

Effects of citric acid and heat-treated soybean meal on rumen fermentation characteristics, methane emissions, and microbiota: an *in vitro* study

Daekyum Yoo^{1#}, Joonpyo Oh^{2#}, Siwoo Jeong¹, Jakyeom Seo^{1*}

¹Department of Animal Science, Life and Industry Convergence Research Institute, Pusan National University, Miryang 50463, Korea

²Cargill Animal Nutrition Korea, Seongnam 13630, Korea



Received: Sep 9, 2024

Revised: Oct 8, 2024

Accepted: Oct 15, 2024

#These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author

Jakyeom Seo

Department of Animal Science, Life and Industry Convergence Research Institute, Pusan National University, Miryang 50463, Korea

Tel: +82-55-350-5513

E-mail: jseo81@pusan.ac.kr

Copyright © 2025 Korean Society of Animal Science and Technology. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID

Daekyum Yoo

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6430-9539>

Joonpyo Oh

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1906-5520>

Siwoo Jeong

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7062-9836>

Jakyeom Seo

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9176-5206>

Competing interests

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Abstract

This study aimed to assess the impact of citric acid (CA) and heat-treated soybean meal (SBM) on rumen fermentation characteristics, methane production, and microbiota through an *in vitro* experiment. Untreated SBM, heat-treated SBM (HSBM), CA-treated SBM (CSBM), and SBM treated with a combination of heat and CA (HCSBM). Parameters assessed in *in vitro* were gas production, methane emissions, dry matter degradability (IVDMD), crude protein degradability (IVCPD), ammonia nitrogen (NH₃-N), microbial crude protein (MCP), volatile fatty acids (VFA), pH, and microbiota composition. The HCSBM exhibited the lowest gas production and theoretical maximum gas production ($p < 0.01$). Methane production (%) was significantly reduced in both CSBM and HCSBM ($p < 0.01$), with the lowest methane emissions (mL/g dry matter, DM) observed in HCSBM ($p < 0.01$). The IVCPD was significantly reduced in both the HSBM and HCSBM groups ($p < 0.01$). HCSBM had the lowest NH₃-N and MCP concentrations ($p < 0.01$). Total VFA production was the lowest in HCSBM ($p < 0.01$), with a higher proportion of acetate and lower proportions of propionate ($p < 0.01$). HCSBM reduced the enrichment of Thermoplasmata compared to HSBM ($p < 0.05$) and decreased the enrichment of the coenzyme M biosynthesis pathway in the microbial functional profiles compared to SBM and CSBM ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, an increase in fiber-degrading bacteria, particularly Fibrobacterota, was observed in HCSBM ($p < 0.05$). These findings suggest that the HCSBM may effectively reduce ruminal protein degradation and methane emissions. Further *in vivo* studies are necessary to validate these results and assess their practical application in ruminant nutrition.

Keywords: Soybean meal, Citric acid, Heat, Methane production, Ruminal protein degradation

INTRODUCTION

Animal nutritionists are actively exploring various strategies to mitigate the environmental impact of

Funding sources

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (Ministry of Science and ICT) (No. RS-2022-NR069351).

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Availability of data and material

Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: Yoo D, Oh J, Jeong S, Seo J.

Data curation: Yoo D, Oh J, Seo J.

Formal analysis: Yoo D, Oh J, Jeong S.

Methodology: Yoo D, Jeong S, Seo J.

Software: Oh J, Jeong S.

Validation: Yoo D, Oh J, Seo J.

Investigation: Yoo D, Oh J, Jeong S, Seo J.

Writing - original draft: Yoo D, Oh J.

Writing - review & editing: Yoo D, Oh J, Jeong S, Seo J.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The protocols for animal use in this study were reviewed and approved by the Animal Research Ethics Committee of Pusan University (PNU-2022-3168).

animal production. In this context, it is notable that ruminants exhibit lower nitrogen utilization efficiency than non-ruminants. Approximately 70%–75% of the nitrogen ingested by ruminants is excreted in manure [1]. The excreted nitrogen can lead to environmental problems, including the production of nitrous oxide, a significant greenhouse gas, and soil eutrophication [2–4].

Rumen-protected protein (RPP) is a protein-rich ingredient that is artificially treated using physical and chemical methods to increase the proportion of ruminal undegradable protein (RUP). Recent studies have focused on evaluating combinations of physical and chemical treatments for the development of RPP. Rigon et al. [5] and Molosse et al. [6] reported that combining heat treatment with xylose increased the RUP content in peanut and cottonseed meals. Díaz-Royón et al. [7] suggested that applying malic acid or orthophosphoric acid in combination with heat treatment decreased rumen degradation of sunflower meal and spring peas. Venegas et al. [1] observed that the combined application of malic acid and heat treatment to sunflower seeds and sunflower meal did not negatively affect rumen fermentation and was effective in reducing ammonia-nitrogen ($\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$) concentrations. Although treating protein feed with a combination of heat and sugars or heat and acid solutions can effectively inhibit microbial degradation in the rumen, the efficacy of these treatments varies depending on several factors, such as the type of protein feed, type and concentration of sugars and acids, and the intensity and duration of heat [1,5,6].

In this study, citric acid (CA) and heating were applied to soybean meal (SBM) since CA offers the advantage of being relatively cheaper compared to commonly used organic acids such as malic acid and orthophosphoric acid. CA has been suggested to act as a catalyst for rumen microbial metabolism when used as a feed additive [8]. Packett and Fordham [9] reported that adding 2% sodium citrate to lamb feed increased weight gain by 47% and feed efficiency by 23%. Additionally, Kazemi-Bonchenari et al. [10] found that treating barley grains with CA improved fiber digestibility in total mixed rations, and enhanced weight gain and feed efficiency in Holstein male calves. Sun et al. [11] proposed that citrate may have the potential to mitigate methane emissions. However, our literature investigation estimated that no studies have evaluated methane production following CA supplementation in *in vitro* or *in vivo* experiments. In contrast, Vanegas et al. [1] reported that a combined heat and malic acid treatment of sunflower seeds and sunflower meal was effective in reducing methane emissions. SBM was selected as the protein source because it is a major protein ingredient in Korea [12] and has a better amino acid composition than the other sources used in previous RPP studies. Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate the effects of CA and heat-treated SBM (HCSBM) on rumen fermentation characteristics, methane production, and microbiota using *in vitro* experiments.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Protocols for animal use in this study were reviewed and approved by the Animal Research Ethics Committee of Pusan University (PNU-2022-3168).

Sample preparation and chemical analysis

The SBM and CA used for the *in vitro* experiments were provided by GeneBiotech (Gongju, Korea). The experimental treatments included untreated SBM, heat-treated SBM (HSBM), CA-treated SBM (CSBM), and HCSBM. HSBM was produced by heat-treating 100 g of SBM at 160 °C for 1 h using a roaster (FEC-006, Biotech, Gimpo, Korea). CSBM was prepared by mixing 100 g of SBM with 0.4 mL of 1.5 mol L⁻¹ CA solution per gram of SBM. HCSBM was formulated by adding 0.4 mL of 1.5 mol L⁻¹ CA solution per gram to 100 g of SBM, followed by heat treatment at 160 °C for 1 h using a roaster. All experimental feeds were dried at 60 °C for 72

h and then ground using a cyclone mill (Foss Tecator Cyclotec 1093, Foss, Hillerød, Denmark) equipped with a 1 mm screen. Crude protein ([CP] method #990.03), ether extract ([EE] method #920.39), and ash (method #942.05) were analyzed according to AOAC standards [13]. Neutral detergent fiber (NDF) and lignin contents were determined using the method described by Van Soest et al. [14]. Gross energy was measured using a Parr 6400 Automatic Isoperibol Calorimeter (Parr Instrument, Moline, IL, USA) in accordance with the manufacturer's guidelines.

Donor cattle and rumen fluid collection

Rumen fluid was collected from two cannulated Holstein steers (body weight: 650 ± 12.3 kg). The steers were fed a diet consisting of commercial concentrate (Famsco, Chilgok, Korea) and oat hay in a 6:4 ratio twice daily. Water and mineral blocks were provided ad libitum. Rumen fluids were collected from various regions of the rumen 1 h before the morning feeding. The collected rumen fluid was immediately stored in a 4 L thermos bottle and transported to the laboratory within 30 min. It was then filtered through a mesh filter with a pore size of 250 μ m while maintaining a temperature of 39 °C, diluted at a 1:4 ratio with *in vitro* buffer [15], and bubbled with O₂-free CO₂ to maintain strictly anaerobic conditions until inoculation.

In vitro rumen fermentation

We conducted an *in vitro* batch culture experiment in two consecutive runs. Each experiment included three blanks, and each treatment was performed with four replicates. The experimental substrates (dry matter [DM], 1.0 g) were placed in 250 mL serum bottles. While flushing with O₂-free CO₂ gas, 100 mL of buffered rumen fluid was allocated into 250 mL serum bottles that contained the substrates. The bottles were completely sealed using butyl rubber stoppers and aluminum caps, then incubated at 39 °C in a rotary shaker (JSSI-300T, JS Research, Gongju, Korea) at 80 rpm for 24 h.

Experimental procedures, sample collection, and analysis

Gas production was measured at 3, 6, 9, 12, and 24 h using a pressure transducer (XP01KPS1C1G; Honeywell, Charlotte, NC, USA) as described by Theodorou et al. [16]. After each measurement, all headspace gas was collected in evacuated gas sampling bags (Best Pack, Seoul, Korea) to prevent the inhibition of microbial activity due to headspace gas pressure and for methane analysis. The gas production profiles obtained during incubation were analyzed using a simple exponential model [17] to determine the fractional rate constant for gas production (K_g) and theoretical maximum gas production (V_{max}). The concentrations of methane after 24 h were analyzed using a gas chromatograph (YL6500 GC System, Young-In Chromass, Anyang, Korea) equipped with a thermal conductivity detector and packed columns (3.05 m $\times$ 0.125 mm $\times$ 2 mm, Carboxen-1000, Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Helium was used as a carrier gas at a flow rate of 30 mL/min. The injector operated at room temperature, and the detector temperature was set to 130 °C. The column oven was programmed to ramp at a rate of 15 °C/min from an initial temperature of 60 °C to a final temperature of 180 °C, and the final temperature was maintained for 2 min. After 24 h of incubation, the serum bottles were opened, and the feed substrates were filtered using nylon bags (10 $\times$ 14 cm) with a pore size of 22 μ m (Supply Filter Tech, Ansan, Korea). The nylon bags were dried at 60 °C for 72 h to determine DM degradability (IVDMD). The CP content of the weighed bags was determined using the Kjeldahl method to assess CP degradability (IVCPD). Approximately 50 mL of the cultures were centrifuged at 3500 rpm for 20 min at 4 °C. The supernatant was then separated into aliquots for the analysis of pH, volatile fatty acids (VFA), and NH₃-N. The pH was measured using a pH meter (FP20, Mettler Toledo, Columbus, OH,

USA). Pretreatment and analysis of VFA and $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ were conducted according to the methods described by Yoo et al. [18]. microbial crude protein (MCP) analysis was conducted with slight modifications to the method described by Makkar et al. [19]. Briefly, 10 mL of liquid culture was centrifuged at $500\times g$ for 5 min at 4°C . The resulting supernatant was centrifuged at $20,000\times g$ for 15 min to obtain a pellet. The pellet was resuspended in 10 mL $1\times$ phosphate-buffered saline solution and centrifuged at $20,000\times g$ for 15 min. The washing step was repeated twice. The final pellet was analyzed using the Kjeldahl method. Microbial DNA was sampled for the second experiment. A 1.8 mL sample of rumen fluid was placed into a 2 mL collection tube and centrifuged at $20,000\times g$ for 20 min at 4°C . After centrifugation, the supernatant was discarded, and the remaining pellet was stored at -80°C until microbial DNA extraction.

DNA extraction, 16S rRNA gene sequencing, and data processing

Total DNA was extracted from the pellet according to the manufacturer's protocol (QiAamp Fast DNA Stool Kit, QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany). Following DNA extraction, quantity and quality were assessed using a NanoDrop spectrophotometer (ND-200, Allsheng, Hangzhou, China). The purified DNA was stored at -20°C until used for 16S rRNA gene sequencing.

The sequencing libraries were generated using a universal primer set with Illumina adapter overhang sequences, targeting the V3 and V4 regions of the 16S rRNA gene (V3-F: 5'-CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG-3' and V4-R: 5'-GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC-3') as described by Herlemann et al. [20]. Paired-end sequencing (2×300 bp) was performed by Macrogen (Seoul, Korea) on the MiSeq™ platform. Barcode sequences were trimmed using Cutadapt (Martin, 2011, version 4.1). Amplicon sequences were processed using Quantitative Insights into Microbial Ecology 2 (QIIME2, version 24.02) [21]. Initially, the Divisive Amplicon Denoising Algorithm 2 (DADA2) plugin was used to remove primer sequences, filter out low-quality reads ($Q_{\text{score}} < 25$), merge paired-end reads, and eliminate chimeric sequences [22]. The amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) were classified taxonomically with the Silva 16S rRNA gene database [23], version SSU138.1. Several ASVs, including those that were taxonomically unassigned, eukaryotes, mitochondria, and chloroplasts, were excluded from the analysis. The alpha diversity of each sample was evaluated using the Shannon index, Simpson index, Faith's phylogenetic diversity, observed ASVs, and evenness based on rarefied ASV tables with 28,819 randomly selected ASVs per sample. Good's coverage was greater than 99.7% for all samples. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) was conducted using unweighted and weighted UniFrac distance matrices to evaluate the overall differences in ruminal microbiota among various treatments. Visualizations were performed using the Plotly package in R (version 4.3.3). Functional profiles derived from 16S rRNA gene sequences were predicted using ASVs and the corresponding biological observation matrix (BIOM) table through phylogenetic investigation of communities by reconstruction of unobserved state 2 (PICRUSt2, version 2.5.2) [24]. The updated Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) was used to infer KEGG orthologs and the KEGG modules were mapped using the hierarchical database. Principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted to evaluate the overall variance in the predicted KEGG orthologs across treatments, utilizing Bray-Curtis dissimilarities for comparison. The PCA plot was generated and visualized using the ggfortify package in R [25].

Statistical analysis

Normality of the data distribution was verified using the Shapiro-Wilk test via the UNIVARIATE procedure in SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). Data on gas production, methane emissions, and fermentation characteristics were analyzed using the R software (version 4.3.3). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to evaluate the main effects of heat treatment, CA

treatment, their interactions, and experimental runs as blocking factors. The statistical model used was as follows:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + H_i + C_j + (H \times C)_{ij} + B_k + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

where Y_{ijk} is the response variable, μ is the overall mean, H_i is the fixed effect of heat treatment ($i = 1, 2$), C_j is the fixed effect of CA treatment ($j = 1, 2$), $(H \times C)_{ij}$ is the interaction effect of heat and CA treatment, B_k is the random effect of the block (experimental run) ($k = 1, 2$), and ε_{ijk} is the random error term. When significant effects were observed, Tukey's post-hoc test was used to compare the differences between treatments. Alpha diversity metrics that followed a normal distribution were analyzed using QIIME2. To assess the statistical differences in the PCoA and PCA results among treatments, a permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) was conducted with 9,999 random permutations in both QIIME2 and R. Analysis of the composition of microbiomes with bias correction (ANCOM-BC) was utilized to identify differentially predominant microbiota (phyla and genera) and predict microbial functions across treatments, employing 1,000 maximum iterations and excluding structural zeros [26]. A significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$, with trends noted for $0.05 \leq p < 0.10$.

RESULTS

Chemical composition

The results of the chemical composition analysis of each treatment are presented in Table 1. The DM content increased in the heat-treated groups (HSBM: 99.5%, HCSBM: 97.4%) compared to the SBM (90.3%). The CP content in the CA-treated groups (CSBM: 47.7%DM, HCSBM: 47.9%DM) was lower compared to the SBM (51.6%DM). The NDF content was higher in the heat-treated groups (HSBM: 16.7%DM, HCSBM: 13.4%DM) compared to the SBM (8.51%DM). Similarly, lignin content was also greater in the heat-treated groups (HSBM: 2.43%DM, HCSBM: 2.03%DM) than in the SBM (0.80%DM).

Gas production, gas parameters, and methane emission

The results for gas production, gas parameters, and methane emissions are presented in Table 2. The 3 h gas production was significantly higher in the CSBM ($p < 0.01$). At 6 h, gas production

Table 1. Chemical composition of experimental diets

Items	Treatments			
	No-citric acid		Citric acid	
	No-heat (SBM)	Heat (HSBM)	No-heat (CSBM)	Heat (HCSBM)
DM (%)	90.3	99.5	89.6	97.4
CP (%DM)	51.6	52.6	47.7	47.9
EE (%DM)	1.83	1.72	1.70	2.18
NDF (%DM)	8.51	16.7	8.02	13.4
Lignin (%DM)	0.80	2.43	1.23	2.03
Ash (%DM)	7.31	7.18	6.94	6.51
GE (MJ/kg of DM)	18.9	19.5	18.7	18.8

SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; DM, dry matter; CP, crude protein; EE, ether extract; NDF, neutral detergent fiber; GE, gross energy.

Table 2. *In vitro* gas production characteristics and methane emission of experimental diets incubated in buffered rumen fluid

Items	Treatments				SEM	<i>p</i> -value ¹⁾		
	No-citric acid		Citric acid			Heat	CA	H×C
	No-heat (SBM)	Heat (HSBM)	No-heat (CSBM)	Heat (HCSBM)				
Gas production (mL/g DM)								
3 h	55.9 ^{bc}	51.7 ^c	65.7 ^a	59.0 ^b	1.77	0.007	< 0.001	0.471
6 h	106 ^b	97.9 ^c	118 ^a	97.6 ^c	2.17	< 0.001	0.014	0.011
9 h	148 ^b	136 ^c	160 ^a	128 ^d	2.63	< 0.001	0.568	0.002
12 h	185 ^b	169 ^c	194 ^a	151 ^d	2.90	< 0.001	0.136	< 0.001
24 h	260 ^a	234 ^b	264 ^a	214 ^c	1.84	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Methane (%)	11.7 ^a	11.3 ^b	10.8 ^c	10.6 ^c	0.11	0.003	< 0.001	0.793
Methane (mL/g DM)	30.3 ^a	26.5 ^c	28.6 ^b	22.6 ^d	0.28	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Fitted parameters of gas ²⁾								
V _{max}	299 ^a	282 ^b	290 ^a	246 ^c	5.00	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
K _n	0.076 ^{ab}	0.071 ^b	0.084 ^a	0.082 ^a	0.0034	0.013	< 0.001	0.492

¹⁾ CA, effect of citric acid addition; H×C, interaction.

²⁾ $V_{\max}$, theoretical maximum gas production (mL/g DM); K_g , fractional rate of gas production (h^{-1})

^{a-d} Values within a row with different superscripts differ significantly at $p < 0.05$.

SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; DM, dry matter;

was significantly lower in the heat-treated groups ($p < 0.01$). The interaction effect of heat and CA resulted in the lowest gas production and $V_{\max}$ in the HCSBM between 9 and 24 h ($p < 0.01$, respectively). K_g was the lowest in the groups treated with CA ($p < 0.01$). Methane production (%) was the lowest in the groups treated with CA ($p < 0.01$), and HCSBM showed the lowest methane production (mL/g DM) ($p < 0.01$).

In vitro rumen fermentation characteristics

Results for *in vitro* ruminal fermentation characteristics are shown in Table 3. IVDMD and IVCPD were lower in groups of heat treatment ($p < 0.01$). The highest pH was observed in SBM ($p < 0.01$). The NH_3 -N concentration was significantly lower in the HCSBM ($p < 0.01$), although no significant interaction was observed. As a result of the interaction effect, MCP and total VFA production, as well as the molar proportions of propionate and butyrate, were the lowest in the HCSBM ($p < 0.01$, respectively), while the molar proportion of acetate was the highest ($p < 0.01$). The molar proportions of iso-butyrate and iso-valerate were the lowest in the heat-treated groups ($p < 0.01$, respectively), while the valerate levels were significantly lower in the CA-treated groups ($p < 0.01$).

Comparison of overall differences in rumen microbiota

The rarefaction curves based on the alpha diversity indices tended to plateau, indicating that the sequencing depth adequately captured the overall ASVs for each treatment (Fig. 1). In the rumen microbiota, the evenness index was significantly lower in HCSBM than in SBM, HSBM, or CSBM (Fig. 2, $p < 0.05$). The Shannon and Simpson indices were significantly higher in the HSBM group than in the SBM, CSBM, and HCSBM groups (Fig. 2, $p < 0.05$). Overall differences in rumen microbiota were estimated using PCoA based on UniFrac distance matrices (Fig. 3). Regardless of the UniFrac matrix type, SBM and CSBM did not separate distinctly (pairwise comparison, Fig. 3; (A) unweighted UniFrac distance, Q -value = 0.170; (B) weighted UniFrac distance, Q -value = 0.105). However, a significant separation was observed among the SBM,

Table 3. *In vitro* fermentation parameters of experimental diets incubated in buffered rumen fluid

Items	Treatments				SEM	<i>p</i> -value ¹⁾		
	No-citric acid		Citric acid			Heat	CA	H×C
	No-heat (SBM)	Heat (HSBM)	No-heat (CSBM)	Heat (HCSBM)				
IVDMD (%DM)	74.6 ^a	63.9 ^b	76.4 ^a	60.6 ^b	3.02	< 0.001	0.780	0.339
IVCPD (%CP)	71.8 ^a	51.3 ^b	71.5 ^a	45.8 ^b	3.47	< 0.001	0.151	0.180
NH ₃ -N (mg/dL)	64.5 ^a	52.8 ^c	59.5 ^b	46.1 ^d	1.48	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.459
MCP (mg/mL)	0.28 ^a	0.24 ^b	0.26 ^b	0.18 ^c	0.009	< 0.001	0.016	< 0.001
pH	6.90 ^a	6.82 ^b	6.83 ^b	6.79 ^b	1.48	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.459
TVFA (mM)	65.4 ^{ab}	62.7 ^b	67.5 ^a	57.2 ^c	1.01	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.020
VFA proportion (mmol/mol)								
Acetate	535 ^d	548 ^c	566 ^b	581 ^a	1.96	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Propionate	191 ^a	190 ^a	175 ^b	166 ^c	0.54	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Iso-butyrate	45.4 ^a	42.5 ^b	42.4 ^b	43.3 ^b	0.45	0.007	< 0.001	< 0.001
Butyrate	110 ^a	111 ^a	108 ^b	103 ^c	0.74	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Iso-valerate	64.5 ^a	56.3 ^c	59.3 ^b	56.1 ^c	0.63	0.006	< 0.001	0.002
Valerate	53.9 ^a	51.7 ^b	50.1 ^c	49.9 ^c	0.53	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
A:P ratio	2.81 ^c	2.89 ^c	3.23 ^b	3.50 ^a	0.028	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

¹⁾ CA, effect of citric acid addition; H×C, interaction.

^{a-d} Values within a row with different superscripts differ significantly at *p* < 0.05.

SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; IVDMD, dry matter degradability; IVCPD, crude protein degradability; NH₃-N, ammonia nitrogen; MCP, microbial crude protein; TVFA, total volatile fatty acids; VFA, volatile fatty acids; A:P ratio, acetate to propionate ratio.




Fig. 1. Rarefaction curves of (A) Observed amplicon sequence variants, (B) Evenness, (C) Faith's phylogenetic diversity, (D) Shannon's index, and (E) Simpson's index. SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal.




Fig. 2. Variations in alpha diversity metrics of the rumen microbiota. SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal.




Fig. 3. Principal coordinate analysis of rumen microbiota based on (A) unweighted UniFrac and (B) weighted UniFrac distance matrices. Differences in the rumen microbiota were compared using permutational multivariate analysis of variance. PC, principal component; SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal.


HSBM, and HCSBM groups in the overall rumen microbiota (Fig. 3; (A) unweighted UniFrac distance, $p < 0.05$; (B) weighted UniFrac distance, $p < 0.05$).

Compositional profiles of the rumen microbiota and taxonomic differences

Predominant rumen microbiota at the (A) phylum and (B) genus levels were presented only for taxa with an occurrence rate of $\geq 30\%$ and a relative abundance of $\geq 0.5\%$ in at least one treatment (Fig. 4). The major rumen phyla were primarily assigned to five taxonomic groups (Fig. 4A): Bacteroidetes (71.6%), Firmicutes (21.4%), Spirochaetota (3.4%), and Verrucomicrobiota (0.9%). At the genus level, Bacteroidales_F082 and *Prevotella* were dominant, accounting for at least 20.5% and 18.6% of the total rumen microbiota, respectively, regardless of the treatment. Approximately 89.4% of rumen microbiota was assigned to 24 major genera (Fig. 4B).

ANCOM-BC analysis was performed on rumen samples to identify differentially abundant

(A) Phylum level



(B) Genus level




Fig. 4. Predominant rumen microbiota at the (A) phylum and (B) genus levels. The visualized taxa include those with an occurrence rate of $\geq 30\%$ and a relative abundance of $\geq 0.5\%$ in at least one treatment. UCG represents an uncultured genus-level group, while UG denotes an unclassified genus. Others represent bacteria with an occurrence rate of $< 30\%$ and a relative abundance of $< 0.5\%$. SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal.

taxa across treatments, as shown at the phylum level in Fig. 5 and the genus level in Fig. 6. At the phylum level, no significant differences in enriched taxa were observed among the SBM, HSBM, and CSBM groups. Fibrobacterota was significantly enriched in HCSBM. At the genus level, the Prevotellaceae_YAB2003_group was enriched in both the SBM and CSBM groups. *Butyrivibrio* and *Succinivibrio* were more abundant in the SBM. *Oribacterium* was more enriched in CSBM. *Streptococcus* showed more absolute abundance in HSBM. *Fibrobacter* showed a tendency toward increased absolute abundance in HCSBM.

Differences in the predicted functional profiles

To compare the differences in microbial functional profiles, we estimated 16S rRNA gene sequencing data using PICRUSt2. Significant differences were detected in the overall distribution of microbial functions at the KEGG ortholog level (Fig. 7A; PERMANOVA, $R^2 = 0.704$, $p < 0.001$). While the SBM cluster was not significantly different from the CSBM cluster, it showed distinct differences from the HSBM and HCSBM clusters (Fig. 7A, SBM vs. HSBM, Pseudo- $F = 10.559$, $p < 0.05$; SBM vs. HCSBM, Pseudo- $F = 5.377$, $p < 0.05$). The clusters of HSBM, CSBM, and HCSBM showed distinct differences (Fig. 7A, HSBM vs. CSBM, Pseudo- $F = 5.927$, $p < 0.05$; HSBM vs. HCSBM, Pseudo- $F = 30.358$, $p < 0.05$; CSBM vs. HCSBM, Pseudo- $F = 12.524$, $p < 0.05$). In pairwise comparisons, the amino acid metabolism module (M00134: Polyamine biosynthesis, arginine $\Rightarrow$ ornithine $\Rightarrow$ putrescine) and carbohydrate metabolism module (M00580: Pentose phosphate pathway, archaea, fructose 6P $\Rightarrow$ ribose 5P) were notably enriched in the HSBM treatment compared to the SBM treatment (Fig. 7B, adjusted $p < 0.05$, respectively). No significant differences were observed between the SBM and CSBM groups. In the HCSBM, two amino acid metabolism modules (M00533: Homoprotocatechuate degradation, homoprotocatechuate $\Rightarrow$




Fig. 5. Differentially abundant phyla were identified using the ANCOM-BC software. Only major phyla with an occurrence rate of $\geq 30\%$ and a relative abundance of $\geq 0.1\%$ in at least one treatment were included in the evaluation. (A) Relative abundance of prokaryotic phyla, represented as mean $\pm$ standard error. Screening p -values were obtained using ANCOM-BC's global test, with only significantly different phyla based on the p -values visualized. (B)–(G) Pairwise comparisons: (B) SBM vs. HSBM, (C) SBM vs. CSBM, (D) SBM vs. HCSBM, (E) HSBM vs. CSBM, (F) HSBM vs. HCSBM, and (G) CSBM vs. HCSBM. Data are shown as log fold change $\pm$ 95% confidence interval, with red symbols indicating significantly different phyla. SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; ANCOM-BC, analysis of the composition of microbiomes with bias correction.




Fig. 6. Differentially abundant genera were identified using the ANCOM-BC software. Only major genera with an occurrence rate of $\geq 30\%$ and a relative abundance of $\geq 0.1\%$ in at least one treatment were included in the evaluation. (A) Relative abundance of prokaryotic genera, represented as mean $\pm$ standard error. Screening p -values were obtained using ANCOM-BC's global test, with only significantly different genera based on p -values visualized. (B)–(G) Pairwise comparisons: (B) SBM vs. HSBM, (C) SBM vs. CSBM, (D) SBM vs. HCSBM, (E) HSBM vs. CSBM, (F) HSBM vs. HCSBM, and (G) CSBM vs. HCSBM. Data are shown as log fold change $\pm$ 95% confidence interval, with red symbols indicating significantly different genera, while a blue symbol indicates a statistical tendency. SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; ANCOM-BC, analysis of the composition of microbiomes with bias correction.

2-oxohept-3-enedioate; M00879: Arginine succinyltransferase pathway, arginine $\Rightarrow$ glutamate) were enriched compared to the SBM (Fig. 7D, adjusted $p < 0.05$, respectively). Conversely, the energy metabolism module (M00358: Coenzyme M biosynthesis) was enriched in the SBM (Fig. 7D, adjusted $p < 0.05$). The carbohydrate metabolism module (M00580: Pentose phosphate pathway, archaea, fructose 6P $\Rightarrow$ ribose 5P) was more enriched in the HSBM than in the CSBM (Fig. 7E, adjusted $p < 0.05$), whereas the lipid metabolism module (M00090: Phosphatidylcholine (PC) biosynthesis, choline $\Rightarrow$ PC) was more enriched in the CSBM (Fig. 7E, adjusted $p < 0.01$). The lipid metabolism module (M00090: PC biosynthesis, choline $\Rightarrow$ PC) and three energy metabolism modules (M00154: Cytochrome c oxidase; M00155: Cytochrome c oxidase, prokaryotes; M00358: Coenzyme M biosynthesis) were significantly enriched in CSBM compared to HCSBM (Fig. 7G, adjusted $p < 0.05$, respectively).

DISCUSSION

Heat treatment of protein sources has been shown to enhance Maillard reactions or non-enzymatic browning, leading to an increased content of RUP [27]. Similarly, acid treatment has been suggested to induce structural alterations in proteins, potentially improving protection against ruminal degradation [28,29]. Furthermore, when heat and acid treatments are applied together, the protective effect against ruminal degradation is greater than with either treatment alone. Previous studies evaluating RPP using a combination of heat and organic acids have primarily focused on applying heat and malic acid or orthophosphoric acid [1,7,29–32]. The efficacy of these treatments can vary depending on several factors, including the type of acid and heating method used. In this study, we employed a combination of CA and heat to specifically target SBM. We hypothesized that treatment of SBM with heat and CA would reduce ruminal degradation and




Fig. 7. Predicted functional profiles were inferred using PICRUST2 (version 2.5.2) and matched using the KEGG database. (A) PCA plot based on KEGG orthologs. Only primary KEGG modules with a relative abundance of $\geq 0.01\%$ in at least one treatment were assessed using ANCOM-BC. **(B)–(G)** Differentially enriched KEGG modules are shown as log-fold changes with 95% confidence intervals. Red symbols indicate significantly different KEGG modules, whereas blue symbols denote statistical tendencies. KEGG, Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; PC, principal component; SBM, untreated soybean meal; HSBM, heat-treated soybean meal; CSBM, citric acid-treated soybean meal; HCSBM, heat and citric acid-treated soybean meal; ANCOM-BC, analysis of the composition of microbiomes with bias correction; PCA, principal component analysis.

lower methane emissions. Wright [33] reported that ruminal microbes rapidly metabolize CA to CO_2 and acetate. In our study, the highest gas production observed in the CSBM during the initial 3 h was likely due to the rapid degradation of CA. Additionally, K_g was the highest in CSBM and HCSBM, which may be attributed to the effect of CA supplementation. *In vitro* fermentation experiments measuring gas production have been widely used to evaluate feed degradability and rumen fermentation kinetics [34,35]. After 6 h, both HSBM and HCSBM exhibited minimal gas production. However, as fermentation progressed beyond 9 h, HCSBM consistently demonstrated the lowest gas production. Furthermore, the $V_{\max}$ was significantly lower in the HCSBM group. These findings indicate that HCSBM provided the most effective protection against ruminal degradation among all treatments.

Methane production (%) was the lowest in CSBM and HCSBM. Despite these observed

differences in methane production (%), our investigation into microbial ecology revealed no significant variations in the community structure between SBM and CSBM at the phylum and genus levels. Similarly, the microbial functional profiles did not differ between the SBM and CSBM. Wu et al. [36] suggested that coenzyme M plays a critical role in the archaeal methanogenic pathways as a cofactor required for the final step of methanogenesis. Notably, the enrichment of methane metabolism (M00358: Coenzyme M biosynthesis) was significantly lower in the HCSBM than in both the SBM and CSBM. The significant reduction of the M00358 module (Coenzyme M biosynthesis) in the HCSBM indicates that the combination of heat and CA treatments may inhibit methanogenic activity by limiting the availability of this crucial cofactor. Furthermore, the HCSBM group showed lower methane production (%) than the HSBM group, which was accompanied by a significant reduction in the absolute abundance of Thermoplasmatota at the phylum level. Thermoplasmatota, a phylum primarily represented in the archaeal community, is still not fully understood [37]. This reduction in key methanogenic pathways suggests that HCSBM has the potential to modulate microbial metabolism, thereby reducing methane production. However, given that there was no significant difference in methane production (%) between the CSBM and HCSBM groups, further research is required to elucidate the effect of CA supplementation on methane reduction. In particular, mechanistic studies are needed to investigate how heat treatment and CA interact to influence coenzyme M biosynthesis and other key methanogenic pathways. The lowest methane emission (mL/g DM) observed in the HCSBM may be due to a reduction in methane production (%) and decreased total gas production resulting from inhibited ruminal degradation of the substrate. The IVCPD was significantly lower in the HSBM and HCSBM groups, with no significant interaction effects observed. Heat treatment is the most effective physical protection method because it produces amino-sugar complexes via the Maillard reaction, resulting in resistance to microbial enzymatic hydrolysis [27]. Additionally, Lin and Kung [27] found that roasting soybeans at temperatures between 100°C and 160°C yielded the highest RUP content at 160°C. Consequently, it is believed that the structural changes in proteins induced by heat treatment reduce their degradation in the rumen. The concentration of NH₃-N was positively correlated with IVCPD. Based on the IVCPD results, we predicted that the NH₃-N concentrations would be similar in the HSBM and HCSBM. However, the NH₃-N concentration was the lowest in the HCSBM. According to Russell et al. [38], fibrolytic bacteria rely exclusively on NH₃-N as their nitrogen source. In our study, the absolute abundance of *Fibrobacter* was higher in HCSBM than in HSBM. Thus, the lower NH₃-N concentration in HCSBM might be due to the increased utilization of NH₃-N by *Fibrobacter*.

MCP was the lowest in the HCSBM group. When nitrogen is sufficiently available, the fermentation of carbohydrates in the rumen is the primary factor influencing MCP synthesis efficiency [39]. Zhang et al. [40] noted that a higher content of non-structural carbohydrates in the feed enhanced total VFA production and MCP synthesis. Similarly, Berthiaume et al. [41] confirmed that increasing non-structural carbohydrate levels in alfalfa improved microbial nitrogen synthesis in the rumen. Total VFA production, primarily resulting from the microbial fermentation of carbohydrates [42], was significantly lower in HCSBM, with a particularly marked reduction in the proportion of propionate generated by the microbial degradation of non-structural carbohydrates [43]. Therefore, the lower MCP might be due to the reduced non-structural carbohydrate content following the combined heat and CA treatment. The proportion of acetate was the highest in HCSBM. Previous studies have noted that CA supplementation increases acetate production [8,10]. HCSBM contained a significantly higher proportion of acetate than CSBM. This observation may be linked to the significant enrichment of Fibrobacterota in the HCSBM. Fibrobacterota is a key bacterial phylum responsible for cellulose degradation

and primarily produces acetate and succinate as the main fermentation products [44]. Therefore, the enriched Fibrobacterota in HCSBM may have promoted fiber degradation, potentially contributing to the increased proportion of acetate production. Nevertheless, because this study did not evaluate fiber degradability, further investigation is required to establish a connection between fiber degradation and acetate production. Iso-butyrate and iso-valerate, classified as branched-chain VFA, are produced through the deamination of branched-chain amino acids and are considered indicators of protein fermentation [45]. HCSBM and HSBM exhibited the lowest CP degradation. Similarly, the proportions of iso-butyrate and iso-valerate production were the lowest between the two treatments. Moreover, no differences in amino acid metabolism were observed between HCSBM and HSBM.

Overall, our findings suggest that HCSBM reduces methane emissions by decreasing the enrichment of the methane metabolism pathway (M00358: Coenzyme M biosynthesis) and lowering the absolute abundance of the phylum Thermoplasmata. Although HCSBM and HSBM exhibited similar IVCPD and proportions of branched-chain VFA production, the increased abundance of fiber-degrading bacteria in HCSBM may have contributed to the lowest observed $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ concentration. In conclusion, treating SBM with a combination of heat and CA showed the potential to reduce ruminal protein degradation and methane emissions, suggesting the need for additional *in vivo* studies to confirm these results.

REFERENCES

1. Vanegas JL, Carro MD, Alvir MR, González J. Protection of sunflower seed and sunflower meal protein with malic acid and heat: effects on *in vitro* ruminal fermentation and methane production. *J Sci Food Agric*. 2017;97:350–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7743>
2. Haro A, de Evan T, De La Fuente Vázquez J, Díaz MT, González Cano J, Carro MD. Effect of a diet supplemented with malic acid–heat (MAH) treated sunflower on carcass characteristics, meat composition and fatty acids profile in growing lambs. *Animals*. 2020;10:487. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10030487>
3. O'Hara E, Neves ALA, Song Y, Guan LL. The role of the gut microbiome in cattle production and health: driver or passenger? *Annu Rev Anim Biosci*. 2020;8:199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-animal-021419-083952>
4. Park SH, Lee BR, Kim TH. Urease and nitrification inhibitors with pig slurry effects on ammonia and nitrous oxide emissions, nitrate leaching, and nitrogen use efficiency in perennial ryegrass sward. *Anim Biosci*. 2021;34:2023–33. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ab.21.0046>
5. Rigon F, Pereira DAB, Loregian KE, Magnani E, Marcondes MI, Branco RH, et al. Use of heating methods and xylose to increase rumen undegradable protein of alternative protein sources: 1) peanut meal. *Animals*. 2023;13:23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13010023>
6. Molosse VL, Pereira DAB, Rigon F, Loregian KE, Magnani E, Marcondes MI, et al. Use of heating methods and xylose to increase rumen undegradable protein of alternative protein sources: 2) cottonseed meal. *Animals*. 2022;13:41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13010041>
7. Díaz-Royón F, Arroyo JM, Sánchez-Yélamo MD, González J. Sunflower meal and spring pea ruminal degradation protection using malic acid or orthophosphoric acid–heat treatments. *Anim Prod Sci*. 2015;56:2029–38. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN14669>
8. Wang C, Liu Q, Meng J, Yang WZ, Yang XM, He DC, et al. Effects of citric acid supplementation on rumen fermentation, urinary excretion of purine derivatives and feed digestibility in steers. *J Sci Food Agric*. 2009;89:2302–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.3724>
9. Packett LV, Fordham JR. Utilization of citric acid by rumen microorganisms. *J Anim Sci*.

- 1965;24:488-93. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas1965.242488x>
10. Kazemi-Bonchenari M, Salem AZM, López S. Influence of barley grain particle size and treatment with citric acid on digestibility, ruminal fermentation and microbial protein synthesis in Holstein calves. *Animal*. 2017;11:1295-302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731116002810>
 11. Sun W, Mitsumori M, Takenaka A. The detection of possible sensor histidine kinases regulating citrate/malate metabolism from the bovine rumen microbial ecosystem. *Lett Appl Microbiol*. 2008;47:462-6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2008.02460.x>
 12. Tsai CF, Lin LJ, Wang CH, Tsai CS, Chang SC, Lee TT. Effects of fermented soybean meal with *Bacillus velezensis*, *Lactobacillus* spp. or their combination on broiler performance, gut antioxidant activity and microflora. *Anim Biosci*. 2022;35:1892-903. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ab.21.0529>
 13. AOAC (Association of Official Analytical Chemists) International. Official methods of analysis of the AOAC International. Gaithersburg, MD: AOAC International; 2005.
 14. Van Soest PJ, Robertson JB, Lewis BA. Methods for dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. *J Dairy Sci*. 1991;74:3583-97. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(91\)78551-2](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(91)78551-2)
 15. Goering HK, Van Soest PJ. Forage fiber analyses (apparatus, reagents, procedures, and some applications). Washington DC: Agricultural Research Service; 1970.
 16. Theodorou MK, Williams BA, Dhanoa MS, McAllan AB, France J. A simple gas production method using a pressure transducer to determine the fermentation kinetics of ruminant feeds. *Anim Feed Sci Technol*. 1994;48:185-97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401\(94\)90171-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401(94)90171-6)
 17. Schofield P, Pitt RE, Pell AN. Kinetics of fiber digestion from in vitro gas production. *J Anim Sci*. 1994;72:2980-91. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1994.72112980x>
 18. Yoo D, Hamid MMA, Kim H, Moon J, Song J, Lee S, et al. Substitution effects of rice for corn grain in total mixed ration on rumen fermentation characteristics and microbial community in vitro. *J Anim Sci Technol*. 2020;62:638-47. <https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2020.62.5.638>
 19. Makkar HPS, Sharma OP, Dawra RK, Negi SS. Simple determination of microbial protein in rumen liquor. *J Dairy Sci*. 1982;65:2170-3. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(82\)82477-6](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(82)82477-6)
 20. Herlemann DPR, Labrenz M, Jürgens K, Bertilsson S, Wanick JJ, Andersson AF. Transitions in bacterial communities along the 2000 km salinity gradient of the Baltic Sea. *ISME J*. 2011;5:1571-9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.41>
 21. Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet CC, Al-Ghalith GA, et al. Reproducible, interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2019;37:852-7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0209-9>
 22. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. DADA2: high-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nat Methods*. 2016;13:581-3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3869>
 23. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2013;41:D590-6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks1219>
 24. Douglas GM, Maffei VJ, Zaneveld JR, Yurgel SN, Brown JR, Taylor CM, et al. PICRUSt2 for prediction of metagenome functions. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020;38:685-8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0548-6>
 25. Tang Y, Horikoshi M, Li W. ggfortify: unified interface to visualize statistical results of popular R packages. *R J*. 2016;8:474-85. <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2016-060>
 26. Lin H, Peddada SD. Analysis of compositions of microbiomes with bias correction. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11:3514. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17041-7>

27. Lin C, Kung L. Heat treated soybeans and soybean meal in ruminant nutrition [Internet]. American Soybean Association. 1999 [cited 2024 Sep 1]. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Limin-Kung/publication/265150138_Heat_Treated_Soybeans_and_Soybean_Meal_in_Ruminant_Nutrition/links/55ccc4ab08ae5b71d57aabb7/Heat-Treated-Soybeans-and-Soybean-Meal-in-Ruminant-Nutrition.pdf
28. Waltz DM, Loerch SC. Effect of acid and alkali treatment of soybean meal on nitrogen utilization by ruminants. *J Anim Sci*. 1986;63:879-87. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas1986.633879x>
29. Arroyo JM, González J, Muñoz J, Alvir MR, Rodríguez CA, Ibañez MA, et al. In vitro efficiency of combined acid-heat treatments for protecting sunflower meal proteins against ruminal degradation. *Animal*. 2011;5:1188-94. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731111000279>
30. Arroyo JM, González J, Ouarti M, Silván JM, Ruiz del Castillo ML, de la Peña Moreno F. Malic acid or orthophosphoric acid-heat treatments for protecting sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*) meal proteins against ruminal degradation and increasing intestinal amino acid supply. *Animal*. 2013;7:223-31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731112001292>
31. Vanegas JL, González J, Alvir MR, Carro MD. Influence of malic acid-heat treatment for protecting sunflower protein against ruminal degradation on in vitro methane production: a comparison with the use of malic acid as an additive. *Anim Feed Sci Technol*. 2017;228:123-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2017.04.015>
32. Haro A, Gonzalez J, de Evan T, de la Fuente J, Carro MD. Effects of feeding rumen-protected sunflower seed and meal protein on feed intake, diet digestibility, ruminal, cecal fermentation, and growth performance of lambs. *Animals*. 2019;9:415. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9070415>
33. Wright DE. Citric acid metabolism in the bovine rumen. *Appl Microbiol*. 1971;21:165-8. <https://doi.org/10.1128/am.21.2.165-168.1971>
34. Sommart K, Parker DS, Rowlinson P, Wanapat M. Fermentation characteristics and microbial protein synthesis in an in vitro system using cassava, rice straw and dried ruzi grass as substrates. *Asian-Australas J Anim Sci*. 2000;13:1084-93. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.2000.1084>
35. Ki KS, Park SB, Lim DH, Seo S. Evaluation of the nutritional value of locally produced forage in Korea using chemical analysis and in vitro ruminal fermentation. *Asian-Australas J Anim Sci*. 2017;30:355-62. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.16.0626>
36. Wu HH, Pun MD, Wise CE, Streit BR, Mus F, Berim A, et al. The pathway for coenzyme M biosynthesis in bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2022;119:e2207190119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2207190119>
37. Krizsan SJ, Ramin M, Chagas JCC, Halmemies-Beauchet-Filleau A, Singh A, Schnürer A, et al. Effects on rumen microbiome and milk quality of dairy cows fed a grass silage-based diet supplemented with the macroalga *Asparagopsis taxiformis*. *Front Anim Sci*. 2023;4:1112969. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fanim.2023.1112969>
38. Russell JB, O'Connor JD, Fox DG, Van Soest PJ, Sniffen CJ. A net carbohydrate and protein system for evaluating cattle diets: I. ruminal fermentation. *J Anim Sci*. 1992;70:3551-61. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1992.70113551x>
39. Bach A, Calsamiglia S, Stern MD. Nitrogen metabolism in the rumen. *J Dairy Sci*. 2005;88:E9-21. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(05\)73133-7](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(05)73133-7)
40. Zhang X, Zhang H, Wang Z, Zhang X, Zou H, Tan C, et al. Effects of dietary carbohydrate composition on rumen fermentation characteristics and microbial population in vitro. *Ital J Anim Sci*. 2015;14:3366. <https://doi.org/10.4081/ijas.2015.3366>
41. Berthiaume R, Benchaar C, Chaves AV, Tremblay GF, Castonguay Y, Bertrand A, et al. Effects of nonstructural carbohydrate concentration in alfalfa on fermentation and microbial protein synthesis in continuous culture. *J Dairy Sci*. 2010;93:693-700. <https://doi.org/10.3168/>

- jds.2009-2399
42. Liu Q, Wang C, Guo G, Huo WJ, Zhang YL, Pei CX, et al. Effects of branched-chain volatile fatty acids supplementation on growth performance, ruminal fermentation, nutrient digestibility, hepatic lipid content and gene expression of dairy calves. *Anim Feed Sci Technol.* 2018;237:27-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2018.01.006>
 43. Sutton JD, Morant SV, Bines JA, Napper DJ, Givens DI. Effect of altering the starch: fibre ratio in the concentrates on hay intake and milk production by Friesian cows. *J Agric Sci.* 1993;120:379-90. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600076541>
 44. Ransom-Jones E, Jones DL, McCarthy AJ, McDonald JE. The Fibrobacteres: an important phylum of cellulose-degrading bacteria. *Microb Ecol.* 2012;63:267-81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-011-9998-1>
 45. Qin X, Zhang D, Qiu X, Zhao K, Zhang S, Liu C, et al. 2-Hydroxy-4-(methylthio) butanoic acid isopropyl ester supplementation altered ruminal and cecal bacterial composition and improved growth performance of finishing beef cattle. *Front Nutr.* 2022;9:833881. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.833881>