Journal of Animal Science

Comparison of fecal crude protein and fecal near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy to predict digestibility of fresh grass consumed by sheep

A. Fanchone, H. Archimède and M. Boval

INRA, UR143, Unité de Recherches Zootechniques, 97170 Petit-Bourg Guadeloupe, French West Indies

Abstarc:

Organic matter digestibility (OMD), an essential criterion forthe evaluation of the nutrition of ruminants, cannot be measuredeasily at pasture. Therefore, the objective of this study wasto test and compare 2 methods of OMD prediction based on thefecal CP content (CPf) or near infrared reflectance spectroscopy(NIRS) applied to feces. First, published equations derived from fecal N (Eq. 1_{CP} , n = 40) and from fecal NIRS (Eq. 1_{NIRS} , n = 84) were used to predict OMD of an independent validationdata set from which in vivo OMD, ranging from 58 to 74%, wasmeasured for 4 regrowth stages of Digitaria decumbens. Second,to establish equations usable in grazing situations and to improve the efficiency of the predictions, new equations were calculatedfrom a large data set (n = 174) using CPf (Eq. 2_{CP}) or fecalNIRS (Eq. 2_{NIRS}). By applying the CPf method, Eq. 2_{CPf} (OMD,% = 88.4 – 263.9/CPf, % of OM; residual SD = 2.92, r^2 = 0.63) showed similar statistical parameters (*P* < 0.01) when compared with Eq. 1_{CP} (OMD, % = 86.6 – 266.2/CPf,% of OM; residual SD = 2.95, r^2 = 0.79). When using fecal NIRS, Eq. 2_{NIRS} showed decreased SE of calibration (SEC = 1.48) and of cross-validation (SECV = 1.75) and greater coefficient ofdetermination of cross-validation ($R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. 1_{NIRS} (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, SECV = 2.02, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.78, $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.88) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.88) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.88) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.88) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1.88) than the previously published Eq. $R_{CV}^2 = 0.85$ (SEC = 1 0.77). The validation of the 4 equations on the validation data setwas satisfactory overall with an average difference betweenthe predicted and the observed OMD ranging from 0.98 to 2.79percentage units. The Eq. 2_{NIRS} was nevertheless the most precisewith a decreased residual SD of 2.53 and also the most accurate, because the SD of the average difference between predicted andobserved OMD was the lowest. Therefore, fecal NIRS provided the most reliable estimates of OMD and is thus a useful toolto predict OMD at pasture. However, an adequate number of referencedata are required to establish good calibration. Indeed, bettercalibration statistics were obtained by increasing the dataset from 84 (Eq. 1_{NIRS}) to 174 (Eq. 2_{NIRS}). In contrast, usingfecal N on a set of 84 or 174 points did not improve the prediction. Both methods are useful for predicting OMD at pasture in certaincircumstances, using fecal NIRS when a large data set (n = 84and n = 174) is available and fecal CP with smaller data sets(n = 40).

Key Word:

digestibility, fecal crude protein, near infrared reflectance spectroscopy, sheep, tropical grass

Volume 87, Number 1, January 2009