

2335W: Effects of feeding 2 rumen-protected choline sources during the transition period on Holstein dairy cows performance and blood metabolites



V. Sáinz de la Maza-Escolà¹, E. Trevisi², E. Grilli^{1,3}, F. Piccioli-Cappelli²

¹Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy; ²Department of Animal Sciences, Food and Nutrition, Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science, Università Cattolica

del Sacro Cuore, Piacenza, Italy; ³Vetagro S.p.A., Reggio Emilia, Italy

INTRODUCTION

- Supplementation of rumen-protected choline (RPC) to peripartum dairy cows has been of interest due to the consistent improvements in milk performance and reduction of postpartum metabolic incidences¹.
- Choline is a methyl donor that may increase hepatic phosphatidylcholine synthesis and triglyceride secretion during the peripartum^{2,3}.

OBJECTIVE

Evaluate the effect of two sources of RPC supplemented from 21 d pre- to 35 d postpartum on production performance and blood metabolites.

APPROACH

- Twenty-four multiparous Holstein dairy cows (248 ± 4.9 days caring calf, 3.6 ± 2 parity, 2.7 ± 0.3 BCS) were randomly assigned to 1 of 3 groups (n = 8).
- Cows were fed a corn-silage based total mixed ration formulated to provide 2.38 (pre-) and 2.19 (postpartum) Met as % of metabolizable protein and top-dressed with the following treatments:

<u>CON</u> = unsupplemented.

RPC1 = 60 g/d of Ruprocol[®], Vetagro S.p.A., Italy, a lipid-microencapsulated product containing 25 % choline chloride (CC).

<u>RPC2</u> = 25 g/d of Reashure[®] XC, Balchem Corp., USA, a lipid-encapsulated product containing 60% of CC.

- Either RPC supplement provided 15 g/d of CC.
- Cows were fed once and milked twice daily. Dry matter intake (DMI), milk yield and components were recorded daily.
- Blood metabolites were determined by an automated biochemistry analyzer (ILAB 650; Instrumentation Laboratory, Lexington, MA) in accordance with methods already described by Calamari et al., 2016⁴.
- Data were analyzed under a mixed model with the random effect of cow and the fixed effects of parity and days in milk (DIM), treatment and their interaction.

RPC2: 45.17 ± 1.9

RPC2: 51.01 ± 2.4

Week Relative to Calving



Post-supplementation MY/pre-partum DMI

RPC supplementation ECM/pre-partum DMI

Post-supplementation ECM/pre-partum DMI

4.2

4.1^a 3.6^{ab}

4.7

3.3

3.3^b

3.7

3.9

4.2

0.07

0.03

0.06

CONCLUSIONS

- Interestingly, even if all cows were fed ad libitum during the trial, RPC cows showed a numerical reduction of -1.35kg/d in prepartum DMI relative to CON (Interaction P = 0.10; Figure A).
- Blood glucose, β-hydroxybutirate, free fatty acids and triglycerides results support that RPC cows were not in a different metabolic status compared to CON (P > 0.10; Figure C).
- CON cows had lower blood calcium levels (P = 0.07) and higher blood ceruloplasmin (P = 0.02) around parturition relative to RPC cows. This findings could indicate that feeding RPC might contribute to the resolution of calving-related inflammation.
- Although no treatment effects were detected on MY, energy-corrected milk (ECM) or milk solids, an interaction treatment x time is suggesting that feeding RPC increased MY (*P* < 0.01), ECM (*P* = 0.06) and milk fat yield (*P* < 0.01) over time during RPC supplementation (Figure B and Table 1). This is probably due to numerically greater milk solids, specially for RPC1 compared to CON and RPC2 (Table 1).
- Same interaction during post-supplementation period was observed on MY and ECM (P < 0.01; Figure B).
- **RPC** groups had a greater pre-partum DMI efficiency relative to MY and ECM during RPC supplementation (week 1 to 5) and post-supplementation (week 5 to 10) compared to CON ($P \le$ 0.07). In particular, **RPC1 was more efficient on ECM** during week 1 to 5 compared to CON and RPC2 (P = 0.03; Table 2).
- These preliminary results would suggest that RPC has an effect on energy and nutrient utilization, not only while supplemented but also later on over the lactation. In this study, RPC1 is showing a more pronounced response compared to RPC2.



¹ Zenobi et al 2018c. J Dairy Sci. 2018 Feb;101(2):1088-1110
² McFadden et al., 2020 J Dairy Sci. 2020 Jun;103(6):5668-5683
³ Cooke et al., 2007. J Dairy Sci. 2007 May; 90(5):2413-2418
⁴ Calamari et al., 2016. BMC Vet Res 12, 4
⁵ Holdorf et al., 2022. Abstract ADSA & EAAP