



Low degradable protein supply to increase nitrogen efficiency in lactating dairy cows and reduce environmental impacts at barn level

Nadège Edouard, Mélynda Hassouna, Paul Robin, Philippe Faverdin

► To cite this version:

Nadège Edouard, Mélynda Hassouna, Paul Robin, Philippe Faverdin. Low degradable protein supply to increase nitrogen efficiency in lactating dairy cows and reduce environmental impacts at barn level. *Animal*, 2016, 10 (2), pp.212-220. 10.1017/S1751731115002050 . hal-01209292

HAL Id: hal-01209292

<https://hal.science/hal-01209292>

Submitted on 28 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.

Low degradable protein supply to increase nitrogen efficiency in lactating dairy cows and reduce environmental impacts at barn level

N. Edouard ^{1, 2}, M. Hassouna ^{3, 4}, P. Robin ^{3, 4} and P. Faverdin ^{1, 2}

¹ INRA, UMR1348 Physiologie, Environnement et Génétique pour l'Animal et les Systèmes d'Elevage, F-35590 Saint Gilles, France

² Agrocampus Ouest, UMR1348 Physiologie, Environnement et Génétique pour l'Animal et les Systèmes d'Elevage, F-35000 Rennes, France

³ INRA, UMR1069 Sol Agro et hydrosystème Spatialisation, F-35000 Rennes, France

⁴ Agrocampus Ouest, UMR1069 Sol Agro et hydrosystème Spatialisation, F-35000 Rennes, France

Corresponding author: Nadège Edouard. nadege.edouard@rennes.inra.fr

Short title: Nitrogen excretion and gas emissions in dairy cow

Abstract

Generally, less than 30% of dairy cattle's nitrogen intake is retained in milk. Large amounts of nitrogen are excreted in manure, especially in urine, with damaging impacts on the environment. This study explores the effect of lowering dietary degradable nitrogen supplies - while maintaining metabolisable protein - on dairy cows' performance, nitrogen use efficiency and gas emissions (NH₃, N₂O, CH₄) at barn level with tied animals. Two dietary N concentrations (CP: 12 %DM for LowN; 18 %DM for HighN) were offered to two groups of three lactating dairy cows in a split-plot design over four periods of two weeks. Diets were formulated to provide similar

metabolisable protein supply, with degradable N either in deficit or in excess (PDIN of 84 and 114 g/kgDM for LowN and HighN respectively). Cows ingested 0.8 kg DM/d less on the LowN diet, which was also 2.5% less digestible. Milk yield and composition were not significantly affected. N exported in milk was 5% lower (LowN: 129 gN/d; HighN: 136 gN/d; $P < 0.001$) but milk protein yield was not significantly affected (LowN: 801 g/d; HighN: 823 g/d; $P = 0.10$). Cows logically ingested less nitrogen on the LowN diet (LowN: 415 gN/d; HighN: 626 gN/d; $P < 0.001$) resulting in a higher N use efficiency (N milk / N intake; LowN: 0.31; HighN: 0.22; $P < 0.001$). N excreted in urine was almost four times lower on the LowN diet (LowN: 65 gN/d; HighN: 243 gN/d; $P < 0.001$) while urinary urea N concentration was 8-fold lower (LowN: 4.6 g/L; HighN: 22.9 g/L; $P < 0.001$). Ammonia emission (expressed in g/h in order to remove periods of the day with potential interferences with volatile molecules from feed) was also lower on the LowN diet (LowN: 1.03 g/h/cow; HighN: 1.25 g/h/cow; $P < 0.05$). Greenhouse gas emissions (N_2O and CH_4) at barn level were not significantly affected by the amount of dietary N. Offering low amounts of degradable protein with suitable metabolisable protein amounts to cattle improved nitrogen use efficiency and lowered ammonia emissions at barn level. This strategy would however need to be validated for longer periods, other housing systems (free stall barns) and at farm level including all stages of manure management.

Keywords: dairy cattle, nitrogen balance, urea, ammonia, greenhouse gas

Implications

In dairy systems, many farmers tend to secure the protein supply with “over supplementation” to maximise milk production per cow, leading to higher feed costs

and N excretion. In a context of volatile input-output prices (Insee, 2015), together with a societal demand to reduce environmental impacts, more efficient feeding strategies are required. This study shows that better nitrogen use efficiency can be achieved for dairy cattle fed with low amounts of degradable protein, leading to reduced impacts on the environment, with a modest reduction in milk protein in the short term.

Introduction

In Europe, animal production has been, and still is, encouraged to become more productive (public policy measures such as tariffs and export subsidies) in order to meet a growing consumer demand: e.g. the demand for meat and milk in 2050 is projected to grow by 73% and 58% respectively compared with 2010 (FAO, 2011). Intensive systems are often characterised by high inputs of nitrogen, which are mostly excreted. This is not without consequence for global environmental and health issues related to the emission of greenhouse gases (GHG) and other pollutants like ammonia (NH₃; European Environment Agency, 2009, Gerber *et al.*, 2013). Dairy cattle consume high amounts of soybean meal (Institut de l'élevage, 2011), mainly imported from South-America and other parts of the world (Peyraud *et al.*, 2012), known to be associated with land use change and concomitant GHG emissions (Gerber *et al.*, 2013, Pellerin *et al.*, 2013). Generally less than 30% of the N intake is retained in the produced milk, and the remainder is typically excreted roughly equally between faeces and urine (Castillo *et al.*, 2000, Calsamiglia *et al.*, 2010). In urine, nitrogen is principally found in the form of urea, which is rapidly hydrolysed to ammonium (NH₄⁺) by urease enzymes present in faeces and soil. This ammonium may then volatilise in the form of ammonia depending on temperature

76 and air velocity. Alternatively, it may be oxidised into nitrites and nitrates through a
 77 two-step nitrification process, leading to emissions of intermediate compounds such
 78 as nitric oxides (NO_x) and nitrous oxide (N₂O; Petersen *et al.*, 2013). Reducing
 79 nitrogen excretion hence appears critical to reduce environmental impacts.
 80 Lowering the amount of nitrogen consumed by the animals generally results in a
 81 higher proportion of N exported to milk and decreased N excretion (Castillo *et al.*,
 82 2000, Kebreab *et al.*, 2001). In the INRA feeding system, the metabolisable protein
 83 (PDIE, protein digested in the small intestine when rumen-fermentable energy is
 84 limiting; INRA, 2007) is used to calculate animal protein balance, assuming an
 85 efficiency of 64% to transform PDIE into milk protein. Moreover, the requirements in
 86 terms of degradable nitrogen for microbial protein in the rumen are considered to be
 87 fulfilled when PDIN (protein digested in the small intestine when rumen-fermentable
 88 nitrogen is limiting; INRA, 2007) equals or exceeds PDIE concentration in the diet.
 89 Two strategies could then be used to reduce N excretion: 1/ improve protein use
 90 efficiency by decreasing metabolisable protein supplies in relation to energy from the
 91 diet (PDIE / UFL, milk feed unit, 1 UFL = 7.106MJ of net energy for lactation; INRA,
 92 2007); 2/ favour urea reuse by a deficit in degradable protein in the diet ((PDIN –
 93 PDIE) / UFL). A decline of PDIE intake was shown to reduce milk yield
 94 (Cantalapiedra-Hijar *et al.*, 2014) and milk protein concentration (Monteils *et al.*,
 95 2002) with a curvilinear response (Vérité and Delaby, 2000). On the other hand,
 96 reducing PDIN available for microbes stimulates urea reuse for microbial synthesis
 97 (Reynolds and Kristensen, 2008), resulting in lower N excreted in urine without
 98 affecting protein synthesis and animal performance (Cutullic *et al.*, 2013), but with a
 99 risk of decreasing microbial activity. Moreover, a lower amount of highly degradable
 100 protein in the diet has been shown to modify the partition of N excreted between

101 urine and faeces, likely due to more efficiently captured N in the rumen (Kebreab *et*
102 *al.*, 2001).

103 The reduction of urinary N excretion should result in lower amounts of urea in
104 manure likely to volatilise in the form of ammonia (Dijkstra *et al.*, 2013). Moreover,
105 transformation from ammonium to nitrate via nitrification is a source of N₂O
106 (Chadwick *et al.* 2011); a variation of ammonium in manure could therefore influence,
107 even if marginally, N₂O emissions at the building level. Finally, methane (CH₄)
108 emissions from animal housing are mainly caused by enteric fermentation, sensitive
109 to rate of OM degradability, type of VFA produced and efficiency of microbial
110 synthesis (Monteny *et al.*, 2006). A reduction in N content of grass due to low N
111 fertilisation was also predicted to increase enteric CH₄ emissions, through
112 modification of rumen degradation characteristics and associated changes in the
113 carbohydrate composition and degradability of the feed (Bannink *et al.*, 2010). The
114 potential benefit from lowering dietary nitrogen supplies in terms of ammonia and
115 nitrous oxide emissions could therefore be counter-balanced by increased methane
116 emissions.

117 This study therefore explores the effect of lowering PDIN supplies from a theoretical
118 excess to a theoretical deficiency, while maintaining PDIE, on dairy cows' N use
119 efficiency and performance as well as gas emissions (NH₃, N₂O, CH₄) at barn level.

120 From current knowledge in the literature, we hypothesised that, due to a high
121 possibility of urea reuse for microbial synthesis in lactating dairy cows, a deficit in
122 PDIN supply in the diet will 1/ induce higher N use efficiency without detrimental
123 consequences on animal performance (dry matter intake and digestibility, milk
124 production and composition, etc.); 2/ decrease N excretion, especially in urine,
125 resulting in lower urinary urea content as well as lower ammonia and nitrous oxide

126 emissions from manure. With the will to avoid pollution swapping, methane emissions
127 were also monitored to ensure that the modulation of the diet composition was not
128 associated with higher methane production at barn level.

129

130 **Material and Methods**

131 The experiment was conducted at the INRA experimental farm of Méjusseaume near
132 Rennes, France, from September to October 2008.

133

134 *Treatments, animals, experimental rooms and experimental design*

135 Treatments consisted of total mixed rations offering either low (LowN; CP: 12% DM,
136 84 g PDIN/kgDM) or high (HighN; CP: 18% DM, 114 g PDIN/kgDM) dietary
137 degradable nitrogen. The rations were composed of a 80:20 mixture of maize
138 silage:concentrate and were given *ad libitum* (constant access to the trough; refusal
139 maintained between 0.05 up to 0.10 of feed offered) and individually twice a day (\approx
140 8:00am and 6:00pm). Diets were formulated to provide similar PDIE concentrations
141 (96 and 99 g PDIE/kg DM for LowN and HighN respectively), but with degradable N
142 either in deficit or in excess (PDIN/PDIE of 0.87 and 1.15 for the LowN and HighN
143 respectively; INRA, 2007). Diet compositions are given in Table 1. Six Holstein dairy
144 cows in late lactation (221 ± 32 days in milk) were used for the experiment (Mean
145 Live Weight = 617 ± 13 kg). All were in their second or later lactation and were not
146 pregnant. Three of them were fitted with a rumen cannula; fistulated and non-
147 fistulated cows were kept apart throughout the experiment to account for potential
148 gas losses through the cannula. Each group was housed in a mechanically ventilated
149 and hermetic experimental room (temperature ≈ 18 °C) with negative air-pressure so
150 as to ensure unique and constant air extraction through the extraction duct. Air
151 renewal was achieved by the controlled air-conditioning system. The two rooms were
152 equipped with tied stalls and mattresses covered with sawdust (except during urine
153 and faeces collection), which were renewed daily. The cows had continuous access
154 to water and were milked on site twice a day.

155 The experiment followed a split-plot design with two groups of cows (fistulated and
156 non-fistulated cows), two treatments (LowN and HighN), and two experimental rooms
157 (A and B) during four periods of two weeks (Table 2). All the cows received the two
158 diets and were housed successively and conversely in the two experimental rooms to

account for possible biases due to ventilation systems. For each period of two weeks, the first four days were used to accustom the cows to their diet; animal performances (DM intake, milk yield and composition) were measured from days 5 to 14. From days 8 to 11, urine and faeces were totally collected to estimate diet digestibility and N excretion. Gaseous measurements were continuously taken from days 5 to 14 so as to compare periods with and without manure collection. The cows were weighed at the beginning and the end of the experiment.

Measurements and analyses

Feed sampling and intake Offered and refused feed was weighed precisely and sampled every day to determine DM concentration (80°C, 48 h) in order to assess individual cow DM intake. From days 8 to 11 of each period, samples of feed were collected daily: concentrate was dried (80°C during 48 h), maize silage (offered and refused) was freeze dried. Average samples of concentrate and maize silage per period, and per cow for refusals, were then ground with a 3-blade knife mill through a 0.8 mm screen. The OM concentration was determined by ashing for 6 h at 500 °C. Total N concentration was assessed by the Dumas method (Association Française de Normalisation, 1997). Feed and refusals ADF, NDF, and ADL were analysed using the method described by van-Soest *et al.* (1991), using a neutral detergent solution containing α -amylase without sulphite, on a Fibersac analyzer (Ankom Technology, Fairport, NY), and were corrected for ash concentration. Water intake was recorded individually every day by monitoring mechanical water meters. Dietary PDIE and PDIN concentrations were calculated from the diet ingredients chemical composition (Table 1), and predicted rumen degradability of CP and intestinal digestibility of rumen undegraded diet CP (INRA, 2007).

184 On day 10 of each period, rumen liquor was collected from fistulated cows at 8:00am
 185 (just before the morning ration distribution) and again at 9:00am, 10:00am, 11:00am,
 186 12:00pm, 2:00pm, 4:00pm and 6:00pm (just before evening ration distribution) to
 187 assess pH kinetics. Samples were then frozen to determine N-NH_4^+ concentrations
 188 later (Berthelot colour reaction method).

189 *Milk yield and composition* Individual milk yield was monitored each day throughout
 190 the experiment. Morning and evening milk samples were collected three times a
 191 week (each Monday, Wednesday and Friday) to analyse for true protein and fat via
 192 infrared analysis using a Milkoscan 605 (Foss Electric, Hillerød, Denmark). An
 193 additional fresh milk sample was collected in the morning and evening of day 10 of
 194 each period to assess individual milk total N (Kjeldahl method).

195 *Digestibility, faeces and urine* Digestibility ($[\text{intake} - \text{faecal output}] / \text{intake}$) was
 196 estimated from days 8 to 11 for each period. Faeces were collected individually in the
 197 gutter behind the animals, and were weighed daily. Animals were equipped with
 198 harnesses to collect urine separately. Urine was acidified with 500 ml of H_2SO_4 20%
 199 to prevent ammonia volatilisation and weighed daily. Samples were collected every
 200 day for each cow, and average samples were frozen every week in order to analyse
 201 faecal DM, OM, and total-N (Dumas method; Association Française de
 202 Normalisation, 1997). Urea-N was assessed in urine using colorimetric enzymatic
 203 reaction with a multi-parameter analyser (KONE Instruments 200 Corporation,
 204 Espoo, Finland).

205 *Uremia* In order to depict urea variations in relation to the diet, uremia was assessed
 206 just before and 3 hours after the morning ration distribution. Even if urea
 207 concentrations in blood and milk are correlated when measured at short time
 208 intervals (Gustafsson and Palmquist, 1993), blood was preferred to milk as it was

209 easier to sample at both times. Blood samples were collected from the tail vein once
 210 per period (day 10) at 8:00am and at 11:00am to assess plasmatic uremia (KONE
 211 Instruments 200 Corporation, Espoo, Finland).

212 *Gas emissions measurements* Air samples were continuously collected in each
 213 isolated room at air entrance and air extraction ducts so as to calculate a gradient.
 214 Measurements of gas concentrations were performed on the last 10 days of each
 215 period, therefore including periods with and without urine and faeces collection. An
 216 infra-red photo acoustic analyser (INNOVA model 1312, Air Tech Instruments,
 217 Ballerup, Denmark) was used coupled with a sampler-doser (INNOVA 1303). Air
 218 samples were withdrawn from the experimental rooms into the analyser through 3
 219 mm PTFE (Teflon ®) sampling lines protected with dust filters, insulated and heated
 220 to avoid water condensation within the sampling tubes. The analyser was fitted with
 221 six filters, enabling the concentrations of six gases (NH₃, CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, SF₆ and
 222 H₂O) to be sequentially measured. The analyser sampled air with a 2 min interval
 223 between measurements, each location being analysed during 15 min, and a
 224 computer was used to record concentrations. The instrument was span-calibrated
 225 with known concentrations by the manufacturer before the experiment. The
 226 instrument internally corrected for signal interferences from gases measured (optical
 227 filters/detection limit: NH₃ 973/0.2 ppm; CO₂ 982/1.5 ppm; CH₄ 969/0.4 ppm; N₂O
 228 985/0.03 ppm). However, for NH₃, non-compensated interferences were detected by
 229 unexpected variations in gas concentration (two important peaks in NH₃
 230 concentrations associated with feeding phases). As was recently highlighted by
 231 Hassouna *et al.* (2013) under the same experimental conditions, these NH₃
 232 oscillations were due to interferences with ethanol and acetic acid emitted by mixed
 233 rations (maize silage in particular). We noticed that 6 h after the meal distribution the

234 quantity of feed remaining in the trough was close to the quantity of refusals (0.05-
 235 0.10 of feed offered); from that time, interference was probably negligible. NH_3
 236 emission measurements were therefore only considered between 12:00am and
 237 7:00am and between 2:00pm and 5:00pm. The flow rate in each experimental room
 238 was determined with the tracer ratio method using the constant dosing approach
 239 (Baptista *et al.*, 1999). Sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6) was continuously injected through
 240 PTFE sampling lines directly in the air entrance duct equipped with a mixing system
 241 to homogenise air and SF_6 . The amount of SF_6 released at each time step was
 242 determined by the sampler-doser (INNOVA 1303). Ventilation rate (Q , in $\text{m}^3/\text{h}/\text{cow}$)
 243 was calculated as a function of time (t) from the rate of tracer release (ϕT) in m^3/h
 244 and the indoor tracer concentration (CT inside) in mg/m^3 after correction for the
 245 background concentration of the tracer (CT outside) (Demmers *et al.*, 2001):
 246
 247 Indoor (ambient) and outdoor (air entrance) temperature and moisture were
 248 monitored using thermo-hygrometers while collecting air samples. Temperature,
 249 moisture, flow rates and gas concentrations were expressed as mean values per h.
 250 Gas emissions were calculated by multiplying the ventilation rate ($\text{m}^3/\text{h}/\text{cow}$) by gas
 251 concentrations (air extraction concentrations corrected by air entrance
 252 concentrations, in mg/m^3). Methane and nitrous oxide emissions were expressed as
 253 cumulated gas emissions per cow per day; ammonia emissions per cow were
 254 averaged at the hourly rate for the periods of the day when interferences were
 255 expected to be negligible (i.e. between 12:00am and 7:00am and between 2:00pm
 256 and 5:00pm).
 257

258 *Statistical analyses*

259 For each period, only the last 10 days were considered for measurements, as the
 260 first 4 days were used to adapt the animals to experimental conditions. For animal
 261 performance and N balance variables, data was averaged per period for each
 262 individual (N = 24) in order to overcome the temporal correlation between daily
 263 measurements. Statistics were performed using the linear procedure of SAS 9.4
 264 (PROC GLM; SAS Enterprise Guide v6.1 2013, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA)
 265 following the statistical model below:

$$266 \quad Y_{ijklm} = \mu + Nconc_i + Room_j + Period_k + Group_l + Cow(Group)_{m(l)} + e_{ijklm},$$

267 where Y_{ijklm} is the studied variable; μ is the average; $Nconc_i$ is the diet degradable N
 268 concentration (LowN or HighN, 1 df); $Room_j$ is the experimental room housing the
 269 cows (A or B, 1 df); $Period_k$ is the period of two weeks (1 to 4, 3 df); $Group_l$ is the
 270 group of cows (fistulated cows vs. normal cows, 1 df); $Cow(Group)_{m(l)}$ is the cow
 271 nested in the group of cows (4 df); and e_{ijklm} is the error associated with each Y_{ijklm} . In
 272 order to account for the split-plot design, the factor $Group_l$ was specifically tested
 273 against the $Cow(Group)_{m(l)}$ error.

274 Hourly (NH_3) and daily gas emissions (N_2O , CH_4 , CH_4/kg DMI) were averaged per
 275 experimental room and per period, identifying excreta (urine + faeces) collection and
 276 no-collection periods (N = 16), and compared using the linear procedure of SAS 9.4
 277 (PROC GLM; SAS Enterprise Guide v6.1 2013, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA)
 278 following the statistical model below:

$$279 \quad Y_{ijklmn} = \mu + Nconc_i + Collection_j + Room_k + Period_l + Group_m + (Nconc \times Collection)_n +$$

$$280 \quad e_{ijklmn}$$

281 where Y_{ijklmn} is the studied variable; μ is the average; $Nconc_i$ is the diet degradable N
 282 concentration (LowN or HighN, 1 df); $Collection_j$ is the excreta collection status (yes

or no, 1 df); Room_k is the experimental room housing the cows (A or B, 1 df); Period_i is the period of two weeks (1 to 4, 3 df); Group_m is the group of cows (fistulated or not, 1 df); and e_{ijklmn} is the error associated with each Y_{ijklmn}.

Because of confounding effects, the interactions Nconc x Room and Nconc x Group could not be tested in either model.

Results and Discussion

Maintained animal performances and improved N use efficiency

Compared with the HighN diet, animals that were fed low amounts of degradable N ingested 0.8 kg DM/d less ($P < 0.001$) with a 2.5% reduction in DM digestibility ($P < 0.001$; Table 3); however, during the 8 weeks of experimentation, all the cows gained weight ($+14 \pm 5$ kg). Nitrogen excreted in milk was 5% lower ($P < 0.001$), but milk protein secretion was only 3% lower ($P = 0.10$; Table 3), the difference probably being due to non-protein nitrogen content, higher in the HighN diet. Neither milk yield ($P = 0.13$) nor milk composition ($P = 0.16$ and $P = 0.23$ for fat and protein concentration respectively) were significantly affected by N supply; only milk fat yield was reduced on the LowN diet (difference of 40 g/d, $P = 0.02$; Table 3). These results corroborate those of Cutullic et al. (2013) where a reduction of degradable protein supply in the diet (-10 g (PDIN-PDIE)/UFL; 12% CP) did not significantly affect milk yield and protein milk yield for dairy cows compared with a balanced diet (PIDE = PDIN). When both PDIN and PDIE supplies are reduced, the decrease in milk and milk protein yields is generally more important, (e.g. -2 kg/d and -13 to 18% nitrogen in milk; Monteils et al., 2002, Cantalapiedra-Hijar et al., 2014). In the present study, PDIE concentrations of the diets were deliberately maintained equivalent between treatments even if a small reduction in PDIE supply came from the decrease in DM

308 intake. A deficit of PDIE (under the threshold of 100 g PDIE/UFL) is known to rapidly
 309 lead to important drops in performance (Vérité and Delaby, 2000). Moreover, in order
 310 to obtain an optimal microbial protein synthesis and a satisfying diet digestibility,
 311 microbes need a minimal and balanced amount of fermentable energy and
 312 degradable protein in the rumen. Dairy cattle can tolerate a deficit of PDIN (down to
 313 $(\text{PDIN} - \text{PDIE})/\text{UFL} = -8$ g/unit UFL for low milk production; INRA, 2007) as microbes
 314 in the rumen are able to use a certain amount of $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ recycled in the form of urea.
 315 On the other hand, the excess of PDIN for the HighN diet $((\text{PDIN} - \text{PDIE})/\text{UFL} = 15$
 316 g/unit UFL) resulted in higher amounts of nitrogen excreted compared with the LowN
 317 diet, especially in urine ($P < 0.001$, Table 3). As cattle consumed much less nitrogen
 318 in the low N diet (-33%) and exported quite similar quantities of nitrogen in milk (-
 319 5%), they achieved considerably improved N use efficiency (from 22% up to 31%; P
 320 < 0.001), which is consistent with the literature (Huhtanen and Hristov 2009).
 321 Moreover, as both milk protein concentration and yield were not significantly affected
 322 by the diet ($P > 0.05$, Table 3), it seemed that the animals were able to achieve a
 323 better use of nutrients with a lower amount of feed ingested, as illustrated by the food
 324 conversion ratio that tended to be higher for the LowN diet (1.24 vs. 1.22, $P = 0.05$,
 325 Table 3). This could represent a certain economy for farmers and act as
 326 compensation for the slight loss in milk production (Frank and Swensson, 2002). For
 327 example, changing the diet from 16% to 14% CP by replacing soybean meal and
 328 urea by grains was estimated to bring a benefit of 12 €/cow/year, provided balanced
 329 supplies of PDIN and PDIE were maintained (taking into account milk yield and milk
 330 protein concentration reductions in winter; Pellerin *et al.*, 2013). The recent inflation
 331 of nitrogen-rich feed prices (Insee, 2015) should encourage farmers to promote low

degradable N diets, even more so if it results in improved protein self-sufficiency on these farms (Pellerin *et al.*, 2013).

Partitioning of nitrogen excretion and consequences for ammonia emissions

As expected, nitrogen excreted in urine was substantially decreased with the LowN diet ($P < 0.001$), representing as little as 30% of the total N excreted in manure (urine + faeces) vs. 60% for the HighN diet. On the other hand, the amount of N excreted in faeces was not significantly modified ($P = 0.36$, Table 3). This observation is consistent with the literature for diets varying in CP concentration (Castillo *et al.*, 2000, Monteils *et al.*, 2002, Cantalapiedra-Hijar *et al.*, 2014). As already mentioned by Kebreab *et al.* (2001), the proportion of N excreted in faeces in relation to N intake increased (from 26% to 38%) when animals were fed diets with lower amounts of highly degradable protein.

Ruminal kinetics showed a peak of NH_4^+ -N in rumen liquor after the morning ration distribution. Ruminal NH_4^+ -N concentration was 4 times higher for the HighN diet at 09:00am (76 and 396 mg/L for the LowN and the HighN diets respectively, $P < 0.001$, RMSE = 44; Figure 1) and stayed more elevated throughout the day ($P < 0.001$).

Despite this peak, ruminal pH was not significantly affected by treatment, either before or after the meal ($P > 0.05$). Urinary and blood urea concentrations were considerably lower for the LowN diet ($P < 0.001$, Table 3) leading to a large drop in urinary urea excretion (47 g/d vs. 385 g/d for the LowN and HighN diets respectively, $P < 0.001$). The clearance rate of urea (volume of blood cleared per unit of time) can be calculated as the ratio between urinary urea excretion (g/d) and blood urea concentration (g/L). In the present study, the clearance rate of urea was almost twice as high for the HighN diet (36 L/h) as it was for the LowN diet (20 L/h). These values

are consistent with recent studies reporting that urea clearance was reduced from 41 to 27 L/h when the diet CP concentration of lactating cows decreased from 17% to 13% DM (Kristensen *et al.*, 2010) and from 35 to 25 L/h for decreasing urea ruminal infusions (Rojen *et al.*, 2011). The large drop in urinary urea excretion for the LowN diet was moreover accompanied by an important decrease in terms of the proportion of urea N in urine (34% of total urinary N) compared to the HighN diet (76% of total urinary N). Nitrogen deficiency in the LowN diet therefore led to nitrogen saving in the kidney (Rojen *et al.*, 2011). As discussed by Kohn *et al.* (2005), keeping urea in the blood may enable herbivores to recycle greater amounts of N in the gut compared with omnivores, which explains how herbivores can survive on low amounts of low-quality protein.

As expected, hourly NH₃ emissions were significantly decreased on the LowN diet compared with the HighN diet (respectively 1.03 and 1.25 g NH₃/h/cow, $P = 0.01$, Table 4). The 18% reduction does not seem very important given the large reduction in urine volumes (1.5 times lower, $P < 0.001$) and urinary urea concentration (divided by 5, $P < 0.001$) for the LowN diet vs. the HighN diet and when compared with the literature. In controlled conditions, ammonia emission from manure (measured in flux chambers) was for example 3 times lower when dietary CP decreased from 21% to 15% (Burgos *et al.*, 2010). At the dairy barn level, based on a large range of diets, ammonia emissions were predicted to be reduced by 80% with a grass-based diet with balanced amounts of rumen degradable protein (Monteny *et al.*, 2002).

However, as reported by Powell *et al.* (2008), ammonia emissions from tie-stall dairy barns, where narrow gutter scrapers remove manure once or twice a day, are usually lower than from free-stall barns where the emitting surface is much larger. In the present study, the small reduction in ammonia emissions could therefore be viewed

382 as the result of the interaction between diet and a low emitting housing system. On
383 the other hand, the non-reduced ammonia emissions when excreta were collected
384 and acidified either as a single factor ($P = 0.44$, $N = 16$) or in interaction with the N
385 concentration of the diet ($P = 0.12$, $N = 16$) are surprising. However, the calculation of
386 mean hourly emissions excluding feeding periods - because of interferences - could
387 limit these interpretations.

388

Unaccounted N (not recovered either in manure or in milk) was 66 and 94 g N/d/cow for the LowN and the HighN diets respectively, representing around 15% of N intake for both treatments. These proportions are high but not unexpected when compared with the literature. As pointed out by Cheng *et al.* (2011), the nitrogen balance technique is difficult to implement and often leads to overestimations of N retention. In a meta-analysis, Spanghero and Kowalski (1997) recorded an average N balance of 39 g/d (ranging from -57 up to 205 g/d), representing 8% of N intake and 1/3 of N contained in milk. More recently, Klevenhusen *et al.* (2010) reported N balances of up to 26% of N intake (maize diet, 21% CP), and even if the average value reported in the review of Spek *et al.* (2013) is only 2% of N intake (for EU trials), the high standard deviation of 31 (N = 68) suggests high variations. In the present study, considering that the cows were adult and non-pregnant, N retention could only be linked to N accretion related to the energy balance of the animals. Calculations of the animals' energy balance (based on UFL intake, mean body weight and fat corrected milk yields as described in INRA, 2007) for each treatment, using the value of 6 g N retained per UFL reported by Faverdin and Vérité (1998), make it possible to estimate N retention in cows of 19 and 20 g N/d/cow respectively for the LowN and the HighN diets. Nitrogen balances corrected for N retention were therefore 47 and 74 g N/d/cow, representing about 11% of N intake. Consequently, a significant part of N ingested was probably lost during the recovery process or because of errors associated with the measurement of N concentrations in the various samples. Volatile N losses during urine collection should be prevented by the addition of a strong acid (here H₂SO₄ 20%). In contrast, underestimation of faecal N by incomplete collection of material or volatile losses of ammonia during collection and subsequent drying of the samples could be important (e.g. -15% N in faecal samples after drying

compared to fresh faeces; Spanghero and Kowalski 1997). Echoing the words of Reynolds and Kristensen (2008), mysteries of N balance still need to be solved today.

Consequences of N dietary manipulation for GHG emissions

The dietary treatment did not affect N₂O ($P = 0.92$) and CH₄ emissions either expressed in g/d or in g/kg DM intake (respectively $P = 0.65$ and $P = 0.41$; Table 4). We could not identify any group effect (fistulated cows vs. normal cows) in measured emissions of any of the gases concerned, suggesting that losses through the cannula could not be detected, even for methane.

Urinary N is the principal source of N₂O emissions (Dijkstra *et al.*, 2013). In this experiment, urine and faeces were deposited on small areas (gutters) and stayed for short periods in the house before being scraped twice daily. Consequently, N₂O emissions were very low (daily averages between 0.07 and 1.86 mg/m³) and variations were difficult to detect for the photo acoustic IR gas analyser (detection limit of 0.05 mg/m³).

Methane emissions at room level measured in this paper are rather high (> 550 gCH₄/d and > 26 gCH₄/kgDMI) when compared with the literature (19-22 gCH₄/kgDMI for grass and maize silage diets varying in CP concentration measured in respiratory chambers, Reynolds *et al.*, 2010b). In the present study, we cannot exclude that part, even if marginal, of the methane at room level was produced by manure. Moreover, gaseous emissions result from the product between gas concentrations and the ventilation rate in the experimental room, both being associated with high uncertainties (about 30% for the estimation of gas emissions from livestock;

Scholtens *et al.*, 2004). Biases being most likely the same for both treatments, they should not affect the major conclusions of this study.

Bannink *et al.* (2010) reported that both observed and predicted enteric CH₄ emissions decreased with an increased dietary N:OM ratio, even if, as discussed by the authors, variations in DMI may have affected these results. However, in the literature, most papers were not able to link either the amount of total or digestible protein consumed, nor N fertilisation levels to methane emissions (Reynolds *et al.*, 2010a, Podesta *et al.*, 2013), which would be consistent with our results that dietary N modulation did not affect CH₄ emissions.

More generally, efforts to mitigate an emission can sometimes lead to higher emissions of other pollutants, or of the same pollutant at a different stage; this is referred to as pollution swapping (Monteny *et al.*, 2006). Reduced gas formation at animal or manure level in the barn might be partially compensated by increased gaseous emissions from manure in the following step of manure management (Dijkstra *et al.*, 2011). In the future, more attention should be given to GHG and ammonia mitigation options at farm level to account for effects on C and/or N flows and associated gas emissions, considering all possible interactions at every stage of the manure management continuum (Petersen *et al.*, 2013).

Conclusion

In the literature, most of the papers show that with less than 14% CP in the diet, animal performance is severely reduced. This study demonstrates that dairy cattle can tolerate, at least for periods of two weeks, important deficits of degradable protein supply in maize based diets (down to 84 gPDIN/kgDM, 12% CP) without an important drop in performances if metabolisable protein is maintained close to the

threshold of 100 gPDIE/UFL. The LowN diet might have favoured urea reuse for microbial synthesis, compensating the deficit in degradable N in the rumen for milk protein production. Excess intake of degradable nitrogen on the HighN diet (114 g PDIN/kgDM, 18% CP) involved, on the contrary, higher uremia, resulting from greater ruminal NH₃ production by microbes. This additional N was then lost in the form of urea through urine, leading to increased NH₃ emissions. Offering low amounts of degradable protein to cattle can therefore generate a win-win situation. On one hand, low supplies of degradable N contributed to higher N use efficiency, at least on the short term, with a limited reduction of performance that could be compensated by lower amounts of feed ingested (potential economic gain). On the other hand, impacts on the environment could be reduced via lower ammonia emissions (acidification, eutrophication, human health, etc.). This strategy would however need to be validated for longer periods of time, other housing systems (e.g. free stall barns) and at farm level, including all stages of the manure management continuum.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the staff from the INRA unit PEGASE both at the dairy experimental farm for taking care of the animals and taking the measurements, and at the laboratory for their lab analyses. Many thanks also to Luc Delaby for precious advice on statistics and to anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier versions of the manuscript.

References

- Association Française de Normalisation 1997. Aliments des animaux - Dosage de l'Azote - Méthode par combustion (DUMAS) - NF V18–120. Association Française de Normalisation, Saint-Denis-La-Plaine, France.
- Bannink A, Smits MCJ, Kebreab E, Mills JAN, Ellis JL, Klop A, France J and Dijkstra J 2010. Simulating the effects of grassland management and grass ensiling on methane emission from lactating cows. *Journal of Agricultural Science* 148, 55-72.
- Baptista FJ, Bailey BJ, Randall JM and Meneses JF 1999. Greenhouse Ventilation Rate: Theory and Measurement with Tracer Gas Techniques. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* 72, 363-374.
- Burgos SA, Embertson NM, Zhao Y, Mitloehner FM, DePeters EJ and Fadel JG 2010. Prediction of ammonia emission from dairy cattle manure based on milk urea nitrogen: Relation of milk urea nitrogen to ammonia emissions. *Journal of Dairy Science* 93, 2377-2386.
- Calsamiglia S, Ferret A, Reynolds CK, Kristensen NB and van Vuuren AM 2010. Strategies for optimizing nitrogen use by ruminants. *Animal* 4, 1184-1196.
- Cantalapiedra-Hijar G, Peyraud JL, Lemosquet S, Molina-Alcaide E, Boudra H, Noziere P and Ortigues-Marty I 2014. Dietary carbohydrate composition modifies the milk N efficiency in late lactation cows fed low crude protein diets. *Animal* 8, 275-285.
- Castillo AR, Kebreab E, Beever DE and France J 2000. A review of efficiency of nitrogen utilisation in lactating dairy cows and its relationship with environmental pollution. *Journal of Animal and Feed Sciences* 9, 1-32.

- 510 Chadwick D, Sommer S, Thorman R, Fanguero D, Cardenas L, Amon B and
 511 Misselbrook T 2011. Manure management: Implications for greenhouse gas
 512 emissions. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 166–167, 514-531.
- 513 Cheng L, Kim EJ, Merry RJ and Dewhurst RJ 2011. Nitrogen partitioning and isotopic
 514 fractionation in dairy cows consuming diets based on a range of contrasting
 515 forages. *Journal of Dairy Science* 94, 2031-2041.
- 516 Cutullic E, Delaby L, Edouard N and Faverdin P 2013. Rôle de l'équilibre en azote
 517 dégradé et de l'alimentation protéique individualisée sur l'efficience
 518 d'utilisation de l'azote. *Rencontres Recherches Ruminants* 20, 53-56.
- 519 Demmers TGM, Phillips VR, Short LS, Burgess LR, Hoxey RP and Wathes CM 2001.
 520 Validation of ventilation rate measurement methods and the ammonia emission
 521 from naturally ventilated dairy and beef buildings in the United Kingdom. *Journal*
 522 *of Agricultural Engineering Research* 79, 107-116.
- 523 Dijkstra J, Oenema O and Bannink A 2011. Dietary strategies to reducing N excretion
 524 from cattle: implications for methane emissions. *Current Opinion in*
 525 *Environmental Sustainability* 3, 414-422.
- 526 Dijkstra J, Oenema O, van Groenigen JW, Spek JW, van Vuuren AM and Bannink A
 527 2013. Diet effects on urine composition of cattle and N₂O emissions. *Animal* 7,
 528 292-302.
- 529 European Environment Agency 2009. EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory
 530 guidebook 2009- Technical guidance to prepare national emission inventories.
- 531 FAO 2011. *World Livestock 2011 – Livestock in food security*. Rome, FAO.
- 532 Faverdin P and Vérité R 1998. Use of milk urea concentration as an indicator of
 533 protein nutrition and nitrogen losses in dairy cows. In *Rencontres autour des*
 534 *Recherches sur les Ruminants* 5, pp. 209-212.

- 535 Frank B and Swensson C 2002. Relationship between content of crude protein in
 536 rations for dairy cows and milk yield, concentration of urea in milk and ammonia
 537 emissions. *Journal of Dairy Science* 85, 1829-1838.
- 538 Gerber PJ, Steinfeld H, Henderson B, Mottet A, Opio C, Dijkman J, Falcucci A and
 539 Tempio G 2013. Tackling climate change through livestock – A global
 540 assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities. Food and Agriculture
 541 Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.
- 542 Gustafsson AH and Palmquist DL Diurnal Variation of Rumen Ammonia, Serum Urea,
 543 and Milk Urea in Dairy Cows at High and Low Yields¹. *Journal of Dairy Science*
 544 76, 475-484.
- 545 Hassouna M, Robin P, Charpiot A, Edouard N and Méda B 2013. Infrared
 546 photoacoustic spectroscopy in animal houses: Effect of non-compensated
 547 interferences on ammonia, nitrous oxide and methane air concentrations.
 548 *Biosystems Engineering* 114, 318-326.
- 549 Huhtanen P and Hristov AN 2009. A meta-analysis of the effects of dietary protein
 550 concentration and degradability on milk protein yield and milk N efficiency in
 551 dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 92, 3222-3232.
- 552 Inra 2007. Alimentation des bovins, ovins et caprins - Besoins des animaux - Valeur
 553 des aliments - Tables INRA 2007. Quae, Versailles, France.
- 554 Insee 2015. <http://www.insee.fr/fr/bases-de-donnees/bsweb/default.asp>
- 555 Institut de l'élevage 2011. Observatoire de l'alimentation des vaches laitières. 15 des
 556 principaux systèmes d'élevage décrits sous forme de fiches.
- 557 Kebreab E, France J, Beever DE and Castillo AR 2001. Nitrogen pollution by dairy
 558 cows and its mitigation by dietary manipulation. *Nutrient Cycling in*
 559 *Agroecosystems* 60, 275-285.

- 560 Klevenhusen F, Kreuzer M and Soliva CR 2010. Enteric and manure-derived
 561 methane and nitrogen emissions as well as metabolic energy losses in cows fed
 562 balanced diets based on maize, barley or grass hay. *Animal* 5, 1-12.
- 563 Kohn RA, Dinneen MM and Russek-Cohen E 2005. Using blood urea nitrogen to
 564 predict nitrogen excretion and efficiency of nitrogen utilization in cattle, sheep,
 565 goats, horses, pigs, and rats. *Journal of Animal Science* 83, 879-889.
- 566 Kristensen NB, Storm AC and Larsen M 2010. Effect of dietary nitrogen content and
 567 intravenous urea infusion on ruminal and portal-drained visceral extraction of
 568 arterial urea in lactating Holstein cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 93, 2670-2683.
- 569 Monteils V, Jurjanz S, Blanchart G and Laurent F 2002. Nitrogen utilisation by dairy
 570 cows fed diets differing in crude protein level with a deficit in ruminal
 571 fermentable nitrogen. *Reproduction Nutrition Development* 42, 545-557.
- 572 Monteny GJ, Smits MCJ, van Duinkerken G, Mollenhorst H and de Boer IJM 2002.
 573 Prediction of ammonia emission from dairy barns using feed characteristics Part
 574 II: Relation between urinary urea concentration and ammonia emission. *Journal*
 575 *of Dairy Science* 85, 3389-3394.
- 576 Monteny G-J, Bannink A and Chadwick D 2006. Greenhouse gas abatement
 577 strategies for animal husbandry. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 112,
 578 163-170.
- 579 Pellerin S, Bamière L, Angers D, Béline F, Benoît M, Butault JP, Chenu C, Colnenne-
 580 David C, De Cara S, Delame N, Doreau M, Dupraz P, Faverdin P, Garcia-
 581 Launay F, Hassouna M, Hénault C, Jeuffroy MH, Klumpp K, Metay A, Moran D,
 582 Recous S, Samson E, Savini I and Pardon L 2013. Quelle contribution de
 583 l'agriculture française à la réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre ?

- 584 Potentiel d'atténuation et coût de dix actions techniques. Rapport d'étude,
585 INRA, France, 454p.
- 586 Peyraud JL, Cellier P, Donnars C and Réchauchère O 2012. Les flux d'azote liés aux
587 élevages, réduire les pertes, rétablir les équilibres. INRA (France).
- 588 Petersen SO, Blanchard M, Chadwick D, Del Prado A, Edouard N, Mosquera J and
589 Sommer S 2013. Manure management for greenhouse gas mitigation. *Animal* 7,
590 266-282.
- 591 Podesta SC, Hatew B, Klop G, Van Laar H, Kinley RD, Bannink A and Dijkstra J
592 2013. The effect of nitrogen fertilization level and stage of maturity of grass
593 herbage on methane emission in lactating cows. *Proceedings of the 5th*
594 *Greenhouse Gas in Animal Agriculture Conference. Advances in Animal*
595 *Biosciences* 4, 272.
- 596 Powell JM, Broderick GA and Misselbrook TH 2008. Seasonal Diet Affects Ammonia
597 Emissions from Tie-Stall Dairy Barns. *Journal of Dairy Science* 91, 857-869.
- 598 Reynolds CK and Kristensen NB 2008. Nitrogen recycling through the gut and the
599 nitrogen economy of ruminants: An asynchronous symbiosis. *Journal of Animal*
600 *Science* 86, E293-E305.
- 601 Reynolds CK, Mills JAN, Crompton LA, Givens DI and Bannink A 2010a. Ruminant
602 nutrition regimes to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in dairy cows. In
603 *proceedings of the 3rd EAAP International Symposium on Energy and Protein*
604 *Metabolism and Nutrition* (ed. Crovetto GM), pp. 427-437. Wageningen
605 Academic Publishers, the Netherlands.
- 606 Reynolds CK, Crompton LA, Mills JAN, Humphries DJ, Kirton P, Relling AE,
607 Misselbrook TH, Chadwick DR and Givens DI 2010b. Effects of diet protein
608 level and forage source on energy and nitrogen balance and methane and

- 609 nitrogen excretion in lactating dairy cows. In proceedings of the 3rd EAAP
 610 International Symposium on Energy and Protein Metabolism and Nutrition (ed.
 611 Crovetto GM), pp. 463-464. Wageningen Academic Publishers, the
 612 Netherlands.
- 613 Rojen BA, Theil PK and Kristensen NB 2011. Effects of nitrogen supply on inter-
 614 organ fluxes of urea-N and renal urea-N kinetics in lactating Holstein cows.
 615 Journal of Dairy Science 94, 2532-2544.
- 616 Scholtens R, Dore CJ, Jones BMR, Lee DS and Phillips VR 2004. Measuring
 617 ammonia emission rates from livestock buildings and manure stores - part 1:
 618 development and validation of external tracer ratio, internal tracer ratio and
 619 passive flux sampling methods. Atmospheric Environment 38, 3003-3015.
- 620 Spanghero M and Kowalski ZM 1997. Critical analysis of N balance experiments with
 621 lactating cows. Livestock Production Science 52, 113-122.
- 622 Spek JW, Dijkstra J, van Duinkerken G, Hendriks WH and Bannink A 2013.
 623 Prediction of urinary nitrogen and urinary urea nitrogen excretion by lactating
 624 dairy cattle in northwestern Europe and North America: A meta-analysis. Journal
 625 of Dairy Science 96, 4310-4322.
- 626 van-Soest PJ, Robertson J and Lewis B 1991. Methods of dietary fiber, neutral
 627 detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition.
 628 Journal of Dairy Science 74, 3583–3597.
- 629 Vérité R and Delaby L 2000. Relation between nutrition, performances and nitrogen
 630 excretion in dairy cows. Annales de Zootechnie 49, 217-230.
- 631

Table 1 Ingredients and nutrient composition of the two experimental diets varying in crude protein concentration fed to lactating dairy cows

Component, % DM unless noted	LowN ¹	HighN ¹
Ingredient		
Maize silage	79.7	79.5
Soybean meal mix ²	4.8	12.3
Soybean meal formaldehyde-treated	5.8	3.0
Mix concentrate ³	8.5	2.9
Urea	0.0	1.3
Minerals	1.0	1.0
Nutrients		
DM, % fresh matter	41.3	41.5
OM	94.6	93.5
Starch	30.5	27.9
CP	12.2	17.6
NDF	39.2	39.3
ADF	19.6	19.5
ADL	1.78	1.71
Fat	3.25	3.14
Ca	0.47	0.46
P	0.28	0.29
Feeding value		
UFL/kgDM ⁴	0.97	0.96
PDIE, g/kgDM ⁵	96.4	99.0
PDIN, g/kgDM ⁶	83.9	114.2
(PDIN – PDIE)/UFL	-12.8	15.8

¹ LowN and HighN diets correspond to 12% and 18% of crude protein respectively

² Soybean meal mix composed of 98% soybean meal and 2% of molasses

³ Mix concentrate is composed of 25% wheat, 25% maize, 25% barley, 20% beet pulp, 3% molasses, 1% vegetable oil, 1% NaCl

⁴ UFL: Amount of net energy for milk production contained in 1 kg of a reference barley (87% of dry matter, 2,700 kcal of metabolisable energy), based on INRA feeding system (INRA, 2007)

⁵ PDIE: True protein absorbable in the small intestine when rumen-fermentable energy is limiting in the rumen based on INRA feeding system (INRA, 2007)

⁶ PDIN: True protein absorbable in the small intestine when rumen-fermentable nitrogen is limiting in the rumen based on INRA feeding system (INRA, 2007)

Table 2 Description of the split-plot experimental design (LowN and HighN diets correspond to 12% and 18% of crude protein respectively)

		Period			
Room		1	2	3	4
A	Cows Diet	Non-fistulated HighN	Non-fistulated LowN	Fistulated HighN	Fistulated LowN
B	Cows Diet	Fistulated LowN	Fistulated HighN	Non-fistulated LowN	Non-fistulated HighN

Table 3 Influence of diet degradable N concentration on components of animal production, milk composition and nitrogen balance in late-lactating cows over the last 10 days of experimentation (least square mean, probability and root mean squared error of the model; N = 24)

	LowN ¹	HighN ¹	RMSE	P-value
DM intake kg/d	20.6	21.4	0.4	< 0.001
DM digestibility %	69.4	71.9	1.1	< 0.001
Milk yield kg/d	25.6	26.1	0.8	0.13
Milk fat g/kg	42.1	43.3	2.0	0.16
Milk fat yield g/d	1075	1115	38	0.02
Milk protein g/kg	31.4	31.7	0.6	0.25
Milk protein yield g/d	801	823	30	0.10
Water intake L/d	66.5	72.1	2.9	< 0.001
Urine L/d	10.3	16.8	1.6	< 0.001
Food conversion ratio (Milk yield / DM Intake)	1.24	1.22	0.03	0.05
N balance g/d	66	94	16	< 0.001
N intake g/d	415	626	10	< 0.001
N milk g/d	129	136	4	< 0.001
N faeces g/d	159	163	10	0.36
N urine g/d	65	243	19	< 0.001
N use efficiency %	31	22	1	< 0.001
Urinary urea g/L	4.6	22.9	1.1	< 0.001
Blood urea g/L ²	0.10	0.45	0.20	< 0.001

¹ LowN and HighN diets correspond to 12% and 18% of crude protein respectively.

² Mean of two samples (before and 3 h after the morning ration distribution)

656 **Table 4** Influence of diet degradable N concentration on ammonia and greenhouse gas
 657 emissions in late-lactating cows housed in tied stall barns (least square mean, probability
 658 and root mean squared error of the model; N = 16)

	LowN ¹	HighN ¹	RMSE	P-value
NH ₃ ² g/h/cow	1.03	1.25	0.15	0.01
N ₂ O g/d/cow	0.76	0.76	0.18	0.92
CH ₄ g/d/cow	586	567	74	0.65
CH ₄ g/kg DM intake	26.6	28.2	3.4	0.41

659 ¹ LowN and HighN diets correspond to 12% and 18% of crude protein respectively.

660 ² Ammonia emission measurements were only considered during periods of the day when
 661 interferences were expected to be negligible (i.e. between 12:00am and 7:00am and between 2:00pm
 662 and 5:00pm), and were averaged at an hourly scale.

663 **Figure captions**

664 **Figure 1** Ruminal liquor $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ concentration (mg/l) in late-lactating cows fed two
665 diets (open circles for the LowN diet at 12% CP; full squares for the HighN diet at
666 18% CP); statistical differences between diets are indicated: *** $P < 0.001$
667
668