EFFECT OF PRE-FERMENTED JUİCE, *LACTOBACİLLUS PLANTARUM* AND *LACTOBACİLLUS BUCHNERİ* ON THE FERMENTATİON CHARACTERİSTİCS AND AEROBİC STABİLİTY OF HİGH DRY MATTER ALFALFA BALE SİLAGE

F. Koc[1], S. Ozturk Aksoy[1], A. Agma Okur[1], G. Celikyurt[2], D. Korucu[2], M. L. Ozduven[1]

[1] Faculty of Agricultural, Department of Animal Science, University Namik Kemal, Tekirdag, Turkey
[2] Faculty of Agricultural, Deparment of Food Engineering, University of Namik Kemal Tekirdag, Turkey
Corresponding author e-mail address: fkoc@nku.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted to investigate the effects of pre-fermented juice (PFJ), *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium* (LP), and *Lactobacillus buchneri* (LB) on the fermentation characteristics and aerobic stability of alfalfa bale silage. The herbage was wilted to 602.3 g/kg dry matter (DM). Treatments of alfalfa silage included (1) control; (2) PJF: 2.6×10^5 colony-forming units (cfu/g); (3) LP: 1.0×10^6 cfu/g *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium (*Pioneer 1188, USA) and (4) LB: 1.0×10^6 cfu/g *Lactobacillus buchneri* (Pioneer 11A44) and baled, 150 days. At the end of the ensiling period, three bales of each treatment group were opened and chemical and microbiological analyses were made. Consequently, Lactic acid bacteria inoculants and PFJ increased the quality of alfalfa silages. In terms of aerobic stability, PFJ and LP used had a positive effect on CO_2 concentrations coliform bacteria and yeast. Also, LB inoculant decreased NDF content and increased *in vitro* organic matter digestibility of silages. A total number of 15 representatives of lactic acid bacterial strains were retained and among them 3 dominant genus were identified as *Lactobacillus plantarum (*46.66%), *Lactobacillus pentosaceus (*33.33%) and *Lactobacillus collinoides (*20%). It can be concluded that PFJ can be used as silage additive alfalfa bale silage in farm condition.

Keywords: Alfalfa bale silage; identification; *in vitro* organic matter digestibility; lactic acid bacterial inoculants: PFJ (pre fermented juice).

INTRODUCTION

Ensiling has been known as a method to preserve the moist crops by controlling anaerobic fermentation (Bureenok *et al.* 2005). The success of the ensiling can be achieved when the number of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) is dominant in the fermentation, and the activity of clostridia is restricted. Therefore, an inoculation of LAB in the ensiling process has been recommended in order to make good quality silage.

The concept of using a microbial inoculant for silage involves adding fast-growing homofermentative LAB in order to dominate the fermentation, thereby producing higher quality silage. The most common homofermentative inoculant is *Lactobacillus plantarum.* It is generally considered that $1x10^6$ viable inoculant cells per gram is sufficient for bacterial additives to overwhelm the epiphytic LAB and predominant population in the silage (Gollop *et al*. 2005). In addition to *L. plantarum,* other *Lactobacillus* or *Pediococcus* species may be employed and *Enterococcus faecium* is also frequently used (*D*unière *et al*. 2013). Recently, in order to improve the aerobic stability and reduce fermentation losses of silage, heterofermentative LAB species, such as *Lactobacillus buchneri* was developed as silage additives (Keles and Demirci 2011, Arriola *et al*. 2011). Also, many researchers have reported that manipulating numbers of the epiphytic LAB can be improved by using fermented juice of epiphytic LAB (FJLB) as a silage additive obtained by macerating crop silage with water and anaerobic incubating for 2 days (Denek *et al*. 2011, Denek *et al.* 2012*,* Bureenok *et al*. 2012). It is natural, easy to prepare and have promising affects as a silage additive.

Commercial LAB inoculants contain one or more of these bacteria that have been selected for their ability to dominate the fermentation process (Widyastuti 2008). However, the properties of a bacterial strain vary even within the same species, and some strains are not effective in improving fermentative quality of silage as well (Woolford and Sawczyc 1984). However, inoculants sometimes do not improve silage quality because of limited substrates in the material crop, and because the inoculant strain does not grow well on the target crop.

It is well known that epiphytic LAB play a major role in natural silage fermentation, and their numbers become a significant factor in predicting the adequacy of silage fermentation and determining whether or not to apply bacterial inoculants to silage materials (Kozaki *et al.* 1992). However, from the silage fermentation and microbiological point of view, we know of no information available on the LAB composition of silage prepared, and the influence of epiphytic LAB from silage on fermentation quality. Therefore, the present

study set out to screen, isolate and identify the LAB colonizing silages prepared on farm conditions. In order to evaluate the relationships between natural populations of LAB and silage quality, the fermentation characteristics and chemical composition of silage samples were also studied.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Silage preparatioon: A second-cut alfalfa (*Medicago sativa L.)* was harvested at approximately 10% bloom mower conditioner on 10 June 2013. Cutting was carried out with a mower conditioner with flails (Kverneland Taarup 347; Kverneland, Nykoping, Sweden) and wilted for 24 h to a DM content of around 602.3 g/kg). There was no rainfall during harvesting and drying conditions were considered excellent. After wilting, fresh matter (FM) samples were taken from the field and the crop was baled with a high-density baler (Orkel GP 1260 Orkel AS, Fannrem, Norway; bale size 90x100 cm; cut length: 8-12 cm; bale colour: white).

Inoculants were supplied as freeze-dried powders by Pioneer (USA). The number of viable bacteria in the inoculants was determined by enumeration of diluted suspensions on DeMan±Rogosa±Sharpe (MRS) agar (Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK). The additive treatments were as followes: no additive (control treatment); PJF: additional at a therotical application rate of 2.6×10^5 colony-forming units (cfu/g); LP: 1.0×10^6 cfu/g *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium (*Pioneer 1188, USA) and LB: *Lactobacillus buchneri* (Pioneer 11A44). Additives were applied during baling with two nozzles attached to the baler pick up frame, pointing at the swath and spreading the additive on the crop as it was collected by the pick-up. All additives were applied at 2 L per ton FM. The bales were wrapped in 6 layers of 0.025 mm thick and 750 mm wide white plastic film (Trio Wrap, Trioplast AB, Sweden). Each bale was weighed (720-894 kg on fresh weight basis) and sampled to measure DM yield. The wrapped bales were weighed immediately and transferred to an open storage yard about 250m away with a clutch fork which picked the bales at both sides. Bales were prepared and stored outdoor at the feeding center. Ambient high temperatures were 25-28 °C in spring and 33-36 °C in summer. A total of 16 bales ensiled for 150 days.

Preperation of PFJ's: PFJ was prepared according to the method described by Masuko *et al*. (2002). For this purpose, 200 g plant material was macerated with 1000 ml distilled water for 2 min in a high-speed blender. The macerate was filtered through two layers of cheesecloth, and aliquots of filtrate were collected in glass bottles to which molasses was added at 3 g per 100 mL(w/v) filtrate. These bottles were fitted with a gas trap and kept in a incubator for 48 h at 30°C.

Aerobic stability: All of the treatment silages at 150 days were subjected to an aerobic stability test in four 2L polyethylene terepthalate bottles for treatment at room temperature (25°C), which lasted for 5 days by the procedure of Ashbell *et al*. (1991).The system was constructed in two parts from recycled soft drink bottles (polyethylene terepthalate): the upper part (1 L) was filled with about 250 g (wet weight) of loosely packed silage, and the lower part with 100 ml of 20% KOH. Gas was exchanged through 1 cm holes in the upper part. Carbon dioxide produced during aerobic exposure was absorbed in the base and determined by titration with 1 N HCL. In addition, change in pH, yeast and mould counts served as indicators of aerobic spoilage. Chemical and microbiological analyses were carried out on the silage samples, initially and after 5 d exposure to air. Visual appraisal of the samples exposed to air was performed by a panel of 3 according to the extent of mould cover, texture and their odour. The panel evaluation was converted into a numeric scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being good quality silage with no apparent moulding and 5 being completely moulded samples (Filya and Sucu 2007). Visual appraisal is expressed using a scale of 1-5 where 1: good quality silage with no visible moulding, 2: a few small mould spots, 3: scattered mould spots, 4: silage with partially covered moulds, lumpy silage, 5: completely mould covered samples, unpleasant odour and silage particles sticking together.

Analytical analysis: Chemical analyses were performed on triplicate samples. Dry matter (DM) was determined by oven drying for 48 h. The pH in fresh material and silage samples was measured according to the British Standard method (Anonymous 1986). The ammonia nitrogen (NH_3-N) content of silages was determined, according to Anonymous (1986). The WSC content of silages was determined by spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV-1201, Kyoto, Japan); after reaction with antron reagent (Thomas 1977). LA was determined by the spectrophotometric method (Koc and Coskuntuna 2003).

Crude protein (CP), ash and crude fiber (CF) were determined following the procedure of Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC 1990). Neutral detergent fiber (NDF) and acid detergent fiber (ADF) and acid detergent lignin (ADL) were analyzed according to the method of Van Soest (1982). Cellulose was calculated as the difference between ADF and ADL. *In vitro* organic matter (OM) digestibilities were estimated according to Aufrère and Michalet-Doreau (1988), with a three-stage technique: Pre-treatment with pepsin in hydrochloric acid (0.2% pepsin in 0.1 N HCl), starch hydrolysis, attack by cellulase (Onozuka R 10 from *Trichoderma viride*, Merck).

Microbiological analysis: For the quantitative microbial analysis, an aseptically weighed 10 g sample of g fresh matter or silage was suspended in 90 ml of

physiological saline containing 0.1% peptone and homogenized. The samples were analysed for counts of LAB (MRS agar, Oxoid; 30˚C, 3 days, anaerobic incubation), aerobic mesophilic bacteria (Plate Count Agar, Difco; 30˚C, 3 days), clostridia (SFP Agar Base, Difco; 37˚C, 2 days, anaerobic incubation), as well as yeasts and moulds were determined by pour plating in malt extract agar (Oxoid CM59) that had been acidified, after autoclaving, by the addition of 85% lactic acid at a concentration of 0.5% vol/vol. Plates were incubated aerobically at 32˚C for 48 to 72 h (Seale *et al.* 1990).

Morphological, physiological and biochemical tests: Morphological characteristics and Gram staining of LAB were examined after 24 h incubation on MRS agar. Catalase activity and gas production from glucose were determined by the methods of Temiz (2008). Carbonhydrate fermentation tests were carried out with the Analytical Profile Index (API 50 CH) strips (bioMerieux, Tokyo, Japan) of 49 different compounds and one control, according to the manufacturer's instructions, and reactions were determined after incubation at 30˚C for 48 h (Lopez-Diaz *et al*. 2000).

Statistical analysis: Statistical analysis of the silage chemical analysis results included a one-way analysis of variance and Duncan's multiple range test performed with the Statistical Analysis System (2005) Software (SAS, Cary, NC).

RESULTS

The chemical and microbiological composition of the alfalfa forages prior to ensiling are summarized in Table 1. The fresh alfalfa contained 602.3, 181.9, and 42 g/ kg DM, CP, and WSC, respectively, and the pH was 5.75. The log numbers of colony forming unit (cfu)/ g FM of LAB and yeasts in the fresh material were 3.52 and 2.47, respectively. The pH and LAB counts of the PFJ were found 6.03 and 5.39 $\log_{10}$ cfu/g FM, respectively.

The chemical composition of the ensiled alfalfa silages are given in Table 2. The pH of all silages was lower than the fresh alfalfa. During fermentation, significant difference was observed between, the pH values of control and treatment silages ($P<0.05$). LP and LB treatment significiantly improved fermentation parameters in alfalfa silages with reduced pH ($P<0.05$) and an increased LA level ($P<0.01$) being notable. In the experiment, the WSCs in all silages decreased with the decrease in pH. PFJ treatment had significantly lower WSCs compared with control and LAB treatments. No significant differences were observed between the control and additived silages with regard to DM and NH_3-N ($P>0.05$).

The microbiological composition of the alfalfa silage is given in Table 3. The addition of PFJ and LAB inoculant had no influence on TMB, LAB and mold and yeast numbers of the silages. No differences were detected among treatments for microbiological composition.

Table 4 presents fiber composition, CP, CF and ash content of the ensiled alfalfa after 150 days. No differences were detected among treatments for ADF, ADL, and CF. Some differences were noted among treatments in ADF, ADL, and CF but were most likely a consequence of sampling variation. However, LP inoculant affected CP ($P<0.01$), and NDF contents ($P<0.05$).

Values for in vitro OM digestibility are given Table 5. The addition of LB at ensiling had significantly higher *in vitro* OM digestibility compared with the control, PFJ and LB silages ($P<0.05$).

Table 6 gives the results of the aerobic exposure test. pH change, CO_2, production and an increase mold and yeast numbers are indicators of silage deterioration. In present study, PFJ and LP treated silages decreased significantly CO_2 production in the alfalfa silages compared to control and LB silages. TMB and coliform bacteria counts were higher in the control and LB treated silages.

The phenotypically characteristics of LAB strains are shown in Table 7. A total of 15 strains isolated from the alfalfa silages. All isolates were gram-positive, catalase-negative, rod shaped bacteria. The 7 strains isolates were identificated as *Lactobacillus plantarum,* 5 strains were alloted to *Lactobacillus pentosaceus,* 3 strains were identificated as *Lactobacillus collinoides.*

Table 1. The chemical and microbiological composition of silage material prior to ensiling and PFJ.

Silage material								PFJ	
		g/kg DM				$\log_{10}$ cfu/g			
pH	DM g/kg	NDF	ADF	CP	WSC	LAB	Yeast	LAB	pH
5.75	602.3	367.9	313.2	181.9	42	3.52	2.47	5.39	6.03

DM: Dry matter; PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice). NDF: Neutral detergent fiber; ADF: Acid detergent fiber; CP: Crude protein; WSC: Water soluble carbohdrates; LAB: Lactic acid bacteria; cfu: Colony forming unit.

Table 2. The chemical composition of alfalfa silage after 150 days of ensiling.

Item	Treatment				*SEM*	*P level*
	Control	PFJ	LP	LB		
pH	5.40 [b]	5.63 [a]	5.43 [b]	5.40 [b]	0.066	<0.05
DM, %	60.60	61.43	59.72	57.50	1.803	0.25
WSC, g/kg DM	21.50 [a]	15.00 [b]	17.00 [ab]	22.00 [a]	1.517	<0.05
NH_3-N, g/kg	0.85	0.80	0.37	0.65	0.094	0.29
LA, %DM	1.64 [c]	1.85 [bc]	2.58 [a]	2.03 [b]	0.136	<0.00

PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice). LP: *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium*; LB: *Lactobacillus buncheri;* LAB: lactic acid bacteria. DM: dry matter; WSC: water soluble carbohdrates; NH_3-N: ammonia nitrogen; LA: lactic acid

[a,b,c]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different; (P<0.05).

[A,B,C]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different (P<0.01)

Table 3. Microbiological (log_{10} cfu/g) composition of alfalfa silage after 150 days of ensiling.

Item	Treatment				*SEM*	*P*
	Control	PFJ	LP	LB		
TMB	5.31	5.17	5.22	5.47	0.175	0.963
LAB	5.20	5.01	5.34	5.25	0.182	0.759
Coliform	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Mold and yeast	2.65	3.30	2.15	2.15	0.329	0.848

PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice). LP: *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium*; LB: *Lactobacillus buncheri*; TMB: total mesophilic bacteria; LAB: lactic acid bacteria; ND: not detected.

Table 4. Fiber composition, crude protein, crude cellulose and ash of alfalfa silage after 150 days of ensiling.

Item	Treatment				SEM	*P level*
	Control	PFJ	LP	LB		
CP, %DM	19.11[d]	19.34[c]	20.67[a]	19.71[b]	0.226	<0.00001
Ash, %DM	8.58[d]	9.38[c]	9.67[b]	11.44[a]	0.395	<0.0008
NDF, % DM	37.08	37.37	35.96	37.08	0.276	0.318
ADF, % DM	28.71	32.96	31.56	31.02	0.750	0.240
ADL, % DM	4.86	5.01	5.37	6.98	0.383	0.158
In vitro OM Digestibility	71.54[b]	72.56[b]	71.65[b]	77.03[a]	1.008	<0.043

PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice). LP: *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium*; LB: *Lactobacillus buncheri*; CP: crude protein; DM: dry matter; NDF: neutral detergent fiber; ADF: acid detergent fiber; ADL: acid detergent lignin; OM: Organic matter; NF: not detected

[a,b,c,d]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different (P<0.05).

[A,B,C,D]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different (P<0.01)

Table 5. Results of the aerobic stability test of alfalfa silages after five days of exposure.

Item	Treatment				*SEM*	*P level*
	Control	PFJ	LP	LB		
pH	5.54 [b]	5.56 [b]	5.45 [b]	5.83[a]	0.065	<0.05
CO_2, g/kg DM	11.50[a]	5.18[bc]	4.72[c]	10.57[ab]	1.233	<0.025
TMB, log_{10} cfu/g	7.34 [a]	6.39 [ab]	5.91[b]	7.40 [a]	0.142	<0.049
LAB, log_{10} cfu/g	3.84	4.64	4.43	4.70	0.279	0.174
Coliform, log_{10} cfu/g	3.51[b]	3.44[b]	3.40[b]	4.51[a]	0.109	<0.000
Mold and yeast, log_{10} cfu/g	5.13 [b]	3.80 [d]	4.55 [c]	5.37 [a]	0.101	0.001
Visual appraisal [*]	1	1	1	1		

PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice); LP: *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium*; LB: *Lactobacillus buncheri*; TMB: Total mesophilic bacteria; LAB: Lactic acid bacteria

[*] Visual appraisal is expressed using a scale of 1-5 where 1: good quality silage with no visible moulding; 2: a few small mould spots; 3: scattered mould spots; 4: silage with partially covered moulds, lumpy silages; 5: completely mould covered samples, unpleasant odor and silage particles sticking together.

[a,b,c,d]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different (P<0.05).

[A,B,C,D]Means with a different letter in the same row are significantly different (P<0.01)

Table 6. The phenotypic characteristics of LAB strains.

Item	FM		Control			PJF			LP			LB		
Shape	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod
Gram stain	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fermentation type	Hetero	Homo	Homo	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Homo	Homo	Homo	Homo	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero
Catalase activity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L-arabinose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Ribose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
D-Xylose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Galactose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
D-Glucose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
D-Fructose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dulcitol	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mannitol	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Sorbitol	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
N-acetyl glucosamine	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Amygdalin	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
Arbutin	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Esculin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Salicin	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Cellobiose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Maltose	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Saccharose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Trehalose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Melezitose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
B-Gentiobiose	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
D-Tagatose	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
Gluconate	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
5-Ceto-gluconate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Type strains	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*	*L. b.*

+ pozitive reaction; - negative reaction; FM. Fresh matter PFJ: (Pre-Fermented Juice); LP: *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Enterococcus faecium*; LB: *Lactobacillus buncheri*

DISCUSSION

Silage fermentation is a complex process which depends on many factors. The forage characteristics that contribute to a good fermentation are: dry matter content, physiological properties of epiphytic bacteria and, most importantly, the quantity of soluble carbohydrates (Zanine *et al.* 2010). The decline in pH values inhibit the spoilage microorganism proliferation, which allows the silage nutritive values to be preserved. Thus, the best silage forages are the ones with high soluble carbohydrates contents, which should be sufficient to promote the fermentation and produce enough acid to preserve the silage. In the present experiment, content of WSC in all preensiled alfalfa forages (4.2% DM, Table 1) was lower than the 6 to 7% content recommended theoretical requirement to achieve well preserved fermentation (Wang *et al*. 2009). Thus the alfalfa without additives was adequate for producing good quality silages.

In the experiment, LAB inoculants improved some fermentation parameters of alfalfa silages. Generally the addition of LAB inoculants at ensiling is intended to ensure rapid and vigorous fermentation that results in faster accumulation of lactic acid (LA), lower pH values at earlier stages of ensiling, and improved forage conservation. Well preserved alfalfa silage is characterized by lower pH, greater LA content, lower contents of NH_3-N (Muck and Kung 1997, Zhang *et al*. 2009). In this study, after 150 days of ensiling, alfalfa silages treated with LP and LB properly improved the silage fermentation quality with markedly lower contents of pH and NH_3-N and markedly higher LA content as compared with the control silage. Many studies (Adesogan *et al*. 2003, Nkosi *et al.* 2009, Vakily *et al*. 2011) have shown the advantage of such inoculants.

In some studies, LAB inoculants decreased cell wall contents of silages (Nadeau *et al.* 2000, Filya 2002, Polat *et al.* 2005). In contrast to these researcher's findings, some reports show that inoculants did not decrease significantly cell wall contents of silages (Kung *et al.* 1991, Meeske *et al*. 1999, Zahiroddini *et al*. 2004). At the end of the ensiling period, treatment with LP significantly decreased NDF concentration alfalfa silages compared with the control, PFJ and LB silages in present study. All of the additives did not affect the ADF, ADL and CF content of alfalfa silage compared to control silage, which is in agreement with past findings (Ranjit and Kung 2000, Kleinschmit *et al*. 2005).

There are various reports indicating that LAB inoculant did not effect ruminal DM and OM degrabilities or digestibility of silages (Arriola *et al.* 2011, Mohammadzadeh *et al.* 2012, Postulka *et al.* 2012). However in some studies, LAB and PFJ treated silage improved, degradability or digestibility (Keles and Demirci 2011, Denek 2011, Bureenok *et al*. 2012, Haghparvar *et al.* 2012) In the present study, the *in vitro* OM digestibility were higher in LB silages treated with control, PFJ and LP silages.

The effect of LB on silage fermentation has been well known since 1996 when an increase in aerobic stability was first observed in LB inoculated silages (Mari *et al.* 2009, Kristensen *et al.* 2010, Tabacco *et al.* 2011). In our experiment control and LB silages had high contents of both residual WSC and mold and yeast count therefore, tended to spoil more upon aerobic exposure, as indicated by more intensive CO_2 production, but did not change in pH test. The results revealed that aerobic deterioration of the control and LB silages was more intensive than PFJ silages.

Many studies (Lin *et al.* 1992a, Tjandraatmadja *et al*. 1994, Santos *et al.* 2011) have reported that lactobacilli are the dominant microbial population on forage crops and contribute to silage fermentation. The lactobacilli play a more important role in fermentation processes and effectively promote lactic acid fermentation for a longer time than do lactic acid-producing cocci (e.g., enterococci, streptococci, leuconostocs, weissella, and pediococci). Generally, silage can be well preserved when the lactobacilli reach at least 10^5 cfu/ g of FM (Hellings *et al*. 1985). In this study all silages were well preserved, as would be expected with 24 h wilted alfalfa material. *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Lactobacillus pentosaceus* are usually found living in association with forage crops and silages (Muck 1989, Lin *et al*. 1992b). In this study on alfalfa silages, found as the predominant species *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Lactobacillus pentosaceus.*

Conclusıons: The results obviously confirmed that using of PFJ and LAB inoculant additive some how would be one of the ways to improve the fermentative quality of silage in the alfalfa. In terms of aerobic stability, PFJ and LP used had a positive effect on CO_2 concentrations coliform bacteria and yeast. Also, LB inoculant decreased neutral detergent fibre content and increased in vitro organic matter digestibility of silages. It can be concluded that PFJ can be directly used as silage additive alfalfa bale silage in farm condition.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Namik Kemal University (Project No: NKUBAP. 00.24.YL.12.09).

REFERENCES

Adesogan, A.T., M.B. Salawu, A.B. Ross, D.R. Davies, and A.E. Brooks (2003). Effect of *Lactobacillus buchneri, Lactobacillus fermentum, Leuconostoc mesenteroides* inoculants, or a chemical additive on the fermentation, aerobic stability, and nutritive value of crimped wheat grains. J. Dairy Sci. 86: 1789-1796.

Anonymous (1986). ADAS, Analysis of Agricultural Materials (London), pp. 248 (Reference Book: 427).

AOAC (1984). Official Methods of Analysis. 14th edn., Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Arlington, VA.

Arriola, K.G., S.C. Kim, C.R. Staples, and A.T. Adesogan (2011). Effect of applying bacterial inoculants containing different types bacteria to corn silage on the performance of dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 94: 3973-3979.

Arriola, K.G., O.C.M. Queiroz, J.J. Romero, J. Kivipelto, E.N. Muniz, J.C. Hamie, M.A. Zarate, L.G. Paranho, and A.T. Adesogan (2011). Effect of microbial inoculants on the quality and stability of bermudagrass silage. Proc. ASAS-ADSA-PSA Annual meeting, 2011. New Orleans, LA, Abstract.

Ashbell, G., Z.G. Weinberg, Hen Y. Azrielia, and B. Horev (1991). A simple system to determine the aerobic determination of silages. Can. Agric. Eng. 33: 391-395.

Aufrère, J., and B. Michalet-Doreau (1988). Comparison of methods for predicting digestibility of feeds. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 20: 203-218.

Bureenok, S., T. Namahira, Y. Kawamoto, and T. Nakada (2005). Additive effects of fermented juice of epiphytic lactic acid bacteria on the fermentative quality of guinea grass *(Panicum maximum Jacq*.) silage. Grassl. Sci. 51: 243-248.

Bureenok, S., T. Namihira, M. Tamaki, S. Mizumachi, Y. Kawamoto, and T. Nakada (2005). Fermentative quality of guineagrass silage by using fermented juice of the epiphytic lactic acid bacteria (FJLB) as a silage additive. Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 18 (6): 807-811

Bureenok, S., C. Yuangklang, K. Vasupen, J.T. Schonewille, and Y. Kawamoto (2012). The effects of additives in napier grass silages on chemical composition, feed intake, nutrient digestibility and rumen fermentation. Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 25 (9): 1248-1254.

Denek, N., A. Can, M. Avci, and T. Aksu (2012). The effect of fresh and frozen pre-fermented juice on the fermentation quality of alfalfa silage. Kafkas Univ. Vet. Fak. Derg. 18 (5): 785-790.

Denek, N., A. Can, M. Avci, T. Aksu, and H. Durmaz (2011). The effect of molasses-based pre-fermented juice on the fermentation quality of first-cut lucerne silage. Grass Forage Sci. 66: 243-250.

Duniere, L., J. Sindou, F. Chaucheyras-Durand, I. Chevallier, and D. Thévenot-Sergentet (2013). Silage processing and strategies to prevent persistence of undesirable microorganisms. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 182: 1-15.

Filya, I. (2002). The effects of lactic acid bacteria and lactic acid bacteria+enzyme mixture silage inoculants on maize silage. Turk J. Vet. Animal Sci. 26: 679-687.

Filya, I., and E. Sucu (2007). The effect of bacterial inoculants and a chemical preservatives on the fermentation aand aaerobic stability of whole crop cereal silages. Asian-Austr. J. Anim. Sci. 20: 378-384.

Gollop, N., V. Zakin, and Z.G. Weinberg (2005). Antibacterial activity of lactic acid bacteria included in inoculants for silage and in silages treated with these inoculants. J. Appl. Microbiol. 98: 662-666.

Haghparvar, R., K. Shojaian, E. Rowghani, S. Parsaei, and M.Y. Ellahi (2012). The effects of *Lactobacillus plantarum* on chemical composition, rumen degradability, *in vitro* gas production and energy content of whole-plant corn ensiled at different stages of maturity. Iranin J. V. Res. 13: 8-15.

Hellings, P., G. Bertin, and M. Vanbelle (1985). Effect of lactic acid bacteria on silage fermentation. Pages 932-933 in Proc.15th Int. Grassl. Congr. Kyotosyuppan, Kyoto, Japan.

Keles , G., and U. Demirci (2011). The effect of homofermentative and heterofermentative lactic acid bacteria on conservation characteristics of baled triticale-Hungarian vetch silage and lamb performance. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 164: 21-28.

Kleinschmit, D.H., R.J. Schmidt, and L. Jr. Kung (2005). The effects of various antifungal additives on the fermentation and aerobic stability of corn silage. J. Dairy Sci. 88: 2130-2139.

Koc, F., and L. Coskuntuna (2003). The comparison of the two different methods on the determination of organic acids in silage fodders. J. Anim. Product. 44: 37-47.

Kozaki, M., T. Uchimura, and S. Okada. 1992. Experimental Manual for Lactic Acid Bacteria. Asakurasyoten, Tokyo, Japan.

Kristensen, N.B., K.H. Sloth, O. Højberg, N.H. Spliid, C. Jensen, and R. Thøgersen (2010). Effects of microbial inoculants on corn silage fermentation, microbial contents, aerobic stability, and milk production under field conditions. J. Dairy Sci. 93: 764-774.

Lin, C., K.K. Bolsen, B.E. Brent, and D. Fung (1992a). Epiphytic lactic acid bacteria succession during the pre-ensiling and ensiling periods of alfalfa and maize. J. Appl. Bacteriol. 73: 375-387.

Lin, C., K.K. Bolsen, B.E. Brent, and R.A. Hart (1992b). Epiphytic microflora on alfalfa and whole-plant corn. J. Dairy Sci. 75: 2484-2493.

Lopez-Diaz, T.M., C. Alonso, C. Roman, M.L. Garcia-Lopez, and B. Moreno (2000). Lactic acid bacteria isolated from a hand-made blue cheese. Food Microbiol. 17: 23-32.

Mari L.J., R.J. Schmidt, L.G. Nussio, C.M. Hallada, and L.Jr. Kung (2009). An evaluation of the effectiveness of *Lactobacillus buchneri* 40788 to alter fermentation and improve the aerobic stability of corn silage in farm silos. J. Dairy Sci. 92: 1174-1176.

Masuko, T., Y. Hariyama, Y. Takahashi, L.M. Cao, M. Goto ,and M .Ohshima (2002). Effect of addition of fermented epiphytic lactic acid prepared from timothy and orchardgrass on fermentation quality of silages. Grassl. Sci. 48: 120-125.

Mohammadzadeh, H., M. Khorvash, G.R. Ghorbani, and W.Z. Yang (2012). Frosted corn silage with or without bacterial inoculants in dairy cattle ration. Livest. Sci. 145: 153-159.

Muck, R.E. (1989). Initial bacterial numbers on lucerne prior to ensiling. Grass Forage Sci. 44: 19-25.

Nadeau, E.M.G., J.R. Russell, and D.R. Buxton (2000). Intake, digestibility, and composition of orchardgrass and alfalfa silages treated with cellulase, inoculant, and formic acid Fed to lambs. J. Anim. Sci. 78: 2980-2989.

Nkosi, B.D., R. Meeske, D. Palic, T. Langa, K.J. Leeeuw, and I.B. Groenewald (2009). Effects of ensiling whole crop maize with bacterial inoculants on the fermentation, aerobic stability, and growth performance of lambs. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 154: 193-203.

Polat, C., F. Koc, and M.L. Ozduven (2005). The effects of lactic acid bacteria and lactic acid bacteria+enzyme mixture silage inoculants on maize silage fermentation and nutrient digestibility in lambs. JOTAF. 2: 13-22.

Postulka, R., P. Dolezal, J. Pelikan, and D. Knotova (2012). Effect of dry matter content and inoculation on ruminal protein degradability in alfalfa silages. Iranian J. Appl. Anim. Sci., 2: 45-49.

Ranjit, N.K., and L.Jr. Kung (2000). The Effect of *Lactobacillus buchneri*, *Lactobacillus plantarum*, or a chemical preservative on the fermentation and aerobic stability of corn silage. J. Dairy Sci. 83: 526-535.

Santos, E.M., O.G. Pereira, G. Rasmo, C.L.L.F. Ferreira, J.S. Oliveir, T.C. Silva, and L.O. Rosa (2011). Microbial populations, fermentation profile and chemical composition of signalgrass harvested of different regrowth ages. R. Bras. Zootec. 40: 747-755.

Seale, D.R., G. Pahlow, S.F. Spoelstra, S. Lindgren, F. Dellaglio, and J.F. Lowe (1990). Methods for the microbiological analysis of silage. Proceeding of The Eurobac Conference. p. 147, Uppsala.

Statistical Analysis System (2005). SAS® User's Guide: Statistics. Version 6, (Cary, NC: SAS Institute).

Tabacco, E., S. Piano, A. Revello-Chion, and G. Borrean (2011). Effects of *Lactobacillus buchneri* LN4637 and *Lactobacillus buchneri* LN40177 on the aerobic stability, fermentation products, and microbial populations of corn silage under under farm conditions. J. Dairy Sci. 94: 5589-5598.

Temiz, A. (2008). Genel Mikrobiyoloji Uygulama Teknikleri. Hatiboğlu Yayınları: 96, Yükseköğretim Dizisi: 29, 90-93, Ankara.

Thomas, T.A. (1977). An automated procedure for the determination of soluble carbonydrates in herbage. J. Sci. Food Agric. 28: 639-642.

Tjandraatmadja, M., B.W. Norton, and I.C. Macrae (1994). Ensilage characteristics of three tropical grasses as influenced by stage of growth and addition of molasses. World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 10: 74-81.

Vakily, H., A.A. Khadem, M. Rezaeian, A. Afzalzadeh, and A.S. Chaudhry (2011). The impact of a bacterial inoculant on chemical composition, aerobic stability and *in sacco* degradability of corn silage and the subsequent performance of dairy cows. Int. J. Vet. Res. 5: 73-74.

Van Soest, P.J. (1982). Analytical Systems for Evaluation of Feeds. In P. J. van Soest (ed.) Nutritional Ecology of the Ruminant (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press), pp. 75-94.

Wang, J., J.Q. Wang, H. Zhou, and T. Feng (2009). Effects of addition of previously fermented juice prepared from alfalfa on fermentation quality and protein degradation of alfalfa silage. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 151: 280-290.

Widyastuti, Y. (2008). Fermentasi silase dan manfaat probiotik silase bagi ruminansia. Med. Pet. 31: 225-232.

Woolford, M.K., and M.K. Sawczyc (1984). An investigation into the effect of cultures of lactic acid bacteria on fermentation in silage 1. Strain selection. Grass Forage Sci. 39: 139-184.

Zanine, A.M., E.M. Santos, J.R.R. Dorea, P.A.S. Dantas, T.C. Silva, and O.G. Pereira (2010). Evaluation of elephant grass with adition of cassava scrapings. R. Bras. Zootec. 39: 2611-2616.

Zhang T, Li L., X. Wang, Z. Zeng, Y. Hu, and Z. Cui (2009). Effects of *Lactobacillus buchneri* and *Lactobacillus plantarum* on fermentation, aerobic stability, bacteria diversity and ruminal degradability of alfalfa silage. 48. World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 25: 965-97.