Comparison of different cereal grains for hydroponic fodder production in locally constructed polyhouse at Khumaltar, Lalitpur, Nepal
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INTRODUCTION

Ruminant livestock farming in peri-urban areas is growing rapidly in Nepal. There is, however, a serious problem with the availability of quality fodder on a year-round basis in those urban peripheries, for commercial ruminant farms. Most of these dairy farmers are adopting straw-based concentrate-supplemented feeding systems; which are neither healthy for those high productive animals nor cost-effective to the farmers.

Hydroponic fodder production technology is being adopted by the ruminant farmers of urban and peri-urban area where the land is limited. It is best suited to land and time-scarce and areas suffering from chronic water shortages or in areas where irrigation infrastructure is difficult (Bakshi, 2018). Recently, hydroponic fodder production technology to grow nutritious and quality fodder within one to two weeks on a year-round basis under closed enclosure in a controlled condition (i.e. temperature and relative humidity) has been
developed and being quite popular among the peri-urban farmers in Nepal. Internalizing its importance, this technology is now promoted by Government in Nepal (NAFLQML, 2019).

This fodder production system helps to get regular green fodder to supplement to the crop residues and improve feeding value in the diets. Further, hydroponic fodder help to replace the expensive concentrate feed that ultimately helps to the reduction of the existing cost of milk production (Upreti et al., 2021).

There are several cereal crops selected as suitable for hydroponic fodder production with different yield potentials in the reports. Some of them are barley (Reddy et al., 1988), oat and wheat (Snow et al., 2008), sorghum, alfa-alfa and cowpea (Karki et al., 2012) and maize (Naik et al., 2011; Naik et al., 2014). Studies have proved that the nutrient contents and digestibility of hydroponic fodders are superior to certain common cereal and leguminous fodder such as berseem and clover in terms of nutrients availability such as OM, CP, EE and NFE content (Reddy et al., 1988; Pandey & Pathak, 1991; Naik et al., 2012). The need of alternative ways to grow fodder for farm animals has been realized to support animals during both normal feeding and emergency feeding (Sneath & McIntosh, 2003, Naik et al., 2011). Therefore, this study was performed to evaluate the different cereal species for better fodder yield, nutrient composition and cost of production under hydroponic fodder production technology.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was carried out in a newly established polyhouse at National Pasture and Fodder Research Program, Khumaltar, Lalitpur, Nepal during July 2017 and July 2018.

Establishment of Poly house

A polyhouse was constructed in a 3.65 m length, 2.43 m width and 2.74 m height dimensions at National Pasture and Fodder Research Program, Khumaltar, NARC. The racks in three tiers were established inside to place the experimental trays. Antifungal tray of size of 0.75 m long and 0.37 m width were provisioned inside the polyhouse. The trays were used to spread germinated seeds of maize, oat and wheat for growing fodder with root mat. The automatic fogger was used for maintaining the relative humidity (90%) and for irrigation.

Experimental design and crop management

The experiment was executed in the Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with three treatments and 12 replications. The seed of maize, oat and wheat were used as the treatments. A tray was used as an experimental unit.

Clean and unbroken seeds of maize were soaked in tap water for overnight and then kept in jute sack for two days. Germinated seeds were placed in antifungal trays kept in the racks of inside the polyhouse.

Field observations

Morphological characteristics of the plants from different cereals were recorded. Plant height and leaf colour data were recorded from randomly selected 5 plants within 20*20 cm quadrate used in tray. Growth parameters of the foders were measured and recorded daily. The color patterns of the leaves were recorded by the visual observation of group of scientists with the use of 9-scale hedonic table.
The plants were allowed to grow for 10 days until it reaches to the height of 20-30 cm and harvested on 11 days after sowing (DAS). Hydroponic fodder, a mat of germinated seeds, embedded in their white roots and green shoots was produced. The samples of green fodder were taken on the eleventh day in order to determine the dry matter and nutrient contents. Hydroponic fodder within 20 cm × 20 cm quadrate used in a tray were harvested with mat to calculate the fodder yield.

**Laboratory analysis**

The samples of hydroponic fodder were analyzed in the laboratory of the National Animal Nutrition Research Center, Khumaltar, Lalitpur, Nepal. The dry matter (DM) was estimated by using the continuous heating method. Crude protein fraction of the sample was analyzed by using AOAC protocol (AOAC, 1980) and fiber fractions were analyzed by using Georing and Van Soest protocol (Georing and Van Soest, 1970).

**Economics of hydroponic maize fodder**

The costs of production of hydroponic fodders from different cereals were calculated by using the Partial Budgeting Method. The cost of each expense was recorded and the cost of hydroponic fodder production was calculated.

**Data analysis**

All the collected data were processed and ANOVA was used to analyze the data. Mean comparison of the treatments was done by using Tukey’s test. Statistical software GenStat discovery 18th Edition (VSNi, 2015) was used to analyze the data. The cost of production was calculated manually.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Morphological characters of Hydroponic fodder of major cereals grains**

The plant height varied significantly (P<0.001) for the hydroponic fodder from different cereal grains (Table 1). The mean plant height of hydroponic oat fodder (HOF) recorded as 27.11 cm was higher than that of hydroponic wheat fodder (HWF, 25.03 cm) and hydroponic maize fodder (HMF, 21.77 cm). Leaf colour was yellow green for all the cereals. The hydroponics fodder looks like a mat at the end of the germination period of about 8 days consisting of germinated seeds embedded in their white roots and green shoots (Snow et al., 2008; Naik et al., 2014).

**Table 1. Morphological characters of hydroponic fodders from different cereal grains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Plant height (cm)</th>
<th>Leaf color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>Yellow Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oat</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>Yellow Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>Yellow Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>F-test ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>CV% 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: Standard error of mean, LSD: Least significant difference, CV: Coefficient of Variation, ***P<0.001

**Fodder yield**

The year effect was obtained as non-significant (p>0.001) in the fodder yield of different cereal grains. In the combined analysis of both year data, the fodder yield varied significantly.
(P<0.05) for hydroponic fodders of different cereal grains (Table 2). Oat produced better fodder yield compared to wheat and maize.

Several authors reported that the fresh yield and DM contents of the hydroponic fodder are mainly influenced by the type of crops, days of harvest, degree of drainage of free water prior to weighing, type and quality of seed, seed rate, seed treatment, water quality, pH, irrigation frequencies, light, growing period, temperature, humidity, clean and hygienic condition of the greenhouses (Trubey & Otos, 1969; Sneath and McIntosh, 2003; Dung et al., 2010, Fazelietal, 2011). Accordingly, cereal species had also shown differences in fodder yield, fodder quality, and cost of production in the present experiment. From the perspective of higher fodder yield, oat seeds produced the highest hydroponic fodder. In the experiment, one kg of maize grain produced 5.32 kg of fresh fodder yield in the case of HMF which was lower than the report of Naik et al. 2015 (8-10 kg). Sneath and McIntosh (2003) reported that oat grain gives 5.5 times fresh yield in 7 days and maize grains produce 3.5-6 times fresh yield in 7 days. In line with these reports, each kg of oat and maize seed yielded 7.96 and 5.32 kg of fresh fodders in 11 days in the experiment.

Table 2. Hydroponic fodder yield of different cereals grains at Khumaltar, Lalitpur, Nepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Yield (kg from per kg cereals grain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oat</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: Standard error of mean, LSD: Least significant difference, CV: Coefficient of Variation, ***P<0.001

Nutrient composition of Hydroponic Fodder

The fodder DM content was higher for HWF and HOF in comparison to HMF (Table 3). HWF had shown better CP content than HOF and HMF, but contained lower fractions of Calcium (Ca) and was high in Acid Detergent Lignin (ADL). Modest CP and ADL content and better Ca contents were found in HOF. Better fiber fractions with lower NDF, ADF and ADL contents were found in HMF.

Table 3. Nutrient composition of hydroponic fodder from different cereals grains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient composition (%)</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Oat</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry matter</td>
<td>12.55 (2.05)</td>
<td>14.13 (0.71)</td>
<td>14.49 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein</td>
<td>12.51 (0.83)</td>
<td>13.96 (2.08)</td>
<td>16.16 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral detergent fiber</td>
<td>37.49 (3.68)</td>
<td>60.22 (2.86)</td>
<td>62.72 (6.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid detergent fiber</td>
<td>12.58 (1.83)</td>
<td>32.63 (2.03)</td>
<td>29.63 (2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid detergent lignin</td>
<td>3.78 (0.96)</td>
<td>7.72 (0.62)</td>
<td>8.17 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>2.41 (0.22)</td>
<td>2.88 (0.74)</td>
<td>2.19 (0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.3 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.35 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM: Standard error of mean

Several authors reported that the nutrient contents of hydroponics fodder are superior to certain common non-leguminous fodders, but comparable to leguminous fodder in terms of available organic matter, CP, ether extract and nitrogen-free extract content (Reddy et al., 2014; Pandey & Pathak, 1991; Naik et al., 2012). In the experiment, the CP content of the HMF was lower than the values reported by other authors (13.57% and 13.75% by Naik et
al., 2015; Adebiyi et al., 2018, respectively). But, HOF and HWF had yielded better CP content than those reports. Although the HWF had better CP content, higher ADL content may retard its fodder quality. Moreover, Naik et al. (2015) reported that the increase in the content of CF, NDF and ADF; and decrease in the nitrogen-free extract and non-fibrous carbohydrate may be attributed to the increase in the number and size of cell walls for the synthesis of structural carbohydrates (cellulose and hemicellulose). The HOF produced a modest fodder yield with good quality in the experiment.

**Per unit cost of production**
The cost of production per kg of fodder was recorded the lowest (NPR 18.76) for HWF (Table 4). The production cost of per kg HOF was highest (NPR 24.67). The cost expensed for a kg of HMF was NPR 20.67.

Per kg cost of production of all the fodders were higher in the experiment compared to other experiments conducted in India. The production cost of per kg of HMF found by Naik et al. (2013), Jemimah et al. (2015) and Gunasekaran et al. (2017) were NPR 5.60, NPR 3.00 and NPR 4.50, respectively. It was due to the lower cost of labor, seed, and electricity in those experiments. This denotes that the production costs of hydroponic fodders vary with the locations, market price, and accessibility. Gunasekaran et al. (2017) reported that even though hydroponic fodder is costlier, it can be effectively utilized for feeding animals during adverse situations such as drought, flooding, and cold wave at a reasonable cost.

| Table 4. Per unit production cost of hydroponic fodders from different cereal crops |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Input                          | HMF (NPR/kg) | HOF (NPR/kg) | HWF (NPR/kg) |
| Fixed Cost                     | 0.84      | 0.84      | 0.84      |
| Operational Cost               |           |           |           |
| Seed                           | 6.02      | 10.05     | 4.14      |
| Electricity                    | 0.25      | 0.25      | 0.25      |
| Labor                          | 13.53     | 13.53     | 13.53     |
| Total cost                     | 20.64     | 24.67     | 18.76     |

**CONCLUSION**
The productivity of hydroponic fodder was highest for oat whereas the fodder quality was modest. Wheat produced the best quality fodder with a modest fodder yield. The maize produces a lower fodder yield but with some good digestibility bearing quality parameters. The study revealed that oat is better for fodder yield with modest quality fodder and wheat is better for better quality fodder with modest yield.
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