

Brazilian Journal of Animal Science e-ISSN 1806-9290 www.rbz.org.br

*Corresponding author: anibalcr@ufc.br

Received: April 2, 2024 Accepted: December 31, 2024

How to cite: Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S.; Rondina, D.; Bernardes, T. F.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. 2025. Effect of storage condition and time on the quality of relocated whole-plant corn silages in bags. Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia 54:e20240055.

https://doi.org/10.37496/rbz5420240055

Editors: Gustavo José Braga João Luiz Pratti Daniel

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

(cc) BY

Forage crops Full-length research article

Effect of storage condition and time on the quality of relocated wholeplant corn silages in bags

Amanda Caroliny Marques de Queiroz¹ (D), Marcus Vinicius Santa Brígida Cardoso² (D), Melany Simões de Souza¹ (D), Juliana Schuch Pitirini¹ (D), Davide Rondina³ (D), Thiago Fernandes Bernardes⁴ (D), Cristian Faturi¹ (D), Thiago Carvalho da Silva¹ (D), Aníbal Coutinho do Rêgo^{1,2*} (D)

¹ Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia, Instituto da Saúde e Produção Animal, Belém, PA, Brasil.

² Universidade Federal do Ceará, Departamento de Zootecnia, Fortaleza, CE, Brasil.

³ Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Faculdade de Veterinária, Fortaleza, CE, Brasil.

⁴ Universidade Federal de Lavras, Departamento de Zootecnia, Lavras, MG, Brasil.

ABSTRACT - We aimed to evaluate the effects of storage condition (SC) and storage time (ST) on the fermentative parameters and nutritional value of relocated wholeplant corn silage (WPCS) in plastic bags. A completely randomized design was used in a 2 × 5 factorial arrangement, with two SC (in the field without cover and in a barn as covered space) and five ST (10, 30, 60, 90, and 120 d), with four replications. Corn was harvested (321 ± 10.3 g kg⁻¹ dry matter (DM)) and relocated in plastic bags (50 kg) after 210 d of fermentation. The mold count of silage stored in the barn displayed a quadratic adjustment (P = 0.008) and reached its lowest value at 60 d of storage. Yeast count decreased (P = 0.001) linearly as a function of time in the silage stored in the barn. Lactic (P<0.001) and acetic (P<0.001) acid concentrations increased linearly as a function of silage ST in the field. A quadratic relationship was observed between protein concentration (P = 0.039) and *in vitro* dry matter digestibility (IVDMD; P<0.001) and ST for silage in the field, with the lowest value observed at 90 (58.3 g kg⁻¹ DM) and 60 (529.3 g kg⁻¹ DM) days, respectively. The concentration of ammonia nitrogen increased linearly by 6.80 g kg⁻¹ TN (P<0.001) as a function of ST in relocated silage in the field. The IVDMD increased linearly (P<0.001) as a function of time in silage stored in the barn. Silage in the field had 1.00 log CFU g⁻¹ more lactic acid bacteria (LAB) than those stored in barns. A quadratic adjustment was observed (P<0.05) as a function of ST on LAB count, aerobic stability, maximum temperature, time to reach maximum temperature, DM, and organic matter. It is recommended that silage be stored in bags in the field for use within 60 d. Silage stored in bags in a barn can be used within 120 d.

Keywords: aerobic deterioration, fermentation parameters, marketing, plastic bag, silage

1. Introduction

Silage relocation involves crop production, feed-out, transportation, compaction, and sealing in a new silo (Chen and Weinberg, 2014). Silage can be relocated to different types of silos, but plastic bags (30–50 kg) are commonly used for commercialization and transportation.

The plastic films used to seal the silos must meet certain basic criteria, such as maintenance of anaerobiosis, resistance to physical damage caused by weather, and ability to withstand transportation (Bernardes et al., 2018; Borreani et al., 2018). These criteria apply when choosing plastic bags used for storing relocated silage. The bags are manufactured using polyethylene, which is permeable to oxygen (Borreani et al., 2018). Brazil has no suitable materials for manufacturing bags to relocate silage, and recycled materials are often used.

Plastic bags used to store silage in the field are constantly exposed to environmental conditions, such as temperature, radiation, wind, rain, humidity, and birds and rodents, which can cause physical damage. The oxygen permeability of plastic films increases when exposed to radiation, owing to heat absorption and pore dilation (Tabacco and Borreani, 2002), resulting in airflow into the silo. Therefore, paying attention to the storage condition (SC) of silage in plastic bags is essential to prevent silage quality from being compromised.

Furthermore, hot and humid climates can enhance aerobic spoilage due to the rapid growth of yeasts and molds (Bernardes et al., 2018). If the SC of plastic bags affect the preservation of relocated silage, storage time (ST) may intensify this effect. Santos et al. (2023) evaluated the ST after relocating corn silage and observed that the ideal range for silage use was between 30 and 90 d, considering the fermentation parameters and nutritional value. It is worth mentioning that all research involving relocated silage available in the literature has been conducted using plastic drums and anaerobic jars as experimental silos (Santos et al., 2023; Queiroz et al., 2021; Chen and Weinberg, 2014) and do not evaluate the possible effects of ST and ST on the quality of relocated silage packed in plastic bags.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that plastic bag silos produced at the farm level affect the preservation quality of relocated silage when stored under different conditions over the ST, and that SC over the ST affect the nutritional and fermentative characteristics of relocated whole-plant corn silage (WPCS) in plastic bags. The objective of this study was to evaluate the effects of SC and ST on the microbial counts, fermentation parameters, and chemical composition of relocated WPCS in plastic bags.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Silage preparation and experimental design

The silages were prepared on a farm located in Paragominas, Pará, Brazil (03°02'2" S, 47°20'18" W, and 90 m altitude). According to the classification of Köppen and Geiger (1928), the climate of the region is tropical rainy (Awi). The average annual rainfall is 1742.9 mm, with annual average temperature and humidity values of 26.3 °C and 81%, respectively (Alvares et al., 2014).

The experiment was conducted using a completely randomized design in a 2×5 factorial arrangement with four replicates. The SC and ST after relocation (10, 30, 60, 90, and 120 d) were evaluated.

Hybrid corn DEKALB 177 was cultivated with a spacing of 50 cm between rows and three plants per linear meter (60,000.00 plants ha⁻¹). The corn was harvested when the grains were in the semi-hard stage (dry matter [DM] = $321.6 \pm 10.3 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$; organic matter (OM) = 968.8 g kg^{-1} ; crude protein (CP) = 53.0 g kg^{-1} ; ether extract (EE) = 17.8 g kg^{-1} ; neutral detergent insoluble fiber (NDF) = 411.3 g kg^{-1} ; starch = 204.3 g kg^{-1} ; and *in vitro* dry matter digestibility (IVDMD) = 509.7 g kg^{-1}), with a self-propelled harvester (FX40; New Holland Agriculture, Italy) adjusted to harvest 45 cm above the soil, with a theoretical particle size between 1 and 2 cm.

Corn was ensiled in a bunker silo (50 m long; width: smaller base 10.44 m and larger base 13.09 m; height: 3.07 m) and mechanically compacted with a tractor. Five bags with 4 kg of forage were placed on the surface, center, and base of the panel at a distance of 10 m from the beginning of the silo to determine the silage dry matter recovery (DMR). After filling, the silo was sealed with a double-faced PVC plastic film. The silo was opened after 210 d, and the bags were removed and weighed after a further 6 d, and the silage contained in them was sampled to determine the silage DMR (Table 1).

Relocation was carried out 15 d after opening the silo, following a process commonly used in practice. The silage feed-out rate was 1.50 m day^{-1} before relocation. Relocation was carried out in the morning and lasted for approximately 2 h. Before relocation, the silo face was exposed to oxygen for 12 h, predominantly at night, as it was used to feed the animals. The relocation was repeated, and four piles were prepared from different portions of the silo panel (surface, center, and base). The silage unloaded from the silo was mixed (total amount of silage = 1700 kg) and the piles were prepared.

Silage (43.31 \pm 0.80 kg) was added to each bag. The silages were placed in light green plastic bags (80% polyethylene and 20% recycled material; 200 μ m thick). Recompaction was performed manually, and the samples were sealed using plastic tape. At the time of relocation, 400 g of silage was collected from each bag to characterize its chemical composition and organic acids (Table 1). Furthermore, 200 g of silage was collected from each pile to evaluate microbiological counts.

The silages relocated in plastic bags were transported and stored in the forage sector of an institution located in Belém, Pará, Brazil (1°27'07" S, 48°26'13" W, and 11 m altitude). According to the classification of Köppen and Geiger (1928), the climate of the region is humid tropical (Af). The average annual rainfall is 2774.33 mm, with annual average temperature and humidity values of 26.9 °C and 82%, respectively (Alvares et al., 2014).

The bags with the relocated silage were stored inside or outside the barn for opening at different ST. The barn was constructed using masonry, covered with fiber cement tiles, and had no side walls. The bags stored in the field were placed in direct contact with the ground in a vertical position in rows without any protection or cover, simulating the conditions observed on farms selling relocated silage. Upon opening, the visibly deteriorated portion was removed, and the silage was homogenized for sample collection. The ambient temperature was 30.3, 28.3, 26.4, 28.2, and 26.0 °C for each opening time of 10, 30, 60, 90, and 120 d, respectively.

| Chemical composition, nutritional value, and losses (g kg ⁻¹ dry matter [DM]) | Mean |
|--|-------|
| DM (g kg ⁻¹ fresh matter) | 309.1 |
| Organic matter | 961.4 |
| Crude protein | 59.2 |
| Ether extract | 23.5 |
| Neutral detergent fiber | 446.4 |
| Starch | 236.6 |
| In vitro dry matter digestibility | 531.4 |
| Dry matter recovery | 952.0 |
| Microbiology (log ₁₀ CFU g ⁻¹) and fermentation parameter (g kg ⁻¹ DM) | |
| Yeast | 4.0 |
| Mold | 5.0 |
| pH | 4.0 |
| Lactic acid | 106.8 |
| Acetic acid | 14.5 |
| Propionic acid | 4.6 |
| Butyric acid | 42.9 |
| Lactic acid:acetic acid | 74.0 |

Table 1 - Characterization of whole-plant corn silages before relocation

2.2. Microbial counts and fermentation parameters

The numbers of lactic acid bacteria (LAB), yeasts, and molds were analyzed in all collected samples. An aqueous extract (1:10) of the sample (25 g) was prepared by adding 0.1% (w/v) sterile peptone water and then homogenized for 3 min in a sterile bag. Microbial counts were determined by pour-

R. Bras. Zootec., 54:e20240055, 2025

plating 10-fold serial dilutions (five per sample) of the extract onto MRS agar and potato dextrose agar (Sigma-Aldrich). After incubation at 35 °C for 3 d (LAB) and at 26 °C for 3 d (yeasts) and 5 d (molds), the colonies of yeasts and molds were counted separately based on their morphological characteristics. The pH of each sample (a 1:4 water extract [25 g of silage to 100 mL of water] manually homogenized and incubated for 15 min) was determined using a digital potentiometer (T-1000; Tekna, São Bernardo do Campo, Brazil) (Bolsen et al., 1992, adapted from Bernardes et al., 2019).

An aqueous extract was prepared at a ratio of 1:9 (30 g silage to 270 mL distilled water), homogenized for 4 min, and filtered three times to analyze the organic acids (lactic [LA], acetic [AA], propionic [PA], and butyric [BA]). Acids were analyzed using high-performance liquid chromatography (Shimadzu LC-10Ai; Shimadzu Corp., Tokyo, Japan) equipped with a dual detection system consisting of an ultraviolet radiation detector (UV-Vis SPD – 10Ai) and a refractive index detector (RID 10A). A Shimadzu ion exclusion column (Shim-pack SCR-101H; 7.9 mm × 300 mm) operating at 50 °C was used for the chromatographic separation. The analysis of ammonia nitrogen (NH₃-N) was carried out according to method 941.04 (AOAC, 1990) using an aqueous extract prepared at a ratio of 1:10 (25 g of silage to 250 mL of 0.2N sulfuric acid).

2.3. Aerobic stability

Silage (1.5 g kg) was placed in 9-L plastic buckets to determine aerobic stability. The buckets were stored in an acclimatized room at a temperature of 26.5±0. 2 °C for 168 h. The temperature was measured every 4 h using a digital thermometer at two points in the geometric center of the mass, and the average was calculated. The aerobic stability (AS, h), i.e., the time taken for the silage to reach 2 °C above ambient temperature; maximum silage temperature (maxT, °C); time for silage to reach maximum temperature (HmaxT, h); and amplitude (AMP, °C), i.e., the difference between the highest and lowest silage temperatures during the period of aerobic exposure, were determined.

2.4. Chemical composition

The samples were weighed and pre-dried in a forced-air circulation oven (55°C/72 h) and then ground using a knife-type mill (STAR-FT-80/2; Fortinox, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil) with a 1-mm diameter sieve to determine the chemical composition of the silages. The DM (934.01), OM (923.03), and CP (978.04) per storage were conditioned following official methods (AOAC, 1990). The NDF was determined using an autoclave, and thermostable alpha-amylase was used without sodium sulfite (INCT-CA F-002/1). The EE content was determined using a fat extraction device (XT10 extractor; Ankom, Macedon, NY, USA) and Ankom XT4 filter bags. These were washed with a degreaser and neutral detergent before use. The non-fibrous carbohydrates (NFC) in the silages were calculated using the following equation:

$$NFC = 100 - (CP + EE + NDF + ash)$$
(1)

Starch concentration was measured according to the method described by Hall and Mertens (2008). The IVDMD was determined using a DAISY apparatus (Ankom Technology Corp., Fairport, NY), after the material was incubated for 30 h at 39 °C (Holden, 1999). Rumen fluid was obtained from two Nellore cows, fistulated in the rumen, and fed corn silage and a protein-energy concentrate.

2.5. Statistical analyzes

Statistical analyses were performed using the statistical program R (R Core Team, 2019) after testing for residual normality and variance homogeneity. The microbial count data were transformed to \log_{10} to obtain a normal distribution of the data. Data were analyzed according to the following model:

$$Yijk = \mu + SCi + STj + (SC \times ST)ij + eijk$$
(2)

in which Yijk = dependent variable, μ = mean, SCi = fixed effect of SC, STj = fixed effect of ST after relocation, SC × ST= fixed effect of interaction between SC and ST, and eijk = residue. Tukey's test was

4

used to evaluate the effect of SC, while regression equations were used to evaluate the effect of ST. The equations were chosen based on the significance of the parameter and the determination coefficient. For all statistical analyses, statistical significance was set at $P \le 0.05$.

3. Results

There was no interaction (P = 0.342) between SC and ST on LAB counts (Table 2). There was an effect of the storage method (P<0.001), in which the LAB population was 1.00 log CFU g⁻¹ higher in relocated silage in the field (Table 3) than in those stored in the barn. With quadratic adjustment (P = 0.001), the LAB population had the lowest value at 30 d of storage.

There was an interaction between SC and ST (P = 0.002) on yeast counts (Table 2). Yeast counts were 1.18, 0.80, and 1.57 log CFU g⁻¹ at 60, 90, and 120 d of storage, respectively, which were significantly higher (P = 0.047) in relocated silage in the field than in those stored in the barn (Table 3). Yeast count decreased linearly (P<0.001) depending on the ST of the silages in the barn. The yeast population in relocated silage in the field did not change (P = 0.610) with ST (Table 2).

There was an interaction (P = 0.040) between SC and ST on the mold count (Table 2). The mold count was 1.07 log CFU g⁻¹ higher in relocated silage in the barn (P = 0.010) than in the field at 10 d of storage; there was no difference (Table 3; P = 0.900) on the other days. The mold count of relocated silage in the barn showed a quadratic relationship (P = 0.008) and was the lowest at 60 d of storage. The mold count of relocated silage in the field did not change (P = 0.692) with ST (Table 2).

There was an interaction (P<0.001) between SC and ST and pH (Table 2). The pH decreased linearly (P<0.001) depending on the storage time of the silage in the barn. There was a quadratic relationship (P<0.002) in the pH of relocated silage in the field as a function of ST, with the lowest value at 90 d of storage.

Interactions were observed between SC and ST and the concentrations of LA (P = 0.017), AA (P<0.001), PA (P<0.001), and BA (P = 0.029) (Table 2). The concentrations of LA, AA, and PA at 90 days of storage were 31.3, 34.4, and 4.0 g kg⁻¹ DM, respectively. At 120 days, they were 18.1, 22.0, and 10.9 g kg⁻¹ DM. These concentrations were higher (P<0.043) in the silage relocated to the field than in the barn. The BA concentration was 32.0 g kg⁻¹ DM higher in relocated silage in the field at 90 d of storage than in that stored in the barn. The LA and AA concentrations increased linearly (P<0.001) as a function of ST in relocated silage in the field. The PA concentration (P<0.001) was quadratically adjusted, with a lower concentration at day 30 in the field. The BA concentration (P = 0.034) was quadratically adjusted, with the highest concentration at 90 d in the field. The LA, PA, and BA concentrations in relocated silage in the barn did not change (P = 0.890) with ST (Table 2). The AA concentration of the silage stored in the barn differed (P = 0.028) depending on ST, but none of the tested models (linear, P = 0.343; Quadratic, P = 0.060) fitted the data.

There was an interaction (P<0.001) between SC and ST and the concentration of NH_3 -N (Table 2). At 90 and 120 d of storage, the NH_3 -N concentration was 8.80 and 3.80 g kg⁻¹ total nitrogen (TN), respectively, and was higher (P = 0.032) in relocated silage in the field than in the barn. (Table 3). The concentration of NH_3 -N increased linearly by 6.80 g kg⁻¹ TN (P<0.001) as a function of ST in relocated silage in the field. The NH_3 -N concentration of the silage stored in the barn did not change (P = 0.062) with ST (Table 2).

There was no interaction (P = 0.646) between SC and ST on AS, maxT, and HmaxT (Table 2). There was an effect of SC (P<0.001) on these variables, in which relocated silage in the barn was 11.6 h more stable and took 12.6 h longer to reach maxT compared with that in the field (Table 4). Relocated silage in the field had a maxT 1.6 °C higher than relocated silage in the barn. With quadratic adjustment of the data (P = 0.003), relocated silage at 60 d showed greater stability (18.5 h) and delayed time (35.0 h) to reach maxT. The maxT of the silages had a quadratic adjustment (P<0.001) depending on ST, with the lowest maxT (42.85 °C) at 90 d. There was an interaction (P = 0.002) between SC and ST on amplitude (Table 2). There was a quadratic relationship (P<0.001) in the range of relocated silage in barns as a function of ST, with a smaller difference between the maximum and ambient temperatures over 90 d. The amplitude of relocated silage in the field decreased linearly (P<0.001) as a function of ST.

| Variable | Va | Variance analysis | lysis | | | | | ST related to SC | ed to SC | | | | | 1 | Isolated e | isolated effect of ST | |
|--------------------|--------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------|------------------|--------------|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | SC | ST | $SC \times ST$ | Barn × time | Г | \mathbb{R}^2 | Q | \mathbb{R}^2 | Field × time | Г | \mathbb{R}^2 | Q | \mathbb{R}^2 | Г | \mathbb{R}^2 | Q | \mathbb{R}^2 |
| LAB | <0.001 | 0.004 | 0.342 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.029 | 0.277 | 0.001 | 0.968 |
| Yeast | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.002 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.725 | 0.015 | 0.897 | 0.610 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| Mold | 0.960 | 0.340 | 0.040 | 0.017 | 0.031 | 0.359 | 0.008 | 0.924 | 0.692 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| рН | 0.094 | <0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.883 | 0.076 | 0.925 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.536 | 0.002 | 0.632 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| LA | 0.032 | <0.001 | 0.017 | 0.321 | NS | NS | NS | SN | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.663 | 0.232 | 0.702 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| AA | <0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.028 | 0.343 | 0.073 | 0.060 | 0.375 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.713 | 0.152 | 0.718 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| PA | <0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.890 | NS | NS | NS | SN | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.702 | <0.001 | 1.000 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| BA | <0.002 | 0.010 | 0.029 | 0.722 | NS | NS | SN | SN | <0.001 | 0.627 | 0.009 | 0.034 | 0.195 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| NH ₃ -N | 0.009 | 0.046 | <0.001 | 0.062 | NS | NS | NS | SN | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.764 | 0.538 | 0.775 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| AS | <0.001 | 0.002 | 0.646 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.792 | 0.003 | <0.001 | 0.665 |
| MaxT | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.167 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | <0.001 | 0.605 | <0.001 | 0.928 |
| HmaxT | <0.001 | 0.015 | 0.158 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.312 | 0.072 | 0.003 | 0.760 |
| AMP | 0.989 | <0.001 | 0.002 | <0.001 | 0.001 | 0.370 | <0.001 | 0.956 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.569 | 0.224 | 0.603 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| DM | <0.001 | 0.026 | 0.692 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.005 | 0.734 | 0.967 | 0.734 |
| MO | 0.209 | <0.001 | 0.456 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | <0.001 | 0.361 | <0.001 | 0.797 |
| CP | 0.002 | 0.689 | <0.001 | 0.017 | 0.112 | 0.189 | 0.120 | 0.369 | <0.001 | 0.001 | 0.425 | 0.039 | 0.581 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| NDF | 0.089 | 0.741 | 0.111 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| EE | 0.058 | 0.123 | 0.369 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| NFC | 0.269 | 0.478 | 0.086 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| Starch | <0.001 | 0.002 | 0.150 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | <0.001 | 0.713 | 0.017 | 0.845 |
| IVDMD | <0.001 | 0.013 | <0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.660 | 0.449 | 0.676 | <0.001 | 0.005 | 0.324 | 0.001 | 0.791 | NS | NS | NS | NS |

Table 2 - P-values related to the measured variables analyzed for the effects of storage condition (SC) and time (ST) and interaction of these factors

Effect of storage condition and time on the quality of relocated whole-plant corn silages in bags Queiroz et al.

| SC | Storage time (d) | | | | | | CV% | Equation |
|-------|--------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|---------------------------------|
| 30 | 10 | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | Mean | CV 70 | Equation |
| | | LA | B (log CFU | g ⁻¹) | | | 8.07 | |
| Barn | 6.60 | 5.75 | 5.58 | 6.25 | 7.00 | 6.24b | | |
| Field | 7.20 | 6.98 | 7.20 | 7.08 | 7.75 | 7.24a | | |
| Mean | 6.90 | 6.36 | 6.39 | 6.66 | 7.38 | | | $Y = 0.0003x^2 - 0.03x + 7.09$ |
| | | Yea | st (log CFU | g ⁻¹) | | | 11.04 | |
| Barn | 6.08 | 4.65 | 4.30b | 4.18b | 3.93b | 4.63 | | Y = -0.02x + 5.64 |
| Field | 5.30 | 5.13 | 5.48a | 4.98a | 5.50a | 5.28 | | NS |
| Mean | 5.69 | 4.89 | 4.89 | 4.58 | 4.71 | | | |
| | | Мо | ld (log CFU | g-1) | | | 9.68 | |
| Barn | 6.55a | 5.98 | 5.15 | 5.50 | 5.73 | 5.78 | | $Y = 0.0003x^2 - 0.04x + 6.97$ |
| Field | 5.48b | 5.93 | 5.95 | 5.63 | 5.88 | 5.77 | | NS |
| Mean | 6.01 | 5.95 | 5.55 | 5.56 | 5.80 | | | |
| | | | pН | | | | 1.20 | |
| Barn | 3.90 | 3.90 | 3.80 | 3.80a | 3.65b | 3.81 | | Y = -0.002x + 3.94 |
| Field | 3.88 | 3.93 | 3.76 | 3.60b | 3.75a | 3.79 | | $Y = 0.00003x^2 - 0.006 + 3.99$ |
| Mean | 3.89 | 3.91 | 3.79 | 3.70 | 3.70 | | | |
| | | Lacti | c acid (g kg | ⁻¹ DM) | | | 11.11 | |
| Barn | 95.5 | 102.8 | 113.8 | 108.1b | 105.8b | 105.2 | | NS |
| Field | 100.0 | 92.5 | 113.4 | 139.4a | 123.9a | 113.8 | | Y = 0.03x + 9.25 |
| Mean | 97.7 | 97.7 | 113.6 | 123.7 | 114.9 | | | |
| | | Aceti | c acid (g kg | ⁻¹ DM) | | | 7.21 | |
| Barn | 37.4 | 30.9 | 34.5 | 31.8b | 34.3b | 33.8 | | No adjusted model |
| Field | 33.5 | 34.6 | 38.6 | 66.2a | 56.3a | 45.8 | | Y = 0.03x + 2.86 |
| Mean | 35.5 | 32.8 | 36.5 | 49.0 | 45.3 | | | |
| | | Propio | nic acid (g k | kg⁻¹ DM) | | | 42.02 | |
| Barn | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.8b | 3.3b | 2.6 | | NS |
| Field | 4.1 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 6.8a | 14.2a | 6.2 | | $Y = 0.0002x^2 - 0.02x + 0.53$ |
| Mean | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 8.8 | | | |
| | Butyric acid (g kg ⁻¹ DM) | | | | | | 49.12 | |
| Barn | 15.4 | 14.8 | 12.6 | 12.5b | 7.1 | 12.5 | | NS |
| Field | 23.1 | 19.5 | 20.5 | 44.5a | 14.1 | 24.3 | | $Y = -0.0004x^2 - 0.05x + 1.32$ |
| Mean | 19.3 | 17.2 | 16.5 | 28.5 | 10.6 | | | |
| | | NH | l ₃ -N (g kg ⁻¹ | TN) | | | 9.45 | |
| Barn | 26.3 | 24.5 | 22.8 | 21.5b | 25.0b | 24.0 | | NS |
| Field | 23.5 | 22.0 | 26.0 | 30.3a | 28.8a | 26.1 | | Y = 0.007x + 2.19 |
| Mean | 24.9 | 23.3 | 24.4 | 25.9 | 26.9 | | | |

Table 3 - Microbiological count and fermentative parameters of relocated whole-plant corn silages in plastic bags stored in different conditions (SC: field and barn) and storage times

CV% - coefficient of variation; LAB - lactic acid bacteria (log₁₀ CFU g⁻¹); NS - non-significant effect; NH₃-N - ammonia nitrogen (%TN); TN - total nitrogen

Means followed by different letters in the column differ (P<0.05) by Tukey's test.

There was no interaction (P = 0.692) between SC and ST for the concentrations of DM, OM, NDF, EE, NFC, or starch in the silages (Table 2). There was an effect of SC (P<0.001) on DM concentration; the relocated silage in the barn had 24.9 g kg⁻¹ fresh matter more DM than those stored in the field. There was an effect of ST (P = 0.02) on DM concentration of the silages, which decreased linearly over time (Table 5). There was a quadratic adjustment (P<0.001) in OM concentration of the relocated silages as a function of ST, which decreased until day 30. There was an effect of SC (P<0.001) on starch concentration; silage stored in the field had 44.1 g kg⁻¹ DM more starch than relocated silage in a barn. The starch concentration in the silages increased linearly (P<0.001) with ST.

| | | St | orage time (| (d) | | | CI IO (| P |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|--------|-------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| SC | 10 | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | Mean | CV% | Equation |
| | | Aer | obic stability | y (h) | | | 38.92 | |
| Barn | 15.0 | 16.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 | 19.0a | | |
| Field | 8.0 | 4.00 | 13.0 | 10.0 | 2.0 | 7.4b | | |
| Mean | 11.5 | 10.0 | 18.5 | 17.0 | 9.0 | | | $Y = -0.0025x^2 + 0.33x + 6.28$ |
| | Maximum temperature (°C) | | | | | | 2.11 | |
| Barn | 45.15 | 44.33 | 42.23 | 41.83 | 43.50 | 43.4b | | |
| Field | 46.08 | 45.58 | 45.13 | 43.88 | 44.35 | 45.0a | | |
| Mean | 45.61 | 44.95 | 43.68 | 42.85 | 43.93 | | | $Y = 0.0004x^2 - 0.0770x + 46.55$ |
| | Time | to reach th | e maximum | temperatu | re (h) | | 21.91 | |
| Barn | 27.0 | 33.0 | 42.0 | 41.0 | 35.0 | 35.6a | | |
| Field | 25.0 | 19.0 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 18.0 | 23.0b | | |
| Mean | 26.0 | 26.0 | 35.0 | 33.0 | 26.5 | | | $Y = -0.0026x^2 + 0.36x + 20.84$ |
| | Amplitude (°C) | | | | | | 6.78 | |
| Barn | 20.20 | 17.03 | 15.95b | 15.78 | 17.12a | 17.22 | | $Y = 0.001x^2 - 0.15x + 21.30$ |
| Field | 19.63 | 16.40 | 18.48a | 17.05 | 14.55b | 17.22 | | Y = -0.03x + 19.27 |
| Mean | 19.91 | 16.71 | 17.21 | 16.41 | 15.84 | | | |

Table 4 - Aerobic stability of relocated whole-plant corn silages in plastic bags stored in different conditions (SC; field and barn) and storage times

CV% - coefficient of variation.

Means followed by different letters in the column differ (P<0.05) by Tukey's test.

There was an interaction (P<0.001) between SC and ST and the concentration of CP and IVDMD in the silages (Table 2). There was a quadratic relationship (P = 0.039) in the CP concentration of relocated silage in the field as a function of ST, which decreased until day 90 (Table 5). The CP concentration of relocated silage in the barn changed (P = 0.017) depending on ST, but none of the tested models (linear, P = 0.112; Quadratic, P = 0.120) fitted the data.

Relocated silage in the field was 52.0 g kg⁻¹ DM more digestible than silages in the barn. The IVDMD increased linearly (P<0.001) with ST of relocated silage in the barn. A quadratic adjustment was observed for the IVDMD (P<0.001) of silage stored in the field as a function of ST. Relocated silages for 60 d were less digestible than those stored for other periods in the field (Table 5).

4. Discussion

The higher LAB count in relocated silage in the field may be associated with higher temperature that accelerates the growth of these microorganisms, increasing their population (Bernardes et al., 2018). According to Borreani et al. (2018), optimal temperatures for LAB occur between 27 and 38 °C, increasing their growth. Also, this probably explains the higher LA and AA concentrations in these silages compared with relocated silages stored in a barn with 90 and 120 d of storage, due to their higher LAB count. Associated with the higher LA concentration, the lower pH values may be explained by LA ability to reduce the pH more efficiently compared with other acids, acidifying the environment during silage fermentation (Pahlow et al., 2003). Furthermore, the increase in pH of relocated silages after 120 d of storage in the field is possibly related to their lower LA concentration.

Yeasts are the primary initiators of the deterioration process in silages (Kung et al., 2018), which can grow at pH < 4.0, and high temperatures can increase the population (McDonald et al., 1991). The Belém region is characterized by high temperatures throughout the day and year, with a minimum average of 26.3 °C and a maximum average of 31.7 °C (Alvares et al., 2014). This may have contributed to the greater proliferation of yeasts in silages stored in the field throughout the storage time. Koc et al. (2009) observed that the highest yeast counts occur in silages exposed to temperatures between 30 and 37 °C, and Bernardes et al. (2018) reported that hot environments improve yeast growth and accelerate

| SC | | orage time (| (d) | Moon | CV0/ | Faustian | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|-------|----------------------------------|
| SC | 10 | 30 | 60 | 90 | 120 | Mean | CV% | Equation |
| | | Dry n | natter (g kg | ⁻¹ FM) | | | 4.52 | |
| Barn | 319.8 | 323.8 | 314.8 | 318.3 | 306.8 | 316.7a | | |
| Field | 306.8 | 298.8 | 282.3 | 293.0 | 278.3 | 291.8b | | |
| Mean | 313.3 | 311.3 | 298.5 | 305.6 | 292.5 | | | Y = -0.017x + 31.46 |
| | | Organic | matter (g k | kg⁻¹ DM) | | | 0.27 | |
| Barn | 963.8 | 955.8 | 961.0 | 962.5 | 967.0 | 962.0 | | |
| Field | 961.8 | 957.8 | 958.5 | 961.3 | 965.5 | 961.0 | | |
| Mean | 962.8 | 956.8 | 959.8 | 961.9 | 966.3 | | | $Y = 0.0002x^2 - 0.017x + 96.29$ |
| | | Crude j | protein (g k | g-1 DM) | | | 3.15 | |
| Barn | 58.8b | 56.8b | 60.3 | 61.5a | 58.8 | 59.2 | | No adjusted model |
| Field | 62.8a | 64.8a | 59.5 | 58.3b | 60.8 | 61.2 | | $Y = 0.0001x^2 - 0.01x + 6.55$ |
| Mean | 60.8 | 60.8 | 59.9 | 59.9 | 59.8 | | | |
| | Neut | ral deterger | nt insoluble | fiber (g kg⁻ | ¹ DM) | | 5.14 | |
| Barn | 443.3 | 482.0 | 445.3 | 446.8 | 438.0 | 451.1 | | |
| Field | 466.0 | 454.0 | 466.8 | 462.3 | 471.8 | 464.2 | | |
| Mean | 454.6 | 468.0 | 456.0 | 454.5 | 454.9 | | | |
| | | Ether e | extract (g kg | g ⁻¹ DM) | | | 22.89 | |
| Barn | 18.3 | 22.8 | 27.0 | 24.3 | 20.5 | 22.6 | | |
| Field | 21.0 | 18.3 | 20.5 | 22.3 | 15.8 | 19.6 | | |
| Mean | 19.6 | 20.5 | 23.8 | 23.3 | 18.1 | | | |
| | No | on-fibrous c | arbohydrat | es (g kg ⁻¹ D | M) | | 6.35 | |
| Barn | 443.3 | 388.0 | 429.3 | 430.0 | 444.5 | 427.0 | | |
| Field | 412.3 | 427.5 | 411.5 | 418.8 | 417.3 | 417.5 | | |
| Mean | 427.8 | 407.8 | 420.4 | 424.4 | 430.9 | | | |
| | Starch (g kg ⁻¹ DM) | | | | | | 10.30 | |
| Barn | 188.7 | 171.7 | 197.6 | 198.1 | 213.6 | 193.9b | | |
| Field | 204.1 | 220.1 | 262.9 | 259.6 | 243.3 | 238.0a | | |
| Mean | 196.4 | 195.9 | 230.3 | 228.8 | 228.4 | | | Y = 0.03x + 19.46 |
| | | | MD (g kg ⁻¹ | | | | 2.40 | |
| Barn | 477.0b | 464.0b | 503.5b | 498.0b | 506.5b | 489.8 | | Y = 0.03x + 46.89 |
| Field | 568.8a | 539.8a | 524.3a | 529.3a | 537.0a | 541.8 | | $Y = 0.0008x^2 - 0.13x + 57.59$ |
| Mean | 522.8 | 501.9 | 513.9 | 518.6 | 521.8 | | | |

 Table 5 - Chemical composition of relocated whole-plant corn silages in plastic bags stored in different conditions (SC; field and barn) and storage times

CV% - coefficient of variation; IVDMD - *in vitro* dry matter digestibility.

Means followed by different letters in the column differ (P<0.05) by Tukey's test.

silage spoilage. Furthermore, as the material used to manufacture plastic bags is relatively permeable to oxygen, the relocated silages in the field were possibly directly influenced by environmental conditions, where the gas exchange can be more intense in these silages, creating an aerobic environment inside the bags to yeast growth.

The mold count in all relocated silages (stored in the field or barn and opened at any storage time) may indicate silage spoilage. However, the relocated silage did not have visible characteristics of deteriorated silage. In the literature, molds are related to silage quality and there is a variation about mold count in silages: 4 log CFU g⁻¹ (Alonso et al., 2013; Ávila et al., 2020), 5 log CFU g⁻¹ (Tapia et al., 2005), 6 log CFU g⁻¹ (Kung et al., 2018). In the relocation process of silages, contact with aerobic conditions is inevitable, allowing the growth of aerobic microorganisms, possibly explaining the presence of mold in the silages. The higher mold population in relocated silages stored in the barn after 10 d may be related to a possible increase in silage temperature due to the higher accumulation of heat inside the silo, since the barn is an enclosed space, reducing the heat exchange with the external environment. In addition, residual oxygen may have contributed to accelerating mold growth, leading to stabilization of the

mold population, while the available oxygen is reduced. The gas exchange between the environmental condition and the silages in the barn was possibly lower, interrupting the mold and yeast growth in these silages.

Clostridial fermentation may have occurred in relocated silage in the field, which can be confirmed by BA concentration. According to Kung et al. (2018), bacteria of the genus *Clostridium* grow at pH > 4.5 and DM concentrations < 30%, which can be observed in the silages stored in the field evaluated in the present study. The humid environment of these silages (DM < 30%) probably contributed to the clostridia growth, even in an acidic environment, which increased the BA concentration at 90 d of storage. According to Whittenbury et al. (1967), bacteria of the genus *Clostridium* are osmotic pressure-sensitive and high acid concentration-tolerant in a humid environment, and the inhibition of clostridia growth occurs in an inversely way between pH and humidity. According to that, pH values below 4.5 may not be enough to inhibit the clostridia growth in humid environments. High PA concentration (0.3-0.5%) and NH_3 -N are also frequently related to clostridial fermentations, a result of *Clostridium* proliferation (Kung et al., 2018). In the present study, the higher PA and NH_3 -N concentrations can indicate clostridial fermentation in relocated silages stored in the field after 90 d (Kung et al., 2018).

When silage is exposed to air, the aerobic stability depends mainly on the aerobic microorganisms population and the organic acids concentration (Chen and Weinberg, 2014). In this study, the instability of relocated silage in the field is due to the fact that they already have a higher population of yeast and lactic acid. Therefore, when exposed to an aerobic environment, the development of yeasts is accentuated, causing the temperature peak to be higher and reach it in less time, as these microorganisms intensify heat production. The increase in AS and HmaxT and reduction in maxT with ST could be explained by the increase in acetic acid and consequent reduction in yeast. Acetic and propionic acids are known for their antifungal effects, preventing yeast growth in silages when exposed to the aerobic environment (Moon, 1983).

The lower DM content of the relocated silage in the field may have occurred due to the infiltration of rainwater and humidity inside silage bags. It is worth mentioning that the region where the experiment was carried out is characterized by high humidity (average of 81%) and well distributed rainfall throughout the year (Alvares et al., 2014), which may have contributed to increase the moisture concentration of the relocated silage in the field. The lower CP concentration of the relocated silage in the field at 90 d may be a result of the higher clostridial fermentation in these silages. At 90 d, the NH₃-N concentration was also higher in relocated silage in the field. According to Kung et al. (2018), some bacteria of the genus *Clostridium* are capable of degrading proteins, producing ammonia, increasing the NH₃-N, and reducing the CP concentrations in silages.

The reduction of CP concentration in relocated silage in the field up to 90 d may have contributed to the proportional increase in starch in these silages. Corn grain starch is covered with a protein-matrix composed mainly of hydrophobic protein zein. According to Junges et al. (2017), bacterial activity (60%) is the main contributor to proteolysis in corn silages, and the main proteolytic bacteria in silages are *Clostridium*, not LAB (McDonald et al., 1991). In the present study, clostridial fermentation, as well as the higher LAB population in relocated silage in the field, may have contributed to the protein-matrix degradation, indicated by the increase in NH₃-N concentration, increasing starch availability and, consequently, the digestibility of these silages. The reduction in DM concentration during ST may be related to the higher effluent losses in these silages. Effluents are composed of proteins and sugars (McDonald et al., 1991), and the leaching of these constituents results in a reduction in the DM concentration of the silages.

The reduction in IVDMD up to 60 d in relocated silage in the field was due to the lower DM content of these silages. Furthermore, the chemical composition of the relocated silage was similar to that before relocation. Therefore, evaluating the acceptability of relocated silages by animals through preference assay and quantifying losses due to deterioration are crucial to reach more accurate conclusions regarding the storage location of the silos. The use of bagged silage in small units of 30 to 50 kg is

common in Brazil, heating up the silage market. However, the plastic film industry still does not offer bags with low permeability, with materials such as polyethylene, which allow air infiltration during storage. This leads to higher silage spoilage when in contact with the plastic film. The situation is worse in tropical regions, where high temperatures increase the permeability of the films, intensifying gas exchange and aerobic deterioration.

5. Conclusions

The characteristics of relocated silages were more affected by storage condition than storage time. Relocated silages in barn provide silages with a high aerobic stability, but a lower IVDMD. It is recommended that relocated silage in the field be used within 60 d. Relocated silage in a barn can be used within 120 d.

Author contributions

Data curation: Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B. and Rêgo, A. C. **Formal analysis:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S. and Pitirini, J. S. **Funding acquisition:** Rondina, D.; Bernardes, T. F.; Faturi, C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Investigation:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S.; Rondina, D. and Silva, T. C. **Methodology:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S. and Rêgo, A. C. **Project administration:** Rondina, D. and Rêgo, A. C. **Resources:** Bernardes, T. F.; Faturi, C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Software:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S. and Rêgo, A. C. **Supervision:** Bernardes, T. F.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Validation:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S.; Rondina, D.; Bernardes, T. F.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Visualization:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S.; Rondina, D.; **Faturi, C.**; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Writing – original draft:** Queiroz, A. C. M.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Souza, M. S.; Pitirini, J. S.; Rondina, D.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. **Writing – review & editing:** Bernardes, T. F. and Rêgo, A. C.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

This study was partially funded by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001, and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq; project 423031/2016-3). The authors thank PROCAD (UFRA/UFPA/UFLA) and Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia (UFRA) for the financial support for the publication; the undergraduate and graduate students from the Grupo de Estudo em Ruminantes e Forragicultura da Amazônia (GERFAM) for their technical support; Editage for English language editing; and the manager of Água Parada farm, Fabiano Freitas, for his valuable collaboration and availability, as well as for providing the necessary inputs for this experiment.

References

Alonso, V. A.; Pereyra, C. M.; Keller, L. A. M.; Dalcero, A. M.; Rosa, C. A. R.; Chiacchiera, S. M. and Cavaglieri, L. R. 2013. Fungi and mycotoxins in silage: an overview. Journal of Applied Microbiology 115:637-643. https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.12178

Alvares, C. A.; Stape, J. L.; Sentelhas, P. C.; Gonçalves, J. L. M. and Sparovek, G. 2014. Köppen's climate classification map for Brazil. Meteorologische Zeitschrift 22:711-728. https://doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2013/0507

AOAC - Association of Official Analytical Chemists. 1990. Official methods of analysis. 15th ed. AOAC, Arlington, VA.

Ávila, C. L. S. and Carvalho, B. F. 2020. Silage fermentation—updates focusing on the performance of micro-organisms. Journal of Applied Microbiology 128:966-984. https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.14450

Bernardes, T. F.; Daniel, J. L. P.; Adesogan, A. T.; McAllister, T. A.; Drouin, P.; Nussio, L. G.; Huhtanen, P.; Tremblay, G. F.; Bélanger, G. and Cai, Y. 2018. Silage review: Unique challenges of silages made in hot and cold regions. Journal of Dairy Science 101:4001-4019. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13703

Bernardes, T. F.; Gervásio, J. R. S.; Morais, G. and Casagrande, D. R. 2019. Technical note: A comparison of methods to determine pH in silages. Journal of Dairy Science 102:9039-9042. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-16553

Bolsen, K. K.; Lin, C.; Brent, B. E.; Feyerherm, A. M.; Urban, J. E. and Aimutis, W. R. 1992. Effect of silage additives on the microbial succession and fermentation process of alfalfa and corn silages. Journal of Dairy Science 75:3066-3083. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(92)78070-9

Borreani, G.; Tabacco, E.; Schmidt, R. J.; Holmes, B. J. and Muck, R. E. 2018. Silage review: Factors affecting dry matter and quality losses in silages. Journal of Dairy Science 101:3952-3979. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13837

Chen, Y. and Weinberg, Z. G. 2014. The effect of relocation of whole-crop wheat and corn silages on their quality. Journal of Dairy Science 97:406-410. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7098

Hall, M. B. and Mertens, D. R. 2008. Technical note: effect of sampling processing procedures on measurement of starch in corn silage and corn grain. Journal of Dairy Science 91:4830-4833. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1183

Holden, L. A. 1999. Comparison of methods of in vitro dry matter digestibility for ten feeds. Journal of Dairy Science 82:1791-1794. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.s0022-0302(99)75409-3

Junges, D.; Morais, G.; Spoto, M. H. F.; Santos, P. S.; Adesogan, A. T.; Nussio, L. G. and Daniel, J. L. P. 2017. Short communication: Influence of various proteolytic sources during fermentation of reconstituted corn grain silages. Journal of Dairy Science 100:9048-9051. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-12943

Koc, F.; Coskuntuna, L.; Ozduven, M. L.; Coskuntuna, A. and Samli, H. E. 2009. The effects of temperature on the silage microbiology and aerobic stability of corn and vetch-grain silages. Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A — Animal Science 59:239-246. https://doi.org/10.1080/09064700903490596

Köppen, W. and Geiger, R. 1928. Klimate der Erde. Verlag Justus Perthes, Gotha. Wall-Map 150 cm × 200 cm.

Kung, L.; Shaver, R. D.; Grant, R. J. and Schmidt, R. J. 2018. Silage review: Interpretation of chemical, microbial, and organoleptic components of silages. Journal of Dairy Science 101:4020-4033. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13909

McDonald, P.; Henderson A. R. and Heron S. J. E. 1991. The biochemistry of silage. 2nd ed. Chalcombe Publications, Marlow.

Moon, N. J. 1983. Inhibition of the growth of acid tolerant yeasts by acetate, lactate and propionate and their synergistic mixtures. Journal of Applied Bacteriology 55:453-460. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.1983.tb01685.x

Pahlow, G.; Muck, R. E.; Driehuis, F.; Oude-Elferink, S. J. W. H. and Spoelstra, S. F. 2003. Microbiology of ensiling. p.31-93. In: Silage science and technology. Buxton, D. R.; Muck, R. E. and Harrison, J. H., eds. American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil Science Society of America, Madison. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr42.c2

Queiroz, A. C. M.; Mendonça, R. C. A.; Santos, R. I. R.; Cardoso, M. V. S. B.; Domingues, F. N.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. 2021. Effects of whole-plant corn silage relocation on quality, chemical composition, and intake, digestibility, and nitrogen balance in sheep. Small Ruminant Research 205:106558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2021.106558

R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Santos, R. I. R.; Mendonça, R. C. A.; Queiroz, A. C. M.; Bernardes, T. F.; Domingues, F. N.; Faturi, C.; Silva, T. C. and Rêgo, A. C. 2023. How do relocation time and length of storage after relocation affect fermentation and nutritive value of corn silage? Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia 52:e20220059. https://doi.org/10.37496/rbz5220220059

Tabacco, E. and Borreani, G. 2002. Contrastare il deterioramento aerobico negli insilati di mais. L'Informatore Agrario 58:105-111.

Tapia, M. O.; Stern, M. D.; Soraci, A. L.; Meronuck, R.; Olson, W.; Gold, S.; Koski-Hulbert, R. L. and Murphy, M. J. 2005. Patulin-producing molds in corn silage and high moisture corn and effects of patulin on fermentation by ruminal microbes in continuous culture. Animal Feed Science and Technology 119:247-258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2004.12.002

Whittenbury, R; McDonald, P. and Bryan-Jones, D. G. 1967. A short review of some biochemical and microbiological aspects of ensilage. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture 18:441-444. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2740181001