



# APPENDIX

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่

Copyright© by Chiang Mai University  
All rights reserved

## APPENDIX A

### Method of analysis

#### *In vitro* digestibility using Daisy<sup>II</sup> incubator

##### 2.1 Materials

- DAISY<sup>II</sup> Incubator - ANKOM Technology
- F57 Filter Bags - ANKOM Technology
- Digestion jar 1 L
- Thermometer
- Cheese cloths for filtering

##### 2.2 Chemical used

###### 1. Buffer Solution A:

|                                      | g/liter |
|--------------------------------------|---------|
| KH <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>      | 10.0    |
| MgSO <sub>4</sub> ·7H <sub>2</sub> O | 0.5     |
| NaCl                                 | 0.5     |
| CaCl <sub>2</sub> ·2H <sub>2</sub> O | 0.1     |

Urea (reagent grade) 0.5

###### 2. Buffer Solution B:

|                                     | g/liter |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Na <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub>     | 15.0    |
| Na <sub>2</sub> S·9H <sub>2</sub> O | 1.0     |

###### 3. Rumen fluid inoculum

###### 4. Neutral Detergent Reagents

## 2.3 Methods

1. Weigh each F57 filter bag and record weight (W1). Zero the balance and weigh 0.25g of sample (W2) directly into filter bag. Place in the Daisy<sup>II</sup> Incubator digestion jar (up to 25 samples per jar). Samples should be evenly distributed on both sides of the digestion jar divider. Include at least one weighed and sealed blank bag for correction factor (C1).
2. Pre-warm (39°C) both buffer solutions (A & B). In separate container, added solution B to solution A (1:5 ratio). The exact amount of A to B should be adjusted to obtain a final pH of 6.8 at 39°C. Add 1600 ml of combined A/B mixture to each jar containing the sample bags.
3. Place digestion jars with samples and buffer solution into **Daisy<sup>II</sup> Incubator** and activate heat and agitation switches (red lights in switches indicate power). Allow temperature of digestion jars to equilibrate for at least twenty to thirty minutes. This time could be used for collection and preparation of rumen inoculum.

### Preparation of Inoculum and Incubation:

1. Purge the blender container with CO<sub>2</sub> gas and continued during the transfer of the inoculum. Empty the rumen inoculum from the thermos through four layers of cheesecloth into a five-liter flask (pre-heated 39° C) and blend at a high speed for 30 seconds.
2. Measure 400ml of rumen inoculum in a graduated cylinder and add the inoculum to each jar contained buffer solution and samples. Purge the digestion jar with CO<sub>2</sub> gas for thirty seconds and secure lid. Repeat process for all digestion jars to be used.
3. Incubate for 48 hours to determine the In Vitro True Digestibility result. The **DAISY<sup>II</sup> Incubator** will maintain a temperature of 39.5°C ± 0.5. At completion of incubation, remove jars and drain fluid. Rinse bags thoroughly with cold tap water until water is clear. Use a minimum of mechanical agitation.

## Analytical procedures

The incubated nylon bag forage samples were analyzed for DM according to AOAC (1984). The NDF residues in forages and bag residues were determined using reagents and methods as described by Van Soest *et al.*, 1991 with exceptions. These were that NDF was calculated as the residue in the in vitro bags after 60 min of immersion in boiling ND with sodium sulfite and amylase.

## Calculation

$$\text{NDFD (\% DM)} = 100 \times [(W2 \times \% \text{NDF}_{\text{Feed}}) - (W3 - (W1 \times C1)) / (W2 \times \% \text{DM}_{\text{Feed}})]$$

$$\text{IVDMD (\%DM)} = 100 - [(W3 - (W1 \times C1)) \times 100] / (W2 \times \% \text{DM}_{\text{Feed}})$$

Where: W1 = Bag tare weight  
W2 = weight of sample  
W3 = final weight (Filter bag + sample)  
NDF<sub>Feed</sub> = NDF contain in Feed (%DM)  
DM<sub>Feed</sub> = dry matter contain in feed  
C1 = correction of factor (blank filter bag)

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่  
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University  
All rights reserved

### Organoleptic test (DLD, 2004)

Organoleptic observations mean using the sense organs (eyes, nose, taste, ears, touch) to evaluate the quality of the forage. This method is practical because it can be easily done, requires no special equipment, and is readily applied. It is the simplest method but it provides the least information. Organoleptic observation can be useful in some ways but cannot determine chemical composition.

| Silage Characteristic |   |           |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|
| 1. Odour              | Smell like preserved fruits   | 12 points |
|                       | Little pungent  | 8 points  |
|                       | Very pungent  | 4 points  |
|                       | Rancid smell or mold smell  | 0 points  |
| 2. Texture            | Firmly, have many leaves and stems and without adulterated thing    | 4 points  |
|                       | Firmly, leaves and stems are soften and mucus                       | 2 points  |
|                       | Firmly, leaves and stem are very soften and have adulterated things | 1 points  |
|                       | dirty   | 0 points  |
| 3. Colour             | Greenish-yellow or Khaki  | 3 points  |
|                       | Yellowish-green or bottle-green                                     | 2 points  |
|                       | Hazel   | 1 points  |
|                       | Niggerbrown or black  | 0 points  |
| 4. pH                 | 3.5 – 4.2   | 6 points  |
|                       | 4.4 – 4.7   | 4 points  |
|                       | 4.7 – 5.1   | 2 points  |
|                       | > 5.1   | 0 points  |

The sum of total scores will grade:

|         |           |
|---------|-----------|
| 20 – 25 | very good |
| 15 – 19 | good      |
| 6 – 14  | fair      |
| 0 – 5   | poor      |



ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่  
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University  
All rights reserved

## APPENDIX B

### Statistical analysis

**Table 1** ANOVA: The chemical composition of the forages (Experiment 4.1.1)

|            | Source    | SS         | df | MS        | F          | Sig.  |
|------------|-----------|------------|----|-----------|------------|-------|
| <b>DM</b>  | Treatment | 13,856.237 | 5  | 2,771.247 | 38,110.210 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 1.309      | 18 | 0.073     |            |       |
|            | Total     | 13,857.546 | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>CP</b>  | Treatment | 3.830      | 5  | 1.966     | 50.682     | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 0.698      | 18 | .039      |            |       |
|            | Total     | 10.528     | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>EE</b>  | Treatment | 3.119      | 5  | .624      | .748       | .598  |
|            | Error     | 15.007     | 18 | .834      |            |       |
|            | Total     | 18.125     | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>CF</b>  | Treatment | 46.669     | 5  | 9.334     | 11.238     | .000  |
|            | Error     | 14.950     | 18 | .831      |            |       |
|            | Total     | 61.619     | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>NDF</b> | Treatment | 140.548    | 5  | 28.110    | 9.227      | .000  |
|            | Error     | 54.834     | 18 | 3.046     |            |       |
|            | Total     | 195.382    | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>ADF</b> | Treatment | 20.897     | 5  | 4.179     | 10.282     | .000  |
|            | Error     | 7.317      | 18 | .406      |            |       |
|            | Total     | 28.214     | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>ADL</b> | Treatment | 8.240      | 5  | 1.648     | .951       | .473  |
|            | Error     | 31.203     | 18 | 1.734     |            |       |
|            | Total     | 39.444     | 23 |           |            |       |
| <b>Ash</b> | Treatment | 27.995     | 5  | 5.599     | 45.083     | .000  |
|            | Error     | 2.235      | 18 | .124      |            |       |
|            | Total     | 30.231     | 23 |           |            |       |

|            | Source    | SS     | df | MS    | F      | Sig.  |
|------------|-----------|--------|----|-------|--------|-------|
| <b>Ash</b> | Treatment | 28.545 | 5  | 5.709 | 18.263 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 5.627  | 18 | 0.313 |        |       |
|            | Total     | 34.172 | 23 |       |        |       |

**Table 2** ANOVA: Silage characteristic of pangola silage (Experiment 4.1.2)

|                     | Source    | SS       | df | MS       | F       | Sig.  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----|----------|---------|-------|
| <b>DMAfter</b>      | Treatment | 22.781   | 1  | 22.781   | 986.913 | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | .139     | 6  | 0.023    |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 22.920   | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>%loss</b>        | Treatment | 558.782  | 1  | 558.782  | 274.332 | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | 12.221   | 6  | 2.037    |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 571.004  | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>pH</b>           | Treatment | 1.575    | 1  | 1.575    | 103.440 | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | .091     | 6  | 0.015    |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 1.667    | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>Acetic acid</b>  | Treatment | 1358.452 | 1  | 1358.452 | 95.226  | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | 85.593   | 6  | 14.266   |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 1444.045 | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>Butyric acid</b> | Treatment | 12.804   | 1  | 12.804   | 7.698   | 0.032 |
|                     | Error     | 9.979    | 6  | 1.663    |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 22.783   | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>Lactic acid</b>  | Treatment | 1635.028 | 1  | 1635.028 | 182.342 | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | 53.801   | 6  | 8.967    |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 1688.829 | 7  |          |         |       |
| <b>Scores</b>       | Treatment | 4050.000 | 1  | 4050.000 | 243.000 | 0.000 |
|                     | Error     | 100.000  | 6  | 16.667   |         |       |
|                     | Total     | 4150.000 | 7  |          |         |       |



**Table 3** ANOVA: *In vitro* gas production characteristics of forages in buffered rumen fluid, organic matter digestibility (%) and metabolizable energy (ME) (Experiment 4.1.3)

|            | Source    | SS       | df | MS      | F       | Sig.  |
|------------|-----------|----------|----|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>G24</b> | Treatment | 1920.346 | 5  | 384.069 | 149.089 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 46.370   | 18 | 2.576   |         |       |
|            | Total     | 1966.715 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>G48</b> | Treatment | 1571.026 | 5  | 314.205 | 20.502  | 0.072 |
|            | Error     | 275.862  | 18 | 15.326  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 1846.887 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>G72</b> | Treatment | 1630.244 | 5  | 326.049 | 11.289  | 0.205 |
|            | Error     | 519.873  | 18 | 28.882  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 2150.117 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>G96</b> | Treatment | 1782.103 | 5  | 356.421 | 10.023  | 0.259 |
|            | Error     | 640.083  | 18 | 35.560  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 2422.186 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>OMD</b> | Treatment | 749.746  | 5  | 149.949 | 547.443 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 1.643    | 18 | 0.274   |         |       |
|            | Total     | 751.389  | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>ME</b>  | Treatment | 22.997   | 5  | 4.599   | 692.508 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | .040     | 18 | 0.007   |         |       |
|            | Total     | 23.037   | 23 |         |         |       |

**Table 4** ANOVA: *In vitro* dry matter and fiber digestion using Daisy<sup>II</sup> incubator (Experiment 4.2)

|                  | Source    | SS      | df | MS     | F     | Sig.  |
|------------------|-----------|---------|----|--------|-------|-------|
| <b>IVDMD 24h</b> | Treatment | 185.103 | 5  | 37.021 | 2.343 | 0.080 |
|                  | Error     | 284.422 | 18 | 15.801 |       |       |
|                  | Total     | 469.525 | 23 |        |       |       |

|                  | Source    | SS      | df | MS     | F     | Sig.  |
|------------------|-----------|---------|----|--------|-------|-------|
| <b>NDFD 24h</b>  | Treatment | 102.772 | 5  | 20.554 | 2.957 | 0.000 |
|                  | Error     | 125.114 | 18 | 6.951  |       |       |
|                  | Total     | 227.886 | 23 |        |       |       |
| <b>IVDMD 48h</b> | Treatment | 353.264 | 5  | 70.653 | 5.767 | 0.002 |
|                  | Error     | 220.509 | 18 | 12.251 |       |       |
|                  | Total     | 573.773 | 23 |        |       |       |
| <b>NDFD 48h</b>  | Treatment | 38.189  | 5  | 7.638  | 1.325 | 0.298 |
|                  | Error     | 103.785 | 18 | 5.766  |       |       |
|                  | Total     | 141.973 | 23 |        |       |       |

**Table 5** ANOVA: Degradation of forages in cattle using nylon bag technique (Experiment 4.3)

|            | Source    | SS       | df | MS      | F       | Sig.  |
|------------|-----------|----------|----|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>24h</b> | Treatment | 692.541  | 5  | 138.508 | 4.214   | 0.010 |
|            | Error     | 591.680  | 18 | 32.871  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 1284.221 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>48h</b> | Treatment | 1476.016 | 5  | 295.203 | 13.634  | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 389.738  | 18 | 21.652  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 1865.754 | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>72h</b> | Treatment | 637.609  | 5  | 127.522 | 6.685   | 0.001 |
|            | Error     | 343.343  | 18 | 19.075  |         |       |
|            | Total     | 980.951  | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>96h</b> | Treatment | 371.498  | 5  | 74.300  | 29.484  | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | 45.361   | 18 | 2.520   |         |       |
|            | Total     | 416.858  | 23 |         |         |       |
| <b>a</b>   | Treatment | 79.547   | 5  | 15.909  | 704.358 | 0.000 |
|            | Error     | .136     | 18 | 0.023   |         |       |
|            | Total     | 79.683   | 23 |         |         |       |

|               | Source    | SS       | df | MS       | F        | Sig.  |
|---------------|-----------|----------|----|----------|----------|-------|
| <b>b</b>      | Treatment | 238.244  | 5  | 47.649   | 3156.496 | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | .091     | 18 | 0.015    |          |       |
|               | Total     | 238.335  | 23 |          |          |       |
| <b>c</b>      | Treatment | .000     | 5  | 0.000    | 143.836  | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | .000     | 18 | 0.000    |          |       |
|               | Total     | .000     | 23 |          |          |       |
| <b>a+b</b>    | Treatment | 243.153  | 5  | 48.631   | 10.915   | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | 80.196   | 18 | 4.455    |          |       |
|               | Total     | 323.349  | 23 |          |          |       |
| <b>ED0.02</b> | Treatment | 4257.160 | 5  | 851.432  | 170.611  | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | 89.829   | 18 | 4.990    |          |       |
|               | Total     | 4346.989 | 23 |          |          |       |
| <b>ED0.04</b> | Treatment | 7130.098 | 5  | 1426.020 | 595.365  | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | 43.114   | 18 | 2.395    |          |       |
|               | Total     | 7173.212 | 23 |          |          |       |
| <b>ED0.08</b> | Treatment | 8647.449 | 5  | 1729.490 | 1765.864 | 0.000 |
|               | Error     | 17.629   | 18 | .979     |          |       |
|               | Total     | 8665.078 | 23 |          |          |       |

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่  
 Copyright© by Chiang Mai University  
 All rights reserved

## CURRICULUM VITAE

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Name</b>          | Miss Masjarat Tasdee  |
| <b>Date of Birth</b> | December 19, 1989   |
| <b>Educations</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Wachirawit secondary School, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 2001-2007: Certificate of matayom VI</li><li>- Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 2008-2012: Bachelor of Science (Agriculture) in Animal Sciences</li></ul>  |
| <b>Scholarship</b>   |   |
| 2014                 | Partial fund from Graduate School, Chiang Mai University, Thailand.   |
| <b>Presentation</b>  |   |
| 2015                 | Oral presentation: <i>In Vitro</i> Digestibility and Ruminant Degradability of Fresh and Preserved Pangola Grass at 45 days of regrowth stage cutting (Outstanding research). <i>In</i> : the 4 <sup>th</sup> National Animal Science Conference of Thailand. At Prince of Songkla University, Songkla, Thailand. |

