The Comparison of in vitro Digestibility of Wheat Straw by Rumen Anaerobic Fungi of Khuzestan Buffalo and Holstein Cattle
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INTRODUCTION

A lot of wheat straw is produced and used in the feeding of livestock. Among the limiting factors the nutritional value of agricultural byproducts are high lignin content and low quantity of easy accessible carbohydrates (Osorio and Cruz, 1990).

In ruminants due to having special digestive system, feeds exposed to microbial fermentation, before digestive enzymes of animal. Since the main limitation for increasing the animal productions is deficiency of feedstuffs in developing country, production of livestock with ability to consume the low quality and fibrous materials is necessary. Buffalo has a high capacity to use the low quality fibrous feedstuffs and roughage. Advantage of rumen metabolism and function of buffalo than the cattle, especially in terms of the activity of cellulytic microorganisms, is considered (Bahatia et al. 2004).

The anaerobic rumen fungi have the necessary enzymes (mostly extra cellular) for degradation of plants cell wall. The fungi digest about 70% of cellulose in rumen, and their cellulase and xylanase activity are more than other cellulytic microorganisms like bacteria and protozoa in rumen (Lee et al. 2004). Before rumen bacteria could degrade the forage, they must be attached and colonized on the plant tissues. Cuticle that covers the aerial parts of all plants, prevented from colonization of rumen bacteria. The rumen anaerobic fungi have ability to penetrate to the cuticle layer.

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to compare digestibility of wheat straw (WS) by fungi and whole rumen microorganisms (WRM). Dry matter (DM), neutral and acid detergent fiber (NDF and ADF) digestibility of WS were compared with in vitro digestion (IVD), gas production (GP) and specific rumen anaerobic fungi culture (SRAFC). Dry matter, NDF and ADF digestibility of WS by WRM of buffalo (60.80, 49.93 and 17.45%, respectively) were more than cattle (53.00, 38.63 and 10.62%, respectively) (P<0.05). Regardless the type of microorganisms, digestibility of DM (P>0.05), NDF and ADF by buffalo (51.03, 44.41 and 12.09%) was more than cattle (48.04, 36.34 and 8.76) (P<0.05). Potential of GP (B) by fungi and WRM in cattle was more than buffalo (P<0.05). Rate of GP (C) for WRM and fungi of cattle was less than buffalo (P<0.05). Regardless the type of microorganisms, C in buffalo was more than cattle (P<0.05) and was vice versa for B (P<0.05), but rate of GP of them was same. In SRAFC, DM digestibility of WS by fungi of buffalo at days 3 and 12 was more than cattle (P<0.05). The number of fungi in cattle rumen was more than buffalo (P<0.05). The potential of fungi and WRM of buffalo were more than cattle. Therefore, the results were shown the advantage and supremacy of buffalo in usage the low quality roughages.
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INTRODUCTION

A lot of wheat straw is produced and used in the feeding of livestock. Among the limiting factors the nutritional value of agricultural byproducts are high lignin content and low quantity of easy accessible carbohydrates (Osorio and Cruz, 1990).

In ruminants due to having special digestive system, feeds exposed to microbial fermentation, before digestive enzymes of animal. Since the main limitation for increasing the animal productions is deficiency of feedstuffs in developing country, production of livestock with ability to consume the low quality and fibrous materials is necessary. Buffalo has a high capacity to use the low quality fibrous feedstuffs and roughage. Advantage of rumen metabolism and function of buffalo than the cattle, especially in terms of the activity of cellulytic microorganisms, is considered (Bahatia et al. 2004).

The anaerobic rumen fungi have the necessary enzymes (mostly extra cellular) for degradation of plants cell wall. The fungi digest about 70% of cellulose in rumen, and their cellulase and xylanase activity are more than other cellulytic microorganisms like bacteria and protozoa in rumen (Lee et al. 2004). Before rumen bacteria could degrade the forage, they must be attached and colonized on the plant tissues. Cuticle that covers the aerial parts of all plants, prevented from colonization of rumen bacteria. The rumen anaerobic fungi have ability to penetrate to the cuticle layer.
for access to plant tissue. The fungi penetrate into the plant tissue and produced a wide range of high activity extracellular enzymes, so they have ability to degrade nearly more than 34% of plant tissue lignin (Krause et al. 2003). The chitinase activity of rumen anaerobic fungi, make them able to degrade hard section of cell wall of plants, including sclerenchyma and vesicular tissue.

There was significant difference in number of buffalo and cattle rumen bacteria, fungi and protozoa (Bahatia et al. 2004). The anaerobic fungi in the rumen of buffalo were significantly higher than cattle (Wanapat et al. 2009). Experiments showed that in diets based on ryegrass, numbers of rumen fungi in cattle is greater than buffalo (Kumar et al. 2002); as well diets containing oats-concentrate (with 27.2% cellulose) resulted to stimulate rumen cellulase microbial activity of cattle than buffalo (Kumar et al. 2002). Due to the low rumen passage rate of buffalo in comparison to cattle, digestibility and efficiency of low quality forage in buffaloes is higher than dairy cow (Bahatia et al. 2004). In the most parts of the world, there is the restriction of feed resources, and ruminants were fed with low quality by-products.

The rumen fungi have direct and indirect role in digestion of cell wall (to facilitate access to the cell wall for bacteria and protozoa through weaken the lingo cellulosic bounds of them), and exist conflicting results regarding the activity of fungal populations in cattle and buffalo (depending on their food and habitat). Therefore, the present experiment was designed to compare the activity of rumen anaerobic fungi of Holstein cattle and Khuzestan buffalo in digestion of WS as typical roughage.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Animal, diet and sample preparation**
The experiment was conducted by 5 Holstein steer (weight 430±4 kg, 18±2 months old) and 5 male buffalo (weight 420±5 kg, 18±2 months old) which fed similar diet. The diet was formulated based on NRC (1996). The diet was composed from: alfalfa hay, wheat straw, sugarcane pith, soybean meal, barley grain, wheat bran, corn grain, urea, minerals and vitamins additives. The animals were fed near *ad libitum* (10% less that), two meals per day within 4 months. The animals had free access to water during the experiment. The WS was oven dried (60 °C, 48h) and milled (through 1 mm screen, Tecator, Sweden).

**In vitro digestibility**
The test was conducted three times, for each run the rumen fluid was collected from all animals before morning feeding via stomach tube, combined and filtered through four layers of cheese cloth, stored in plastic bottles (filled by CO₂) with tight stopper, kept that in a flask with warm water, and transported to the laboratory. The *in vitro* digestibility of WS was measured by the two-step method (Tilley and Terry, 1963). Briefly, 4 tubes contained 0.5 g WS were incubated in rumen fluid for 48 h and then for 48 h in a pepsin-HCl solution. IVD was calculated from difference between the amount of the nutrients at initial and end of incubation for samples. The NDF and ADF were measured Van Soest et al. (1991).

**IVD-by rumen fungi**

For isolation fungi from whole rumen liquor, rumen fluid was collected before morning feeding via stomach tube from all steers, filtered centrifuged (10 min at 1000 rpm), and mixed by 1:4 ratio to McDougall (1948), buffer then 2 mL antibiotics (penicillin, streptomycin and chloramphenicol, each 0.1 mL/L) was added to the culture medium (Davies et al. 1993). The other steps of experiment were operated like above.

**Gas production**

GP was analyzed in triplicate by the Menkeand Steingass (1988) technique, using 100 mL glass syringes (model Fortuna; Haberle Labortechnik, Germany) filled with 300 mg of the WS sample, 20 mL of artificial saliva (McDougall, 1948) and 10 mL of rumen fluid. Rumen liquied sampled and prepared as mentioned before. Syringes were incubated at 39 °C and GP was measured after 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 24, 36, 48, 72 and 96 h. The potential (B) and rate of GP (C) were fitted by the exponential equation:

\[ Y = B(1-e^{-Ct}) \]

Where:

- **B**: gas production from the fermentable fraction (mL).
- **C**: gas production rate constant C (mL/h).
- **t**: incubation time (h).
- **Y**: gas produced at time t.

To measure the GP by anaerobic rumen fungi, isolation was done like the procedure described in IVD Section.

**Preparation anaerobic fungi culture**

The SRAFC was prepared based on Davies et al. (1993) and including: saline solution 1 (D-potassium hydrogen phosphate) and 2 (potassium hydrogen phosphate, ammonium sulfate, sodium chloride and calcium chloride), centrifuged rumen fluid (15000 rpm, 30 min), yeast extract, trypticase peptone, glucose, cellobiose, sodium bicarbonate, cysteine HCl and Resazurin (0.1%/L of culture medium). The culture mediums transferred into glass serum bottle, under anaerobic condition, then autoclaved for 15 min at 120 °C. Isolated rumen fungi prepared as inoculants (For
preparing rumen fungi inoculants, WS was incubated in the rumen of fistulated steers, and used as the carbon source for growth of the rumen anaerobic fungi, Rezaeian et al. 2005), were cultured in glass serum bottle containing SRAFC, experimental samples (WS, three replicates for each) and antibiotics (penicillin, streptomycin and chloramphenicol, each of 0.1 mg/L) and for purifying cultures three subculture was done. The glass serum bottles were incubated at 39 °C for periods of 3, 9 and 12 days (three replicates for each time). On days 3, 9, 12 replicates removed, glass content was filtered and dried (60 °C, 48 h). The disappearance of DM by fungi was calculated for each time.

Enumeration of rumen fungi

Dilution and enumeration of fungi was performed by MPN methods (Theodorou et al. 1990). Briefly, the dilution solution was saline solution 1 and 2 that explained above. By obtained rumen fluid from the animals under study, the dilution solution was prepared to dilution of 10⁻¹ to 10⁻⁵. Then, with serial inoculated 0.5 ml from each dilution into medium culture of anaerobic fungi (as mentioned above), five tubes were prepared for each dilution and incubated at 39 °C for 12 days. After this time, the pH of the samples (Metrohm model 726, Switzerland) was measured, and turbidity (visually) and pH changes were indexes of fungi growth characteristics. By comparing observations with MPN tables and using existing software fungi were counted (Dehority, 2003).

Ammonia nitrogen assay

To measure ammonia nitrogen, the liquid of medium cultures was mixed with HCl (0.2 N), then used phenol-hypochlorite method (Broderick and Kang, 1980).

Statistical analysis

The IVD, GP (hours 2-96) and SRAFC (days 3, 9, 12) data statistically analyzed by SAS (1996) with a split-plot designs (animals and microorganisms as main plots and subplots, respectively) and compared of means done by Duncan’s multiple range test (P<0.05). Statistical model included:

\[ Y_{ijk} = (\mu + A_i + \delta_{ik} + B_j + A)(ij) + e_{ijk} \]

Where:

- \( Y_{ijk} \): observed value.
- \( \mu \): population mean.
- \( A_i \): effect of animal (cow or buffalo).
- \( B_j \): effect of treatment (WRM or fungi).
- \( (AB)_{ij} \): interaction effects of treatment in animals.
- \( \delta_{ik} \): main plot error.
- \( e_{ijk} \): residual error.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Digestibility of WS-by WRM

The digestibility of DM, NDF and ADF by WRM in buffalo were more than cattle (P<0.05). Regardless the type of microorganisms, digestibility of DM (P<0.05), NDF and ADF by buffalo were more than cattle (P<0.05).

Digestibility of WS-by rumen fungi

Dry matter and ADF digestibility of WS by rumen fungi of cattle and buffalo did not differ (P>0.05), but NDF digestibility in buffalo was more than cattle (P<0.05). Regardless the type of animal, the digestibility of DM, NDF (P<0.05) and ADF (P>0.05) by WRM was higher than fungi (P<0.05). However, the digestibility of DM, NDF and ADF of WS by rumen fungi was about 74.74, 36.82 and 48.50% of the WRM.

Gas production parameters

Potential of GP (B) of WS by WRM, was a significant difference between cattle and buffalo (P<0.05). GP rate (C) of WS in buffalo was more than cattle (P<0.05). Regardless the type of microorganisms, the B of WS in cattle was greater than buffalo (P<0.05), but C was higher in buffalo than cattle (P<0.05). Potential of GP by rumen fungi of cattle was greater than buffalo (P<0.05), but the rate of GP in buffalo was more (P>0.05). Regardless the type of animal species, potential of GP by WRM was more than fungi (P<0.05). Proportion of B and C by rumen fungi, respectively was 69.93 and 95.23% of WRM.

Digestibility and fermentation parameters

Digestibility of DM by rumen fungi of buffalo and cattle in buffalo on days 3 and 12 was higher than cattle (P<0.05). The highest DM digestibility in cattle and buffalo was on the 12th day of culture (Table 3). The concentration of ammonia nitrogen of medium containing WS (Table 4) in the day 6, 9 and 12, had no difference between buffalo and cattle (P<0.05), but was higher on third day in buffalo. In both cattle and buffalo ammonia nitrogen concentration was greater with increasing duration of incubation until the ninth day, and from the ninth and twelfth days stopped. Fungi medium culture pH (Table 3) at all cultural times between buffalo and cattle were similar (P<0.05). It was observed that pH of medium culture containing bovine rumen fungi on the 12th day was the lower than other days.

Number of rumen fungi

The concentration of rumen fungi in cattle was more than buffalo (P<0.05).the fungi concentration per ml rumen fluid of buffalo and cattle was 2 × 10³ and 2.7 × 10³, respectively (Table 5).
**Digestibility of WS-by WRM**

Agrees with our results, digestibility of DM, NDF and cellulose of WS and Berseem grass by WRM of buffalo were reported more than cattle (Tewatia and Bhatia, 1998). Also, the digestibility of DM, NDF and ADF of WS by WRM in buffalo was higher than Holstein cattle (Jabbari et al. 2011). Differences in nutrients digestibility between cattle and buffalo in the present experiments may be was attributed to variety of factors, including differences in density and type of rumen microorganisms (Bahatia et al. 2004) and physiological differences of buffalo and cattle (Wanapat, 2001). There are large cellulosytic populations including bacteria, anaerobic fungi and protozoa in rumen (Chen and Wang, 2008). Therefore, in the present experiments, one reason for the higher digestibility of nutrients in buffalo may be attributed to the role of their protozoa. Stated that about 30 to 40% of total microbial fiber digestion in the rumen is done by protozoa; 34% of rumen cellulase activity is related to protozoa (Bauchop and Clarke, 1976).

In buffalo that fed WS and concentrate, removes protozoa resulted to diminish digestibility of structural carbohydrates in the rumen and whole digestive tract (Chaudhary et al. 1995). In a study on similar diet, number of protozoa per ml rumen fluid of buffaloes was more than cattle (Jabbari et al. 2011). In another study digestibility of DM, NDF and ADF of steam treated sugarcane pith and WS by rumen protozoa of Khuzestan buffalo was higher than cattle (Jabbari et al. 2012). The population of cellulosytic bacteria in rumen of buffalo compared with cattle has been reported three times (Singh et al. 1992; Singh et al. 2003). Wanapat (2001) also found that number of cellulosytic bacteria, cellulose digestibility and rumen ammonia concentration in the rumen of buffalo was higher than cattle. Thus, one reason for better digestion of cellulose by buffalo is more cellulosytic bacteria and higher concentration of ammonia in the rumen.

It seems that the *Bacteroid succinigenes, Ruminococcus albus* and *Ruminococcus flavefaciens* be dominant cellulosytic bacteria of rumen (Bryant and Small, 1960; Bryant, 1973), which actively led to the breakdown the plant tissues, and their population in buffalo reported more than cattle (Singh et al. 2003). The higher digestibility of WS in buffalo than cattle is unlikely can be attributed to the quantity of their rumen fungi (Table 5), because number of fungi in buffalo rumen is less than cattle, which this reality confirmed by others. For example on oats-concentrate diet, researchers stated that the population of rumen fungi in cattle was higher than buffalo (Kumar et al. 2002). But perhaps it can be attributed to the quality of their cellulosyactic activity, because it has been suggested that compared with dominant rumen cellulosyactic bacteria and protozoa, the activity of fungal cellulase and xylanase enzymes are more (Lee et al. 2004).

The cellulase activity of isolated rumen fungi of buffalo was higher than cattle (Samanta et al. 1999). More than 70% *in vivo* cellulose digestion is made by rumen fungi (Akin and Borneman, 1990). However, the population of the rumen fungi is significantly affected by diet. Mansouri et al. (2005) reported that the consumption of alfalfa hay, sugarcane hay and WS had no significant effect on rumen fungi populations of Holstein and Sistani cattle, but the most fungal zoospore density was observed with the consumption of WS; since the fungal zoospore per ml rumen fluid, when intake of WS, was more than sugarcane hay and alfalfa hay. Dey et al. (2004) reported that anaerobic fungi in the cross bred calves, causing increase of growth rate, feed efficiency and nutrients digestibility. Another reason for the difference in digestion between buffalo and cattle can be related to the body size of them, however in the present experiment the animals had approximately the same weight. In this case, Hungate (1966) showed that rumen fermentation per unit of rumen contents weight increases, and with body size of ruminant decrease, which might be associated with the energy needs of the animal.

**Digestibility of WS-by rumen fungi**

The DM and ADF digestibility of WS by rumen fungi of cattle and buffalo did not differ, but NDF digestibility in buffalo was more than cattle (P<0.05). This difference might be due to the higher fungal cellulase activity of buffalo as compared to cattle (Samanta et al. 1999). The diets rich of roughage like diets based on WS or silages which have long retention time in the rumen, leading to the development of anaerobic fungi (Hobson and Stewart, 1997). Investigators reported that direct feeding of *neocallimastix* resulted to increase the nutritional value of diets based on WS (Sehgal et al. 2008). It is reported that the digestibility of DM, NDF and ADF of WS by rumen fungi in cattle is more than buffalo (Kumar et al. 2002), which agrees with the results of this experiment in terms of digestible DM, but is opposite for ADF and NDF digestibility (Table 1). The higher DM digestibility (non-significantly) of WS by rumen fungi in cattle than buffalo can be due to differences in active rumen fungi strains. Because comparing the different active enzymes of anaerobic fungi in domestic and wild animals shown *Promises* species that isolated from bull, increased nutrients digestibility and growth of buffalo calves (Paul et al. 2004). Dayanand et al. (2007) studied biodegradation of WS (treated with urea) by different species of *Promises* and found that *Promises* increased the digestibility of nutrients and volatile fatty acids production (Dayanand et al. 2007).
Gas production parameters of WS-by WRM and fungi

Potential of GP by WRM in cattle was higher than buffalo (P<0.05), and vice versa for GP rate (Table 2). In agrees to the present experimental results, Jabbari (2010) and Rafiei et al. (2013) reported that B by WRM in buffalo was significantly higher than cattle. The results of Jabbari (2010) on C were consistent with our experiment results. Higher B in cattle than buffalo might be due to further fermentation and degradation of feed by cattle rumen microorganisms (Agarwal et al. 1991) and different in their rumen microbial population. It is reported that steaming of sugarcane pith leads to a significant increase in the C and B, that most of this increment was related to the rumen bacteria (Chaji and mohammadabadi, 2011).

The rate of GP in buffalo was more than cattle, this means that more gas is produced in the early hours of incubation, or feed degradation rate in buffalo is faster. Since cattle rumen fungi in present experiment was higher and had more role in fiber digestion than buffalo, might the cause of this delay in cattle attributed to this item, since the colonization of fungi on feeds need longer period (Lowe, 1987), on the other hand, can be expressed that in buffalo other microorganisms than fungi have a greater role in digestion.

Dry matter digestibility and fermentation parameters

The highest dry matter digestibility in cattle and buffalo was on the 12th day of culture (Table 3), might be due to

---

**Table 1.** Digestibility of wheat straw that incubated by fungi and whole rumen microorganisms of cattle and buffalo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Microorganisms</th>
<th>Digestibility (%)</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>NDF</th>
<th>ADF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.80a</td>
<td>49.93a</td>
<td>17.45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53.00a</td>
<td>38.63a</td>
<td>10.62a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>41.26a</td>
<td>38.89a</td>
<td>6.73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>43.80a</td>
<td>34.05a</td>
<td>6.89a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Gas production parameters of wheat straw that incubated by fungi and whole rumen microorganisms of cattle and buffalo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Microorganisms</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>B (mL)</th>
<th>C (mL/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92.38±2.36a</td>
<td>0.028±0.0018a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.54±6.36a</td>
<td>0.028±0.0018a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>108.70±8.51a</td>
<td>0.013±0.0019a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>76.09±5.96a</td>
<td>0.013±0.0019a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Dry matter digestibility and fermentation parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Microorganisms</th>
<th>Digestibility (%)</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>NDF</th>
<th>ADF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.80a</td>
<td>49.93a</td>
<td>17.45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53.00a</td>
<td>38.63a</td>
<td>10.62a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>41.26a</td>
<td>38.89a</td>
<td>6.73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>43.80a</td>
<td>34.05a</td>
<td>6.89a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM:** standard error of means; DM: dry matter; NDF: neutral detergent fiber; ADF: acid detergent fiber.
The means within the same column with at least one common letter, do not have significant difference (P>0.05).
increase of rhizoid growing which lead to break the physical structure of plant and softening of feed, and also may be due to the increased amount of fiber degrading enzymes (Dehority, 2003).

The concentration of ammonia nitrogen (Table 4) was higher on d 3 in buffalo. In both cattle and buffalo ammonia nitrogen concentration from the ninth and twelfth days stopped that represents the end of fermentation. Increased the amount of ammonia during the incubation time, indicating increased the rate of proliferation ofsporangium and proteolytic enzymes follow the increasing of fungi, so digestion more protein and consequently produced greater proteolytic enzymes. Having active proteases by rumen fungi is their unique properties as cellulose-degrading microorganisms, because the majority of cellulose degrading bacteria are not proteolytic (Bahatia et al. 2004). The researchers observed that Neocallimastix frontalis have the extra cellular proteolytic activity; their activity was lower compared with aerobic fungi, but was comparable with most proteolytic bacteria (Wallace and Joblin, 1985). In ruminants that are fed low-quality forage, critical levels of ammonia nitrogen to maintain proper microbial activity have been reported equal to 5-20 mg/100 mL of rumen fluid (Bryant and Small, 1960). When the levels of ammonia increased in the rumen of buffalo up to 13.60 to 34.40 mg/100 mL, digestibility and intake of WS, also bacteria and protozoa as well as the urinary purine bases increased (Wanapat and Sm, 1999). Therefore, ammonia nitrogen levels in the present experiments in both cattle and buffalo was in the proper range. Fungi medium culture pH (Table 3) containing bovine rumen fungi on the 12th day was the lower than other days. In fact, the depression of pH showed low production of fatty acids, specifically the production of acetic acid and methane, while a slight increment of propionic acid (Erfle et al. 1982). Decreased the pH might be due to being closed of medium culture, and is a common occurrence that this causes to stopping the growth of microorganisms and is called suicide.

Rumen fungi
The number of rumen fungi (Table 5) in cattle was more than buffalo (P<0.05). In agrees with the results of the present experiments, Malakar and Walli (1995) and Kumar et al. (2002) reported that under similar feeding conditions, rumen fungi of cow was more than buffalo, but in study of Wanapat et al. (2009) number of fungi in the rumen of buffalo was higher than cattle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>DMD (%)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>DMD (%)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>DMD (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>36.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>33.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: standard error of means and DMD: dry matter digestibility. The means within the same column with at least one common letter, do not have significant difference (P>0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Incubation time (day)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: standard error of means. The means within the same column with at least one common letter, do not have significant difference (P>0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of fungi/mL of rumen fluid</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>2.7 × 10^{24}</td>
<td>2.0 × 10^{34}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: standard error of means. The means within the same column with at least one common letter, do not have significant difference (P>0.05).

Rumen fungi and microbial population is not always constant and uniform, depended on physiological factors such as age, breeding, feeding behavior, production level, animal health, nature and relations between different microbial populations, as well as environmental factors such as diet composition, nature of the diet frequency of feeding, dietary changes, seasonal changes, changes at duration of day and geographical factors, affect the ratio and density of different groups of rumen microorganisms (Russell, 1986). Since the composition of diet, amount and frequency of feeding was similar in the present experiments, probably differences between rumen anaerobic fungi of cattle and Khuzestan buffalo was due to geographical conditions and animal species.

| CONCLUSION |

Overall, the results showed the greater number of rumen fungi in cattle than buffalo however, despite of this difference, the potential of fungi and whole rumen microorgan-
isms of buffalo in the present experiments was greater or equal with cattle. So, results showed the superior of buffalo compared to the Holstein cattle for using low-quality fiber materials. In buffalo might be other microorganisms except fungi had a greater role in digestion of roughage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors appreciate from Ramin Agriculture and Natural Resources University of Khuzestan for supporting the present experiment.

REFERENCES


Comparison Anaerobic Fungi of Buffalo and Cattle


