



## Effect of Saponins from *Chenopodium quinoa* Willd. on Methane Production, Short Chain Fatty Acids and Digestibility *in vitro* Ruminal Fermentation

María Cecilia Alegría-Arnedo <sup>1,\*</sup>, Carlos Alfredo Gómez-Bravo <sup>1</sup> and Fredy Enrique Quispe-Jacobo

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, Av. La Molina s/n, La Molina 15024 Lima, Perú

<sup>2</sup>Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria, INIA, Av. La Molina 1981, Lima-Perú

\*Corresponding author: [calegria@lamolina.edu.pe](mailto:calegria@lamolina.edu.pe)

**Article History:** 24-603 Received: 02-Sep-24 Revised: 23-Oct-24 Accepted: 24-Oct-24 Online First: 01-Nov-24

### ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to assess the effects of saponins derived from *Chenopodium quinoa* by-products on methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) production in a ruminal fermentation system under *in vitro* conditions. Additionally, the study included the analysis of short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) and true dry matter digestibility (TDMD). The saponin extracts obtained from three quinoa varieties were Altiplano (AS), Quillahuama (QS), and Salcedo (SS), and were tested at six different doses (0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, and 1.0mg/mL) each. Rumen fluid was obtained from two fistulated Junín breed sheep, with alfalfa hay (AH) and a 1:1 mixture of maize and bran (MB) was used as basal substrates. The data were processed in a completely randomized design and replicated three times. The CH<sub>4</sub> per dry matter (mL/g DM), after 24h of incubation significantly decreased, acetate molar concentration decreased ( $p<0.05$ ) with AS (3.6%) and QS (6.4%), propionate values increased ( $P<0.05$ ) to 14.4% (AS), 15.7% (QS), and 15.5% (SS), the acetate-to-propionate ratio decreased ( $P<0.05$ ) across all saponins treatments compared to the control and irrespective the substrates. The CH<sub>4</sub> to TDMD ratio decreased ( $P<0.05$ ) with all saponins. Methane inhibition (mL CH<sub>4</sub>/100mgTDMD) was higher by up 25.7% in the presence of AS, followed by QS at 18.7% and SS at 14.6%. The results indicate that saponins extracted from quinoa possess significant potential as feed additives for ruminants. Their application could contribute to the reduction of methane production, which would be advantageous for both livestock efficiency and environmental sustainability.

**Key words:** Extracts; Quinoa; CH<sub>4</sub>; Ruminal fermentation; Substrates

### INTRODUCTION

The increase in livestock production to meet the growing demand for human consumption poses a significant challenge due to its effects on global warming, specifically by emitting methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) (Almeida et al. 2021; Kinley et al. 2021; Notarnicola et al. 2023). Enteric fermentation in ruminants (cattle, sheep, goats, camelids) is the primary source of this potent greenhouse gas and represents 46% of total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in livestock farming (FAO 2023). In a global effort to reduce environmental impact and redirect the energy lost as CH<sub>4</sub>, which can represent up to 12% of the gross energy ingested by ruminants (Öztürk and Gur 2021), various sustainable and natural mitigation strategies are being implemented (Tongwane and Moeletsi 2020; Balasundram et al. 2023). Among these strategies, the inclusion of plant secondary metabolites such as saponins in the diet of ruminants stands out as an alternative to synthetic substitutes (Ku-Vera et al.

2020; Tedeschi et al. 2021; Tyagi et al. 2022).

Saponins are a promising source of metabolites with the capacity to reduce CH<sub>4</sub> production (Jafari et al. 2019). These natural substances, present in various plants, have demonstrated their antimicrobial properties, which affect the microbial community in the rumen, including methanogenic archaea, the microorganisms responsible for CH<sub>4</sub> production (Kholif 2023). Numerous studies have explored the influence of saponins on methane production in both *in vitro* and *in vivo* settings (Canul-Solis et al. 2020; Dhanasekaran et al. 2020; Singh et al. 2020). For example, saponins extracted from *Tribulus terrestris* reduced CH<sub>4</sub> production in an *in vitro* fermentation experiment (Feng et al. 2012). It has also been reported that saponins can reduce CH<sub>4</sub> production and modify the profile of volatile fatty acids within the ruminal environment (Bodas et al. 2012). Furthermore, saponins from various plant sources, such as *Quillaja saponaria* and *Yucca schidigera*, have shown a significant reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> production, exceeding 60% at

**Cite This Article as:** Alegría-Arnedo MC, Gómez-Bravo CA and Quispe-Jacobo FE, 2025. Effect of saponins from *Chenopodium quinoa* willd. on methane production, short chain fatty acids and digestibility *in vitro* ruminal fermentation. International Journal of Veterinary Science 14(2): 341-350. <https://doi.org/10.47278/journal.ijvs/2024.248>

8mg/mL of saponins (Rira et al. 2015). One of the saponin-rich foods is quinoa, *Chenopodium quinoa* Willd. (El Hazzam et al. 2022), a pseudocereal of which Peru is the leading producer in the world. However, its byproduct, saponins, is underutilized. Saponins are bitter compounds located in the outermost layer of the seed, which serves a protective function (El Hazzam et al. 2020). Although saponins arise from a wide variety of quinoa, each with particular characteristics and primarily produced in the Andean regions, there is also increasing production in the coastal areas due to their favorable agroclimatic adaptability (Apaza et al. 2013). Moreover, these compounds exhibit antimicrobial properties (Kuljanabagavad and Wink 2009; Sun et al. 2019; Dong et al. 2020). Nonetheless, only one *in vitro* study on ruminal fermentation examining the impact of quinoa-derived saponins on CH<sub>4</sub> generation at a specific inclusion level has been observed (Budán et al. 2013).

Due to the scarce studies regarding the consequence of saponins from various quinoa varieties on gas emissions, this study was planned to analyze the effects of saponins from by-products of three commercial quinoa varieties grown on the Peruvian coast, on methane production, short-chain fatty acids and diet digestibility in an *in vitro* ruminal fermentation system.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Samples and extraction of quinoa saponins

Three Peruvian quinoa varieties were collected: INIA431-Altiplano, Salcedo-INIA and Quillahuaman-INIA, grown at 241 m.a.s.l. under conventional agronomic conditions at fertilizer levels of 250:150:120 kg NPK/ha in sandy-loam soils from the National Institute of Agricultural Innovation (INIA, acronym in *Spanish*) in La Molina, Lima (Perú) (12°5' S, 76°58' W). To obtain powdered saponin extract (Fig. 1), the Agro Market scarificator (Global-INIA, Peru) was utilized to remove the pericarp layer from quinoa seeds (El Hazzam et al. 2020). The by-product was collected in batches of 3kg from each quinoa variety, processed in triplicate. These were then mixed with distilled water at a 1:20 ratio and stirred for three hours. Subsequently, the mixture underwent a 24-hour maceration, followed by filtration using a vacuum pump (V-700<sup>®</sup> Buchi Labortechnik AG, Switzerland). The aqueous saponin extract was stored at 4°C, while the solids retained on the filter underwent a second extraction. All extracts were then dried in a tray dryer at 40°C and milled in a centrifugal mill (ZM-200<sup>®</sup> Retsch, Germany) (Guzmán et al. 2013).

### Saponin content

Total saponin (Table 1) was determined by the UV-Vis spectrophotometric method (Lozano et al. 2012). In a tube, 0.5g of residual and 25mL of ethyl alcohol (50% v/v) were stirred in a shaker (M 37610-33<sup>®</sup> Thermo Scientific, USA) for 15 minutes. After macerating for one hour, the tubes were centrifuged at 4000rpm for 20 minutes at 25°C, and 5mL of the supernatant was collected. A calibration curve was constructed using standard oleanolic acid (Sigma Aldrich, USA) at concentrations of 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, and 600µg/mL. For the reaction, 1mL of each standard was mixed with 3.5mL of the Lieberman-Burchard reagent (a 1:5 ratio mixture of glacial acetic acid and sulfuric acid).

Similarly, for the sample, 50µL of each extract and 950µL of a 50% v/v ethanolic solvent, along with the reagent, were combined. All tubes were vigorously vortexed for 30s and then allowed to stand for 40min. Absorbance at 528nm was measured using a Genesys 10S UV-Vis<sup>®</sup> spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, USA).

**Table 1:** Composition of substrates and total saponins in powdered extracts

| Items (mg/g)                                     | Substrates |       | Saponins extracts |       |       |
|--|------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|
|  | AH         | MB    | AS                | QS    | SS    |
| Dry matter                                       | 908.6      | 879   | 901.7             | 909.5 | 903.8 |
| Crude protein                                    | 188.7      | 117.0 | 80.0              | 112.4 | 131   |
| Crude fibre                                      | 183.0      | 34.3  | 0                 | 1.2   | 0.4   |
| Ether extract                                    | 11.6       | 20.2  | 0                 | 1.9   | 0.8   |
| Total saponins (mg oleanolic acid equivalents/g) | -          | -     | 757.5             | 795.4 | 611.6 |


Nomenclature: AH=Alfalfa Hay; MB=Maize and bran mixture (1:1); solid saponin extracts: AS: Altiplano saponin; QS: Quillahuaman saponin and SS: Salcedo saponin.

### *In vitro* ruminal fermentation and gas production

For *in vitro* ruminal fermentation, two substrates were used: AH (alfalfa hay) and MB (a 1:1 mixture of ground maize and wheat bran). Both basal materials were provided by the Nutrition Laboratory of Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, dried at 50°C for 48 hours, and ground in a mill (Thomas-Wiley<sup>®</sup>) with a 1mm screen. Dry matter, crude protein, ether extract, and crude fiber were analyzed in that substrates and saponin extracts according to Association of Analytical Communities (AOAC 2005) (Table 1).

The *in vitro* system was following the technique implemented by Theodorou et al. (1994) and modify by Mauricio et al. (2001). In bottles with rubber stoppers, 250mg of substrate, and saponin doses of 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, and 1.0mg/mL were used. Each saponin extract underwent twelve treatments (two substrates at six different doses each), performed in triplicate, plus three blanks containing only the incubation medium. The medium, prepared in a 5000mL flask, was by mixing 0.3mL of micromineral solution (13g of CaCl<sub>2</sub>·2H<sub>2</sub>O, 10g of MnCl<sub>2</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O, 1g of CoCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O and 8g of FeCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O were dissolved in 100mL of distilled water), 600mL of buffer solution (comprising 35g of NaHCO<sub>3</sub> and 4g of NH<sub>4</sub>HCO<sub>3</sub> in 1000 distilled water), 600mL of macromineral solution (5.7g Na<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub>, 6.2g KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> and 0.6g MgSO<sub>4</sub>·7H<sub>2</sub>O in 1000mL of distilled water), 3mL of resazurin (0.1g of resazurin dissolved in 100mL distilled water) and 1200mL of distilled water. In addition, 120mL of reducing solution was added to the flask (625mg of Na<sub>2</sub>S·9H<sub>2</sub>O and 625mg of L-Cysteine HCl, 4mL 1N NaOH in 100mL distilled water). The flask was placed on a magnetic stirrer at 39°C and infused with CO<sub>2</sub> for 90min to maintain the anaerobic environment.

The small ruminants housed at the Experimental Center for Sheep and Camelids of Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, Lima, Perú (12°5' S, 76°57' W) were fed twice a day consisting of a forage and concentrate mixture (2:1) and had unrestricted access to water. The rumen liquor (both solid and liquid components) was collected from various points in the lower middle zone of the rumen, four hours after the first morning feeding, from two fistulated Junin breed sheep. Following the management



**Fig. 1:** Diagram followed to obtain powdered saponin extract from quinoa seeds.

and care guidelines in line with the Animal Care and Use Guidelines (Tucker et al. 2020) and Peruvian Law 30407 on principles of protection and animal welfare (Vega and Watanabe 2016).

The liquor was maintained at 39°C and passed through four stratum of muslin. The rumen liquid (600mL) mixed with the medium (2400mL) constituted the inoculum. Each treatment and blank were incubated with 25mL of inoculum and sealed with a rubber stopper followed by aluminum crimp. All fermentation processes were regulated by CO<sub>2</sub> gasification, and gas measurements were taken using a pressure transducer (JYB-KM®, Collighigh, China) connected to a 3-way stopcock. Gas output was recorded after 24h of incubation period in three runs separated by one week.

#### Determination of methane

The CH<sub>4</sub> concentration was measured from the gas in the headspace of the bottles by gas chromatography (Makkar and Vercoe 2007). A volume of 0.6mL of gas accumulated during 24h incubation was injected into an Agilent-USA 7890B® Gas Chromatography equipment employing a flame ionization detector (FID) and a GS-GASPRO capillary column of 30m x 320µm at 250°C temperature and He gas flow at 2.5 mL/min. A calibration

curve was prepared using a CH<sub>4</sub> standard (99.99%) Praxair-USA. Time retention was 2.6min, and analysis time was 5 min. The CH<sub>4</sub> component readings were in ppm and the CH<sub>4</sub> production was expressed in mL of CH<sub>4</sub> per gram of dry matter.

#### True Dry Matter Digestibility (TDMD)

True dry matter digestibility (TDMD) was carried out after 24h incubation. The fermentation residue was recovered from the bottle and transferred into a filter bag (ANKOM, 25µm porosity size), which was sealed and treated with a neutral detergent solution using the fiber analyzer (Ankom Technology Corp., Macedon, NY) for one hour. Then, the bags were washed and dried at 105°C for 24h. The loss of dry matter showed the degree degradation and the TDMD expressed in percentage (Van Soest et al. 1991).

#### Determination of Short Chain Fatty Acids (SCFAs)

The SCFAs were measured in the buffered rumen fluid after 24h of incubation by High Pressure Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) (Molina-Botero et al. 2020). Acetic, propionic and butyric acids were quantified by HPLC-Waters 2695 Separations Module (Waters, Milford-MA), using an Aminex HPX-87H cation exchange resin

column (300x7.8mm) equipped with an ion exclusion micro guard refill cartridge (Bio-Rad Laboratories Richmond-Ca, USA), a photodiode array detector (PAD), Waters 2996 and Empower software. Previously, each sample was filtered through #541 Whatman filter paper and centrifuged at 10000rpm for 10min. Then 2mL was collected in an Eppendorf tube and centrifuged again at 13000rpm for 2min. The supernatant was passed through a 0.22µm Millipore filter, type GV (Millipore, Bedford). The chromatographic conditions were a mobile phase of 0.005M sulfuric acid, a volumetric flow rate of 0.6mL/min at 50°C and a dilution factor of ten. SCFAs were measured by comparing acetic, propionic and butyric acid standards with time retention of 15.053, 17.710 and 21.663min, respectively at 210nm.

### Statistical analysis

The IBM SPSS Statistics Software Version 22 was applied to evaluate the effect of substrates and different levels of saponins on gas production, CH<sub>4</sub>, SCFAs and TDMD. The data were analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) through the General Linear Model (GLM) procedure in SPSS, employing a completely randomized design with a factorial arrangement of 2 substrates x 6 inclusion levels, as detailed below:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha \times \beta)_{ij} + \xi_{ijk}$$

where:

$Y_{ijk}$ : is the response variable of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  substrate and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  level of saponin inclusion.

$\mu$ : is the general average

$\alpha_i$ : is the effect of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  substrate ( $i=1$  or  $2$ )

$\beta_j$ : is the effect of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  level of saponin inclusion ( $j= 1, 2, .6$ )

$(\alpha \times \beta)_{ij}$ : is the effect of the interaction between the  $i^{\text{th}}$  substrate and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  level of saponin inclusion

$\xi_{ijk}$ : is the experimental error

The Tukey test was applied for multiple comparison

testing between treatments with significant differences were identified at  $p < 0.05$ , and a trend towards significance was noted at  $0.05 \leq p < 0.10$ .

## RESULTS

### Gas production and True Dry Matter Digestibility (TDMD)

The gas produced after 24h of *in vitro* incubation is presented in Table 2. The substrates, irrespective of the saponin inclusion level, significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) affected gas production. The MB substrate generated higher gas production (276.94mL/g DM on average) than AH substrate (191.20mL/g DM on average). Total gas production was not significantly affected ( $p > 0.05$ ) by dose variation across all treatments. On the other hand, the percentage of TDMD did not vary ( $P > 0.05$ ) with the addition of low doses (0.2-0.6mg/mL) of AS and QS extracts, regardless of substrates. However, at higher doses as 0.8mg/mL, the TDMD percentage increased ( $p < 0.05$ ) compared to the control and the rest of the treatments. For the SS extract, none of the doses had a significant effect ( $P > 0.05$ ) on total gas production.

### Short Chain Fatty Acids (SCFAs)

As reported in Table 3, the molar concentrations of acetic acid in an *in vitro* fermentation after 24 hours of incubation exhibit a trend ( $P = 0.067$ ) in the AS interaction, showing a slight decrease at higher doses (0.8mg/mL) with the AH substrate compared to the control. No significant effect ( $P > 0.05$ ) was reported in SS, but in QS with the AH substrate at the highest inclusion level, a lower molar concentration of acetate is observed compared to the MB substrate at the same level. Moreover, the incorporation of quinoa saponins, irrespective of substrates, significantly reduced the acetate proportion at concentrations exceeding 0.4mg/mL by 3.6% with AS and by 6.4% at the maximum

**Table 2:** Effect of saponin extracts of Altiplano (AS), Quillahuaman (QS) and Salcedo (SS) on Gas production (mL/g DM) and True Dry Matter Digestibility (TDMD) in percentage

| Extract                         | Substrate      | Saponin extract level(mg/mL) |                    |                    |                    |                   |                    | Mean of substrate | SEM  | P value   |       |             |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------|
|                                 |                | 0                            | 0.2                | 0.4                | 0.6                | 0.8               | 1                  |                   |      | Substrate | Level | Interaction |
| <b>Gas Production (mL/g DM)</b> |                |                              |                    |                    |                    |                   |                    |                   |      |           |       |             |
| AS                              | AH             | 189 <sup>b</sup>             | 197 <sup>b</sup>   | 192 <sup>b</sup>   | 187 <sup>b</sup>   | 188 <sup>b</sup>  | 186 <sup>b</sup>   | 189.7             | 4.36 | <0.0001   | 0.547 | 0.352       |
|                                 | MB             | 279 <sup>a</sup>             | 274 <sup>a</sup>   | 275 <sup>a</sup>   | 270 <sup>a</sup>   | 274 <sup>a</sup>  | 280 <sup>a</sup>   | 275.4             |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 234                          | 235                | 233                | 228                | 231               | 233                |                   |      |           |       |             |
| QS                              | AH             | 189 <sup>b</sup>             | 196 <sup>b</sup>   | 189 <sup>b</sup>   | 196 <sup>b</sup>   | 192 <sup>b</sup>  | 182 <sup>b</sup>   | 190.8             | 4.35 | <0.0001   | 0.191 | 0.211       |
|                                 | MB             | 279 <sup>a</sup>             | 275 <sup>a</sup>   | 274 <sup>a</sup>   | 275 <sup>a</sup>   | 277 <sup>a</sup>  | 275 <sup>a</sup>   | 275.8             |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 234                          | 236                | 232                | 235                | 234               | 228                |                   |      |           |       |             |
| SS                              | AH             | 189 <sup>b</sup>             | 195 <sup>b</sup>   | 199 <sup>b</sup>   | 190 <sup>b</sup>   | 195 <sup>b</sup>  | 191 <sup>b</sup>   | 193.2             | 4.43 | <0.0001   | 0.299 | 0.142       |
|                                 | MB             | 279 <sup>a</sup>             | 273 <sup>a</sup>   | 278 <sup>a</sup>   | 283 <sup>a</sup>   | 286 <sup>a</sup>  | 278.0              | 279.6             |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 234                          | 234                | 239                | 236                | 240               | 234                |                   |      |           |       |             |
| <b>TDMD (%)</b>                 |                |                              |                    |                    |                    |                   |                    |                   |      |           |       |             |
| AS                              | AH             | 64.5 <sup>c</sup>            | 65.7 <sup>c</sup>  | 64.7 <sup>c</sup>  | 66.5 <sup>c</sup>  | 66.3 <sup>c</sup> | 66.1 <sup>c</sup>  | 65.6              | 1.45 | <0.0001   | 0.009 | 0.114       |
|                                 | MB             | 80.5 <sup>b</sup>            | 79.9 <sup>b</sup>  | 82.5 <sup>ab</sup> | 82.0 <sup>ab</sup> | 85.6 <sup>a</sup> | 83.7 <sup>ab</sup> | 82.4              |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 72.5 <sup>B</sup>            | 72.8 <sup>B</sup>  | 73.6 <sup>AB</sup> | 74.3 <sup>AB</sup> | 75.9 <sup>A</sup> | 74.9 <sup>AB</sup> |                   |      |           |       |             |
| QS                              | AH             | 64.5 <sup>b</sup>            | 67.8 <sup>b</sup>  | 68.6 <sup>b</sup>  | 64.6 <sup>b</sup>  | 68.6 <sup>b</sup> | 67.8 <sup>b</sup>  | 66.9              | 1.12 | <0.0001   | 0.025 | 0.321       |
|                                 | MB             | 80.5 <sup>a</sup>            | 81.7 <sup>a</sup>  | 81.5 <sup>a</sup>  | 81.4 <sup>a</sup>  | 82.6 <sup>a</sup> | 81.3 <sup>a</sup>  | 81.5              |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 72.5 <sup>B</sup>            | 74.7 <sup>AB</sup> | 75.1 <sup>AB</sup> | 72.9 <sup>AB</sup> | 75.6 <sup>A</sup> | 74.5 <sup>AB</sup> |                   |      |           |       |             |
| SS                              | AH             | 64.5 <sup>b</sup>            | 63.0 <sup>b</sup>  | 64.2 <sup>b</sup>  | 66.6 <sup>b</sup>  | 63.4 <sup>b</sup> | 64.6 <sup>b</sup>  | 64.4              | 1.57 | <0.0001   | 0.457 | 0.598       |
|                                 | MB             | 80.5 <sup>a</sup>            | 81.2 <sup>a</sup>  | 80.1 <sup>a</sup>  | 82.1 <sup>a</sup>  | 81.6 <sup>a</sup> | 78.6 <sup>a</sup>  | 80.7              |      |           |       |             |
|                                 | Mean of levels | 72.5 <sup>A</sup>            | 72.1 <sup>A</sup>  | 72.2 <sup>A</sup>  | 74.4               | 72.5 <sup>A</sup> | 71.6 <sup>A</sup>  |                   |      |           |       |             |

Abbreviations: AH: Alfalfa hay; MB: Maize-bran mixture. Means not sharing upper-case letters are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels, irrespective of substrates. Means not sharing lower-case letters differ significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels and substrates. SEM: Standard error of the mean.

**Table 3:** Effect of saponins concentrates Altiplano (AS), Quillahuaman (QS) and Salcedo (SS) on the molar concentration of Acetic and Propionic acids (mM) after 24 h of incubation

| Extract                        | Substrate      | Level of saponin (mg/mL) |                     |                     |                      |                     |                      | Mean of substrate | p-value |           |         |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------|---------|
|                                |                | 0                        | 0.2                 | 0.4                 | 0.6                  | 0.8                 | 1.0                  |                   | SEM     | Substrate | Level   |
| <b>Acetic acid (mmol/L)</b>    |                |                          |                     |                     |                      |                     |                      |                   |         |           |         |
| AS                             | AH             | 41.96 <sup>a</sup>       | 41.15 <sup>ab</sup> | 41.06 <sup>ab</sup> | 40.31 <sup>abc</sup> | 40.13 <sup>bc</sup> | 40.39 <sup>abc</sup> | 0.16              | <0.0001 | 0.003     | 0.067   |
|                                | MB             | 40.61 <sup>abc</sup>     | 39.73 <sup>bc</sup> | 38.91 <sup>c</sup>  | 39.68 <sup>bc</sup>  | 40.18 <sup>bc</sup> | 39.21 <sup>c</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 41.28 <sup>A</sup>       | 40.44 <sup>AB</sup> | 39.98 <sup>B</sup>  | 39.99 <sup>B</sup>   | 40.15 <sup>B</sup>  | 39.80 <sup>B</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
| QS                             | AH             | 41.96 <sup>a</sup>       | 41.15 <sup>a</sup>  | 40.80 <sup>a</sup>  | 41.28 <sup>a</sup>   | 40.08 <sup>a</sup>  | 35.77 <sup>b</sup>   | 0.3               | 0.002   | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                                | MB             | 40.61 <sup>a</sup>       | 42.60 <sup>a</sup>  | 40.30 <sup>a</sup>  | 41.47 <sup>a</sup>   | 40.66 <sup>a</sup>  | 41.50 <sup>a</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 41.28 <sup>A</sup>       | 41.87 <sup>A</sup>  | 40.55 <sup>A</sup>  | 41.37 <sup>A</sup>   | 40.37 <sup>A</sup>  | 38.63 <sup>B</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
| SS                             | AH             | 41.96 <sup>a</sup>       | 41.69 <sup>ab</sup> | 40.98 <sup>ab</sup> | 41.93 <sup>a</sup>   | 41.53 <sup>ab</sup> | 40.78 <sup>ab</sup>  | 0.14              | 0.001   | 0.024     | 0.737   |
|                                | MB             | 40.61 <sup>ab</sup>      | 41.38 <sup>a</sup>  | 38.83 <sup>b</sup>  | 40.88 <sup>a</sup>   | 40.70 <sup>ab</sup> | 40.25 <sup>ab</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 41.28 <sup>A</sup>       | 41.53 <sup>A</sup>  | 40.41 <sup>A</sup>  | 41.41 <sup>A</sup>   | 41.11 <sup>A</sup>  | 40.51 <sup>A</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
| <b>Propionic acid (mmol/L)</b> |                |                          |                     |                     |                      |                     |                      |                   |         |           |         |
| AS                             | AH             | 14.42 <sup>e</sup>       | 14.22 <sup>e</sup>  | 14.41 <sup>e</sup>  | 14.84 <sup>e</sup>   | 15.22 <sup>e</sup>  | 14.71 <sup>e</sup>   | 0.53              | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                                | MB             | 18.42 <sup>d</sup>       | 18.95 <sup>cd</sup> | 20.50 <sup>bc</sup> | 20.40 <sup>c</sup>   | 22.34 <sup>a</sup>  | 22.08 <sup>ab</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 16.42 <sup>D</sup>       | 16.58 <sup>CD</sup> | 17.46 <sup>C</sup>  | 17.62 <sup>BC</sup>  | 18.78 <sup>A</sup>  | 18.39 <sup>AB</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
| QS                             | AH             | 14.42 <sup>d</sup>       | 14.69 <sup>d</sup>  | 14.85 <sup>d</sup>  | 14.88 <sup>d</sup>   | 15.07 <sup>d</sup>  | 13.74 <sup>d</sup>   | 0.6               | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                                | MB             | 18.42 <sup>c</sup>       | 20.19 <sup>b</sup>  | 20.44 <sup>b</sup>  | 23.10 <sup>a</sup>   | 22.86 <sup>a</sup>  | 23.39 <sup>a</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 16.42 <sup>D</sup>       | 17.44 <sup>CD</sup> | 17.64 <sup>BC</sup> | 18.99 <sup>A</sup>   | 18.96 <sup>A</sup>  | 18.56 <sup>AB</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
| SS                             | AH             | 14.42 <sup>gh</sup>      | 14.34 <sup>h</sup>  | 15.69 <sup>ef</sup> | 16.21 <sup>e</sup>   | 15.14 <sup>gh</sup> | 15.22 <sup>fg</sup>  | 0.54              | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | 0.001   |
|                                | MB             | 18.42 <sup>d</sup>       | 19.98 <sup>c</sup>  | 20.17 <sup>c</sup>  | 21.47 <sup>b</sup>   | 22.78 <sup>a</sup>  | 22.49 <sup>a</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |
|                                | Mean of levels | 16.42 <sup>D</sup>       | 17.16 <sup>C</sup>  | 17.93 <sup>B</sup>  | 18.84 <sup>A</sup>   | 18.96 <sup>A</sup>  | 18.85 <sup>A</sup>   |                   |         |           |         |

Abbreviations: AH: Alfalfa hay; MB: Maize-bran mixture. Means not sharing upper-case letters are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels, irrespective of substrates. Means not sharing lower-case letters differ significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels and substrates. SEM: Standard error of the mean.

**Table 4:** Effect of saponins concentrates Altiplano (AS), Quillahuaman (QS) and Salcedo (SS) on A/P proportions and Butyric acid (mM) after 24 h of incubation

| Extract                      | Substrate      | Level of saponins (mg/mL) |                    |                     |                     |                    |                    | Mean of substrate | p-value |           |         |
|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------|---------|
|                              |                | 0                         | 0.2                | 0.4                 | 0.6                 | 0.8                | 1                  |                   | SEM     | Substrate | Level   |
| <b>A/P</b>                   |                |                           |                    |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |         |           |         |
| AS                           | AH             | 2.91 <sup>a</sup>         | 2.90 <sup>a</sup>  | 2.85 <sup>ab</sup>  | 2.72 <sup>bc</sup>  | 2.64 <sup>c</sup>  | 2.75 <sup>bc</sup> | 0.075             | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                              | MB             | 2.21 <sup>d</sup>         | 2.10 <sup>d</sup>  | 1.90 <sup>ef</sup>  | 1.95 <sup>e</sup>   | 1.80 <sup>f</sup>  | 1.79 <sup>f</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 2.56 <sup>A</sup>         | 2.50 <sup>A</sup>  | 2.37 <sup>B</sup>   | 2.33 <sup>BC</sup>  | 2.22 <sup>D</sup>  | 2.26 <sup>CD</sup> |                   |         |           |         |
| QS                           | AH             | 2.91 <sup>a</sup>         | 2.80 <sup>ab</sup> | 2.75 <sup>abc</sup> | 2.78 <sup>abc</sup> | 2.66 <sup>bc</sup> | 2.60 <sup>c</sup>  | 0.073             | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | 0.007   |
|                              | MB             | 2.21 <sup>d</sup>         | 2.11 <sup>de</sup> | 1.98 <sup>ef</sup>  | 1.80 <sup>fg</sup>  | 1.78 <sup>g</sup>  | 1.77 <sup>g</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 2.56 <sup>A</sup>         | 2.46 <sup>AB</sup> | 2.36 <sup>BC</sup>  | 2.29 <sup>CD</sup>  | 2.22 <sup>D</sup>  | 2.19 <sup>D</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
| SS                           | AH             | 2.91 <sup>a</sup>         | 2.91 <sup>a</sup>  | 2.61 <sup>bc</sup>  | 2.59 <sup>c</sup>   | 2.74 <sup>b</sup>  | 2.68 <sup>bc</sup> | 0.071             | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | 0.122   |
|                              | MB             | 2.21 <sup>d</sup>         | 2.07 <sup>de</sup> | 1.97 <sup>ef</sup>  | 1.91 <sup>fg</sup>  | 1.79 <sup>g</sup>  | 1.79 <sup>g</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 2.56 <sup>A</sup>         | 2.49 <sup>A</sup>  | 2.29 <sup>B</sup>   | 2.25 <sup>B</sup>   | 2.27 <sup>B</sup>  | 2.23 <sup>B</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
| <b>Butyric acid (mmol/L)</b> |                |                           |                    |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |         |           |         |
| AS                           | AH             | 3.41 <sup>b</sup>         | 3.61 <sup>b</sup>  | 3.67 <sup>b</sup>   | 3.76 <sup>b</sup>   | 3.74 <sup>b</sup>  | 3.75 <sup>b</sup>  | 0.47              | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                              | MB             | 9.34 <sup>a</sup>         | 9.70 <sup>a</sup>  | 10.13 <sup>a</sup>  | 8.58 <sup>a</sup>   | 8.07 <sup>a</sup>  | 8.75 <sup>a</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 6.37 <sup>ABC</sup>       | 6.65 <sup>AB</sup> | 6.90 <sup>A</sup>   | 6.17 <sup>BC</sup>  | 5.90 <sup>C</sup>  | 6.25 <sup>BC</sup> |                   |         |           |         |
| QS                           | AH             | 3.41 <sup>d</sup>         | 3.70 <sup>d</sup>  | 3.71 <sup>d</sup>   | 3.77 <sup>d</sup>   | 3.91 <sup>d</sup>  | 3.36 <sup>d</sup>  | 0.42              | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | <0.0001 |
|                              | MB             | 9.34 <sup>a</sup>         | 9.70 <sup>a</sup>  | 8.03 <sup>bc</sup>  | 8.54 <sup>b</sup>   | 7.60 <sup>c</sup>  | 7.76 <sup>c</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 6.37 <sup>AB</sup>        | 6.70 <sup>A</sup>  | 5.87 <sup>CD</sup>  | 6.16 <sup>BC</sup>  | 5.76 <sup>CD</sup> | 5.56 <sup>D</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
| SS                           | AH             | 3.41 <sup>c</sup>         | 3.32 <sup>c</sup>  | 3.36 <sup>c</sup>   | 3.42 <sup>c</sup>   | 3.57 <sup>c</sup>  | 3.50 <sup>c</sup>  | 0.49              | <0.0001 | <0.0001   | 0.001   |
|                              | MB             | 9.34 <sup>a</sup>         | 8.10 <sup>b</sup>  | 9.51 <sup>a</sup>   | 9.58 <sup>a</sup>   | 9.06 <sup>a</sup>  | 9.71 <sup>a</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |
|                              | Mean of levels | 6.37 <sup>A</sup>         | 5.71 <sup>B</sup>  | 6.43 <sup>A</sup>   | 6.50 <sup>A</sup>   | 6.31 <sup>A</sup>  | 6.60 <sup>A</sup>  |                   |         |           |         |

Abbreviations: AH: Alfalfa hay; MB: Maize-bran mixture. Means not sharing upper-case letters are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels, irrespective of substrates. Means not sharing lower-case letters differ significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) among saponins levels and substrates. SEM: Standard error of the mean.

inclusion level with QS compared to control. All studied saponins increased ( $P < 0.05$ ) the proportion of propionate across all doses. Saponins at higher levels exhibited better yields, inclusions above of 0.8mgAS/mL by 14.3%, 0.6mg QS/mL by 15.7% and 0.6mg SS/mL by 15.5% compared to the control. The proportion of propionate in the MB substrate showed a significant increase ( $P < 0.05$ ) compared to the AH substrate across all treatments. Additionally, the interaction between AH substrate and inclusion levels revealed lower molar concentrations of propionate compared to MB.

The results of the acetate to propionate (A/P) ratio are

presented in Table 4. At doses higher than 0.4mg/mL, irrespective of substrates, the A/P ratio decreases ( $P < 0.05$ ) significantly in all varieties of saponins. The A/P values are significantly ( $p > 0.05$ ) higher in AH substrate compared to MB. The interactions ( $P < 0.05$ ) between saponins doses and substrates are shown not only when comparing quantities within the same substrate but also between substrates. At higher doses of *Chenopodium quinoa* saponin extracts, acetate/propionate ratio decreased by up to 13.3% (0.8mgAS/mL), 14.5% (1.0mgQS/mL) and 12.9% (1.0mgSS/mL) compared with the control. Further, the Table 4, shows the effects of different levels of AS, QS, and SS on the molar concentration of butyric acid. The

addition of quinoa saponin extracts, irrespective of the substrate, did not vary ( $p>0.05$ ) the butyrate concentrations at lower doses of 0.2-0.4mg/mL AS, 0.2mg/mL QS, and at all doses of SS except lower dose. The remaining doses significantly decreased ( $P<0.05$ ) with the inclusion of quinoa saponins after 24 hours of incubation.

**Methane**


The CH<sub>4</sub> production after 24h *in vitro* incubation is shown in Table 5. The results reveal the significant effect ( $P<0.05$ ) of saponins inclusion on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in rumen fermentation. The inclusion of AS at 0.8 and 1.0mg/mL, irrespective of the substrate, presents similar effects ( $p>0.05$ ), but both significantly reduced CH<sub>4</sub> production values compared to lower inclusions and the control (without saponin) achieving a maximum CH<sub>4</sub> reduction of 22.34%. While with QS at an inclusion level of 0.6mg/mL,

methane production decreased by up to 19.98% compared to the control, with values at higher levels being statistically similar to each other, but all lower than the control. About SS variety inclusions, levels higher than 0.8mg/mL resulted in significantly reduced CH<sub>4</sub> production values, with a CH<sub>4</sub> inhibition of up to 14.92%. A significant reduction ( $P<0.05$ ) in the CH<sub>4</sub> to true digestibility ratio (CH<sub>4</sub> mL/100mg TDMD) was observed with varying saponin levels after 24 hours of incubation (Fig. 3). The study further demonstrated that higher doses of quinoa saponin extracts led to a decrease in the CH<sub>4</sub> to TDMD ratio by up to 25.7% (0.8mg AS/mL), 18.9% (0.6mg QS/mL) and 12.3% (1.0mg SS/mL). Moreover, significant differences ( $P<0.05$ ) were found between the AH and MB substrates, with average values of 4.53 and 6.47mL CH<sub>4</sub>/100mg TDMD, respectively, irrespective of saponin levels.


**Table 5:** Effect of saponin extracts of Altiplano (AS), Quillahuaman (QS) and Salcedo (SS) on methane production in mL CH<sub>4</sub>/g DM and the proportion of methane production to TDMD (mL CH<sub>4</sub>/100 mgTDMD) after 24 h of incubation

| Extract                                    | Substrate      | Level of saponins (mg/mL) |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    | Mean of Substrate | SEM  | <i>p</i> -value |         |             |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------|-----------------|---------|-------------|
|  |                | 0                         | 0.2                 | 0.4                 | 0.6                 | 0.8                 | 1                  |                   |      | Substrate       | Level   | Interaction |
| <b>CH<sub>4</sub> Production (mL/g DM)</b> |                |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| AS   | AH             | 31.1 <sup>de</sup>        | 32.9 <sup>cde</sup> | 29.6 <sup>e</sup>   | 28.0 <sup>e</sup>   | 25.6 <sup>e</sup>   | 28.5 <sup>e</sup>  | 29.3              | 2.06 | <0.0001         | 0.001   | 0.211       |
|  | MB             | 57.3 <sup>a</sup>         | 57.9 <sup>a</sup>   | 54.3 <sup>ab</sup>  | 48.1 <sup>b</sup>   | 43.1 <sup>bcd</sup> | 44.0 <sup>bc</sup> | 50.8              |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 44.2 <sup>A</sup>         | 45.4 <sup>A</sup>   | 42.0 <sup>AB</sup>  | 38.1 <sup>AB</sup>  | 34.3 <sup>B</sup>   | 36.3 <sup>B</sup>  |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| QS   | AH             | 31.1 <sup>bc</sup>        | 33.4 <sup>b</sup>   | 29.5 <sup>bc</sup>  | 21.8 <sup>c</sup>   | 28.7 <sup>bc</sup>  | 26.6 <sup>bc</sup> | 28.5              | 2.21 | <0.0001         | 0.0003  | 0.471       |
|  | MB             | 57.3 <sup>a</sup>         | 54.9 <sup>a</sup>   | 50.9 <sup>a</sup>   | 48.9 <sup>a</sup>   | 48.0 <sup>a</sup>   | 50.3 <sup>a</sup>  | 51.7              |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 44.2 <sup>A</sup>         | 44.1 <sup>A</sup>   | 40.2 <sup>AB</sup>  | 35.4 <sup>B</sup>   | 38.3 <sup>AB</sup>  | 38.4 <sup>AB</sup> |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| SS   | AH             | 31.1 <sup>d</sup>         | 32.8 <sup>d</sup>   | 28.9 <sup>d</sup>   | 27.6 <sup>d</sup>   | 30.0 <sup>d</sup>   | 27.6 <sup>d</sup>  | 29.7              | 2.06 | <0.0001         | 0.001   | 0.285       |
|  | MB             | 57.3 <sup>a</sup>         | 56.6 <sup>a</sup>   | 55.3 <sup>ab</sup>  | 53.0 <sup>abc</sup> | 49.6 <sup>bc</sup>  | 47.8 <sup>c</sup>  | 53.3              |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 44.2 <sup>AB</sup>        | 44.7 <sup>A</sup>   | 42.1 <sup>ABC</sup> | 40.3 <sup>BCD</sup> | 39.8 <sup>CD</sup>  | 37.7 <sup>D</sup>  |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| <b>CH<sub>4</sub> (mL/100mg TDMD)</b>      |                |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| AS   | AH             | 4.9 <sup>cd</sup>         | 5.1 <sup>bcd</sup>  | 4.6 <sup>cd</sup>   | 4.3 <sup>d</sup>    | 3.9 <sup>d</sup>    | 4.4 <sup>cd</sup>  | 4.5               | 0.20 | <0.0001         | <0.0001 | 0.194       |
|  | MB             | 7.2 <sup>a</sup>          | 7.3 <sup>a</sup>    | 6.6 <sup>ab</sup>   | 5.9 <sup>abc</sup>  | 5.1 <sup>bcd</sup>  | 5.3 <sup>bcd</sup> | 6.2               |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 6.0 <sup>AB</sup>         | 6.2 <sup>A</sup>    | 5.6 <sup>ABC</sup>  | 5.1 <sup>BCD</sup>  | 4.5 <sup>D</sup>    | 4.9 <sup>CD</sup>  |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| QS   | AH             | 4.9 <sup>bc</sup>         | 5.0 <sup>bc</sup>   | 4.3 <sup>c</sup>    | 3.6 <sup>c</sup>    | 4.3 <sup>c</sup>    | 3.9 <sup>c</sup>   | 4.3               | 0.21 | <0.0001         | 0.002   | 0.584       |
|  | MB             | 7.2 <sup>a</sup>          | 6.8 <sup>a</sup>    | 6.3 <sup>ab</sup>   | 6.2 <sup>ab</sup>   | 5.9 <sup>ab</sup>   | 6.1 <sup>ab</sup>  | 6.4               |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 6.0 <sup>A</sup>          | 5.9 <sup>AB</sup>   | 5.3 <sup>ABC</sup>  | 4.9 <sup>C</sup>    | 5.1 <sup>BC</sup>   | 5.0 <sup>BC</sup>  |                   |      |                 |         |             |
| SS   | AH             | 4.9 <sup>d</sup>          | 5.3 <sup>bcd</sup>  | 4.7 <sup>d</sup>    | 4.3 <sup>d</sup>    | 4.9 <sup>cd</sup>   | 4.5 <sup>d</sup>   | 4.8               | 0.19 | <0.0001         | 0.013   | 0.146       |
|  | MB             | 7.2 <sup>a</sup>          | 7.0 <sup>a</sup>    | 7.1 <sup>a</sup>    | 6.8 <sup>a</sup>    | 6.4 <sup>ab</sup>   | 6.1 <sup>abc</sup> | 6.8               |      |                 |         |             |
|  | Mean of levels | 6.0 <sup>A</sup>          | 6.1 <sup>A</sup>    | 5.9 <sup>AB</sup>   | 5.6 <sup>AB</sup>   | 5.7 <sup>AB</sup>   | 5.3 <sup>B</sup>   |                   |      |                 |         |             |

Abbreviations: AH: Alfalfa hay; MB: Maize-bran mixture. Means not sharing upper-case letters are significantly different ( $p<0.05$ ) among saponins levels, irrespective of substrates. Means not sharing lower-case letters differ significantly ( $p<0.05$ ) among saponins levels and substrates. SEM: Standard error of the mean.



**Fig. 2:** Effects of short-chain fatty acids (acetic, propionic and butyric) in mmol/L and methane production in mL/g DM of alfalfa hay (AH) and maize-bran mixture (MB) on an addition of increasing doses of quinoa saponins: Altiplano (AS), Quillahuaman (QS) and Salcedo (SS).



**Fig. 3:** Comparison of TDMD (%) and CH<sub>4</sub> to TDMD ratio (mL/100mg TDMD) in the AS, QS and SS saponin concentrates from *Chenopodium quinoa* at different inclusion levels containing AH and MB substrates.

## DISCUSSION

### Gas production and True Dry Matter Digestibility (TDMD)

Previous studies reported that saponins-rich plant extracts as feed additives in high-concentrate diets, with higher levels of non-fiber carbohydrates such as starch, increased gas production compared to a diet predominantly composed of forage (Jayanegara et al. 2020). For instance, the inclusion of *Camellia sinensis* saponin extracts in varying forage-to-concentrate ratios as substrates, demonstrated that higher gas production was achieved at a ratio of 30:70 (49.9 mL/200mg) compared to 70:30 (44.6mL/200mg) (Jadhav et al. 2018).

The gas produced during fermentation depends on the availability of carbohydrates, with lipids and proteins being less fermentable (Aderao et al. 2018). This can explain the higher gas production in the MB mixture compared to AH, as well as the non-significant effect ( $p>0.05$ ) on gas production when associated with quinoa saponin aqueous extracts of varying levels. Some triterpene saponins have the same behavior (Canul-Solis et al. 2020; Unnawong et al. 2021). Similarly, gas production did not vary when comparing 0.6mg/mL of saponins from the aqueous extract of *Yucca schidigera* in hay with the control (Makkar et al. 1998).

In relationship with digestibility, these results are consistent with the inclusion of purified saponins at a level of 0.21mg/mL, which did not affect TDMD (Bharathidhasan et al. 2013), suggesting that the saponins contained can improve nutrient degradability by increasing the microbial population as bacteria, protozoa and fungi zoospore (Matra et al. 2021). However, in the *in vitro* fermentation studies conducted by Makkar et al. (1998), it was reported that the addition of saponins resulted in a reduction in gas and SCFA production, while the extent of the truly degraded substrate remained unchanged or increased.

### Short Chain Fatty Acids (SCFAs)

The decrease in the molar concentration of acetate as saponin inclusion increases is consistent with the behavior of other similar saponins. For instance, at 0.9mg/mL, saponins from *Tribulus terrestris* were found to decrease acetate (Feng et al. 2012) and aqueous and ethanolic extracts of saponins from *Sapindus mukorosii* showed lower acetate concentrations at higher doses (Singh et al. 2020). Conversely, other *in vitro* studies using purified saponins at various levels (ranging from 1.55 to 6.20mg/30mL of inoculum) reported unaltered molar concentrations of acetic acid as observed with SS (Bharathidhasan et al. 2013). Similar studies involving saponin extracts, such as *Sesbania grandiflora* pod saponins (Unnawong et al. 2021), tea saponins (Liu et al. 2019) and *Tribulus terrestris* saponins (Feng et al. 2012), have also documented an increased proportion of propionate in an *in vitro* rumen fermentation study. Lower molar acetate and higher propionate molar concentrations could mean that the addition of saponins caused inhibitory effects on protozoa (Singh et al. 2020) and a shift in hydrogen direction from methanogenesis towards propionate production (Patra and Saxeda 2010; Rira et al. 2015).

Similar *in vitro* studies described a linear reduction in the acetate to propionate ratio for *Quillaja saponins* and *Gypsophilla saponins* (Castro-Montoya et al. 2011) that may be because of amphiphilic structure of saponins (Fleck et al. 2019). Some studies indicate concentration of butyrate using saponins extracts of *Sesbania grandiflora* decreased (Unnawong et al. 2021) and *Quillaja saponins* tend to decrease (Castro-Montoya et al. 2011). On the contrary, other researchers reported that when adding doses of saponins the molar concentration of butyrate remains similar in all their treatments (Patra et al. 2006). Two ways to explain the decrease in CH<sub>4</sub> are suggested, either there is a reduction in methanogen populations, which means a reduction in protozoa numbers (Singh et al. 2020), or there is a direct inhibitory effect on methanogenic archaea by

*Chenopodium quinoa* saponins, similar to the effect of *Sapindus saponaria* saponins (Patra and Saxena 2010). In general, the SCFAs values, using MB substrate are higher than those of AH, resulting in greater CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Fig. 2). The more soluble fraction contained in MB against AH could mean greater fermentable carbohydrates available for rumen microbes, which could lead to faster production of fatty acids (Matra et al. 2021).

### Methane

Budan et al. (2013) investigated the effect of *Chenopodium quinoa* hulls on methane production using a 70:30 ratio of dry ryegrass forage and wheat seeds, but their experiment was conducted at only one dose (0.4mg/mL), which did not result in significant differences compared to the control. Similarly, this study observed no significant effects at the same dose, but it was evident that quinoa saponins demonstrated a positive effect on methane mitigation at higher doses. Additionally, the literature reports on other natural sources of saponins, particularly those with triterpene structures that have been shown to inhibit CH<sub>4</sub> production. For example, 0.4mg/mL of saponins from *Camellia sinensis* reduced CH<sub>4</sub> production by 8% (Guo et al. 2008), 2mg/mL of saponins from *Sapindus rarak* DC inhibited CH<sub>4</sub> production by 4.6% to 16.2% (Jayanegara et al. 2020) and 120mg/g of crude saponins from *Sapindus saponaria* L. led to a 20% reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> compared to the control (Hess et al. 2003).

Many studies on CH<sub>4</sub> in ruminants point out that pure saponins or saponin extracts could have an inhibitory effect on CH<sub>4</sub> production, probably due to suppression of protozoan population and presumably the reduction of methanogen activity (Guo et al. 2008; Jadhav et al. 2018). Similarly, it was observed that the decrease in rumen CH<sub>4</sub> due to the inhibition of methanogens is attributed to the reduction of H<sub>2</sub>, leading to a lower concentration of acetate and a higher concentration of propionate (Li et al. 2024). Fermentation that produces acetate and butyrate generates more hydrogen, providing a substrate for methanogenic archaea that reduce CO<sub>2</sub> to produce CH<sub>4</sub> (Moss et al. 2000). This work obtained similar results to those observed with purified *Quillaja saponaria* saponins, which decreased by 21% (1.25mg/mL) (Castro-Montoya et al. 2011), suggesting that feed intake is an important predictor of methane emissions (Congio et al. 2022).

On the other hand, other researchers have indicated that increased digestibility leads to higher methane production per unit of DM intake. Furthermore, the observed methane emissions and nutrient composition of these substrates are consistent with studies reporting that a greater amount of fermentable carbohydrates is positively associated with CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. In contrast, lower fiber digestibility and the lack of impact from ether extract are negatively associated with methane emissions, primarily due to the respective increase or decrease in the hydrogen requirements by methanogenic microorganisms (Patra et al. 2016).

The reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> observed with the *in vitro* addition of aqueous quinoa saponin extracts is consistent with studies on other saponin sources, such as aqueous extracts of *Sapindus mukorossi* (Agarwal et al. 2006). Differences in methane emissions and other parameters

were observed among varieties of *Chenopodium quinoa* seeds, particularly with the SS extract. The saponin content in the powdered extract is influenced by the genetic diversity of quinoa, characterized by its wide range of accessions. This genetic diversity is a focus of research aimed at improving agro-industrial production, as demonstrated by the quinoa varieties used in this study (Apaza et al. 2013). The antimethanogenic response of these secondary metabolites is shaped by their genetic composition, which affects their antimicrobial activities and nutritional profiles, both of which are dependent on the plant's production and cultivation cycles (Rojas et al. 2016; Dong et al. 2020).

### Conclusion

The saponin extracts from *Chenopodium quinoa* by-products are potential inhibitors of methane emissions in an *in vitro* ruminal fermentation as feed additives, irrespective of substrates. According to the results, better antimethanogenic activity occurs with AS at 0.8mg/mL, that could modulate the fermentation parameters like SCFAs as well as the TDMD in favor of methane reduction. Beyond this, it is recommended to evaluate the ruminal microbial mass to complement the biological characterization of saponins in substrates before *in vivo* studies. Finally, the saponins extracts applied in this study are free of organic solvents, contributing not only to the reduction of greenhouse gases and the improvement of animal production systems but also to the valorization of solid residues.

**Acknowledgement:** María Cecilia Alegria Arnedo is grateful the Vice-Rectorate for Research of the Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina for the financial support for this research as part of a doctoral thesis.

**Author contributions:** M.C. Alegría-Arnedo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing-original draft, Visualization. C.A. Gómez-Bravo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-review & editing, resources, supervision, project administration. F.E. Quispe-Jacobo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-review & editing, resources

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Animal welfare statement:** The authors affirm that they have adhered to the ethical policies of the journal, as indicated on the journal's author guidelines page.

### REFERENCES

- Aderao GN, Sahoo A, Bhatt RS, Kumawat PK, Soni L, 2018. *In vitro* rumen fermentation kinetics, metabolite production, methane and substrate degradability of polyphenol rich plant leaves and their component complete feed blocks. J. of Animal Science and Technology 60:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40781-018-0184-6>
- Agarwal N, Kamra DN, Chaudhary LC and Patra AK, 2006. Effect of *Sapindus mukorossi* extracts on *in vitro* methanogenesis and fermentation characteristics in buffalo rumen liquor. Journal of Applied Animal Research 30(1): 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09712119.2006.9706814>



- Almeida AK, Hegarty RS and Cowie A, 2021. Meta-analysis quantifying the potential of dietary additives and rumen modifiers for methane mitigation in ruminant production systems. *Animal Nutrition* 7(4): 1219-1230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aninu.2021.09.005>
- AOAC, 2005. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, 15th ed.; Association of Official Analytical Chemists: Arlington, VA, USA.
- Apaza MV, Cáceres Sanizo G, Estrada Zúniga R and Pinedo Taco RE, 2013. Catálogo de variedades comerciales de quinua en el Perú. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12955/76>
- Balasundram SK, Shamshiri RR, Sridhara S and Rizan N, 2023. The role of digital agriculture in mitigating climate change and ensuring food security: an overview. *Sustainability* 15(6): 5325. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065325>
- Bharathidhasan A, Viswanathan K, Balakrishnan V, Valli C, Ramesh S and Senthilkumar SMA, 2013. Effects of purified saponin on rumen methanogenesis and rumen fermentation characteristics studied using in vitro gas production technique. *International Journal of Veterinary Science* (2): 44-49 <https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/20133278936>
- Budan A, Freuze I, Bellenot D, Wident M, Fievez V, Tessier N, Gillmann L, Chicoteau P, Richomme P and Guilet D, 2013. Potential of extracts from saponin-containing plants to decrease in vitro methane and ammonia productions in ruminants. *Emissions of Gas and Dust from Livestock* 182 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259224853>
- Bodas R, Prieto N, García-González R, Andrés S, Giráldez FJ and López S, 2012. Manipulation of rumen fermentation and methane production with plant secondary metabolites. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 176(1-4): 78-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2012.07.010>
- Canul-Solis J, Campos-Navarrete M, Piñeiro-Vázquez A, Casanova-Lugo F, Barros-Rodríguez M, Chay-Canul A, Cárdenas-Medina J and Castillo-Sánchez L, 2020. Mitigation of rumen methane emissions with foliage and pods of tropical trees. *Animals* 10(5):843. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10050843>
- Castro-Montoya JM, Makkar HPS and Becker K, 2011. Chemical composition of rumen microbial fraction and fermentation parameters as affected by tannins and saponins using an in vitro rumen fermentation system. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science* 91(3):433-448. <https://doi.org/10.4141/cjas2010-028>
- Congio GF, Bannink A, Mayorga OL, Rodrigues JP, Bougouin A, Kebreab E, Carvalho P, Abdalla A, Monteiro A, Ku Vera J, Gere J, Gómez C and Hristov AN, 2022. Prediction of enteric methane production and yield in sheep using a Latin America and Caribbean database. *Livestock Science* 264: 105036. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2022.105036>
- Dhanasekaran DK, Dias-Silva TP, Filho ALA, Sakita GZ, Abdalla AL, Louvandini H and Elghandour MM, 2020. Plants extract and bioactive compounds on rumen methanogenesis. *Agroforestry Systems* 94: 1541-1553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-019-00411-6>
- Dong S, Yang X, Zhao L, Zhang F, Hou Z and Xue P, 2020. Antibacterial activity and mechanism of action saponins from *Chenopodium quinoa* Willd. husks against foodborne pathogenic bacteria. *Industrial Crops and Products* 149: 112350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2020.112350>
- El Hazzam K, Mhada M, Metougui ML, El Kacimi K, Sobeh M, Taourirte M and Yasri A, 2022. Box-Behnken Design: Wet Process Optimization for Saponins Removal from *Chenopodium quinoa* Seeds and the Study of Its Effect on Nutritional Properties. *Frontiers in Nutrition* 9: 906592. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.906592>
- El Hazzam K, Hafsa J, Sobeh M, Mhada M, Taourirte M, El Kacimi K and Yasri A, 2020. An insight into saponins from Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd): A review. *Molecules* 25(5): 1059. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules25051059>
- FAO, 2023. *Pathways towards lower emissions – A global assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation options from livestock agrifood systems*. Rome. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc9029en>
- Feng Z, Cao Y, Gao Y, Li Q and Li J, 2012. Effect of Gross Saponin of *Tribulus terrestris* on ruminal fermentation and methane production in vitro. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances* 11(12): 2121-2125. <https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/20123274543>
- Fleck JD, Betti AH, Da Silva FP, Troian EA, Olivaro C, Ferreira F and Verza SG, 2019. Saponins from *Quillaja saponaria* and *Quillaja brasiliensis*: particular chemical characteristics and biological activities. *Molecules* 24(1): 171. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24010171>
- Guo YQ, Liu JX, Lu Y, Zhu WY, Denman SE and McSweeney CS, 2008. Effect of tea saponin on methanogenesis, microbial community structure and expression of mcrA gene, in cultures of rumen micro-organisms. *Letters in Applied Microbiology* 47(5): 421-426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2008.02459.x>
- Guzmán BL, Cruz D, Alvarado JA and Mollinedo P, 2013. Cuantificación de saponinas en muestras de cañihua *Chenopodium pallidicaule* aellen. *Revista Boliviana de Química* 30(2): 131-136. [http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S0250-54602013000200004&script=sci\\_arttext](http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S0250-54602013000200004&script=sci_arttext)
- Hess H, Kreuzer M, Díaz T, Lascano C, Carulla J, Soliva C and Machmüller A, 2003. Saponin rich tropical fruits affect fermentation and methanogenesis in faunated and defaunated rumen fluid. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 109 (1): 79-94. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401\(03\)00212-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401(03)00212-8)
- Jadhav RV, Kannan A, Bhar R, Sharma OP, Gulati A, Rajkumar K and Verma MR, 2018. Effect of tea (*Camellia sinensis*) seed saponins on in vitro rumen fermentation, methane production and true digestibility at different forage to concentrate ratios. *Journal of Applied Animal Research* 46(1): 118-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09712119.2016.1270823>
- Jayanegara A, Yogiarto Y, Wina E, Sudarman A, Kondo M, Obitsu T and Kreuzer M, 2020. Combination effects of plant extracts rich in tannins and saponins as feed additives for mitigating in vitro ruminal methane and ammonia formation. *Animals* 10(9): 1531. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10091531>
- Jafari S, Ebrahimi M, Goh YM, Rajion MA, Jahromi MF and Al-Jumaili WS, 2019. Manipulation of rumen fermentation and methane gas production by plant secondary metabolites (saponin, tannin and essential oil)—a review of ten-year studies. *Annals of Animal Science* 19(1): 3-29. <https://doi.org/10.2478/aoas-2018-0037>
- Kholif AE, 2023. A review of effect of saponins on ruminal fermentation, health and performance of ruminants. *Veterinary Sciences* 10(7): 450. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci10070450>
- Kinley RD, Tan S, Turnbull J, Askew S and Roque BM, 2021. Changing the proportions of grass and grain in feed substrate impacts the efficacy of *Asparagopsis taxiformis* to inhibit methane production in vitro. *American Journal of Plant Sciences* 12(12): 1835-1858. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2021.1212128>
- Kuljanabagavad T and Wink M, 2009. Biological activities and chemistry of saponins from *Chenopodium quinoa* Willd. *Phytochemistry Reviews* 8: 473-490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11101-009-9121-0>
- Ku-Vera JC, Jiménez-Ocampo R, Valencia-Salazar SS, Montoya-Flores MD, Molina-Botero IC, Arango J, Gómez-Bravo CA, Aguilar-Pérez CF and Solorio-Sánchez FJ, 2020. Role of secondary plant metabolites on enteric methane mitigation in ruminants. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 7: 584. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.00584>

- Li Q, Ma Z, Huo J, Zhang X, Wang R, Zhang S, Jiao J, Dong X, Janssen P, Ungerfeld E, Greening C, Tan Z and Wang M, 2024. Distinct microbial hydrogen and reductant disposal pathways explain interbreed variations in ruminant methane yield. *The ISME Journal* 18(1): <https://doi.org/10.1093/ismejo/wrad016>
- Liu Y, Gu M, Yin Q and Wu G, 2019. Inhibition mitigation and ecological mechanism of mesophilic methanogenesis triggered by supplement of ferroferric oxide in sulfate-containing systems. *Bioresource Technology* 288: 121546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.121546>
- Lozano M, Ticona E, Carrasco C, Flores Y and Almanza GR, 2012. Cuantificación de saponinas en residuos de quinua real *Chenopodium quinoa* Willd. *Revista Boliviana de Química* 29(2): 131-138. [http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S0250-54602012000200002&script=sci\\_arttext](http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S0250-54602012000200002&script=sci_arttext)
- Makkar HP and Vercoe PE, 2007. *Measuring methane production from ruminants*. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-4020-6133-2>
- Makkar HP, Sen S, Blümmel M and Becker K, 1998. Effects of fractions containing saponins from *Yucca schidigera*, *Quillaja saponaria*, and *Acacia auriculiformis* on rumen fermentation. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 46(10): 4324-4328. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf980269q>
- Matra M, Totakul P and Wanapat M, 2021. Utilization of dragon fruit waste by-products and non-protein nitrogen source: Effects on in vitro rumen fermentation, nutrients degradability and methane production. *Livestock Science* 243: 104386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2020.104386>
- Mauricio RM, Owen E, Mould FL, Givens I, Theodorou MK, France J, Davies DR and Dhanoa MS, 2001. Comparison of bovine rumen liquor and bovine faeces as inoculum for an in vitro gas production technique for evaluating forages. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 89(1-2): 33-48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401\(00\)00234-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401(00)00234-0)
- Molina-Botero IC, Mazabel J, Arceo-Castillo J, Urrea-Benítez JL, Olivera-Castillo L, Barahona-Rosales R, Chirinda N, Ku-Vera J and Arango J, 2020. Effect of the addition of *Enterolobium cyclocarpum* pods and *Gliricidia sepium* forage to *Brachiaria brizantha* on dry matter degradation, volatile fatty acid concentration, and in vitro methane production. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 52: 2787-2798. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-020-02324-4>
- Moss AR, Jouany JP and Newbold J, 2000. Methane production by ruminants: its contribution to global warming. *Annales de Zootechnie* 49(3): 231-253. <https://doi.org/10.1051/animres:2000119>
- Notarnicola B, Spizzirri UG, Renzulli PA, Astuto F, Di Capua R, De Molfetta M and Fosco D, 2023. Regionalized estimates of enteric methane emissions from cattle raised in Italian territory. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1269(1): 012028. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1269/1/012028>
- Öztürk H and Gur G, 2021. Rumen physiology: Microorganisms, fermentation and manipulation. *Ankara Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi* 68(4): 423-434. <https://doi.org/10.33988/auvfd.960447>
- Patra AK and Saxena J, 2010. A new perspective on the use of plant secondary metabolites to inhibit methanogenesis in the rumen. *Phytochemistry* 71(11-12): 1198-1222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2010.05.010>
- Patra AK, Lahlhriatpuii M and Debnath BC, 2016. Predicting enteric methane emission in sheep using linear and non-linear statistical models from dietary variables. *Animal Production Science* 56(3): 574-584. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15505>
- Patra AK, Kamra DN and Agarwal N, 2006. Effect of plant extracts on in vitro methanogenesis, enzyme activities and fermentation of feed in rumen liquor of buffalo. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 128(3-4): 276-291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2005.11.001>
- Rira M, Chentli A, Boufenera S and Boussebous H, 2015. Effects of plants containing secondary metabolites on ruminal methanogenesis of sheep in vitro. *Energy Procedia* 74: 15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2015.07.513>
- Rojas W, Vargas Mena A and Pinto Porcel M, 2016. La diversidad genética de la quinua: potenciales usos en el mejoramiento y agroindustria. *Revista de Investigación e Innovación Agropecuaria y de Recursos Naturales* 3(2): 114-124. [http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S2409-16182016000200001&script=sci\\_arttext](http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S2409-16182016000200001&script=sci_arttext)
- Singh RK, Dey A, Paul SS, Singh M, Dahiya SS and Punia BS, 2020. Associative effects of plant secondary metabolites in modulating in vitro methanogenesis, volatile fatty acids production and fermentation of feed in buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*). *Agroforestry Systems* 94: 1555-1566. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-019-00395-3>
- Sun X, Yang X, Xue P, Zhang Z and Ren G, 2019. Improved antibacterial effects of alkali-transformed saponin from quinoa husks against halitosis-related bacteria. *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine* 19: 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12906-019-2455-2>
- Tedeschi LO, Muir JP, Naumann HD, Norris AB, Ramírez-Restrepo CA and Mertens-Talcott SU, 2021. Nutritional aspects of ecologically relevant phytochemicals in ruminant production. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 8: 628445. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2021.628445>
- Theodorou MK, Williams BA, Dhanoa MS, McAllan AB and France J, 1994. A simple gas production method using a pressure transducer to determine the fermentation kinetics of ruminant feeds. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 48(3-4): 185-197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401\(94\)90171-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8401(94)90171-6)
- Tongwane MI and Moeletsi ME, 2020. Emission factors and carbon emissions of methane from enteric fermentation of cattle produced under different management systems in South Africa. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 265: 121931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121931>
- Tucker CB, MacNeil MD and Webster AB, 2020. *Guide for the care and use of agricultural animals in research and teaching*. American Dairy Science Association, American Society of Animal Science, Poultry Science Association.
- Tyagi N, Mishra DB, Vinay VV and Kumar S, 2022. Feasible Strategies for Enteric Methane Mitigation from Dairy Animals. *Animal Manure: Agricultural and Biotechnological Applications* 335-354. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97291-2\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97291-2_19)
- Unnawong N, Cherdthong A and So S, 2021. Crude saponin extract from *Sesbania grandiflora* (L.) Pers pod meal could modulate ruminal fermentation, and protein utilization, as well as mitigate methane production. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 53: 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-021-02644-z>
- Van Soest PV, Robertson JB and Lewis BA, 1991. Methods for dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. *Journal of Dairy Science* 74(10): 3583-3597. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(91\)78551-2](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(91)78551-2)
- Vega OS and Watanabe WR, 2016. Analysis of the Law 30407" Law on Animal Protection and Welfare" in Peru. *Revista de Investigaciones Veterinarias del Perú* 27(2): 388-396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15381/rivep.v27i2.11664>