

## Original Research Article

### **METHANE MITIGATION IN CROSSBRED BULLOCKS BY UREA TREATED WHEAT STRAW & LUCERNE STRAW BASED TMR**

#### **ABSTRACT**

Present experiment was conducted to study the effect of feeding lucerne straw and urea treated wheat straw based TMR (Total Mixed Ration) on nutrients intake, digestibility of nutrients, rumen parameters, rumen microbial protein synthesis and enteric methane emissions in crossbred bullocks. Experiment was conducted on 15 crossbred bullocks for 50 days using *Completely Randomized Design*. The animals in control group (T<sub>1</sub>) were fed TMR with 70% wheat straw and 30% concentrate. The animals in experimental group T<sub>2</sub> were fed TMR with 35% urea treated wheat straw, 35% wheat straw and 30% concentrate whereas, animals in T<sub>3</sub> group were fed TMR with 35% lucerne straw, 35% wheat straw and 30% concentrate. The intakes of nutrients and rumen parameters were not affected by the treatments. Digestibility coefficients of crude protein (CP), ether extract (EE) and hemicellulose (HC) did not differ significantly among the groups. Similarly, digestibility coefficients of dry matter (DM) and nitrogen-free extract (NFE) did not differ significantly between T<sub>1</sub> & T<sub>2</sub> group, and significant reduction was reported in T<sub>3</sub> group. Crude fibre (CF), NDF (neutral detergent fibre), ADF (acid detergent fibre) and cellulose digestibility was significantly higher in T<sub>2</sub> group, whereas significant reduction noted in NDF, ADF and cellulose digestibility in T<sub>3</sub> group, as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Rumen microbial protein synthesis improved by 17.22% ( $p>0.05$ ) in T<sub>2</sub> group, but almost similar value was reported in T<sub>3</sub> group, as compared to control group. Average daily methane emission in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> group reduced significantly by 16.20% and 17.71%, as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. The energy loss in the form of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) as % of gross energy intake (GEI) in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> groups reduced

numerically by 11.10% and 15.66% ( $p>0.05$ ), as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Hence, inclusion of urea treated wheat straw and lucerne straw in wheat straw based TMR helped in reducing enteric methane emissions in crossbred bullocks.

**Key words:** Lucerne straw, Urea treatment, Methane emission, Ruminants, Greenhouse gas.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Livestock sector in India contributes about 50% of the total methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions which is a potent greenhouse gas, of which enteric fermentation contributes >49% [11]. The *per capita* methane production is relatively higher in India than the values reported from developed countries [3,14] and this can be attributed to the poor quality roughages and feeds available to the animals. Over a wide range of diets, enteric CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ruminant livestock account for 2 to 12% of gross energy intake [12]. Methane emission from enteric fermentation, apart from its association with environmental problem, is also representing a certain amount of energy loss from the animals [6]. It is therefore essential to develop various feeding strategies that simultaneously mitigate methane emission and increase the efficiency of energy utilization. Legume forages have been shown to decrease CH<sub>4</sub> production in ruminants, which is often explained by the low fiber content, high dry matter (DM) intake, faster rate of passage from the rumen and in some cases, the presence of condensed tannins (CT) [3]. Some legumes also contain saponins which has anti-protozoal effect. Lucerne (*Medicago sativa*) fodder a fair source of saponins<sup>15</sup> and grown traditionally on wide scale in India, might be used for mitigation of methane in ruminants fed without any additional input [17]. Urea treatment of cereal straws enhances the quality of straw in terms of increased nitrogen content, improved palatability and digestibility of straw. Thus, the present study was undertaken to evaluate the effect of partial replacement of wheat straw based TMR with

lucerne straw and urea treated wheat straw on nutrient intake, digestibility, rumen parameters, microbial protein synthesis and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in crossbred bullocks.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

On farm study was conducted at Anand Agricultural University, Anand on 15 crossbred bullocks for 50 days using *Completely Randomized Design*. Animals in control group (T<sub>1</sub>) were fed total mixed ration (TMR) containing 30% concentrates and 70% wheat straw. The animals in experimental group T<sub>2</sub> were fed TMR with 35% urea treated wheat straw, 35% wheat straw and 30% concentrate whereas, animals in T<sub>3</sub> group were fed TMR with 35% lucerne straw, 35% wheat straw and 30% concentrate. The quantity of TMR offered twice daily i.e. morning and evening to meet the nutrient requirements [10] (Table 1).

**Table 1: Ingredients & Chemical composition of total mixed rations**

Parameters	Groups		
	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>
<b>Ingredients composition (%)</b>			
Wheat straw	70	35	35
Urea treated wheat straw	0	35	0
Lucerne straw	0	0	35
Maize	5	7	10
Soyabean meal	10	7	0
De-oiled rice bran	5	6	9
Molasses	9	9	10
Mineral mixture	1	1	1
<b>Chemical composition (% on DM basis)</b>			
DM	93.37	93.79	91.34
Crude protein (CP)	9.79	10.56	9.56
Ether extract (EE)	2.54	2.44	2.27
Crude fibre (CF)	26.57	29.86	33.00
Total ash (TA)	13.57	13.66	10.60
Nitrogen free extract (NFE)	47.53	43.48	44.58
Acid insoluble ash (AIA)	7.31	5.15	3.37
Neutral detergent fibre (NDF)	55.92	64.36	62.17

Acid detergent fibre (ADF)	34.65	39.92	39.25
Cellulose (C)	27.88	30.52	30.55
Hemicellulose (HC)	25.26	24.44	22.92
Acid detergent lignin (ADL)	4.35	5.50	6.88
Calcium (Ca)	1.15	1.04	1.35
Phosphorus (P)	0.50	0.50	0.48

Individual feeding of all the bullocks was followed. The bullocks were housed in sheds with proper ventilation, flooring and tying arrangements with facility of individual feeding. They were let loose daily (except during the period of digestion trial) in an open paddock, for two hours in the morning and two hour in the afternoon under controlled conditions for exercise and to access fresh wholesome drinking water. Deworming of all the crossbred bullocks was carried out using broad spectrum of anthelmintics before initiation of the experiment.

The daily feed intake was recorded for each experimental animal during the entire feeding trial. A digestion trial was conducted at the end of experimental period to determine digestibility of the nutrients. The arrangement for quantitative collection of faeces was made during trial period of 7 days. A proper record of feed consumed, refusal and faeces voided by each crossbred bullock was maintained during the entire trial period. Representative samples of feed consumed, refusal and faeces were taken for proximate [2] and fibre fractions [24] analyses.

Samples of rumen liquor (150 ml) were collected from individual bullock at 0 (before feeding), 2, 4 and 6 h post feeding through a stomach tube against negative pressure created by a suction pump. The pH of strained rumen liquor (SRL) was determined immediately after collection using portable digital pH meter. After pH determination, 1.0 mL of saturated HgCl<sub>2</sub> solution was added to each sample to stop microbial activity. The samples of SRL were analyzed for ammonia-N and total-N by Kjeldahl's method. Soluble-N in supernatant of

SRL after centrifuging was estimated by Kjeldahl's method and non-protein nitrogen estimated by Trichloro-acetic acid precipitation of SRL and estimating the N content of supernatant by Kjeldahl's method. Total volatile fatty acids (TVFAs) concentration was determined by the steam distillation method using Markham micro-distillation apparatus.

Urine samples (100 mL) were collected from individual bullocks for three consecutive days and assayed for allantoin, uric acid and creatinine [25]. Urine samples preserved with sufficient quantity of 1.87 mol/L H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> to maintain pH<3.0. Purine derivatives (PD) were measured using Spectrophotometer based on the fact that excretion of creatinine is constant throughout a day, therefore, creatinine was used as an internal marker for estimation of PD [5]. Daily excretion of creatinine was considered as 0.98 mmol/kg W<sup>0.75</sup> and microbial N supply was calculated from the daily urinary PD excreted [9].

Breath samples from each experimental bullock were collected daily for three consecutive days in canisters to estimate enteric CH<sub>4</sub> emissions using a sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) tracer technique [13]. A small permeation tube containing a known release rate of SF<sub>6</sub> gas was inserted into each experimental bullock through mouth. All breath samples were analysed in triplicate using a Gas Chromatograph instrument fitted with a Porapack N column for CH<sub>4</sub> and molecular sieve 5A for SF<sub>6</sub> analysis. Column temperature was maintained at 50°C and nitrogen was used as a carrier gas with flow rate of 30 mL/min. The methane emission rate was calculated as:  $Q_{CH_4} = Q_{SF_6} \times (CH_4)/(SF_6)$ , where  $Q_{CH_4}$ ; methane emissions rate (g/min),  $Q_{SF_6}$ = known release rate of SF<sub>6</sub> from permeation tube (g/min),  $CH_4$ =methane concentration of the collected sample in a canister (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and  $SF_6$ =SF<sub>6</sub> concentration of collected sample in a canister (µg/m<sup>3</sup>). Energy content of CH<sub>4</sub> was considered as 13.34 Kcal/g. Loss of energy in the form of CH<sub>4</sub> as % of gross energy intake, digestible energy intake and metabolizable energy intake was calculated.

The cost of feeding for bullocks was calculated from the records of daily feed consumption and by considering the procurement price of feeds and fodder used for feeding of bullocks.

Data were analysed by the analysis of variance as per the methods of Snedecor and Cochran (1994), with the help of SPSS and WASP software programme.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Ingredient and chemical composition of TMRs used for is presented in Table 1. Intake of DM, CP, DCP & TDN in all three groups was statistically similar (Table 2). Results indicate that lucerne straw and urea treated wheat straw based TMRs have non-significant effect on DMI. The results are in agreement with earlier findings [21]. Similarly, non-significant intake of DM, CP & TDN reported although DCP intake was significantly higher in earlier study [4]. However, significant improvement has been reported in intake of DM, CP, DCP & TDN in crossbred heifers fed urea treated wheat straw containing diet, as compared to untreated counterpart [8].

Digestibility coefficients of DM, CP, EE, NFE & Hemicellulose (HC) did not differ significantly among the groups. However, CF, NDF, ADF and cellulose digestibility was significantly higher in T<sub>2</sub> group which may be due to better microbial activity on account of readily available source of nitrogen (Table 2). This is further supported by higher microbial protein synthesis in T<sub>2</sub> compared to T<sub>1</sub>. However, significant reduction noted in NDF, ADF and cellulose digestibility in T<sub>3</sub> group as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Though the results are unexpected, but may be due to higher passage rate from the rumen giving less time for digestibility of fibre fractions. Similar to our findings, non-significant effect of legume straw based TMR on digestibility of CP, EE, CF & HC have been reported in cattle [21,4]. Similarly, non-significant DMD reported in earlier study supplemented urea treated rice straw compared untreated group although CPD, NDFD & ADFD was significantly higher [7].

The rumen parameters also revealed non-significant difference among the treatments (Table 2). Similar results obtained when compared legume straw with cereal straw in earlier studies [19,21]. However in contrast with this study, significantly higher TVFA and NH<sub>3</sub>-N concentration was noted in crossbred dairy cows fed urea treated rice straw as compared to untreated rice straw [7].

**Table 2: Effect of Urea treated wheat straw & Lucerne straw based TMR on Nutrient intake, Digestibility & Rumen parameters**

Parameters	Groups		
	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>
<b>Nutrient Intake</b>			
DMI (kg/day)	8.21 ± 0.40	8.41 ± 0.63	8.45 ± 0.11
CPI (kg/day)	0.75 ± 0.04	0.83 ± 0.07	0.76 ± 0.01
DCPI (kg/day)	0.50 ± 0.04	0.57 ± 0.05	0.51 ± 0.05
TDNI (kg/day)	4.07 ± 0.21	4.27 ± 0.38	4.01 ± 0.05
<b>Digestibility coefficients (%)</b>			
DM (%)	57.16 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.16	56.89 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.93	52.66 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.34
CP (%)	66.93 ± 2.06	69.52 ± 3.24	68.55 ± 1.03
EE (%)	64.85 ± 4.82	70.14 ± 5.42	62.87 ± 2.46
CF (%)	55.27 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.21	61.70 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.06	53.18 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.46
NFE (%)	63.67 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.41	60.22 <sup>ab</sup> ± 1.63	56.46 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.94
NDF (%)	54.30 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.69	59.37 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.32	49.45 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.44
ADF (%)	47.83 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.89	57.18 <sup>a</sup> ± 2.08	42.60 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.59
Hemicellulose (%)	63.24 <sup>b</sup> ± 2.10	62.88 <sup>b</sup> ± 3.25	60.91 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.78
Cellulose (%)	60.23 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.68	66.53 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.51	53.37 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.22
<b>Rumen Parameters</b>			
pH	6.80 ± 0.04	6.82 ± 0.06	6.77 ± 0.01
TVFA (mmol/dl)	10.90 ± 0.20	10.36 ± 0.46	10.38 ± 0.18

Total Nitrogen (mg/dl)	57.12 ± 1.54	62.44 ± 4.29	62.58 ± 3.42
Ammonia – N (mg/dl)	13.37 ± 1.00	12.95 ± 0.91	11.41 ± 0.76
Non Protein Nitrogen (mg/dl)	17.36 ± 0.81	16.38 ± 1.00	16.52 ± 1.30
Soluble Nitrogen (mg/dl)	15.75 ± 0.60	15.61 ± 0.75	14.21 ± 0.72

<sup>abc</sup>Means with different superscripts in row for a parameter differ significantly (P<0.05)

### Microbial protein synthesis:

The data of various urine parameters and rumen microbial protein synthesis are presented in Table 3. The average rumen microbial protein synthesis in T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> groups was 83.31, 97.66 and 81.65 g/day, respectively. The results were at par however, rumen microbial protein synthesis increased by 17.22% in T<sub>2</sub> group as compared to control group which may be due to urea treated straw and better digestibility of nutrients in T<sub>2</sub>. Significantly higher microbial protein synthesis (8.16% and 37.44%) was reported in buffalo and crossbred calves fed legume straw based TMR, as compared to wheat straw based TMR, respectively [19,4]. In crossbred dairy cows also higher microbial protein synthesis (P<0.05) has been reported on urea treated rice straw, as compared to untreated rice straw [7].

The results of methane emission are delineated in Table 3. Average daily methane emission in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> group reduced significantly by 16.20% and 17.71%, respectively, as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Similarly when expressed as g/kg DMI, CH<sub>4</sub> emission reduced significantly by 19.75% in T<sub>3</sub> group, while non-significantly in T<sub>2</sub> group by 10.32%, as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Methane emission (g/kg DDMI) in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> groups also reduced numerically by 9.93% and 12.92%, respectively as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. The results revealed that inclusion of urea treated straw and legume straws in ration of crossbred bullocks helps in methane mitigation successfully. This is due to the better digestibility of nutrients and more microbial protein synthesis in rumen as methane emission and rumen microbial protein synthesis are inversely related [21]. In lucerne straw containing group, the methane

mitigation may be due to higher tannins and saponin content which is anti-methanogenic. Similar findings have been reported by various researchers [insert citations]. Similarly, lucerne fodder based TMR feeding significantly reduced methane emission by 12% (49.55 vs. 44.29 g/day) and 30% when expressed in g/kg DMI (17.38 vs.12.20 g/kg DMI) in crossbred calves, as compared to wheat straw based TMR [16]. Significant reduction in enteric methane emission by 6.39% (g/day) and 6.65% (g/kg DMI) also reported in buffalo and 7.79% (g/day) and 9.04% (g/kg DMI) in crossbred cattle, on legume straw based TMR, as compared to wheat straw based TMR [19, 21].

**Table 3: Effect of Urea treated wheat straw & Lucerne straw based TMR on Rumen microbial protein synthesis, Methane emission & Economics of feeding**

Parameters	Groups		
	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>
<b>Rumen microbial protein synthesis</b>			
Allantoin (mmol/l)	0.267 ± 0.03	0.287 ± 0.01	0.310 ± 0.14
Uric acid (mmol/l)	1.70 ± 0.27	1.93 ± 0.13	2.13 ± 0.40
Creatinine (mmol/l)	1.37 ± 0.17	1.38 ± 0.08	1.69 ± 0.05
PDC index	111.13 ± 7.29	128.40 ± 8.17	108.73 ± 14.08
Total PD excreted (mmol/day)	108.91 ± 7.14	125.83 ± 8.01	106.56 ± 13.80
Absorbed purine (mmol/day)	114.6 ± 8.26	134.33 ± 9.23	112.3 ± 16.09
Intestinal flow of microbial nitrogen supply (g/d)	83.31 ± 6.01	97.66 ± 6.71	81.65 ± 11.70
<b>Enteric Methane emission</b>			
CH <sub>4</sub> emission (g/day)	347.81 <sup>a</sup> ± 13.34	291.45 <sup>b</sup> ± 11.96	286.20 <sup>b</sup> ± 20.10
CH <sub>4</sub> emission (g/kg DMI)	42.94 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.43	38.51 <sup>ab</sup> ± 2.62	34.46 <sup>b</sup> ± 2.03
CH <sub>4</sub> emission (g/kg DDMI)	75.23 ± 2.74	67.76 ± 4.65	65.51 ± 4.13
GE intake (Mcal/day)	23.63 ± 1.15	22.82 ± 2.21	22.89 ± 0.26
Energy loss as CH <sub>4</sub> (Mcal/day)	4.64 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.18	3.89 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.16	3.82 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.27
Energy loss as CH <sub>4</sub> (% of GEI)	19.73 ± 0.78	17.54 ± 1.36	16.64 ± 1.02
Energy loss as CH <sub>4</sub> (% of DEI)	23.57 ± 0.93	20.96 ± 1.62	19.88 ± 1.22
Energy loss as CH <sub>4</sub> (% of MEI)	28.58 ± 1.19	25.37 ± 2.03	24.39 ± 1.51
<b>Economics of feeding</b>			
Daily Feed Cost (Rs.)	58.84 ± 3.15	58.10 ± 4.64	50.14 ± 0.73

<sup>abc</sup>Means with different superscripts in row for a parameter differ significantly (P<0.05)

Daily gross energy (GE) intake was similar in all three groups (Table 3). However, daily energy loss through CH<sub>4</sub> (Mcal/day) was 4.64, 3.89 and 3.82 in T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub>, respectively where significant reduction noted by 16.16% and 17.67 % in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> than T<sub>1</sub>. The energy loss through methane when calculated as % of GE intake was found less by 11.10% and 15.66%. Similar trend was observed for energy loss through methane as % of DE and ME intake. The results are in agreement with many findings. Similar to this finding, reduction of 7.15%, 9.57% and 15.95% in energy loss through methane as % of GE intake has been reported ( $p < 0.05$ ) in buffalo, crossbred cattle & crossbred calves, respectively, fed legume straw based TMR as compared to wheat straw based TMR [19,21,4]. Energy loss through methane reduced by 20.34% as percent of gross energy intake in sheep fed ammonia treated wheat straw, as compared to untreated counterpart, which supports the present findings [18].

The economics of feeding was calculated based on the records of TMR consumption and considering the actual price of feeds and fodder used to prepare TMR during entire experimental period. Average daily feed cost was Rs.58.84, 58.10 and 50.14 in T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> group, respectively indicating non-significant differences among the groups (Table 3). Here we can see that average daily feed cost was almost similar in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> group while 14.78% reduction observed in T<sub>3</sub> group as compared to T<sub>1</sub> group. Furthermore, we can decrease the ration of the animal equivalent to energy saved through methane mitigation and thus cost of feed will decrease.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The results suggested that incorporation of 35% urea treated wheat straw or lucerne straw replacing wheat straw in TMR with ratio of 70:30 for roughage: concentrate reduces daily methane emission as well as energy loss through methane and by 16.20 and 17.71 %, respectively.

respectively in crossbred bullocks. The dietary energy loss saved can be used by the animals for physiological functions like health, production and reproduction etc.

## REFERENCES

1. Anonymous 2013. Annual Progress Research Report. 10th meeting of Agricultural research sub-committee, Anand Agricultural University, Anand
2. AOAC 1995. Official Methods of Analysis (15<sup>th</sup> ed.). Arlington, VA: Association of Official Analytical Chemists.
3. Beauchemin, K. A., Kreuzer, M., O'mara, F. and McAllister, T. A. 2008. Nutritional management for enteric methane abatement: a review. *Aust. J. Exp. Agr.*, 48(2), 21-27.
4. Chaudhari, K. I. 2018. Methane mitigation in crossbred calves by feeding legume straw based total mixed ration with SSF biomass. M.V.Sc. thesis submitted to the Anand Agricultural University, Anand, India.
5. Chen, X. B., Grubic, G, Orskov, E. R. and Osuji, P. 1992. Effect of feeding frequency on diurnal variation in plasma and urine purine derivatives in steers. *Anim. Prod.* 55: 185-491.
6. Cottle, D. J., Nolan, J. V. and Wiedemann, S. G. 2011. Ruminant enteric methane mitigation: a review. *Animal Prod. Sci.*, 51(6), 491-514.
7. Gunun, P., Wanapat, M. and Anantasook, N. 2013. Rumen fermentation and performance of lactating dairy cows affected by physical forms and urea treatment of rice straw. *Asian-Australas J Anim Sci.*, 26(9), 1295.

8. Gupta, L. 2003. Effect of Feeding Urea Treated Wheat Straw With or Without Sulphur Source on Feed Utilization by Crossbred Heifers. Doctoral dissertation submitted to the maharana pratap university of agriculture and technology, Udaipur, India.
9. IAEA 1997. Estimation of rumen microbial protein production from purine derivatives in urine. IAEA-TECDOC-945, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria.
10. ICAR 2013. Nutrient requirements of cattle and buffalo. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, India.
11. INCCA 2010. Indian Network on Climate Change Assessment, India: Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2007. Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.
12. Johnson, K. A. and Johnson, D. E. 1995. Methane emissions from cattle. *J. Animal Sci.*, 73(8), 2483-2492.
13. Johnson, K. A., Huyler, M. T., Westberg, H. H., Lamb, B. K. and Zimmerman, P. 1994. Measurement of methane emissions from ruminant livestock using SF<sub>6</sub> tracer technique. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 28: 359-362.
14. Johnson, K. A., Kincaid, R. L, Westberg, H. H, Gaskins C. T, Lamb, B. K and Cronrath J. D. 2002. The effect of oilseeds in diets of lactating cows on milk production and methane emissions. *J Dairy Sci.*, 85, 1509–1515.
15. Klita, P. T., Mathison, G., Fenton, T. W. and Hardin, R. T. 1996. Effect of alfalfa root saponins on digestive function in sheep. *J. Anim. Sci.*, 74: 1144-1156.
16. Malik, P. K. and Singhal, K. K. 2008. Influence of lucerne fodder supplementation on enteric methane emission in crossbred calves. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 78 (3): 293-297.
17. Malik, P. K. and Singhal, K. K. 2009. Effect of lucerne (*Medicago sativa*) fodder supplementation on nutrient utilization and enteric methane emission in male buffalo

- calves fed on wheat straw based total mixed ration. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 79 (4): 416–421.
18. Moss, A. R., Givens, O. L. and Gransworthy, P. C. 1994. The effect of alkali treatment of cereal straws on digestibility and methane production by sheep. *Anim. Feed Sci. Tech.*, 49: 245-249.
19. Prajapati, M. V. 2016. Methane mitigation in buffalo on legume straw based total mixed ration. M.V.Sc. thesis submitted to the Anand Agricultural University, Anand, India.
20. Schroeder, G. F. and Titgemeyer, E. C. 2008. Interaction between protein and energy supply on protein utilization in growing cattle: a review. *Livest. Sci.* 114: 1–10.
21. Sherasia, P. L. 2016. Methane mitigation through feeding legume straw based total mixed ration supplemented with solid state fermentation biomass in crossbred cattle. Ph.D. thesis. Anand agricultural university.
22. Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G. 1994. Statistical Methods. 8th ed., Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India.
23. Vadiveloo, J., and Fadel, J. G. 2009. The response of rice straw varieties to urea treatment. *Anim. Feed Sci. Tech.*, 151(3-4), 291-298.
24. Van Soest, P. J., Robertson, J. B. and Lewis, B. A. 1991. Methods of dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber and non-starch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. *J. Dairy Sci.*, 74: 3583-3597.
25. Young, E. G. and Conway, C. F. 1942. Estimation of allantoin by the Rimini-Schryver reaction. *J. Biol. Chem.* 142: 839-853.