



# Comparison of mean retention time (MRT) of markers in the reticulorumen (RR) estimated by modelling their faecal excretion curves or by an algebraic method, in sheep

Laurence Bernard, Jp Chaise, E Delval, C Poncet

## ► To cite this version:

Laurence Bernard, Jp Chaise, E Delval, C Poncet. Comparison of mean retention time (MRT) of markers in the reticulorumen (RR) estimated by modelling their faecal excretion curves or by an algebraic method, in sheep. *Annales de zootechnie*, 1995, 44 (Suppl1), pp.171-171. hal-00889333

**HAL Id: hal-00889333**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00889333>**

Submitted on 11 May 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Comparison of mean retention time (MRT) of markers in the reticulorumen (RR) estimated by modelling their faecal excretion curves or by an algebraic method, in sheep

L Bernard, JP Chaise, E Delval, C Poncet

INRA, Nutrition des herbivores, Theix, 63122 St-Genès-Champanelle, France

Compartmental analysis of marker excretion in the faeces is now widely used to obtain estimates of retention time of digesta in various segments of the gastrointestinal tract of ruminants. In this trial we compared MRT<sub>RR</sub> obtained with the more commonly used models : Grovum et Williams (1973, Br J Nutr, 30, 231-240) (Gw), Ellis *et al* (1979, Fed Proc, 38, 2702-2706) (El) and Dhanoa *et al* (1985, Br J Nutr, 53, 663-671) (Dh), to those obtained with an algebraic method (Thielemans *et al*, 1978, Ann Biol Biochim Biophys, 18, 237-247) (Ref) considered as the reference one but requiring surgically fistulated animals.

Four Texel wethers surgically fitted with rumen and duodenal cannulae were fed a mixture of chopped and ground pelleted orchardgrass hay in the ratio 90/10, 50/50, 30/70, 10/90 according to a 4x4 latin square design, delivered in 8 equal meals (1200 g DM/day). Pulse doses of 18 µCi <sup>170</sup>Tm labelled chopped hay, 18 µCi <sup>169</sup>Yb ground hay and 40 µCi <sup>51</sup>Cr-EDTA were delivered orally to animals prior to duodenal sampling (20 samples distributed over 6 days) and total faecal collection (7 days). Then, abomasal dose of markers (6 µCi <sup>169</sup>Yb labelled duodenal particles and 8 µCi <sup>51</sup>Cr-EDTA) were injected via the rumen

cannula through the reticulo-omasal orifice prior to duodenal sampling (9 samples distributed over 1 day). <sup>170</sup>Tm, <sup>169</sup>Yb and <sup>51</sup>Cr counts were performed simultaneously on fresh samples using a gamma spectrophotometer. MRT between dosing site (mouth or abomasum) and duodenum was obtained from duodenal markers excretion curves using equation developed by Thielemans *et al* (1978). MRT<sub>RR</sub> used as reference was calculated by subtracting MRT in whole stomach from MRT in abomasum. Faecal excretion curves were fitted for all markers to the previous cited models, Gw, El, Dh. MRT<sub>RR</sub> estimated by each model was compared to the reference. Differences between MRT estimations and corresponding reference values were analysed by the GLM and MEANS procedures of SAS (1985).

MRT<sub>RR</sub> values estimated by modelling and algebraic methods were close. Markers (digesta phases) had an effect on accuracy of MRT<sub>RR</sub> estimations with the models. The particulate (Tm, Yb) phase MRT<sub>RR</sub> calculated using Dh modelling procedure were statistically similar to those calculated with the algebraic method, whilst this was so only for liquid (Cr) when Gw and El models are used.

		Tm	Yb	Cr
Method :	Ref	27.9	21.9	15.7
	Gw	24.6	20.0	16.6
	El	23.1	19.4	16.7
	Dh	26.5	23.2	18.0
Difference :	Gw - Ref	-3.35 <sup>b</sup> (0.78)	-1.93 <sup>ab</sup> (0.65)	0.90 <sup>a*</sup> (0.46)
	El - Ref	-4.83 <sup>c</sup> (0.85)	-2.49 <sup>b</sup> (1.04)	0.93 <sup>a*</sup> (0.55)
	Dh - Ref	-1.41 <sup>b*</sup> (1.00)	1.30 <sup>a*</sup> (0.48)	2.24 <sup>a</sup> (0.57)

Results are expressed in hours (n = 16).

a, b, c : significant differences between means (P<0.05) ; horizontal comparison.

\* : differences not significantly different from zero (P<0.05).

() : standard error.