Influence of live cells or cells extract of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on *in vitro* gas production of a total mixed ration
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Abstract

The effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as live cells (LC) or cells extract (CE) on *in vitro* gas production (GP) kinetics and ruminal fermentation parameters of a total mixed ration (TMR) consisting of commercial concentrate and alfalfa hay [1:1 dry matter (DM)] as a substrate was studied. The TMR was incubated with CE at 1, 2 and 4 mg/g or LC at 0.3, 0.6 and 0.9 mg/g DM for 96 h. Rumen GP was recorded after 6, 12, 19, 24, 48, 72 and 96 h of incubation. Interaction effects were observed (P<0.01) between treatment type and yeast dose for the asymptotic GP and methane (CH₄) dose. Incubation of yeast CE improved (P<0.01) the asymptotic GP compared to control and LC with greater effects (P<0.01) for the low and the intermediate doses. Yeast CE treatment was more effective (P<0.01) in GP than both of LC and control treatments with greater effect (P<0.01) for the low and the intermediate doses. Treatment type and yeast dose affected (P<0.01) CH₄ production, metabolisable energy (ME), and short chain fatty acids (SCFA) without affecting *in vitro* DM degradability (IVDMD). Higher values (P<0.01) of CH₄, ME, SCFA and IVDMD were observed for the yeast CE treatment. It could be concluded that adding yeast *S. cerevisiae* (CE and LC extract) improved GP and ruminal fermentation parameters, where CE at 0.3 and 0.6 mg/g DM was more effective than the yeast LC.

Introduction

In ruminant species, there is a possibility for losing energy and protein due to ruminal fermentation processes (Ando et al., 2004; Salem et al., 2014a). Ionophores and antibiotics were good strategies for reducing energy and protein losing for many years (McGuffey et al., 2001). However, the European Union banned their use due to the potential appearance of residues in milk and meat (Russell and Houlihan, 2003). For this reason, there is substantial interest to evaluate the potential of using natural feed additives, generally recognized as safe for human consumption, to modify rumen microbial fermentation and improve feed utilization (Chauveyras-Durand et al., 2008). Phytothermic extracts (Salem et al., 2014b; Cedillo et al., 2014, 2015), fibrolytic enzymes (Togtokhbayar et al., 2015; Valdes et al., 2015) and yeast (Elghandour et al., 2014) proved to be good strategies to modulate ruminal fermentation for better feed utilization. Yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, live cells (LC) or cells extract (CE) are generally recognized as safe by the US Food and Drug Administration, and they can be legally used as animal feed additives (Kwiatkowski and Kwiatkowski, 2012).

Yeast is a natural feed additive used to promote growth and activity of rumen microbes through stabilizing rumen fermentation and preventing rumen flora disorders and disturbances (Kumar et al., 2013; Pinloche et al., 2013). Increased viable bacterial numbers (Jouany, 2001) as a result of yeast supplementation with enhanced ammonia utilization by ruminal microorganisms (Chauveyras-Durand et al., 2008) were achieved. Elghandour et al. (2014) reported an increased *in vitro* rumen degradability of forages as a result of stimulated growth and activity of fibrolytic bacteria due to yeast addition. Yeast CE is a non-antibiotic functional product that is naturally obtained from yeast. Although the composition of yeast extracts is variable, it contains three major constituents: glucan (glucose polysaccharide), mannan (mannose polysaccharide) and a protein fraction (Kwiatkowski and Kwiatkowski, 2012).

The content of yeast CE from glucan vary from 1% (Lille and Pringle, 1980) to about 29% (Sedmak, 2006) of the dry weight. The content depends upon the nutritional status of yeast cells, isolation method, analysis method and the phase of growth at cells harvest (Lille and Pringle, 1980; Kwiatkowski and Kwiatkowski, 2012).

Mannan and glucan are not degradable in the rumen by animal’s digestive enzymes; so, they pass through the digestive tract with the pathogens attached thus prevent the colonization of the pathogenic bacteria (Wellens et al., 2008). Mannan and glucan addition has been shown to increase both intestinal and serum IgG levels in dairy cows and calves (Franklin et al., 2005).

Therefore, the current study aimed to study the effect of yeast, as feed additive; in two different forms as LC or CE in the *in vitro* ruminal fermentation and gas production (GP) of a total mixed ration (TMR) consisted from commercial concentrate and hay alfalfa hay [1:1 dry matter (DM)].

Materials and methods

Yeast live cells and yeast cells extract products

Two commercial yeast products of yeast cells extract and live yeast cells were used. The product of live cells Selyeast3000® (Biosaf SC47®, Lesaffre Feed Additives, Toluca, Mexico) is a highly concentrated source of organic selenium to be used in animal feed. The product contains 47.0% crude protein (CP), 0.3% selenium and 5% moisture. The product also characterized by its content from total coliforms less than 100 CFU/g with no Salmonella. The product of yeast cell extract Salmannan® (Biosaf SC47®) is a highly concentrated source of mannan oligosaccharide and β-glucanos derived from a primer inactivated yeast (*S. cerevisiae*) for use in animal...
feed. The product contains 14% CP, 20% fat, 24% β-glucans, 22% mannose and less than 6% ash. Yeast CE at 1, 2 and 4 mg/g DM and yeast LC at 0.3, 0.6 and 0.9 mg/g DM were tested throughout 96 h of incubation.

**In vitro incubations**

Rumen inoculum was obtained from two Brown Swiss cows (400-450 kg body weight) fitted with permanent rumen cannula and fed ad libitum with a TMR consisting of commercial concentrate 1:1 DM (PURINA®, Toluca, Mexico) and alfalfa hay (Table 1) formulated to meet nutrient requirements (National Research Council, 2001). Fresh water was available for cows at all times during the collection phase of ruminal inoculum.

Rumen contents of each cow were obtained before the morning meal, mixed and filtered through four layers of cheesecloth into a flask with O2 headspace. Samples of TMR were weighed into 120 mL serum bottles with appropriate addition of S. cerevisiae LC or CE dose/g DM. Accordingly, 10 mL particle free ruminal fluid was added to each bottle followed by 40 mL of the buffer solution according to Goering and Van Soest (1970), without added tryptophan, in (ρρ) ratio of 1:4. A total of 162 bottles (3 bottles of each doses in three different runs for each of the treatments with three bottles as blanks (rumen fluid only)) were used. Once all the bottles filled, they were immediately closed with rubber stoppers, shaken and placed in the incubator at 39°C. Gas production readings were made at 6, 12, 19, 24, 48, 72, and 96 h post inoculation, using the technique of pressure reading (Extech Instruments, Waltham, USA) of Theodorou et al. (1994). At the end of incubation (i.e., 96 h), bottles were uncapped, the pH was measured using a pH meter (Conductronic pH15, Puebla, Mexico). Contents of each bottle were then transferred to filter the residue for determination of apparent degraded substrate.

After recording the final gas volume at 96 h of incubation, 2 mL of NaOH (10 M) were added to each bottles and gas pressure was determined immediately. Mixing of the contents with NaOH allowed absorption of carbon dioxide, with the gas volume remaining in the headspace of bottles considered to be CH4 (Demeeyer et al., 1988).

**Dry matter degradability and sample analysis**

The DM degradability was determined as described previously in Elghandour et al. (2014). In brief, at the end of incubation (i.e., 96 h), the contents of each serum bottle were filtered under vacuum through glass crucibles with a sintered filter (coarse porosity no. 1, pore size 100–160 m, Pyrex, Stone, UK). Fermentation residues were dried at 65°C overnight to estimate DM disappearance. Loss in weight after drying being the measure of non-degradable DM. Dry matter degradability (mg/g DM) at 96 h of incubation was calculated as the difference between DM content of substrate and its non-degradable DM (Ørskov and McDonald, 1979).

Samples of the feeds were analysed for DM (ID 934.01), ash (ID 942.05), N (ID 954.01) and ether extract (ID 920.39) according to AOAC (1997). The neutral detergent fibre (NDF; Van Soest et al., 1991) and acid detergent fibre (ADF) content of both feeds and fermentation residues were determined using an ANKOM200 Fibre Analyser Unit (ANKOM Technology Corp., Macedon, NY, USA) without use of an alpha amylase but with sodium sulfite in the NDF. Both NDF and ADF are expressed without residual ash.

**Calculations and statistical analyses**

All the calculations were mentioned previously in Elghandour et al. (2014). To estimate kinetic parameters of GP, results (mL/g DM) were fitted using the NLIN option of SAS (2002) according to France et al. (2000) as:

\[
A = b \times (1 - e^{-0.632})
\]

where A is the volume of GP at time t; b is the asymptotic GP (mL/g DM); c is the rate of GP (h), and L (h) is the discrete lag time prior to GP.

Metabolizable energy (ME, MJ/kg DM) was estimated according to Menke et al. (1979) as:

\[
ME = 2.20 + 0.136 \, GP \, (mL/0.5 \, g \, DM) + 0.057 \, CP \, (g/kg \, DM)
\]

where GP is net GP in mL from 200 mg of dry sample after 24 h of incubation.

Short chain fatty acid concentrations (SCFA) was calculated according to Getachew et al. (2002) as:

\[
SCFA \, (mmol/200 \, mg \, DM) = 0.0222 \, GP - 0.00425
\]

where GP is the 24 h net GP (mL/200 mg DM).

Data on *in vitro* ruminal fermentation parameters, GP parameters, *in vitro* DM degradability (IVDMD) and ME were analysed as 2 x 3 factorial arrangement [2 additives (LC and CE) x 3 levels (LC 1, 2 and 4 mg/g DM, CE 0.3, 0.6 and 0.9 mg/g of DM and Control 0 mg/g of DM)] with three repetitions (Steel and Torrie, 1980). The mixed model was:

\[
Y_{jkl} = \mu + S_{pj} + E_{Lk} + S_{pj} * E_{Lk} + \varepsilon_{jkl}
\]

where \(Y_{jkl}\) represents response variables (ruminal fermentation activity, energy utilization of metabolizable energy and short chain fatty acids) for the \((j)\) additives and \((k)\) level; \(\mu\) = general mean; \(S_{pj}\) = effect of \(j\)- additive; \(E_{Lk}\) = effect of \(k\)- level; \(S_{pj} * E_{Lk}\) = interaction of the \(j\)- additives with \(k\)- level; \(\varepsilon_{jkl}\) = the error term–NI (0, 2). In the case of significant \((P<0.05)\) interactions, Tukey test was used to separate means additives (Steel and Torrie, 1980).

**Results**

**In vitro gas production**

An interaction effect was observed \((P=0.009)\) between treatment type and treatment dose for the asymptotic GP without interaction effects \((P>0.05)\) for the rate of GP and the initial delay before gas production begins. In general, incubation of yeast CE improved \((P=0.0007)\) the asymptotic GP compared to control and yeast LC. In both of CE and LC, the low and the intermediate doses were more

---

**Table 1. Ingredients and chemical composition of the incubated total mixed ration.**

| Ingredient                  | TMR          |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Sorghum grain               | 195          |
| Corn grain                  | 195          |
| Soybean meal                | 160          |
| Broilers wests              | 140          |
| Corn stover                 | 110          |
| Orange peel                 | 100          |
| Wheat bran                  | 80           |
| Vitamins and minerals°      | 20           |
| Chemical composition, g/kg DM |             |
| Dry matter                  | 883.2        |
| Organic matter              | 958.1        |
| Crude protein               | 158.4        |
| Ether extract               | 31.7         |
| Neutral detergent fibres    | 227.0        |
| Acid detergent fibres       | 140.5        |

**TMR, total mixed ration; DM, dry matter; °Mineral and vitamin premix (COVASALT): Ca, 18.00%; P, 0.02%; Mg, 1.79%; Zn, 4066.19 ppm; Mn, 3168.48 ppm; Fe, 2338.98 ppm; Cu, 12.62 ppm; Se, 41.68 ppm; Co, 18.60 ppm; Vitamin A, 150,000.00 U/g; Vitamin D, 25,000.00 U/g; Vitamin E, 150.00 U/g.
effective (P<0.009) than the higher dose (Table 2).

Before the first 12 h of incubation, no effects for both of treatment type and treatment dose on the GP. However, after 12 h of incubation, treatment affected (P<0.01) the GP. After 19 h of incubation, the treatment dose affected (P<0.01) GP. Yeast CE had greater effect (P<0.01) in GP than both of yeast LC and control treatment. In both yeast types, the low and the intermediate doses had greater effects (P<0.01) in GP than the higher dose (Table 2).

**In vitro ruminal fermentation parameters**

No treatment and dose interaction effect (P<0.05) was observed for pH. However, an interaction effect was observed (P<0.01) for CH4 production. In the contrary, both of treatment and dose insignificantly (P>0.05) affected the pH values. However, treatment type and treatment dose affected (P<0.01) CH4, ME, and SCFA without affecting IVDMD. No differences (P>0.05) were observed between the control and yeast LC treatments for CH4 production (at 96 h), ME, SCFA and IVDMD. However, higher values (P<0.001) were observed for the yeast CE treatment for the previous parameters (Table 3). Regarding the dose effect, the most effective dose was the intermediate dose for yeast CE and the low dose for yeast LC treatment (Table 3).

### Table 2. Impact of live cells and cell extract of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on *in vitro* gas production parameters, and gas volume accumulated after different hours of incubation.

| Yeast dosage, mg/g DM | GP parameters | In vitro GP, mL/g DM |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|
|                       | b, mL/g DM    | c, h                | L, h    | GP6 | GP12 | GP24 | GP48 | GP72 | GP96 |
| Control               |               |                      |         |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| 0                    | 176.3<sup>c</sup> | 0.086 | 1.57 | 55.6 | 104.0<sup>c</sup> | 136.5<sup>c</sup> | 150.3<sup>c</sup> | 172.9<sup>c</sup> | 175.9<sup>c</sup> | 176.2<sup>c</sup> |
| LC                   |               |                      |         |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1                    | 182.1<sup>c</sup> | 0.078 | 1.40 | 55.1 | 102.7<sup>c</sup> | 136.1<sup>c</sup> | 151.0<sup>c</sup> | 177.3<sup>c</sup> | 181.4<sup>c</sup> | 182.0<sup>c</sup> |
| 2                    | 176.5<sup>c</sup> | 0.084 | 1.99 | 49.9 | 99.8<sup>b</sup> | 133.7<sup>c</sup> | 148.3<sup>c</sup> | 172.6<sup>c</sup> | 176.0<sup>c</sup> | 176.4<sup>c</sup> |
| 4                    | 164.9<sup>c</sup> | 0.100 | 2.25 | 50.9 | 100.7<sup>c</sup> | 131.4<sup>c</sup> | 143.6<sup>c</sup> | 162.3<sup>c</sup> | 164.5<sup>c</sup> | 164.8<sup>c</sup> |
| CE                   |               |                      |         |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| 0.3                  | 195.3<sup>c</sup> | 0.087 | 1.26 | 65.8 | 118.2<sup>c</sup> | 153.2<sup>c</sup> | 168.0<sup>c</sup> | 191.9<sup>c</sup> | 194.9<sup>c</sup> | 195.3<sup>c</sup> |
| 0.6                  | 195.7<sup>c</sup> | 0.087 | 1.24 | 66.5 | 119.1<sup>c</sup> | 154.1<sup>c</sup> | 168.8<sup>c</sup> | 192.4<sup>c</sup> | 195.3<sup>c</sup> | 195.6<sup>c</sup> |
| 0.9                  | 185.7<sup>c</sup> | 0.082 | 1.22 | 60.3 | 109.1<sup>c</sup> | 142.5<sup>c</sup> | 157.1<sup>c</sup> | 181.7<sup>c</sup> | 185.1<sup>c</sup> | 185.6<sup>c</sup> |
| Pooled SEM           | 3.97          | 0.0063 | 0.284 | 4.09 | 3.84 | 3.21 | 3.01 | 3.62 | 3.92 | 3.97 |
| P value              |               |                      |         |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Treatment            | 0.0007        | 0.4722 | 0.1666 | 0.0769 | 0.0111 | 0.0005 | 0.0001 | 0.0003 | 0.0006 | 0.0007 |
| Dose                 | 0.0089        | 0.3859 | 0.4079 | 0.4374 | 0.1358 | 0.0149 | 0.0045 | 0.0054 | 0.0082 | 0.0086 |
| Dose×Treatment       | 0.0089        | 0.3859 | 0.4079 | 0.153 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 |

GP, gas production; DM, dry matter; b, asymptotic gas production; c, rate of gas production; L, initial delay before gas production begins; LC, live cells; CE, cell extract; “<sup>c</sup>”Different letters following means in the same column indicate differences at P<0.05.

### Table 3. Impact of live cells and cell extract of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on ruminal fermentation parameters.

| Yeast dosage, mg/g DM | pH | CH4, mL/g DM | ME, MJ/kg DM | SCFA, mmol/g DM | IVDMD, mg/g DM |
|----------------------|----|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Control               | 6.71 | 2.20<sup>b</sup> | 11.30<sup>b</sup> | 1.33<sup>b</sup> | 823.7 |
| LC                   | 6.69 | 1.95<sup>b</sup> | 11.30<sup>b</sup> | 1.34<sup>b</sup> | 869.7 |
| 2                    | 6.72 | 2.02<sup>b</sup> | 11.20<sup>b</sup> | 1.31<sup>b</sup> | 878.0 |
| 4                    | 6.71 | 2.14<sup>b</sup> | 10.90<sup>b</sup> | 1.27<sup>b</sup> | 858.7 |
| CE                   | 6.72 | 1.96<sup>b</sup> | 12.23<sup>b</sup> | 1.49<sup>b</sup> | 855.6 |
| 0.6                  | 6.75 | 2.71<sup>c</sup> | 12.30<sup>c</sup> | 1.49<sup>c</sup> | 818.0 |
| 0.9                  | 6.75 | 2.16<sup>c</sup> | 11.63<sup>ab</sup> | 1.39<sup>ab</sup> | 754.0 |
| Pooled SEM           | 0.030 | 0.069 | 0.181 | 0.026 | 27.84 |
| P value              |               |                      |         |      |      |
| Treatment            | 0.7892        | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.1107 |
| Dose                 | 0.8867        | 0.0001 | 0.0041 | 0.0046 | 0.2290 |
| Dose×Treatment       | 0.8867        | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.241 |

pH, ruminal pH; CH4, methane production; ME, metabolisable energy; SCFA, short-chain fatty acids; IVDMD, *in vitro* dry matter degradability; LC, live cells; CE, cell extract. “<sup>b</sup>”Different letters following means in the same column indicate differences at P<0.05.

### Discussion

**In vitro gas production**

The obtained result of GP showed improved GP as a result of yeast addition. Increased GP with addition of yeast was showed in many studies (Tang et al., 2008; Elghandour et al., 2014). This may have resulted from the increased production of propionate fatty acid due to improved ruminal fermentation. Because carbon dioxide is produced when propionate is made by some ruminal bacteria via the succinate-propionate pathway (Wolin and Miller, 1988). Fermentation of dietary carbohydrates to volatile fatty acids produces gases in the rumen, which mainly constitutes hydro-

---
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gen, carbon dioxide and CH₄. Addition of yeast not only has the ability to improve GP, but also, can make qualitative changes in produced gases making it less negatively affects environment (Hristov et al., 2013).

Improved GP with yeast CE than LC reflects the enhanced incubation environment. A number of specific hypothetical biochemical mechanisms have been developed to explain the stimulatory effects of yeast in ruminal fermentation (Chevaux and Fabre, 2007). Some of these mechanisms have been based on the ability of yeast to provide important nutrients or nutritional cofactors that stimulate microbial activities in the rumen (Callaway and Martin, 1997). Yeast CE material is stable to acid digestion in the digestive tract and various fractions are known to survive passage through the stomach (Wellens et al., 2008). The ability of yeast CE to remain unchanged through acid conditions found in the stomach and intestine that may account for the product’s biological activity in a wide range of species. Moreover, the ability of yeast to scavenge excess oxygen, from rumen, creates a more optimal environment for rumen anaerobic bacteria (Newbold et al., 1996; Jouany, 2001). In addition, S. cerevisiae supplementation could provide vitamins such as biotin and thiamine, which are reported to be required for microbial growth and activity (Callaway and Martin, 1997). Other studies suggested that yeast can provide a site for metabolic exchanges and a suitable environment that promotes the growth and activity of beneficial microorganisms around substrates (Jouany, 2001).

From obtained results, S. cerevisiae addition to the inoculated diet decreased the lag time with increasing the asymptotic GP. Elghandour et al. (2014) illustrated this phenomenon based on two basic mechanisms. The first mode of yeast action reported by Newbold et al. (1996) is the respiratory activity that scavenges oxygen, which is toxic to anaerobic bacteria and causes inhibition of adhesion of cellulolytic bacteria to cellulose, and this peak in oxygen concentration occurs at approximately the time of feeding (i.e., initial time). The second mode of action is that yeast contains small peptides and nutrients that required to ruminal cellulolytic bacteria to initiate microbial growth (Callaway and Martin, 1997). Ando et al. (2004) stated that the asymptotic GP was higher with the addition of yeast extract to Italian ryegrass and whole corn corn. However, they found that the values were greater with the addition of yeast than with the addition of yeast extract.

In vitro ruminal fermentation parameters

In previous studies, adding S. cerevisiae increased SCFA production and ME from forage substrates (Mao et al., 2013; Elghandour et al., 2014). Increased SCFA production and ME are associated with high activities of microbes in the rumen. S. cerevisiae produces growth factors for microbial growth that can stimulate rumen microbial growth and activity (Chiquette, 2009). Moreover, S. cerevisiae has ability to provide conducive conditions to microbial growth in a way that is capable of using oxygen in the rumen so that the conditions of an aerobic rumen awake (Mosoni et al., 2007). Newbold et al. (1996), for example, used this mode of action to explain a 35% increase in total bacterial counts with S. cerevisiae addition in vitro. Increased SCFA is important in terms of enhanced lactose production, milk volume and overall energy balance (Khattab et al., 2011; Kholif et al., 2014, 2015).

Most of experiments studied the effect of S. cerevisiae on CH₄ production was in vitro (Elghandour et al., 2014). In the current study, addition of yeast LC lowered the CH₄ production compared to the yeast cells extract. Some studies suggested that yeast might stimulate the acetogens to compete or to co-metabolize hydrogen with methanogens thereby, reducing CH₄ emissions (Mwenya et al., 2004; Elghandour et al., 2014). However, other studies increased CH₄ production (Martin et al., 1989; Martin and Nisbet, 1992). These conflicting results of CH₄ production are likely due to yeast strain difference and type of diets.

Ruminal pH was not changed during fermentation processes. Several studies have suggested that S. cerevisiae cultures moderate the ruminal pH by increasing lactate utilization, making relatively more stable pH and meet the needs of rumen microbes to perform its activity (Chaucheyras-Durand et al., 2008; Elghandour et al., 2014). Yeast could stimulate growth and activity of total ruminal anaerobes and cellulolytic bacteria (Girard, 1996; Jouany, 2001). According to Girard (1996), S. cerevisiae can increase rumen microorganism total numbers, improve fibre digestion, reduce lactate accumulation, reduce the concentration of oxygen in rumen fluid so as to improve utilisation of fed ration. Researchers have reported increases in the rate of cellulose digestion by Fibrobacter succinogenes, Ruminococcaceae Flavivaciac and Selenomonas ruminantium in response to yeast supplementation (Callaway and Martin, 1997; Sullivan and Martin, 1999). Yeast has also directly stimulated rumen fungi, which may improve fibre digestion (Chaucheyras et al., 1995). Ando et al. (2004) found that, in Italian ryegrass, whole crop corn and rice straw, higher degradability values were observed for the samples incubated with the yeast extract.

Conclusions

Administration of yeast S. cerevisiae to the diets in two different forms as a LC or CE was effective to improve GP and ruminal fermentation parameters than the control. Addition of yeast CE was more effective than the yeast LC. In both type of treatments, the low and intermediate doses were more effective than the higher doses.
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