# QUALITY OF COMPLETE FEED SILAGE WITH THE ADITION OF CONCENTRATE CONTAINING RAMI WASTE OF DIFFERENT ENSILAGE TIME

by Emi Susanti

**Submission date:** 01-Apr-2023 08:18PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 2052841988

**File name:** ISAINI 2017.pdf (408.38K)

Word count: 3734

Character count: 16996



#### **QUALITY OF COMPLETE FEED SILAGE WITH THE ADITION OF** CONCENTRATE CONTAINING RAMI WASTE OF DIFFERENT ENSILAGE TIME

Emmy Susanti, Munasik, Khafid Syarif Abdullah and Pinky Hutama Faculty of Animal Science, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto

#### ABSTRACT

This study aimed to test the quality of complete feed consisted of field grass and concentrate containing ramie leaf waste in the balance and different length of ensilage time. The treatments of this study were forage to concentrate ratios; 40% of concentrate: 60% of silage; 50% of concentrate: 50% of silage 2nd 60% of concentrate: 40% of silage, and duration of ensilage; 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks. The experimental design in this study was a completely randomized design of factorial pattern. Each research unit was repeated three times. Physical qualities that were observed were: color, arouz, texture, yield weight, fungus. Complete feed temperature did not show any interaction (P> 0.05) but it was highly significant at pH (P <0.01). The interaction of both treatments had an effect on DM, CF, CP, Free-N extract and lactic acid (P <0.01). Forage to concentrate ratio had a very significant effect on texture quality, DM, ash, CFt, CF, CP, N-free extract, and lactic acid (P < 0.01) and significant effect on color, aroma and texture (P < 0.05). The duration of ensilage had significant effect on all variables except on CFt and CP (P> 0,05). The interaction of forage treatment and the concentration of ensilage occurs in almost all chemical qualities but not on the physical quality of feed.

**Key words:** forage, concentrate, ensilage, complete feed, ramie.

#### INTRODUCTION

The goat's main feed is mainly forage. Forage production is very fluctuating when the rainy season of abundant production with low dry matter content (DM). On the contrary, during the dry season, production is low but with higher production of DM. The condition shows fluctuations in the quality of forage provided by the farmers, which resulted in the low quality of feed consumed by goats. The search for forage sources that can cope with fluctuations in the availability of forage feed is a responsibility that must be resolved soon. The settlement includes the use of feed technology. Forage crops that have such potential include ramie. The use of ramie plant waste can be as an alternative to improving the quality of goat feed because of its nutrient content.

Rami (Boehmerianivea L Gaud) is a bush-producing shrub with forage production of 93-97% of total crop production (Sastrosupadi et al., 2004) as waste. The composition of DM of ramie is; leaves 22.0%, CP 24.3%, CF 23.0%, CFt 2.9%, ash 2.5% and N-free extract 27.4% (DM basis) but deficient of methionine amino acid (1.27 %), P mineral (0.16%) and Cu (0.69 mg) (Duarte et al., 1997). Ramie plants are harvested once every 50 - 60 days throughout the year (Suratman, 1986). Production of fresh ramie leaf waste is 3.000kg / ha / harvest (Santoso, 2003). Handling of ramie leaf waste requires technological applications because of its decaying nature. The character is caused by high levels of water, organic matter (OM) and CP of leaf.

Utilization of ramie leaf waste as the constituent of concentrate and then with the field grass formulated to be complete feed to have complete nutrient content according to the needs of livestock. Complete feeds are prepared using nutrient-rich ingredients so they can not be stored long after mixing. This resistance is similar to silage. Ensilage is a process of feed preservation by utilizing spontaneous microorganisms that exist in the plant and is beneficial ie lactic acid bacteria. Ensilage complete feed (Total Mixed Ration / TMR) is a simple method that potentially increases nutrient use and extends feed durability (Wongnen et al., 2009). Wongnen et al. (2009), further states that ensilage is a method that can maintain the quality of the complete feed during storage and its use can increase the intake (Yuangklang et al., 2004), and improve the digestibility of BK, BO, SK and non-structural carbohydrates (Vasupen et al., 2005; 2006). Ensilage is a consideration of the preservation technique for forage with high PK content (Man and Wiktorsson, 2002) and is increasingly popular as an effective forage preservation method (Ozturk et al., 2006). The question is, how does the physical quality change of complete feed field grass silage with the balance of concentrate to silage and at different length of ensilage?

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material used as the constituent of concentrate is leaf of ramie, cassava tuber waste, coconut meal, drops, urea, salt and mineral mix with PK 13,09 and TDN 71,47% and field grass. Complete feed was composed of forage balance: 60% concentrate: 40% (I1); 50%: 50% (I2) and 40%: 60% (I3) and ensilage for 0 (W1); 1 (W2); 2 (W3); 3 (W4) and 4 (W5) weeks. Complete feeds were placed in silos (polyethylene plastic bags). The experimental design was a Completely Randomized Design, 3X5 factorial pattern and 3 replications. The complete quality of the observed silage characters were the color, the aroma, the texture, the weight of the yield, the fungus, the pH, temperature and the chemical qualities of DM, CF, CP, CFt, ash, N-free extract,m and lactic acid. Concentrate formula and complete feed were presented in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Concentrate Formulation

| Concentrate          | %      | DM    | Ash     | EE   | CF   | CP    | N-free<br>extract | TDN   |
|----------------------|--------|-------|---------|------|------|-------|-------------------|-------|
|                      |        |       | % of DM |      |      |       |                   |       |
| Rami waste           | 20.00  | 4.40  | 0.50    | 0.58 | 4.60 | 4.86  | 5.48              | 5.48  |
| Caassava tuber waste | 36.50  | 29.82 | 0.91    | 0.07 | 0.80 | 0.29  | 34.42             | 29.91 |
| Coconut cake         | 30.00  | 25.80 | 1.92    | 3.06 | 3.63 | 6.48  | 14.91             | 25.86 |
| Mollase              | 12.00  | 7.92  | 0.61    | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14  | 11.24             | 10.23 |
| Urea                 | 0.50   | 0.50  | 0.00    | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.41  | 0.00              | 0.00  |
| Mineral mix          | 0.50   | 0.48  | 0.45    | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00              | 0.00  |
| Salt                 | 0.50   | 0.47  | 0.00    | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00              | 0.00  |
| Total                | 100.00 | 69.38 | 4.39    | 3.71 | 9.03 | 13.19 | 66.05             | 71.47 |

Table 2. Complete Feed Silage Formulation

| Feedstuff                      | %       | DM    | Ash  | EE   | CF    | СР    | N-free<br>extract | TDN   |  |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------------------|-------|--|
|                                | ,-      | 2     |      | %BK  |       |       |                   |       |  |
| Forage to concentrate o        | f 50:40 |       |      |      |       |       |                   |       |  |
| Field grass                    | 60      | 13.20 | 7.09 | 0.82 | 20.18 | 4.91  | 27.00             | 32.95 |  |
| Concentrate                    | 40      | 27.75 | 1.76 | 1.49 | 3.61  | 5.27  | 26.42             | 28.59 |  |
| Total                          | 100     | 40.95 | 8.85 | 2.30 | 23.80 | 10.18 | 53.42             | 61.54 |  |
| Forage to concentrate o        | f 50:50 |       |      |      |       |       |                   |       |  |
| Field grass                    | 50      | 11.00 | 5.91 | 0.68 | 16.82 | 4.09  | 22.50             | 27.46 |  |
| Concentrate                    | 50      | 34.69 | 2.20 | 1.86 | 4.52  | 6.59  | 33.03             | 35.74 |  |
| Total                          | 100     | 45.69 | 8.11 | 2.54 | 21.33 | 10.68 | 55.53             | 63.20 |  |
| Forage to concentrate of 40:60 |         |       |      |      |       |       |                   |       |  |
| Field grass                    | 40      | 8.80  | 4.73 | 0.55 | 13.45 | 3.27  | 18.00             | 21.97 |  |
| Concentrate                    | 60      | 41.63 | 2.64 | 2.23 | 5.42  | 7.91  | 39.63             | 42.88 |  |
| Total                          | 100     | 50.43 | 7.36 | 2.77 | 18.87 | 11.18 | 57.63             | 64.85 |  |

The physical quality test of aroma, texture and color of silage follows the instructions of Soekanto et al. (1980), pH Measurement using Naumann and Bassler (1997) procedures while proximate chemical analysis) following AOAC procedure (1994).

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result of observation on the physical quality of complete feed silage with forage balance treatment: concentrate and the length of different ensilage presented in table 3.

**Table 3.** Physical quality of complete feed silage with forage balance treatment: concentrates and length of different ensilage

| Treatment combinations | Color     | Aroma         | Texture   | Randement (%) | Fungus<br>appearance | Temperature (°C) | pH*       |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------|
| I1 W0                  | 2,93±0,32 | 2.83±0.42     | 2,73±0,15 | 100±0         | 2,93±0,38            | 33,33±0,93       | 7.84±0.47 |
| I1 W1                  | 3,13±0,31 | 3.13±0.31     | 3,13±0,25 | 98.6±0.11     | 3,30±0,26            | 30,67±0,95       | 6.55±0.23 |
| I1 W2                  | 3,80±0,10 | $3.8 \pm 0.1$ | 2,93±0,12 | 99±0.45       | 3,20±0,17            | 29,10±0,56       | 5.39±0.05 |
| I1 W3                  | 4,23±0,15 | 4.23±0.15     | 3,87±0,49 | 98.3±0.14     | 3,53±0,29            | 28,33±0,93       | 4.97±0.11 |
| I1 W4                  | 3,47±0,23 | 3.47±0.23     | 3,13±0,06 | 98.4±0.13     | 3,10±0,44            | 28,73±1,37       | 4.82±0.2  |
| I2 W0                  | 3,03±0,35 | $3.03\pm0.35$ | 3,03±0,35 | 100±0         | 2,97±0,29            | 32,87±1,82       | 7.61±0.35 |
| I2 W1                  | 3,40±0,60 | 3.43±0.55     | 3,43±0,55 | 98.8±0.41     | 3,27±0,06            | 30,37±0,55       | 5.96±0.38 |
| I2 W2                  | 3,23±0,21 | 3.23±0.21     | 3,27±0,23 | 98.2±0.48     | 3,40±0,10            | 28,53±0,95       | 5.52±0.15 |
| I2 W3                  | 3,97±0,15 | 3.97±0.15     | 3,83±0,25 | 98.1±0.14     | 3,60±0,35            | 26,93±1,46       | 5.09±0.12 |
| I2 W4                  | 3,70±0,10 | $3.7 \pm 0.1$ | 3,43±0,42 | 98.3±0.87     | 3,50±0,10            | 28,57±0,93       | 5.09±0.43 |
| I3 W0                  | 3,37±0,25 | 3.37±0.25     | 3,47±0,42 | 100±0         | 3,33±0,15            | 33,77±1,10       | 7.3±0.31  |
| I3 W1                  | 3,60±0,00 | 3.6±0         | 3,37±0,21 | 98.8±0.11     | 3,03±0,15            | 29,83±0,23       | 5.59±0.39 |
| I3 W2                  | 3,70±0,00 | 3.7±0         | 3,93±0,25 | 99.2±1.37     | 3,50±0,35            | 28,27±0,65       | 5.58±0.43 |
| I3 W3                  | 4,27±0,64 | 4.27±0.64     | 3,87±0,15 | 98.2±0.62     | 3,30±0,26            | 27,03±0,83       | 5.49±0.08 |
| I3 W4                  | 3,77±0,15 | 3.77±0.15     | 3,73±0,12 | 98.1±0.22     | 3,10±0,20            | 27,80±0,36       | 5.09±0.2  |

Description: \* There were interaction of forage treatment: concentrate and different length of ensilage

The result of variance analysis of pH silage complete feed, showed that there is very real interaction (P <0,01) between concentration forage counter and long ensilage. Concentrate forage factor did not give significant effect (P> 0,05) and on old treatment ensilage had very real influence (P <0,01) to change pH value of complete feed.

Variance analysis showed a very significant interaction (P <0.01) between concentrated forage counterpart and long ensilage on pH silage complete feed changes. This suggests that the counterweight of concentrated forage and long ensilage factors directly affect the pH silage complete feed score change. The interaction of forage concentrates and the duration of the ensilage were tested using the BNJ test. The BNJ test results showed the highest pH silage complete feed score on I1W0 interaction (7.84) and the lowest score on I1W4 interaction (4.82).

Table 3. shows that in the balance interaction 60% forage 40% concentrate with long weeks ensilage (I1W0) has the highest pH score (7.84). These results do not vary much with the interaction of I2W0 and I3W0, this proves that in 0 weeks ensilage there is no lactic acid bacteria activity so that pH silage complete feed is still high. The interaction data of the concentration forage and the duration of the ensilage indicate that the longer ensilage pH silage complete feed is decreased, this is because during the ensilage process lactic

acid formation occurs by lactic acid bacteria utilizing fermentable carbohydrates contained in the concentrate and forage. Type of fermentable carbohydrates are often used in the process of fermentation of the type of glucose. The process of formation of glucose into lactic acid Winarno (2004), namely:

The decrease in pH is relatively stopped after 3 weeks of ensilage because on the 21st day fermentation has reached a stable phase which means that lactic acid production is optimal and stop developing (Santi et al., 2012).

The result of observation on the physical quality of complete feed silage with forage balance treatment: concentrate and the length of different ensilage presented in table 5.

**Table 5.** Chemical quality of complete feed silage with forage balance treatment: Concentrate and different length of ensilage

|             | erent length |       |      |       |       |                 |       |              |
|-------------|--------------|-------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------------|
| Treatment   | DM*(%)       | Ash   | CFt  | CF*   | CP*   | N-free extract* | TDN** | Laktic acid* |
| combination | DM (70)      |       |      |       | %BK   |                 |       | Laktic acid  |
| I1W0        | 90,76        | 13,65 | 2,42 | 19,69 | 13,50 | 41,50           | 69,53 | 1,80         |
| I1W1        | 90,19        | 9,84  | 2,09 | 20,87 | 13,25 | 44,14           | 71,81 | 1,80         |
| I1W2        | 89,62        | 10,34 | 1,75 | 23,19 | 11,26 | 43,07           | 68,39 | 1,62         |
| I1W3        | 88,79        | 11,99 | 1,90 | 21,44 | 13,01 | 40,46           | 68,07 | 2,76         |
| I1W4        | 87,97        | 9,34  | 2,04 | 22,04 | 12,52 | 42,03           | 69,05 | 1,80         |
| I2W0        | 89,80        | 12,78 | 1,79 | 22,09 | 9,87  | 43,27           | 66,31 | 1,56         |
| I2W1        | 88,51        | 9,99  | 1,98 | 27,66 | 10,38 | 38,49           | 64,03 | 1,43         |
| I2W2        | 87,22        | 9,33  | 2,18 | 21,29 | 10,13 | 44,29           | 67,60 | 3,12         |
| I2W3        | 88,62        | 11,05 | 2,38 | 21,69 | 10,89 | 42,61           | 67,30 | 2,28         |
| I2W4        | 90,02        | 10,65 | 2,59 | 33,23 | 11,91 | 31,64           | 61,46 | 1,92         |
| I3W0        | 88,36        | 11,64 | 0,54 | 32,64 | 11,80 | 31,74           | 60,39 | 1,92         |
| I3W1        | 88,17        | 9,38  | 0,53 | 40,70 | 11,55 | 26,01           | 56,66 | 2,40         |
| I3W2        | 87,97        | 9,11  | 0,51 | 47,80 | 12,59 | 17,95           | 52,37 | 3,48         |
| I3W3        | 88,22        | 10,38 | 0,68 | 38,56 | 11,30 | 27,30           | 57,05 | 4,26         |
| I3W4        | 88,47        | 9,65  | 0,86 | 42,08 | 10,81 | 25,06           | 55,20 | 4,02         |

Descriptions there were interaction of forage treatment: concentrate and length of ensilage in contrast to a confidence level of P < 0.01 (\*) or P < 0.05 (\*\*).

Dry matter (DM) is a nutrient whose quantity depends on forage balance: the concentrate at once undergoes a reshuffle during the ensilage process so that after ensilage process there is a decrease of BK percentage. The initial process of fermentation is related to

the enzymatic activity of plant cells or residual respiration (Owen et al., 2002), which uses carbohydrates, especially glucose and fructose with oxygen trapped in the feed (Shao et al., 2005). Aerobic microbial activity at baseline resulted in heat up to 12 hours after mixing resulting in loss of BK (Kung et al., 2005) even loss of BK during fermentation (Owen et al., 2002). Wongnen et al. (2009), reported the fermentation process in total mixed ration (TMR) containing wholecottonseed showed a decrease of BK from 63.8% (TMR) to 61.9% fermented TMR (FTMR). The same is reported by Nishino et al. (2004), the decrease of BK in total mixed ration (FTMR).

Other nutrients, crude protein (CP) and nitrogen-free extract (N-free extract) showed a decrease in percentage after ensilage. Wongnen et al. (2009), TMR fermentation with whole cottonseed showed a decrease of CP 16.1% (TMR) to 15.7% (FTMR). The fermentation process involving microbial activity by producing proteolytic enzymes results in the degradation of proteins into ammonia (NH3-N). Microbial and plant proteolytic enzyme activity resulted in CP losses converted to NH3-N on grass silage (Kung et al., 2000).

The composition of crude fiber (SK) and lactic acid showed an increase in yield after ensilage process. The lactate acid enhancer is an indicator of the success of the ensilage as a product of lactic acid bacteria activity that grows optimally during the ensilage process. The concentration of lactic acid in the TMR was in the form of a bales of 10.4 g / kg BK (1.04% BK) to 38.0 g / kg DM (3.8% DM) at FTMR after 30 day fermentation. This ball-shaped total mixed ration decreased pH from 5.35 to 4.65 and loss of DM by 43 g / kg BK (4.3% BK) in forage proportions: concentrate of 40:60 (Wang et al., 2010).

#### CONCLUSION

The interaction of forage treatment with the concentration of ensilage occurs in almost all chemical qualities but not on the physical quality of the complete feed.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the Chairman of the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) Unsoed for providing fund for this activity through DIPA BLU UNSOED fiscal year 2016 with contract number: 2316 / UN.23.14 / PM / 2016.

#### REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C. 1994. Official Methode of Analysis. Association of Official Agricultural Chemists. Agricultural Chemicals; Contaminants and Drugs. Vol 2. Association of Official Agricultural Chemists., Inc. Virginia USA.
- Duarte, A.D., V.C. Sgarberi and R.B. Junior. 1997. Composition and nutritive value of ramie leaf flour for monogastric animals. Reviata PAB http://webnotes.sct.embrapa.br/pab/pab.nsf/1369aa7a4f8bbb9d03256508004f4e1d/d 59fc8d31a8cf5dc032565730060cd62/\$FILE/Pab05296.doc. Diunduh 10/1/2010.
- Kung, Jr.L. 2005. Aerobic stability of silages. In: Proceedings of the conference on silage for dairy farms. Harrisburg http://ag.udel.edu/faculty/kung/documents/05AerobicStability.pdf (cited 19.01.12)
- Kung, Jr. L., J.R. Robinson, N.K. Ranjit, J.H. Chen, C.M. Golt and C.D.Pesek. 2000. Microbial populations, fermentation end products and aerobic stability of corn silage treated with ammonia or a propionic acid-based preservative. J. Dairy Sci. 83:1479-1486.
- Man, N.V. and H. Wiktorsson. 2002. Effect of molasses on nutritional quality of cassava and gliricidia tops silage. Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 15(9):1294 – 1299.
- Naumann, C. dan R. Bassler.1997. VDLUFA-Methodenbuch Band III, Die chemische Untersuchung von Futtermitteln. 3rd ed. VDLUFA-Verlag, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Nishino, N., H. Wada, M. Yoshida and H. Shiota. 2004. Microbial counts, fermentation products and aerobic stability of whole crop corn and a total mixed ration ensiled with and without inoculation of Lactobacillus casei or Lactobacillus buchneri. J. Dairy Sci. 87:2563-2570.
- Owen, V.N., K.A. Albrecht and R.E. Muck. 2002. Protein degradation and fermentation characteristics of unwilted red clover and alfafa silage harvested at various times during the day. Grass Forage Sci. 57:329-341.
- Ozturk, D., M. Kizilsimek, A. Kamalak, O. Canbolat and C.O. Ozkan. 2006. Effects of ensiling alfalfa with whole-crop maize on the chemical compositon and nutritive value of silage mixtures. Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 19(4):526-532.
- Santi, R.K., D. Fatmasari, S. D. Widyawati, dan W. P. S. Suprayogi. 2012. Kualitas dan Nilai Kecernaan In Vitro Silase Batang Pisang (Musa paradisiaca) dengan Penambahan Beberapa Akselerator. Tropical Animal Husbandry. Universitas Sebelas Maret. Surakarta. Vol. 1 (1).
- Sastrosupadi, A., B. Santoso dan S. Supadi. 2004. Agribisnis Rami. Informasi Tehnis No. 25/03/2004. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pertanian. Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Perkebunan. Balai Penelitian Tanaman Tembakau dan Serat. Malang.
- Santoso, B. 2003. Peluang Usaha tani Rami dengan Proses Mikrobiologi. Balai Penelitian Tanaman Serat. Ciawi. Bogor.
- Shao, T., Z.X. Zhang, M. Shimojo, T. Wang and Y. Masuda. 2005. Comparison of fermentation characteristics of Italian ryegrass (Lolium multiflorum Lam.) and guineagrass (Panicum maximum Jacq.) during the early stage of ensiling. Asian-Austr. J. Anim. Sci. 18:1727-1734.

- Soekanto, L., P. Subur, M. Soegoro, U. Riastianto, Muridan, Soedjadi, Soewondo, R. M.Toha, Soediyo, S. Purwo, Musringan, M. Sahari, dan Astuti. 1980. Laporan Proyek Konservasi Hijauan Makanan Ternak Jawa Tengah. Direktorat Bina Produksi, Direktorat Jenderal Peternakan, Departemen Pertanian dan Fakultas Peternakan Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta
- Steel, R. G. D. and J. H. Torrie, 1995. Prinsip dan Prosedur Statistika. Terjemahan Oleh. B. Sumantri. IPB. PT. Gramedia. Jakarta.
- Suratman. 1986. Penelitian rami (Boehmeria nivea L.). Jurnal Litbang Pertanian V (1): 27-30. Badan Litbang Pertanian. Bogor.
- Vasupen, K., C. Yuangklang, S. Witayakun and Srinanuan. 2005. Effect of Difference Moisture on Quality of Fermented Total Mixed Ration. In: Proceeding of the Technical Conference of 43th Kasetsart University, Bangkok.
- Vasupen, K., C. Yuangklang, C. Sarnklong, S. Wongsuthavas, J. Matchaothai and P. Srenanul. 2006. Effects of total mixed ration and fermented total mixed ration on voluntary feed intake, digestion nutrition digestibility and milk production in lactating dairy cows. In: Proceedings of the Technical Conference of 44<sup>th</sup>. Kasetsart University, Bangkok.
- Wang, J., J.Q. Wang, D.P. Bu, W.J. Guo, Z.T. Song and J.Y. Zhang. 2010. Effect of storing total mixed rations anaerobically in bales on feed quality. Animal Feed Science and Technology 161:94-102.
- Winarno, F.G. 2004. Kimia Pangan dan Gizi. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Wongnen, C., C. Wachirapakorn, C. Patipan, D. Panpong, K. Kongweha, N. Namsaen, P. Gunun and C. Yuangklang. 2009. Effects of fermented total mixed ration and cracked cottonseed on milk yield and milk composition in dairy cows. Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 22(12):1625 - 1632.
- Yuangklang, C., K. Vasupen, S. Wittyakun, P. Srinanaun and C. Sukho. 2004. Effects of total mixed ration and fermented total mixed ration on feed intake, ruminal fermentation, nutrient digestibility and blood metabolite in dairy cows. In: Proceedings of 11st AAAP Conggres "New dimensions and challenges for sustainable livestock farming" The Asian-Australian Association of Animal Production Societies, Kuala Lumpur Malaysia.

## QUALITY OF COMPLETE FEED SILAGE WITH THE ADITION OF CONCENTRATE CONTAINING RAMI WASTE OF DIFFERENT ENSILAGE TIME

| ENSILAGE HIVE               | <u>-</u>   |                                  |                 |        |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| ORIGINALITY REPORT          |  |                                  |                 |        |
| 6%<br>SIMILARITY INDEX      | 4% INTERNET SOURCES  | 2% PUBLICATIONS                  | O%<br>STUDENT I | PAPERS |
| PRIMARY SOURCES             |  |                                  |                 |        |
| Baccioli, a<br>economi      | Briola, Roberto<br>Andrea Fino, Al<br>c analysis of a r<br>abled by two-ph<br>2021 | do Bischi. "Th<br>novel trigener | ermo-<br>ation  | 1 %    |
| eprints2. Internet Source   | undip.ac.id  |                                  |                 | 1 %    |
| e-century Internet Source   |  |                                  |                 | <1%    |
| 4 repositor Internet Source | ry.ipb.ac.id:808   | 0                                |                 | <1%    |
| ajas.info Internet Source   | •  |                                  |                 | <1%    |
| O                           | e, J. Sindou, F.<br>lier, D. Thévend   |                                  |                 | <1%    |

processing and strategies to prevent

### persistence of undesirable microorganisms", Animal Feed Science and Technology, 2013

Publication

| 7  | ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id Internet Source    | <1% |
|----|---|-----|
| 8  | ia902805.us.archive.org                     | <1% |
| 9  | nexusacademicpublishers.com Internet Source | <1% |
| 10 | download.atlantis-press.com Internet Source | <1% |
| 11 | edepot.wur.nl Internet Source               | <1% |
| 12 | openaccess.ahievran.edu.tr Internet Source  | <1% |
| 13 | ejournal.unsri.ac.id Internet Source        | <1% |

Exclude quotes Off
Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches

Off