

# FERTILIZER N EFFECTS ON SILAGE QUALITY OF GRASS-LEGUME AND HERB MIXTURES



Susanne Ohl, Beeke Ehlers & Uzair Ahmad Faraz

### Introduction

- Climate change adversely impacts grassland yield, stability and feed availability.
- Plants grown in mixtures respond less strongly to drought stress.
- Herbal mixtures not only have good forage qualities but are also suitable for preservation as silage.

# Objectives

To evaluate the silage quality of herbal mixtures grown under different nitrogen fertilization levels and assess the effects of a biological silage additive (SA) containing homo- and heterofermentative lactic acid bacteria.

### Material & Methods

- Base: Plot trial in Northern Germany (2020-2022) with different forage types and nitrogen fertilization levels 40 (N1) & 220 kg N/ha/year (N2)
- Chosen forage for ensiling: 3rd cut 2022 of Mix 1 (perennial ryegrass & white clover) and Mix 2 (ryegrass, white clover, ribwort plantain & chicory) sown as mixed and strip variants
- Ensiling of wilted forage (35 % DM) in glass jars (n=3) as untreated control (CON) and inoculated with SA (*L. plantarum, P. pentosaceus, L. buchneri, L. kefiri*)
- Analyses of fresh forages: nutritional value, sugar, buffering capacity, nitrate, fermentability coefficient
- Analyses of silages: nutritional value, sugar, DM loss, fermentation & hygienic quality, aerobic stability



## **Results & Discussion**

- 3rd cut 2022:
  - $\rightarrow$  DM yield between 9.3 dt/ha (Mix 2, N1) 11.5 dt/ha (Mix 1, N2)
  - > growth with the highest proportion of clover and herbs in the trial period
- Fresh forages: free of nitrate (< 0.3 g/kg DM), sugar ≥ 100 g/kg DM, mean buffering capacity 38 51 g lactic acid/kg DM, due to fermentability coefficient ≥ 48 classified as easy to ensile
- ↓ N fertilization levels: ↑ proportion of white clover, ↑ crude protein, ↑ buffering capacity, ↓ sugar (Tab. 1)
- ↑ N fertilization levels: ↑ proportion of ryegrass & ribwort plantain, ↓ crude protein, ↑ sugar, ↑ energy
- High silage quality for both mixtures: strong acidification, minor DM loss ( $\leq 4.6\%$ ), minor protein degradation, no butyric acid, no molds
- SA: Inoculation led to faster pH decrease, ↑ lactic acid content
- Aerobic storage: most silages without reheating (exception Mix 1, N1, SA) but nevertheless sometimes signs of spoilage

### **Unexpected finding:**

> ↑ lactic acid content in mixtures with lower fertilization – similar findings in unfertilized multispecies mixtures reported at literature

# Conclusion

The level of nitrogen fertilization influenced the composition of grass-legume (and herb) mixtures and their nutritional value.

The successfully wilted mixtures exhibited a rapid and substantial reduction in pH, driven by efficient lactic acid production, which was further enhanced by using a biological silage additive.

Adhering to good professional practices is key to producing high-quality silage from these mixtures.

**Tab. 1:** Mean values (n=3) of silage quality parameters of grass-legume mixtures (Mix 1) containing additional herbs (Mix 2), cultivated with different N fertilization, after 90 days of fermentation with (SA) or without inoculation (CON).

		MIX 1				MIX 2			
	-	N1¹		N2 <sup>2</sup>		N1		N2	
<b>Parameters</b>		CON	SA	CON	SA	CON	SA	CON	SA
DM	[%]	38.0 <sup>a</sup>	35.6e	38.0a	38.5 <sup>ab</sup>	36.5 <sup>c</sup>	38.0 <sup>d</sup>	37.8a	38.8 <sup>b</sup>
Crude ash		9.7a	9.0 <sup>b</sup>	8.2 <sup>c</sup>	<b>7.9</b> <sup>c</sup>	<b>9.4</b> <sup>a</sup>	8.7 <sup>b</sup>	<b>7.7</b> <sup>c</sup>	8.2 <sup>c</sup>
Crude protein		15.5 <sup>a</sup>	15.8a	13.8 <sup>b</sup>	13.5 <sup>b</sup>	15.6ac	15.6 <sup>c</sup>	12.9 <sup>b</sup>	13.9 <sup>b</sup>
aNDFom	[% DM]	38.4 <sup>a</sup>	39.2a	44.4 <sup>c</sup>	43.7 <sup>c</sup>	36.6 <sup>b</sup>	37.2 <sup>b</sup>	43.4 <sup>c</sup>	42.9 <sup>c</sup>
ADFom		28.0 <sup>a</sup>	27.9a	25.6 <sup>b</sup>	25.0 <sup>c</sup>	27.6a	28.0 <sup>a</sup>	24.7 <sup>b</sup>	25.2 <sup>bc</sup>
Sugar		<b>5.8</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>5.7</b> <sup>a</sup>	10.9 <sup>c</sup>	10.5 <sup>c</sup>	5.6a	4.2 <sup>b</sup>	10.6 <sup>c</sup>	8.8 <sup>d</sup>
NEL	[MJ/kg DM]	6.2a	<b>6.1</b> <sup>a</sup>	6.6 <sup>c</sup>	<b>6.5</b> <sup>d</sup>	<b>6.1</b> <sup>b</sup>	6.0 <sup>b</sup>	6.5 <sup>bc</sup>	6.5 <sup>cd</sup>
Lactic acid	 [% DM]	<b>5.8</b> <sup>a</sup>	8.4 <sup>b</sup>	<b>5.4</b> <sup>e</sup>	7.5 <sup>f</sup>	6.0 <sup>c</sup>	7.7 <sup>d</sup>	<b>4.0</b> <sup>g</sup>	6.0 <sup>h</sup>
Acetic acid		1.9 <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.8</b> <sup>b</sup>	1.6 <sup>e</sup>	$1.1^{f}$	1.4 <sup>c</sup>	<b>1.1</b> <sup>d</sup>	1.6 <sup>eg</sup>	1.5 <sup>h</sup>
Ethanol		<b>0.5</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.7</b> ad	<b>0.5</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.9</b> <sup>d</sup>	<b>0.6</b> <sup>b</sup>	<b>0.5</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.5</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.4</b> <sup>c</sup>
pH 3 d		5.1 <sup>a</sup>	4.2 <sup>b</sup>	4.5 <sup>c</sup>	<b>4.3</b> e	4.6 <sup>c</sup>	<b>4.4</b> <sup>d</sup>	4.5 <sup>c</sup>	4.5 <sup>c</sup>
pH 90 d		4.2a	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	<b>4.1</b> <sup>a</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	<b>4.1</b> <sup>a</sup>	<b>4.0</b> <sup>d</sup>	4.2 <sup>c</sup>	4.0 <sup>d</sup>

 $^{1}$ N1= 40 kg N/ha/year,  $^{2}$ N2= 220 kg N/ha/year

Dr. Susanne Ohl

Landwirtschaftskammer Schleswig-Holstein, Lehr- und Versuchszentrum Futterkamp Gutshof, 24327 Blekendorf, Germany sohl@lksh.de



Landwirtschaftskammer Schleswig-Holstein Uzair Ahmed Faraz
Beeke Ehlers
Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel,
Germany
uzair.ahmedfaraz14@gmail.com