COMPARITIVE STUDY ON DIFFERENT MIXTURES OF SILAGES ON MILK PRODUCTION, RUMEN AVTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE OF BORN KIDS IN DAIRY ZARIBI GOATS.

Saleh, M.R.M.

Animal Production Res. Institute, Agric .Research Center, Dokki, Egypt.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate milk yield, milk composition and rumen activity of Zaribi does and performance of their newly born kids when were fed different silage mixtures Eighteen Zaribi dairy goats showing healthy were divided into three similar groups (6 animal each) with average body weight 39.87kg and nearly 30-36 months of age, every kids with their dams (average BW 3.60 kg). All animals were fed concentrate feed mixture (CFM) to cover 40 % of requirements recommended by NRC (1981). Besides ad libitum berseem silage offered to R1, silage of berseem x Raygrass for R_2 and silage of berseem x Rodgrass for R_3 . The experiment lasted for 120 day.Nutrient digestibility and nutritive value were determined by digestibility trials. The obtained results of saponine residues in rations, milk, feces, urine and rumen liquor showed that there significantly (P<0.05) higher with R_1 group of all parameters than other tested groups. Moreover, feed intake of R_2 and R_3 groups were significantly(P<0.05) higher compared with R_1 As for digestion coefficients the results were revealed that all nutrients digestibility were increased gradually with R₂ and R₃ in comparison of R₁.But no differences were observed of feed intake and digestion coefficients between R2 and R3 groups . Addition to Water consumption recorded lower values with R_2 and R_3 groups than control(R_1). Ruminal pH, VFA's and ammonia-N concentrate were recorded the highest values at 3 hrs post feeding.Molar proportion of ruminal volatile fatty acid (VFA's) found that there variations between acetic, propionate, butrtate and Iso-Biotrate values and the R₂ results showed that there significant (p< 0.05) decrease in acetic, butrate and isobiotrate than those of R_1 and R_3 , as same time the propionate and valerate were gave higher value with R₂ group. Milk production as affected experimental rations showed that there were significant differences (p<0.05) in milk composition among the different tested groups. And the daily milk yield of R₂ and R₃ were significantly (p<0.05) higher than R1. Data of kids BWG sucking their mother milk illustrated that R2 and R_3 groups were significantly (p<0.05) increased compared to those in R_1 group. Thereafter the second group was recorded higher value of the total viable bacteria count than first and third groups. Economical efficiency of kids body gain , milk yield of dairy Zaribi goats based upon the differences in both growth rate and total cost. The corresponding values of the economical efficiency were 100%,123% and 119% for R1, R2 and R3 respectively.

Keyword : Different type of silages, dairy goats, milk production and constituents, performance of born kids, rumen activity and economic efficiency.

INTRODUTION

Earlier experiments have established the high intake and milk production potential of legume silages. (Castle *et al.*,1983) and (Auldist *et al.*,1999) showed the high feeding value of clover silage for dairy goats (Thomas *et al.*,1985).Other studies with red clover and alfalfa have demonstrated the superiority of legume silages in comparison with grass

silages (Hoffman et al., 1998). Shortage of the concentrate feed in Egypt is a well known problem, therefore several studies were carried out to improve the nutritive values of the preserved mixture of green forages on the form of silage or hay to increase feed quantity and participate in solution of feed shortage problem and the dramatic increase in prices of animal feed ingredients .In Egypt ,sheep and goats are less developed compared to other livestock and the commercial goat's production is an intensive basis and commercial for feed resources with human. The ruminant in Egypt was predicated to be as10.8 million animal unites in year 2010. This animals required about 15.8 million tons of TDN and 2.49 million tones of DCP (Abdelhamid et al., 2001). The available conventional feed resources could cover only 84% and 89% of the required TDN and DCP, respectively (Abou Akkada 1984). However, feeding Egyptian berseem in green forage crops mixtures led to Saponine as considering anti nutritional factor and affected performance of ruminants and pigs (Patil et al., 1972). Harmful of saponine effect on cell membranes permeabilisation and other membrane. Saponins have long been known to action on erythrocyte membranes and this property has been used for their detection, (Plock et al., 2001).

The aim of the study is to investigate the effect of feeding the different silage mixtures types on milk yield, milk composition and rumen activity in Zaribi does and performance of their newly born kids.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted to evaluate the effect of mixtures of green forages on milk production, ruminal microorganisms activity and body gain of born kids sucking their mother milk in dairy Zaribi goats.

Experimental animals and rations

Eighteen Zaribi dairy does were divided into three similar groups (6 animal each) with average body weight 39.87 kg and nearly 30-36 months of age, every kid with her dam (average BW 3.60 kg). Each group was housed in a separate wall-ventilated pen. Animals were weighed at the beginning and at biweekly intervals thereafter. All animals were fed concentrate feed mixture (CFM)to cover 40% of requirements recommended by NRC(1981). Besides ad libitum berseem silage to R₁, silage of berseem x Raygrass for R₂ and silage of berseem x Rodgrass for R₃.Daily rations were offered to animals in two equal meals at 8 am and 4 pm.Feed intake and feces were recorded daily, Chemical analysis of the concentrate feed mixture, EBSxRay grass and EBSxRod grass and experimental rations are shown in(Table1).Clean water was permanently available throughout the experimental period to provide the production requirements.Whereas the feed and water consumption was daily measure-ed.Feed samples were prepared and keep for analyzed.Concentrate feed mixture.(CFM) consists of 36% yellow corn, 30% undecortecated cotton seed, 27% wheat bran, 3.0% molasses, 2.5 % limestone, 1% common salt and 0.5% minerals mixture.

Feces and urine collection

At experiment end three animals from each group were chosen and put in digestion boxes preliminary to feces and urine collection. The collection period was 7 days following a two weeks as preliminary period, the feces samples were collected quantities daily during the collection period. Representatively samples of fresh feces were dried and ground then mixed and kept for chemical analysis. Whereas the urine was measured daily and collected after diluted with 20 ml of conc. sulfuric acid to kept ammonia messed until nitrogen determining.

Rumen liquor samples

Rumen liquor samples were collected at the end of the digestibility trials using a rubber stomach tube before feeding(0 hr),3 and 6 hrs post-feeding .Rumen liquor samples were strained through four layers of cheese cloth at each samples time for immediate determination of rumen digital pH meter. Ammonia-N was determined in rumen liquor according to(Conway 1962).Total volatile fatty acids concentrations were determined in rumen liquor according to(Warner 1964).

Silage making

Silage was made from green forages were chopped(10-15 cm)and sun dried to reach a moisture content of about 65-70%,the silage was prepared by filling successive layers of the shopped materials and heavy trodden before adding the next layers. However, each layer was included the chopped Ray grass and Rod grass with berseem (1:1 on DM bases). All silages were put in plastic bags for 8 weeks. (Soliman, 1997).

Blood samples

Blood samples were collected from the jugular vein once before feeding (3 animals from each treatment) at the end of feeding trials. Blood samples were centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 20 minutes.Part of the separated serum was directed to enzymes activity determination, while the other part was stored frozen at -20c⁰ till the biochemical analysis. Commercial kits were used for colorimetric biochemical determinations.

Economics efficiency

Economics efficiency are calculated on bases of Selling income of (milk+ income of BWG)-coast of feed intake as following :

1-Feed cost / Kg gain (LE) = Total feed cost (LE) / BWG (kg)

2-Income over feed cost (LE) = { (milk production (kg) x price (LE) +body weight gain x price(LE) -Total feed cost (LE) Aboul Ella (2000), where price of one ton CFM =2300 LE, rice straw = 80 LE, berseem hay = 800 LE, rod grass =140 LE, ray grass =140 LE, milk = 5 LE, price of 1 kg live bod weight = 25 LE as the dominant market price in this period.

Chemical Analysis

Analyses of ingredients, CFM, Egyptian berseem (EB),rations and feces were carried out according to(A.O.A.C.2000).Fiber fractions were determined according to (Analyses of ingredients, CFM, Egyptian berseem (EB),rations and feces were carried out according(Goering and Van Soest, 1970).Plasma biochemical analysis were done using Biomerieux reagent kits.

bilirubin(Monnet 1963)Milk fat total protein, total solid, solid not fat and ash were determined according to(Ling1963). Plasma samples were used for determination of total protein(Weichselbaum ,1989),albumin(Doumas *et al.*,1971),liver enzymes(Reitman and Frankle1957)urea (Patton and Crouch 1977),creatinine(Bartil *et al.*,1971),bilirubin(Elveback,1970),Whereas hemoglobin, haematocrite(Linne and Ringsrud1992)and Saponine Oleszek (2002).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of data was performed using SAS(2003) procedures for personal computer, and the significant differences among means were detected by Duncans multiple range test (Duncan 1955).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chemical composition

The chemical composition and fiber constituents of the feed ingredients and the experimental rations are presented in Table(1).The results showed that Ray grass (R₂) and Rod grass (R₃) were higher content of CP ,CF ,EE and Ash than control group(R₁).Furthermore NFE was higher with R1 compared to R₂ and R₃ groups .In addition to the fiber fractions as well as NDF,ADF and hemicellulose were higher for R₂ and R₃ rations.Some studies reported that forages in rations should never exceed more 44% of NFC or contain less than 15% NDF.The voluntary intake of feed depends essentially on the rate of degradation of its digestible matter into particles of a size small enough to enable their passage from the reticule-rumen to the lower gut.

Table (1): Analysis of Ingredients and experimental rations fed by lactating Zaribi goats (%on dry matter basis).

láoma		dients		experimental rations					
items	CFM	BS	RYE	RO	D R ₃		3	R ₂	R ₁
DM	90.27	88.56	87.65	89.	74	90.6	68	87.92	89.17
OM	89.70	88.58	88.41	90.0)7	89.7	78	88.56	87.03
CP	13.79	13.16	17.84	14.0)9	14.1	6в	17.39*	16.58*
CF	12.50	25.14	26.74	28.0	53	16.3	34в	22.54*	21.01^
EE	1.80	2.59	3.64	2.9	3	2.5	9в	3.69 ^A	2.88ª
ASH	10.30	11.42	11.59	9.9	3	10.2	22в	11.44^	12.97*
NFE	61.61	47.69	40.19	44.4	12	56.6	<u>9</u> 4	44.94 ^B	46.56*
DCP	-	-	-	-		10.1	4в	13.38^	12.49*
SE	-	-	-	-		62.5	51^	61.17 ^в	60.10 ^в
TDN	-	-	-	-		64.2	27^	62.41 ^B	61.74 [₿]
			cellulos	ses fra	ctio	nation			
NDF					43	3. 29в		44.17^	45.63^
ADF					32	2.16 ^B 33.47 ^A		35.94^	
ADL					1	10.07 10.16		10.65	
Hemicellulos	ses				11.13 ^a 10.70 ^b		9.69 ^B		
Cellulose					22	2.09в		23.31^	25.29 ^A
NFC	NFC			26	6.74^	24.31^		20.94 ^B	
UNDF				7.61 6.62		6.62	7.82		
ANDF					3	33.92 32.52		32.52	29.81
NDS					5	8.47		60.86	62.37
RAC				4	6.78		48.53	47.91	

Saponines residues

Saponines residues was determined by method of Oleszek (2002) in both rations, milk, feces, urine and rumen liquor Table(2).Data showed that Saponines of R₁ were significantly(P<0.01) higher for ration, milk, blood, rumen liquor ,feces and urine than other rations .Saponins more action on cell membranes and hemolytic action on erythrocyte membranes (El-Izzi *et al.*,1992,Authi *et al.*,1988,Menin *et al.*,2001). Also the Saponines has harmful damage in enzymes action and have toxic effects because Saponines are inhibition of cholinesterase isoenzymes in vitro and in vivo. Moreover Saponines is a poison associated with animal rations and toxic glycoside in Egyptian berseem, medicago sativa and sugar beet. (Plohmann *et al.*,2008) reported that Saponines has enhancement effect to the Humeral immune response on blood cells, it defects the protein digestibility and growth performance this data was obtained by (Plock *et al.*,2001,Choi *et al.*,2001).

Table (2) : Saponine in both rations, milk , blood, rumen liquor, feces and urine fed by lactating Zaribi goats fed experimental rations .

Itome	g / 100 gm.)	g / 100 gm.)						
items	R ₁	R ₂	R₃					
Rations	146.82*	84.67 ^в	88.84 ^B					
MILK	22.47*	14.41 ^B	17.59 ^B					
Blood	25.66 ^A	13.39 ^B	15.59 ^в					
Rumen liquor	39.58*	32.19 ^в	36.07в					
Feces	29.52 ^A	7.34 ^в	7.38 [₿]					
Urine	24.11 ^A	5.89 ^B	6.27 ^в					

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.01).

Silage quality

Data in Table(3) showed that the silage of R₂ and R₃ rations had good quality of the tested parameters as well as pH, ammonia-N ,lactic acid and TVFA . Addition to increase value of protein and CF values and decrease of ash and NFE than control group Table (1).These results are in agreement with those reported by Abou-Akkada and Nour(1986),they indicated that the ensilage can preserve feed and improve its feeding value .

Table	(3) : Mean	values	of c	guality	parameters	of	ⁱ mixtures silages
		,					-	

v v			0
Items	R1	R ₂	R ₃
pH value	4.37	4.82	4.49
Ammonia-N(mg/100g)	23.10 ^в	24.59 ^A	24.36 ^A
Lactic acid(mg /100g)	3.28	3.96	3.59
TVFA(ME q /100g)	19.92 ^в	21.44 ^A	20.78 ^B
A sural D Massura landina differen		delation also a surre-	ware and almost flag and the

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05) .

Average daily feed intake

The criteria of dairy Zaribi goats fed different experimental rations are shown in Table(4).Group 1 had significantly (p<0.05) higher of DM intake compared to others.as same time no significant differences observed between R₂ and R₃ groups.Furthermore the water consumption was

decrease and recorded differences (p<0.05) lower with R_2 and R_3 groups in protein level and lower value of saponines content than those in R_1 .

U (,		
Items	R₃	R ₂	R ₁
Body weight (kg)	40.10	39.65	38.82
Body weight 0.75	15.93	15.80	15.55
DMI (gm /day/d)	1958^	1759 ^B	1824 ^B
DMI As% BW	4.88	4.44	4.70
DM I (gm BW ^{0.75})	122.8 ^A	111.33ª	117.30*
CPI (gm /day/d)	27.73 ^B	28.83 ^в	30.24 ^A
DM intake / kg MILK	1.33	1.10	1.13
Water consumption (MI/h/day)	2294^	2143 ^B	2068 ^B

Table(4): Feed intake and water consumption of lactating goats fed mixtures silages .(on DM basis) .

Digestion coefficients

Data of digestibility coefficients are presented in Table(5).The obtained results revealed that the DMI was decreased with R2 and R3 than R1.Moreover, the OM of R1 ration was less digested and increased gradually with R2 and R3 than R1 .Subsequently except of DM and OM observed that forages mixtures silage(FMS)in lactating Zaribi goats rations resulted in better digestion coefficients for R2 and R3 groups of all digestion nutrients parameters than R1 ration , and results were clearly that CP digestibility was increased with higher protein rations R2 and R3. This are in agreement with those reported by Leupp(2008). On the other side the fiber constituents data Indicated that digestibility coefficients of R₂ and R₃ groups were increased linearly with rations contain higher fiber level as well as Ray grass and Rod grass silages at all cell wall constituents. This may be due to the low concentration of ADL and the increase in ruminal fiber digestion that may occur with decrease of ADF content with control ration compared to second and third groups which resulted in an increase in rate of passage of digest from the rumen.(Weimer et al., 1999) they reported that increased dietary NFC is often observed to depress fiber digestion partly by depressing ruminal pH.(Hall,2001)reported that construction of ruminant rations must has potentially higher digestible fiber and non fiber carbohydrate contribution to the ration. Furthermore, the Energy concentration (ME,DE,GE and NE) of second and third rations were higher in all energy values .

Nitrogen utilization

As show in Table(6).Nitrogen intake(NI), nitrogen excretion(NE)and nitrogen digestion were increased with R₃ group than R₁ and R₂.nitrogen retention(NR) was recorded higher value for second and third experimental groups(R₂& R₃)with higher differences as a reflection of DM intake.However, fecal nitrogen (NE) was decrease with R₁ and R₂ as same time the urine nitrogen was significantly(p<0.05) higher with R₁ and R₃ rations compared to R₂.This may be due back to increase of nitrogen utilization and high retention and laxative effect reported by(Al-Yousef *et al.*,1994).Moreover, the high level of nitrogen free extract and nitrogen intake in R₁ and R₃ rations gave fast fermentation carbohydrate which can couple the fast degradation of urea in this ration.Hence the production of ammonia can be efficiency used in building microbial protein rather than adsorption from rumen wall so the level

of urinary excretion decreased with R₂ group.Nitrogen balance as percentage of NI had differ significantly (p<0.05)increase among R₂ and R₃ rations than R1.This may be a reflection to the higher CP digestibility in R₂ and R₃ compared to control ration.In accordance with the present results,(Mohsen *et al.*,1999). reported that increasing level of urea in diets of growing goats to 0.4 % was resulted in decreasing (p<0.05) NB as % of NI.Nitrogen balance obtained in this study were closed to that reported by (Yacout and EI- Badawi 2001).They found that N balance of goats fed rations contained 12% CP was 41.4 g/h /d.

Nutrients digestibility, % DM intake (kg /day) 1.958 ^A 1.824 ^a 1.759 ^a DM 71.37 ^a 73.97 ^A 73.62 ^A OM 69.54 ^a 71.57 ^a 70.32 ^A CP 71.59 ^a 76.94 ^A 74.11 ^A CF 62.81 ^a 67.51 ^A 65.39 ^A EE 70.49 ^a 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^a 71.60 70.30 ^A FEE 71.35 ^a 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^a 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % MDF 63.70 ^a 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADF 61.20 ^a 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A AO ADE 32.80 ^a 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A AB Celluloses 65.50 ^a 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A AP NFC 67.89 ^a 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A AB DN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 </th <th>Items</th> <th>R₃</th> <th>R₂</th> <th>R₁</th>	Items	R ₃	R ₂	R ₁			
DM intake (kg /day) 1.958^A 1.824 ^a 1.759 ^a DM 71.37 ^a 73.97^A 73.62^A OM 69.54 ^a 71.57^A 70.32^A CP 71.59 ^a 76.94^A 74.11^A CF 62.81 ^a 67.51^A 65.39^A EE 70.49 ^a 72.22^A 74.97^A NFE 71.35 ^b 74.63^A 73.15^A GE 68.30 ^b 71.60 70.30^A Fiber fractions , % NDF 63.70 ^b 64.60^A 68.40^A ADL 32.80 ^b 34.50^A 35.90^A ADL 32.80 ^b 34.50^A 35.90^A Celluloses 56.20 ^a 58.60 ^a 62.80^A Celluloses 56.50 ^b 67.40 ^A 70.90^A NFC 67.89 ^a 69.59^A 68.19^A DN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 DN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NEL Meal/ kg 0.75 0.78	Nutr	ients digestibility	,%				
DM 71.37 ^B 73.97 ^A 73.62 ^A OM 69.54 ^B 71.57 ^A 70.32 ^A CP 71.59 ^B 76.94 ^A 74.11 ^A CF 62.81 ^B 67.51 ^A 65.39 ^A EE 70.49 ^B 75.22 ^A 74.97 ^A NFE 71.35 ^B 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^B 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % 70.30 ^A NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADL 322.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A DN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration<	DM intake (kg /day)	1.958^	1.824 [₿]	1.759 [₿]			
OM 69.54* 71.57* 70.32* CP 71.59* 76.94* 74.11* CF 62.81* 67.51* 65.39* EE 70.49* 75.22* 74.97* NFE 71.35* 74.63* 73.15* GE 68.30* 71.60 70.30* Fiber fractions ,% NDF 63.70* 64.60* 68.40* ADF 61.20* 63.80* 64.30* ADF 61.20* 63.80* 64.30* ADL 32.80* 34.50* 35.90* Hemicelluloses 56.20* 58.60* 62.80* Celluloses 65.50* 67.40* 70.90* NFC 67.89* 69.59* 68.19* DN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP <	DM	71.37 ^в	73.97*	73.62 ^A			
CP 71.59 ^B 76.94 ^A 74.11 ^A CF 62.81 ^B 67.51 ^A 65.39 ^A EE 70.49 ^B 75.22 ^A 74.97 ^A NFE 71.35 ^B 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^B 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NCC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0	OM	69.54 [₿]	71.57*	70.32ª			
CF 62.81 ^s 67.51A 65.39A EE 70.49 ^s 75.22A 74.97A NFE 71.35 ^s 74.63A 73.15A GE 68.30 ^s 71.60 70.30A Fiber fractions ,% NDF 63.70 ^s 64.60A 68.40A ADF 61.20 ^s 63.80A 64.30A ADL 32.80 ^s 34.50A 35.90A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^s 58.60 ^b 62.80A Celluloses 65.50 ^s 67.40A 70.90A NFC 67.89 ^s 69.59A 68.19A DN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / lag milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 ME 2.367 2.449 2.467	CP	71.59 ^в	76.94*	74.11^			
EE 70.49 ^B 75.22 ^A 74.97 ^A NFE 71.35 ^B 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^B 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % ************************************	CF	62.81 ^в	67.51^	65.39^			
NFE 71.35 ^B 74.63 ^A 73.15 ^A GE 68.30 ^B 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % 71.60 70.30 ^A NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADF 61.20 ^B 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 57.40 ^A 70.90 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A DN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Emergy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 DE	EE	70.49 ^в	75.22 ^a	74.97*			
GE 68.30 ^B 71.60 70.30 ^A Fiber fractions , % NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADF 61.20 ^B 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A OK 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A NFC 70.90 ^A 70.90 ^A 70.90 ^A NE 71.63 10.55 11.91 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / day 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78	NFE	71.35 ^в	74. 63 ^a	73.15 ^a			
Fiber fractions , % NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADF 61.20 ^B 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596	GE	68.30 ^в	71.60	70.30*			
NDF 63.70 ^B 64.60 ^A 68.40 ^A ADF 61.20 ^B 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A DN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Effici=ror/ / ME utilizatior % K		iber fractions , %					
ADF 61.20 ^B 63.80 ^A 64.30 ^A ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % <td>NDF</td> <td>63.70^в</td> <td>64.60^A</td> <td>68.40^A</td>	NDF	63.70 ^в	64.60 ^A	68.40 ^A			
ADL 32.80 ^B 34.50 ^A 35.90 ^A Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01 ^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A <	ADF	61.20 ^B	63.80 ^A	64.30 ^A			
Hemicelluloses 56.20 ^B 58.60 ^B 62.80 ^A Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 GET 233.01 ^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01	ADL	32.80 ^B	34.50 ^A	35.90*			
Celluloses 65.50 ^B 67.40 ^A 70.90 ^A NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability Metabolisability Metabolisability Metabolisability Metabolisability Metabolisability Metabolisability <td< td=""><td>Hemicelluloses</td><td>56.20^B</td><td>58.60^B</td><td>62.80^A</td></td<>	Hemicelluloses	56.20 ^B	58.60 ^B	62.80 ^A			
NFC 67.89 ^B 69.59 ^A 68.19 ^A Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 ME Concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 MEtabolisability 3.00 RFQ 233.014 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 <td< td=""><td>Celluloses</td><td>65.50^в</td><td>67.40 ^</td><td>70.90^A</td></td<>	Celluloses	65.50 ^в	67.40 ^	70.90 ^A			
Nutritive values TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Emergy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / Me utilization RFQ 233.01A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70A 147.55 ^C 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 <td>NFC</td> <td>67.89[₿]</td> <td>69.59^A</td> <td>68.19^A</td>	NFC	67.89 [₿]	69.59 ^A	68.19 ^A			
TDN% OF DM 58.73 60.86 59.55 TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Emergy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability Metabolisability ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / Me utilization RFQ 230.01A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33		Nutritive values					
TDN kg / day 12.82 12.45 11.91 TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	TDN% OF DM	58.73	60.86	59.55			
TDN kg / kg milk 8.71 7.70 7.43 NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	TDN kg / day	12.82	12.45	11.91			
NED Mcal/ kg 1.53 1.55 1.54 NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 GT 233.01A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 A2.36 A2.39	TDN kg / kg milk	8.71	7.70	7.43			
NEL Mcal/ kg 0.75 0.78 0.84 NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	NED Mcal/ kg	1.53	1.55	1.54			
NEL / NED % 49.0 50.3 54.6 NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % Metabolisability % Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 GFRC 233.01 ^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	NEL Mcal/ kg	0.75	0.78	0.84			
NFC/ DCP 2.83 2.52 2.65 Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	NEL / NED %	49.0	50.3	54.6			
Energy concentration ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % Metabolisability % RFGE 54.56 54.51 GETICIENCY / ME utilization % RFQ 233.014 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^C 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.29	NFC/ DCP	2.83	2.52	2.65			
ME 2.367 2.449 2.467 GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	En	ergy concentratio	n				
GE 4.373 4.489 4.526 DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	ME	2.367	2.449	2.467			
DE 2.887 2.986 3.009 NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	GE	4.373	4.489	4.526			
NE 1.572 1.613 1.596 Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization RFQ 233.01A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	DE	2.887	2.986	3.009			
Metabolisability % ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	NE	1.572	1.613	1.596			
ME/GE 54.12 54.56 54.51 Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29		Aetabolisability %					
Efficiency / ME utilization % RFQ 233.01 ^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	ME/GE	54.12	54.56	54.51			
RFQ 233.01 ^A 214.96 ^B 232.55 ^A QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	Efficiency / ME utilization %						
QI 3.01 2.78 3.00 RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	RFQ	233.01*	214.96 ^B	232.55*			
RFV 167.70 ^A 147.55 ^c 153.33 ^B DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	QI	3.01	2.78	3.00			
DDM 44.33 42.87 42.36 NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	RFV	167.70*	147.55 ^c	153.33 ^в			
NE/ME 66.41 64.23 64.29	DDM	44.33	42.87	42.36			
	NE/ME	66.41	64.23	64.29			

Table(5): Digestion	coefficients a	and n	utritive	values	of	mixtures	silages	fed	by
experime	ntal goats.								

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05) .

Itoms	Experimental rations					
items	R ₁	R ₂	R₃			
N intake(g / h / d)	46.13 ^в	44.36 ^в	48.39 ^A			
Fecal N (g /h/ d)	11.46 ^B	11.76 ^в	12.94 ^a			
Urinary N(g/h/d)	15.48*	13.58 [₿]	14.81^			
N excretion (FU + UN)	26.94 ^B	25.34 [₿]	27.75*			
Digestion N (g / h / d)	32.67 ^в	33.60 ^в	34.45 ^A			
N- balance (g / h / d)	19.19 ^в	21.02B ^A	20.64 ^A			
NB/NI, %	41.59 ^A	42.87 ^в	42.65*			

 Table (6):Nitrogen utilization of experimental rations by dairy Zaribi goats.

Milk production and composition

Milk yeild of dairy Zabibi goats as affected by feeding experimental rations are presented in Table (7).Data obtained showed that there differences(p<0.05) in milk yield among experimental rations. These results may be attributed to the increase of nutritive values of R2 and R3 rations. The current results are in accordance with those reported by (Kholif et al., 1999) and (El-Ashry et al., 2001), they found that milk yield was ranged between (2.0 -2.1kg /head /day)for lactating goats and 6.1- 8.6 kg /head/day)for lactating buffaloes fed ration contained 50 % concentrate and 50% roughage. On the other side the milk constituents indicated that second and third groups were significantly (p<0.05) higher of all milk constituents compared to control group. The changes in milk contents may be due to the level of prolactin hormone secretion and efficiency of udder secretary cells.(Soliman et al., 1995) Total solid %, solid non fat % and lactose% were significantly (p<0.05) increased when feeding R2 or R3 rations compared to R1. These results are agreed with the results reported by (Allam et al., 2001) and (El-Ashry et al.,2001). The percentage of milk protein % and fat% were lower (p<0.05) with feeding on R1 and R3 rations than R2, while there was no significant differences between R1 and R3.Increasing fat% synchronized with Ray grass and Rod grass mixtures silage in goats rations may be due to higher fermentation of fiber into volatile fatty acid in rumen Table(9). It had subsequently converted to fat in milk, that agreed with (Jin et al. 2007). On the other hand protein and lactose content increased in similar trend, this may be due to DCP and TDN intake Table (5) .These results agreed with those obtained by (Ahmed et al. 2003) and Bendary et al. 2000). The whey protein nitrogen (WPN%), whey protein (WP%) and acidity recorded higher values with significant(p<0.05) increase when feeding with R₂ and R₃ in comparison with R1 group . Furthermore the milk composition as well as, protein yield ,solids yield, fat yield, solid not fat yield, lactose yield ash were recorded significantly lower values(p<0.05)for R1 ration than others. However, the NE Mcal/kg no differences were observed among experimental treatments

Items	R₃	R ₂	R ₁
Total milk yield , kg / h/ period	176.52 ^в	198.36 ^A	194.16 ^A
Daily milk yield (kg/h/d)	1.471 [₿]	1.603^	1.618*
Protein %	3.79 [₿]	4.08 *	3.97в
Total solid%	14.23 [₿]	15.71 ^	15.56 ^A
Fat%	3.90 в	4.10 ^	3.98в
Total N (TN)	0.60	0.65	0.64
Solid not fat(SNF%)	10.33 ^в	11.71^	11.5 ^A
Lactose%	4.60 ^в	5.10 ^	5.00 ^A
Non casein nitrogen (NCN%)	0.17	0.18	0.20
Non protein nitrogen (NPN %)	0.04	0.6	0.7
Casein nitrogen (CN%)	0.43	0.44	0.46
Casein %	2.75	2.81	2.94
Whey protein nitrogen(WPN%)	0.11 [₿]	0.12*	0.13 ^A
Whey protein (WP%)	71.00 [₿]	77.00*	83.10 ^A
Milk constitu	ients yield gm	ı / h/day	
protein yield gm / h/day	55.76 ^в	65.40^	64.24 ^A
solids yield gm / h/day	209.32 ^в	251.80 ^A	251.76 ^A
fat yield gm / h/day	57.37 ^в	64.12 ^A	64.40 ^A
Solid not fat yield gm / h/day	151.95₿	182.90*	187.36 ^A
Lactose yield gm / h/day	67.67 ^в	81.75*	80.90 ^A
Ash%	0.784 ^B	0.839*	0.816*
Acidity %	0.189*	0. 176 ^в	0.172 ^в
NE (Mcal / kg)	0.748	0.750	0.785

Table(7):Effect of mixture silage on milk yield and composition of lactating Zaribi goats.

Blood profile

Values of some blood parameters are presented in(Table 8)Data obtained of R1 group explained that there were decrease significant differences for free fatty acids (FFA), total lipids, triglycerides, cholesterol, Total lipids, Trigly-cerides, urea-N and Glucose compared to R_2 and R_3 groups, the higher value of serum urea-N of R_2 and R_3 may be due to higher level of ammonia-N in the rumen as reported also by Ibrahim et al. (2008).on the other hand ,haematocrit(HC),Bilirubin, Alk-P-ase and WBCs for R_2 and R_3 were recorded lower significant differences than R1 group.In addition to the higher blood lipids might be due to the inhibition in lipiogenic enzyme activities by liver and adipose tissue of animals fed rations containing fat Storry (1981). Thus the blood minerals as well as calcium, phosphorus and magnesium in R₂ ration was recorded higher values than those obtained with R_1 and R_3 groups. This may indicate that nutrients were more available and utilizable, this results are agreed with those reported by Steele(1980). On the other hand hematological picture of goats fed experimental rations showed that there significant (p < 0.05) decreased in erythrocyte and leucocytes for R₂ and R₃ groups compared to R₁.In addition to the fractions of white blood cells (lymphocyte, Neutrophile and Eiosinophile%) were significantly increased with R1 group, whereas monocyte was decrease for same group than the other experimental groups. This increases of lymphocyte, neutrophile and Eiosinophile in R1 group may be due back to the increases of saponine level because saponine have an enhancement effect to the humoral immune response and increase white blood cells as reported by Saleh et al . (2007).

geute de difected by							
Items	Experimental rations						
	R₃	R ₂	R1				
Haematocrit values (%)	18.36 ^A	15.76 ^B	16.97 ^B				
Total protein(gm / dl)	7.34	7.83	7.64				
Albumen (gm / dl)	4.86	4.28	4.71				
Globulin (gm / dl)	2.48	3.55	2.93				
Glucose, mg/dl	76.34 ^B	81,48 ^A	78.2 ^A				
Urea-N, mg/dl	17.45 ^B	19.87 ^A	19.27 ^A				
FFA (m.mol/L)	389.23 ^B	416.78 ^A	399.69 ^A				
Total lipids (g / dL)	7.34 ^B	9.21 ^A	9.59 ^A				
Triglycerides(mg/dL)	78.93 ^B	94.65 ^A	88.12 ^A				
Cholesterol (mg / dl)	62.48 ^B	78.94 ^A	78.36 ^A				
Bilirubin (mg / 100 ml)	0.42 ^A	0.187 ^B	0.197 ^B				
Alk-P-ase(lu / L)	56.4 ^A	16.79 ^B	18.34 ^B				
Ca (mg / dL)	10.26	11.94	10.68				
P (mg / dL)	6.14	6.70	6.33				
Mg (mg / dL)	8.53 ^B	10.34 ^A	8.28 ^B				
WBCs (10 ³ ul)	7.43 ^A	6.20 ^B	6.10 ^B				
Lymphocyte (%)	63.7 ^A	57.37 ^B	55.87 ^B				
Neutrophile (%)	57.9 ^A	41.87 ^B	42.57 ^B				
Eiosinophile (%)	6.9 ^A	4.7 ^B	5.27 ^B				
Monocyte (%)	14.77 ^B	21.90 ^A	17.57 ^B				

Table(8):Blood plasma constituents and some minerals of dairy Zaribi goats as affected by experimental rations fed by.

Ruminal fermentation parameters

Table (9) presented the criteria obtained from ruminal tested fluid fermentation parameters of lactating Zaribi goats under investigation. The ruminal pH values and the maximum total VFA's values were recorded at 3 hrs post feeding. The same trend was obtained by(Johnson and Sultan1968), (Allam *et al.*1984). Moreover, ruminal ammonia-N concentrate were greatly higher and the maximum values were reached at 3 hrs postfeeding then decreased with all dietary treatments. Similar results were reported by (Ziad *et al.* 2009). subsequent, effective neutral detergent fiber (eNDF) was calculated to estimate adjustment of ruminal pH useful only when eNDF below 30%. In addition to predication of ruminal pH and eNDF were used to adjust passage rate, Fouad (2002).

 Table (9):The effect of experimental rations on some rumen liquor Parameters of lactating Zaribi goats .

Items	Time	R ₁	R ₂	R₃	SIM
	0	6.84	6.94	6.76	0.21
	3	6.35	6.58	6.41	0.15
FH - Values	6	6.61	6.83	6.73	0.11
	0	16.48 [₿]	18.37^	19.45^	0.31
NH3(ma/100ml PL)	3	22.76 ^B	25.83*	26.87*	0.09
NH3(IIIg/100IIII RE)	6	18.55₿	20.52 ^в	23.14*	0.14
	0	12.61^	14.67в	15.36 ^B	0.19
	3	15.29 ^в	17.88 [₿]	19.49^	0.13
TVFS(mequ./100mi RE)	6	14.71 ^B	16.23 ^в	18.55 [*]	0.22
	0	33.46*	35.82*	31.57₿	0.78
	3	21.87 ^в	27.31^	23.29 ^в	0.49
	6	28.02в	33.22*	30.86 ^в	0.82

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05). * effective neutral detergent fiber (eNDF) = (pH-5,425) / 0.04229 (Fox et al . 2000)

Molar proportion of ruminal volatile fatty acid (VFA's)

Data in Table (10) illustrated that there were differences between acetic, propionate, butrtate and Iso-biotrate values of rumen liquor of goats fed experimental rations. Acetic , butrtate and iso-biotrate of R2 ration were significant(p<0.05)decrease compared to R1 and R3 rations.Whereas propionate and valerate were recorded higher values with R₂ group. This results were agreed with those represented by (Mohammed et al., 2003). Ruminal ammonia-N concentration was greatly higher at 3 and 6 hrs postfeeding than before-feeding. The same trend was observed by Ibrahim et al. (2012).The lowest values of ruminal ammonia-N were recorded with R1 and the highest values were detected with R_2 and R_3 and the differences were significant at 3 and 6 hrs post-feeding only. This increase in ruminal ammonia-N concentration in R₂ and R₃ may be due to the high content of CP in rations as reported earlier in Table1. The same results were observed by Ahmed et al.(2013) with using berseem silage and its mixtures with some grasses in goats rations. The average concentrations of total VFA's post-feeding (3 and 6 hrs) in the rumen were significantly decreased with R_1 compared with R_2 and R₃. Similar findings were shown by Haggag et al. (2002).and El-Kholany (2004) using mixture forage and silage in Rahmani sheep and Zaraibi goats.

Table (10). Mollar proportion of ruminal volatile fatty acid (VFAs) of dairy Zaribi goats fed on experimental rations.

Item	R ₁	R ₂	R ₃
Acetate , %	38.09*	33.47в	36.61^
Propionate , %	27.84 ^B	34.51^	28.85 ^в
A:p	1.43:1	1.03:1	1.63:1
Butrtate, %	21.57^	17.2 [₿]	19.84 ^a
Iso – biotrate %	2.68ª	1.67 ^в	2.91^
Valerate, %	1.76 ^B	2.49 ^A	1.37 ^в

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05) .

Total bacterial count of rumen liquor

The obtained results of total viable bacteria count for R_2 ration was recorded higher significant than R_1 and $R_3 R_3$.Table (11)illustrates the data collected for microbial protein of goats under investigation.Ruminal microbial protein was significantly different among three treatments at zero time and was significantly (P<0.05) higher with R_2 than of R_1 at 3 and 6 hrs postfeeding. But, R_3 recorded the medium values.This positive effect of mixture silage on ruminal microbial protein was observed also by Shehata *et al.* (2001), in the rumen of bucks, lambs and lactating does, respectively.The results obtained from this study are in harmony with those of (Kurihara *et al.*1968) who observed that the peak of bacterial counts was between 3 and 6 hr's after feedi .Nour *et al.*(1989),reported that the active bacterial population in the rumen may help to increase the rate of digestion.Total cellulolytic bacterial count of rumen liquor recorded the highest values at 3 hrs after feeding within R_2 but the lowest value was in R_1 and R_3 groups.

Total protozoal count of rumen liquor after 3 hrs of feeding showed the lowest value with R_1 compared to the other tested rations, and the highest value was obtained with R_2 group. Perhaps that back to lower level of

Saponine in R₂ ration, this result agreement with those obtained by Sony and Sharma(1982), who found significantly increased in ciliate protozoal count with. increasing concentrate level in diet. This possibly related to ingest starch. Maximum protozoal counts were observed at 3 hrs post feeding than after 6 hrs post feeding

Items	Time	R1	R ₂	R3		
Total bacterial count (10 ⁷ / ml)	0	1519 ^B	1860 ^A	1347 ^c		
	3	2175 ^B	2617 ^A	2080 ^c		
	6	3818 ^B	4346 ^A	3576 ^c		
Cellullolytic bacterial(10 ⁴ / ml)	0	2.91 ^B	3.16 ^A	2.46 ^B		

6

0

3

4.68

3.72^E

3 97

<u>3.</u>41^B

2.97^B

5.57

4.65^A

4 61⁴

4.79^A

4.27^A

3.91

2.64

3 88

3.52

3.11ⁱ

Table (11). Effect of experimental rations on rumen microorganisms

6 A ,B and C Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05) Growth performance of born kids

Table(12)showed the variations in body weight gain of kids whose sucking their dams milk, the results were recorded high significant BWG with R_2 followed by R_3 compared to those in R_1 group. This increase of daily weight gain may be back to the higher milk yield and its content of total solid, total protein and milk fat(Table7). Thereby, the feed conversion was lower values with R_2 and R_3 than R_1 and the values were 6.00 , 5.36 and 5. 64 for R₁, R₂, R₃ respectively.

Table (12): Growth performance of born kids as affected by the tested rations.

Items	R ₁	R ₂	R₃	
Initial weight (kg)	3.55	3.45	3.70	
Weaning weight (kg)	23.71	24.95	24.75	
Total body gain (kg)	20.16	21.50	21.05	
Daily gain (g)	168.00	179.17	175.42	
Milk consumption (kg /h /d)	1.01 ^A	0.96 ^B	0.99 ^A	
Feed conversion	6.00 ^A	5.36 ^в	5.64 ^A	

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.05).

Economical efficiency

Total protozoal count(104 / /ml

Calculated economic efficiency are presented in Table(13). It based upon milk production of does, BWG of kids and total intake costs. Subsequent, final body weight and feeding cost are the most important factor affecting the maximum efficiency of milk yield and meat production. Ragrass140 L.E./ton and Rod grass 140 L.E. where kg milk was 3 L.E., while selling price of 1kg of live live weight was 25 L.E.according to local prices of year 2013[\$ = 6.75 L.E.(Egyptian Pound)]. The results illustrated that when goats fed ration The price of concentrate feed mixture / ton was 2500 L.E./ ton, berseem hay 1000 L.E./ ton Net revenue ={(Selling income of milk +Selling income of BWG)-coast of feed intake (LE)}

Net revenue / animal (LE)

Economic efficiency % =

Total feed Coast (LE))

containing forages mixtures silage with high level of mitabolizable energy (ME), the cost / kg BW was decreased, specially with R_1 and R_3 . The corresponding values of the economical efficiency were increased 23.00 and 19.00% for R₂ and R₃ respectively than those of control group. This indicated

X100

that the replacement of 50% of total Egyptian berseem by Ray(R₂)and Rodgrass(R₃)in goats feeding give higher net revenue and economic efficiency values compared to control group(R₁). This improvement in economic efficiency could be attributed to improvement in both growth rate and feed conversion ratio. Whereas no significant different was observed between R₂ and R₃ groups this results were in agreement with those obtained by (Murdoch ,1962).

Items	R1	R ₂	R3				
Feed intake kg / h							
DM intake (kg /h)	2495 ^	2390 ^B	2360 ^B				
DM intake(kg over all)period	299.4	286.8	283.2				
Coast of intake (LE)	555.00	477.60	478.95				
Milk consumption, Total milk yield and Price of milk / h overall (LE)							
Milk consumption(gm/h/d)	1953 ^	1780 ^B	1918 ^				
Total milk yield (LE)	224.52	234.36	230.16				
Price of milk/h overall(LE)	673.56	703.08	690.48				
Body weight gain of offspring (kg)							
Total body weight gain(kg)	20.16	21.50	21.05				
Price of BG (LE)	504.00	537.50	526.25				
Revenue(LE)							
Net revenue / animal (LE)	622.56	762.98	737.73				
Economical efficiency %	100.00 ^B	123.00 ^A	119.00 ^A				

Table(13): Economical efficiency(LE) of tested rations on growth of born kids

A and B Means having different superscripts within the same row are significantly different at (P<0.01).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion , using 60 % of forage mixtures silages as Egyptian berseem silage (EBS),EBS x Ray grass or EBS x Rod grass)are suitable for dairy Zaribi goats feeding compared to EBS alone .These silage mixtures improved milk production and performance of born kids received their mothers milk ,and decreased feeding cost .On the other side the decreased of Ray and Rodgrass silage prices had adverse effects on animal production, which was reflected on feeding cost and economical Efficiency .

REFFERENCES

- Abdelhamid,A.M.; M.S.Nowar;S.M.Bassuny and G.I.El-Emam (2001).Evalution of unconventional silage making using plant and animal wastes in feeding ruminants. J. Agric.Sci.Mansoura Univ.,26 : 5349 - 5360.
- Abou Akkada,A.R.(1984).Evaluation of present status and potential develop -ment of animal feed resources in the Arab countries khartom,p129.
- Abou Akkada, A R.and A.M.Nour, (1986). Ensilage and improvement of feeding value Proceeding of Conference of Animal Production, In the 26th Century, 16-18 Septamber, Alexandria, p.40.
- Aboul Ella,A.A.(2000).Mathematical programing models applied to feed formul ation for ruminants .Ph.D.Thesis in animal Nutrition,Faculty of Agrriculture,Ain-Shms,University ,Shubra El-Khe, Cairo Egypt.
- Ahmed,B.M.; H.T.Taie;M.M.Bendary and K.F.Abdel-Latif (2003).Influence of dietary corn silage on digestibility performance and economical efficiency of dietary cattle.Egyptian Journal Nutrition and Feeds,6 (Special issue):587-594.

- Allam,A.M.;A.K.Abou-Raya;E.A.Gihad and T.M.El-Bedawy(1984).Nutritional studies by sheep and goats fed NaOH treated straw.1st Egyptian British Conf. Anim.And Poultry Prod.,Zagazig Univ.,11-13Sep.,p.53.
- Allam, A.M.; K.El-Shazly; B.E.A.Borhami and M.A.Mohmed (2001).Effect of Bakers yeast *Saccharomyces cervisia* supplementation on diges -ion in Sheep.Proc.of the 8 th Conf.on Anim.Nutrition .Sharm.
- El-Shikh, Egypt , 23-26 October 2001. Egtptian J. Nutrition and Feeds,4 (Specil issue):315.
- AI-Yousef,Y.M.;F.N.AlMulhim;G.A.EI- Hag and G.A.AI-Gsim,(1994).utilization of diets with different forage mixtures with Egyptian berseem by growing awassi lambs.Annals.Agric.,Sci.Ain Shams Univ.,39(2), 663-670.
- A.O.A.C.(2000).Association of Official Analytical Chemists.Official Methods of Analysis17ed.Washington D.C.
- Auldist, D.E.; K.L. Atkinson; M. J. Silvapulle ;D.W.Dellow, and G.H. McDowell(1999).Utilization of white clover silage fed alone or with maize silage by lactating dairy cows.Austr.J.Exp.Agric.39:237-246.
- Authi , K.S.; Rao ,G.H.R.; B.J. Evenden and N.Crawford (1988) Action of Guanosine 50-(beta-thio) diphosphate on thrombin-induced activation and calcium mobilization in saponin-permeabilized and intact human platelets. Biochemical Journal 255, 885 – 894.
- Bartiles, H. (1971). Colorimetric determination of creatinine. Clin. Acta, 32-81.
- Bendary, M.M.;S.A.El-Ayouty;F.H.H.Farrage;A.M.A .Mohiel Din and F.M. KhalilF,(2000).Productive performance of lactating cows fed rations containing different forms of sugar beet tops and berseem silage.Proceeding of Conference of Animal Production,In the 21th Century,18-20 April, Sakha, Egypt, Pp. 255-265.
- Castle,M.E.;D.Reid and J.N.Watson.(1983).Silage and milk production:studies with diets containing white clover silage.Grass For.Sci.38:193-200.
- Choi,S.; S.Y.Jung ;C.H.Kim.; HS.Kim; H.Rhim ; S.C.Kim and S,Y,Nah(2001) Effect of ginsenosides on voltage dependent Ca2+subtypes Chann el in bovine chromaffin cells.Journal of Ethnopharmacology. 74,75-81.
- Conway,E.J.(1962).Microdefusion Analysis and Volumatric Error(5thEd) Crosby-Lock wood and Sons LK td .London .
- Doumas, B.T.; W.Watson and H.G.Biggs,(1971). A method of determination of plasma albumin. Cli. Chemists Acya, 31:87.
- Duncan, D.B.(1955) .Multiple range and multiple F-test .Biometrics, 11:1-42 .
- El-Ashry,M.A.;A.M.Kholif,H.A.;H.El-Amry;H.M.El-Sayed and T.A.El-Hamamsy (2001).Effect of different yeast cultures supplementation to diet on the productive performance of lactating buffaloes.Egyptian J.Nutr. And Feeds 4-21.
- El Izzi, A.S.; T.N.Benie; M.L.Thieulant;L.Oliver anJ.Duval(1992).Stimulation of LH release from cultured pituitary cells by saponins of Petersia- nthus macrocarpus: a permeabilising effect.Planta Medica 58,229-233.
- El-Kholany, M. M (2004). Evaluation of some new green fodder for Farm animals. Ph.D. Thesis Fac. of Agric, Mansoura Univ.
- Elveback ,L. R. (1970) Calcium determination in foods and feeds . J. Am. Med . Ass., 211: 69.

- Fouad ,R.T.(2000).Effect of replacing corn by barely grain in concentrate feed mixture on the performance of sheep.J.Agric Scie . Mansoura Univ. , 27 (3): 1371-1380.
- Haggag, M. El-H., E. S. Soliman and M.E. Ahmed (2002). Triticale forage as a feed for sheep. Proc., 1st Ann. Sc. Conf. Anim. and Fish Prod, P. 77-83. Mansoura, Sep,.
- Hall, M.B.(2001). How should we formulate for non-NDF carbohydrate in:12 th annual Florida ruminant nutrition symposium . Gainsville , Fl. 44.
- Goering , H.K.and P.J.Van Soest (1970).Forage fiber Analysis. A gric. Handbook , No . 379, USDA . Washington , DC. USA.
- Hoffman, P.C.;D.K.Combs and M. D. Casler(1998).Performance of lactating dairy cows fed alfalfa silage or perennial ryegrass silage.J.Dairy Sci.81:162-168.
- Ibrahim, F.A., E.S, Soliman, A. A. Abd El-Hamid and M. E. Ahmed. (2012). Growth performance and feed utilization efficiency of Rahmani lambs fed some legume and /or grass silages. Egyptian J. of Sheep and Goats Sciences, 7 (2): 1- 10.
- Jin, G.L.;S.K. Choi;S.H.Choi;M.K.Song(2007).Effect of microbial additives on metabolic characteristics in sheep and milking performance of lactating dairy cows. Jurnal of Animal Science and Technology Center, Seoul Korea Republic :2007.49:779-828.
- Johnson ,V.W. and J.D.Sultan(1968).The continuous recordingof the pH in The small ruminant's .Br. J. Nutr. , 22: 303.
- Kholif ,M.;M.M.Yossef ; H.El-Amary and S.A.H.Abo El-nor(1999).Productive and reproduction performance of lactating goats fed diets supplemented with different levels of dolomite .Proc.of the 7th scientific conference on Animal Nutrition(19-21Oct.)2:97.El- Arish, Egypt.
- Kurihara,Y.J.M.Eadie;P.N.Hobson andS.O.Mann (1968). Relationship between bacteria and cillate protozoa in sheep rumen.j.Gen.Microbial,51: 267-278.
- Leupp,J.L.(2008).Use of corn distiller dried grains in beef cattele diets. Ph.D. Thisis,Fac. Of the North Dakota state University of agriculture and applied Science.
- Ling , E.R.(1963).Text Book of Dairy Chemistry, Vol .11.Practical Champ Man and Hill , London . 3 rd Ed .
- Linne , J.J. and K.M.Ringsrud (1992).Basic .Techniques in clinical Laboratory Science . 3 rd Ed., Mosby year book .
- Menin,L;M.Panchichkina ;C.Keriel; J.Olivares; U.Braun;E.K.Seppert and V.A. Saks (2001).Macro compartmentation of total creatine Cardiomyocytes revisited.Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry 220,149-159.
- Mohammad , M.I.;Y.A.A.Marrek and I.M.Awadalla (2003).Feed utilization and growth of dairy goats offered green forages silage as an alternative for berseem .J.Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ.,28: 205-218.
- Mohsen ,M.K.; M.F.Ali and M.I. Bassiouni (1999). The effect of partial replacing concentration mixture by ray and rod grass on perfrormanceof growing Angora goats. Proceeding of the 7 th . Scientific Conference of Animal Nutrition 19-21 October, pp,309. El- Arish, Egypt .

- Monnet, L. (1963). Determined of bilirubin. Animal Biol. Clin., 21: 717. Murdoch,J.(1962). Making and feeding silage. Farming Prees Books,LTD, London.
- Murdoch,J.(962).Making and feeding silage.Farming Prees Books , LTD,London. Nour,A.M.;A.E.Tag El-Den;S.M.Z. Zahran and M.H.Ahmed(1989).Effect of feeding Agro-industrial by-products on total and differential proto- zoal counts in the rumen.Third Egyptian-British Conference on Animals Products.Alexandria,7-10 October,91-101.
- NRC (1981).Nutrient Requirements of Domestic Animals. Nutrient Requirements of Goats. National Research Council, Washington,D.C.USA of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D.C.,USA.
- Oleszek,W.A.(2002).Chromatographic determination of plant Saponins,J.of pharmacy and Pharmacology,vol.53,No.12,1Decemb 2002,PP.1637-1643 (7).
- Patil, B.C.; R.P.Sharma ; D.K. Salunke and K.Salunkhe (1972).Evaluation of saponine as anti nutritional factor .Food . Cosmet.Toxicol.,10:, Toxicol.,10:395-398.
- Patton ,C.J.and Crouch, S. (1977).Spectrophotometeric and kinetics investigation of the berthelot reaction for the determination of ammonia . Anal . Chem., 49: 464 -469 .
- Plock A ; W.Sokolowska-Kohler and W.Presber (2001).Effect of Saponins as a natural content harmful and anti nutritional factor. Experimental Parasitology 97,141–153.
- Plohmann ,B.k ; G.L. Bader; K.R.Hiller and G.T.Franz (2008).enhancement effect to the Humeral immune response saponine on blood cells . Pharmazie 52, 953-957.
- Reitman, S.and Frankle,S.(1957). A method for determination of plasma GOT and GPT. Am. J. Clin. Path., 28: 108.
- Saleh,M.R.M.(2007).Potato by-products as animal feed.2-milk production and constituents and their effects on performance of new born lambs in lactating Rahmany ewes.J.Agric.Sci.Mansoura Univ.,32:4235-4245. SAS(2000).SAS/STAT Guide for Personal Computer.SAS inst.
- Shehata E.I; M.E. Ahmed, A.M. Abdelhamid, Faten F. Abou Ammou, and M. El-H. Haggag (2001) Comparative nutritive values of silage ration containing different level of teosinte and kochia. Egyptian J. Nutrition and Feeds, (4):129.
- Soliman,A.S ;M.SD.Gado and M.H.Abu El-Fadi (1995).Factors effecting milk yield and composition in fresian X Balady cross bred cows. EgyptianJ.Appl.SCI.,10:601.M.Sc.Thesis,Fac.OFagric .,Tanta Univ.
- Soliman,A.M.A.(1997).Ensiling some farm by-products in feeding ruminants. M.Sc.Thesis, Fac.OF agric.,Tanta Univ.
- Sony ,V.K.and D.D.Sharma (1982).Influence of levels of concentrate feeding on the microbial population in goat rumen Indian.J.Anim.Sci.,52(9) :821-833.
- Steel ,W.(1980).The effect of soybeen meal and type of forage in the diet on the plasma lipid composition of sheep .Br.J.Nutr. 44: 333.
 - Story ,J.E.(1981) .The effect of dietary fat on milk composition . Recent Advances in Animal Nutrition (W.Haresign . Ed) pp3-33.

- Thomas, C.; K. ston and S.R. Daley (1985). Milk production from red clover with grass silage. Anim. Prod. 41:23–31.
- Warner,A.G.T.(1964). Production of volatile fatty acids in the rumen Methods of mesurment . Nutr. Abstr. And Rev., 34:339 .
- Weichselbaum,(1989).Colorimetric determination of total protein.Anim.J. PATH., 16:40.
- Weimer, P.J.;G.C. waghorn ; D.R. Metens (1999). Effect of diet on population of three species of ruminal cellulolytic bacteria in lactating ruminants .J.Dairy Sci.,82:122.
- Zeid, A. M.;E.I.Shehata and A.M. Abd-El-Gawad (2009).Growth performance of male Zaraibi goats fed green forages silage in their rations differing in roughage:concentrate ratio.J.Agric.Mansoura univ.34(11): 10441.
- Yacout, M.H.M. and A.Y.El-Badawi, (2001).Effect of dietary protein level on fattening performance of animal calves. Egyptian. J.Nutrition and feeds 4 (special issue): 545 - 556.

دراسة مقارنة على مخاليط أنواع مختلفة من السيلاج وأثرها على انتاج اللبن وييئة الكرش وأداء النمو للجداء حديثة الولادة في الماعز الزرايبي الحلابة . مصطفى راشد محمد صالح . معهد بحوث الإنتاج الحيواني – مركز البحوث الزراعية – دقي – مصر .

أجريت هذه الدراسة لمعرفة تأثير إستخدام سيلاج البرسيم بمفرده أو في مخاليط مع حشيشة الراي جراس أو حشيشة الرود جراس في علائق الماعز الزرايبي على محصول اللبن ونشاط الكرش وكفاءة التحويل الغذائي ونمو الجداء حديثة الولادة التي ترضّع لبن الأمهات . إستخدمٌ في هذه الدراسة ١٨منّ الماعز الزّرايبي الحلابة بمتوسط وزن٤٧, ٣٩ كج وعمر حوالي ثلاثة سنوات , كل أم معها إنتاجهًا (متوسط الوزن ٣,٦٩ كج) , حيث وزَّعت عشوائيا في٣ مجاميع متساويةً (٦حيوانات بكل مجموعة) ، كل الحيوانات غذيت ُعلي العلف المركز ليغطَّي ٢٠ % من الاحتياجات البروتينية طبقًا للـ ان أر سي (١٩٨١) إضافة إلي السيلاج الذي أعطى للشبع سواء سيلاج البرسيم بمفرده في المعاملة الأولى (مجموعة المقارنة) أو مخلوط سيلاج البرسيم مّع الراي جراس او الرود جراس المعاملتين الثانية والثالثة (المجاميع المُختبرة) ، وقد غذيتُ المجموعة الأولى (مج1)ُعلى سيلاج البرسيم ، المجموعة الثانية (مج٢) على مخلوط سيُلاج البرسيم مع الرأى جراس و المجموعة الثالثة (مج٣) على مخلوط سيلاج البرسيم مع الرود جراس بنسبة (١:١). استمرت التجربة لمدة ١٢٠ يوما أوضحت النتائج أن (مج١) التي تناولت سيلاج البرسيم بمفرده كانت أقل في محتواها من البروتين الخام المستخلص الإيثيري و الألياف بينما كانت مرتفعة في محتواها من الرماد والمستخلص خالي الأزوت مقارنة بالمجموعتين (مج٢) , (مج٣). كما تم تقدير المحتوى من الصابونين الضار الطبيعي في البرسيم والذي سجل إرتفاعا معنويا مع(مج١)علي مستوى(٥.٠.) في كـلا مـن العليقـة واللـبن , سـائل الكـرش ,الـروث , البـول والـدم مقارنـة بالمعـاملات الأخـري (مج٢), (مج٣) من ناحية أخرى وجد أن الأحماض الدهنية الطيارة والأمونيا كانتا منخفضة معنويا في الـ (مج٢) , (مج٣) إذا قورنت بـ (مجر) أما محصول اللبن فقد سجل انخفاضا معنوياً مع (مجرًا) كما إنخفض كل من البروتين الكلي والمواد الصلبة الكلية والدهن الكلي لنفس المعاملة مقارنة بالمعاملات التجريبية الأخرى ببينما أعطت الـ (مج۲) , (مج۳) أعلى القيم لكل مقابيس مكونات اللبن .وفي الوقت نفسه سجلت الـ(مج١) أقل القيم لكلاً من المركبات الصلبةُ اللَّدهنيةُ واللأكتوز . ومن نتائج تحليل الدم وجد أن (مج٢) , (مج٣) كانتا مرتفعتين معنويا على مستوى (٥, .) لكل مقاييس الدم . أما الحملان حديثة الولادة فقد سجلت فرقاً معنويا منخفضًا على مستوى (٥. .) في وزن الجسم والزيادة اليومية مع (مج١) بينما أعطت الرمج٢) , (مج٣) أعلى المقاييس في الزيادة اليومية لوزن الجسم وكمية اللبن المستهلكة وكذا العائد المادي . أما الناحية الإقتصادية فكانت المعاملتان الـ(مج٢) , (مج٣) أعلى في العائد الإقتصادي مقارنة بالكنترول .

نستخلص من هذه الدراسة أن مخاليط الطف الأخضر من البرسيم المسقاوى مع حشيشة الراى جراس وحشيشة الرود جراس كانتا جيدة في تحقيق زيادة في الإنتاجية والنمو للصغار حديثة الولادة ومعامل التحويل الغذائي , كما ان مخلوط الراي جراس مع البرسيم وكذا مع الرود جراس كانت نتائجهما جيدة فاقت معاملة المقارنة