

# editwithout ref

*by Asep Ali*

---

**Submission date:** 23-Mar-2022 11:11AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1790691861

**File name:** kmbingair\_smallrum\_revpr2\_clean.doc (287K)

**Word count:** 4771

**Character count:** 23300

29  
1 **Effects of acid drinking water on nutrient utilization, water balance, and growth of**  
2 **goats under hot-humid tropical environment**

3  
4 A. I. M. Ali<sup>a\*</sup>, S. Sandi<sup>a</sup>, E. Sahara<sup>a</sup>, M. N. Rofiq<sup>b</sup>, Dahlanuddin<sup>c</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>  
6 <sup>a</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Sriwijaya, South Sumatra, 30662, Indonesia

7 <sup>1</sup>  
8 <sup>b</sup>Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology, Jakarta, 10340, Indonesia

9 <sup>c</sup>Faculty of Animal Science, University of Mataram, Mataram, Lombok, West Nusa  
10 Tenggara, 83125, Indonesia

11  
12  
13 \*Corresponding email: asepe\_ali@fp.unsri.ac.id

14 **Abstract**

15 Water available for livestock in the tropical lowland region is generally high in acidity. <sup>4</sup> This  
16 study aimed to determine the effects of the acid water on nutrient intake, water balance, and  
17 the growth of goats in the tropical environment. A total of nine Kacang goats were stratified  
18 based on body weight (BW) and assigned to three treatment groups which were offered  
19 drinking water at varying pH levels, namely 6.9, 5.2, and 3.8. All goats were offered *ad*  
20 *libitum* *Asystasia gangetica* hay and dried cassava chips at 1% of BW (dry matter (DM)  
21 basis) following a crossover design with three treatments tested in three periods. At the 5.2  
22 pH level, drinking water intake (DWI) tended to be lower ( $P = 0.09$ ) while total DM intake  
23 (%BW) was decreased ( $P < 0.05$ ). <sup>26</sup> Ruminal pH was significantly difference ( $P < 0.01$ ); 6.98,  
24 6.94, and 6.58 at the 6.9, 5.2, and 3.8 pH levels, respectively. Metabolizable energy and daily  
25 gain tended to be higher at the 6.9 and 3.8 pH levels compared to those at the 5.2 level ( $P =$   
<sup>23</sup> 0.08). There were no significant adverse effects of acid water on nutrient intake, utilization,

26 and growth of Kacang goats. Moreover, the increase in temperature-humidity index was  
27 followed by the elevated DWI ( $P < 0.01$ ) at 6.9 pH level, but no such significant relationship  
28 was found at other pH levels that indicated a better capability of thermoregulation response  
29 under heat stress exposure.

30 **Keyword** acid drinking water, ruminal pH, livestock, heat stress

31

## 32 **1. Introduction**

33 Water is one of the most important nutrients in the animal body due to its  
34 physiological roles in nutrient transport, maintenance of proper fluid and ion balance,  
35 biochemical reactions, as well as body thermoregulation. Previous studies showed that a  
36 sufficient supply of good quality water is a limiting factor for all animals to maintain good  
37 health and optimal productivity (NRC, 2001). However, the supply of clean water resources  
38 is a decreasing trend globally, driven by population and economic growth. In the following  
39 decades, there is a potential for additional pressure on water resources to fulfill the high  
40 demand for agriculture, household use, and industry. Moreover, the adequate supply of clean  
41 water is challenged by extreme weather events due to climate change (Boretti and Rosa,  
42 2019).

43 In humid tropical lowlands, most of the water is characterized by high acidity due to  
44 the natural oxidation processes of pyrite and ferric ion. The pH of the surface water could fall  
45 to 3, where most of the contaminants are sulfate (SO<sub>4</sub>), iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), and  
46 aluminum (Al) (Ali et al., 2021; Manders et al., 2002). Another source of water in the  
47 lowland region is groundwater, which has less acidity and contaminants (Winkel et al., 2008).  
48 Although the minimum recommended pH for livestock is 5.5 (Bagley et al., 1997) or 6.0  
49 (Olkowski, 2009), the effects of the acidic water on ruminants have not been fully studied. It  
50 is necessary to identify the influence of acid water on the animal's performance, implications

51 for water quality standards, and intervention options for the animal in the lowland region.  
52 Therefore, <sup>28</sup> this study was conducted to assess the influence of acid drinking <sup>2</sup> water on water  
53 <sup>5</sup> consumption, nutrient intake, and growth goats under hot tropical climates.

## 54 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 55 **2.1. Study site**

56 This study has been approved by the <sup>1</sup> Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Sriwijaya,  
57 <sup>2</sup> Indonesia. The site is situated at an altitude of  $\pm 6$  m above sea level and  $3^{\circ}11'38.4''\text{S}$ ,  
58 <sup>1</sup>  $104^{\circ}39'30.5''\text{E}$ . Meanwhile, the animals were cared for according to the Animal Welfare  
59 <sup>1</sup> Guidelines of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences. The environmental variables in the site are  
60 shown in Table 1.

### 61 **2.2. Experimental animal, treatments, and feeding management**

62 A total of nine Kacang goats, based on body weight (BW), were stratified and divided  
63 into three treatment groups with an average  $\text{BW}=14.8 \pm 1.0$  kg, which were offered drinking  
64 water at varying pH levels, namely 6.9, 5.2, and 3.8. The <sup>1</sup> animals were housed in individual  
65 <sup>1</sup> pens ( $1.5 \text{ m} \times 0.75 \text{ m}$ ) in an open-sided type of house which allowed a total collection of  
66 daily fecal and urinary excretion (Ali et al., 2021). Each pen was equipped with two identical  
67 feed troughs and an individual water bucket of diameter 23 cm, 5 L capacity. Subsequently,  
68 the goats were treated orally with Oxfendazole (25 mg/5 kg BW), acclimatized <sup>2</sup> to feeding and  
69 <sup>2</sup> environmental conditions for 15 d, and subjected to their respective water treatment group.  
70 <sup>2</sup> All animals were weighed at the beginning of the study as well as every Sunday and  
71 <sup>2</sup> Thursday to determine changes in the BW on an electronic weighing balance before offering  
72 feed and water.

73 This study used a crossover design that consisted of three levels of pH over three  
74 <sup>1</sup> periods. Meanwhile, each experimental period lasted for three weeks of adaptation and one  
75 <sup>1</sup> week of sampling, where feed intake, fecal and urinary excretion were measured. Each

76 measurement period was followed by one week of recovery, where all animals received only  
77 pH 6.9 drinking water.

78 The diet consisted of *Asystasia gangetica* hay and dried cassava chips as shown in  
79 Table 2. The hay was harvested at the pre blooming stage, chaffed to  $\pm 5$  cm particle length,  
80 and sun-dried for 4 d while the cassava tubers were chopped to  $\pm 2$  cm particle size and sun-  
81 dried for 5 d. Subsequently, the feeding and drinking were started at 9:00 after refusals from  
82 the previous day had been removed and weighed. The hay was offered ad libitum, according  
83 to 15% of the previous intake, while the amount of cassava chips was referred to 1% of  
84 individual BW and adjusted after each BW measurement. Animals always had ad libitum  
85 access to drinking water and salt-mineral lick, which contained g/kg, DM basis: 730 NaCl, 34  
86 Calcium, 15 Magnesium, 8 Phosphorous, and 1 trace minerals.

### 87 2.3. Preparation of different pH levels of water

88 Naturally available high-acidity surface water was collected from non-tidal swamp  
89 area ( $3^{\circ}10'29.7''S$ ,  $104^{\circ}41'34.5''E$ ), while the underground water with pH = 5.2 was collected  
90 from a well in the experimental site. The swamp water was manually collected using a 20-L  
91 bucket, while the well water was pumped. Meanwhile, the swamp water had an acidulous  
92 taste and a 3.8 pH level, which was checked using a portable pH meter (Hanna HI 98130). A  
93 pH level of 6.9 water was prepared from the well water by aeration for 4 d in a 50-L bucket  
94 using an aerator (Amara BS-410) and each of the water was stored in separate 50-L buckets  
95 before the offering.

### 96 2.4. Sample collection, preparation, and analysis

97 The indoor temperature and relative humidity (RH) were recorded by a climate data  
98 logger (Benetech G1365) at 10-minutes intervals, while rainfall, sunshine, and wind speed  
99 were taken at a meteorological station. The temperature-humidity index (THI) values were  
100 calculated according to NRC (1971).

101 Moreover, the samples of the offered feeds were taken<sup>4</sup> and stored in paper bags at  
102 room temperature. After weighing, refusals were homogenized and a subsample<sup>16</sup> (~100 g) was  
103 taken and stored. Total fecal and urinary excretion was determined by daily collection over 7  
104 d. Meanwhile, the total feces excreted by each animal was<sup>6</sup> thoroughly mixed by hand,  
105 weighed, and a subsample of approximately 100 g fresh matter was taken and dried at 45°C<sup>1</sup>  
106 for three consecutive days. The dried feed and fecal samples were ground to pass through a 1-  
107 mm mesh. At the end of each period, the feed and fecal samples were pooled per animal<sup>6</sup>  
108 proportionally to the daily amount of each animal during the sampling week. The dried<sup>1</sup>  
109 samples were stored in zipper plastic bags before laboratory analyses.

110 The dried feces, feed, and refusals were analyzed as follows: DM, ash (AOAC, 1990;  
111 Method 924.05), N (AOAC, 1990; Method 988.05), ether extract (EE; Method 920.39),<sup>5</sup>  
112 neutral detergent fiber (NDF), and acid detergent fiber (ADF) with alpha-amylase and<sup>1</sup>  
113 including residual ash (Van Soest et al., 1991). Organic matter (OM) concentrations were  
114 calculated by subtracting the ash concentration from 100, while the CP content was  
115 calculated as  $N \times 6.25$ . Neutral detergent-insoluble N (NDIN) and Neutral detergent-insoluble<sup>17</sup>  
116 ash (NDIash) were estimated according to Licitra et al. (1996). Furthermore, NDF corrected<sup>30</sup>  
117 for ash and crude protein (NDF<sub>acp</sub>) was calculated by subtracting the NDIN and NDIash.<sup>15</sup> Non  
118 fibrous carbohydrates (NFC) were calculated by subtracting the concentration of NDF<sub>acp</sub>, CP,  
119 EE, and ash from 100 (Mertens, 1997).

120 Daily feed intake was calculated as the difference between the amount of feed offered<sup>3</sup>  
121 and the amount of feed refusals for each animal across the sampling week. Metabolizable<sup>1</sup>  
122 energy (ME, MJ/kg) content was calculated as  $0.0157 \times \text{digestible OM}$  (AFRC, 1993). Total<sup>11</sup>  
123 tract apparent digestibility of DM, OM, CP, NDF, and ADF were obtained from the<sup>4</sup>  
124 difference between the amount of nutrient ingested and of nutrients excreted in feces over the  
125 7 d of sampling week.

126 Before the measurement of rumen fluid pH, the animals were not given drinking  
127 water for two h (9:00 – 11:00). The fluid was collected using a stomach tube of 6 mm  
128 diameter one h after the goats consumed the water. The drinking water sample was collected  
129 every week and stored in a 250-mL bottle at 5 °C. At the end of each period, the samples  
130 were pooled proportionally and then analyzed to determine total dissolved solids (TDS,  
131 conductivity method, Orion Star A212, Thermo Scientific), Fe, Mn, Al (spectrometric  
132 techniques, inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy Varian 715-ES,  
133 Agilent), nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub>), nitrite (NO<sub>2</sub>), ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), sulfate (SO<sub>4</sub>) (spectrometric  
134 techniques, Spectrophotometer UV-VIS Lambda 45, Perkin Elmer), organic substances  
135 (permanganometric titration method).

136 Individual drinking water intake (DWI) was calculated as the difference between the  
137 amount of water offered and refusals. Subsequently, three buckets with water were placed in  
138 the barn to estimate daily evaporative water loss, and then the daily DWI was corrected by  
139 the evaporative loss. The amount of water in the consumed feed (FWI) was calculated by the  
140 difference between the amount of water in the feed offered and refusals. Metabolic water was  
141 estimated using the factors 0.62, 0.42, and 1.10 for digestible carbohydrates, protein, and fat,  
142 respectively (Taylor, 1970). Apparent total water intake (TWI) was determined as the sum of  
143 DWI, FWI, and metabolic water, while the fecal water was estimated from the amount of  
144 fecal excretion and the content of water. The amount of urinary water was the amount of  
145 urine corrected by the DM content of urine. Meanwhile, the water retention was calculated by  
146 subtracting the amount of water in fecal and urinary excretion from TWI.

147 After homogenizing and filtering with a surgical gaze, individual urine excretion was  
148 recorded. A sample of urine (~100 mL) was taken daily and stored at -20 °C for N analysis.  
149 The DM content of urine was determined by drying a 3 mL urine sample at 60 °C for 12 h  
150 and the total was determined using the micro Kjeldahl method (AOAC, 1990; Method

151 988.05). Nitrogen absorption<sup>22</sup> was calculated by subtracting fecal N excretion from the  
152 amount of N intake (feed and DWI), while N<sup>24</sup> retention was calculated by subtracting the  
153 amount of urinary N loss from the absorbed N.

## 154 2.5. Statistical analysis

155 The data generated from 3 treatments,<sup>4</sup> 3 periods, and 9 animals were analyzed using  
156 SAS 9.1 and presented as mean ± standard error. Meanwhile,<sup>12</sup> the data were analyzed using  
157 the mixed model procedure as stated below:

$$158 Y_{ijk} = \mu + T_i + P_j + TP_{ij} + a_k + e_{ijk};$$

159 Where  $Y_{ijk}$  is observed response at a particular  $ijk$  case,  $\mu$  is overall mean,  $T_i$  is the fixed effect  
160 of treatment  $i$ ,  $P_j$  is the fixed effect of period  $j$ ,  $TP_{ij}$  is the fixed effect of the interaction  
161 between treatment  $i$  and period  $j$ ,  $a_k$  is the random effect of animal  $k$ , and  $e_{ijk}$  is experimental  
162 error.

163 Differences between means<sup>3</sup> were determined using the Tukey test and the significance  
164 level was declared at  $P < 0.05$ , where p-values of 0.05 to 0.10 were considered as a trend.  
165 The relationship between daily maximum temperature-humidity index ( $THI_{max}$ ), DWI, and  
166 DM intake (DMI) during the collection weeks was tested by Pearson correlation analysis.

## 167 3. Results

168 The composition of drinking<sup>2</sup> water offered to animals in different treatment groups  
169 increases in Fe, Mn, Al,  $NH_3$ ,  $SO_4$ , and organic substances with the decrease in pH level. In  
170 the 6.9 and 5.2 levels, the contaminant<sup>10</sup> concentrations were not significantly different ( $P >$   
171 0.05) while the highest concentrations were found in the 3.8 pH level ( $P < 0.05$ ; Table 3).

172 Meanwhile, the values of feed intake, nutrient digestibility, rumen pH, and daily gain  
173 of the goats are shown in Table 4. In the group with a 5.2 pH level, total DMI<sup>12</sup> was lower ( $P <$   
174 0.05) than those subjected to the other treatments that comparable to the lower ( $P < 0.05$ ) DM  
175 intake of hay (%BW) in the group. Furthermore, metabolizable energy intake (MJ/kg  $BW^{0.75}$ )



176 and daily gain were only influenced by trends ( $P = 0.06$ ). As the pH level reduced, the rumen  
177 pH was also decreasing ( $P < 0.01$ ), where the pH in the 3.8 group was lower than those in the  
178 6.9 and 5.2 groups. Meanwhile, the apparent DM, OM, CP, NDF, and ADF digestibility were  
179 not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ).

180 Drinking water intake and FWI (%BW) tended to be lowered at the 5.2 group ( $P =$   
181 0.09) but metabolic water and TWI were not influenced ( $P > 0.05$ ). Fecal water excretion  
182 (%BW) was lowered ( $P < 0.05$ ) in the 5.2 pH group, which was not significantly different  
183 from those in the 6.9 group ( $P > 0.05$ ), but higher than those in the 3.8 group. Meanwhile,  
184 urinary water excretion and apparent water retention were not significantly affected by the  
185 pH level ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Table 5).

186 Intake of N was also lowered at 5.2 level ( $P < 0.05$ ). However, N absorption, urinary  
187 N excretion, and N retention did not vary among the different groups ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Table 6).

188 During the collection weeks, the daily maximum temperature-humidity index  
189 ( $THI_{max}$ ) correlated positively with DWI of the 6.9 group but not of the 5.2 and 3.8 groups.  
190 Furthermore, DMI did not significantly correlate with  $THI_{max}$  among all the groups ( $P >$   
191 0.05), while the ratio DWI/DMI correlated with  $THI_{max}$  in the 6.9 group ( $P < 0.01$ ) (Table 7).

#### 192 **4. Discussion**

193 The varied DM intake was not attributable to the DWI while water contaminant  
194 concentrations were varied among the different pH levels of drinking water. The tendency of  
195 lower DWI in the 5.2 pH group was also not related to the contaminant concentrations in the  
196 water where the higher concentrations were found in the 3.8 pH group. Based on the  
197 maximum limits of contaminant concentrations in the drinking water, the concentrations of  
198 TDS, Fe,  $NO_3$ ,  $NO_2$ ,  $SO_4$  were much lower (Table 3). The oxidation process of contaminant  
199 ions could relate to the lowered  $H^+$  concentration of the aerated water in the 6.9 pH group  
200 (Lytle et al., 1998; Manders et al., 2002). Aeration followed by filtration treatment to remove

201 contaminants from water has been widely used (Lytle et al., 1998; Marsidi et al., 2018). The  
202 non-significant differences of the contaminant concentrations in the 6.9 and 5.2 groups due to  
203 the absence of the filtration process to remove the precipitates.

204 Several studies have been conducted on the effect of high-contaminant water on DWI  
205 and the performance of ruminants. Mdletshe et al. (2017) stated that reductions of DWI,  
206 DMI, and daily gain in Nguni goats as the TDS content of water exceeded the permissible  
207 limits. Meanwhile, other studies also observed decreased DWI due to the higher levels of  
208 TDS in sheep (Assad and El-Sherif, 2002), beef cattle (López et al., 2016), and buffalo  
209 (Sharma et al., 2017). The water intake of beef cattle was also reduced when SO<sub>4</sub> was 1900  
210 mg/L (Lardner et al., 2013) due to the ability of the animals to protect their metabolism status  
211 from salt stress.

212 Furthermore, the intake level of DWI might be more related to the palatability of the  
213 water. In this study, the tendency of lower DWI at 5.5 pH level ( $P=0.09$ ) was due to the less  
214 palatability of the water for the goats. There was a significant decrease in DWI at a lower  
215 level of contaminant reported by Sharma et al. (2017) for buffalo calves on five TDS levels in  
216 drinking water where DWI was lower at 557 than those at 2571 mg/L level.

217 The rumen pH was declined by the acid drinking water in this study, however, it was  
218 still within the normal range. Acid drinking water may cause rumen acidosis (Olkowski,  
219 2009) when the rumen pH becomes less than 5 (Giger-Reverdin, 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2020).  
220 However, the rumen pH values at the pH levels of 5.2 and 3.8 in this study increased to the  
221 normal range at one h post-drinking (Table 4). During the experiment, the animals' normal  
222 eating and ruminating behavior and the sufficiency of the minerals-salt supplement might  
223 indicate a normal secretion of saliva to maintain the range of rumen pH when the animal  
224 continuously consumed the acid drinking water. As a result, the nutrients' digestibility was

225 not affected. A similar OM and NDF digestibility was also reported when the ruminal pH was  
226 decreased from 7.0 to 6.2 (Shriver et al., 1986).

227 The lowered fecal water excretion at the 5.5 level was associated with the lowered  
228 DWI and feed water intake, while the insignificant effect on urinary water excretion and  
229 apparent water retention was due to the lower contaminants contents in the drinking water.  
230 When TDS level was higher, a greater urinary water excretion was reported in sheep (Assad  
231 and El-Sherif, 2002), beef cattle (López et al., 2016), and buffalo (Sharma et al., 2017) as an  
232 adaptive response of the animals to excrete the excess salts.

233 The daily gain was only affected by a trend ( $P = 0.06$ ), although the gain of goats at  
234 the 5.2 level was 48 and 29% lower than those at the 6.9 and 3.8 levels, respectively.  
235 Similarly, a higher N retention of the goats at the 6.9 level was not significantly different  
236 from those on the 5.2 and 3.8 levels (Table 6). This means the positive gain, N retention, feed  
237 intake, and nutrient digestibility indicated that the acid water did not have detrimental effects  
238 on the goat performances.

239 The positive correlation of  $THI_{max} - DWI$  and  $THI_{max} - DWI/DMI$  was due to an  
240 increase in demand for water by the goats under heat stress in response to a higher loss of  
241 water through evaporation and sweating, which was only applied for the 6.9 group.  
242 Furthermore, a positive correlation for daily maximum temperature and DWI was also  
243 reported for buffalo calves on five levels of TDS in drinking water (Sharma et al., 2017),  
244 lactating goats (Olsson and Dahlborn, 1989) and goat kids (Al-Tamimi, 2007).

245 In tropical humid areas, goats continuously face high ambient temperature and  
246 humidity that affect their physiology, behavior, metabolism, and performances, which will  
247 become worse in the future due to the increase of climatic extreme events (Silanikove and  
248 Koluman, 2015). According to Salama et al. (2021), Murciano-Granadina goats exposed to  
249 heat stress at THI of 77, 30 °C, and 40% humidity showed a reduction in feed intake and

250 higher water consumption than goats in the thermal neutral environment. During the  
251 experimental periods of this study, the means of THI were 79 to 80 (Table 1) which  
252 fluctuated daily from 75 in the dawn to 85 in the afternoon (data not shown). Furthermore,  
253 the positive correlation  $THI_{max} - DWI$  was in line with the result of a previous study, which  
254 indicated that DWI also fluctuated at a higher value in the afternoon when THI was at a  
255 maximum level. A higher daily THI fluctuation from 70 to 87 with a shift of feeding and  
256 drinking frequency was also reported in the tropical humid region of India (Abhijith et al.,  
257 2021). This fluctuation showed the influence of feeding management in minimizing the  
258 adverse effect of heat stress on goat performances. Since the drinking water was offered at *ad*  
259 *libitum* level in this study, the animals could freely fulfill the additional requirement of water  
260 for the thermoregulation processes. The significant correlations in the 6.9 group showed the  
261 important aspect of clean and good palatability water for maximum intake when the animals  
262 experience heat stress.

## 263 5. Conclusions

264 <sup>20</sup> The effect of lowering pH levels in drinking water depends on the concentration of  
265 contaminants in the water. In this study, the lowering of pH level from 6.9 to 3.8 did not lead  
266 to adverse effects on the nutrient intake, balance, and growth due to the minimum levels of  
267 the contaminants in the water and the animal's ability to maintain the normal range of the  
268 ruminal pH. However, the better ability of the animal in the 6.9 group to cope with the heat  
269 stress was shown by the positive correlation between DWI and  $THI_{max}$ . In addition, a further  
270 study with a more extended period of the acid drinking water is recommended to confirm the  
271 effects on rumen fermentation characteristics, thermoregulation, and drinking behavior  
272 responses.

273

274 **Funding**

275 This study was supported by Universitas Sriwijaya (Grand number  
276 023/17.2.677515/2021).

277 **Author contribution**

278 Original intellectual concept and study design: A. I. M. Ali; Methodology: A. I. M.  
279 Ali, S. Sandi; Data curation, formal analysis, and investigation: E. Sahara, A. I. M. Ali;  
280 Writing - original draft preparation: A. I. M. Ali; Writing - review and editing: M. N. Rofiq,  
281 Dahlanuddin; Funding acquisition: A. I. M. Ali. All authors read and approved the final  
282 manuscript.

283 **Data availability**

284 The datasets analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author  
285 on reasonable request.

286

287 **Tables**

**Table 1**

Environmental variables observed during the experiment.

Variable	Experimental periods		
	1	2	3
Maximum temperature ( $T_{\max}$ ) (°C)	31.7 ± 0.27	32.7 ± 0.26	33.4 ± 0.29
Minimum temperature ( $T_{\min}$ ) (°C)	24.4 ± 0.10	24.8 ± 0.14	24.7 ± 0.17
Average temperature ( $T_{\text{av}}$ ) (°C)	26.9 ± 0.17	27.6 ± 0.22	27.8 ± 0.18
Average relative humidity (%)	86.0 ± 0.90	84.4 ± 1.07	80.4 ± 0.93
Temperature humidity index	78.7 ± 0.20	79.6 ± 0.29	79.3 ± 0.20
Rainfall (mm/d)	7.8 ± 2.92	2.3 ± 0.68	3.6 ± 2.16
Sunshine (h)	4.1 ± 0.54	5.3 ± 0.46	5.8 ± 0.55
Wind speed (m/s)	1.9 ± 0.11	1.6 ± 0.11	2.1 ± 0.14

Temperature humidity index =  $(1.8 \times T^{\circ}\text{C} + 32) - [(0.55 - 0.0055 \times \text{RH} \%) \times (1.8 \times T^{\circ}\text{C} - 26)]$  (NRC, 1971), where  $T^{\circ}\text{C}$  is air temperature and RH is the relative humidity.

288

**Table 2**

Chemical composition (mean  $\pm$  standard error) of Chinese violet (*Asystasia gangetica*) hay and cassava chips offered during the experiment (% dry matter basis)

	Chinese violet hay	Cassava chips
Dry matter	88.4 $\pm$ 0.70	88.3 $\pm$ 1.06
Organic matter	89.8 $\pm$ 0.11	97.9 $\pm$ 0.13
Crude protein	14.3 $\pm$ 0.36	4.2 $\pm$ 0.25
Ether extract	1.7 $\pm$ 0.04	0.3 $\pm$ 0.02
Ash	10.2 $\pm$ 0.50	2.1 $\pm$ 0.13
Non fibrous carbohydrates <sup>a</sup>	27.6 $\pm$ 0.98	72.9 $\pm$ 1.50
Neutral detergent fiber	48.1 $\pm$ 0.75	22.2 $\pm$ 0.07
Neutral detergent fiber <sub>acp</sub> <sup>b</sup>	46.2 $\pm$ 0.71	21.9 $\pm$ 0.08
Acid detergent fiber	30.5 $\pm$ 0.24	4.0 $\pm$ 0.18
Acid detergent lignin	14.9 $\pm$ 0.12	1.5 $\pm$ 0.07

<sup>a</sup>100-CP (%) - EE (%) - [NDF (%) - NDICP (%) - Ash (%).

<sup>b</sup>Neutral detergent fiber corrected for residual ash and crude protein.

**Table 3**

Concentrations of contaminant substances (mg/L, mean  $\pm$  standard error) in drinking water offered to treatment groups and their permissible limits

Element	Treatment groups			P-value	Permissible limits
	6.9	5.2	3.8		
Total dissolved solids	51.0 $\pm$ 2.31 <sup>a</sup>	48.3 $\pm$ 2.96 <sup>a</sup>	87.7 $\pm$ 8.67 <sup>b</sup>	0.004	4000 <sup>1</sup> , 3000 <sup>2</sup>
Iron	0.008 $\pm$ 0.002 <sup>a</sup>	0.010 $\pm$ 0.000 <sup>a</sup>	0.223 $\pm$ 0.074 <sup>b</sup>	0.019	2 <sup>1</sup>
Manganese	0.001 $\pm$ 0.001 <sup>a</sup>	0.004 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>a</sup>	0.027 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>b</sup>	0.001	0.3 <sup>2</sup>
Aluminum	0.014 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>a</sup>	0.036 $\pm$ 0.001 <sup>a</sup>	2.870 $\pm$ 0.067 <sup>b</sup>	0.000	NA
Nitrate	14.1 $\pm$ 3.52 <sup>a</sup>	12.8 $\pm$ 0.51 <sup>a</sup>	24.8 $\pm$ 1.03 <sup>b</sup>	0.014	100 <sup>1</sup> , 77 <sup>2</sup>
Nitrite	0.01 $\pm$ 0.011	0.02 $\pm$ 0.022	0.02 $\pm$ 0.02	0.897	33 <sup>1</sup> , 10 <sup>2</sup>
Ammonia	0.27 $\pm$ 0.033 <sup>a</sup>	0.30 $\pm$ 0.058 <sup>ab</sup>	0.47 $\pm$ 0.033 <sup>b</sup>	0.035	NA
Sulfate	3.3 $\pm$ 1.67 <sup>a</sup>	5.4 $\pm$ 2.11 <sup>a</sup>	25.6 $\pm$ 5.66 <sup>b</sup>	0.009	500 <sup>1</sup> , 1000 <sup>2</sup>
Organic substances	1.9 $\pm$ 0.07	1.7 $\pm$ 0.16	2.6 $\pm$ 0.28	0.053	NA
pH	6.9 $\pm$ 0.03 <sup>c</sup>	5.2 $\pm$ 0.06 <sup>b</sup>	3.8 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>a</sup>	0.000	5.5 <sup>1</sup> , 6.0 <sup>2</sup>

21

Means with different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ );

Limits for pH (minimum) and other elements (maxima) for livestock drinking water based on United States Environmental Protection Agency (Bagley et al., 1997)<sup>1</sup> and Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (Olkowski, 2009)<sup>2</sup>;

ND: not detected;

NA: not available

**Table 4**

Dry matter (DM) intake, metabolizable energy (ME) intake, digestibility of DM, organic matter (OM), crude protein (CP), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), and acid detergent fiber (ADF), as well as rumen pH, and daily gain (mean  $\pm$  standard error) of Kacang goats offered water having different pH levels

Parameter	pH level			P-value
	6.9	5.2	3.8	
Chinese violet hay				
g DM/d	389 $\pm$ 36.6	332 $\pm$ 32.5	390 $\pm$ 48.3	0.154
%BW	2.1 $\pm$ 0.15 <sup>b</sup>	1.8 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>a</sup>	2.1 $\pm$ 0.17 <sup>b</sup>	0.035
Cassava chips				
g DM/d	159 $\pm$ 15.2	166 $\pm$ 15.6	158 $\pm$ 11.3	0.715
%BW	0.9 $\pm$ 0.06	0.9 $\pm$ 0.05	0.9 $\pm$ 0.05	0.683
Total DM intake				
g/d	548 $\pm$ 41.8	498 $\pm$ 39.9	549 $\pm$ 49.6	0.078
%BW	3.0 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>b</sup>	2.7 $\pm$ 0.11 <sup>a</sup>	2.9 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>b</sup>	0.026
ME intake				
(MJ/d)	5.8 $\pm$ 0.44	5.3 $\pm$ 0.40	5.8 $\pm$ 0.43	0.137
MJ/kg BW <sup>0.75</sup>	0.65 $\pm$ 0.03	0.59 $\pm$ 0.02	0.64 $\pm$ 0.02	0.078
Digestibility (%)				
DM	68.1 $\pm$ 0.94	68.5 $\pm$ 0.99	67.7 $\pm$ 1.21	0.379
OM	67.9 $\pm$ 1.04	68.5 $\pm$ 1.04	67.5 $\pm$ 1.28	0.339
CP	57.7 $\pm$ 0.95	57.3 $\pm$ 1.29	56.9 $\pm$ 0.62	0.722
NDF	41.6 $\pm$ 1.61	41.9 $\pm$ 2.06	40.3 $\pm$ 2.46	0.448



ADF	23.4 ± 2.55	19.8 ± 3.91	23.6 ± 2.95	0.866
Rumen pH	6.98 ± 0.06 <sup>b</sup>	6.94 ± 0.05 <sup>b</sup>	6.58 ± 0.08 <sup>a</sup>	0.002
Daily gain (g/d)	73.4 ± 8.74	49.7 ± 8.42	64.2 ± 6.16	0.062

Means with different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ); BW: body weight

294

295

**Table 5**

Water balance (mean  $\pm$  standard error) of Kacang goats offered water having different pH levels

Parameter	pH level			P-value
	6.9	5.2	3.8	
<b>Drinking water intake</b>				
ml/d	1456 $\pm$ 173	1218 $\pm$ 118	1460 $\pm$ 173	0.243
%BW	7.8 $\pm$ 0.59	6.6 $\pm$ 0.58	7.7 $\pm$ 0.55	0.091
<b>Feed water intake</b>				
ml/d	83.9 $\pm$ 6.64	73.6 $\pm$ 5.54	82.4 $\pm$ 7.07	0.091
%BW	0.45 $\pm$ 0.02	0.40 $\pm$ 0.02	0.44 $\pm$ 0.02	0.056
<b>Metabolic water</b>				
ml/d	209.2 $\pm$ 15.8	191.6 $\pm$ 14.4	206.2 $\pm$ 14.6	0.330
%BW	1.13 $\pm$ 0.05	1.02 $\pm$ 0.04	1.11 $\pm$ 0.03	0.186
<b>Total water intake</b>				
ml/d	1750 $\pm$ 192	1484 $\pm$ 133	1749 $\pm$ 192	0.231
%BW	9.4 $\pm$ 0.63	8.0 $\pm$ 0.63	9.3 $\pm$ 0.58	0.187
<b>Fecal water excretion</b>				
ml/d	261 $\pm$ 32.4	202 $\pm$ 21.9	277 $\pm$ 45.5	0.055
%BW	1.4 $\pm$ 0.15 <sup>ab</sup>	1.1 $\pm$ 0.08 <sup>a</sup>	1.4 $\pm$ 0.17 <sup>b</sup>	0.034
<b>Urinary water excretion</b>				
ml/d	418 $\pm$ 56.2	321 $\pm$ 37.6	385 $\pm$ 66.4	0.392
%BW	2.3 $\pm$ 0.24	1.8 $\pm$ 0.21	2.0 $\pm$ 0.23	0.397
<b>Apparent water retention</b>				

ml/d	1070 ± 132.1	960 ± 97.9	1087 ± 88.4	0.421
%BW	5.7 ± 0.45	5.2 ± 0.49	5.8 ± 0.27	0.406

Means with different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ); BW: body weight

297

298

**Table 6**

Nitrogen (N) balance (mean  $\pm$  standard error) of Kacang goats offered water having different pH levels

Parameter (%BW)	pH level			<i>P</i> -value
	6.9	5.2	3.8	
N intake	0.056 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>b</sup>	0.048 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>a</sup>	0.055 $\pm$ 0.004 <sup>ab</sup>	0.036
Fecal N	0.024 $\pm$ 0.002	0.020 $\pm$ 0.001	0.024 $\pm$ 0.002	0.062
N absorb	0.032 $\pm$ 0.002	0.028 $\pm$ 0.002	0.031 $\pm$ 0.002	0.240
Urinary N	0.018 $\pm$ 0.003	0.015 $\pm$ 0.002	0.016 $\pm$ 0.003	0.469
N retention	0.015 $\pm$ 0.003	0.013 $\pm$ 0.002	0.015 $\pm$ 0.002	0.728

18

Means with different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ); BW: body weight

**Table 7**

Pearson correlation coefficients and significance levels<sup>1</sup> of the relationship between daily maximum temperature humidity index (THI<sub>max</sub>)<sup>4</sup> as well as drinking water intake (DWI) and dry matter intake (DMI) in Kacang goats offered water having different pH levels

Parameter	pH level		
	6.9	5.2	3.8
THI <sub>max</sub> - DWI			
ml/d	0.62 **	0.14 <sup>5</sup> n.s.	-0.02 n.s.
%BW	0.54 *	-0.15 n.s.	-0.04 n.s.
THI <sub>max</sub> - DMI			
g/d	0.04 <sup>5</sup> n.s.	0.25 n.s.	-0.31 n.s.
%BW	-0.18 n.s.	-0.29 n.s.	-0.33 n.s.
THI <sub>max</sub> - DWI/DMI	0.61 **	-0.06 n.s.	0.11 <sup>14</sup> n.s.

<sup>1</sup> Significance levels: n.s., not significant, (\*)  $p \leq 0.10$ , \* $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; BW: body

weight

ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

18%

SIMILARITY INDEX

11%

INTERNET SOURCES

14%

PUBLICATIONS

6%

STUDENT PAPERS

---

PRIMARY SOURCES

---

1	Asep I.M. Ali, Sofia Sandi, Riswandi, Muhamad N. Rofiq, Suhubdy. "Effect of feeding <i>Asystasia gangetica</i> weed on intake, nutrient utilization, and gain in Kacang goat", <i>Annals of Agricultural Sciences</i> , 2021 Publication	3%
2	Amit Sharma, S.S. Kundu, Hujaz Tariq, N. Kewalramani, R.K. Yadav. "Impact of total dissolved solids in drinking water on nutrient utilisation and growth performance of Murrah buffalo calves", <i>Livestock Science</i> , 2017 Publication	3%
3	<a href="http://www.tandfonline.com">www.tandfonline.com</a> Internet Source	3%
4	<a href="http://d-nb.info">d-nb.info</a> Internet Source	1%
5	<a href="http://www.mdpi.com">www.mdpi.com</a> Internet Source	1%
6	<a href="http://doi.org">doi.org</a> Internet Source	1%

---

7	<a href="http://oamjms.eu">oamjms.eu</a> Internet Source	<1 %
8	<a href="http://docsdrive.com">docsdrive.com</a> Internet Source	<1 %
9	Iván Mestres, Jen-Zen Chuang, Federico Calegari, Cecilia Conde, Ching-Hwa Sung. "SARA regulates neuronal migration during neocortical development through L1 trafficking", <i>Development</i> , 2016 Publication	<1 %
10	S. Chumpawadee, K. Sommart, T. Vongpralub, V. Pattarajinda. "Effects of Synchronizing the Rate of Dietary Energy and Nitrogen Release on Ruminal Fermentation, Microbial Protein Synthesis, Blood Urea Nitrogen and Nutrient Digestibility in Beef Cattle", <i>Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences</i> , 2005 Publication	<1 %
11	<a href="http://www.ajas.info">www.ajas.info</a> Internet Source	<1 %
12	<a href="http://www.cambridge.org">www.cambridge.org</a> Internet Source	<1 %
13	<a href="http://www.oalib.com">www.oalib.com</a> Internet Source	<1 %
14	<a href="http://link.springer.com">link.springer.com</a> Internet Source	<1 %

15 Youl Chang Baek, Min Seok Kim, Kondreddy E Reddy, Young Kyoon Oh, Young Hun Jung, Joon Mo Yeo, Hyuck Choi. "Rumen fermentation and digestibility of spent mushroom (*Pleurotus ostreatus*) substrate inoculated with *Lactobacillus brevis* for Hanwoo steers", *Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias*, 2017

Publication

<1 %

---

16 D. Korir, J. P. Goopy, C. Gachuri, K. Butterbach-Bahl. "Supplementation with *Calliandra calothyrsus* improves nitrogen retention in cattle fed low-protein diets", *Animal Production Science*, 2016

Publication

<1 %

---

17 Kozloski, G.V.. "Intake and digestion by lambs of dwarf elephant grass (*Pennisetum purpureum* Schum. cv. Mott) hay or hay supplemented with urea and different levels of cracked corn grain", *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 20060106

Publication

<1 %

---

18 [acikerisim.ibu.edu.tr](http://acikerisim.ibu.edu.tr)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

19 [csdlkhoahoc.hueuni.edu.vn](http://csdlkhoahoc.hueuni.edu.vn)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

20 Submitted to National Paralegal College

Student Paper



<1 %

21

[mdpi-res.com](https://mdpi-res.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

22

William L.S. Reis, Málber N.N. Palma, Mário F. Paulino, Luciana N. Rennó, Edenio Detmann. "Investigation on daily or every three days supplementation with protein or protein and starch of cattle fed tropical forage", *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 2020

Publication

<1 %

23

A. Keli, L.P.S. Ribeiro, T.A. Gipson, R. Puchala, K. Tesfai, Y. Tsukahara, T. Sahl, A.L. Goetsch. "Effects of pasture access regime on performance, grazing behavior, and energy utilization by Alpine goats in early and mid-lactation", *Small Ruminant Research*, 2017

Publication

<1 %

24

[www.animbiosci.org](http://www.animbiosci.org)

Internet Source

<1 %

25

[yosemite.epa.gov](http://yosemite.epa.gov)

Internet Source

<1 %

26

Abebe, G.. "Effects of ammoniation of wheat straw and supplementation with soybean meal or broiler litter on feed intake and digestion in yearling Spanish goat wethers", *Small Ruminant Research*, 200401

<1 %

---

27 [d-scholarship.pitt.edu](https://d-scholarship.pitt.edu) <1 %  
Internet Source

---

28 [www.science.gov](http://www.science.gov) <1 %  
Internet Source

---

29 H. Yirga, R. Puchala, Y. Tsukahara, K. Tesfai, T. Sahlu, U.L. Mengistu, A.L. Goetsch. "Effects of level of brackish water and salinity on feed intake, digestion, heat energy, ruminal fluid characteristics, and blood constituent levels in growing Boer goat wethers and mature Boer goat and Katahdin sheep wethers", Small Ruminant Research, 2018 <1 %  
Publication

---

30 de Oliveira, A.S.. "Nutrient digestibility, nitrogen metabolism and hepatic function of sheep fed diets containing solvent or expeller castorseed meal treated with calcium hydroxide", Animal Feed Science and Technology, 20100602 <1 %  
Publication

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off