

1 **Effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on *In Vitro* Fecal Digestion of Four Feed Ingredients**
2 **Commonly Used to Feed Horses in Mexico**

3 Susana Ballinas¹, Abdelfattah Z.M. Salem¹, Ahmed E. Kholif², Alberto Barbabosa¹, Mona M.Y.
4 Elghandour¹, Miguel Mellado³, Nicholas Odongo⁴

5
6 ¹ *Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México,*
7 *México*

8 ² *Dairy Science Department, National Research Centre, 33 Bohouth St. Dokki, Giza, Egypt*

9 ³ *Autonomous Agrarian University Antonio Narro, Department of Animal Nutrition, Saltillo,*
10 *Mexico*

11 ⁴ *Department of Animal Sciences, School of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Pwani*
12 *University, P. O. Box 195-80108, Kilifi, Kenya*

13
14 * Corresponding author at: Abdelfattah Z.M. Salem, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México,
15 50000 Toluca, Mexico. E-mail address: asalem70@yahoo.com (A.Z.M. Salem).

16

17 **Running head:** *Yeast and in vitro fecal fermentation*

18

19 **ABSTRACT:** The study aimed to assess the nutritive value in vitro of 4 feeds (grains and
20 forages) commonly used in horses nutrition in Mexico, in the absence or presence of
21 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* at 4 mg/g DM. Fecal inoculum was obtained from 4 adult English
22 Thoroughbred horses fed on restricted amount of concentrate and oat hay ad libitum. The
23 incubated substrates included were corn gluten meal, soybean meal, oat grain and alfalfa hay.
24 Gas production was recorded at 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 24, 48 and 70 h using the Pressure
25 Transducer Technique. Some ingredient \times yeast interactions were observed ($P < .020$) for the
26 asymptotic gas production (GP) and GP at 48 and 70 h of incubation. Yeast addition increased (P
27 $< .001$) the asymptotic GP of concentrates compared to forages. Concentrate feeds had higher (P
28 $< .05$) GP and lower ($P < .001$) rate of GP compared to forages without yeast. From 24 to 70 h
29 of incubation, forages with or without yeast had lower ($P < .05$) GP compared to concentrates
30 with yeast addition. Forages had higher fermentation pH compared to concentrates, but lower (P
31 $< .05$) metabolizable energy (ME), in vitro organic matter digestibility (IVOMD) and microbial
32 protein production (MBP) compared to concentrates. Yeast addition increased ($P < .05$) the
33 asymptotic GP of oat grain and soybean meal, without affecting the rate of GP or lag time of
34 both. Yeast treatment improved fermentation of feeds with higher effects on concentrates
35 compared to forage. It was concluded that concentrate feeds had higher nutritive value than
36 forages commonly fed to horses.

37

38 *Keywords:* Feeds, fecal inoculum, gas production, nutritive value, yeast.

39

40

41 **1. Introduction**

42 In Mexico, the horse industry within the agriculture economy has become a strong sector. For
43 top performance, horses must be fed adequately. A well-balanced ration in terms of energy,
44 protein, minerals and vitamins should be provided to fulfill their needs for good health and good
45 performance [1]. Horse rations can be made from locally available ingredients including
46 roughages (e.g. hays and crops) and concentrates (e.g. grains and meals) [2]. The choice of feed
47 ingredient for horse feeding depends on the horses' requirements, availability and cost of
48 commercially prepared feeds, and horse activity.

49 Concentrate feeds are required for growing and working horses which require condensed energy
50 and protein feeds. To prevent metabolic disorders associated with high grain concentrate feeding,
51 concentrates should be fed as a supplement to a forage-based diet and should not be more than
52 50 to 60 % of the total diet. Oat, corn, and barley are the most widely used grains in horse diets.
53 Grains can be cracked, coarsely ground, rolled or steam-flaked.

54 Concentrate feeds are needed when a horse cannot meet its energy and protein requirements from
55 forage alone. Straws and hays are the most popular and less expensive sources of fiber for
56 horses. Moreover, forage feeding to horses can provide many of the essential nutrients and
57 prevent nutritional disorders because forage fiber maintain gastrointestinal health of horses [2].

58 Addition of yeast to the horse's diet has been shown to improve feed utilization and nutritive
59 value [3,4] with positive effect on the hindgut microbial population [4]. Moreover, in vitro
60 experiments [3,5,6] showed improved digestion and fermentation kinetics of feeds.

61 The improved feed utilization is related to increased total number and activity of hindgut
62 microorganisms, especially cellulolytic bacteria [8]. In addition, raising fermentation pH or at

63 least maintaining fermentation pH with yeast feeding is another reason for using yeast [9]. On
64 the other side, Lattimer et al [8] in an *in vitro* study and Glade and Biesik [10] in an *in vivo* study
65 reported no effect of yeast-treated feed in horses. This may be related to different yeast culture
66 products and different diet types used [5,6].

67 The evaluation of the nutritive value of feed ingredients in each country is very important for
68 nutritionists for establishing feed inventory and for formulating diets for horses. Therefore, the
69 present experiment aimed to evaluate the fermentative capacity of 10 feed ingredients commonly
70 used in equine feeding in Mexico in the presence or absence of *S. cerevisiae*.

71

72 **2. Materials and methods**

73 *2.1. Substrate and Yeast Cultures*

74 Four feeds were used as incubation substrates corn gluten meal (*Zea mays*), soybean meal
75 (*Glycine max*), oat grain (*Avena sativa*) and alfalfa hay (*Medicago sativa*) - (Table 1).

76 Procreatin 7[®] (Safmex/Fermex S.A. de C.V., Toluca, Mexico) yeast product of *S. cerevisiae*, in
77 powdered form, containing 1×10^{10} cells/g of the product) was used at 0 and 4 mg/g of feed DM.

78

79 *2.2. In Vitro Incubations*

80 Before the morning feeding, fecal contents were collected from the rectum of 4 adult English
81 Thoroughbred horses of 7 to 9 years of age and weighing 490 ± 20.1 kg at the hospital of Faculty
82 of Veterinary Medicine, University of the State of Mexico, Mexico and these were used as the

83 inoculum sources. The donor horses were fed 2 kg of commercial concentrate (Pell Rol Cuarto
84 de Milla, Mexico; 26.7 g protein/kg DM) and oat hay *ad libitum*. Fecal contents of all horses
85 were equally mixed and homogenized and then mixed with the Goering and Van Soest [11]
86 buffer solution without trypticase at 1 g feces to 4 mL buffer. The incubation media was then
87 mixed and saturated with CO₂ for about 20 minutes and then strained through four layers of
88 cheesecloth into a flask with an O₂-free headspace. After filtration, the filtrates were used to
89 inoculate three identical runs of incubation at 50 mL solution in 120-mL serum bottles
90 containing 0.5 g DM of substrate and yeast at either 0 or 4 mg/g DM.

91 A total of 180 bottles (2 yeast levels × 3 replicates × 3 runs × 10 substrates) plus three bottles
92 without substrate and yeast as blanks were used. After filling, bottles were flushed with CO₂ for
93 1 minutes and immediately closed with rubber stoppers, shaken and placed in an incubator set at
94 39 °C for 70 h. Gas production was recorded at 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 24, 48 and 70 h using the
95 Pressure Transducer Technique (Extech instruments, Waltham, USA) of Theodorou et al [12]. At
96 the end of incubation after 70 h, bottles were uncapped and the pH was immediately measured
97 using a digital bench pH meter (Hanna[®] instrument, Italy).

98

99 2.3. Chemical analyses and calculations

100 Samples of the feed ingredients were analyzed for DM (#934.01), ash (#942.05), N (#954.01)
101 and EE (#920.39) according to AOAC [13]. The neutral detergent fiber (NDF) [14] and acid
102 detergent fiber (ADF) content of both feeds and fermentation residues were determined using an
103 ANKOM²⁰⁰ Fiber Analyzer Unit (ANKOM Technology Corp., Macedon, NY, USA) without use

104 of an alpha amylase but with sodium sulfite in the neutral detergent solution. Both NDF and
105 ADF are expressed without residual ash.

106 To estimate the kinetic parameters of GP, results of GP (mL/g DM) were fitted using the NLIN
107 option of SAS [15] according to the equation of France et al [16] as:

$$108 \quad A = b \times (1 - e^{-c(t-L)})$$

109 where: A is the volume of GP at time t ; b is the asymptotic GP (mL/g DM); c is the rate of GP
110 (/h), and L (h) is the discrete lag time prior to GP. Metabolizable energy (ME, MJ/kg DM) and *in*
111 *vitro* organic matter digestibility (IVOMD, g/kg DM) were estimated according to Menke et al
112 [17].

113

114 2.4. Statistical Analyses

115 Data of each of the three runs within the same sample of the four individual samples of
116 ingredients were averaged before statistical analysis. Mean values of each individual sample
117 were used as the experimental unit. Data of measured parameters were analyzed using the PROC
118 GLM option of SAS [15] as:

$$119 \quad Y_{ijk} = \mu + F_i + D_j + (F \times D)_{ij} + E_{ijk}$$

120 Where: Y_{ijk} is every observation of the i th feed (F_i) with j th yeast level (D_j); μ is the general
121 mean; $(F \times D)_{ij}$ is the interaction between feed ingredient and yeast level; E_{ijk} is the experimental
122 error. Statistical significance was declared at $P < .05$.

123

124 **3. Results**

125 *3.1. Chemical Composition*

126 The chemical composition differed between concentrate feed ingredients and the forage feeds
127 (Table 1). A high CP content was observed with soybean meal (concentrate), alfalfa hay (forage)
128 and the corn gluten meal (concentrate). In the other hand, higher NDF contents were observed
129 with forage ingredients than concentrate ingredients. The highest NSC contents were observed
130 with oat grain. However, the chemical composition of all feed ingredients was comparable with
131 those reported in the NRC [2] of horse nutrition.

132

133 *3.2. In Vitro Gas Production*

134 Interactions between ingredients \times yeast level occurred ($P \leq .020$) for the asymptotic GP and GP
135 at 48 and 70 h of incubation (Table 2). Moreover, the asymptotic GP, the rate of GP, GP at 24,
136 48 and 70 h of incubation, fermentation pH, ME, IVOMD and MBP were different ($P < .05$)
137 between forages and concentrates. Yeast addition increased ($P < .001$) the asymptotic GP of
138 concentrates compared to forage with or without yeast addition. However, yeast decreased ($P <$
139 $.001$) the rate of GP from concentrates and forage compared to forage without yeast, with no
140 effect ($P > .05$) on lag time. During fermentation (2 h of incubation), concentrates with yeast
141 addition had higher ($P < .05$) GP compared to concentrates without yeast, with no difference (P
142 $> .05$) compared to forages either with or without yeast; however, during the incubation hours
143 from 24 to 70 h forages with or without yeast has lower ($P < .05$) GP compared to concentrates
144 with yeast addition. With no yeast effect ($P = .574$), forage increased fermentation pH compared

145 to concentrates. Concentrates with yeast had higher ($P < .05$) ME, IVOMD and MBP compared
146 to concentrates without yeast and compared to forages with or without yeast addition (Table 2).

147

148 3.3. Regression Analysis of Data

149 Data on Table (3) shows the occurrence of ingredient \times yeast interactions ($P < .01$) for the
150 asymptotic GP, GP, ME, IVOMD and MBP. All measured parameters differed ($P \leq .002$)
151 between the incubated substrates. Moreover, yeast addition affected ($P \leq .008$) all measured
152 parameters except the lag time and fermentation pH. Yeast had no effect ($P > .05$) on GP or
153 fermentation kinetics of corn gluten meal. On the contrary, yeast addition increased ($P < .05$) the
154 asymptotic GP of oat grain and soybean meal. Besides, yeast addition had no effect ($P > .05$) on
155 the rate of GP or lag time of oat grain and soybean meal. Yeast addition increased ($P < .05$) GP
156 during fermentation with increased effect ($P < .05$) during the incubation at 24 to 70 h of
157 incubation (Table 3).

158

159 4. Discussion

160 The in vitro technique of Theodorou et al [12] has been used successfully to study the nutritive
161 value of ruminant feeds *in vitro*. Moreover, in equine nutrition, the technique of Theodorou has
162 been used successfully to evaluate feed nutritive value [4,18]. The only difference between
163 ruminant and equine studies is the use of feces as the source of inocula in equine studies instead
164 of rumen fluid [4,18]. Using rumen fluid or feces as a source of inoculum showed the same
165 amounts of gases from feeds [19].

166 *4.1. Chemical Composition*

167 Within each ingredient type (concentrates vs. forages) and also between different feed
168 ingredients, the chemical composition widely varied due to the genotype of the feed, the growing
169 conditions, production environments, and the interaction between environment and genotypes
170 [21]. Other factor including variations in climate, soil, harvesting conditions and post-harvesting
171 treatments cannot be ignored [21]. This was reflected as different individual fermentation
172 characteristics with different incubated substrates.

173

174 *4.2. In Vitro Fermentation*

175 The interactions between feed ingredient and yeast addition reveal that the asymptotic GP and
176 the accumulated GP from 48 to 70 h of incubation differed between feed ingredients and yeast
177 addition. Besides, the asymptotic GP, the rate of GP, and fermentation kinetics including pH,
178 ME, IVOMD and MBP were different between forages and concentrates. Therefore, the main
179 effect of feed ingredients and yeast will be discussed instead of individual feed ingredients. The
180 chemical composition was varied between concentrates and forages, and also between individual
181 feeds, and is the main reason for differed fermentation kinetics. The chemical composition and in
182 vitro fermentation kinetics showed that concentrate ingredients had higher nutritive value (i.e.
183 availability of nutrients for ruminal microflora activity) than the forage ingredients [4,6,7].
184 Availability of essential nutrients required for rumen microorganisms activity will stimulate the
185 degradability of different nutrients [20]. The production of gases from roughages depends on the
186 protein and fiber contents of feeds [20]. As shown in Table 1, increased CP content of feeds was

187 inversely related to fiber content [7,22]. This phenomenon had a great effect on the asymptotic
188 GP and in vitro GP at different hours of incubation.

189 Higher GP from concentrates compared to forages reveals the concentrates higher content of
190 highly fermentable constituents compared to slowly fermented constituents with forage feeds. In
191 addition, the effect of yeast addition on the asymptotic GP was clearer with concentrates than
192 with the forage with or without yeast addition. Regression analysis showed a strong relationship
193 between CP and NSC contents of concentrate feeds and a weak relationship between GP and
194 NDF content of forage feeds. The response to the addition of dietary yeast depends on many
195 factors including yeast source, feed type and composition, method of application method, and
196 yeast level [7,23,24]. Besides, yeast addition increased the asymptotic GP of oat grain and
197 soybean meal. This is related to the chemical composition of each feed ingredient [4,6,7].
198 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* has the ability to stimulate the microbial cellulolytic growth and
199 activity in the hindgut resulting in an improved fiber digestion [25,26]. The main end-products of
200 dietary carbohydrates fermentation are acetate, propionate and butyrate as well as the gases,
201 hydrogen, carbon dioxide and methane [27]. Yeast not only has the ability to increase GP, but
202 also, can induce qualitative changes in the produced gases; decrease methane and ammonia
203 production [28].

204 Callaway and Martin [29] suggested that *S. cerevisiae* has the ability to provide ruminal
205 microflora with some important nutrients and nutritional cofactors required for their activities. In
206 another experiment, Newbold et al [30] and Jouany [31] validated the ability of *S. cerevisiae* to
207 scavenge excess oxygen from the rumen creating an optimal environment for rumen anaerobic
208 bacteria. In addition, *S. cerevisiae* has the ability to provide a focal point for the development of
209 a stable microbial consortium and an environment that promotes the growth of beneficial

210 microorganisms around substrates [31]. Salem et al [5] indicated that live yeasts positively
211 altered the microbial balance in the hindgut of horses. Besides, Medina et al [32] observed that
212 yeast feeding stimulated the population of cellulolytic bacteria and their activity. In their
213 experiment, Lattimer et al [8] suggested that *S. cerevisiae* addition caused an improved
214 energetics of the microflora resulting in improved microbial balance in the hindgut, stimulated
215 cellulolytic bacteria activity, increased nutrients digestibility, and increased GP.

216 Forages increased fermentation pH compared to concentrates, with no effect of yeast addition.
217 Moreover, for the individual feed ingredients, yeast did not affect fermentation pH and lag time.
218 Concentrates compared to forage showed increased fermentation pH with no effect of yeast
219 addition before incubation revealing that fecal pH depend on the fermented substrate [7].
220 Fermentation of concentrates produced higher concentration of lactate which is known to lower
221 the pH compared to the forage which produce less lactate and maintain a more desirable pH in
222 the cecum [25, 33].

223 Yeast addition was effective from 24 to 70 h of incubation. This may be due to the time required
224 for the release of slowly fermented materials from forage feeds compared to the concentrate
225 feeds. For forages, time was necessary for degradation of forage feeds, and therefore less gas was
226 produced in the first few hours of incubation. Reddy [34] and Elghandour et al [35] observed
227 lower gas volume as the roughage level increased in the diet. Increased cell-wall components
228 with forages compared to the concentrates was considered to suppress microbial activity through
229 a reduction in the availability of rapidly fermented carbohydrates [36].

230

231

232 **5. Conclusions**

233 The responses to *S. cerevisiae* addition varied among the tested feed ingredients. The effect was
234 more effective with concentrates than with forages. However, the addition of *S. cerevisiae*
235 improved fermentation kinetics and gas production of forage ingredients. The results of the
236 present study suggest that the *S. cerevisiae* can support ruminal fermentation of forages at the
237 level of 4 g/kg DM.

238

239 **Acknowledgements**

240 Authors would like to thank the financial support from Universidad Autónoma del Estado de
241 México of the project #3706/2014 CID.

242

243 **References**

- 244 [1] Brooks CC, Campbell CM. Horse nutrition. Honolulu: University of Hawaii; 1981.
- 245 [2] NRC. Nutrient requirements of horses. 6th ed. Washington, DC: National Academy Press;
246 2007.
- 247 [3] Clarke LL, Roberts MC, Argenzio RA. Feeding and digestive problems in horses:
248 physiologic responses to a concentrate meal. Vet Clin North Am Equine Pract 1990;6:433–
249 51.
- 250 [4] Elghandour MM, Kholif AE, Lopez S, Mendoza GD, Odongo NE, Salem AZM. *In vitro* gas,
251 methane and carbon dioxide productions of high fibrous diet incubated with fecal inocula

252 from horses fed live yeasts in response to the supplementation with different yeast
253 additives. J Equine Vet Sci 2016; 38: 64–71.

254 [5] Salem AZM, Elghandour MMY, Kholif AE, Barbabosa A, Camacho LM, Odongo NE. The
255 Effect of feeding horses a high fiber diet with or without live yeast cultures
256 supplementation on feed intake, nutrient digestion, blood chemistry, fecal coliform count
257 and *in vitro* fecal fermentation. J Equine Vet Sci 2016; 39:12–19.

258 [6] Elghandour MMY, Chagoyán JCV, Salem AZM, Kholif AE, Castañeda JSM, Camacho LM,
259 Cerrillo-Soto MA. Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* at direct addition or pre-incubation
260 on *in vitro* gas production kinetics and degradability of four fibrous feeds. Ital J Anim Sci
261 2014; 13: 295–301.

262 [7] Elghandour MMY, Vázquez Chagoyán JC, Salem AZM, Kholif AE, Martínez Castañeda JS,
263 Camacho LM, Buendía G. *In Vitro* Fermentative capacity of equine fecal Inocula of 9
264 fibrous forages in the presence of different levels of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. J Equine
265 Vet Sci 2014; 34: 619–625

266 [8] Lattimer JM, Cooper SR, Freeman DW, Lalman DA. Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on
267 *in vitro* fermentation of a high concentrate or high fiber diet in horses. Proceedings of the
268 19th Symposium of the Equine Science Society, Tucson, AZ; 2005. p. 168– 173.

269 [9] Velázquez AE, Kholif AE, Elghandour MM, Salem AZM, de Oca Jiménez RM, Pliego AB,
270 Odongo N, Bórquez JL, Cipriano M, Olivares J. Effect of partial replacement of steam-
271 rolled corn with soybean hulls or prickly pear cactus in the horse's diet in the presence of
272 live *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on *in vitro* fecal gas production. J Equine Vet Sci, 2016; 42,:
273 94-101.

- 274 [10] Glade MJ, Biesik LM. Enhanced nitrogen retention in yearling horses supplemented with
275 yeast culture. *J Anim Sci* 1986; 62: 1635.
- 276 [11] Goering MK, Van Soest PJ. Forage fibre analysis (apparatus, reagents, procedures and some
277 applications). Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Washington, DC, USA; 1970.
- 278 [12] Theodorou MK, Williams BA, Dhanoa MS, McAllan AB, France J. A simple gas
279 production method using a pressure transducer to determine the fermentation kinetics of
280 ruminant feeds. *Anim Feed Sci Technol* 1994;48: 185–97.
- 281 [13] Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC). Official methods of analysis. 16th ed.
282 Arlington, VA, USA: AOAC; 1997.
- 283 [14] Van Soest PJ, Robertson JB, Lewis BA. Methods for dietary fibre, neutral detergent fibre,
284 and non-starch carbohydrates in relation to animal nutrition. *J Dairy Sci* 1991;74:3583–97.
- 285 [15] SAS. User's guide: statistics, version 9.0. Cary, NC: SAS Institute; 2002.
- 286 [16] France J, Dijkstra J, Dhanoa MS, López S, Bannink A. Estimating the extent of degradation
287 of ruminant feeds from a description of their gas production profiles observed *in vitro*:
288 derivation of models and other mathematical considerations. *Br J Nutr* 2000; 83: 143–50.
- 289 [17] Menke KH, Raab L, Salewski A, Steingass H, Fritz D, Schneider W. The estimation of the
290 digestibility and metabolizable energy content of ruminant feedstuffs from the gas
291 production when they are incubated with rumen liquor *in vitro*. *J Agr Sci* 1979;92: 217–22.
- 292 [18] Kholif AE, Baza-García LA, Elghandour MM, Salem AZM, Barbabosa A, Domínguez-Vara
293 IA, Sanchez-Torres JE. *In vitro* assessment of fecal inocula from horses fed on high-fiber

- 294 diets with fibrolytic enzymes addition on gas, methane and carbon dioxide productions as
295 indicators of hindgut activity. J Equine Vet Sci. 2016; 39: 44–50.
- 296 [19] Lowman RS, Theodorou MK, Hyslop JJ, Dhanoa MS, Cuddeford D. Evaluation of an *in*
297 *vitro* batch culture technique for estimating the *in vivo* digestibility and digestible energy
298 content of equine feeds using equine faeces as the source of microbial inoculum. Anim
299 Feed Sci Technol 1999;80: 11–27.
- 300 [20] Paya H, Taghizadeh A, Janmohammadi H, Moghadam GA. Nutrient digestibility and gas
301 production of some tropical feeds used in ruminant diets estimated by the *in vivo* and *in*
302 *vitro* gas production techniques. Am J Anim Vet Sci 2007;2:108–13.
- 303 [21] Welch RW. The chemical composition of oats. In: Welch R, editor. The oat crop:
304 production and utilization. London: Chapman & Hall; 1995.
- 305 [22] Radhakrishnan L, Murugan M, Sivakumar T. Biomass yield, chemical composition and
306 nutritive value of *Desmanthus virgatus* (hedge lucerne) for sheep. Anim Feed Sci Technol
307 2007;7: 119–23.
- 308 [23] Yalçın S, Yalçın S, Can P, Gürdal AO, Bağcı C, Eltan Ö. The nutritive value of live yeast
309 culture (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) and its effect on milk yield, milk composition and
310 some blood parameters of dairy cows. Asian-Aust J Anim Sci 2011; 24: 1377–85.
- 311 [24] Patra AK. The use of live yeast products as microbial feed additives in ruminant nutrition.
312 Asian J Anim Vet Adv 2012;7: 366–75.

- 313 [25] Glade MJ. Dietary yeast culture supplementation of mares during late gestation and early
314 lactation: effects on dietary nutrient digestibilities and fecal nitrogen partitioning. *J Equine*
315 *Vet Sci* 1991; 11:10–6.
- 316 [26] Jouany JP, Medina B, Bertin G, Juiliand V. Effect of live yeast culture supplementation on
317 hindgut microbial communities and their polysaccharides and glycoside hydrolase
318 activities in horses fed high-fiber or high-starch diet. *J Anim Sci* 2009;87:2844–52.
- 319 [27] Makkar HPS. Applications of the in vitro gas method in the evaluation of feed resources,
320 and enhancement of nutritional value of tannin-rich tree/browse leaves and agro-industrial
321 by-products. Development and field evaluation of animal feed supplementation packages,
322 pp.23-40; 2002.
- 323 [28] Hristov AN, Oh J, Firkins JL, Dijkstra J, Kebreab E, Waghorn G, Makkar HPS, Adesogan
324 A, Yang W, Lee C, Gerber PJ, Henderson B, Tricarico J. Mitigation of methane and nitrous
325 oxide emissions from animal operations: I. A review of enteric methane mitigation options. *J*
326 *Anim Sci* 2013; 91: 5045–5069.
- 327 [29] Callaway ES, Martin SA. Effects of a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* culture on ruminal bacteria
328 that utilize lactate and digest cellulose. *J Dairy Sci* 1997;80:2035–44.
- 329 [30] Newbold CJ, Wallace RJ, McIntosh FM. Mode of action of the yeast *Saccharomyces*
330 *cerevisiae* as a feed additive for ruminants. *Br J Nutr* 1996; 76: 249–61.
- 331 [31] Jouany, J.-P., 2001. A new look to at yeast culture as probiotics for ruminants. *Feed Mix*
332 9:17-19.

- 333 [32] Medina M, Girard ID, Jacotot E, Julliand V. Effect of a preparation of *Saccharomyces*
334 *cerevisiae* on microbial profiles and fermentation patterns in the large intestine of horses fed
335 a high fiber or a high starch diet. *J Anim Sci* 2002;80: 2600–9.
- 336 [33] Hall MM, Miller-Auwerda PA. Effect of a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* pelleted product on
337 cecal pH in the equine hindgut. Proceedings of the 19th Equine Science Society
338 Symposium. Arizona State University, AZ; 2005. p. 45–46.
- 339 [34] Reddy B. Utilization of red gram (*Cajanus cajan*) by-products for intensive goat production.
340 PhD, Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India, 2003.
- 341 [35] Elghandour MMY, Kholif AE, Marquez-Molina O, Vazquez-Armijo JF, Puniya AK, Salem
342 AZM. Influence of individual or mixed cellulase and xylanase mixture on in vitro rumen
343 gas production kinetics of total mixed rations with different maize silage and concentrate
344 ratios. *Turk J Vet Anim Sci* 2015; 39(4): 435-442.
- 345 [36] Wilson JR, Hatfield RD. Structural and chemical changes of cell wall types during stem
346 development: consequences for fibre degradation by rumen microflora. *Aust J Agric Res*
347 1997; 48: 165–180.
- 348 [37] Chiquette J. Evaluation of the protective effect of probiotics fed to dairy cows during a
349 subacute ruminal acidosis challenge. *Anim Feed Sci Technol* 2009; 153(3): s278-291.

Table 1.

Chemical composition (g/kg DM) of the ingredients used as substrates.

	Corn gluten meal	Soybean meal	Oat grain	Alfalfa hay
Organic matter	918.1	927.3	967.8	883.3
Crude protein	210.6	397.6	117.2	220.3
Ether extract	11.88	16.15	41.80	26.82
Neutral detergent fiber	425.1	251.0	249.9	337.0
Acid detergent fiber	98.6	61.2	65.9	214.8
Non-structural carbohydrates	270.5	262.5	558.9	299.2

Table 2.

In vitro fecal gas kinetics and cumulative gas production of some concentrate versus forage feed ingredients during 70 hours of incubation as affected by addition of 4 mg/g DM (+) or absent (-) of yeast cultures.

	Concentrate		Forage		SEM	Ingredient	Yeast	Ingredient × Yeast
	-	+	-	+				
Gas production parameters ¹								
<i>B</i>	181.4b	301.8a	137.2b	182.9b	13.44	<0.001	<0.001	0.007
<i>C</i>	0.043bc	0.033c	0.075a	0.054b	0.0037	<0.001	<0.001	0.166
<i>L</i>	1.33	1.13	1.29	1.27	0.156	0.760	0.479	0.568
<i>In vitro</i> gas production (ml/g DM)								
2h	14.7b	17.7ab	18.3a	18.2ab	0.93	0.032	0.132	0.100
4h	28.1	34.19	34.1	34.4	1.71	0.079	0.066	0.100
6h	40.4b	49.6a	47.6ab	48.9ab	2.37	0.172	0.031	0.104
8h	51.6b	63.9a	59.3ab	62.0ab	2.93	0.334	0.014	0.104
10h	61.9b	77.4a	69.4ab	73.6ab	3.39	0.584	0.005	0.103
12h	71.3b	89.9a	78.1ab	84.1ab	3.79	0.899	0.002	0.102
14 h	80.0b	101.6a	85.7b	93.5ab	4.12	0.773	0.007	0.098
24h	113.5b	150.0a	110.8b	128.1b	5.24	0.022	<0.001	0.070
48h	154.2bc	219.6a	131.5c	164.6b	6.69	<0.001	<0.001	0.020
70 h	169.1b	252.3a	135.7c	175.7b	7.96	<0.001	<0.001	0.009
Fermentation kinetic ²								
pH	6.41b	6.52ab	6.80a	6.59ab	0.086	0.012	0.574	0.069
ME	6.35b	7.35a	5.78b	6.25b	0.247	0.001	0.005	0.293
IVOMD	437.7b	502.7a	394.9b	425.5b	18.23	0.002	0.011	0.350
MBP	488.2b	556.5a	483.3b	515.5b	9.79	0.023	<0.001	0.070

Different superscripts following means in the same row indicate differences at $P < .05$.

SEM is the standard error of the mean.

¹ 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).

² IVOMD is the in vitro organic matter digestibility (mg/g DM), MBP is microbial protein production (mg/g DM), ME is the metabolizable energy (MJ/kg DM).

Table 3.

In vitro fecal gas kinetics and cumulative gas production of 4 feed ingredients during 70 hours of incubation as affected by addition of 4 mg/g DM (+) or absent (-) of yeast cultures.

Feed ingredient	Yeast	Gas production parameters ¹			<i>In vitro</i> gas production (ml/g DM)										Fermentation kinetic ²			
		<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>L</i>	2h	4h	6h	8h	10h	12h	14 h	24h	48h	70 h	pH	ME	IVOMD	MBP
Corn gluten meal	-	211.2	0.049	1.47	19.3	36.9	52.8	67.2	80.8	92.2	103.0	143.8	189.3	203.3	6.77	7.31	504.1	545.0
	+	264.9	0.037	1.37	18.6	35.9	52.0	66.9	80.3	93.7	105.7	154.0	218.1	243.5	6.68	7.59	522.3	564.0
	<i>P</i> -value	0.109	0.071	0.632	0.595	0.711	0.827	0.949	0.931	0.827	0.734	0.427	0.202	0.149	0.041	0.429	0.428	0.428
	SEM	18.47	0.0037	0.137	0.86	1.66	2.42	3.13	3.84	4.54	5.18	8.17	13.34	15.94	0.022	0.223	14.55	15.28
Oat grain	-	177.8	0.028	0.92	9.6	18.7	27.3	35.5	43.2	50.5	57.3	86.5	130.7	152.1	6.65	5.2	354.7	437.8
	+	313.0	0.028	1.06	17.1	33.3	48.6	63.0	76.7	89.5	101.7	153.3	231.2	268.5	6.67	7.0	473.5	562.7
	<i>P</i> -value	0.004	0.807	0.816	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.006	0.004	0.467	0.001	0.001	0.001
	SEM	8.79	0.0018	0.379	0.84	1.60	2.28	2.90	3.43	3.92	4.34	5.86	7.13	7.40	0.021	0.159	10.44	10.98
Soybean meal	-	167.7	0.053	1.55	17.0	32.2	45.9	58.2	69.3	79.2	88.1	120.8	154.4	163.5	6.65	7.99	565.5	501.9
	+	234.2	0.046	1.02	20.4	39.1	56.1	71.6	85.7	98.6	110.4	155.5	207.4	224.1	6.65	8.94	627.1	566.7
	<i>P</i> -value	0.002	0.216	0.477	0.141	0.118	0.097	0.078	0.063	0.051	0.041	0.013	0.001	0.003	0.752	0.013	0.013	0.013
	SEM	3.63	0.0037	0.475	1.34	2.44	3.31	4.02	4.57	4.98	5.30	5.77	4.46	3.71	0.014	0.157	10.24	10.76
Alfalfa hay	-	189.6	0.059	0.91	20.9	39.5	56.0	70.7	83.6	95.2	105.5	142.0	177.1	185.8	6.68	7.03	484.1	541.6
	+	228.0	0.038	1.16	16.6	31.9	46.1	59.3	71.5	82.8	93.3	135.1	189.5	210.6	6.65	6.84	471.7	528.6
	<i>P</i> -value	0.284	0.047	0.635	0.224	0.246	0.272	0.304	0.342	0.385	0.430	0.726	0.637	0.415	0.336	0.722	0.724	0.725
	SEM	21.95	0.0052	0.345	2.13	3.94	5.48	6.83	7.97	8.96	9.84	13.00	17.12	19.25	0.015	0.352	23.12	24.31
	SEM pooled	17.22	0.0056	0.279	1.38	2.51	3.44	4.23	4.89	5.45	5.93	7.60	9.56	10.57	0.126	0.206	13.51	14.20
	Ingredient	<0.001	<0.001	0.002	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	Yeast	<0.001	<0.001	0.308	0.008	0.002	0.003	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.769	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	Ingredient × Yeast	<0.001	0.121	0.244	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.009	0.008	0.006	0.003	<0.001	0.075	0.006	0.006	0.006

¹ *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).

² IVOMD is the in vitro organic matter digestibility (mg/g DM), MBP is microbial protein production (mg/g DM), ME is the metabolizable energy (MJ/kg DM); PF, partitioning factor at 24 h of incubation.