Direct-fed microbes: A tool for improving the utilization of low quality roughages in ruminants
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Abstract
For many years, ruminant nutritionists and microbiologists have been interested in manipulating the microbial ecosystem of the rumen to improve production efficiency of different ruminant species. Removal and restriction of antibiotics sub-therapeutic uses from ruminant diets has amplified interest in improving nutrient utilization and animal performance and search for more safe alternatives. Some bacterial and fungal microorganisms as a direct-fed microbial (DFM) can be the most suitable solutions. Microorganisms that are commonly used in DFM for ruminants may be classified mainly as lactic acid producing bacteria (LAB), lactic acid utilizing bacteria (LUB), or other microorganism’s species like Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, Enterococcus, Streptococcus, Bacillus, Propionibacterium, Megasphaera elsdenii and Prevotellabryantii, in addition to some fungal species of yeast such as Saccharomyces and Aspergillus. A definitive mode of action for bacterial or fungal DFM has not been established; although a variety of mechanisms have been suggested. Bacterial DFM potentially moderate rumen conditions, and improve weight gain and feed efficiency. Fungal DFM may reduce harmful oxygen from the rumen, prevent excess lactate production, increase feed digestibility, and alter rumen fermentation patterns. DFM may also compete with and inhibit the growth of pathogens, immune system modulation, and modulate microbial balance in the gastrointestinal tract. Improved dry matter intake, milk yield, fat corrected milk yield and milk fat content were obtained with DFM administration. However, the response to DFM is not constant; depending on dosages, feeding times and frequencies, and strains of DFM. Nonetheless, recent studies have supported the positive effects of DFM on ruminant performance.
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1. Introduction
The main goals of rumen microbial studies are to improve feed utilization, animal production and health, and animal food safety, which may be achieved by facilitating desirable fermentation, minimizing ruminal disorders, and excluding pathogens. For the past few decades, a number of chemical feed additives such as antibiotics, ionophores, methane inhibitors and defaunating agents have been used in rumi-
nant nutrition to manipulate the microbial ecosystem and fermentation characteristics in the rumen and intestinal tract of livestock (Seo et al. 2010). Due to probable toxicity problems to the host animals, these feed additives are not routinely used (Salem et al. 2014a, b). Recently, a great awareness from public health aspects such as residues of these chemicals in milk and meat, and bacterial resistance to antibiotics as a result of increased use in the food chains prohibits their use as feed additives (Barton 2000). These supplements have been criticized by the consumers’ organizations on the ground of product safety and quality. The consumers’ demands have stimulated to search for natural alternatives to chemical feed additives. Supplementation with probiotics that can survive in the rumen has become a suitable alternative (Fon and Nsahlai 2013).

Therefore, this review summarizes the effects of direct-fed microbial (DFM) on rumen fermentation, methane inhibition, microbial populations and ruminant performance as growth, milk production and the efficiency of feed utilization.

2. Direct-fed microbial

The term “probiotic” is composed from two parts of Greek words: “pro” which means in favor and “biotic” which means life. The term probiotic has been defined as “a live microbial feed supplement, which beneficially affects the host animal by improving its intestinal microbial balance” (Fuller 1989). However, as pointed out by Vanbelle et al. (1990), many researchers accept that probiotic refers to “selected and concentrated viable counts of lactic acid bacteria Lactobacillus, Streptococcus”. Moreover, Kmet et al. (1993) defined the term probiotics as “live cultures of microorganisms that are deliberately introduced into the rumen with the aim of improving animal health or nutrition”. The Food and Drug Administration of USA has required feed manufacturers to use the term “direct-fed microbial” instead of probiotic (Miles and Bootwalla 1991) and has narrowed the definition to “a source of live, naturally occurring microorganisms” (Yoon and Stern 1995). Krehbiel et al. (2003) and Yang et al. (2004) defined the DFM as “alive, naturally occurring microorganisms that have been used to improve digestive function of livestock”. The definition of DFM is very broad and may include specific and non-specific yeast, fungi, bacteria, cell fragments, and filtrates (Sullivan and Martin 1999; Oetzel et al. 2007; Elghandour et al. 2014b). DFM grow in the rumen and beneficially modify its microbial ecosystem and/or fermentation characteristics. The intestinal tract may also provide a suitable habitat for DFM (Seo et al. 2010).

There are many different types of DFM being used in livestock production. They can be classified into three main categories; bacterial, fungal, and a combination of both. The bacterial DFM is the most common. The bacterial DFM strains may be classified as lactic acid producing bacteria (LAB), lactic acid utilizing bacteria (LUB), or other microorganisms. Lactobacillus, Propionibacterium, Bifidobacterium, Enterococcus, Streptococcus, and Bacillus, all of which are common microorganisms used in bacterial DFM for ruminants, in addition to other distinctive bacterial species such as Megasphaera elsdenii and Prevotella bryantii (Kung 2006; Seo et al. 2010). Development of this organism for ruminant animals should be continued with emphasis on optimizing dose and timing of administration. Success with such organisms could allow feedlot producers to decrease the time it takes to adapt cattle to a high concentrate diet. It could also be useful by reducing chronic acidosis in lactating cows (Kung 2006). The response to DFM was inconstant in ruminants; however, it has been positive in many experiments.

3. DFM mode of action

3.1. Bacterial DFM

The mode of action of DFM depends on many factors, such as dosages, feeding times and frequencies, and strains of DFM. Some of DFM act within the rumen while others impact the gastrointestinal tract (Puniya et al. 2015).

1. Within rumen: The mode of action of different DFM sources within the rumen depends mainly on LAB and LUB. LAB might affect the rumen positively through preventing ruminal acidosis in dairy cows (Nocek et al. 2002) by facilitating the growth of ruminal microorganisms adapted to the presence of lactic acid in the rumen (Yoon and Stern 1995) and by stimulating LUB. LUB have been proposed as DFM that can decrease concentrations of lactate and maintain ruminal pH. Megasphaera elsdenii is the major lactate-utilizing bacterium in the rumen that prevents the drastic pH drops caused by accumulation of lactate in the rumen when fed a highly fermentable diet (Yang et al. 2004; Kung 2006) or prevents lactic acidosis in steers (Robinson et al. 1992). This bacteria simultaneously uses lactate, glucose, and maltose (Russell and Baldwin 1978) and would compete with lactate-producing organisms for substrate. During the feeding of readily degradable soluble carbohydrates, M. elsdenii seems to be the major ruminal lactate utilizing bacterium because Selenomonas ruminantium undergoes catabolite repression (Russell and Baldwin 1978) and is relatively acid-intolerant (Mackie and Gilchrist 1979).

Another bacterial species is the Propionibacteria which is naturally found in high numbers in the rumen of animals fed forage and medium concentrate diets (Kung 2006). Propionate is quantitatively the most important single precursor of glucose synthesis among volatile fatty acids (VFA), and tissue distribution of nutrient (Nagaraja et al. 1997). Certain
species of *Propionibacteria* were reported to modify rumen fermentation and increase the molar portion of ruminal propionate (Stein et al. 2006). It can ferment lactate to propionate in early lactation dairy cows (Reynolds et al. 2003; Kung 2006) resulting in increased hepatic glucose production (Stein et al. 2006), providing more substrates for lactose synthesis, improving energetic efficiency and reducing ketosis (Weiss et al. 2008). For growing ruminants and lactating cows, propionate has been estimated to account for 61 to 67% of glucose release (Reynolds et al. 1994; Huntington 2000). Also, increased propionate has been accompanied with a decrease in methane ($\text{CH}_4$) production according to the stoichiometric laws of chemical balance and its equation (van Soest 1994). When the acetate:propionate ratio decreases, $\text{CH}_4$ production declines, and energy retention by cattle would theoretically increase (Wolin 1960).

Feeding *Propionibacterium* increased protozoa especially *Entodinium* with decreased amylolytic bacteria in the rumen of feedlot steers (Ghorbani et al. 2002). The mechanism by which bacterial DFM stimulate protozoa remains unclear (Ghorbani et al. 2002).

(2) Within the post-ruminal gastrointestinal tract. Many proposals were adjusted to elucidate the mode of action of DFM within post-ruminal gastrointestinal tract (GIT) (Seo et al. 2010). DFM can inhibit or prevent pathogen like *Escherichia coli* establishment attached to the intestinal mucosa via hydrophobic interactions and limit pathogens from attaching to the enterocytic receptor or producing enterotoxins that can induce diarrhea (Lee et al. 2003; Kung 2006). LAB was able to adhere to the intestinal tract and protect animals against *Salmonella* (Frizzo et al. 2010). In addition to the role of LAB of producing lactate and acetate as main metabolic end-products, it had critical roles in penetrating microbial cells and interfering with essential cell function (Holzapfel et al. 1995).

Another mechanism is that DFM like LAB can produce antibacterial compounds such as bacteriocin and hydrogen peroxide that have a competitive exclusion and probiotic characteristics. Hydrogen peroxide can oxidize the sulfhydryl groups in metabolic enzymes such as glucose transport enzymes, hexokinase, and glycerol aldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase causing glycolysis blocking (Carlsson et al. 1983; Dicks and Botes 2010). In contrast, LAB bacteriocins can inhibit the binding of substrates to the subunit of ribonucleotide reductase so as to interfere with DNA-synthesis of target microorganisms ( Cotter et al. 2005; Dicks and Botes 2010).

A newly discovered mechanism is that DFM have the ability to modulate host immune function. In the GIT, various immune cells exist such as dendritic cells, natural killer cells, macrophages, neutrophils, and T and B lymphocytes that are aggregated in Peyer’s patches, lamina propria, and intraepithelial regions (Krehbiel et al. 2003). After DFM are administered to the GIT, they are directly taken up by intestinal epithelial cells via transcytosis. Antigen presenting cells, macrophages or dendritic cells engulf them, finally stimulating an immune response (Dicks and Botes 2010). Various strains of LAB activate macrophages to produce cytokines that stimulate immune response. Matsuguchi et al. (2003) suggested that *Lactobacillus casei* Shirotota and *Lactobacillus rhamnusos* Lr23 stimulated macrophages to secrete TNF-α or promote development of regulatory dendritic cells (Seo et al. 2010).

### 3.2. Fungal DFM

Fungal DFM have been extensively used in ruminants for improving performance and normalizing rumen fermentation. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae* are the most common used species (Elghandour et al. 2014a; Puniya et al. 2015).

A variety of mechanisms have been put to explain changes in ruminal fermentations and improvements in performance when ruminants are fed fungal-based DFM. The mode of action can be illustrated based on many facts. Yeast may have a buffering effect in the rumen by mediating the sharp drops in rumen pH (Elghandour et al. 2014a, b). Fungal cultures may improve the use of lactate by the ruminal organism, *Selenomonas ruminantium*, by providing a source of dicarboxylic acids (e.g., malic acid) and other growth factors (Martin and Streeter 1995). Thus, yeast may help to buffer excess lactic acid production when ruminants are fed high concentrate diets (Kung 2006). Moreover, yeasts can remove oxygen on the surfaces of freshly ingested feed to maintain metabolic activity in the rumen (Newbold et al. 1996) and keep the rumen as anaerobic chamber. Another mechanism depends on the ability of yeast to decrease the redox potential in the rumen (Jouany et al. 1999) which provides a better condition for the growth of strict anaerobic cellulolytic bacteria, and stimulates their attachment to forage particles (Roger et al. 1990), and increases the initial rate of cellulolysis. In addition, S. *cerevisiae* was able to compete with other starch utilizing bacteria for fermentation of starch (Lynch and Martin 2002), which preventing lactate accumulation in the rumen, providing growth factors, such as organic acids or vitamins in the rumen, and resulting in stimulated ruminal cellulolytic bacteria and LUB (Chaucheyras et al. 1995).

The effects on buffering are subtle, as added yeast cannot prevent lactic acidosis if the rumen is challenged with a diet rich in fermentable carbohydrates (Dawson and Hopkins 1991; Asian et al. 1995). The effect of fungal cultures on ruminal VFA has been inconsistent. Newbold et al. (1991) reported that fungal extracts had no effect or it...
tended to increase the rumen acetate: propionate ratio, while active yeast either had no effect or decreased the acetate: propionate ratio. There is no direct evidence that yeast or fungal extracts affect digestion or metabolism in the lower gut. However, the potential for such effects should not be overlooked.

4. Effect of DFM on ruminant performance

4.1. Preruminant calves

The young calves differ from the adult ruminants that they can digest a significant amount of ration nutrients in their intestine with the risk of intestinal proliferation of detrimental organisms that increased the chance for diarrhea and weight loss. Here come the roles of DFM administration which may obtain positively modified GIT function (Abu-Tarboush et al. 1996; Kung 2001). For dairy calves, repaid adaptation to solid feed by accelerating the establishment of ruminal and intestinal microorganisms and avoiding the establishment of enteropathogens, which often results in diarrhea, is the primary goal. In the experiment, Nakanishi et al. (1993) found that Holstein calves supplemented with yogurt containing *Lactobacillus acidophilus* tended to ruminate more at 30 d than untreated calves, indicating that *L. acidophilus* may promote ruminal development.

Dicks and Botes (2010) suggested that *Bifidobacteria* produces acetic and lactic acids at a ratio of 3:2, and that these acids may be more effective for the control of Gram-negative pathogens and yeasts in the GIT than *Lactobacillus* spp. because acetate is more effective against Gram-negative bacteria, moulds and yeasts (Gilliland 1989).

In other experiments, LAB was also inoculated into young calves to improve growth performance (Adams et al. 2008; Frizzo et al. 2010). Adams et al. (2008) examined the effect of *Propionibacterium jensenii* 702 (PJJ702) on growth performance of young calves. There were improvements in weight gains with the treated group during both the pre-weaning and the weaning period with heavier calves final weight. Frizzo et al. (2010) fed young calves on milk replacer and a large quantity of spray-dried whey powder to generate an intestinal imbalance. Under these conditions, calves fed LAB had higher daily gain, total feed intake, and starter diet intake as well as lower fecal consistency index, indicating that diarrhea incidence was reduced.

The most common DFM species to young calves are *Lactobacillus* and *Streptococcus* species. Many reports have been documented a decreased incidence of diarrhea (Abu-Tarboush et al. 1996). Abu-Tarboush et al. (1996) found that feeding *L. acidophilus* 27SC to calves significantly lowered the incidence of diarrhea in calves. The decreased incidence of diarrhea might be associated with a consistently increased shedding of *Lactobacillus* (Gilliland et al. 1980; Jenny et al. 1991; Abu-Tarboush et al. 1996) and an inconsistent decreased shedding of coliforms (Bruce et al. 1979) in feces in response to supplements of *Lactobacillus*.

4.2. Dairy cows

Limited research has evaluated the efficiency of bacterial DFM for lactating dairy cows. High producing cows in early lactation would be the best candidates for such products because these cows are in negative energy balance and have diets that contain highly fermentable carbohydrates that sometimes lead to acidosis (Kung 2006). During the period of 3 wk prior to calving to 3 wk after calving (i.e., transition periods; Oetzel et al. 2007), cows may be subject to many metabolic disorders such as sub-acute acidosis as a result of calving stress, changing diets to rapidly fermented carbohydrate sources, and lactation (Oetzel et al. 2007; Chiquette et al. 2008). In this case, DFM should be used to improve performance of dairy cows through increasing dry matter intake, milk yield and milk protein content, higher blood glucose and insulin levels at the pre- and/or post-partum periods (Nocek et al. 2003; Nocek and Kautz 2006; Oetzel et al. 2007). In the study of Weiss et al. (2008), they supplemented dairy cows from 2 wk before anticipated calving to 119 d in milk with *Propionibacterium* P169. Cows fed P169 had lower concentrations of acetate with greater concentrations of propionate and butyrate. Plasma glucose and plasma β-hydroxybutyrate levels were not affected by DFM, with higher concentrations of plasma non-esterified fatty acids. Cows fed DFM produced similar amounts of milk with similar composition as cows fed the control diet. Calculated net energy used for milk production, maintenance, and body weight change were similar between treatments, but cows fed *Propionibacterium* P169 consumed less dry matter, which resulted in a 4.4% increase in energetic efficiency.

Chiquette et al. (2008) used *P. bryantii* 25A as a DFM to dairy cows in early lactation. They found that administration of *P. bryantii* 25A did not change milk yield, but tended to increase milk fat in accordance with increased acetate and butyrate concentrations in the rumen. *P. bryantii* 25A also decreased lactate concentration after 2–3 h of feeding compared with control treatments, thereby exhibiting the potential to prevent acidosis.

Exogenous cellulolytic bacteria have been studied as DFM to improve ruminal fermentation (Chiquette et al. 2008; Khattab et al. 2011). *Ruminococcus flavefaciens* NJ, was supplemented into the rumen of non-lactating dairy cows fed either a high concentrate or a high forage diet daily. *R. flavefaciens* NJ modified the abundance of other cellulolytic bacterial populations, and improved in sacco digestibility of timothy hay in the rumen when fed as part of a
high concentrate diet. The presence of *Aspergillus oryzae* or *S. cerevisiae*, or a change of concentrate to forage ratio in the diet did not succeed in establishing the new strain in the rumen.

### 4.3. Beef production

In finishing beef cattle, it is very important to prevent ruminal acidosis caused by highly fermentable feeds that are commonly be used. Beef cattle fed DFM showed improved growth performance, meat production, and feed efficiency in many experiments (Ghorbani et al. 2002; Krehbiel et al. 2003). DFM can have an important role on lowering newly received beef calves under stress on both newly received stressed calves and adult feedlot cattle. Newly received calves entering the feedlot heard undergo a variety of stress conditions, such as recent weaning, traction, and dehorning. Such conditions can alter microorganisms in the rumen and lower gut (Williams and Mahoney 1984), resulting in decreased performance and increased mortality and death loss. Administration of bacterial DFM to repopulate the gut might reduce these changes in the microbial population. The response to bacterial DFM might be greater when newly weaned and/or received calves are more prone to health problems. Krehbiel et al. (2003) administered 5×10⁹ CFU LAB (*Enterococcus faecium, L. acidophilus, Bifidobacterium thermophilum, and Bifidobacterium longum*) to 466 newly received calves, to study the effects of LAB administration on health and performance. Daily gain did not differ among calves received DFM vs. those received no DFM. However, calves treated with DFM during their first antimicrobial treatment were less likely to be treated a second time within 96 h. In addition, the number of calves treated twice tended to be lower for calves administered DFM compared with calves received no DFM. The effects of administrating DFM on stressed calves are limited. But in general, results suggest that the addition of DFM to the diet can improve health and performance of stressed stocker calves. These data suggested that DFM might improve recovery of morbid newly received feedlot calves.

Regarding to supplementing diets of feedlot with DFM, results showed that supplementing diets with LAB or LUB can improve feed efficiency and daily gain of feedlot cattle (Galyean et al. 2000). Huck et al. (1999) studied the effects of feeding *L. acidophilus* BG2FO4 and *Propionibacterium freudenreichii* P-63 as a DFM on growth performance and carcass characteristics of finishing heifers for 126 d. Feeding either *L. acidophilus* BG2FO4 or *P. freudenreichii* P-63 did not affect daily gain, dry matter intake (DMI), or feed efficiency. These authors suggested that growth performance of finishing cattle could be improved by targeting the appropriate DFM to a particular phase of production. Also, Krehbiel et al. (2003) summarized results of many reports and suggested that feeding bacterial DFM to feedlot cattle results in a 2.5 to 5% increase in daily gain and an approximately 2% improvement in feed efficiency, whereas DMI was inconsistent. In studies reviewed, carcass weight was generally increased by 6 to 7 kg.

Another role for DFM in case of feedlot cattle is reduction of *Escherichia coli* from GIT. The species of *E. coli* O157:H7 are commonly isolated from feedlot cattle. Feedlot cattle have been recognized as a host for *E. coli* O157:H7. This organism appears to be confined to the GIT and is shed in feces. Many studies suggested the possible application of bacterial DFM to reduce fecal shedding of *E. coli* O157:H7 from cattle. Based on those results, supplementing feed for cattle with certain DFM might decrease the incidence of *E. coli* O157:H7 in feedlot cattle. An increase in VFA, especially acetate, correlated with the reducing of *E. coli* O157:H7. For example, Ohya et al. (2000) used LAB of *Streptococcus bovis* LC86 and *Lactobacillus gallinarum* LCB 12 to eliminate *E. coli* O157:H7 from experimentally infected Holstein calves.

### 5. Conclusion

It could be indicated that supplying DFM can contribute to the ability of the rumen ecosystem to manage lactic acid production and utilization can be beneficial, even for animals that do not have clinical acidosis.
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