

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Fatty acid profile and nutritive value of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) seeds and plants at different growth stages

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/140602> since 2015-12-10T10:09:59Z

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

This is an author version of the contribution published on:

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

[Animal Feed Science and Technology 183 (2013) doi site:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2013.04.012>]

The definitive version is available at:

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:

[<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037784011300093X>]

1 **Fatty acid profile and nutritive value of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) seeds and plants**
2 **at different growth stages**

3

4 P.G. Peiretti^{a*}, F. Gai^a, S. Tassone^b

5

6 ^aInstitute of Sciences of Food Production, National Research Council, via L. da Vinci 44, 10095

7 Grugliasco (TO), Italy.

8 ^bDepartment of Animal Sciences, University of Torino, via L. da Vinci 44, 10095

9 Grugliasco (TO), Italy.

10

11 * Corresponding author. Tel. +39-011-6709230, fax: +39-011-6709297

12 E-mail: piergiorgio.peiretti@ispa.cnr.it (P.G. Peiretti)

13

1 **Abstract**

2 Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) is a native of the Andean region and belongs to the
3 group of crops known as pseudocereals. It has great potential for improving food for humans and
4 animals. Quinoa was studied to determine its fatty acid (FA) composition, chemical composition,
5 gross energy, *in vitro* dry matter digestibility (IVDMD) and neutral detergent fibre digestibility
6 (IVNDFD) of the seeds and of the plant during growth. Herbage samples were collected six times at
7 progressive morphological stages from the early vegetative to the grain fill stage. The effect of plant
8 ageing was analysed by polynomial contrasts. The chemical composition of quinoa is closely
9 connected to the development of the plant and the quality of crop decreased with increasing
10 morphological stages. Dry matter (DM), organic matter (OM), neutral detergent fibre (NDFom)
11 content increased linearly from the mid vegetative to the grain fill stage, while acid detergent fibre
12 (ADFom) content increased linearly from the first to the last stage. The pattern of FAs in the seed
13 was characterised by three dominant FAs: palmitic acid (PA, C_{16:0}), oleic acid (OA, C_{18:1 n-9}) and
14 linoleic acid (LA, C_{18:2 n-6}). Between main FAs of the plant during growth, α -linolenic acid (ALA,
15 C_{18:3 n-3}) was the most abundant FA (from 385 to 473 g/kg of total FA), while LA content, which
16 ranged from 146 to 176 g/kg of total FA, decreased with increasing growth until the shooting stage
17 and then increased, while PA, OA and stearidonic acid (C_{18:4 n-3}) did not show significant
18 differences in their content during growth. Moreover as far as LA content polynomial contrasts
19 showed linear and quadratic effects. IVDMD and IVNDFD decreased linearly with increasing
20 stages and the gross energy content from the early vegetative stage to the mid vegetative stage and
21 then increased from the late vegetative stage to the grain fill stage. The first summer cut of quinoa,
22 whose lipid fraction is rich in ALA and other polyunsaturated FAs, should be performed before
23 shooting, since its nutritional quality deteriorates when cutting is delayed.

24

1 *Keywords: Chenopodium quinoa* L.; Growth stage; Lipid; Fibrous fractions; Crude protein, *In vitro*
2 digestibility.

3
4 **Abbreviations:** **ADFom**, acid detergent fibre expressed exclusive of residual ash; **ALA**, α -linolenic
5 acid ; **CP**, crude protein; **EE**, ether extract; **FA**, fatty acid; **FM**, fresh matter; **GE**, gross energy;
6 **IVDMD**, *in vitro* dry matter digestibility; **IVNDFD**, *in vitro* neutral detergent fibre digestibility;
7 **LA**, linoleic acid; **NDFom**, neutral detergent fibre expressed exclusive of residual ash; **OA**, oleic
8 acid; **OM**, organic matter; **PA**, palmitic acid; **PUFA**, polyunsaturated fatty acids; **SA**, stearic acid

10 **1. Introduction**

11 Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) seed is a human staple food of Andean South
12 America that has received attention because of its high nutritional value, due in particular to the
13 fatty acid (FA) composition (Wood et al., 1993) with a high proportion of unsaturated FA,
14 particularly of oleic acid (OA, C_{18:1 n-9}) and linoleic acid (LA, C_{18:2 n-6}) and its balanced amino-acid
15 spectrum with high methionine (4–10 g/kg DM) and lysine (51–64 g/kg DM) contents (Bhargava et
16 al., 2003).

17 Quinoa seed has also been used as animal feed. Jacobsen et al. (1997) concluded that quinoa
18 seed has potential as broiler feed, but proportionally should not exceed 150 g/kg of the diet, while
19 they found that dehulling of quinoa slightly improved performance in broilers. Horsted and
20 Hermansen (2007) found that nutrient-restricted, high-producing organic layers are capable of
21 finding and utilising considerable amounts of different feed items (quinoa and other forage crops)
22 from a cultivated foraging area without negative effects on their health and welfare. Improtta and
23 Kellens (2001) reported that processing (polishing or washing) of quinoa prior to feeding, or
24 diluting the quinoa with some other available feed are viable options that can be considered for
25 improving performance of broilers when quinoa is a major component of the diet.

1 Quinoa has been evaluated as a new crop outside its original areas of cultivation (Van
2 Schooten and Pinxterhuis, 2003; Jacobsen et al., 2005).

3 The plant's nutritional value is considerable and the whole plant has been used as animal
4 feed (Galwey, 1989). Harvest residues are also used to feed cattle, sheep, pigs, horses and poultry
5 (FAO, 1994). Rosero et al. (2010) indicated that a high proportion of Colombian livestock farmers
6 know the quinoa crop, but a low proportion of farmers (20%) used quinoa in animal feed. Research
7 in Denmark showed that quinoa could be a valuable forage crop for dairy farms when ensiled, with
8 good yields and high protein content (Darwinkel and Stolen, 1998).

9 Although claims of a nutritionally favourable quality of quinoa seed have been made, only
10 limited information is available on the evolution of **the chemical composition in the whole plant at**
11 **different growth stages. The objective of this study was to determine the fatty acid profile and**
12 **nutritive value of quinoa seeds and plants during growth.**

13

14 **2. Materials and methods**

15 *2.1. Plant material*

16 **The quinoa seeds (Ayni variety), which was grown in Mantaro Valley (Peru),** were kindly
17 furnished by Dr. Aurelio Ciancio (Institute for Plant Protection, National Research Council, Bari,
18 Italy), who obtained them from the Escuela de Nutrición Psicosomática (Lima, Peru). The study
19 was conducted in the Western Po Valley near Cuneo, Italy. The quinoa stands were seeded in May
20 2010. No irrigation or fertilisers were applied after sowing. The herbage samples were collected
21 from 1 m² subplots randomly located in 3 x 6 m² plots with three replicates. Plants were cut to a 1-2
22 cm stubble height. Sampling was performed in the morning after the evaporation of dew and was
23 never carried out on rainy days. Herbage samples were collected **with edging shears (0.1m cutting**
24 **width) at six** progressive morphological stages from early vegetative to grain fill stage from the end
25 of June to the end of September 2010.

1

2 *2.2. Chemical analysis*

3 The herbage samples were immediately dried in a forced-draft air oven to a constant weight
4 and the drying temperature was set at 65°C. The samples were then brought to air temperature,
5 weighed, ground in a Cyclotec mill (Tecator, Herndon, VA, USA) to pass through a 1 mm screen
6 and stored for qualitative analyses.

7 Whole seed and dried herbage samples were analysed by methods of AOAC (1990) for DM
8 (#925.40), N (#984.13), and ash (#923.03). Neutral detergent fibre (NDFom), acid detergent fibre
9 (ADFom) and lignin (sa) were determined with the Ankom²⁰⁰ Fibre Analyser (Ankom Technology
10 Corp., Fairport, NY, USA), following the Ankom Technology Method and corrected for residual
11 ash content. The NDF of herbage samples was analyzed without sodium sulfite and α -amylase. The
12 gross energy (GE) was determined using an adiabatic calorimeter bomb (IKA C7000, Staufen,
13 Germany).

14 Fresh samples (200 g) of the herbage were refrigerated, freeze-dried and ground to pass
15 through a 1 mm screen. Lipid extraction was performed on freeze-dried samples according to Hara
16 and Radin (1978), while the transesterification of the FAs was performed according to Christie
17 (1982), with the modifications described by Chouinard et al. (1999).

18 The FAs were analysed as their methyl esters. The analysis was carried out by gas
19 chromatography, using a Dani GC 1000 DPC (Dani Instruments S.P.A., Cologno Monzese, Italy),
20 equipped with a Supelcowax-10 fused silica capillary column (60 m x 0.32 mm (i.d.), 0.25 μ m).
21 The injector and detector ports were set at 245°C and 270°C, respectively. The oven temperature
22 program was initially set at 50°C for the first min, and then increased at a rate of 15°C/min to
23 200°C, where it remained for 20 min and then increased at a rate of 5°C/min to 230°C, where it
24 remained for the last 3 min. The carrier gas was helium. One microlitre was injected using a Dani
25 ALS 1000 autosampler with a 1:50 split ratio. The peak area was measured using a Dani Data

1 Station DDS 1000, where each peak was identified and quantified according to pure methyl ester
2 standards (Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA).

3

4 *2.3 In vitro digestibility*

5 The samples were also analysed to determine their *in vitro* dry matter digestibility (IVDMD)
6 and NDF digestibility (IVNDFD) using the Daisy^{II} Incubator (Ankom Technology Corp., Fairport,
7 NY, USA) according to Robinson et al. (1999). The *in vitro* rumen incubations were performed in
8 two fermentative runs with different rumen inoculum. Ground samples (250 mg) were inserted into
9 filter bags (Ankom F57 bags) which were then sealed. Jars were divided vertically by using a
10 perforated plastic separator and 2 bags for each sample were inserted on either side of the separator,
11 giving a total of 18 bags per jars. Moreover, seed samples were incubated in another jar in the same
12 run. Digestion jars were filled with pre-warmed (39°C) buffer solutions and placed into the
13 incubator. Rumen liquor was collected from rumen contents obtained at a slaughterhouse from
14 cattle (two animals per run) of the same farm and fed a fibre-rich diet (Spanghero et al., 2010).
15 Rumen liquor was filtered (through two layers of cheesecloth) and 400 ml of it was introduced into
16 each jar together with the filter bags. After 48 h of incubation, the bags were removed, rinsed
17 thoroughly with cold tap water and immediately analysed for NDF content with the Ankom²⁰⁰ Fibre
18 Analyzer and incinerated to correct the residual NDF for the residual ash.

19 IVDMD was calculated using the following equation:

$$20 \quad 1 - (W_3 - (W_1 * C_1)) * 1000 / (W_2 * DM),$$

21 where W_1 is the filter bag weight, W_2 is the sample weight, W_3 is the final weight (filter
22 bag+residue) after *in vitro* and sequential treatment with NDF solution, C_1 is a comparison of the
23 blank filter bag weight after and before digestion treatment and DM is the dry matter content (g/kg)
24 of the samples.

25 IVNDFD was calculated using the following equation:

$$1-(W_3-(W_1*C_1))*1000/(W_2*NDF)$$

where W_1 is the filter bag weight, W_2 is the sample weight, W_3 is the final weight (filter bag+residue) after in vitro and sequential treatment with NDF solution, C_1 is a comparison of the blank filter bag weight after and before digestion treatment and NDF is neutral detergent fibre content (g/kg) of the sample.

2.4. Statistical analysis

The variability in the FA and herbage quality characteristics harvested at six different stages of maturity were analysed for their statistical significance via analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS Inc., 2002) to test the effect of the growth stage. In addition, single degree-of-freedom orthogonal contrasts were used to test for linear, quadratic and cubic effects due to morphological stage (Steel and Torrie, 1980). **The effect on digestibility was tested based on a multiple linear regression with DM, ADF, NDF, and ADL content.**

3. Results

3.1. Chemical composition

The proximate composition of the quinoa seed and plant during growth are presented in **Table 2.**

Quinoa seeds are higher in DM, OM, CP and GE contents than the plant during the growth cycle, while the lipid content was from twofold to threefold greater in the seed than in the plant during the growth cycle.

The results showed that the DM content increased linearly ($P<0.001$) and non-linearly ($P<0.01$) with advancing morphological stages from 130 g/kg fresh matter (FM), at the mid vegetative stage, to 189 g/kg FM at the grain fill stage. The CP content decreased **quadratically or cubically** ($P<0.001$) as the plant matured from 133 g/kg DM, at the early vegetative stage, to 94

1 g/kg DM at the budding stage, while the highest CP content, 151 g/kg DM, was recorded in the last
2 stage (grain fill stage). At this stage, there is, in fact, protein accumulation in the seed. The NDFom
3 and ADFom contents varied widely with maturity stage, ranged from 446 to 534 g/kg DM and from
4 219 to 370 g/kg DM, respectively. The linear increase in NDFom ($P<0.001$), ADFom ($P<0.001$)
5 and lignin (sa) ($P<0.05$) amounts with increased stage of maturity is due to the progressive
6 translocation of the soluble cell contents from the stems and leaves to the seed. The GE content
7 decreased ($P<0.001$) linearly and non-linearly from the early vegetative stage to the mid vegetative
8 stage and then increased from the late vegetative stage to the grain fill stage.

9 The pattern of FAs in the seed (Table 1) was characterised by three dominant FAs: palmitic
10 acid (PA, C_{16:0}), OA and LA, representing about 823 g/kg of total FA.

11 The FA profile in the plant during growth (Table 3) is different from that of the seed oil. The
12 whole plant was characterised by a high percentage of α -linolenic acid (ALA, C_{18:3 n-3}) and of
13 polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA), which made up from 385 to 474 g/kg of total FA and from 611
14 to 691 g/kg of total FA, respectively. LA content, which ranged from 146 to 176 g/kg of total FA,
15 decreased ($P<0.05$) with increasing growth stages until the shooting stage and then increased, while
16 other FAs did not show significant differences in their content during growth. Although there was
17 difference for LA content among means, there were not differences explained by polynomial
18 orthogonal contrasts for minor FAs. The average values of saturated FAs (C_{14:0} + C_{16:0} + C_{18:0})
19 ranged from 155 g/kg of the total FA at the late vegetative stage to 131 g/kg of total FA at the grain
20 fill stage. Other non-identified FAs were detected in amounts that ranged from 77 g/kg of the total
21 FA in the early vegetative stage to 147 g/kg of the total FA at shooting.

22

23 *3.2. In vitro digestibility*

24 The IVDMD and IVNDFD are presented in Table 2. Estimated digestibility at 48 hours of
25 incubation showed significant linear decreases ($P<0.001$) with increasing stages of plant maturity.

1 Generally, at the grain fill stage, quinoa is less digestible. The IVDMD ranged from 0.921 g/g DM,
2 at the early vegetative stage, to 0.714 g/g DM at the grain fill stage. Similarly IVNDFD showed
3 significant linear decreases ($P < 0.001$) with plant ageing and ranged from 0.837 to 0.429 g/g NDF.
4 IVDMD depends on DM, NDF and ADF content ($R^2 = 0.98, 0.98, 0.96$ respectively). IVNDFD
5 depends on DM and ADF content ($R^2 = 0.98$ and 0.97). There were not relationships between
6 digestibilities and lignin content.

7

8 **4. Discussion**

9 The quinoa seed oil analysed in the present investigation has a lower LA content and higher
10 stearic acid (SA, $C_{18:0}$) than those found by other authors and these differences can be ascribed to
11 genetic variability. Quinoa oil appears to be a high-quality edible oil, similar in FA composition to
12 soybean oil. Ruales and Nair (1993) found that quinoa fat had a high content of OA (245-248 g/kg
13 of total FA) and LA (523 g/kg of total FA) and a low content of ALA (38-39 g/kg of total FA). **The**
14 **very high digestibility of quinoa seeds together with their attractive nutritive value raised their**
15 **potential use as source of new grain, mainly in human nutrition against hunger (Miranda et al.,**
16 **2012), but also in animal nutrition. In fact the outstanding nutritional and functional properties of**
17 **quinoa seeds will be promoted by the FAO in 2013 since the United Nations has declared that year**
18 **as the international year of quinoa.**

19 Wood et al. (1993) reported that 11% of the total FAs of quinoa were saturated, with PA
20 predominant, while LA, OA, and ALA accounted for 523, 230, and 81g/kg of total FA,
21 respectively. Przybylski et al. (1994) found LA as the principal FA (560 g/kg of total FA) in quinoa,
22 followed by OA (211 g/kg of total FA), PA (96 g/kg of total FA), and ALA (67 g/kg of total FA).
23 Jahaniaval et al. (2000) reported the highest content of FAs from quinoa seed being 528 g/kg of
24 total FA for LA and 70 g/kg of total FA for ALA, respectively.

1 As far as GE content of the quinoa seed is concerned, this value is lower than the GE of the
2 other seed such as false flax (28.1 MJ/kg DM; Peiretti and Meineri, 2007), chia (26.1 MJ/kg DM;
3 Peiretti and Gai, 2009) and *Galega officinalis* (20.5 MJ/kg DM; Peiretti and Gai, 2006).

4 Ramos and Cruz (2002) evaluated the performance of quinoa for forage production to obtain
5 high quality feed for livestock in Cuba during the dry season and found DM of 18.9%, CP of 23.8%
6 and crude fibre of 26.3%. They concluded that quinoa can improve the biological quality of feed for
7 livestock.

8 Solíz-Guerrero et al. (2002) found that there was no difference in CP content at the panicle
9 and blooming stages between a variety of soil water deficit treatments, but that it decreased during
10 plant development.

11 Quinoa whole crop silage was used in a feeding experiment with dairy cows, comparing
12 three rations: 35% of DM in the form of maize silage, 65, 45 or 25% wilted grass/clover silage and
13 0, 20 or 40% quinoa silage, respectively (Zom et al., 2002). This experiment showed that the DM
14 intake of the ration with 20% quinoa silage was higher than with no or 40% quinoa silage, but due
15 to the lower feeding values of the quinoa silage (57% digestibility of organic matter and a CP
16 content of 80-100 g/kg DM) compared to the grass/clover silage, milk production and milk fat and
17 protein content decreased with increasing quinoa silage in the ration, even though it was only for
18 40% quinoa silage that the decrease became significant.

19 As far as FA profile is concerned, the presence of ALA in the whole plant was at lower
20 levels than those found in other forage crops such as *Galega officinalis* (Peiretti and Gai, 2006),
21 false flax (Peiretti and Meineri, 2007), and flax (Peiretti and Meineri, 2008) at similar growth
22 stages.

23 The digestibility of quinoa, determined using the Daisy *in vitro* technique, declines with
24 advancing maturity during the growing season. Moreover, results show that NDF digestibility is one
25 of the most variable quinoa parameters analysed, ranging from 43% for mature plants to 84% at the

1 early vegetative stage. Digestibility variability is greatly affected by the high proportion of DM and
2 NDF. In fact, the differences in digestibility during plant maturity are primarily associated with the
3 chemical composition of the samples, especially with their cell wall content and cell wall fractions.
4 With advancing maturity, like all plants, quinoa develops xylem tissue for water transport, and
5 accumulates cellulose and other complex carbohydrates; these tissues then become bound together
6 by lignification (Hoffman et al., 2005). Lignification of plant tissues imposes a barrier to complete
7 cell wall polysaccharide digestion in the rumen. For this reason, lignification of the plant cell wall is
8 considered to be the primary impediment to forage digestibility (Jung et al., 2012). Since NDF
9 digestibility influences animal performance (Oba and Allen, 1999), the optimal utilization of quinoa
10 as forage for livestock must consider this parameter in order to assess forage quality and to rank it
11 accurately. **In general, our data confirm a high relationship between digestibility and DM, NDF and**
12 **ADF contents of the plant during growth.**

13 In conclusion, the first cut of quinoa, whose lipid fraction is rich in ALA and other
14 polyunsaturated FAs, should be performed before shooting, since its nutritional quality deteriorates
15 when cutting is delayed.

16

17 **References**

- 18 AOAC, 1990. Official Methods of Analysis, vol. I., 15th ed. Association of Official Analytical
19 Chemists, Arlington, VA, USA.
- 20 Bhargava, A., Shukla, S., Ohri, D., 2003. Genetic variability and heritability of selected traits during
21 different cuttings of vegetable Chenopodium. *Ind. J. Genet. Plant Breed.* 63, 359–360.
- 22 Chouinard, P.Y., Corneau, L., Sæbø, A., Bauman, D.E., 1999. Milk yield and composition during
23 abomasal infusion of conjugated linoleic acids in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 82, 2737–2745.
- 24 Christie, W.W., 1982. A simple procedure for rapid transmethylolation of glycerolipids and
25 cholesteryl esters. *J. Lipid Res.* 23, 1072–1075.

- 1 Darwinkel, A., Stolen, O., 1998. Understanding the quinoa crop: Guidelines for growing in
2 temperate regions of N.W. Europe. Brochure of the Quinoa Project. AIR 2 Programme –
3 contract #931426, pp. 20.
- 4 FAO, 1994. Plant Production and Protection Series, in: Hernández, J.E, León, J. (Eds.), Neglected
5 crops 1492 from a different perspective. No.26; ISBN 92-5-103217-3. Available at
6 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/T0646E/T0646E00.htm> (accessed March 2012).
- 7 Galwey, N.W., 1989. Exploited plants – Quinoa. *Biologist* 36, 267–274.
- 8 Hara, A., Radin, N.S., 1978. Lipid extraction of tissues with a low-toxicity solvent. *Anal. Biochem.*
9 90, 420–426.
- 10 Hoffman, P.C., Lundberg, M., Bauman, L.M., Shaver, R.D., 2005. The effect of maturity on NDF
11 digestibility. *Focus on Forage* 5 (15), 1-3. Available at
12 <http://www.uwex.edu/CES/crops/uwforage/MaturityNDF-FOF.pdf> (accessed March 2012)
- 13 Horsted, K., Hermansen, J.E., 2007. Whole wheat versus mixed layer diet as supplementary feed to
14 layers foraging a sequence of different forage crops. *Animal* 1, 575–585.
- 15 Improta, F., Kellens, R., 2001. Comparison of raw, washed and polished quinoa (*Chenopodium*
16 *quinoa* Willd.) to wheat, sorghum or maize based diets on growth and survival of broiler
17 chicks. *Livest. Res. Rural Develop.* 13 (1). Available at
18 <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd13/1/impr131.htm> (accessed March 2012).
- 19 Jacobsen, E.E., Skadhauge, B., Jacobsen, S.-E., 1997. Effect of dietary inclusion of quinoa on
20 broiler growth performance. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 65, 5–14.
- 21 Jacobsen, S.-E., Monteros, C., Christiansen, J.L., Bravo, L.A., Corcuera, L.J., Mujica, A., 2005.
22 Plant responses of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) to frost at various phenological
23 stages. *Eur. J. Agron.* 22, 131–139.

- 1 Jahaniaval, F., Kakuda, Y., Marcone, M.F., 2000. Fatty acid and triacylglycerol compositions of
2 seed oils of five *Amaranthus* accessions and their comparison to other oils. *J. Am. Oil Chem.*
3 *Soc.* 77, 847–852.
- 4 Jung, H.J.G., Samac, D.A., Sarth, G., 2012. Modifying crops to increase cell wall digestibility.
5 *Plant Sci.* 185-186, 65–77.
- 6 Miranda, M., Vega Galvez, A., Quispe-Fuentes, I., Rodriguez, M.J., Maureira, H., Martinez, E.A.,
7 2012. Nutritional aspects of six quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) ecotypes from three
8 geographical areas of Chile. *Chilean J. Agr. Res.* 72, 175–181.
- 9 Oba, M., Allen, M.S., 1999. Evaluation of the importance of the digestibility of neutral detergent
10 fiber from forages: effects on dry matter intake and milk yield of dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 82,
11 589–596.
- 12 Peiretti, P.G., Gai, F., 2006. Chemical composition, nutritive value, fatty acid and amino acid
13 contents of *Galega officinalis* L. during its growth stage and in regrowth. *Anim. Feed Sci.*
14 *Technol.* 130, 257–267.
- 15 Peiretti, P.G., Meineri, G., 2007. Fatty acids, chemical composition and organic matter digestibility
16 of seeds and vegetative parts of false flax (*Camelina sativa* L.) after different lengths of
17 growth. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 133, 341–350.
- 18 Peiretti, P.G., Meineri, G., 2008. Chemical composition, organic matter digestibility and fatty acid
19 content of linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) harvested at five stages of growth. *J. Sci. Food*
20 *Agric.* 88, 1850–1854.
- 21 Peiretti, P.G., Gai, F., 2009. Fatty acid and nutritive quality of chia (*Salvia hispanica* L.) seeds and
22 plant during growth. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 148, 267–275.
- 23 Przybylski, R., Chauhan, G., Eskin, N., 1994. Characterization of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa*)
24 lipids. *Food Chem.* 51, 187–192.

- 1 Ramos, N., Cruz, A.M., 2002. Evaluation of seven seasonal crops for forage production during the
2 dry season in Cuba. *Cuban J. Agric. Sci.* 36, 271–276.
- 3 Robinson, P.H., Campbell, M., Fadel, J.G., 1999. Influence of storage time and temperature on *in*
4 *vitro* digestion of neutral detergent fibre at 48 h, and comparison to 48 h in sacco neutral
5 detergent fibre digestion. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 80, 257–266.
- 6 Rosero, O.L., Rosero, D.A., Lukešová, D., 2010. Determination of the capacities of farmers to
7 adopt quinoa grain (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) as potential feedstuff. *Riv. Agr. Trop.*
8 *Subtrop.* 43, 308–315.
- 9 Ruales, J., Nair, B.M., 1993. Content of fat, vitamins and minerals in quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa*,
10 Willd) seeds. *Food Chem.* 48, 131–136.
- 11 Solíz-Guerrero, J.B., Jasso de Rodriguez, D., Rodríguez-García, R., Angulo-Sánchez, J.L.,
12 Méndez-Padilla, G., 2002. Quinoa saponins: concentration and composition analysis, in:
13 Janick, J., Whipkey, A. (Eds.), *Trends in new crops and new uses*. ASHS Press, Alexandria,
14 VA, pp. 110–114.
- 15 Spanghero, M., Berzaghi, P., Fortina, R., Masoero, F., Rapetti, L., Zanfi, C., Tassone, S., Gallo, A.,
16 Colombini, S., Ferlito, C., 2010. Precision and accuracy of *in vitro* digestion of neutral
17 detergent fiber and predicted net energy of lactation content of fibrous feeds. *J. Dairy Sci.* 93,
18 4855–4859.
- 19 SPSS Inc., 2002. *Statistical Package for Social Science - Version 11.5.1 for Windows*, SPSS Inc.,
20 Chicago, IL, USA.
- 21 Steel, R.G.D., Torrie, J.H., 1980. *Principles and Procedures of Statistics: A Biometrical Approach*,
22 2nd ed. McGraw Hill, New York, NY, USA.
- 23 Van Schooten, H.A., Pinxterhuis, J.B., 2003. Quinoa as an alternative forage crop in organic dairy
24 farming, in: Kirilov, A., Todorov, N., Katerov, I. (Eds.), *Optimal forage systems for animal*

- 1 production and the environment. Proc. 12th Symp. European Grassland Federation, Pleven,
2 Bulgaria, pp. 445–448.
- 3 Wood, S.G., Lawson, L.D., Fairbanks, D.J., Robison, L.R., Andersen, W.R., 1993. Seed lipid
4 content and fatty acid composition of three Quinoa cultivars. *J. Food Comp. Anal.* 6, 41–44.
- 5 Zom, R.L.G., Van Schooten, H.A., Pinxterhuis, I.B., 2002. The effects of replacing grass silage by
6 quinoa whole crop silage in the ration of dairy cows, in: *Praktijkonderzoek Veehouderij,*
7 *Praktijk Rapport Rundvee 7*, Lelystad, the Netherlands, p. 29.