

Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports

Volume 0
Issue 10 *Swine Day (1968-2014)*

Article 281

1983

Influence of alfalfa addition to sow diets

D S. Pollmann

S M. Dennis

R R. LaForge

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr>



Part of the [Other Animal Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pollmann, D S.; Dennis, S M.; and LaForge, R R. (1983) "Influence of alfalfa addition to sow diets," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 0: Iss. 10. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.6121>

This report is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. Copyright 1983 the Author(s). Contents of this publication may be freely reproduced for educational purposes. All other rights reserved. Brand names appearing in this publication are for product identification purposes only. No endorsement is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products not mentioned. K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



K**S****INFLUENCE OF ALFALFA ADDITION TO SOW DIETS****D. Steven Pollmann, Scott M. Dennis and Robert R. LaForge****U**

Summary

Twenty-four sows were utilized to evaluate the influence of a high fiber diet on nutrient digestibility and hindgut bacterial populations and volatile fatty acid (VFA) concentrations. Sows were fed either a control of milo-soybean meal or a 50% sun-cured alfalfa diet. The addition of alfalfa decreased ($P < .05$) energy, nitrogen and fiber utilization as compared to the control diet. Alfalfa-fed sows, after a 90-day adaptation, were able to utilize more cellulose and crude fiber, which contributed to slight improvement in energy utilization. Bacterial populations and VFA concentrations in the hindgut were altered when sows were fed a 50% alfalfa diet. Therefore, these results indicate that alfalfa, if cost effective, can be added to sow diets.

Introduction

Feed represents the major cost of producing swine and about 25% of the total feed costs in a farrow-to-finish operation is attributed to maintaining the breeding herd. Thus, anything that can be done to reduce breeding herd feed costs without sacrificing production will improve the economic picture for swine producers. When conventional feeds (grain and soybean meal) are in question because of price or availability, alternate feedstuffs, such as forages, may be considered. Of all the forage crops presently grown, alfalfa appears to have the most potential as an alternative feedstuff for gestating sows.

Therefore, this study was conducted to evaluate the effect of adding alfalfa to sow diets on nutrient digestibility and hindgut bacterial populations and volatile fatty acids (VFA) concentrations.

Experimental Procedures

Twelve sows (2nd parity) per treatment were fed isocaloric (approximately 5000 kcal of metabolizable energy per day) diets of either a control of milo-soybean meal or a 50% sun-cured alfalfa diet formulated to have similar nutrient intakes (table 1). The treated group received 2.2 pounds of sun-cured alfalfa pellets and 2.2 pounds of supplement daily and the control group received 3.7 pounds of the milo-soybean meal diet per day.

Digestion studies were conducted at 30, 60 and 90 days after the initiation of the treatments. Catheters were inserted into sows' bladders to facilitate urine collection. Fecal collections for five successive days were initiated after the appearance of ferric oxide marker in the feces. Digestibility coefficients (%) were calculated for energy, crude fiber, hemicellulose, cellulose and nitrogen. Four sows per treatment were killed at the end of each collection period and lower digestive tracts were excised for bacteria enumeration and analysis of VFA

concentrations. Whole cecum and a section of the colon (approximately 3 inches anterior and posterior to apex) were ligated and excised. Fecal samples also were collected from the distal colon and/or rectum. Concentrations of bacteria were enumerated with a complete medium and four differential carbohydrate media (starch, glucose, cellobiose, and xylan). The percentage of bacteria utilizing a specific carbohydrate was determined by comparing the counts to total count of the complete medium. Samples were taken also for VFA analyses from the cecum, colon, and feces.

Results and Discussion

In table 2, the chemical analyses of the two diets are shown. Crude protein, ether extract (fat), calcium, and phosphorus were similar between the two diets. The crude fiber level was substantially higher for the alfalfa diet compared to the control (17.3 versus 3.1%). The fiber components (hemicellulose, cellulose, and lignin) also were greater for the alfalfa treatment.

The addition of alfalfa decreased ($P < .05$) the digestibility of nitrogen, energy, crude fiber, hemicellulose, and cellulose (table 3). Sows on the alfalfa diet had a negative nitrogen balance (-1.1 gram of nitrogen retented per day) and those on the control diet had a positive balance (9.0 grams per day). The digestibility energy value of the control was 40% greater than the alfalfa diet (1197 vs. 1681 kcal per pound). The alfalfa-fed sows, after the 90-day adaptation, were able to utilize more cellulose and crude fiber, which contributed to a slight improvement in the energy utilization.

By feeding alfalfa to sows the total VFA concentrations were not affected in the cecum and colon but were significantly increased in the feces (table 4). The total VFA concentrations were increased in the colon at day 90 for the alfalfa-fed sows. Acetic and propionic acid levels were increased in the colon and feces of sows consuming the alfalfa diet. Butyric levels in the feces were greater for sows on the alfalfa diet, but butyric levels were greater in the cecum of sows on the control diet.

Although the alfalfa addition decreased ($P < .05$) the total bacteria count (dry basis), bacteria populations (table 5) that utilize glucose, cellobiose, and xylan were increased ($P < .05$). There were no differences among locations of bacterial populations utilizing the various carbohydrate substrates. This indicates that feces could be used as an effective indicator of hindgut bacteria population in sows. The percentage of bacteria able to utilize cellulose (cellobiose) and hemicellulose (xylan) increased with time, which correlates with fiber utilization data.

Therefore, the results of this study indicate that alfalfa, if cost effective, can be added to sow diets. By feeding sows a 50% alfalfa diet, an alteration in the hindgut bacterial populations and VFA concentrations will be evident.

Table 1. Composition of Diets

Ingredient, %	Control	Alfalfa
Grain sorghum	79.8	41.8
Alfalfa, sun-cured pellets	--	50.0
Soybean meal, 44%	15.5	5.5
Dicalcium phosphate	2.5	.7
Monosodium phosphate	--	1.1
Limestone	1.1	--
Salt	.5	.3
Vitamin premix	.5	.5
Trace mineral premix	<u>.1</u>	<u>.1</u>
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

Table 2. Analyzed Chemical Composition of Diets

Item, %	Alfalfa	Control
Crude protein	16.2	17.4
Ether extract	2.8	2.8
Ash	9.3	6.2
Crude fiber	17.3	3.1
Nitrogen free extract	35.6	48.7
Cell wall	35.0	15.4
Acid detergent fiber	21.3	7.6
Hemicellulose	13.7	7.9
Cellulose	16.7	4.9
Lignin	5.0	2.5
Calcium	1.2	1.1
Phosphorus	.8	.9

Table 3. Effect of Alfalfa Addition on Nutrient Digestibility

Item	Period, Days	Treatment		SE ^f
		Control	Alfalfa	
N-digestibility, % ^a	30	80.1	59.8	3.5
	60	80.3	52.3	
	90	80.5	53.7	
	Average	<u>80.3</u>	<u>55.3</u>	
Digestible energy, % ^{abd}	30	85.1	61.5	1.7
	60	85.2	56.3	
	90	87.4	63.6	
	Average	<u>85.9</u>	<u>60.5</u>	
Crude fiber, % ^{abc}	30	77.9	36.0	3.1
	60	74.5	28.8	
	90	79.8	41.5	
	Average	<u>77.4</u>	<u>35.4</u>	
Hemicellulose, % ^a	30	81.6	68.2	5.1
	60	87.8	65.1	
	90	91.7	74.2	
	Average	<u>87.0</u>	<u>69.2</u>	
Cellulose, % ^{abcde}	30	86.2	47.5	2.5
	60	82.8	45.4	
	90	85.8	60.9	
	Average	<u>84.9</u>	<u>51.3</u>	

^aTreatment effect (P < .05)^bPeriod effect (P < .05)^cPeriod quad (P < .05)^dPeriod linear (P < .05)^eTreatment by period interaction (P < .05)^fStandard error

Table 4. Effect of Alfalfa Addition on VFA Concentrations

Item, mmoles	Period	Treatment:	Control			Alfalfa			SE
		Location:	Cecum	Colon	Feces	Cecum	Colon	Feces	
Total VFA ^{abcd}	30		17.65	18.33	12.16	15.90	15.92	13.74	.92
	60		14.26	9.23	6.00	15.45	9.08	13.95	
	90		17.41	13.51	10.26	14.06	16.17	14.90	
	Average		16.44	13.69	9.47	15.13	13.37	14.92	
Acetic ^{bc}	30		11.32	11.40	8.81	11.71	10.44	8.66	1.23
	60		10.28	5.76	3.63	11.58	6.19	8.25	
	90		12.93	8.55	6.29	11.34	10.13	8.87	
	Average		11.51	8.57	6.24	11.54	8.92	8.59	
Propionic ^{abcd}	30		3.92	3.99	1.98	2.71	3.22	3.31	
	60		2.57	2.00	1.24	2.72	2.00	3.94	
	90		3.33	3.14	2.38	2.17	3.88	3.99	
	Average		3.27	3.04	1.87	2.53	3.03	3.75	
Butyric ^{abcd}	30		1.74	2.08	.89	1.03	1.56	1.27	.16
	60		1.16	.97	.57	.95	.74	1.05	
	90		1.07	1.38	.77	.53	1.77	1.41	
	Average		1.32	1.48	.74	.84	1.36	1.24	
Minor ^{abd}	30		.68	.86	.48	.44	.69	.50	.05
	60		.25	.51	.55	.20	.15	.71	
	90		.09	.44	.81	.02	.40	.62	
	Average		.34	.60	.61	.22	.41	.61	

^aPeriod effect (P < .05)^bLocation effect (P < .05)^cTreatment x location interaction (P < .05)^dPeriod x location interaction (P < .05)

Table 5. Effect of Alfalfa Addition on Microbial Populations

Item, mmoles	Period	Control			Alfalfa			SE
		Cecum	Colon	Feces	Cecum	Colon	Feces	
Total count, 10^{6abc} on dry basis	30	17.2	38.2	-	2.6	10.0	23.0	8.6
	60	14.0	35.9	37.3	11.0	24.3	28.4	
	90	15.2	46.4	79.2	23.5	41.6	49.9	
	Average	15.5	40.2	58.3	12.4	25.3	33.8	
Glucose, % ^{ad}	30	68.0	74.7	-	73.0	83.1	74.6	4.0
	60	71.3	65.8	68.7	64.7	68.4	74.6	
	90	57.9	67.8	63.7	79.9	78.8	78.4	
	Average	65.7	69.5	66.2	72.5	76.8	75.9	
Starch ^{ac}	30	69.1	74.3	-	53.8	70.1	55.5	4.9
	60	75.2	81.2	78.0	68.9	71.7	66.4	
	90	74.9	84.6	85.1	78.8	78.8	78.5	
	Average	73.0	80.0	81.6	67.2	73.5	66.8	
Xylan % ^{acd}	30	42.4	37.9	-	73.1	57.1	58.2	4.0
	60	50.1	53.1	53.6	64.2	70.5	74.2	
	90	43.3	50.5	48.5	79.1	81.0	74.1	
	Average	45.2	47.1	51.1	72.1	69.5	68.8	
Cellobiose ^{ac}	30	45.7	40.7	-	76.9	66.4	67.1	4.4
	60	44.5	50.5	48.3	67.0	73.4	74.2	
	90	51.3	51.6	62.4	83.8	84.5	83.8	
	Average	47.2	47.6	55.4	75.9	74.8	75.0	

^aTreatment effect (P < .05)^bLocation effect (P < .05)^cPeriod effect (P < .05)^dTreatment by period interaction (P < .05)