

Discovery, The Student Journal of Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences

Volume 15

Article 7

Fall 2014

Palatability of teff grass by horses

Rachel R. Cummins

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Kenneth Coffey

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Nancy Jack

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Kathleen Jogan

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Edward Gbur

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/discoverymag>

 Part of the [Animal Studies Commons](#), and the [Plant Pathology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cummins, Rachel R.; Coffey, Kenneth; Jack, Nancy; Jogan, Kathleen; Gbur, Edward; Rhein, Robert; Philipp, Dirk; Adams, Melissa; Smith, William; and Clayton, Katherine (2014) "Palatability of teff grass by horses," *Discovery, The Student Journal of Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences*. University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture. 15:26-33.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/discoverymag/vol15/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Discovery, The Student Journal of Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

Palatability of teff grass by horses

Authors

Rachel R. Cummins, Kenneth Coffey, Nancy Jack, Kathleen Jogan, Edward Gbur, Robert Rhein, Dirk Philipp, Melissa Adams, William Smith, and Katherine Clayton

Palatability of teff grass by horses

*Rachel R. Cummins**, *Kenneth P. Coffey†*, *Nancy E. Jack§*, *Kathleen S. Jogan‡*,
Edward E. Gbur¶, *Robert T. Rhein#*, *Dirk Philipp††*, *Melissa Adams§§*,
William B. Smith‡‡, and *Katherine N. Clayton¶¶*

ABSTRACT

Most forages commonly used to feed horses have potential detriments including blister beetles or excessive fiber concentrations. Teff grass (T), a warm-season annual forage, has the potential to be a good alternative for horses because of its lack of observed disorders. Our objective was to compare preference by horses for T harvested under different conditions with that of bermudagrass (B) harvested at two maturities. Six different forages were evaluated: T harvested at the late vegetative stage (TLV), at late bloom but that incurred 33 mm of rainfall between mowing and baling (TLBR), with caryopsis visible (TES), or at soft dough (TSD), and B harvested at late vegetative (BLV) and mid-bloom (BMB) growth stages. Five mature horses were used in a balanced incomplete block design where each horse received a different combination of 4 forages each day for 6 d. The 4 different forages were suspended in hay nets in each corner of each stall, and each hay was offered at 50% of the average daily hay consumption measured during a 12-d adaptation period. Forage preference as measured by individual forage dry matter (DM) consumption (kg and % of total DM consumed across the 4 forages) was greatest ($P < 0.05$) from TLV followed by BLV. Preference (kg and % of total DM consumed) of BMB was greater ($P < 0.05$) than that of TMBR, TES, and TSD, which did not differ from each other ($P \geq 0.63$). Therefore, within a specific growth stage, horses apparently preferred teff grass, but effects of maturity and rainfall had a more dramatic effect on preference by horses than forage species.

* Rachel R. Cummins is a May 2014 Honors graduate with a major in Animal Science.

† Kenneth Coffey is a Professor in the Department of Animal Science; Faculty mentor.

§ Nancy Jack is an Associate Professor in the Department of Animal Science.

‡ Kathleen Jogan is a Program Technician in the Department of Animal Science.

¶ Edward Gbur is a Professor in the Agricultural Statistics Lab.

Robert Rhein is a Research Field Technician in the Department of Animal Science.

†† Dirk Philipp is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Animal Science.

§§ Melissa Adams is a Senior at Scotland's Rural College (SRUC), Riverside Campus, Ayre, Scotland.

‡‡ William Smith graduated with an MS degree in Animal Science and is now pursuing a Ph.D. at Texas A&M University.

¶¶ Katherine Clayton is a December 2013 graduate with a major in Animal Science.

MEET THE STUDENT-AUTHOR



Rachel Cummins

I grew up in Coppell, Texas where I graduated from Coppell High School in 2010. I came to the University of Arkansas and majored in animal science with an emphasis on pre-veterinary medicine and a minor in equine science. I am involved with many organizations on campus, including the Pre-Vet Club and the D.E. King Equine Program. I was also a member of the Razorback Marching Band Color-guard for 3 years. I have always hoped to pursue a career in veterinary medicine, and I have been accepted to University of Missouri's College of Veterinary Medicine. I will begin classes there in August of 2014. In my spare time I enjoy reading, hiking and playing video games.

INTRODUCTION

Teff grass is warm-season annual forage recently introduced in the United States from Ethiopia and Eritrea. Teff grass has already gained popularity in the western United States as a horse forage, especially as a forage for horses with metabolic disorders and obesity (Anonymous, 2012). Teff grass has the potential to be a viable alternative to other popular horse forages because of its lack of potential disorders. Alfalfa hay is a popular horse forage, but it is commonly contaminated with blister beetles which emit a chemical that can be fatal if consumed by horses (Echevarria and Hooser, 2006). Bermudagrass is another widely-utilized horse forage; however, it often has problems with low digestibility due to rapid maturity (Coleman et al., 2003). Teff grass does not mature as rapidly as bermudagrass (Miller, 2010), and does not have any observed insect problems. Teff grass is lower in non-structural carbohydrates compared with cool-season forages (Staniar et al., 2010), thereby giving it potential as an alternative forage for horses. To be a contender as a replacement of bermudagrass and alfalfa hay, teff grass must first be established as a forage that horses will willingly consume. The purpose of this study is to determine the palatability of teff grass relative to that of bermudagrass at different maturities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

All procedures were approved by the University of Arkansas Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (Protocol no. 13055). Teff grass (T) was planted at the University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture Watershed Research and Education Center (WREC) according to recommended practices on 29 May 2013. A comparable field of bermudagrass (B), a perennial warm-season grass, was also chosen to provide B hays for comparison with T. The field of B was harvested 15 June and baled for hay to initiate the regrowth process in an attempt to have both forages reaching comparable maturities under similar growing conditions. Both B and T were harvested beginning in late June. The forages included in the study were: T harvested at the late vegetative stage (TLV), T harvested at late bloom but that incurred 33 mm of rainfall between mowing and baling (TLBR), T harvested when the caryopsis was visible (early seed stage; TES), T harvested at soft dough (TSD), B harvested at the late vegetative stage (BLV) and B harvested at the mid-bloom (BMB) growth stage. All forages were allowed to dry in the field to a maximum of 20% moisture and packaged in small-rectangular bales. All bales were stored inside a metal enclosed shed until subsequent feeding.

Five mature horses [511 ± 17.4 kg body weight (BW)], 2 to 10 yr of age, were housed individually in stalls (3.7 × 3.7 m) at the Dorothy E. King (DEK) Equine facility for a 12-d adaptation period followed by a 6-d forage preference evaluation. During the adaptation period, the horses were offered bermudagrass and teff grass hays that were harvested at the mid-bloom growth stage the previous year. This was done to acclimate the horses to each forage. Initially horses were offered 1% of their body weight of each forage divided equally into 2 hay bags. This resulted in a total of 2% of body weight from each forage offered in 4 different hay bags. One hay bag was placed at random in each corner of each stall, and the amount offered increased daily based on consumption. Triangular tarps were suspended beneath each hay bag to catch forage that was pulled from the bags but not consumed. The average daily dry matter (DM) consumption (ADC) for each horse was determined during the last 5 d of the adaptation period.

The preference portion of the experiment immediately followed the adaptation period and utilized a balanced incomplete block design (Plan 11.6 from Cochran and Cox, 1957) that was repeated twice. The original design was for 3 d, with each horse offered a total of 4 of the 6 forages each day. By repeating the design twice, we were able to offer each forage in combination with each other forage at least twice, and each forage was offered to each horse a total of 4 times during the 6-d period. Each horse had a different combination of 4 forages from each other horse, and the combinations were changed daily based on the experimental design (Fig. 1). In order to account for any idiosyncrasies, a number of factors were considered and randomized. First, horses were allocated to a different stall each day based on plans for 5 × 5 Latin Squares with one extra period. This resulted in each horse being housed in each stall at least one day during the study and in only 1 stall a second time. Secondly, the specific corner in which a particular forage was offered was randomized such that the particular forage was offered in all 4 corners of a stall for each individual horse. Each forage was offered at a rate of one-half of the total average daily consumption during the last 5 d of the adaptation period. This is done to ensure that the horses selected from and established a preference ranking for at least two of the forages each day. For example, if the total consumption of both B and T by horse “X” was 10 kg during the last 5 d of the adaptation period, then horse “X” was offered 5 kg of each of the 4 experimental forages.

Horses were given 2-h exercise periods twice daily in the morning at 6:30 AM and in the evening at 7:30 PM. During the morning exercise period, orts were removed and weighed and new forages were placed in the stalls. Each stall door also had a fan to ensure horses were not

overheated. Stalls were bedded in sand and cleaned twice daily. No grain was offered during the adaptation period or trial period. Horses had unlimited access to water, even during the exercise periods.

Samples of each hay were taken daily at the time the hay bags were filled and were dried to a constant weight at 50 °C. Unconsumed hay was collected daily, weighed, and a representative sample was dried to a constant weight at 50 °C. Hay samples from each forage were maintained separately for each day and were ground to pass through a 1-mm screen using a Wiley mill (Arthur H. Thomas, Philadelphia, Pa.) and analyzed for neutral-detergent fiber, acid-detergent fiber, and acid-detergent lignin (Vogel et al, 1999).

Consumption data were analyzed using PROC GLM of SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, N.C.). The model included the effects of horse, forage, day, stall, and corner. The effect of stall was included to ensure that location in the barn was not having an effect. The effect of corner was included to determine if horses preferred to consume forages out of a favorite corner. Stall affected ($P < 0.05$) each of the consumption measurements, but corner and day of study did not ($P \geq 0.56$) affect any of the consumption measurements. Therefore the final consumption model included effects of forage, stall, and horse. Means are reported as least-squares means. Pearson correlation coefficients were also determined among consumption measurements and fiber components using PROC CORR of SAS. The fiber components from each forage on each individual day were matched with consumption of that particular forage on a given day for correlation analyses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Weather data affecting the forages in the present study are presented in Table 1. When compared with the 30-yr averages, May of 2013 was relatively wet. This delayed the planting of the teff grass. June of 2013 was unusually dry, which allowed the late vegetative forages to be baled

Table 1. Weather data during the growing period for teff grass and bermudagrass in 2013.

Item	May	June	July	August
2013				
Avg. Temp. Min., °C	13.7	19.1	19.6	19.3
Avg. Temp. Max., °C	22.7	29.5	30.8	29.8
Rainfall, cm	26.7	3.6	8.7	15.5
30-year avg.				
Avg. Temp. Min., °C	13.3	18.3	20.6	20.0
Avg. Temp. Max., °C	24.4	28.9	31.7	31.7
Rainfall, cm	13.2	12.1	8.2	7.7

Day	Stall 1	Stall 2	Stall 3	Stall 4	Stall 5
Monday 1	C Petal	F Sport	E Des	B Dailey	D Pride
Tuesday 2	E Des	A Pride	C Dailey	A Petal	B Sport
Wed 3	D Sport	A Dailey	F Pride	A Des	F Petal
Thur 4	F Pride	D Des	C Petal	F Sport	C Dailey
Fri 5	D Dailey	A Petal	D Sport	D Pride	C Des
Sat 6	B Petal	F Sport	B Des	B Dailey	D Pride
	D	E	A	E	A

Fig. 1. Stall and corner layout for a study to evaluate the palatability of teff grass and bermudagrass harvested at different maturities. Forages were A – teff grass with the caryopsis visible; B – teff grass harvested at soft dough; C – teff grass harvested at late bloom that received 33 mm of rainfall; D – bermudagrass harvested at mid-bloom; E – bermudagrass harvested at the late vegetative stage; F – teff grass harvested at the late vegetative stage. Each horse's name is in the center cell of each block.

Table 2. Harvest dates and fiber components of forages offered to horses in a palatability study.[†]

Item [§]	Forages [‡]						SEM [¶]
	BLV	TLV	TLBR	BMB	TES	TSD	
Date baled	1-July	28-June	18-Aug.	2-Aug.	24-Aug.	24-Aug.	
NDF, %	67.6 ^b	64.7 ^c	73.5 ^a	68.2 ^b	73.6 ^a	72.5 ^a	0.86
ADF, %	28.4 ^c	29.7 ^c	35.2 ^b	28.6 ^c	37.7 ^a	37.4 ^a	0.60
Hemicellulose, %	39.2 ^a	35.1 ^b	38.3 ^a	39.6 ^a	35.9 ^b	35.1 ^b	0.68
Lignin, %	2.6 ^c	2.7 ^c	3.8 ^{ab}	3.2 ^{bc}	4.4 ^a	3.9 ^{ab}	0.33

[†]Means within a row without a common superscript letter differ ($P < 0.05$).

[‡]BLV = bermudagrass late vegetative; TLV = teff grass late vegetative, TLBR = teff grass late bloom with rain damage, BMB = bermudagrass mid-bloom, TES = teff grass with caryopsis visible, TSD = teff grass soft dough stage.

[§]NDF = neutral detergent fiber; ADF = acid detergent fiber.

[¶]SEM = standard error of mean.

under ideal conditions. However, the dry June also led to issues with growing the later maturities of the forages. Our original intention was to have 3 different maturities each of B and T. However, due to the slow growth rate, only 2 maturities of B were available because of field size limitations. August of 2013 had a greater rainfall compared with the 30-yr average, which delayed the baling of TLBR, TES and TSD. The TLBR also incurred 33 mm of rain damage between mowing and baling.

Forage fiber components are presented in Table 2. The NDF concentration of TES, TSD and TLBR were not different ($P \geq 0.40$) from each other, but were greater ($P < 0.05$) than the NDF concentrations of the other forages. The NDF concentrations of BMB and BLV were greater ($P < 0.05$) than those of TLV. The greater NDF concentration of TLBR suggests that the rain damage removed soluble components, resulting in NDF concentrations similar to that of a more mature forage. The TES and TSD forages also had the greatest ($P < 0.05$) ADF concentrations. These are followed by TLBR ($P < 0.05$). The two maturities of bermudagrass and TLV were not different from each other ($P \geq 0.14$), and had the lowest ($P < 0.05$) ADF concentrations. Lignin concentrations of TES, TSD and TLBR were greater ($P < 0.05$) than those from BLV and TLV. Lignin concentrations of TSD and TLBR are also not different (P

≥ 0.18) from the lignin concentrations of TES or BMB. A previous study reported that rain damage increased all fiber components excluding hemicellulose in B and orchardgrass (Scarborough et al., 2005).

Preference of the different hays by horses was expressed in three ways: kg of dry matter consumed per day (kg/d; Fig. 2), the amount of each forage consumed as a percentage of the amount of that particular forage offered (% offered daily; Fig. 3), and the amount of each forage




Fig. 2. Intake (kg/d) of teff grass and bermudagrass harvested under different conditions and offered to horses in combinations of 4 different forages each day for 6 days. Forages offered were bermudagrass late vegetative (BLV), teff grass late vegetative (TLV), teff grass late bloom with rain damage (TLBR), bermudagrass mid-bloom (BMB), teff grass with caryopsis visible (TES), and teff grass soft dough stage (TSD). Bars without a common superscript are different ($P < 0.05$).

consumed as a percentage of the total DM intake by each horse (% of DM intake; Fig. 4). Preference (kg/d) was greatest ($P < 0.05$) for TLV followed by BLV ($P < 0.05$). The least preferred ($P < 0.05$) forages were TLBR, TES and TSD. The low preference for TLBR, and the fact that

the preference for TLBR was not different ($P \geq 0.63$) from that of TES and TSD suggests that the rainfall was just as damaging to preference as the increased maturity of TES and TSD. A study in cattle reported a 10% reduction of intake in response to rain damage on forages (Coblentz,




Fig. 3. Intake of teff grass and bermudagrass harvested under different conditions and offered to horses in combinations of 4 different forages each day for 6 days. Intake is expressed as a percentage of a particular forage offered. Forages offered were bermudagrass late vegetative (BLV), teff grass late vegetative (TLV), teff grass late bloom with rain damage (TLBR), bermudagrass mid-bloom (BMB), teff grass with caryopsis visible (TES), and teff grass soft dough stage (TSD). Bars without a common superscript are different ($P < 0.05$).




Fig. 4. Intake of teff grass and bermudagrass harvested under different conditions and offered to horses in combinations of 4 different forages each day for 6 days. Intake is expressed as a percentage of the total daily dry matter (DM) intake. Forages offered were bermudagrass late vegetative (BLV), teff grass late vegetative (TLV), teff grass late bloom with rain damage (TLBR), bermudagrass mid-bloom (BMB), teff grass with caryopsis visible (TES), and teff grass soft dough stage (TSD). Bars without a common superscript are different ($P < 0.05$).

2006). Preference expressed as a percentage of the total amount offered daily was greatest ($P < 0.05$) for BLV and TLV. The later maturities of T including TLBR were the least preferred forages ($P < 0.05$). This again suggests that the rainfall on TLBR was just as damaging to preference as increasing maturity. Preference expressed as a percentage of the total DM intake was greatest ($P < 0.05$) for TLV. Consumption of TLV was slightly above 50% of the DM intake for horses, which suggests that horses consumed all of the TLV offered, since each forage was offered at half of the estimated ADC. Preference was least ($P < 0.05$) for TLBR, TES and TSD, once again suggesting that rain damage and advanced maturity are equally detrimental to preference by horses.

Forage concentrations of NDF and ADF were both highly and negatively correlated with preference ($P < 0.05$; Table 3). Lignin content was also highly and negatively correlated with preference ($P < 0.05$), but not as highly correlated as NDF and ADF. Hemicellulose content was not correlated with preference ($P \geq 0.11$). In a previous study (Staniar et al., 2010), voluntary intake of T was less from late-heading maturity than from early-heading and boot stage maturities. In that study, concentrations of NDF and ADF were greatest from the late-heading T, lowest from the boot stage T, and intermediate from the early-heading T, which was not different from the late-heading T or the boot stage T in NDF concentrations (Staniar et al., 2010). These results are consistent with the results of our study, which demonstrate that an increase in maturity is detrimental to palatability, and that preference appears to follow closely with NDF and ADF concentrations.

CONCLUSIONS

When given a choice of different forages, horses preferred late-vegetative teff grass. However, forage maturity had a larger effect on preference than forage species when forages were compared across different maturities. This conclusion is drawn based on the relatively small difference in preference between bermudagrass and teff grass harvested at a comparable maturity, but a very large negative effect of maturity on preference of both forages. It is also apparent that rain damage can be just as detrimental to palatability as increasing maturity as preference for teff grass harvested at the late bloom stage was never different from preference for the later maturities of teff grass. Strong negative correlations among preference and NDF and ADF support the use of these measures to estimate preference by horses. Therefore, teff grass is palatable to horses, but forage maturity and rain damage are more important factors affecting palatability than forage species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge Ashley Young for assistance with laboratory analyses, Mandi Goodall and Kelsey Rogers for helping with general horse care during the project, and the D.E. King Equine Program for the use of their facilities and horses. Financial assistance to support this project was provided by the University of Arkansas Honors College and the Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences.

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients relating forage quality measurements to palatability by horses across different forages.

Item[†]	DM consumption per forage, kg/d[‡]	DM consumption % of offer	DM consumption % of total DMI
NDF, %	-0.73	-0.74	-0.72
p-value	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
ADF, %	-0.75	-0.76	-0.74
P-value	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Hemicellulose,%	0.13	0.15	0.13
P-value	0.14	0.11	0.14
Lignin, %	-0.55	-0.57	-0.55
P-value	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

[†] NDF = neutral detergent fiber; ADF = acid detergent fiber.

[‡] DM = dry matter; DMI = dry matter intake.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anonymous. 2012. Teff as an Irrigated Alternative Forage. *Hay & Forage Grower*, 27(3), 18.
- Cochran, W. G. and G. M. Cox. 1957. *Experimental Designs* (2nd Ed.). pp. 472. John Wiley & Sons. New York, NY.
- Coblentz, W. K. 2006. Rain Damage and Spontaneous Heating in Southern Forages Harvested as Hay. *In: Proceedings of the 60th Southern Pasture and Forage Crop Improvement Conference*, April 11-13, 2006, Auburn, Alabama. 2006 CD ROM.
- Coleman, S. W., S. P. Hart, and T. Sahlu. 2003. Relationships among forage chemistry, rumination and retention time with intake and digestibility of hay by goats. *Small Rumin. Res.* 50: 129-140.
- Echevarria, C. and S. Hooser. 2006. Blister beetle poisoning: cantharidin toxicosis in equines. <https://www.addl.purdue.edu/newsletters/2006/Fall/EquineCT.htm>. Accessed 18 April 2013.
- Miller, D. 2010. Teff grass: crop overview and forage production guide. Producers Choice Seed. <http://www.producerschoiceseed.com/documents/TeffGrass-ManagementGuide.pdf>. Accessed 15 April 2013.
- Scarborough, D. A., W. K. Coblentz, J. B. Humphry, K. P. Coffey, T. C. Daniel, T. J. Sauer, J. A. Jennings, J. E. Turner, and D. W. Kellogg. 2005. Evaluation of dry matter loss, nutritive value, and in situ dry matter disappearance for wilting orchardgrass and bermudagrass forages damaged by simulated rainfall. *Agron. J.* 97:601-614.
- Staniar, W. B., J. R. Bussard, N. M. Repard, M. H. Hall, and A. O. Burk. 2010. Voluntary intake and digestibility of teff hay fed to horses. *J. Anim. Sci.* 88:3296-3303.
- Vogel, K. P., J. F. Pedersen, S. D. Masterson, and J. J. Troy. 1999. Evaluation of a filter bag system for NDF, ADF, and IVDMD forage analysis. *Crop Sci.* 39:276-279.
-