

(DMD)

ADF

(ADF)

(ME)

Cynodon dactylon

Lotus goebelia

...

()

()

()

()

(...

)

()

()

()

()

()

۵۰°۳۴'۳۰"

۳۶°۱۰'۴"

۵۰°۴۴'۱۸"

۳۶°۱۶'۵۸"

()

()

()

()

()

()

: ()
 %DMD = 83.85-0.824 ADF % + 2.626 N%

: ()
 M/D = 0.17 DMD% -2
 M/D

SAS

ADF

*Bromus tomentellus, Dactylic
 glomerata, Agropyron tauri, Stipa
 Hordeum bulbosum, Agropyron barbata,
 trichophorum*

*Prangus uloptera Apiaceae
 Diplotaenia cachrydifolia , Ferula ovina*

*Astragalus, Lotus,
 Thymus, Medicago, Salvia, Stachys
 ... Achillea , Euphorbia*

()
 ()

<i>Diplotaenia cachrydifolia</i>	(DMD)	(CP)	(ADF)
/		(ME)	
/ <i>Scorzonera lacinata</i>	ADF	()	
<i>Agropyron trichophorum</i>			
<i>Sanguisorba minor</i>	/		
ADF	/		

- Fibertec
- Oddy et al.
- Standard Committee on Agriculture

- Crude Protein
- Acid Detergent Fiber
- Dry Matter Digestibility
- Metabolizable Energy
- Van Soest

...

Lotus Astragalus aegobromus

/ / *goeblia* DM) / *Diplotaenia cachrydifoli*
 ADF / *Agropyron trichophorum* (Mj/kg
 (Mj/kg DM)

/ *Lotus goeblia*

(Mj/kg DM) *Lotus*
 (Mj/kgDM) / *Cynodon dactylon* *Bromus tomentellus* / *goeblia*
 /

(ME)	() DMD	() ADF	() CP		
LMN / ± /	LMN / ± /	DE / ± /	IHJ / ± /		<i>Agropyron tauri</i>
TU / ± /	TU / ± /	A / ± /	O / ± /		
LMN / ± /	LMN / ± /	D / ± /	FG / ± /		<i>Agropyron trichophorum</i>
TU / ± /	TU / ± /	A / ± /	N / ± /		
E / ± /	E / ± /	M / ± /	CD / ± /		<i>Astragalus aegobromus</i>
RS / ± /	RS / ± /	A / ± /	IJ / ± /		
GHI / ± /	GHI / ± /	IJK / ± /	D / ± /		<i>Bromus tomentellus</i>
QR / ± /	QR / ± /	C / ± /	R / ± /		
D / ± /	D / ± /	O / ± /	FG / ± /		<i>Centaurea virgata</i>
U / ± /	U / ± /	A / ± /	QR / ± /		
KLM / ± /	KLM / ± /	FG / ± /	K / ± /		<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>
U / ± /	U / ± /	A / ± /	R / ± /		
IJ / ± /	IJ / ± /	IJK / ± /	F / ± /		<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>
U / ± /	U / ± /	A / ± /	QR / ± /		
A / ± /	A / ± /	O / ± /	A / ± /		<i>Diplotaenia cachrydifolia</i>
KL / ± /	KL / ± /	GHI / ± /	ML / ± /		
B / ± /	B / ± /	Q / ± /	E / ± /		<i>Ferula ovina</i>
O / ± /	O / ± /	DEF / ± /	N / ± /		
B / ± /	B / ± /	P / ± /	B / ± /		<i>Ferula galbanifolia</i>
K / ± /	K / ± /	HIJ / ± /	KL / ± /		
GHI / ± /	GHI / ± /	L / ± /	FG / ± /		<i>Hordeum bulbosum</i>
U / ± /	U / ± /	A / ± /	OP / ± /		
B / ± /	B / ± /	P / ± /	C / ± /		<i>Lotus goeblia</i>
FG / ± /	FG ± /	M / ± /	IHJ / ± /		
GHI / ± /	GHI / ± /	L / ± /	IHG / ± /		<i>Melica persica</i>
Q / ± /	Q / ± /	C / ± /	OP / ± /		
HIJ / ± /	HIJ / ± /	LK / ± /	HG / ± /		<i>Prangus uloptera</i>
MNO / ± /	MNO / ± /	EF / ± /	ML / ± /		
KL / ± /	KL ± /	FG / ± /	J / ± /		<i>Psathyrostachys fragilis</i>
ST / ± /	ST / ± /	B / ± /	O / ± /		

B / ± /	B / ± /	Q / ± /	J / ± /		<i>Sanguisorba minor</i>
KLM / ± /	KLM / ± /	IJK / ± /	O / ± /		
C / ± /	C / ± /	O / ± /	B / ± /		<i>Scariola orientalis</i>
P / ± /	P / ± /	C / ± /	M / ± /		
F / ± /	F / ± /	N / ± /	L / ± /		<i>Scorzonera lacinata</i>
J / ± /	J / ± /	L / ± /	KL / ± /		
GHI / ± /	GHI / ± /	JKL / ± /	D / ± /		<i>Stipa barbata</i>
U / ± /	U / ± /	A / ± /	OPQ / ± /		
FGH / ± /	FGH / ± /	M / ± /	KL / ± /		<i>Thymus kotschyanus</i>
NO / ± /	NO / ± /	GH / ± /	O ± /		

Agropyron tauri CP
Agropyron trichophorum ME ADF ,
 ×
Psathyrostachys fragilis ME ADF CP
Sanguisorba minor
 ME CP
Bromus tomentellus ADF
 ×
 ME DMD ADF CP

...

(F)				
/ ** / ** / **	/	/		ADF
/ ** / ** / **	/	/		ADF
/ ** / ** / **	/	/		ADF *
	/	/		ADF
		/		ADF

*

()

.()

Lotus goeblia

()

()
()

()

.()

()

.()

/

.()

"

.()

,

"

()

()

()

	-۱
	-۲
	-۳
	-۴
()	-۵
()	-۶
	-۷
) <i>Trifolium pretense</i> <i>Coronilla varia</i>	-۸
()	-۸

9- Arzani. H., 1994. Some aspects of estimating short-term and long-term rangeland carrying capacity in the Western Division of New South Wales, Ph.D.Thesis, University of New South Wales, Australia.

10- Arzani. H., M. Zohdi, E.Fish, G.H. Zahedi Amiri, A. Nikkhah and D.Wester, 2004. Phenological effect on forage quality, *Journal of Range Management*: 57(6).pp.624-629.

11- Crowder,L.V.& Chheda,H.R,1982. *Tropical Grassland Husbandry*, Long Man Inc., New York. Pp.127-159.

12- Ghadaki.MB.,P.J. VanSoest,R.C.,Mcdowell & Malekpour B. 1974, Composition and in-vitro digestibility of some arid zone forage species of Iran, XII International Grassland Congress, Moscow, Vol. III Part 1.

13- Holechek,J.L.,C.H.Herbel & R.D.Pieper. 2001. *Range Management Principles and Practices*. Prentice Hall Pub. USA. Forth Edition. 587 p.

14- Norton,B.W.,M.H.Waterfall,2000,The nutritive value of *Tipuana tipu* and *Calliandra calochrsus* as supplements to low_quality straw for goats, *Small Ruminant Research*: 38. NO. 2. Pp.175. 182.

15- Oddy, V.H., Robards, G.E. & Low, S.G. 1983. Prediction of invivo dry matter digestibility from the fiber nitrogen content of a feed, In *Feed Information and Animal Production*, eds. G.E.Robards, and R.G. Pakham Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, Australia, pp. 395-398.

16- Pinkerton B.1996. "Forage Quality", *Crope & Soil Enviroment Science College Of Agriculture, Forest & life Science, Clemson University*.4p.

-
- 17- Rhodes, B.D.S.H. & Sharrow, S.H. 1990. Effect of grazing by sheep on the quantity and quality of forage available to big game in Oregon coast range. *Journal of Range Management*: 43. NO. 3. pp. 235-237.
- 18- CSIRO 1990. Feeding standards for Australian livestock: ruminants. Standing Committee on Agriculture and Resource Management. Ruminants sub-committee. Melbourne, CSIRO Publications. 266 p.
- 19- Vallentine J.F. 2001. *Grazing Management*, 2nd ed, Academic Press, New York, p. 657.
- 20- Van Soest, P.J., 1982, *Nutritional Ecology of the Ruminant* Books, Inc. Corvallis, 375 p.

An Investigation of the Effects of Phenological Stages on Forage Quality in Different Species in Taleghan Summer Rangelands

H. Arzani¹

M. Mosayyebi²

A. Nikkhah³

Abstract

Variation in forage quality at different phenological stages was investigated for twenty forage plant species. Samples at two phenological stages were collected from Taleghan summer rangelands. Nitrogen and acid detergent fiber (ADF) were measured through chemical analysis. Crude protein, ADF, dry matter digestibility and metabolizable energy were assessed as indicators of forage quality. Forage quality significantly differed at different phenological stages. It was higher at vegetative stage, while lower at maturity. Forage quality also differed significantly for different species ($p < 0.01$). Among species the highest forage quality was related to *Lotus goebelia* while the lowest related to *Cynodon dactylon*.

Keywords: Forage quality, Phenological stages, Crude protein, Acid detergent fiber, Dry matter Digestibility, Metabolizable energy.

1- Professor, Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran

2- Ph.D. Scholar Range Management, Azad University, Science and Research Unit

3- Professor, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Tehran