

1 **Influence of bitter lupin on consumption and digestibility in organic dairy cattle soya bean**
2 **free diets.**

3
4 **G. Lorenzini¹, A. Martini¹, C. Lotti¹, M. Casini², S. Gemini¹, F. Riccio¹, S. Squilloni¹,**
5 **A. Rovida¹, R. Tocci¹**

6
7 ¹ Dipartimento di Scienze Zootecniche, Università degli Studi di Firenze.

8 ² Cooperativa Agricola Emilio Sereni, Borgo San Lorenzo (FI).

9
10 *Corresponding Author:* G. Lorenzini, Via delle Cascine 5, 50144 Firenze. +390553288357.
11 g.lorenzini@unifi.it

12
13 **ABSTRACT:** One of the main principles of organic husbandry is that animal feed must be GMO
14 free, and soya bean is well-known as a high risk GMO alimentary source. About 25 dry dairy cattle
15 of the Italian Holstein breed, from the Cooperativa Emilio Sereni of Borgo S. Lorenzo (FI), were
16 fed in two successive diets: the first with extruded soya bean (A), and the second in which bitter
17 lupin, faba bean and proteinic pea substituted the soya bean (B). We evaluated both the
18 consumption and the apparent digestibility (using acid insoluble ash as internal marker) of the two
19 diets, repeating the trial twice. The presence of bitter lupin did not influence either the consumption
20 of other feed, or the faecal water content. The apparent digestibility of the organic matter resulted
21 satisfactory in both the diets, but was significantly higher in diet (A) than in diet (B) (71,6% vs.
22 67,3%). In conclusion, even though we wish the cultivation of sweet lupin would be increase in
23 Italy, we retain that also bitter lupin (mixed with other feed to increase the palatability) could be
24 used as alternative protein source in dairy cattle diets.

25
26 *Keywords:* Bitter lupin, Organic dairy cattle, Apparent digestibility, GMO

27 **Introduction** – One of the main principles of organic animal production is that the feedstuffs of
28 animals are GMO free (European Commission, 1999). The GMO contamination risk is particularly
29 present in dairy cattle nutrition, where soya bean is used to attain the high protein values required
30 by the animals. The solution could be represented by other legumes such as lupin that has a DM yield
31 in grain of 1300 kg/ha and a crude protein (CP) content of 30 - 35 % (on DM) whereas soya bean, a
32 high risk GMO supplement, has a DM yield in grain of 2784 kg/ha and 40 - 41% of CP (on DM).
33 In fact, lupin is one proteinaceous species that appears more interesting and promising for its high
34 content in proteins. Although sweet lupin is widely used in Northern Europe and other large areas
35 of the world, in Italy it is not widely cultivated and it is difficult to obtain. For this reason in this
36 work we were limited to the use of bitter lupin from the province of Viterbo. However, it is well-
37 known that bitter lupin contains alkaloids and anti-nutritional factors (Singh et al., 1994; El-Adawy
38 et al., 2001). Since the cattle refused the addition of pure bitter lupin to the rations, and it was not
39 possible to soak the bitter lupin the day before, in order to eliminate the alkaloids accountable of the
40 bitter flavour (as it is usually performed by shepherds before giving it to sheep), it was necessary to
41 crush and mix the lupin with faba bean and proteinic pea, to make it more appealing to the animals.
42 The aim of this work was to evaluate whether there were changes in feed consumption, in the
43 consistency of faeces and in digestibility, by replacing soya bean in the ration of organic dairy cattle
44 with different legumes: bitter lupin mixed with faba bean and proteinic pea. Such test was useful as
45 a “forerunner” for a successive trial on the utilization of bitter lupin on lactating dairy cattle.

46
47 **Material and methods** – In spring 2006, a trial was carried out on dry dairy cattle using rations
48 with bitter lupin. For this trial the entire group of dry dairy cattle (about 25 animals) of the Italian
49 Holstein breed from the Cooperativa Agricola Emilio Sereni of Borgo S. Lorenzo (FI) were used.
50 The cattle were fed for 15 days diets with extruded soya bean (1 kg TM) (A) or bitter lupin (0,3 kg

51 TM) mixed with faba bean and proteinic pea (0,7 kg TM) (B). The diets have the same nutritional
 52 value (0,69 UFL/kg DM), but the diet A, by comparison with the B, where we substituted the same
 53 quantity of soya bean with others Legumes, has a slighter higher CP content (9,16% vs. 8,24%)
 54 (table 1). The farm adopts an intentionally low protein level in the diet of dry cattle, because, in this
 55 way, it has verified a reduction of sanitary problems during the drying period and at the calving.
 56 The trial, A versus B, was repeated twice, using all available dry dairy cattle. Every day both the
 57 administered diets and the residues were weighed to evaluate the consumption. The first 10 days
 58 were considered adaptation time and hence only the last 5 days were considered to calculate the
 59 intake. During the last day of the cycle, individual samples of faeces were collected to evaluate the
 60 dry matter (DM) of the faeces, and the apparent digestibility of both dry matter (DMd) and organic
 61 matter (OMd), using acid insoluble ash (AIA) as internal marker (Antongiovanni et Gualtieri,
 62 2002). All the aliments of the diet were analyzed in order to determine the bromathological
 63 composition: DM, organic matter (OM), crude fibre (CF), CP, ether extract (EE) and the content in
 64 AIA with the method described by Martillotti et al (1987) (table 1).
 65 For the faecal samples only the DM, the OM and the AIA were determined. The data on the
 66 consumption of the last five days of the trial were analyzed with ANOVA, using as a fixed factor
 67 the type of diet, in order to determine possible differences in consumption between the treatments.
 68 ANOVA, fixed factor type of diet, was used to evaluate, for each repetition of A vs. B and in total,
 69 also the faecal DM and the apparent digestibility of both the DM and OM (SAS, 2002).

70
 71 **Results and conclusions** – In table 1 we reported the bromathological composition of two diets.

72
 73 Table 1. Diets composition.

Diets	Total Matter (TM) kg		DM kg		CF % DM		CP % DM		EE % DM		Ash % DM	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
May hay	11.0	11.0	9.4	9.4	31.6	31.6	7.2	7.2	1.5	1.5	6.9	6.9
Straw	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	45.0	45.0	3.7	3.7	1.3	1.3	6.3	6.3
Bitter lupin	-	0.3	-	0.3	-	15.0	-	34.0	-	8.7	-	3.7
Faba bean + Proteinic pea	-	0.7	-	0.6	-	5.1	-	26.4	-	1.4	-	3.6
Extruded soya bean	1.0	-	0.9	-	6.8	-	39.6	-	6.1	-	12.3	-
Total	14.0	14.0	12.1	12.0	31.6	31.8	9.2	8.2	1.8	1.6	7.2	6.5

74
 75 As far as the consumption of the alimentary sources was concerned, significant differences between
 76 the two diets were not found, for the intake of the different feedstuffs (table 2). From this result, it
 77 seems possible to speculate that addition of bitter lupin to diets of dry cattle, did not affect the DM
 78 intake. We observed that animals fed with extruded soya bean (A) consumed the feedstuff quickly,
 79 whereas more time was required for the animals fed with bitter lupin, proteinic pea and faba bean
 80 (B).

81 Table 2: Consumption of alimentary sources (results of ANOVA).

Diets	May hay			Straw			Bitter lupin		F.bean + Proteinic pea		Extruded S. bean		Total		sign
	A	B	sign	A	B	sign	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	
TMkg	11.3	10.9	ns	2.1	2.0	ns	-	0.3	-	0.7	1.1	-	14.4	13.9	ns
DMkg	9.6	9.3	ns	1.8	1.8	ns	-	0.3	-	0.6	1.0	-	12.4	11.9	ns
DM%	77.2	77.8	ns	14.6	14.7	ns	-	2.3	-	5.3	8.2	-	100.0	100.0	-

82 ns = not significative

83 As shown in table 3, the water content in the faeces was not significantly influenced by the diet.
 84 Concerning the apparent digestibility of the two rations, calculated by using the AIA as an internal
 85 marker, there were no significant differences during the first trial, even if the apparent digestibility
 86 seemed to be slightly higher in diet B. Significant differences were shown during the second trial
 87 and considering both trials together: results showed that diet A was more digestible (4%) than diet
 88 B. An explanation for this result could be due to the presence of alkaloids and antinutritional factors
 89 in bitter lupin, even though the levels of apparent digestibility of the diet B resulted good. To have
 90 an idea, even if approximative, of the synergistic effect of the various aliments of the rations on
 91 apparent digestibility, we also tried to calculate the weighted average of the theoretic digestibility of
 92 organic matter of the two diets using the data evaluated by INRA for each aliment (Sauvant et al.,
 93 2002). The values shown are very similar for both the diets (A = 55.2% vs. B = 55.3%) even if
 94 clearly lower to the apparent digestibility found in the present work, and this would demonstrate the
 95 positive effect of the presence of proteinaceous feed, particularly soya bean.
 96 The OMD could be influenced also by the low protein level adopted in this trial, but, as reported
 97 above, we followed the choices of the organic farm where the trial was carried out.

98
 99 Table 3: Faecal DM and digestibility (results of ANOVA):

Diets	1st Trial - DF = 41			2nd Trial - DF = 55			Total - DF = 98		
	A	B	sign	A	B	sign	A	B	sign
Faeces DM%	12.9	13.2	ns	13.4	13.9	ns	13.2	13.5	ns
DMd %	62.5	65.8	ns	73.1	65.1	***	69.4	65.5	**
OMd %	64.8	67.8	ns	75.1	66.7	***	71.6	67.3	**

100 ns = not significative; ** P<0,01; *** P<0,001.

101
 102 In conclusion, bitter lupin, when mixed to make it more palatable (even when not soaked to remove
 103 the alkaloids), could be an interesting legume for the formulation of diet in organic dairy cattle
 104 nutrition both to avoid the GMO contamination risk and as a good alternative to soya bean. The
 105 result of this trial, could also be used to convince the breeder that soya bean is not better than
 106 lupin or faba bean only because the animals eat these Legumes with avidity.

107
 108
 109 *The Authors want to thank the Cooperativa Agricola Emilio Sereni for its collaboration.*

110 The research was supported by Marche Region (inter-regional Equizoobio project on organic
 111 animal production).

112
 113 **REFERENCES** – **Antongiovanni**, M., Gualtieri, M., 2002. Nutrizione e alimentazione animale.
 114 Edagricole, Bologna, Italy. **El-Adawy**, T.A., Rahma, E.H., El-Bedawey, A.A., Gafar, A.F., 2001.
 115 Nutritional potential and functional properties of sweet and bitter lupin seed protein isolates. Food
 116 Chemistry. 74:455–462. **European Commission**, 1999. Council Regulation on Organic Livestock
 117 Production 1804/1999 of 19 July 1999 supplementing regulation (EEC) No 2092/91. Committee of
 118 the European Communities, Bruxelles, Belgium. **Martillotti**, M., Antongiovanni, M., Rizzi, L.,
 119 Santi, E., Bittante, G., 1987. Metodi di analisi per la valutazione degli alimenti d'impiego
 120 zootecnico. Quaderni metodologici n. 8. CNR-IPRA, Roma, Italy. **SAS**, 2002. User's Guide:
 121 Statistics, Version 8.2. SAS institute. Inc. Cary, NC, USA. **Sauvant**, D., Perez, J.M., Tran, G.,
 122 2002. Tables de composition et de valeur nutritive del matieres premieres destinees aux animaux
 123 d'elevage. INRA editions, Paris, France. **Singh**, C. K., Robinson, P. H., McNiven, M. A., 1995.
 124 Evaluation of raw and roasted lupin seeds as protein supplements for lactating cows. Animal Feed
 125 Science and Technology. 52:63-76.