pH declined linearly (P < 0.05) with increasing doses of extracts added. As no interactions (P > 0.05) occurred between the extracts and doses, it could be conclude that all extracts positively modified rumen fermentation at doses of 1.2 to 1.8 mL extract/g diet DM.

Key words: in vitro gas production, plant extracts, rumen fermentation.

INTRODUCTION

There has been an increased interest in using natural feed additives such as plant secondary metabolites (PSM), generally recognized as safe for human consumption (Food and Drug Administration 2004) and to modify rumen microbial fermentation. Crude extracts of a variety of plants contain saponins, terpenoids, phenolics, phenolic glycosides, tannins, alkaloids and essential oils, that have the ability to alter rumen fermentation patterns (Salem et al. 2011, 2014). The effectiveness of plant extracts depends upon the source, type and level of PSM (Bodas et al. 2012). Oral administration of Salix babylonica and Leucaena leucocephala extracts to growing lambs as feed additives, in lower or moderate doses, have modified in vitro ruminal fermentation (Jiménez-Peralta et al. 2011), and increased digestibility and average daily gain of lambs (Salem et al. 2011). Some extracts have also improved animal growth and nutrient digestion (Salem et al. 2011, 2014) due to positive impacts of their PSM on ruminal microorganism activity (Jiménez-Peralta et al. 2011).

There is a constant relationship between PSM at relatively low and moderate concentrations, and gas production (GP). This depends on the nature, activity and concentration of its active principles (Jiménez-Peralta et al. 2011; Salem et al. 2014). Rumen microorganisms have the ability to degrade low concentrations of alkaloids (Wachenheim et al. 1992), saponins (Hart et al. 2008) and phenolics (Varel et al. 1991) and utilize them as an energy source, without negative effects on rumen fermentation. The result of stimulated effects on fermentation, due to

Correspondence: Abdelfattah Z. M. Salem, Facultad de Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Estado de México 50000, México. (Email: asalem70@vahoo.com)

Received 15 September 2013; accepted for publication 9 Feb-

presence of PSM should maintain more efficient nutrients utilization, and by increasing degradabilities of crude protein (CP) and cell-wall constituents, as well as increasing metabolizible protein (MP) due to improved synchronization between energy and protein release in the rumen. Fermentation of dietary carbohydrates to acetate, propionate and butyrate produce gases in the rumen which mainly constitutes hydrogen, carbon dioxide and methane. However, fermentability of protein produces relatively small GP compared to carbohydrate fermentation (Makkar et al. 1995). In contrast, consumption of large amounts of tannins or saponins may have a direct hemolytic effect and may even cause death (Athanasiadou & Kyriazakis 2004). Sarsaponins (Yucca schidigera; thymol, secondary metabolites of Origanum vulgare) have been reported to change the acetate and propionate proportions in rumen fluid (Singer et al. 2008).

Moreover, some other plant extracts with high flavonoid (Broudiscou et al. 2002) and tannin (Woodward et al. 2001) contents decreased methane production with more microbial biomass yield, which results in higher degradability and utilization of CP and cell-wall constituents. Jiménez-Peralta et al. (2011) found that addition individual extracts of S. babylonica and L. leucocephala increased gas volume after 24, 48 and 72 h; however, the combination of two extracts had lower values during the first 48 h of incubation. The highest two doses used (1.2 and 1.8 mL/g dry matter (DM) of diet) of individual extracts had more positive impacts than the 0 and 0.6 doses on in vitro fermentation. Salem (2012) evaluated if adaptation of lambs to ingestion of tree leaf extracts such as S. babylonica and L. leucocephala can modify in vitro GP of Celtis ehrenbergiana, Ficus trigonata, Fraxinus excelsior and Prunus domestica. They found that incubations of these tree species with rumen inoculum of lambs fed plant extracts for 60 days reduced ruminal in vitro GP and fermentation, and it has been demonstrated the orally administrated extracts mixture could modify rumen GP and fermentation of browse tree species, which may affect their utilization by growing lambs.

This experiment was conducted to evaluate the impact of different levels of seven tree species extracts (rich in PSM) added to a high concentrate diet, on *in vitro* rumen GP and fermentation kinetics.

MATERIALS AND METHODS Preparation of extracts

Leaves from seven trees (*Byrsonima crassifolia, Celtis pallida, Enterolobium cyclocarpum, Fraxinus excelsior, Ficus trigonata, Phoradendrom brevifolium* and *Prunus domestica*) were collected randomly in triplicate from several young and mature trees during summer. Leaves were fresh chopped (1–2 cm) and immediately extracted at 1 g leaves/8 mL of solvent mixture.

The mixture of solvents contained 10 mL methanol, 10 mL ethanol and 80 mL distilled water. Plant materials were individually soaked and incubated in solvent in the laboratory at 25–30°C for 48–72 h in closed flasks. Thereafter, all flasks were incubated in a water bath at 39°C for 1 h, and then immediately filtered, and the filtrates were collected and stored at 4°C for further use (Salem *et al.* 2011).

Treatments

The seven plant extracts were tested at four doses (0, 0.6, 1.2, 1.8 mL/g DM) of feed concentrate in three replicates for each treatment on the resultant *in vitro* fermentation kinetic profile of substrate. One kg diet (i.e. substrate) contained on a DM basis 220 g soya bean meal, 150 g alfalfa hay, 550 g sorghum grain, 35 g fishmeal, 25 g mineral-vitamin premix and 20 g salt. The composition of this substrate was (g/kg DM) 973 g organic matter (OM), 208 g CP, 12 g ether extract (EE), 364 g neutral detergent fiber (NDF), 41 g acid detergent fiber (ADF). The same substrate was fed to lambs used for the rumen fluid donor during incubations (Jiménez-Peralta *et al.* 2011).

In vitro incubations

Rumen fluid was collected by a stomach tube from eight growing lambs (Katahdin \times Pelibuey, live weight 24 ± 0.3 kg) fed *ad libitum* the diet described in Table 1. Samples (1 g) of substrate were weighed into 120 mL serum bottles. Extract doses (0, 0.6, 1.2, 1.8 mL/g DM) of the seven tree species were applied directly onto the substrate inside the bottles immediately before adding buffer medium and rumen fluid

Rumen fluid from each sheep was obtained shortly before the morning meal, flushed with CO₂, then mixed and strained through four layers of cheesecloth into a flask with an O₂-free headspace. Ten mL of particle-free rumen fluid was added to each bottle and 40 mL of the buffer solution of Goering and Van Soest (1970), without trypticase was immediately added in a proportion of 1:4 (v/v). The solution contained micro-minerals (CaCl₂·2H₂O, MnCl₂·4H₂O, CoCl₂·6 H₂O, FeCl₃·6 H₂O), macro-minerals (Na₂HPO₄ anhydrous, KH₂PO₄ anhydrous, MgSO₄·7 H₂O) and reducing solution (1N NaOH, Na₂S·9H₂O), in addition to resazurin and buffer reagent of NH₄HCO₃ and NaHCO₃.

A total of 252 bottles, three bottles for each extract dose (0, 0.6, 1.2, 1.8 mL extract (g DM of substrate)) and seven trees of each individual extract sample (three of each) in three runs with three bottles as blanks (rumen fluid only), in each

Table 1 Secondary metabolite levels in extracts from leaves of seven tree species

Tree species	Secondary compounds, g/kg dry matter					
	Total phenolics	Saponins	Aqueous fraction			
Byrsonima crassifolia	86.9	94.9	133.1			
Celtis pallida	37.3	33.2	156.5			
Enterolobium cyclocarpum	26.4	12.3	85.1			
Fraxinus excelsior	58.9	12.4	116.8			
Ficus trigonata	65.6	20.4	96.5			
Phoradendron brevifolium	21.9	23.7	135.5			
Prunus domestica	7.6	13.3	135.2			

run, were incubated for 72 h. Once all the bottles were filled, they were immediately closed with rubber stoppers, shaken and placed in the incubator at 39°C. Volume of gas produced was recorded at incubation times of 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 24, 48 and 72 h after inoculation, using the reading pressure technique (RPT; Delta Ohm, Padua, Italy) described by Theodorou et al. (1994). At the end of the incubation period, bottles were uncapped, the pH was measured immediately with a pH meter (GLP 22, Crison Instruments, Barcelona, Spain), and the fermentation was stopped by swirling the bottles in ice. The contents of each bottle were then transferred to filtered fermentation residue for determination of DM degradability (DMD).

DMD

The DMD was determined at the end of the incubation period as previously described in Salem (2012). Briefly, after 72 h of incubation, the contents of each serum bottle were filtered through sintered glass crucibles under vacuum. Fermentation residues were dried at 105°C overnight to estimate potential DM disappearance. Weight loss after drying was taken as undegradable DM. The DMD (mg/g DM) at 72 h of incubation was calculated as the difference between substrate DM content and its undegradable DM.

Proximate analyses and secondary metabolites

Diet sample was analyzed for DM (#934.01), ash (#942.05), CP (#954.01) and EE (#920.39) according to Association of Official Analytical Chemists (1997). The NDF (Van Soest et al. 1991), ADF and lignin (Association of Official Analytical Chemists 1997; #973.18) were analyzed using an ANKOM 200 Fibre Analyser Unit (ANKOM Technology Corporation, Macedon, NY, USA). The NDF was assayed without use of α-amylase but with sodium sulphite in the NDF. Both NDF and ADF are expressed without residual ash.

The determination of PSM was previously descripted in Salem (2012). Briefly, 10 mL of extract were fractionated by funnel separation with a double volume of ethyl acetate to determine total phenolics by drying and quantifying the phenolics layer in the funnel. After phenolics separation, a double volume of n-butanol, was added to fractionate saponins. The remaining solution was considered to be the aqueous fraction that has the other PSM such as lectins, polypeptides and starch (Cowan 1999).

Calculations

Kinetic parameters of gas production (i.e. GP) were estimated by fitting GP results (mL/g DM) in the NLIN option of SAS (2001) according to the model described by France et al. (2000):

$$A = b \times (1 - e^{-c(t-L)})$$

where *A* is the volume of GP at time *t*; *b* is the asymptotic GP (mL/g DM); c is the rate of GP (/h) from the slowly fermentable feed fraction b; and L is the lag time prior to GP.

Metabolizable energy (ME, MJ/kg DM) and in vitro organic matter digestibility (OMD, %) were estimated according to Menke *et al.* (1979) as:

$$ME (MJ/kg DM) = 2.20 + 0.136 GP + 0.057 CP$$

 $OMD (\%) = 14.88 + 0.889 GP + 0.45 CP + 0.0651 XA$

where DM and CP in percent; XA, ash in percent; and GP, the net gas production in mL from 200 mg dry sample after 24 h of incubation.

The partitioning factor at 24 h of incubation (PF₂₄; a measure of fermentation efficiency) was calculated as the ratio of DMD in vitro (mg/g DM) to the volume of gas (mL) produced at 24 h (i.e. DMD/total gas production (GP_{24}) according to Blümmel et al. (1997)).

Gas yields (GY₂₄) were calculated as the volume of gas produced after 24 h (mL gas/g DM) of incubation divided by the amount of DMD (g) as:

Gas yields $(GY_{24}) = mL$ gas per g DM/g DMD

Short chain fatty acids (SCFA) were calculated (Getachew et al. 2002) as:

SCFA (mmol/200 mg DM) = 0.0222 GP - 0.00425

where GP is 24 h net gas production (mL/200 mg DM). Microbial biomass production (MP) was calculated as indicated by Blümmel et al. (1997):

 $MP (mg/g DM) = mg DMD - (mL gas \times 2.2 mg/mL)$

where 2.2 mg/mL is a stoichiometric factor that expresses mg of C, H and O required for the SCFA gas associated with production of 1 mL of gas (Blümmel et al. 1997).

Statistical analyses

The experimental design for the in vitro ruminal GP and fermentation parameters analysis was a completely random design considering, as fixed factors, tree species (S) and extract doses (D) in the linear model (Steel & Torrie 1980). Data of each of the three runs within the same sample were averaged prior to statistical analysis. Mean values of each individual extract within each species (three samples of each) were used as the experimental unit. The statistical model

$$Y_{ijkl} = \mu + S_j + D_k + (S*D)_{jk} + E_{ijkl}$$

where Y_{ijk} = is every observation of the i_{th} tree species (S_i) when incubated in the j_{th} extract doses (D_i); μ is the general mean; S_i (i = 1–4) is the feed effect; D_i is the extract dose effect (j = 1-4); $(S*D)_{ij}$ is the interaction between tree species and extract dose; and Eijk is experimental error. Linear and quadratic polynomial contrasts were used to examine responses of tree species extract to increasing addition of extract dose.

RESULTS

Total phenolics content varied widely; being particularly high in B. crassifolia and low in P. domestica. Saponins content ranged from 12.3 in *E. cyclocarpum* to 94.9 (g/kg DM) in B. crassifolia. The highest aqueous fraction content was for C. pallida, whereas the lowest was for *E. cyclocarpum* (Table 1).

No interactions were observed (P > 0.05) between extracts and doses on ruminal GP and in vitro ruminal fermentation parameters. However, relative to control, all extracts tended to linearly increase (P < 0.05) the asymptotic GP with decreased (P = 0.012, linear effect)

lag time with exception of C. pallida, which had no impact (P > 0.05). Both, B. crassifolia and P. brevifolium linearly decreased (P < 0.05) the c fraction of GP with no impact (P > 0.05) of extracts. Before 24 h of incubation, extracts did not alter (P > 0.05) GP; however, C. pallida, E. cyclocarpum and P. domestica started to linearly increase (P < 0.05) GP followed by F. trigonata and P. brevifolium after 48 h of incubation. At 72 h of incubation, all extracts tended to linearly increase (P < 0.05) GP. The asymptotic GP (mL/g DM) was linearly increased (P < 0.01) as the extract dose increased, whereas the rate of GP and the lag time before GP begins tended to linearly decrease (P < 0.01). Addition of all extracts except that of E. cyclocarpum at 0.6 and 1.2 mL extract/g DM linearly increased (P < 0.05) GP at GP_{24} , GP_{48} and GP_{72} (Table 2).

Extracts of *B. crassifolia, F. excelsior, F. trigonata* and *P. brevifolium* did not alter (P > 0.05) all *in vitro* ruminal fermentation profiles. However, *C. pallida, E. cyclocarpum* and *P. domestica* linearly increased (P < 0.05) DMD, OMD ME, PF₂₄, SCFA and MCP, with no effects (P > 0.05) on GY₂₄. The effective (P < 0.05, linear effect) doses for those parameters varied between different extracts (i.e. 1.2 and 1.8 for *C. pallida, F. excelsior, P. brevifolium* and *P. domestica*; 0.6 and 1.2 for *B. crassifolia* and *F. trigonata*; 0.6 and 1.8 for *E. cyclocarpum*) compared to other doses (Table 3).

DISCUSSION Gas production

Many recent studies have shown that PSM have potentiality to improve rumen fermentation and GP favorably, at relatively low and moderate concentrations (Jiménez-Peralta et al. 2011; Salem et al. 2011, 2014; Bodas et al. 2012; Salem 2012; Abarghuei et al. 2013). In this study, PSM may suppress protozoal populations, increase bacterial and fungal populations, and microbial activity with decreasing methanogenesis which will be positively reflected in the form of increased amino acid flow to the duodenum (Mueller-Harvey 2006) and more muscle deposition and greater milk production (Abarghuei et al. 2013). The GP is generally a good indicator of digestibility, fermentability and microbial protein production. Higher gas values indicating a better nutrient availability for rumen microorganisms (Mahala & Fadel Elseed 2007). In our study, different responses on rumen fermentation were expected due to the different PSM contents of the different trees used.

Increased GP was paralleled with decreasing the initial delay before GP begins with individual extracts administration. The improvement in GP could be ascribed to the low or moderate amount of PSM in the trees studied, which had positive impacts on ruminal fermentation (Jiménez-Peralta *et al.* 2011; Salem *et al.* 2014), and possibly due to the ability of rumen micro-

organisms to degrade them in plant extract and utilize them as an energy source (Wachenheim et al. 1992; Hart et al. 2008). Degradation of some steroidal saponins by rumen microbes has been demonstrated (Gutierrez et al. 1959). Butyrivibrio and Bacteroides strains capable of degrading alfalfa saponins have been isolated from the rumen (Gutierrez et al. 1959). However, PSM at high doses are recognized as antimicrobial agents which act against bacteria, protozoa and fungi (Bodas et al. 2012). Phenolic compounds at high levels have the potential for intruding into the bacterial cell membrane to disintegrate membrane structures which causes ion leakage. However, the effects are modulated by the rumen pH, the diet in which they are included and by methods of preparation and extraction (Patra & Saxena 2009).

The varied response to individual extracts observed in the present study depended on the nature, activity and concentration of its active compounds (Bodas *et al.* 2012). However, differences in the activity of PSM of the individual plants in our study are not only due to their different chemical nature, activity and concentration of active compounds, but also to factors that can influence the concentration and activity of PSM within each plant species (Jiménez-Peralta *et al.* 2011). In addition, some variations among leaf extracts could be due to genotypic characteristics relative to the type of PSM activity on rumen digestibility (Patra & Saxena 2009). The increase in GP was expected and agrees with the results of previous studies (Jiménez-Peralta *et al.* 2011; Salem *et al.* 2011).

Degradation of OM in the rumen by the action of microorganisms produces gases, mainly hydrogen, carbon dioxide and methane. Methane production has negative effects on ruminants, causing energy loss and bloat as a result of its accumulation in the rumen. It is likely that the use of high doses of plant extracts with antimicrobial activity would decrease microbial activity and diet fermentability (Bodas *et al.* 2012).

In vitro rumen fermentation profile

Comparison between the fermentation patterns showed that only three extracts differed (*C. pallida*, *E. cyclocarpum* and *P. domestica*). It is very clear that the response of fermentation patterns depends on harmony between different PSM compounds in each extract. *C. pallida* had higher total phenolics and saponins, resulting in higher rumen fermentation patterns. *P. domestica* had intermediate content of saponins and the aqueous fraction was moderate. In contrast, *E. cyclocarpum* had the lowest saponins content and the aqueous fraction resulted in lower response.

Plant extracts with high content of active constituents, such as flavonoids, can decreased methane production and stimulate microbial metabolism causing higher degradability of CP and cell-wall constituents and the efficiency and yield of microbial biomass

Table 2 In vitro rumen gas kinetics and cumulative gas production after 72 h of incubation as affected by increasing levels of seven tree species extracts (mL/g dry matter (DM))

Control 0 231 0,059 3,14 71 119 176 216 22 23 37 Byrsonima crassifolia 0,6 315 0,047 1,98 80 141 221 293 31 1,18 395 0,030 1,69 64 117 199 296 34 P Linear 0,001 0,012 0,049 0,686 0,929 0,540 0,062 Celtis pallida 0,6 269 0,081 2,52 103 167 230 263 264 1,2 313 0,062 2,03 97 165 243 297 31 1,8 363 0,050 1,99 95 165 255 331 35 P Linear 0,001 0,260 0,052 0,121 0,007 0,021 0,004 Quadratic 0,598 0,318 0,297 0,303 0,310 0,337 0,416 Enterolobium cyclocarpum 0,6 255 0,079 2,37 96 156 217 249 25 1,8 373 0,046 1,89 89 157 247 330 35 P Linear 0,001 0,124 0,049 0,256 0,144 0,042 0,005 Linear 0,001 0,124 0,049 0,256 0,144 0,442 0,44 Linear 0,001 0,124 0,049 0,256 0,144 0,44 0,44 Linear 0,001 0,124 0,049 0,256 0,144 0,44 0,44 0,44 Linear 0,001 0,124 0,049 0,256 0,144 0,44 0,44 0,44 Linear 0,002 0,053 1,63 88 144 0,44 0,44 0,44 Linear 0,002 0,053 1,63 88 144 0,44 0,44 0,44 0,44 0,44 0,44 0,44	Tree species	Dose of extract	Gas production parameters+			In vitro gas production (mL/g DM)					
Byrsonima crassifolia			b	С	L	$\overline{GP_6}$	GP ₁₂	GP ₂₄	GP ₄₈	GP ₇₂	
Byrsonima crassifelia	Control	0	231	0.059	3.14	71	119	176	216	226	
1.8 395 0.030 1.69 64 117 199 296 34	Byrsonima crassifolia	0.6	315	0.047		78	137	214	282	304	
P	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1.2	329	0.047	1.98	80	141	221	293	317	
Linear 0.001 0.012 0.049 0.686 0.929 0.540 0.062 0.062 0.661 0.599 0.792 0.440 0.403 0.388 0.300 0.283 0.66 0.6 269 0.081 2.52 103 167 230 263 264 265 265 275 311 35 265 265 275 311 35 265 265 275 311 35 265 265 265 265 265 311 35 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265			395	0.030	1.69	64	117	199	296	345	
Celtis pallida			0.001	0.012	0.049	0.686	0.929	0.540	0.062	0.010	
Celtis pallida 0.6 269 0.081 2.52 103 167 230 263 26 1.2 313 0.062 2.03 97 165 243 297 31 1.8 363 0.050 1.99 95 165 255 331 33 P Linear 0.001 0.260 0.052 0.121 0.067 0.021 0.004 Quadratic 0.538 0.318 0.297 0.303 0.310 0.337 0.416 Enterolobium cyclocarpum 0.6 255 0.079 2.37 96 156 217 249 25 1.8 373 0.046 1.89 89 157 247 330 35 P Linear 0.001 0.124 0.049 0.256 0.144 0.042 0.005 Quadratic 0.488 0.307 0.233 0.717 0.779 0.916 0.818 Fraxinus excelsior 0.6 248 0.074 2.03 88 144 204 240 240 1.2 294 0.053 1.8 306 0.049 1.50 79 137 212 277 25 Linear 0.027 0.226 0.009 0.600 0.449 0.238 0.079 Quadratic 0.376 0.855 0.178 0.696 0.638 0.544 0.436 Ficus trigonata 0.6 294 0.071 2.43 102 169 241 285 25 1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 25 1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 25 1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 25 1.2 298 0.060 1.30 82 143 222 289 31 P Linear 0.012 0.208 0.006 0.442 0.307 0.141 0.038 Quadratic 0.410 0.223 0.352 0.205 0.213 0.238 0.307 Phoradendrom brevifolium 0.6 262 0.060 1.62 78 133 198 246 25 1.2 330 0.049 1.70 83 145 226 297 31 1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Purnus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.079 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.079 0.406 0.040 0.190 91 154 229 283 25 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.079 0.190 0.191 0.191 0.034 0.006 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.31 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 P Elinear 0.001 0.206 0.31 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 P Pooled SEM										0.340	
1.2 313 0.062 2.03 97 165 243 297 31	Celtis nallida	-								268	
1.8 363 0.050 1.99 95 165 255 331 35 35 2	Series purities									310	
Particle Particle										353	
Particle Quadratic Quadr			505	0.050	1.//		105	200	JJ1	,,,,	
Enterolobium cyclocarpum 0.6 255 0.079 2.37 96 156 217 249 25 1.2 324 0.043 1.75 74 131 208 281 33 36 1.8 373 0.046 1.89 89 157 247 330 35 P		Linear	0.001	0.260	0.052	0.121	0.067	0.021	0.004	0.002	
1.2 324 0.043 1.75 74 131 208 281 30 33 373 0.046 1.89 89 157 247 330 35 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 330 35 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 2		Quadratic	0.538	0.318	0.297	0.303	0.310	0.337	0.416	0.481	
1.8 373 0.046 1.89 89 157 247 330 35	Enterolobium cyclocarpum	0.6	255	0.079	2.37	96	156	217	249	254	
Parameter Para		1.2	324	0.043	1.75	74	131	208	281	308	
Linear 0.001 0.124 0.049 0.256 0.144 0.042 0.005 0.048 0.307 0.233 0.717 0.779 0.916 0.818 0.60 248 0.074 2.03 88 144 204 240 24 1.2 294 0.053 1.63 80 138 211 270 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 2			373	0.046	1.89	89	157	247	330	358	
Praxinus excelsion			0.001	0.124	0.049	0.256	0 144	0.042	0.005	0.002	
Fraxinus excelsior 0.6 248 0.074 2.03 88 144 204 240 24 1.2 294 0.053 1.63 80 138 211 270 28 1.8 306 0.049 1.50 79 137 212 277 25 Linear 0.027 0.226 0.009 0.600 0.449 0.238 0.079 Quadratic 0.376 0.855 0.178 0.696 0.638 0.544 0.436 Ficus trigonata 0.6 294 0.071 2.43 102 169 241 285 25 1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 25 1.8 319 0.050 1.30 82 143 222 289 31 P Linear 0.012 0.208 0.006 0.442 0.307 0.141 0.038 1.8 377 0.034										0.644	
1.2	Fraxinus excelsior	-								246	
1.8 306 0.049 1.50 79 137 212 277 25										287	
Linear 0.027 0.226 0.009 0.600 0.449 0.238 0.079 0.376 0.855 0.178 0.696 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.638 0.544 0.436 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.66 0.696 0.698 0.544 0.436 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.436 0.544 0.446 0.56 0.66 0.65 0.606 0.66 0.642 0.307 0.141 0.038 0.307 0.141 0.038 0.307 0.406 0.400 0.223 0.352 0.205 0.213 0.238 0.307 0.304 0.224 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.304 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.307 0.238 0.304 0.226 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.246 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245 0.245										297	
Quadratic 0.376 0.855 0.178 0.696 0.638 0.544 0.436											
Ficus trigonata 0.6 294 0.071 2.43 102 169 241 285 29 1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 29 1.8 319 0.050 1.30 82 143 222 289 31 P Linear 0.012 0.208 0.006 0.442 0.307 0.141 0.038 Quadratic 0.410 0.223 0.352 0.205 0.213 0.238 0.307 Phoradendrom brevifolium 0.6 262 0.060 1.62 78 133 198 246 25 1.2 330 0.049 1.70 83 145 226 297 31 1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 P- Pooled SEM P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of		Linear	0.027		0.009		0.449	0.238	0.079	0.042	
1.2 298 0.063 1.73 94 158 233 284 298 1.8 319 0.050 1.30 82 143 222 289 318 289 289 289 318 289 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 318 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289		Quadratic	0.376	0.855	0.178	0.696	0.638		0.436	0.394	
1.8 319 0.050 1.30 82 143 222 289 31	Ficus trigonata	0.6	294	0.071	2.43		169	241	285	292	
P			298	0.063		94	158	233	284	295	
Linear 0.012 0.208 0.006 0.442 0.307 0.141 0.038 0.406 0.410 0.223 0.352 0.205 0.213 0.238 0.307 0.307 0.307			319	0.050	1.30	82	143	222	289	310	
Quadratic 0.410 0.223 0.352 0.205 0.213 0.238 0.307											
Phoradendrom brevifolium 0.6 262 0.060 1.62 78 133 198 246 25 1.2 330 0.049 1.70 83 145 226 297 31 1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 Poled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.019</td>										0.019	
1.2 330 0.049 1.70 83 145 226 297 31 1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of	DI 1 1 1 10 11	-								0.362	
1.8 377 0.034 1.21 67 122 203 293 33 P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of	Phoradendrom brevifolium									258	
P Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of										319	
Linear 0.001 0.013 0.007 0.819 0.912 0.406 0.040 Quadratic 0.379 0.795 0.398 0.340 0.295 0.235 0.194 Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of			3//	0.034	1.21	67	122	203	293	334	
Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ 7 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818			0.001	0.013	0.007	0.819	0.912	0.406	0.040	0.006	
Prunus domestica 0.6 264 0.074 2.16 94 154 218 256 26 1.2 300 0.060 1.90 91 154 229 283 29 1.8 356 0.049 1.87 90 157 245 321 34 P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of			0.379	0.795	0.398	0.340	0.295	0.235	0.194	0.210	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Prunus domestica	0.6			2.16					262	
P Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of		1.2	300	0.060	1.90	91	154	229	283	296	
Linear 0.001 0.206 0.031 0.197 0.110 0.034 0.006 Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of			356	0.049	1.87	90	157	245		345	
Quadratic 0.797 0.440 0.226 0.443 0.453 0.495 0.615 Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of			0.001	0.206	0.031	0.197	0.110	0.034	0.006	0.002	
Pooled SEM 46.6 0.0126 0.851 22.9 36.1 47.3 49.7 4 P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of										0.711	
P-values‡ Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of	Pooled SEM									48.0	
Tree species 0.142 0.001 0.696 0.189 0.304 0.600 0.818 Polynomial effects of						***					
Polynomial effects of			0.142	0.001	0.696	0.189	0.304	0.600	0.818	0.582	
CAMAGE GODON	Polynomial effects of										
			< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.082	0.010	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	
										0.033	

[†]b is the asymptotic gas production (mL/g DM); c is the rate of gas production (/h); L is the initial delay before gas production begins (h). ‡P-values of the overall interaction between tree species and extract doses were not significant (i.e. P > 0.05) for all the measured and estimated parameters.

(Broudiscou et al. 2002). Flavonoids produce phenolic acids, such as 3,4-dihydroxyphenylacetic acid from isoquercitrin and quercetin or phenylacetic acid from naringenin (Winter et al. 1989). Phenolic acids such as

p-coumaric, ferulic, cinnamic and phloretic, and some monomeric phenolics, decrease methane, acetate and propionate production (Asiegbu et al. 1995). Some of the chemical compounds identified as responsible for

Table 3 In vitro rumen fermentation profilet of the high concentrate diet with increasing doses of seven tree species extracts (mL/g dry matter (DM))

Tree species	Dose of extract	pН	DMD	OMD	ME	PF ₂₄	GY_{24}	SCFA	MCP
Control	0	6.3	591	556	8.2	3.9	5.8	604	173
Byrsonima crassifolia	0.6	6.3	747	625	9.2	4.7	5.4	676	186
	1.2	6.2	774	637	9.4	4.9	5.3	689	188
	1.8 P	6.0	684	597	8.8	4.4	5.5	647	183
	Linear	0.221	0.540	0.540	0.537	0.540	0.384	0.540	0.419
	Quadratic	0.672	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.299	0.353	0.300	0.337
Celtis pallida	0.6	6.4	811	653	9.6	5.1	5.3	706	190
	1.2	6.3	864	676	10.0	5.4	5.2	730	192
	1.8 P	6.2	914	698	10.3	5.6	5.2	753	194
	Linear	0.741	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.061	0.021	0.048
	Quadratic	0.723	0.337	0.337	0.335	0.335	0.360	0.337	0.353
Enterolobium cyclocarpum	0.6	6.3	759	630	9.3	4.8	5.4	681	187
	1.2	6.3	722	614	9.0	4.6	5.4	665	185
	1.8 P	6.2	883	684	10.1	5.5	5.2	738	193
	Linear	0.794	0.042	0.042	0.042	0.042	0.087	0.042	0.075
	Quadratic	0.785	0.916	0.916	0.916	0.919	0.801	0.916	0.863
Fraxinus excelsior									
	0.6	6.3	708	608	8.9	4.5	5.4	658	184
	1.2	6.3	736	620	9.1	4.7	5.4	671	186
	1.8 P	6.1	741	622	9.2	4.7	5.4	673	186
	Linear	0.322	0.238	0.238	0.237	0.235	0.195	0.238	0.206
	Quadratic	0.650	0.544	0.544	0.542	0.542	0.475	0.544	0.487
Ficus trigonata	0.6	6.2	857	673	9.9	5.3	5.2	727	192
	1.2	6.2	823	658	9.7	5.1	5.3	711	190
	1.8 P	6.1	779	639	9.4	4.9	5.3	691	188
	Linear	0.312	0.141	0.141	0.141	0.139	0.139	0.141	0.138
	Quadratic	0.869	0.238	0.238	0.238	0.239	0.313	0.238	0.294
Phoradendrom brevifolium	0.6	6.3	683	597	8.8	4.4	5.5	647	183
	1.2	6.3	796	646	9.5	5.0	5.3	699	189
	1.8 P	6.1	701	605	8.9	4.5	5.5	655	183
	Linear	0.383	0.406	0.405	0.406	0.405	0.302	0.405	0.331
	Quadratic	0.631	0.235	0.235	0.235	0.234	0.280	0.235	0.264
Prunus domestica	0.6	6.4	763	632	9.3	4.8	5.3	684	187
	1.2	6.3	808	651	9.6	5.1	5.3	704	190
	1.8 P	6.2	873	680	10.0	5.4	5.2	734	192
	Linear	0.606	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.075	0.034	0.063
	Quadratic	0.599	0.495	0.494	0.492	0.494	0.441	0.495	0.451
Pooled SEM		0.30	192.7	84.2	1.29	1.05	0.52	88.5	14.9
P-values‡									
Tree species Polynomial effects of extract doses:		0.869	0.600	0.600	0.601	0.600	0.970	0.600	0.924
Linear		0.039	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
		ひ.ひノブ	< 0.001	< U.UU1	< 0.001	< U.UUI	√ 0.001	< U.UU1	√ 0.001

 $[\]dagger$ DMD is dry matter degradability (mg/g DM incubated); OMD is *in vitro* organic matter digestibility (mg/g DM incubated); ME is metabolizable energy (MJ/kg DM); PF₂₄ is the partitioning factor at 24 h of incubation (mg DMD: mL gas); GY₂₄ is gas yield at 24 h (mL gas/g DMD); SCFA is short chain fatty acids (mmol/g DM); MCP is microbial CP production (mg/g DM).

 $[\]ddagger P$ -values of the overall interaction between tree species and extract doses were not significant (i.e. P > 0.05) for all the measured and estimated parameters.

this effect were thymol, eugenol, carvacrol (Chiquette & Benchaar 2005), tannins (Hess et al. 2005) or tea saponins (Liu et al. 2005). Saponins and other phenolic compounds may increase total bacterial concentration as well as the efficiency of microbial synthesis changing rumen fermentation patterns (Hess et al. 2003). Moreover, the presence of some active chemical constituents of plant extracts can improve synchronization between energy and protein release in the rumen, resulting in higher microbial protein synthesis and PF24. Some of these phenolic compounds may interact with biosynthesis of aromatic amino acids, as both biosynthesis pathways are linked through cinnamic acid (Salem et al. 2011). In addition, phenylpropanoic acid and phenylacetic acid were reported to enhance cellulose degradation and growth of several strains of Ruminococcus albus (Stack & Cotta 1986). The role of PSM in ruminal degradation and microbial protein synthesis is well documented. This should include protection of dietary proteins and reduction in microbial proteolysis, peptidolysis, deamination and degradation to ammonia, allowing their escape to the duodenum (Mueller-Harvey 2006). The mechanism in which PSM does this is based on the formation of a compound-protein complex which physically protects it from enzymatic attack by rumen microbial enzymes (Min et al. 2002). Another protective mechanism can be based on the reduced peptidolysis and deamination, likely due to direct inhibition of rumen microbial growth or inhibition of hyper-ammonia producing bacteria such as Clostridium sticklandii, Peptostreptococcus anaerobius and anaerobic fungi (McIntosh et al. 2003).

From these explanations we can expect that administration of plant extracts, rich in plant metabolite compounds, to ruminants will be reflected on improved animal performance in form of productive performance (milk, Abarghuei et al. 2013; average daily gain, Salem et al. 2011, 2014) in addition to reproduction (Patel et al. 2011).

Conclusions

Plant extracts used in the present study appear to have a potential to influence rumen fermentation for a more efficient utilization of dietary energy and protein. Administration of tree species extracts like Celtis pallida, Enterolobium cyclocarpum and Prunus domestica could potentially improve rumen fermentation kinetics at doses of 1.2 to 1.8 mL/g DM of diet. Since these extracts also suppressed ruminal feed degradability, various levels of the extracts should be tested to find out a suitable dose to get maximum returns without adversely affecting feed degradability. There is a need to study the adaptation of rumen microbes to the antimicrobial action of these PSM on prolonged feeding to ruminants. Moreover, these plant extracts should be tested in vivo to elucidate the suitable dose for improving ruminal fermentation with minimum adverse effects on animals, so that these can be practically explored for economic and ecologically friendly livestock production.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors wish to acknowledge the financial support from SAGARPA, Mexico, Project Grupo Produce Estado de Mexico #3645/2013E.

REFERENCES

- Abarghuei MJ, Rouzbehan Y, Salem AZM, Zamiri MJ. 2013. Nutrient digestion, ruminal fermentation and performance of dairy cows fed pomegranate peel extract. Livestock Science 157, 452-461.
- Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC). 1997. Official Methods of Analysis, 16th edn. AOAC, Arlington, VA.
- Asiegbu FO, Paterson A, Morrison IM, Smith JE. 1995. Effect of cell wall phenolics and fungal metabolites on methane and acetate production under in vitro conditions. Journal of General and Applied Microbiology 41, 475-485.
- Athanasiadou S, Kyriazakis I. 2004. Plant secondary metabolites: antiparasitic effects and their role in ruminant production systems. Proceedings of the Nutrition Society 63, 631-639.
- Blümmel M, Steingss H, Becker K. 1997. The relationship between *in vitro* gas production, *in vitro* microbial biomass yield and 15N incorporation and its implications for the prediction of voluntary feed intake of roughages. British Journal of Nutrition 77, 911-921.
- Bodas R, Prieto N, García-González R, Andrés S, Giráldez FJ, López S. 2012. Manipulation of rumen fermentation and methane production with plant secondary metabolites. Animal Feed Science and Technology 176, 78-93.
- Broudiscou LP, Papon Y, Broudiscou AF. 2002. Effects of dry plant extracts on feed degradation and the production of rumen microbial biomass in a dual outflow fermenter. Animal Feed Science and Technology 101, 183-189.
- Chiquette J, Benchaar C. 2005. Effects of different dose levels of essential oils compounds on in vitro methane production by mixed ruminal bacteria. Journal of Dairy Science (Suppl 1), 83, 306.
- Cowan MM. 1999. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. Clinical Microbiology Reviews 12, 564-582.
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 2004. Food and Drug Administration of the US, 21 CFR 184. [cited 20 September 2004]. Available from URL: http://www.cfsan.fda .gov/~lrd/FCF184.html
- France J, Dijkstra J, Dhanoa MS, Lopez S, Bannink A. 2000. Estimating the extent of degradation of ruminant feeds from a description of their gas production profiles observed in vitro: derivation of models and other mathematical considerations. British Journal of Nutrition 83, 143-150.
- Getachew G, Makkar HPS, Becker K. 2002. Tropical browses: contents of phenolic compounds, in vitro gas production and stoichiometric relationship between short chain fatty acid and in vitro gas production. Journal of Agricultural Science 139, 341-352.
- Goering MK, Van Soest PJ. 1970. Forage Fiber Analysis (Apparatus, Reagents, Procedures and Some Applications). Agriculture Handbook, No 379. Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Washington, DC.

- Gutierrez J, Davis RE, Lindahl IL. 1959. Characteristics of saponin-utilizing bacteria from the rumen of cattle. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **7,** 304–308.
- Hart KJ, Yanez-Ruiz DR, Duval SM, McEwan NR, Newbold CJ. 2008. Plant extracts to manipulate rumen fermentation. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **147**, 8–35.
- Hess HD, Kreuzer M, Díaz TE, Lascano CE, Carulla JE, Soliva CR, Machmuller A. 2003. Saponin rich tropical fruits affect fermentation and methanogenesis in faunated and defaunated rumen fluid. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **109**, 79–94.
- Hess HD, Tiemann TT, Noto F, Carulla JE, Kreuzer M. 2005. Strategic use of tannins as means to limit methane emission from ruminant livestock. *International Congress Service* **1293**, 164–167.
- Jiménez-Peralta FS, Salem AZM, Mejia-Hernandez P, Gonzalez-Ronquillo M, Albarran-Portillo B, Rojo-Rubio R, Tinoco-Jaramillo JL. 2011. Influence of individual and mixed extracts of two tree species on *in vitro* gas production kinetics of high-concentrate diet fed to growing lambs. *Livestock Science* **136**, 192–200.
- Liu JX, Hu WL, Guo YQ, Wu YM, Ye JA. 2005. Effect of tea saponins on methane emission and fermentation in the faunated and defaunated rumen fluids. In: Soliva CR, Takahashi J, Kreuzer M (eds), 2nd *International Conference on Greenhouse Gases and Animal Agriculture Working Papers. Publication Series*, Vol. 27. Institute of Animal Science, ETH Zurich, pp. 432–435.
- Mahala AG, Fadel Elseed AMA. 2007. Chemical composition and *in vitro* gas production characteristics of six fodder trees, leaves and seeds. *Research Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences* **3**, 983–986.
- Makkar HPS, Blummel M, Becker K. 1995. Formation of complexes between polyvinyl pyrrolidones or polyethylene glycols and tannins and their implications in gas production and true digestibility in *in vitro* techniques. *British Journal of Nutrition* **73**, 897–933.
- McIntosh FM, Williams P, Losa R, Wallace RJ, Beever DA, Newbold CJ. 2003. Effects of essential oils on ruminal microorganisms and their protein metabolism. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **69**, 5011–5014.
- Menke KH, Raab L, Salewski A, Steingass H, Fritz D, Schneider W. 1979. The estimation of the digestibility and metabolizable energy content of ruminant feedstuffs from the gas production when they are incubated with rumen liquor *in vitro*. *Journal of Agricultural Science* **92**, 217–222.
- Min BR, Attwood GT, Reilly K, Sun W, Peters JS, Barry TN, McNabb WC. 2002. *Lotus corniculatus* condensed tannins decrease *in vivo* populations of proteolytic bacteria and affect nitrogen metabolism in the rumen of sheep. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* **48**, 911–921.
- Mueller-Harvey I. 2006. Review, unraveling the conundrum of tannins in animal nutrition and health. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* **86**, 2010–2037.
- Patel DK, Kumar R, Prasad SK, Hemalatha S. 2011. Pharmacologically screened aphrodisiac plant a review of current scientific literature. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine* 1, 131–138.

- Patra AK, Saxena J. 2009. Dietary phytochemicals as rumen modifiers: a review of the effects on microbial populations. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* **96**, 363–375.
- Salem AZM. 2012. Oral administration of leaf extracts to rumen liquid donor lambs modifies *in vitro* gas production of other tree leaves. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **176**, 94–101.
- Salem AZM, Kholif AE, Olivares M, Elghandour MMY, Mellado M, Arece J. 2014. Influence of *S. babylonica* extract on feed intake, growth performance and diet *in vitro* gas production profile in young lambs. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* **46**, 213–219.
- Salem AZM, Olivares M, Lopez S, Gonzalez-Ronquillo M, Camacho LM, Cerrillo SMA, et al. 2011. Effect of natural extracts of Salix babylonica and Leucaena leucocephala on nutrient digestibility and growth performance of lambs. Animal Feed Science and Technology 170, 27–34.
- SAS Institute Inc. 2001. SAS User's Guide: Statistics. Ver 9.0. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.
- Singer MD, Robinson PH, Salem AZM, DePeters EJ. 2008. Impacts of rumen fluid modified by feeding *Yucca schidigera* to lactating dairy cows on *in vitro* gas production of 11 common dairy feedstuffs, as well as animal performance. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **146**, 242–258.
- Stack RJ, Cotta MA. 1986. Effect of 3-phenylpropanoic acid on growth of, and cellulose utilization by, cellulolytic ruminal bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **52**, 209–210.
- Steel RGD, Torrie JH. 1980. Principles and Procedures of Statistics: A Biometrical Approach. McGraw-Hill Book, Co, New York.
- Theodorou MK, Williams BA, Dhanoa MS, McAllan AB, France J. 1994. A simple gas production method using a pressure transducer to determine the fermentation kinetics of ruminant feeds. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **48**, 185–197.
- Van Soest PJ, Robertson JB, Lewis BA. 1991. Methods for dietary fibre, neutral detergent fibre, and non-starch carbohydrates in relation to animal nutrition. *Journal of Dairy Science* 74, 3583–3597.
- Varel VH, Jung HG, Krumholz LR. 1991. Degradation of cellulose and forage fiber fractions by ruminal cellulolytic bacteria alone and in coculture with phenolic monomerdegrading bacteria. *Journal of Animal Science* 69, 4993– 5000.
- Wachenheim DE, Blythe LL, Craig AM. 1992. Characterization of rumen bacterial pyrrolizidine alkaloid biotransformation in ruminants of various species. *Veterinary & Human Toxicology* **34**, 513−517.
- Winter J, Moore LH, Dowell VR Jr, Bokkenheuser VD. 1989. C-ring cleavage of flavonoids by human intestinal bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **55**, 1203–1208.
- Woodward SL, Waghorn GC, Ulyatt MJ, Lassey KR. 2001. Earlyindication that feeding lotus will reduce methane emission from ruminants. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production* **61,** 23–26.