

## Rumen Dry Matter Degradability and Preference by West African Dwarf Goats for selected Multipurpose Trees in Nigeria

Akinyemi A. Fadiyimu,\* Adebawale N. Fajemisin<sup>1</sup> and Moses O. Arigbede<sup>2</sup>

\*Department of Animal Production Technology, Federal College of Agriculture, Akure

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Production and Health, Federal University of Technology, Akure Nigeria. Tel: +234 0803 374 6415; [debofajemisin@yahoo.com](mailto:debofajemisin@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pasture and Range Management, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta Nigeria. Tel: +44; [arigbede2002@yahoo.com](mailto:arigbede2002@yahoo.com)

\*Corresponding author: [yemifadiyimu@yahoo.com](mailto:yemifadiyimu@yahoo.com) Tel: +234 0803 355 9984

**Abstract:** The incorporation of trees into farming systems is a viable option to profitable and sustainable crop and livestock production. Trees help to reduce reliance on fertilizers, minimize soil erosion, maintain soil fertility, ensure plant diversity and provide a range of useful products like fodder, mulch, timber, food, medicine and crop protection. In Africa, a wide range of tree species are available but only few have been given detailed nutritive characterization taking into consideration both plant and animal factors. This study involved evaluation of seven local and four exotic multipurpose trees for proximate and mineral compositions, rumen dry matter degradability and preference by West African Dwarf goats, with *Leucaena leucocephala* and *Gliricidia sepium* as controls. Crude protein content varied from 17.5% for *Dialium guineense* to 29.9% for *L. leucocephala*. The average crude fibre content was 19.8%. There was no significant difference ( $P>0.05$ ) in nutrient composition of legume and non-legume browse types. Ca content ranged from 0.02% for *Alchornea cordifolia* to 1.10% for *Grewia pubescens* while P content ranged from 0.004% for *Calliandra calothyrsus* to 0.2% for *A. cordifolia*. Potential degradation varied from 32.8% to 87.5% for *D. guineense* and *A. cordifolia* respectively while effective degradability was highest in *G. pubescens* and least in *Xylocarpus xylocarpa*. *G. sepium* was the most preferred species by WAD goats followed by *D. guineense* while *Milletia thonningii* and *Enterolobium cyclocarpum* were least preferred. *D. guineense*, *Inga edulis*, *A. cordifolia* and *G. pubescens* were recommended as potential ruminant feed resources.

[Akinyemi A. Fadiyimu, Adebawale N. Fajemisin and Moses O. Arigbede. **Rumen Dry Matter Degradability and Preference by West African Dwarf Goats for selected Multipurpose Trees in Nigeria.** *Rep Opinion* 2014;6(9):8-13]. (ISSN: 1553-9873). <http://www.sciencepub.net/report>. 3

**Keywords:** Trees, degradability, preference, WAD goats, Nigeria

### 1. Introduction

The problem of ruminant production in sub-Saharan Africa is both genetic and nutritional; nutritionally, appropriate techniques for local breeds of ruminants to express their full genetic potential through enhanced feeding systems are lacking. Also, the major feed resources for ruminant animals are natural grasslands, which are becoming increasingly unavailable due to human pressure on land-use and unpredictable drought (precluding animals from herbage preference) which constrain the animals to the insufficient, low-quality available herbage. The use of straws, stovers and crop wastes and by-products such as groundnut and bean haulms, maize cobs, brewers' grains and rice husk as supplements to natural grazing is limited by high fibre contents, low metabolizable energy, crude protein, minerals, vitamins and low to moderate digestibility.

In Nigeria, the two exotic browse species, *Leucaena leucocephala* and *Gliricidia sepium* have shown appreciable forage potentials. However, they have difficulty adapting to the local environment and are susceptible to pests and diseases, such as psyllid

attack on *Leucaena*. Furthermore, most native species shed their leaves during the dry season and majority of them possess physical structures and anti-nutritive chemical compounds that are said to protect them against herbivores (Coley et al. 1985), but could reduce their palatability as well as limit their nutrient availability and digestibility (Barry, 1989).

There is therefore, an urgent need to identify alternative fodder sources which are less unencumbered by morphological, biochemical or cultural limitations in livestock nutrition. This is the basis of the present study with the objective to determine the proximate and mineral compositions, rumen dry matter degradability and preference by West African Dwarf goats of eleven multipurpose tree species with *L. leucocephala* and *G. sepium* as controls.

### 2. Materials and Methods

The study was conducted at the Teaching and Research Farm, University of Ibadan and the International Livestock Research Institute (I.L.R.I.), Ibadan in the rain forest zone of southwestern Nigeria. The species used in the study were harvested in the

early dry season (November) from the arboretum of International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (I.I.T.A.), Ibadan and consisted of the followings: *L. leucocephala* (control), *Calliandra calothyrsus*, *Enterolobium cyclocarpum*, *Inga edulis*, *Grewia pubescens*, *Pterocarpus santalinoides*, *G. sepium* (control), *Dialium guineense*, *Prosopis africana*, *Milletia thonningii*, *Alchornea cordifolia*, *Xylocarpa xylocarpa* and *Albizia niopoides*. Leaves were harvested from at least 10 different trees and then pooled and oven dried at 60 °C for 48 h.

Samples for chemical analyses were ground to pass through a 1 mm sieve and then analyzed for proximate and mineral compositions (AOAC 1990). N content was determined using the Kjeldahl method and crude protein (CP) calculated as  $N \times 6.25$ . Dry matter (DM) was determined by drying fresh samples in the oven at 105°C for 24 hours and ash by igniting the samples in a muffle furnace at 525 °C for 8 h. Nitrogen-free extract (N.F.E.) and organic matter (OM) were determined by difference. Calcium content was determined by flame photometry and Phosphorus by the phosphomolybdate method after digesting the samples.

Samples for dry matter degradability were ground to pass through a 2.5 mm sieve and 3g of each sample were measured in triplicates into weighed Dacron bags. These were then tied onto rubber loops and inserted into the rumen of three matured West African Dwarf (WAD) goats fitted with permanent rumen cannulae for a period of 6, 24, 48 or 72 hours of incubation. After each incubation period, the samples were thoroughly washed under tap water until the water became colorless. Washing loss, or degradability at zero hour, was determined by soaking nylon bags containing 3g of each sample in ordinary warm water (37°C) for one hour. The bags were then dried to constant weight at 65°C. The DM degradability of each sample at each incubation time was calculated as the difference in the quantity of DM in the bags before and after incubation (Ørskov et al. 1980). The goats used for the experiment were kept in individual pens and were fed on a diet of fresh *Panicum maximum* (60%) and concentrate (40%). They had unrestricted access to water and mineral licks.

Relative preference for each species was determined using the cafeteria technique (Larbi et al. 1993). It was conducted over a fourteen-day period divided into seven days each of adjustment and data collection respectively. WAD goats (n = 6) averagely weighing 12.7 kg were used. On each collection day, 500g fresh leaves of each species were offered in separate feeding troughs for one hour. The troughs were randomly placed around the perimeter of an 8m<sup>2</sup> floor pen. Left-over was weighed immediately after to determine consumption of each species. A daily

relative preference index for each species was calculated by dividing quantity consumed of the species by the value for the species with highest consumption and multiplying the result by 100. Browse species were ranked based on mean preference index.

The DM degradation data were fitted to the exponential equation

$$P = a + b(1 - e^{-ct})$$

where P = DM degraded in rumen at time t, a = the rapidly soluble fraction, b = the insoluble but fermentable fraction, c = the constant rate of degradation of b (% h<sup>-1</sup>), a + b = potential degradability (PD) or extent of degradation and t is the rumen incubation time (Ørskov & McDonald, 1979). Effective degradability (ED) was calculated by applying the equation

$$ED = a + [bc / (c+k)]$$

where k is the rumen outflow rate of 2% per hour.

Values for a, b, c, PD, ED were analyzed by ANOVA (SAS, 1998). The statistical model adopted was

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + e_{ij}$$

where Y<sub>ij</sub> = record of the i<sub>th</sub> species measured in the j<sub>th</sub> goat; μ = common mean; α<sub>i</sub> = effect of the i<sub>th</sub> species; β<sub>j</sub> = effect of the j<sub>th</sub> goat; e<sub>ij</sub> = uncontrolled environmental and genetic error. Means were separated by Duncan (1955) methods. Linear correlation and regression analyses were determined using a scientific calculator (Casio fx-7400G PLUS POWER GRAPHIC model) to show the relationship between nutrient composition, DM degradability and preference index values.

### 3. Results and Discussion

From Table 1, average DM content of the selected browse plants was comparable with 38.7% for selected leaves of shrubs and trees in Nigeria (Ikhimioya, 2008) and 40.8% for jackfruit leave (Ly et al. 2001). Species with DM contents >40% probably have hard and coarse leaf texture, as reported by Daovy et al. (2008) for mango leaves. Mean CP content (22.1%) is higher than 14.7% obtained by Ngodigha and Oji (2009) for tropical browse plants. This suggests that the evaluated species have the potential to supply moderate to high levels of CP and can therefore be used as protein supplements to tropical grasses and other low quality feeds in ruminant diets. Difference in CP contents of leguminous (L) and non-leguminous (NL) browse species were not significant. This contradicts the findings of Cobbina et al. (1990) and Larbi et al. (1993), probably because two NL species against eleven L species were used in the study. Mean ash content compares favourably with that reported by Topps (1992) while mean Ca and P contents were slightly lower than those reported by Kabaija and

Smith (1988), probably due to differences in species, climatic and edaphic factors. Apart from *A. niopoides*, Ca:P ratio in all the species are higher than recommended, although the mean is within the range (1:1 – 1:7) in which no harmful effect may occur to the animal, provided the level of the two minerals in the diet are adequate (Underwood, 1981).

Table 2 shows that the species differed significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) in rumen DM degradability parameters. *Leucaena* had the highest soluble fraction (33.98%) while *D. guineense* had the least (8.19%). Higher level of soluble fraction is known to result in a more efficient fermentation in the rumen (Beever et al. 1978). The differences in soluble fraction could be attributed to the proportion of soluble carbohydrates to structural carbohydrates (Ngodigha and Oji, 2009). According to Van Soest (1982), the soluble carbohydrates ferment faster than structural carbohydrates and their relative proportions are determined by differences in the stage of maturity. This is probably why *Leucaena* with moderate CF content had the highest soluble fraction and *X. xylocarpa* with the highest CF content had the least soluble fractions, apart from *D. guineense*. Degradable fractions (b) in *G. pubescens* and *A. cordifolia* were comparable and significantly higher ( $P < 0.05$ ) than in other plants. Both species could therefore have better potential as sources of highly fermentable nutrients than the other plants especially since they have moderate to high crude protein contents.

Rate of degradation (c) varied from 0.3% h<sup>-1</sup> in *A. niopoides* to 3.9% h<sup>-1</sup> in *P. santalinoides*. Abdulrazak et al. (1996) found that 'c' values of foliage from *G. sepium* and *L. leucocephala* fluctuated from 5.2 to 7.6%/h and from 4.0 to 5.2%/h, respectively, while Alayón (1996) estimated a degradation rate of 10.7%/h for *G. sepium* foliage. These values are higher than those obtained for both species in this study, probably due to the difference in the basal diets fed to the experimental animals, ages of the leaves used and species of fistulated animals (Ezenwa and Kithara, 2001). The faster degradation of DM of *P. santalinoides*, *G. pubescens*, and *D. guineense* could be advantageous, which may probably release greater rumen metabolites, enhance rumen microbial functions and proliferations, improve the rumen ecology (i.e., N, minerals and isoacids), and they may further enhance forage intake since they move out of the rumen faster and thus reduce rumen fill (Bonsi et al. 1995).

Potential degradation increased markedly from 32.8% in *D. guineense* to 87.53% in *A. cordifolia*. This compares with 30.4 % to 80.9 % reported by Bamualim et al. (1980) for tropical browse legumes. According to Von Keyserlingk et al. (1996),

the higher the CP content of forage, the higher the effective degradability. This was confirmed in this study as *G. pubescens* with the highest ED had very high crude protein content comparable with *L. leucocephala* while *X. xylocarpa* with the least ED had one of the least CP contents.

Table 3 shows the average preference index (API) values and ranking of the evaluated species. The highest preference ranking of *G. sepium* in this study is probably because it is the most familiar to the goats at the time of the study since according to Ikhimiya (2008), goats more readily accept feeds with which they have had previous experience. The result is in contrast with Larbi et al. (1993) and Odeyinka (2000) who reported low preference for *G. sepium* leaves which according to Lowry (1990) are refused by animals on the basis of smell, and is often rejected without being tasted, which suggests that the problem lies with volatile compounds released from the leaf surface. These compounds probably include coumarin which imparts a repulsive odour on leaves and barks (Lana et al. 1989) and other phytochemical compounds (Russel and McDonald, 1992).

However, the result agrees with Mejia et al. (1991) who stated that *G. sepium* was selected in preference to all other feeds and also with Brewbaker (1986) that it is highly acceptable to animals when fed in a cut and carry method. There is therefore an apparent variation in the acceptability of *G. sepium* by ruminant animals in different parts of the world. Factors responsible for this probably include climatic or edaphic effects on leaf chemical composition, differences in behaviour or in rumen flora between animals in different places (whether genetically or environmentally caused), or genetic variation in *Gliricidia* itself (Simons and Stewart, 1994).

The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> ranking recorded for *Dialium* and *Inga* in this study is probably a reflection of the coarse nature of the leaves judging from their very high dry matter contents since according to Quedrigo et al. (1996) goats prefer coarse feeds. Larbi et al. (1993) equally reported a high acceptability of *Dialium* by small ruminants. Species like *Calliandra*, *Milletia* and *Enterolobium* were least preferred probably because of lack of previous experience by the goats or presence of strong smell resulting in aversion for the species by goats (Simons and Stewart, 1994).

From Table 4, correlations between RPI and chemical components were non-significant, in contrast to the findings of Lambert et al (1989) that preference in sheep and goats correlate positively with CP content of forages. However it is similar to the report of Hadjigeorgiou et al. (2003) and Ikhimiya (2009). Also, non-significant correlations were obtained between RPI and DM degradation characteristics.

**Table 1:** Proximate and mineral compositions (%) of browse species

Species	DM	CP	CF	EE	ASH	NFE	Ca	P
<i>G. sepium</i>	31.60	24.38	14.23	3.14	9.63	48.62	0.74	0.09
<i>D. guineense</i>	45.00	17.15	21.45	4.02	8.80	48.58	0.34	0.10
<i>I. edulis</i>	43.80	17.33	22.01	3.17	8.42	49.07	0.70	0.04
<i>L. leucocephala</i>	34.30	29.87	17.41	2.40	9.65	40.67	0.74	0.12
<i>G. pubescens</i>	37.20	28.93	22.11	2.33	8.37	38.26	1.10	0.12
<i>A. cordifolia</i>	34.23	18.67	17.28	3.36	9.14	51.55	0.02	0.20
<i>A. niopoides</i>	32.25	23.33	19.40	3.23	9.25	44.79	0.22	0.12
<i>X. xylocarpa</i>	48.20	18.08	32.14	3.45	9.64	36.69	0.84	0.10
<i>P. santalinoides</i>	32.92	19.83	13.53	3.50	9.02	54.12	0.92	0.04
<i>C. calothyrsus</i>	40.52	27.65	10.40	3.02	9.80	49.13	0.72	0.04
<i>P. africana</i>	47.20	19.60	22.05	4.10	9.09	45.16	0.48	0.12
<i>M. thonningi</i>	30.70	21.35	31.13	2.22	8.61	36.69	0.76	0.08
<i>E. cyclocarpum</i>	39.32	20.42	17.59	3.42	9.47	49.10	0.52	0.12
Mean	38.25	22.05	20.06	3.18	9.15	45.57	0.62	1.01
SEM	5.95	4.25	6.04	0.56	0.47	5.55	0.29	3.17

SEM = Standard error of the mean

**Table 2:** Dry matter degradation characteristics of browse species (%)

Species	a	b	c	a + b	ED
<i>G. sepium</i>	29.99 <sup>a</sup>	36.89 <sup>bc</sup>	1.42 <sup>b</sup>	66.87 <sup>bc</sup>	45.31 <sup>b</sup>
<i>D. guineense</i>	8.19 <sup>c</sup>	24.61 <sup>c</sup>	2.88 <sup>ab</sup>	32.80 <sup>d</sup>	22.71 <sup>d</sup>
<i>I. edulis</i>	17.02 <sup>b</sup>	42.85 <sup>b</sup>	1.10 <sup>bc</sup>	59.87 <sup>c</sup>	32.22 <sup>c</sup>
<i>L. leucocephala</i>	33.98 <sup>a</sup>	48.97 <sup>b</sup>	1.49 <sup>b</sup>	82.94 <sup>a</sup>	54.89 <sup>ab</sup>
<i>G. pubescens</i>	25.42 <sup>ab</sup>	61.30 <sup>a</sup>	3.46 <sup>a</sup>	86.72 <sup>a</sup>	64.27 <sup>a</sup>
<i>A. cordifolia</i>	26.52 <sup>ab</sup>	61.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.75 <sup>c</sup>	87.53 <sup>a</sup>	43.16 <sup>bc</sup>
<i>A. niopoides</i>	25.05 <sup>ab</sup>	53.49 <sup>ab</sup>	0.37 <sup>d</sup>	78.54 <sup>a</sup>	33.40 <sup>c</sup>
<i>X. xylocarpa</i>	11.90 <sup>c</sup>	21.34 <sup>c</sup>	0.52 <sup>c</sup>	33.23 <sup>d</sup>	16.30 <sup>d</sup>
<i>P. santalinoides</i>	17.14 <sup>b</sup>	24.68 <sup>c</sup>	3.93 <sup>a</sup>	41.82 <sup>d</sup>	33.50 <sup>c</sup>
<i>C. calothyrsus</i>	25.00 <sup>ab</sup>	51.05 <sup>ab</sup>	2.22 <sup>ab</sup>	75.88 <sup>ab</sup>	51.86 <sup>b</sup>
<i>P. africana</i>	31.74 <sup>a</sup>	46.44 <sup>b</sup>	0.46 <sup>cd</sup>	81.64 <sup>a</sup>	40.42 <sup>bc</sup>
<i>M. thonningi</i>	24.53 <sup>ab</sup>	46.07 <sup>b</sup>	0.50 <sup>cd</sup>	69.27 <sup>b</sup>	33.74 <sup>c</sup>
<i>E. cyclocarpum</i>	32.56 <sup>a</sup>	19.71 <sup>c</sup>	1.21 <sup>bc</sup>	52.29 <sup>c</sup>	39.99 <sup>bc</sup>
Mean	23.77	41.42	1.56	65.34	39.37
SEM	7.70	14.09	1.15	18.96	12.50

a=soluble fraction; b=slowly degradable fraction; c=rate of degradation (%/hour); a+b=potential degradability; ED=effective degradability; <sup>a, b, c, d</sup> Means within the same column with different superscripts are significantly different (P<0.05); SEM = Standard error of the mean

**Table 3:** Average preference index (API) values and ranking of MPT species

Species	API	Rank
<i>G. sepium</i>	0.99	1
<i>D. guineense</i>	0.93	2
<i>I. edulis</i>	0.56	3
<i>L. leucocephala</i>	0.53	4
<i>A. cordifolia</i>	0.39	5
<i>G. pubescens</i>	0.27	6
<i>X. xylocarpa</i>	0.09	7
<i>A. niopoides</i>	0.03	8
<i>P. santalinoides</i>	0.02	9
<i>P. africana</i>	0.01	10
<i>C. calothyrsus</i>	0.005	11
<i>M. thonningi</i>	0.004	12
<i>E. cyclocarpum</i>	0.004	13
Mean	0.29	
S.E.M	0.34	

**Table 4:** Linear correlation and regression coefficients of some proximate and degradability components (X) with API (Y)

Nutritive Parameter	Correlation	Regression Equation
DM	-0.02	Y=0.33-0.001X
CP	-0.03	Y=0.35-2.39X
CF	-0.16	Y=0.48-9.22X
EE	+0.08	Y=0.14+0.05X
Ash	-0.07	Y=0.76-0.05X
NFE	+0.19	Y=0.25-0.01X
Ca	-0.11	Y=0.37-0.13X
P	+0.07	Y=0.24+0.59X
a	-0.18	Y=0.49-0.008X
b	-0.06	Y=0.36-0.002X
c	+0.17	Y=0.21+0.05X
a + b	-0.13	Y=0.45-0.002X
ED	+0.01	Y=0.29-0.0002X

#### 4. Conclusion

All the species investigated in this study seem to have good nutrient composition characteristics. The general performance is however outstanding in the control species: *Leucaena* and *Gliricidia*, indicating that the two species will continue to play vital roles in ruminant feed supplementation strategies. The study also revealed that the performance of four species, *Grewia pubescens*, *Inga edulis*, *Alchornea cordifolia* and *Dialium guineense* compared favourably with the controls and these are therefore recommended for further investigations with a view to incorporating them into ruminant feeding systems.

#### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Fadiyimu Akinyemi Albert  
Dept. of Animal Production Technology,  
Federal College of Agriculture, Akure  
Ondo State, Nigeria.  
E-mail: [yemifadiyimu@yahoo.com](mailto:yemifadiyimu@yahoo.com)

#### References

1. AAbdulrazak SA, Muinga RW, Thorpe W and Ørskov ER (1996) The effects of supplementation with *Gliricidia sepium* or *Leucaena leucocephala* forage on intake, digestion and live-weight gains of *Bos taurus* x *Bos indicus* steers offered napier grass. *Animal Science* 63: 381-388.
2. AAlayón JA (1996) Evaluación de métodos de siembra y del efecto de la inclusión de *Gliricidia sepium* (Jacq.) Steud en dietas de heno de *Cynodon nlemfuensis* en ovinos Pelibuey. Tesis de Maestría en Ciencias. Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán. Mérida, Yucatán, México.
3. AOAC (1995) Official Methods of Analysis, 16th edition. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.
4. Bamualim A, Jones RJ and Murray RM (1980) Nutritive value of tropical browse legumes in the dry season. *Australian Journal of Animal Production*, 13: 224-232.
5. Barry TN (1989) Condensed tannins: their role in ruminants' protein and carbohydrate digestion and possible effects upon the rumen ecosystem. In: The roles of protozoa and fungi in ruminants' digestion. J. V. Nolan, Leng R. A. and Demeyer D. I. (eds.) Penambul Books, Armidale, Australia pp 153 – 156.
6. Beaver DE, Terry RA, Cammell SB, Wallace AS (1978) The digestion of spring and autumn harvested perennial rye grass by sheep. *J. Agric Sci. Camb.* 90: 463-470.
7. Bonsi MLK, Osuji PO and Thah AK (1995) Effect of supplementing tef straw with different levels of *Leucaena leucocephala* leaves on the degradability of tef straw, *Sesbania*, *Leucaena*, *Tagasaste* and *Vernonia* and on certain rumen and blood metabolites in Ethiopian Menz sheep. *Animal Feed Science and Technology.* 52, 101-129.
8. Cobbina J, Attah-Krah AN, Meregini AO and Duguma B (1990) Productivity of some browse plants on acid soils of southeastern Nigeria. *Tropical Grassland*, 24: 41-45.
9. Coley PD, Bryant JP and Chapin FS (1985) Resource availability and plant anti-herbivore defense. *Science.* 230: 895-899.
10. Daovy K, Preston TR and Ledin I (2008) Selective behaviour of goats offered different tropical foliages. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 20 (supplement). <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd20/supplement/daov2.htm>.
11. Duncan BD (1955) Multiple range and multiple F tests. *Biometrics* 11:1-42.
12. Ezenwa I and Kithara N (2001) Dry matter degradation of the leaves of eleven mulberry varieties in the rumen of cattle and changes during the grazing season. *Grassland Science*, 47: 245-250.
13. Hadjigeorgiou IE, Gordon IJ and Milne JA (2003) Comparative preference by sheep and goats for Graminae forages varying in chemical composition. *Small Ruminant Research* 49 (2): 147-156.
14. Ikhimiya I (2008) Acceptability of selected common shrubs/trees leaves in Nigeria by West African dwarf goats. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 20 (6). <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd20/6/ikhi20090.htm>.
15. Kabaija E and Smith OB (1988) Influence of season age of regrowth on the mineral profile of *Gliricidia sepium* and *Leucaena leucocephala*. *Tropical Agriculture*, 66 (2): 125-128.
16. Lambert MG, Jung GA, Fletcher RH, Budding PJ and Costall DA (1989) Forage shrubs in North Island hill country. 2. Sheep and goat preferences. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 32: 485-490.
17. Lana K, Nitis IM, Putra S, Suarna M and Sukanten W (1989) Feeding behaviour of Bali cattle fed *Gliricidia* diet. *Proceedings of the 16<sup>th</sup> International Grassland Congress*, Nice, France pp 801-802.
18. Lowry JB (1990) Tree legumes: *Albizia lebbek* Research Notes. Division of Tropical Animal Production, CSIRO, Australia.

19. Larbi A, Jabbar MA, Orok EJ, Idiong NB and Cobbina J (1993) *Alchornea cordifolia*, a promising indigenous browse species adapted to acid soils in southeastern Nigeria for integrated crop-livestock agroforestry production systems. *Agroforestry Systems*, 22: 33-41.
20. Ly J, Pok Samkol and Preston TR (2001) Nutritional evaluation of tropical leaves for pigs: Pepsin/pancreatin digestibility of thirteen plant species. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. (13) 5: <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd13/5/ly135.htm>.
21. Mejia CE, Rosales M, Vargas JE and Murgueitio E (1991) Intensive production from African hair sheep fed sugar cane tops, multinutritional blocks and tree foliage. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 3(1): <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd3/1/mejia.htm>.
22. Ngodigha EM and Oji UI (2009) Evaluation of fodder potential of some tropical browse plants using fistulated N'dama cattle. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 4 (3), pp. 241-246.
23. Odeyinka SM (2000) Feeding behavior and diet selection by West African dwarf goats. *Archives of Animal Breeding*, 43(1): 57-61.
24. Ørskov, ER and McDonald I (1979) The estimation of protein degradability in the rumen from incubation measurements weighted according to rate of passage. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 92: 499-503.
25. Ørskov ER, Hovell F and Mould F (1980) The use of the nylon bag technique for the evaluation of feedstuffs. *Tropical Animal Production* 5: 195-213.
26. Quedrigo Y, Morand-Fehr P, Hervieu J and Sauviant D (1996) Effect of humidity and particle size on barley and beet pulp palatability in dairy goats. In: *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference on goats*, Beijing, China, 6-11 March, 1996, pp 554-557.
27. Russel JM and McDonald HR (1992) Plant toxins and palatability to herbivores. *Journal of Range Management*, 45: 13-18.
28. SAS (1998) *Statistical Analytical Systems Institute, SAS/STAT User's Guide*. SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina, USA.
29. Simons AJ and Stewart JL (1994) *Gliricidia sepium* - a Multipurpose Forage Tree Legume In: *Forage Tree Legumes in Tropical Agriculture*. RC Gutteridge and HM Shelton (eds.), Tropical Grassland Society of Australia. [www.fao.org/ag/AGP/agpc/doc/PUBLICAT/Gutt-shel/](http://www.fao.org/ag/AGP/agpc/doc/PUBLICAT/Gutt-shel/).
30. Topps JH (1992) Potential composition and use of legume shrubs and trees as fodder for livestock in the tropics (review). *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 118:1-8.
31. Underwood EJ (1981) *The mineral nutrition of livestock* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) London, Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau.
32. Van Soest PJ (1982) *Nutritional ecology of the ruminant*. OSH Books, Corvallis, Oregon, U.S.A. pp. 41-52.
33. Von Kesterlingk MAG, Swift ML, Puchala R, Sheldford JA (1996) Degradability characteristics of dry matter and crude protein of forages in ruminants. *Animal Feed Science Technology*, 57: 291 - 311.

7/22/2013