Effect of Feeding Of fortified Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks on Milk Yield of Dairy Cows During Winter Months in Kashmir

**ABSTRACT**

To evaluate the effect of urea molasses mineral blocks with or without enzyme and herb enrichment on the milk yield and milk composition of dairy cows during winter months, the experiment was conducted at Mountain Livestock Research Institute (MLRI)-Manasbal, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, in two phases. In phase 1, experimental multinutrient blocks were prepared and grouping of experimental animals was done based on body weight, stage of lactation, milk yield and parity. In phase 2 of the experiment, animals were offered UMMBs( Urea molasses mineral blocks) and collection of milk samples was done. Milk yield was recorded on daily basis. Milk composition was recorded thrice (start of experiment, mid and at the end of experiment) during the trial (day 0, day 22, day 45of the trial). The milk yield in treatment groups was increased as compared to the control group in which case it was decreased during the experimental period (Dec to Feb). However, this increase in milk yield was non-significant. Highest milk production was recorded in T4 (*Urtica dioca* + enzyme enriched UMMB) and the lowest average milk production was recorded in T0 (Control) group. Significant (P=.05) increase in milk protein percentage was found in all the treatment groups as compared to control group with highest average protein percentage in T4 (*Urtica dioca* and enzyme fortified UMMB) and lowest in T1 (control) group, although there was increase in milk fat percentage and 3.5% fat corrected milk in all treatment groups compared to control group but the differences did not show statistical significance. Significantly (P=.05) higher milk SNF percentage was recorded in T4 group as compared to other treatments and control groups. Milk lactose was reported significantly (P=.05) higher in T1 and T4 than T0 (control).
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**1. Introduction**

Around two-thirds of India’s population depends on agriculture, contributing 17% to GDP, with 27% from animal husbandry (Anonymous, 2017). However, low milk productivity remains a concern. Poor nutrition due to non-scientific feeding is a key factor, with fodder shortages of 33% (concentrates), 60% (green fodder), and 42% (dry fodder) (Datta, 2013). J&K faces a 40% fodder deficit, with Kashmir (49%) and Ladakh (85%) worst affected (Ganai *et al.,* 2006).Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks (UMMBs) offer a cost-effective solution to fortify low-quality roughage (Jayawickrama *et al.*, 2013). These blocks, containing urea, molasses, minerals, and additives, improve digestibility, feed intake, and milk yield while enhancing microbial growth in the rumen. UMMB supplementation increases feed intake by 25-30%, digestibility by 20% (Yami, 2007), and milk yield (Ramesh *et al.*, 2009), improving fertility(Mengistu and Hassan, 2017)and reducing stress.Fortification with probiotics, enzymes, and herbs further enhances UMMB benefits. Urtica dioca, a wild herb rich in minerals and proteins, boosts digestion and immunity. Exogenous fibrolytic enzymes improve fiber digestibility (Burroughs *et al.*, 1960) optimizing forage utilization. With technological advancements, enzyme supplementation has become cost-effective. Given these advantages, a study will be conducted to evaluate UMMB's impact on milk yield and composition in dairy cows.

**2. Methods**

The present study was carried out at Division of Animal Nutrition, Faculty of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry Shuhama and Mountain Livestock Research Institute (MLRI), Manasbal, SKUAST- Kashmir, to assess the effect of fortification of urea molasses mineral blocks by *Urtica dioca* and exogenous fibrolytic enzyme in ration of dairy cows on milk yield and milk composition. The study was carried out in two phases;

2.1. Preparation of UMMBs and grouping of experimental animals

2.2. Feeding of UMMBs, collection and analysis of milk.

**2.1. Preparation of UMMBs and grouping of experimental animals**

**2.1.1. Collection of additives:** Stinging nettle was collected from the premises of Mountain Livestock Research Institute (MLRI), Manasbal, Kashmir. It was freed from dirt and dust and allowed to dry under shade. Dried stinging nettle was crushed using grinding machine and stored in air tight containers after proper labeling at room temperature. Exogenous fibrolytic enzyme used in the present study was received from Division of Animal Nutrition, FVSC SKUAST-K formulated by Sheikh *et al.* (2017). Exogenous fibrolytic enzyme contained Xylanase (350000U), Beta-glucanase (480000U), Cellulase (1200000U), Amylase (5250000U), Pectinase (250000U), Phytase (500000U), Mannase (100000U)

**2.1.2. Experimental ration**: The ration comprised of roughage (maize silage, mixed hay, root crops) and concentrate mixture (compound cattle feed) manufactured at Feed Mill at MLRI, Manasbal. The parts of compound cattle feed were maize, wheat bran, mustard oil cake, rice polish, molasses, salt and mineral mixture. The feeding schedule of experimental animals as in vogue at MLRI Manasbal is given in table 3.3. The animals were not supplemented with UMMB in control group (T0), 300g of non-fortified UMMB was offered to T1, 300g of Urtica fortified UMMB in T2, 300g of fibrolytic enzyme fortified UMMB in T3 and 300g of Urtica and enzyme fortified UMMB in T4, respectively. UMMBs were prepared by cold process dissolving urea in lukewarm and then with molasses in a container. This mixture was added with Salt-cement paste prepared in another container. Other ingredients like wheat bran, mineral mixture, grinded mustard oil cake, Urtica powder and enzyme were added to this mixture after proper weighing. After through mixing, the mixture was put in wooden mould with polythene sheet at base and properly pressed so that the mixture gets in proper shape. Then the mould was emptied by turning it upside down and the block was kept for proper solidification and drying.The ingredient composition of UMMBs used in the experiment are given in Table 1.

**Table-1: Composition of UMMBs used during the trial**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ingredients (kg)** | **T1**  **(Non-fortified UMMB)** | **T2**  **(Urtica fortified UMMB)** | **T3**  **(F. Enzyme fortified UMMB)** | **T4**  **(Urtica and F. Enzyme fortified UMMB)** |
| Urea | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| Molasses | 45.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 |
| Wheat bran | 21.00 | 21.00 | 21.00 | 21.00 |
| Mustard oil cake | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| Mineral mixture | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| Salt | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Cement | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Urtica |  | 2.00 | - | 1.00 |
| Enzyme | - | - | 2.00 | 1.00 |

**2.1.3. Grouping of experimental animals**: The experiment was conducted on thirty lactating Jersey cows in early stages of lactation. The animals were randomly divided into 5 experimental groups of 6 animals each based on average body weight, stage of lactation, average milk yield per day and parity (Table 2). All the experimental animals were kept under similar managemental conditions with respect to housing, basal feeding and watering. The animals were kept indoor within well-ventilated cemented floor sheds during the entire experimental period and left loose in the paddock briefly for exercise. The animals were treated for ecto and endoparasites with proper doses of standard anthelminthics. Clean, wholesome drinking water was kept available all the time within shed.

**2.2. Feeding of UMMBs, collection and analysis of milk samples.**

**2.2.1. *Feeding of UMMBs***: Before the start of experimental trail, an adaptation period of 15 days was provided to introduce animal to the UMMB supplementation, during which the experimental animals were allowed to lick the UMMB for specified time period to prevent toxicity. During the 45 days of the feeding trial, the animals were offered 300 grams of UMMB daily. Animals in the T0 (control) were offered conventional feeding as per feeding schedule of MLRI, Manasbal without any supplementation. However, animals of experimental groups were provided with 300g of non-fortified UMMB, 300g of Urtica fortified UMMB, 300g of fibrolytic enzyme fortified UMMB and 300g of Urtica and enzyme fortified UMMB in T1, T2, T3, T4, respectively.

**Table 2: Grouping of experimental animals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No.** | **Animal No.** | **Lactation stage**  **(month)** | **Body weight**  **(kg)** | **Milk production**  **(liters)** | **Parity** |
| **T0 (Conventional feeding)** | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | 8.00 | 279.00 | 4.50 | 4.00 |
| 2 | 2 | 7.00 | 304.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| 3 | 3 | 8.00 | 254.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 315.00 | 8.50 | 3.00 |
| 5 | 5 | 6.50 | 300.00 | 6.00 | 3.00 |
| 6 | 6 | 7.00 | 276.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 |
| **Avg.** |  | **6.75** | **288.00** | **5.50** | **3.00** |
| **T1 (Group receiving CF+ Non fortified UMMB)** | | | | | |
| 1 | 7 | 8.00 | 331.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| 2 | 8 | 2.00 | 241.00 | 5.00 | 1.00 |
| 3 | 9 | 9.00 | 297.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 4 | 10 | 7.00 | 340.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| 5 | 11 | 7.00 | 310.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| 6 | 12 | 6.00 | 294.00 | 4.50 | 4.00 |
| **Avg** |  | **6.50** | **302.16** | **4.75** | **3.00** |
| **T2  (Group receiving CF+UMMB fortified with 1% Urtica)** | | | | | |
| 1 | 13 | 7.00 | 194.00 | 4.50 | 1 |
| 2 | 14 | 7.00 | 328.00 | 3.00 | 4 |
| 3 | 15 | 4.00 | 310.00 | 5.40 | 3 |
| 4 | 16 | 8.00 | 372.00 | 4.70 | 4 |
| 5 | 17 | 7.00 | 310.00 | 3.90 | 3 |
| 6 | 18 | 6.00 | 292.00 | 5.00 | 3 |
| **Avg.** |  | **6.50** | **301.00** | **4.40** | **3.25** |
| **T3 (Group receiving CF+ UMMB containing 1% enzyme)** | | | | | |
| 1 | 19 | 3.00 | 297.00 | 4.50 | 4 |
| 2 | 20 | 8.00 | 272.00 | 3.00 | 1 |
| 3 | 21 | 9.00 | 263.00 | 5.00 | 3 |
| 4 | 22 | 4.00 | 342.00 | 6.50 | 4 |
| 5 | 23 | 7.00 | 297.00 | 5.00 | 4 |
| 6 | 24 | 5.00 | 300.00 | 4.50 | 3 |
| **Avg.** |  | **6.00** | **295.25** | **4.75** | **3.16** |
| **T4 (Group receiving CF+UMMB containing 1% Urtica and 1% enzyme)** | | | | | |
| 1 | 25 | 7.00 | 401.00 | 5.00 | 4 |
| 2 | 26 | 8.00 | 272.00 | 5.00 | 1 |
| 3 | 27 | 4.00 | 224.00 | 5.00 | 4 |
| 4 | 28 | 7.00 | 276.00 | 5.00 | 1 |
| 5 | 29 | 7.00 | 298.00 | 5.10 | 4 |
| 6 | 30 | 6.00 | 289.00 | 5.10 | 3 |
| **Avg** |  | **6.50** | **293.25** | **5.03** | **2.83** |

in T4 respectively in addition to conventional feeding. Concentrate feed and roughage was offered individually to all animals twice daily in equal amounts in morning and evening, whereas UMMBs were offered once daily in the morning. Blocks were weighed before and after feeding to record the intake. Experimental animals were provided with free access to clean drinking water throughout the experimental period of 60 days. Feeding schedule of experimental animals is given in Table 3.

**Table 3. Feeding Schedule of experimental animals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No.** | **Group** | **Routine diet (kg/animal/day)** | | | **Compound**  **Cattle**  **Feed** | **UMMB supplementation (grams/animal/day)** | |
| **Root crops (Chaffed turnips)** | **Maize Silage** | **Mixed hay** | **Adaptation** | **Trial** |
| 1 | T0 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 100-300 | 300 |
| 2 | T1 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 3 | T2 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 4 | T3 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 5 | T4 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |

**2.3. Parameters studied and observation taken**

**2.3.1. Milk yield**: The milk yield was recorded daily in the morning at 7 am and in evening at 5 pm with the help of measuring cylinder during the experimental period.

**2.3.2. Milk composition*:*** Composition of milk with respect to protein, fat, lactose SNF was analyzed using automatic milk analyzer (EKOMILK ultra PRO) on day 0, day 22, day 45 of the trial period).Fat corrected milk (FCM) was estimated using the formula given by Parekh, 1986:

FCM (3.5%) = 0.35M+18.57F

Where, M = quantity of milk in kg

F =quantity of fat in kg

**2.4. Statistical analysis**

The data obtained in the experiment was analyzed using statistical procedures as given by Snedecor and Cochran (1994) and significance of mean difference was tested by Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test (DNMRT) using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Base 20.0 (SPSS Software products, Marketing Department, SPSS Inc. Chicago, USA)

**3. Results & Discussion:**

In order to assess the impact of UMMB supplementation with or without feed additives on performance of dairy cattle during winter months, four types of blocks viz., Non -fortified UMMB (T1), Urtica fortified UMMB (T2), Enzyme fortified UMMB (T3) and enzyme and Urtica fortified UMMBs (T4) were formulated and fed to dairy animals for sixty days including fifteen days of adaptation period. The following results were obtained during the experiment

**3.1. Effect on Milk yield**

Effect of supplementation of urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on the milk yield (liters) of dairy cattle is shown in Table 4 and Figure 1. Statistical analysis of the data revealed non-significant difference in average milk yield from 0 to 30 day of the experimental period. Significant (P=.05) difference in average milk yield was found during 30-45 days of the trial with significantly (P=.05) higher milk yield in T4 group than control (T0). However, there was non-significant difference in milk yield between animals of T1, T2 and T3 groups than control (T0). Statistically there was no significant difference in average milk yield between animals of treatment (supplemented) and control groups, however in control group reduction in milk yield (870 ml/day) was noticed as winter progressed. Maximum increase in milk production was recorded in T4 (710 ml/day). Supplementation of UMMB not only sustained milk production but also yielded non-significant increase in average milk yield. The reason behind decrease in milk yield in control group could be the stress due to sub-zero temperature prevalent in Kashmir during winter months (Dec- Feb). Our results fall in line with the observations of Upreti *et al.* (2010) and Jayawickrama *et al.* (2013) who reported non-significant increase of 1.1 liters milk/animal/day (17.1%) in crossbred Jersey cows under hill management system and non-significant increase of about 6% was recorded in milk offtake in treatment groups, respectively on supplementation of UMMB. Alam *et al.* (2006) also reported non-significant increase in milk yield in cows till day 60 postpartum, thereafter pleateau was observed till day 90 postpartum in milk yield in the treatment group after UMMB supplementation. Regarding effect of supplementing *Urtica dioca,* no significant change in milk yield following addition of stinging nettle haylage to the total mixed ration of lactating cattle was reported by Humpries and Reynolds (2014). Results of our study with respect to fibrolytic enzyme fortified UMMB on milk yield finds support from Zilio *et al.* (2019) who reported no significant change in milk yield between control and fibrolytic, amylolytic and combination of fibrolytic and amylolytic enzyme fed in HF cows

**Table 4: Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on the milk yield (liters) of dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| Day 0 | 5.00 ±1.08 | 4.75 ±0.45 | 4.37 ±0.71 | 4.75 ±1.01 | 5.00 ±0.40 |
| 0-15 days | 5.17 ±0.60 | 4.95 ±0.47 | 4.53 ±0.27 | 4.83 ±0.11 | 5.10 ±0.54 |
| 15-30days | 4.71 ±0.85 | 5.01 ±0.43 | 4.82 ±0.24 | 5.05 ±0.17 | 5.38 ±0.47 |
| 30-45 days | 4.30 ±0.76a | 5.05 ±0.47ab | 5.02 ±0.22ab | 5.30 ±0.61ab | 5.81 ±0.36b |
| **Average** | **4.73 ±0.41** | **5.00 ±0.25** | **4.79 ±0.14** | **5.06 ±0.09** | **5.43 ±0.26** |
| **Gain/loss(ml)** | **-870** | **+100** | **+490** | **+470** | **+710** |

Means superscripted with different letters in a row (a, b, c, d) for a particular data differ significantly from each other (P=.05).

**Figure 1: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or**

**without feed additives on the milk yield (liters) of dairy cattle**

**3.2. Effect on milk composition**

**3.2.1. Effect on milk protein percentage*:*** A significant (P=.05) increase in milk protein percentage was found in all treatments as compared to control. Highest average protein percentage (3.22%) was found in T4 and the lowest (2.71%) in T1 (control) group. Increase in milk protein in treatment groups could be due to urea supplementation as source of NPN in UMMB. Our results are in line with reports of Duressa and Berissa, (2016) who found significant (P=.05) increase (3.46%) in milk protein percentage in treatment groups compared to control group after UMMB supplementation. Regarding effect of *Urtica dioca*, Khanal *et al,* (2017) and Andualem *et al,* (2016b) found significant (P=.05) difference in milk protein percentage following nettle inclusion in the diet. Enhancement of milk protein by exogenous fibrolytic enzyme supplementation are similar to results obtained by Lunagariya *et al.* (2019) who reported significantly (P=.05) higher milk protein percentage in cows fed exogenous fibrolytic enzyme (Xylanase, glucanase).However Zilio *et al.* (2019) reported lower milk protein percentage in enzyme fed groups as compared to control group, whereas, Mohamad *et al.* (2013), Rodea *et al.* (2013) and Azam *et al.* (2017) reported non-significant change in milk protein percentage compared to control group following exogenous fibrolytic enzyme treatment of rations. The variation in milk protein percentage may be due to different dietary regimes under varied environmental and physiological conditions.

**Figure 2: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or without feed additives on percent milk protein of dairy cattle**

**Table 5. Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on percent milk protein of dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| 0 day | 2.62±6.12 | 2.91±0.13 | 2.87±0.04 | 2.93±0.10 | 2.89±0.21 |
| 22 day | 2.72±0.12a | 3.09±0.19ab | 3.19±0.10b | 3.92±0.13b | 3.18±0.21b |
| 45 day | 2.79±0.11a | 3.36±0.07b | 3.52±0.13b | 3.44±0.15b | 3.60±0.15b |
| **Average** | **2.71±0.06a** | **3.12±0.07b** | **3.19±0.08b** | **3.22±0.08b** | **3.22±0.12b** |

Means superscripted with different letters in a row (a, b, c, d) for a particular data differ significantly from each other (P=.05)

**3.2.2. Effect on milk fat percentage***:* Non-significant increase in milk fat percentage was recorded in all treatment groups compared to control group during the entire trial period. Our results are in agreement with Akhter *et al.* (2004) and Jayawickrama *et al.* (2013) who found non-significant increase in milk fat percentage after UMMB feeding. Our results are also in line with observations of Duressa and Berissa, (2016) who reported non-significant increase in milk fat in treatment group (6.20%) compared to control group (6.0%) on UMMB supplementation. However, Shah *et al.* (2018) found significant (P=.05) increase of 8.23% in milk fat following UMMB supplementation.

Inclusion of nettle in the diet showed non-significant increase in milk fat percentage. Andualem *et al.* (2016b) also reported non-significant change in milk fat percentage following replacement of graded percentage of concentrate by stinging nettle leaf. However Khanal *et al.* (2017) reported significant increase in milk fat percentage from 4.61 to 5.61% two weeks after nettle supplementation in treatment group as compared to control group. Pertaining to exogenous fibrolytic enzyme supplementation, our results are in agreement with Zilio *et al.* (2019), Rodea *et al.* (2013), Azam *et al.* (2017) who reported non-significant change in milk fat percentage in exogenous fibrolytic enzyme offered groups as compared to control group. However Lunagariya *et al.* (2019) reported significantly (P=.05) higher milk fat percentage in cows provided exogenous fibrolytic enzyme (Xylanase, glucanase).

**Table 6. Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on the percent milk fat of dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| 0 day | 3.99±0.34 | 3.87±0.20 | 3.73±0.18 | 3.84±0.32 | 3.72±0.08 |
| 22 day | 4.08±0.25 | 4.05±0.18 | 3.86±0.20 | 3.63±0.11 | 3.96±0.06 |
| 45 day | 3.88±0.34 | 4.21±0.16 | 4.07±0.16 | 3.70±0.11 | 4.15±0.13 |
| **Average** | **3.98±0.17** | **4.04 ±0.4** | **3.88±0.10** | **3.72±0.11** | **3.94±0.06** |

**Figure 3: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or without feed additives on the percent milk fat of dairy cattle**

**3.2.3. Effect on milk solid not fat (SNF) percentage**: Significantly (P=.05) higher milk SNF percentage was recorded in T4 (8.00%) as compared to other treatment groups and control (7.47%). Results obtained for milk SNF are in agreement with Jayawickrama *et al.* (2013) who reported non-significant change in milk SNF upon supplementation of UMMBs. However, Lawania and Khadda, (2017) reported significant (P=.05) increase in milk SNF following usage of UMMBs in feed of dairy cattle.

Pertaining to *Urtica dioca* supplementation, SNF percentage showed significant (P=.05) increase following nettle inclusion in diet (Khanal *et al.*, 2017). However Andualem *et al.* (2016b) reported non-significant change in milk SNF percentage following replacement of graded percentage of concentrate by stinging nettle leaf meal. Lunagariya *et al.* (2018) reported higher SNF percentage in milk of cows fed exogenous fibrolytic enzyme (Xylanase, glucanase). However, Mohamed *et al.* (2013), Azam *et al.* (2017) reported non-significant increase in milk SNF in exogenous fibrolytic enzyme supplemented groups as compared to control.

**Table 7. Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on percent milk SNF content in dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| 0 day | 7.44±0.19 | 7.51±0.10 | 7.48±0.07 | 7.41±0.17 | 7.72±0.20 |
| 22 day | 7.51±0.21a | 7.66±0.16a | 7.63±0.09a | 7.59±0.14a | 8.03±0.18b |
| 45 day | 7.45±0.23a | 7.69±0.13a | 7.91±0.12a | 7.69±0.15a | 8.27±0.18b |
| **Average** | **7.47±0.11a** | **7.62±0.07A** | **7.67±0.07a** | **7.56±0.08a** | **8.00±0.11b** |

Means superscripted with different letters in a row (a, b, c, d) for a particular data differ significantly from each other (P=.05)

**Figure 4: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or without feed additives on percent SNF content of milk of dairy cattle**

**3.2.4. Effect on milk lactose percentage:** Milk lactose was reported significantly (P=.05) higher in T1 and T4 than control. Likewise, Lunagariya *et al.* (2019) reported higher lactose percentage in cows fed exogenous fibrolytic enzyme (Xylanase, glucanase). However, Jayawickrama *et al.* (2013) did not find any change in milk lactose on supplementation of UMMB. Zilio *et al.* (2019), Rodea *et al.* (2013) and Mohamed *et al.* (2013) reported non-significant change in milk lactose percentage in enzyme fed groups as compared to control group.

**Table 8. Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on the percent milk lactose of dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| 0 day | 3.89±0.06 | 3.95±0.07 | 3.75±0.08 | 3.83±0.09 | 3.93±0.07 |
| 22 day | 3.91±0.03 | 4.11±0.07 | 4.02±0.06 | 4.10±0.13 | 4.14±0.09 |
| 45 day | 3.94±0.03a | 4.30±0.11b | 4.32±0.07b | 4.22±0.14ab | 4.46±0.07b |
| **Average** | **3.91±0.02a** | **4.12±0.05b** | **4.03±0.07ab** | **4.05±0.07ab** | **4.18±0.06b** |

Means superscripted with different letters in a row (a, b, c, d) for a particular data differ significantly from each other (P=.05)

**Figure 5: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or without feed additives on the percent milk lactose of dairy cattle**

**3.2.5. Effect on Fat Corrected Milk:** Fat corrected milk (FCM) was found non-significantly higher in all treatments as compared to control. Sudhakar *et al.* (2002) reported 1.5 kg higher milk yield in buffaloes offered UMMB as compared to control. Similarly, Sevilla Lacandula.(2001) published increase in 4% FCM in cows following UMMB inclusion in the diet.

*Urtica dioca* supplementation didn’t resulted in significant change in fat and protein corrected milk (Humpries and Reynolds, 2014). Considering exogenous fibrolytic enzyme supplementation, Non-significant change in 4% FCM was found (Peters *et al.*, 2015).On the other hand, Bordeny *et al.* (2015) and Mohamad *et al.* (2013) reported significant (P=.05) change in FCM after exogenous fibrolytic enzyme mixture in the diet**.**

**Table 9. Effect of supplementation of Urea molasses mineral blocks with or without feed additives on fat corrected milk (3.5%) of dairy cattle**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experimental period** | **T0** | **T1** | **T2** | **T3** | **T4** |
| 0 day | 5.70±0.81 | 4.86±0.37 | 5.20±0.62 | 5.31±0.46 | 5.03±0.14 |
| 22 day | 5.31±1.13 | 5.35±0.41 | 5.39±0.60 | 5.48±0.42 | 5.49±0.20 |
| 45 day | 4.64±0.97 | 5.71±0.39 | 5.63±0.65 | 6.00±0.28 | 5.95±0.22 |
| **Average** | **5.22±0.55** | **5.31±0.23** | **5.41±0.34** | **5.60±0.22** | **5.49±0.14** |

**Figure 6: Effect of supplementation of Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks with or without feed additives on the Fat corrected milk (3.5%) of dairy cattle**

**4. CONCLUSION**

Based on above findings, it is concluded that supplementation of UMMB non-significantly improved milk production and composition and helped animals to withstand harsh winter conditions of Kashmir valley.

**5. Abbreviations**

FCM, Fat corrected milk; MLRI, Mountain Livestock Research Institute; SNF, Solid not fat; UMMB, Urea molasses mineral block.
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