

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Small Ruminant Research



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/smallrumres

Chestnut shells in the diet of lamb: Effects on growth performance, fatty acid metabolism, and meat quality

Ruggero Menci^a, Antonio Natalello^{a,*}, Alessandro Stamilla^a, Fabrizio Mangano^a, Angelique Torrent^b, Giuseppe Luciano^a, Alessandro Priolo^a, Massimiliano Lanza^a, Vincent Niderkorn^b

^a Department Di3A, University of Catania, via Valdisavoia 5, 95123 Catania, Italy

^b INRAE, Université Clermont Auvergne, Vetagro Sup, UMRH, 63122 Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: By-product Sainfoin Tannin Biohydrogenation Vitamin Oxidative stability

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to formulate a diet for finishing lambs that included chestnut shells, an underexploited byproduct of chestnut industry, and evaluate its effects on in vivo performance and meat quality. Twenty-eight male lambs (race Romane; 27.9 ± 2.7 kg bodyweight) were divided into 4 groups and fed 4 different pelleted diets: one control, one containing chestnut shells (CNS), one containing sainfoin, and one containing both. After 21 days of feeding trial, at slaughter, rumen and abomasum digesta were sampled for the analysis of fatty acid (FA) profile, and meat was analysed for FA profile, vitamins content, and oxidative stability. All lambs showed similar growth performance and carcass characteristics. The CNS diet limited (P = 0.001) ruminal biohydrogenation, increasing (P < 0.050) the C18:1 *trans*11 proportion in both rumen and abomasum. Consequently, the C18:1 *trans*11 content of CNS meat was more than 50% higher (P = 0.006) than in the other groups. No differences in the discolouration and lipid oxidation of raw meat were observed over 9 days of refrigerated storage. The phenolic compounds of chestnut shells may have preserved the low native α -tocopherol level of the CNS diet. Chestnut shells can be fed to lambs without detrimental effect on performance, potentially improving meat FA profile.

1. Introduction

Chestnut is the fruit of deciduous trees in the genus *Castanea*. The world production of chestnuts is about 2.3 millions of tonnes (in 2020, FAOSTAT), with China accounting for 75% of global production, followed by the EU (14%), Bolivia (3.5%), and Turkey (3.2%). Chestnut fruit is composed of an edible kernel protected by a thin inner shell (integument) and a hard outer shell (pericarp). Chestnut shells (meant as integument and pericarp) are discarded as a by-product of the peeling process. In sweet chestnut (*Castanea sativa* Miller), integument and pericarp represent respectively 6.3–10.1% and 8.9–13.5% of the whole fruit, depending on the chestnut cultivar (de Vasconcelos et al., 2010). Thus, the annual world production of chestnut shells likely averages 500 thousand tonnes. Chestnut shells are a fibrous material with a remarkable content of phenols (up to 52 mg gallic acid equivalents per kg), especially phenolic acids, flavonoids, and tannins (Pinto et al., 2021a). In particular, chestnut pericarp is rich in procyanidins and hydrolysable

tannins, such as castalagin, whereas chestnut integument is rich in prodelphinidins (de Vasconcelos et al., 2010, Pinto et al., 2021b). However, the phenolic composition of chestnut shells changes depending on cultivar and environmental conditions, as well as the technique used to obtain the phenolic extract (Pinto et al., 2021a). Phenolic compounds are acknowledged for a wide range of positive effects on animal health, such as antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory, and anti-thrombotic effects, thanks to their bioactive properties, first and foremost the antioxidant activity (Hajam et al., 2020).

Research has so far focused on industrial applications for chestnut shells (Vázquez et al., 2009, Zhao et al., 2014, Morana et al., 2017, Morales et al., 2018), however, to the best of our knowledge, no direct application in livestock diet has ever been studied. Livestock farming is one of the human activities with the highest environmental impact, and feed production, including cultivation, processing, and transport, accounts for about half of the greenhouse gas emission of livestock industry (Gerber et al., 2013). In this scenario, feeding livestock with

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* antonio.natalello@unict.it (A. Natalello).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2023.107105

Received 31 May 2023; Received in revised form 16 September 2023; Accepted 27 September 2023 Available online 29 September 2023

0921-4488/© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

alternative agro-industrial by-products has the potential to reduce the environmental impact of feed production and up-cycle industry waste, while limiting feed-to-food competition and promoting circular economy (Salami et al., 2019). Indeed, resorting to locally available by-products for the formulation of animal diets can reduce the need for cultivated feed, which, in some cases, could be destined to human consumption.

Chestnut shells could be included in the diet of ruminants as a fibrous feed, while also representing an interesting source of phenols and tannins. Despite being known for their anti-nutritional effects, dietary tannins have been attracting increasing interest in research for the past 20 years thanks to their positive effects on animal health (Patra and Saxena, 2011), animal pollutant emissions (Herremans et al., 2020, Cardoso-Gutierrez et al., 2021), and the quality of animal products. Indeed, dietary tannins can increase the oxidative stability of meat and milk (Soldado et al., 2021), as well as improve their fatty acid (FA) profile by modulating ruminal biohydrogenation (BH) (Biondi et al., 2019; Frutos et al., 2020). For example, feeding lambs with quebracho (Schinopsis lorentzii Engl.) tannins (40 g of tannic acid equivalents per kg of diet DM) limited colour oxidation and metmyoglobin development in raw meat (Luciano et al., 2009). Moreover, dairy goats fed 700 g/d of sainfoin (Onobrychis viciifolia Scop.), a well-known tanniferous forage, produced cheese richer in C18:3 n-3 and with a lower n-6 to n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) ratio compared to goats fed alfalfa (Menci et al., 2022a). In fact, changes in ruminal BH often lead to changes in the FA profile of products, which may have particular implications in terms of healthiness and oxidative stability. However, the complexity of biochemical reactions combined with the diversity of tannin structures makes any prediction difficult.

On the basis of the above, chestnut shells were integrated into a commercial prototype of pelleted feed for lambs, as part of a balanced diet. Our hypothesis was that chestnut shells could be included in the diet of lamb without detrimental effects on growth performance and meat quality. Furthermore, we hypothesized that the phenolic compounds contained in chestnut shells may modulate ruminal BH and therefore affect meat FA profile and oxidative stability. For the purpose, we assessed the FA profile of rumen content, abomasum content, and meat, the antioxidant fat-soluble vitamins of meat, and colour and lipid stability in meat under a simulated retail condition. Considering that different tannins from different plant sources may interact in biological systems leading to unforeseeable synergistic effects (Luciano et al., 2019; Menci et al., 2021), we included sainfoin in the experimental design, in order to compare different tannin sources and highlight potential synergistic effects.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Animals, diets, and experimental design

The experiment took place in the facilities of INRAE Clermont-Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, in central France. The experimental procedures were conducted in accordance with the European Union Directive 2010/63/EU, reviewed by the local ethics committee (C2E2A, "Comité d'Ethique pour l'Expérimentation Animale en Auvergne") and authorised by the French Ministry for Research under agreement number 22514–2019101821388910.

Twenty-eight pure-bred Romane male lambs were sourced from the same farm, and used in a randomized block experimental design. The lambs were individually penned indoors; building had no temperature control, and the animals received no artificial light. Before the beginning of the trial, the lambs were fed with the same basal diet consisting of hay and a conventional pellet. At 90 d of age (27.9 ± 2.7 kg bodyweight), the lambs were divided into 4 experimental groups (n = 7), each fed with hay and a different pelleted feed: the same conventional pellet as before the beginning of the trial (CON), a pellet including chestnut (*C. sativa*) shells (CNS), a pellet including sainfoin (SFN), and a pellet including

both chestnut shells and sainfoin (C+S). The ingredients of the experimental pellets are reported in Table 1. The experimental feeds were formulated to maximise the inclusion of CNS while ensuring their "pelletability". Maximum temperature reached during pelleting was 64 °C, and pellets diameter was 4.5 mm. Basing on individual bodyweight, the lambs were further assigned to 4 blocks (n = 4, 8, 8, 8 for block 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively), with equal representation of the 4 experimental groups. The 4 blocks started the feeding trial progressively, at intervals of 1 week. This was done to spread slaughtering over a 4-week period, in order to not overload the experimental abattoir.

To ensure the complete ingestion of the pellets, diets (pellet and hay) were restricted to 95% of protein and energy (as feed units for maintenance and meat production; UFV; INRA, 1988) requirements, according to the feed intake recorded before the beginning of the trial. Reference requirement was based on an average daily gain (ADG) of 150 g/d. The offer of pellets and hay was periodically adjusted for the individual body weight. As a consequence of the different energy and protein levels of the experimental pellets (Table 1), the CNS and C+S groups received a higher amount of pellet compared to the CON and SFN groups for all diets to be isonitrogenous and isoenergetic. In practice, the CON and SFN lambs received 640 g DM/d of pellet while the CNS and C+S groups received 900 g DM/d of pellet, on average. All the lambs received 300 g DM/d of hay, on average. All the lambs were fed individually twice a day (0830 and 1530), and any residues of pellet and hay were weighted daily. The feeding trial lasted 21 d, at the end of which the animals were sacrificed at the experimental slaughterhouse.

Table 1

Ingredients and chemical composition of experimental feedstuffs.

Item ^a	Pellet ^b	Pellet ^b				
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
Ingredients of pellet, g/kg						
Alfalfa	640	450	-	-		
Barley	127	60	65	105		
Soybean 46.6 CP	100	45	95	33		
Flaxseed	133	100	135	100		
Chestnut shells	-	321	-	228		
Sainfoin, dehydrated	-	-	705	509		
Hydrogenated vegetable oil	-	24	-	-		
CaCO ₃	-	-	-	25		
Chemical composition, g/kg DM						
DM, g/kg FM	894	902	899	903	930	
CP	209	155	209	156	132	
EE	67	86	61	54	10	
NDF	376	415	367	386	518	
ADF	270	185	251	182	275	
Lignin	59	43	63	47	27	
Starch	88	174	71	177	na ^c	
Phenols (TA eq)	14.7	16.9	21.0	21.3	16.6	
Tannins (TA eq)	1.4	4.6	8.0	7.8	4.5	
Ash	84	80	92	110	89	
UFV, g/kg DM	857	646	914	685	na ^c	
Fatty acids, g/kg DM						
C16:0	3.6	3.0	2.6	2.4	1.3	
C18:0	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.2	
C18:1 cis9	4.0	6.0	3.8	3.4	0.2	
C18:2 n-6	5.1	8.3	4.1	1.8	0.6	
C18:3 n-3	10.0	7.4	8.0	5.8	1.8	
Vitamins, mg/kg DM						
α-tocopherol	37.9	14.8	66.3	24.7	35.4	
γ-tocopherol	11.1	11.0	21.5	24.0	5.5	
δ-tocopherol	16.1	6.2	14.1	12.4	4.5	

^a DM, dry matter; FM, fresh matter; CP, crude protein; EE, ether extract; NDF, neutral detergent fibre; ADF, acid detergent fibre; TA eq, tannic acid equivalents; UFV, feed unit for maintenance and meat production, as g of standard air-dried barley equivalent (INRA, 1988).

^b CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

^c Not assessed.

2.2. Weighing and carcass evaluation

Final body weight was recorded right before slaughtering. Hot carcass weight was recorded immediately after slaughtering, and cold carcass weight was recorded after 24 h of refrigerated storage. Carcasses were graded for conformation (SEUROP classification, from S "superior" to P "poor") and fatness (from 1 "low" to 5 "very high") by a trained assessor, according to Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/1182. The firmness of subcutaneous dorsal fat was measured by a trained assessor on a 7 points scale (from 1 "very soft" to 7 "very hard") using a finger test (Prache et al., 2011).

2.3. Analyses on feedstuffs

Samples of pellets and hay were collected weekly during the trial and then pooled to get a representative sample of each feedstuff. The samples were oven-dried at 60 $^{\circ}$ C for 72 h and then stored refrigerated.

The DM content was determined by oven-drying at 103 °C for 48 h and ash content at 550 °C for 6 h in a muffle furnace (European Union Commission Regulation EC n. 152/2009). The NDF, ADF and lignin contents were determined according to the method described by Van Soest et al. (1991), using a Fibre Analyser (Ankom Technology Corporation, Fairport, NY, USA). The N content was determined by the Dumas combustion method (AOAC International, 2005; method 968.06) using a rapid N-cube protein/N apparatus (Elementar Americas Inc., Mt Laurel, NJ, USA), and CP content was calculated as N content × 6.25. Starch was analysed using an enzymatic method (Faisant et al., 1995). The fat content was determined after acid hydrolysis (AOAC International, 2005; method 954.02). Total phenolic compounds and total tannins were analysed according to the procedure of Makkar et al. (1993), as modified by Luciano et al. (2019).

Fatty acid profile was assessed through a one-step extraction-transesterification (Valenti et al., 2018). In brief, 100 mg of ground sample was mixed with 1.5 mL of chloroform and 2.5 mL of 2% methanolic sulfuric acid. After incubation in a water bath at 70 °C for 2 h, 1.5 mL of chloroform and 2.5 mL of 6% K₂CO₃ were added, and the sample was centrifuged at 2500 ×g for 10 min at 4 °C. The underlying organic phase (1 mL) was collected, evaporated under N flow, and dissolved in 1 mL of hexane. Gas-chromatographic analysis was performed as later described for rumen and abomasum contents, using C13:0 as internal standard.

Fat-soluble vitamins were extracted according to Rufino-Moya et al. (2020). Briefly, 200 mg of ground sample was mixed with 3 mL of methanol:acetone:petroleum ether (1:1:1, v-v:v) with BHT (0.1 g/L), and vortexed 1 min. Supernatant was collected after centrifugation at 1000g for 5 min: this operation was repeated twice. After evaporation under N flow, the residue of the supernatant was dissolved in 1 mL of methanol. The sample was filtered with a 0.22 μ m PTFE filter and placed into a 2 mL vial. Analytes were quantified using a Nexera UHPLC (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto, Japan) equipped with a C18 phase column (Zorbax ODS, Supelco, Bellefonte, PA; length: 25 cm; i.d.: 4.6 mm; particle size: 5 µm). Settings and temperatures were the same described by Natalello et al. (2022). Tocopherols were detected by fluorescence (RF-20AXS, Shimadzu; excitation wavelength: 295 nm; emission wavelength: 330 nm), whereas β -carotene was detected using a photodiode array detector (SPD-M40, Shimadzu; absorbance wavelength: 450 nm). The comparison with the retention time of pure standards (Merck Life Science s.r.l., Milano, Italy) was used for analytes identification. External calibration curves with pure standards were created for each analyte.

2.4. Fatty acid profile of rumen and abomasum contents

At slaughtering, the rumen and abomasum contents of each lamb were sampled and immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen. The samples were then freeze-dried and stored at -20 °C.

The FA profile of rumen and abomasum contents was analysed after

basic-acid transesterification (Alves et al., 2013), following the method described by Menci et al. (2021). Briefly, 250 mg of freeze-dried sample was mixed with 2 mL of 0.5 M methanolic CH₃ONa in a glass tube and incubated at 50 °C for 10 min. Then, 3 mL of 10% methanolic HCl was added and the tube was incubated at 50 °C for 15 min. The solution was then vortexed with 4 mL of 6% aqueous K₂CO₃. After adding 2 mL of hexane, the tube was centrifuged (1500 \times g, 10 min, 4 °C) and the supernatant extract was collected; this phase was repeated once. The extract was evaporated under N2 and the residue was dissolved in 1 mL of hexane (GC grade). A Thermo Finnigan Trace gas chromatograph featuring a flame ionization detector (FID; ThermoQuest, Milan, Italy) and a high-polar fused silica capillary column (SP-2560 fused silica, Supelco, Bellafonte, PA; length: 100 m; i.d.: 0.25 mm; film thickness: 0.25 µm) was used for the separation of FA methyl esters. Oven, injector, and detector were set as described by Natalello et al. (2019), and helium was used as carrier gas at constant flow (1 mL/min). C18:1 isomers were separated through isothermal analysis at 165 °C. Methyl nonadecanoate (C19:0) was used as internal standard. The comparison with the retention time of standard FA methyl esters mixtures (Nu-Chek Prep Inc., Elysian, MN, USA; Larodan Fine Chemicals, Malmo, Sweden) and with published chromatograms (Alves and Bessa, 2007, Kramer et al., 2008) was used to identify individual FA.

2.5. Analyses on meat

After storing the carcasses for 24 h at 0–4 °C, the *longissimus thoracis et lumborum* muscle was excised from the right side of each carcass, and pH was measured with a pH-meter equipped with probe (average of 3 measurements). Meat samples were then cut in different aliquots: the aliquots for the analyses of fatty acid profile, fat-soluble vitamins, and cholesterol were vacuum-packaged and stored at - 80 °C, whereas the aliquot for oxidative stability analysis was processed as described below (Section 2.5.2).

2.5.1. Fatty acid profile, fat-soluble vitamins, and cholesterol

The intramuscular fat was extracted from 10 g meat samples using 2:1 (v:v) chloroform:methanol (Folch method). The FA contained in the fat extract were converted to FA methyl esters through basic transesterification with methanolic CH₃ONa (Christie, 1982). The FA profile of meat was determined by gas chromatography as described above for rumen and abomasum contents.

The tocopherols, retinol, and cholesterol contents in meat were assessed following the method of Bertolín et al. (2018), with some modifications as described by Menci et al. (2022b). Briefly, 2.5 g of meat sample was mixed with 200 mg of L-ascorbic acid and 7.5 mL of KOH (10% in 1:1 ethanol:water), and let saponify overnight in an incubator shaker. Then, the extraction was carried out adding 5 mL of 9:1 hexane: ethyl acetate (with 25 mg/L of BHT), and the supernatant extract was collected after centrifugation (2000 \times g, 5 min, 10 °C); this phase was repeated once. The extract was evaporated under N₂ and the residue was dissolved in 1 mL of methanol (HPLC grade) and then filtered through PTFE syringe filters (0.2 μ m/13 mm). The analytes were quantified by UHPLC as described above for feeds. Cholesterol and retinol were detected using a photodiode array detector (SPD-M40, Shimadzu) at the absorbance wavelength of 220 nm and 325 nm, respectively.

2.5.2. Oxidative stability

Each aliquot of meat for oxidative stability analysis was cut into four 1.5 cm thick slices. The 4 slices were placed on polystyrene trays overwrapped with cling film and stored at 0–4 °C for 0 d (2 h), 3 d, 6 d, or 9 d, respectively. At the end of each storage time, the colour parameters were assessed through reading with a portable spectrophotometer (CM-2022, Minolta Co. Ltd. Osaka, Japan; SCE mode; illuminant: A; 10° standard observer) on the slice surface (average of 3 readings on non-overlapping areas). The colour descriptors L* (lightness), a* (redness), b* (yellowness), C* (saturation), and h_{ab} (hue angle), as well as the reflectance

spectrum between 400 nm and 700 nm were measured in the CIE L*a*b* colour space. The meat slices were then vacuum-packaged and stored at -80 °C before lipid oxidation analysis.

The thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS) were measured to assess the extent of lipid oxidation in meat, following the procedure described by Natalello et al. (2020), with some modification. Briefly, 2.5 g of meat was placed in a tube with 12.5 mL of water and homogenized (9500 rpm, 1 min) keeping the tube in a water-ice bath. Then, 12.5 mL of 10% trichloroacetic acid was mixed with the homogenate, and the sample was filtered (Whatman 541 paper). Four mL of the filtrate was reacted with 1 mL of 0.06 M aqueous thiobarbituric acid in a water bath at 80 °C for 90 min. A blank was prepared with 5% trichloroacetic acid in place of the filtrate. The absorbance at 532 nm was read and the result was expressed as mg of malondialdehyde per kg of meat, through comparison with a TEP (1,1,3,3-tetraethoxypropane) calibration curve (points ranging from 1.25 to 16.25 mmol/L).

2.6. Calculations and statistics

The biohydrogenation of C18:1 cis9, C18:2 n-6, and C18:3 n-3 was estimated according to Oliveira et al. (2016). Biohydrogenation completeness (BHC) was calculated according to Alves et al. (2017). Atherogenicity index (AI) and thrombogenicity index (TI) of meat were calculated according to Ulbricht and Southgate (1991). The hypocholesterolemic to hypercholesterolemic FA ratio (h:H) of meat was calculated according to the formula of Santos-Silva et al. (2002), modified as follows: h:H= (C18:1 cis9 +PUFA)/(C12:0 +C14:0 +C16:0). The activity of stearoyl-CoA 9-desaturase in muscle was calculated basing on the desaturation of C14:0. Concerning colour parameters, total colour change (ΔE) of meat after 3, 6, and 9 days of storage was calculated as $\Delta E = [(\Delta L^*)^2 + (\Delta a^*)^2 + (\Delta b^*)^2]^{1/2}$, where ΔL^* , Δa^* , and Δb^* are the differences in L^{*} , a^{*} , and b^{*} , respectively, between day 0 and day 3, day 6, or day 9. The ratio between the reflectance of meat at 630 nm and 580 nm (630/580) was calculated as indicator of myoglobin oxidation (Khliji et al., 2010). The integral value of the reflectance spectrum of meat at wavelengths between 450 nm and 530 nm ($I_{450-530}$) was calculated as indicator of carotenoids presence (Priolo et al., 2002).

Statistical analysis was performed with the software Minitab 19 (Minitab, LLC) using the single animal as statistical unit. Mixed ANOVA was applied to the data of feed intake, growth performance, carcass weights, intramuscular fat, FA profile, fat-soluble vitamins, and cholesterol, with the dietary treatment as fixed factor and the block as random factor. Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to the scores of carcass conformation, carcass fatness, and subcutaneous fat firmness, to highlight differences among diets. After verifying that the block did not have a significant effect, a mixed ANOVA for repeated measures was applied to the data of oxidative stability, with the single animal as random factor and the dietary treatment, the storage time, and their interaction as fixed factors. Differences were considered significant when P \leq 0.050 and the Tukey post hoc test was performed for multiple comparisons.

3. Results

3.1. In vivo performance and carcass traits

The daily intake of feedstuffs and nutrients by the experimental lambs is reported in Table 2. As CNS and C+S pellets were poorer in protein and energy and considering that diet was restrained to 95% of nutritional requirements, the CNS and C+S lambs had higher (P < 0.001) pellet DMI compared to the CON and SFN lambs. The CNS and C+S groups had the highest (P < 0.001) NDF and starch daily intake. Concerning lipids, the CNS group showed the highest intake of all groups, while the C+S group had a higher value than the SFN (P < 0.001). This, combined with the different FA content of pellets, led to differences (P < 0.001) in all individual FA intake. For example, the CNS group had the highest daily intake of C18:1 *cis*9 and C18:2 *n*-6, whereas

Table 2

Item ¹	Diet ²				SEM	P-value
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
DMI, pellet	656 ^b	926 ^a	634 ^b	886 ^a	27.4	< 0.001
DMI, hay	289.5	309.2	298.0	300.2	4.26	0.462
UFV ³	629.2	662.5	644.4	671.7	9.68	0.377
CP	175.8	185.0	172.0	178.5	2.64	0.347
EE	46.7 ^{bc}	82.7 ^a	41.5 ^c	50.7 ^b	3.19	< 0.001
NDF	397 ^b	544 ^a	387 ^b	497 ^a	14.3	< 0.001
ADF	256.8	257.1	241.5	244.5	3.76	0.302
Lignin	46.35	48.31	47.89	49.96	0.714	0.339
Starch	58 ^b	161 ^a	45 ^c	157 ^a	10.5	< 0.001
Phenols (TA eq)	14.40 ^d	20.72^{b}	18.18 ^c	23.80^{a}	0.711	< 0.001
Tannins (TA eq)	2.23 ^d	5.65 ^c	6.38^{b}	8.22 ^a	0.424	< 0.001
Ash	80.7 ^c	101.9 ^b	84.9 ^c	124.1 ^a	3.55	< 0.001
Fatty acids						
C16:0	2.761^{b}	3.211^{a}	2.052 ^c	2.499 ^b	0.0890	< 0.001
C18:0	0.776 ^b	0.969 ^a	0.564 ^d	0.690 ^c	0.0303	< 0.001
C18:1 cis9	2.69 ^{bc}	5.60 ^a	2.45 ^c	3.04 ^b	0.248	< 0.001
C18:2 n-6	3.54^{b}	7.85 ^a	2.80 ^c	1.82 ^d	0.448	< 0.001
C18:3 n-3	7.07 ^a	7.46 ^a	5.66 ^b	5.73 ^b	0.180	< 0.001
Vitamins (mg/d)						
α-tocopherol	31.7^{b}	22.6 ^c	47.5 ^a	29.7 ^b	1.82	< 0.001
γ-tocopherol	7.60 ^d	10.70°	13.70^{b}	20.69 ^a	0.931	< 0.001
δ -tocopherol	10.65 ^a	6.48 ^c	9.30 ^b	11.21 ^a	0.379	< 0.001

 $^{\rm a,\ b,\ c,\ d}$ Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different.

¹ DMI, dry matter intake; UFV, feed unit for maintenance and meat production, as g of standard air-dried barley equivalent (INRA, 1988); CP, crude protein; EE, ether extract; NDF, neutral detergent fibre; ADF, acid detergent fibre; TA eq, tannic acid equivalents.

 $^{2}\,$ CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

³ Hay excluded.

the C+S group had the lowest intake of C18:2 *n*-6. Furthermore, the CON and CNS groups showed a similar C18:3 *n*-3 intake, which was higher than the SFN and C+S groups (P < 0.001). The phenols and tannins intakes were different (P < 0.001) among feeding groups, according to the order C+S>CNS>SFN>CON and C+S>SFN>CNS>CON, respectively. Finally, the daily intake of tocopherols was different (P < 0.001) among feeding groups. Notably, the SFN group had the highest α -tocopherol intake while the CNS group had the lowest.

Table 3

Growth performance and carcass measurements.

Item	Diet ^a			SEM	P-	
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		value
Initial bodyweight, kg	26.57	28.86	27.39	27.95	0.529	0.391
Average daily gain, g/d	172	163	140	156	12.4	0.304
Final bodyweight, kg	30.14	32.28	30.29	31.18	0.520	0.451
Hot carcass weight, kg	16.52	16.89	15.98	16.07	0.712	0.632
Cold carcass weight, kg	16.04	16.38	15.51	15.58	0.694	0.643
Chilling loss, %	2.92	2.96	2.92	3.06	0.224	0.707
Meat pH (24 h)	5.635	5.681	5.669	5.666	0.0230	0.364
Conformation ^b	R-	R-	O+	O+	-	0.238
(SEUROP)	(17.1)	(17.4)	(9.5)	(13.9)		
Fatness ^b (1–5	3	3	2	2	-	0.301
scale)	(16.0)	(18.4)	(13.2)	(10.4)		
Fat firmness ^b (1–7	5	5	4	5	-	0.505
scale)	(16.1)	(17.1)	(10.9)	(14.0)		

^a CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

^b Values are medians with mean ranks in brackets. The overall mean rank is 14.5.

No difference on growth performance and carcass traits were observed among experimental groups (Table 3).

3.2. Fatty acid profile of rumen and abomasum contents and biohydrogenation

The diet affected the FA profile of rumen content, as shown in Table 4. Concerning branched-chain FA (BCFA), the rumen content of CNS lambs showed a lower ($P \le 0.050$) proportion than the CON group, especially regarding *anteiso* FA. The SFN group had a higher (P < 0.050) proportion of *anteiso* C15:0 and *iso* C15:0 than the CNS group, and the lowest (P < 0.001) proportion of *anteiso* C17:0. Also, the proportion of odd-chain FA (OCFA), particularly C11:0, C13:0, and C17:0, was higher (P < 0.050) in the rumen content of SFN lambs compared with CNS lambs. Concerning BH intermediates, the CNS rumen had a higher (P = 0.009) proportion of C18:1 *trans*11 than the CON and SFN groups, with an intermediate level for the C+S group. In addition, the C18:1 *trans*10 proportion was higher (P = 0.031) in the CNS group than in the SFN group. Finally, the C+S group showed a higher (P = 0.015) proportion of PUFA than the CNS and SFN groups.

The FA profile of abomasum content is showed in Table 5. The CON group had the highest (P < 0.001) proportion of BCFA and *anteiso* FA. In particular, the CNS group had the lowest (P = 0.001) proportion of anteiso C15:0, whereas the SFN group had the lowest (P < 0.001) proportion of anteiso C17:0. Moreover, the CNS group showed the lowest (P = 0.006) value of iso C15:0 proportion. Concerning OCFA, the CNS group had the lowest (P = 0.001) proportion of C17:0, and the SFN group had the highest (P < 0.001) proportion of C15:0. As a result, OCFA proportion was lower (P = 0.001) in the CNS abomasum than in the SFN. The CNS group showed the lowest C16:0 and C16:1 cis9 values (P <0.001 and P = 0.003, respectively). Similar to rumen content, the CNS abomasum content had a higher (P = 0.017) proportion of C18:1 trans11 than the CON and SFN groups, with an intermediate level for the C+S group. Furthermore, the CNS group showed higher C18:1 cis13 (P = 0.016) and C18:2 *n*-6 (P = 0.034) proportions compared with the SFN group.

The analysis of BH indices (Table 6) highlighted a higher C18:1 *cis*9 BH rate in the CNS and C+S groups than in the CON group, with intermediate levels in the SFN group, in both rumen (P = 0.003) and abomasum (P = 0.001) contents. The C+S group stood out for the lowest (P < 0.001) C18:2 *n*-6 BH rate, in both rumen and abomasum contents. According to the FA profile of abomasum content, the least complete BH (P = 0.001) occurred with the CNS diet.

3.3. Meat quality

Concerning meat FA profile (Table 7), the CNS diet increased (P = 0.006) the C18:1 *trans*11 concentration in lamb of 70% (on average) compared to the other diets. The concentration of C18:2 *cis9trans*11 was higher (P = 0.008) in CNS meat than in SFN and C+S meats, but no difference with the CON group was observed. Moreover, the CNS group showed a higher (P < 0.001) concentration of C18:1 *cis*12 in meat than the CON group. The sum of *trans* FA in CNS meat was higher (P = 0.001) than in other meats; the difference disappeared (P > 0.050) when C18:1 *trans*11 was excluded from the count. The diet had no effect (P > 0.050) on the activity of muscle stearoyl-CoA 9-desaturase.

The contents in α -tocopherol, γ -tocopherol, and retinol of lamb are showed in Table 8. The SFN and C+S groups had higher (P < 0.001) α -tocopherol content than the CON and CNS groups. The lambs fed with conventional pellet had the lowest (P < 0.001) γ -tocopherol content in meat. Finally, the content of retinol was lower (P = 0.009) in SFN and C+S meat than in CON meat.

The diet did not affect (P > 0.050) the colour parameters and the lipid oxidation of meat (Table 9). All measured oxidative stability parameters changed during the storage time, without significant interaction with the diet. In particular, L*, b*, and h_{ab} increased, whereas a*,

630/580, and $I_{450-530}$ decreased from 0 to 9 days of storage (P < 0.001). The value of ΔE was lower (P < 0.001) at day 3 compared with day 6 and 9. The content of malondialdehyde in meat was similar between day 0 and day 3, and then progressively increased after 6 days and 9 days of storage (P < 0.001).

4. Discussion

4.1. In vivo performance

According to scientific literature, this is the first time that chestnut shells, a by-product of chestnut industry, have been tested in livestock feeding (Musati et al., 2023). In the present experiment, chestnut shells were included in a pelleted feed as part of a balanced diet for finishing lambs. The different chemical composition of the experimental pellets was balanced by the feeding restriction, as confirmed by the similar UFV and CP intakes, growth performance, and carcass traits among groups. However, it cannot be ignored that achieving the same growth performance with a larger quantity of feed would necessarily lower feed efficiency and increase excretions.

Despite the relatively higher starch intake of the lambs fed pellets containing chestnut shells, all the diets used in the present experiment had no risk of developing rumen acidosis. Indeed, the starch content was lower than 200 g/kg DM and the NDF content was higher than 300 g/kg DM, both parameters that prevent the risk of acidosis (INRA, 2018). This was proven by the ruminal pH values of experimental lambs, which were in the range of 6.6–7 (data not shown).

The high fat intake observed in the CNS group was due to the inclusion of hydrogenated vegetable oil in the formulation of the CNS pellet. This was necessary for two reasons: to overcome the poor "pelletability" of chestnut shells and to balance the energy value of the pellet. Anyway, the presence of hydrogenated vegetable oil did not affect the in vivo performance of the CNS lambs, likely because all the diets consumed were isoenergetic. Similar results were obtained by Castro et al. (2005) when supplementing the diet of lambs with different vegetable oil supplements. Nonetheless, we cannot exclude that a feeding period longer than 21 d may result in different carcass characteristics, such as the fatness score.

The tannin content of agro-industrial by-products may set a limit to their use in animal diet, as these phenolic compounds may have antinutritional properties if a certain dose is exceeded. For example, Shakeri (2016) tested the inclusion of the by-product of pistachio hulling in the diet of lambs and observed that a dose of 300 g/kg (corresponding to a level of tannins of 2.3% in the diet) had a negative effect on growth performance because of dietary tannins. Despite dietary levels of about 1-2% are generally considered not detrimental for ruminant performance (Vasta et al., 2019), the great variability of tannin structures of different plants often leads to conflicting results. For instance, Valenti et al. (2021) observed that supplementing the diet of lambs with 2.3% of chestnut bark tannins resulted in lower feed intake and/or bodyweight gain, whereas mimosa, gambier, and tara tannins at the same dose did not exert any detrimental effects. However, in the present experiment, the composition of pelleted feeds resulted in a "harmless" dietary tannins level of less than 1%, even when chestnut shells and sainfoin were fed together.

Consistent with our results, Copani et al. (2016) found no difference in ADG and carcass weight of lambs when replacing timothy (*Phleum pratense*) with sainfoin (about 460 g/d) in a diet of red clover (*Trifolium pratense*) silage. Indeed, the feeding value of sainfoin can be considered similar to common forages such as alfalfa, provided that its tannin content remains below an indicative threshold of 50 g/kg DM (Wang et al., 2015).

4.2. Fatty acid metabolism

As expected, the diets including chestnut shells and/or sainfoin

Fatty acid profile of rumen content (g/100 g of fatty acids).

Item ¹	Diet ²				SEM	P-value
	CON	CNE	CEN	C I S		
	CON	CNS	SFIN	C+8		
C10:0	0.028	0.021	0.026	0.033	0.0023	0.278
C11:0 C12:0	0.024"	0.012	0.024"	0.019	0.0016	0.006
C12:0	0.165 0.26 ^{ab}	0.111 0.22 ^b	0.142	0.110	0.0158	0.054
C14:0	0.356 ^{ab}	0.22 0.258 ^b	0.32°	0.34 0.345 ^{ab}	0.0173	0.009
iso C14:0	0.184	0.159	0.241	0.216	0.0190	0.064
C14:1 trans9	0.114	0.071	0.123	0.133	0.0117	0.252
C14:1 cis9	0.248	0.202	0.266	0.224	0.0197	0.710
C15:0	1.030	0.893	1.228	1.043	0.0451	0.060
anteiso C15:0	1.184 ^{ab}	0.974 ^b	1.317^{a}	1.041 ^{ab}	0.0434	0.014
iso C15:0	0.436 ^{ab}	0.328^{b}	0.528^{a}	0.507 ^a	0.0256	0.010
C15:1 trans10	0.848 ^b	0.715 ^b	1.052^{a}	0.869 ^b	0.0322	< 0.001
C15:1 cis10	0.038	0.043	0.073	0.047	0.0072	0.309
C16:0	16.07	15.39	16.25	17.25	0.364	0.360
iso C16:0	0.614	0.505	0.618	0.602	0.0301	0.527
C16:1 trans9	0.367	0.233	0.334	0.361	0.0243	0.174
C10:1 (159 C17:0	0.050 0.514 ^{ab}	0.527	0.700	0.669 0.514ab	0.0357	0.355
anteiso C17:0	0.314 0.970 ^a	0.433 0.868 ^{ab}	0.542 0.570 ^c	0.514 0.637 ^{bc}	0.0144	0.030
iso C17:0	0.190	0.202	0.281	0.037	0.0301	0.739
C17.1 trans10	0.080	0.072	0.103	0.076	0.0056	0.176
C17:1 <i>cis</i> 10	0.135	0.130	0.165	0.119	0.0097	0.284
C18:0	40.07	39.67	41.76	36.37	0.920	0.126
C18:1 trans6 + 7 + 8	0.719	0.825	0.715	0.815	0.0425	0.715
C18:1 trans9	0.444	0.489	0.450	0.491	0.0251	0.859
C18:1 trans10	0.704 ^{ab}	1.103 ^a	0.630^{b}	0.674 ^{ab}	0.0775	0.031
C18:1 trans11	8.57^{b}	14.36 ^a	9.46 ^b	10.43 ^{ab}	0.681	0.009
C18:1 cis9	4.17	4.06	3.67	3.54	0.176	0.544
C18:1 cis11	5.33	5.45	5.00	5.77	0.172	0.487
C18:1 <i>cis</i> 12	0.601	0.553	0.840	0.891	0.0570	0.160
C18:1 cts13	0.781*	0.777ab	0.581	0.623	0.0729	0.019
C18:1 cts14	1.307	1.220	1.226	1.148	0.0439	0.701
	0.184	0.151	0.121	0.174	0.0142	0.425
C18.2 n-6	0.030	2.400	2.191	2.430	0.0324	0.212
C18·3 n-3	2.069	1 939	2 208	2 418	0.0745	0.099
C19:1 trans7	0.099	0.089	0.110	0.101	0.0087	0.539
C19:1 trans10	0.302	0.296	0.258	0.244	0.0130	0.285
C20:0	0.512^{ab}	0.459 ^b	0.561^{a}	0.551 ^{ab}	0.0141	0.033
C20:1 trans11	0.034	0.024	0.011	0.097	0.0147	0.136
C20:1 cis11	0.039	0.037	0.034	0.039	0.0044	0.979
C20:2 n-6	0.199	0.206	0.243	0.184	0.0142	0.491
C20:3 n-6	0.059	0.061	0.056	0.062	0.0067	0.992
C20:3 n-3	0.089	0.030	0.054	0.029	0.0752	0.770
C20:5 n-3	0.490	0.487	0.498	0.552	0.0126	0.206
C21:0	0.309	0.296	0.345	0.306	0.0192	0.742
C22:0	0.457	0.534	0.518	0.564	0.0179	0.192
C22:1 trans13	0.017	0.030	0.014	0.036	0.0059	0.393
C22.1 CB13 $C22.2 n_{-6}$	0.180	0.119	0.128	0.025	0.0100	0.000
C22:4 n-6	0.085	0.064	0.086	0.085	0.0051	0.396
C22:5 n-6	0.110 ^{ab}	0.097 ^b	0.161 ^a	0.146 ^{ab}	0.0112	0.047
C22:5 n-3	0.032	0.020	0.026	0.038	0.0113	0.742
C22:6 n-3	0.037	0.018	0.027	0.022	0.0028	0.083
C23:0	0.242	0.212	0.291	0.301	0.0350	0.807
C24:0	$0.012^{\rm b}$	0.021^{ab}	0.031^{a}	0.026 ^{ab}	0.0023	0.024
C24:1 cis9	0.053	0.031	0.027	0.046	0.0095	0.761
Sums and calculations		_		_		
SFA	57.85	56.46	59.67	55.25	0.776	0.104
OCFA	2.38	2.07 ^b	2.75^{a}	3.12 ^a	0.149	0.005
BCFA	3.586	3.036 ^b	3.505 ^{ab}	3.071 ^{ab}	0.0922	0.050
anteiso FA	2.162	1.724	1.887	1.6/8	0.0582	0.002
ISU FA	1.424	1.194	1.491	1.447	0.0/10	0.125
DIFA	≥7.09 8.50 ^{ab}	8 01 ^b	20.92 8.15 ^b	27.70 9.58 ^a	0.089	0.055
PUFA n-6/n-3	1.759	1.866	1.702	1.739	0.0484	0.660
C18:1 trans10/11	0.075	0.084	0.067	0.082	0.0047	0.601

a, b, c Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different.

¹ SFA, saturated fatty acids; OCFA, odd-chain fatty acids; BCFA, branched-chain fatty acids; FA, fatty acids; MUFA, monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acids.

² CON, control; CNS, chestnut peels; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut peels and sainfoin.

Fatty acid profile of abomasum content (g/100 g of fatty acids).

Item ¹	Diet ²	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			SEM	P-value
item	GON	010	CENT	0.0	<u>ULIVI</u>	i vulue
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
C10:0	0.026	0.018	0.025	0.022	0.0036	0.904
C11:0	0.006	0.003	0.010	0.015	0.0030	0.559
C12:0	0.140	0.065	0.168*	0.091	0.0120	0.004
C13:0	0.039	0.025	0.048	0.044	0.0051	0.425
C14:0	0.486	0.3485	0.575	0.513"	0.0252	0.006
	0.278	0.277	0.419	0.371	0.0233	0.065
C14:1 trans9	0.043	0.021	0.056	0.031	0.0063	0.229
C14:1 (189 C15:0	0.085 0.731 ^b	0.049 0.616 ^b	0.084	0.058 0.727 ^b	0.0075	0.247
anteiso C15:0	0.731 0.773 ^a	0.010	0.833 ^a	0.727 0.711 ^{ab}	0.0254	0.001
iso C15:0	0.415 ^a	0.370	0.369 ^a	0.367 ^a	0.0209	0.001
C15:1 trans10	0.745 ^a	0.225 0.506 ^b	0.309 0.774 ^a	0.671 ^{ab}	0.0220	0.000
C15:1 <i>cis</i> 10	0.015	0.008	0.024	0.021	0.0040	0.518
C16:0	11.84 ^a	10.91 ^b	11.79 ^a	12.27 ^a	0.124	< 0.001
iso C16:0	0.190	0.225	0.190	0.176	0.0207	0.869
C16:1 trans9	0.274	0.163	0.238	0.260	0.0161	0.053
C16:1 cis9	0.263 ^a	0.181 ^b	0.290 ^a	0.260^{a}	0.0119	0.003
C17:0	0.514 ^a	0.422^{b}	0.547 ^a	0.515 ^a	0.0128	0.001
anteiso C17:0	1.108^{a}	0.952 ^{ab}	0.606 ^c	0.691 ^{bc}	0.0535	< 0.001
iso C17:0	0.126	0.124	0.153	0.131	0.0107	0.782
C17:1 trans10	0.087	0.050	0.097	0.070	0.0069	0.064
C17:1 cis10	0.007	0.004	0.014	0.017	0.0038	0.602
C18:0	47.00	44.43	48.00	45.45	0.766	0.315
C18:1 trans6 + 7 + 8	0.852	1.055	0.905	0.997	0.0437	0.308
C18:1 trans9	0.519	0.573	0.535	0.592	0.0216	0.610
C18:1 trans10	0.759	1.049	0.643	0.889	0.0571	0.061
C18:1 trans11	11.31^{b}	16.83 ^a	10.49 ^b	11.45 ^{ab}	0.797	0.017
C18:1 cis9	5.53	5.38	5.18	5.43	0.169	0.915
C18:1 cis11	3.48	4.08	3.64	4.12	0.140	0.274
C18:1 cis12	0.655	0.474	0.581	0.550	0.0395	0.455
C18:1 cis13	0.721^{ab}	1.249 ^a	0.621^{b}	0.700^{b}	0.0816	0.016
C18:1 cis14	1.691	1.395	1.506	1.549	0.0429	0.099
C18:2 cis9trans11	0.125	0.107	0.168	0.109	0.0185	0.647
C18:2 n-6	1.734 ^{ab}	1.921 ^a	1.621 ^b	1.952^{a}	0.0480	0.034
C18:3 n-6	0.010	0.059	0.014	0.010	0.0135	0.530
C18:3 n-3	1.908	1.580	1.765	1.883	0.0714	0.365
C19:1 trans7	0.019	0.025	0.038	0.044	0.0087	0.745
C19:1 trans10	0.418	0.351	0.375	0.432	0.0189	0.416
C20:0	0.572^{ab}	0.548	0.603	0.661ª	0.0154	0.040
C20:1 trans11	0.017	0.011	0.011	0.025	0.0038	0.520
C20:1 cis11	0.070	0.066	0.065	0.060	0.0038	0.842
C20:2 n-6	0.129	0.132	0.088	0.131	0.0130	0.589
C20:3 n-6	0.027	0.075	0.117	0.068	0.0172	0.338
C20:3 n-3	0.013 0.520ab	0.008	0.014	0.007	0.0014	0.232
C20:5 <i>n</i> -5	0.532	0.525	0.048	0.000	0.0231	0.036
C21.0	0.233	0.230	0.526	0.2/1	0.0222	0.430
C22.0	0.387	0.003	0.010	0.049	0.0133	0.539
C22.1 titles13	0.045	0.100	0.197	0.040	0.0250	0.034
(22.1, 0.010)	0.015	0.032	0.072	0.017	0.0031	0.649
C22:4 n-6	0.035	0.020	0.025	0.028	0.0029	0.363
C22:5 <i>n</i> -6	0.015	0.012	0.037	0.054	0.0087	0.278
C22:5 n-3	0.000	0.005	0.014	0.012	0.0032	0.437
C22:6 n-3	0.024	0.010	0.030	0.022	0.0048	0.403
C23:0	0.138	0.124	0.143	0.143	0.0031	0.099
C24:0	0.045	0.061	0.040	0.219	0.0355	0.228
C24:1 cis9	0.057	0.056	0.080	0.065	0.0048	0.220
Sums and calculations						
SFA	60.69	56.98	61.82	59.88	0.800	0.127
OCFA	1.664 ^{ab}	1.427^{b}	1.970 ^a	1.715 ^{ab}	0.0537	0.001
BCFA	3.029 ^a	2.249 ^c	2.569^{b}	2.447 ^{bc}	0.0623	< 0.001
anteiso FA	1.881^{a}	1.395^{b}	1.438^{b}	1.402^{b}	0.0553	0.001
iso FA	1.010	0.855	1.131	1.045	0.0427	0.135
MUFA	27.68 ^{ab}	32.13 ^a	26.51 ^b	28.38 ^{ab}	0.761	0.029
PUFA	7.08	7.08	7.13	7.58	0.161	0.655
PUFA n-6/n-3	1.486	1.811	1.459	1.500	0.0566	0.079
C18:1 trans10/11	0.073	0.075	0.063	0.081	0.0045	0.571

a, b, c Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different.

¹ SFA, saturated fatty acids; OCFA, odd-chain fatty acids; BCFA, branched-chain fatty acids; FA, fatty acids; MUFA, monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acids.

² CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

Biohydrogenation indices in rumen and abomasum contents (%).

Item	Diet ¹				SEM	P-value
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
Rumen						
C18:1 cis9 ²	69.0 ^b	78.5 ^a	75.6 ^{ab}	80.6 ^a	1.30	0.002
C18:2 <i>n</i> -6 ²	87.4 ^a	90.9 ^a	87.1 ^a	74.9 ^b	1.43	0.003
C18:3 n-3 ²	94.13	92.23	93.58	92.87	0.282	< 0.001
Completeness ³	64.7	60.9	67.4	61.6	1.28	0.061
Abomasum						0.287
C18:1 cis9 ²	62.7 ^b	73.8 ^a	68.5 ^{ab}	73.7 ^a	1.28	
C18:2 <i>n</i> -6 ²	91.11 ^a	93.32 ^a	91.34 ^a	84.10 ^b	0.730	0.001
C18:3 n-3 ²	95.10	94.20	95.33	95.16	0.225	< 0.001
Completeness ³	71.4 ^a	60.5 ^b	70.4 ^a	67.6 ^a	1.18	0.293
						0.001

^{a, b, c} Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different.

 $^{1}\,$ CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

² Calculated according to Oliveira et al. (2016).

³ Calculated according to Alves et al. (2017).

affected the FA profiles of digesta and meat in the present experiment. This was probably due to the increased dietary intake of tannins, which are known to affect microbial activity and change the proportion of FA in the rumen (Frutos et al., 2020). In particular, tannins affect the presence of two main classes of FA of microbial origin: the odd- and branched-chain FA (OBCFA), which constitute microbial cells, and the FA involved in ruminal BH. Moreover, the different chemical composition of the experimental pellets, such as the high starch and fat content of CNS pellet, may have further affected the composition of rumen microbiota (Mizrahi et al., 2021; Vargas-Bello-Pérez et al., 2016).

Concerning OBCFA, these are particularly related to microbial species, which in turn depend on the composition of the diet. Indeed, cellulolytic bacteria are rich in iso FA, whereas amylolytic bacteria contain high amount of anteiso FA and OCFA (Vlaeminck et al., 2006). In the present experiment, the tannin-containing diets (i.e., CNS, SFN, C+S) particularly reduced the proportion of anteiso FA in rumen and abomasum, suggesting a probable targeted action of tannins against amylolytic bacteria. On the contrary, tannins are generally found to inhibit cellulolytic bacteria and reduce the presence of iso FA in the rumen (Alves et al., 2017). However, the great variability of rumen microbiota makes it difficult to draw univocal conclusion, also considering that some important cellulolytic bacteria such as those of Prevotella strains are particularly rich in anteiso FA (Vlaeminck et al., 2006). Interestingly, feeding the CNS diet had a different effect against ruminal OBCFA compared to the SFN diet, suggesting once again the variability of the action mechanisms of different tannins (Costa et al., 2018, Menci et al., 2021). However, it cannot be ignored that the different ingredients used in the formulation of pellets may have further affected the FA profile of rumen and abomasum contents. For instance, the presence of hydrogenated vegetable oil in the CNS diet may have modified rumen microbiota composition and, thus, rumen FA profile, as already observed by Vargas-Bello-Pérez et al. (2016) in dairy cows fed 27 g DM/kg of hydrogenated palm oil. Consistently with Alves et al. (2017), the different OBCFA content in the abomasum did not lead to a different deposition in meat among treatments. This could have health implications considering that dietary BCFA have shown anti-cancer and anti-inflammatory properties (Vahmani et al., 2020).

Ruminal BH is the process in which rumen microbiota converts dietary unsaturated FA (UFA) such as C18:2 *n*-6, C18:3 *n*-3, and C18:1 *cis*9 to C18:0, producing a number of intermediate FA, including *trans* FA and conjugated FA (Chilliard et al., 2007). In the present experiment, the BH rate of the main UFA reflected the differences in the dietary intake among treatments: the CNS and C+S groups had the highest intake and BH rate of C18:1 *cis*9, and the C+S group had the lowest intake and BH rate of C18:2 *n*-6. Indeed, the greater the quantity of an UFA, the greater its potential toxicity to rumen microorganisms, which leads to a higher BH rate (Maia et al., 2007). The different dietary intake of C18:3 *n*-3 among treatments did not result in a different BH rate probably because even the lowest intake exceeded the toxicity threshold for rumen microorganisms.

Feeding lambs the CNS diet reduced the completeness of BH according to the FA profile of abomasum content, which can be considered the end point of BH (Alves et al., 2017). Indeed, the higher UFA intake of CNS lambs did not result in a higher proportion of C18:0 in digesta, and we observed an accumulation of C18:1 trans11 in rumen and abomasum digesta. This confirms the hypothesis of an inhibitory effect of dietary tannins on the last step of ruminal BH, as already reported in vitro (Khiaosa-Ard et al., 2009) and in vivo (Vasta et al., 2009). Instead, we observed no difference in BH completeness when feeding the SFN and C+S diets, suggesting a lack of effect of sainfoin tannins on ruminal BH. However, dietary sainfoin is reported to affect ruminal BH in both lambs (Campidonico et al., 2016) and cows (Huyen et al., 2020), by reducing the BH of C18:3 *n*-3 and promoting the accumulation of conjugated FA. Interestingly, Jerónimo et al. (2010) and Alves et al. (2017) observed that tannins of Cistus ladanifer L. slowed down ruminal BH in lambs only when the diet was supplemented with vegetable oils. We cannot therefore rule out that an effect on rumen BH could also have been observed in the SFN and C+S groups if the diets had been supplemented with vegetable oil as was the CNS diet.

The modification of rumen FA profile as a consequence of the slowdown of rumen BH by dietary tannins is not steadily reflected in meat FA profile (Frutos et al., 2020). However, in the present experiment, the higher proportion of C18:1 trans11 in digesta led to an increase in this FA in CNS meat of more than 50%. The transfer of C18:1 trans11 from rumen to meat is consistent with the findings of Priolo et al. (2021). In the present study, this resulted in a higher proportion of C18:2 cis9trans11 in CNS meat, even if only compared to the SFN and C+S groups. Indeed, most of the C18:2 cis9trans11 in meat originates from C18:1 trans11 through the action of stearoyl-CoA 9-desaturase in muscle (Bessa et al., 2015). The CNS diet also led to the accumulation of trans FA in meat, the consumption of which is associated with an increased risk of coronary heart disease (Mozaffarian et al., 2009). However, the difference in the trans FA content of meat among treatments was only due to C18:1 trans11, which in turn is reported to have beneficial effects on human health (Vahmani et al., 2020). In particular, C18:1 trans11 showed anti-inflammatory, anti-carcinogenic, anti-atherosclerotic, and anti-diabetic effects, both directly and indirectly, after desaturation to C18:2 cis9trans11 (Vahmani et al., 2020).

4.3. Oxidative stability of meat

The oxidative stability of meat depends on the complex balance between pro-oxidant factors, such as PUFA, and antioxidant factors, such as α -tocopherol. In the present experiment, the diet did not affect the peroxidability of lipids, according to the FA profile of meat, whereas the α -tocopherol content was higher in the meat from lambs fed sainfoin. However, all α -tocopherol values were well below the 3 µg/g indicated by Ponnampalam et al. (2014) as a threshold to ensure good control over lipid oxidation. This probably made the differences in α -tocopherol content irrelevant in slowing down the oxidation of meat.

The inclusion of chestnut shells in the diet (i.e., CNS and C+S) of lambs reduced the daily intake of α -tocopherol, as a consequence of the lack of vitamin E in this by-product (de Vasconcelos et al., 2010).

Intramuscular fat content, cholesterol content, and fatty acid profile of lamb.

ON ON ON ON Calabianci piks Papelin gridar gin Papelin gridar gin Distance 15.81 16.77 16.64 16.64 0.651 0.010 0.041 Clab 0.158 0.163 0.163 0.141 0.114 0.011 0.032 Clab 0.158 0.163 0.142 0.158 0.022 0.032 Clab 2.29 2.50 3.09 2.59 0.033 0.032 0.033 Clab 0.041 0.038 0.059 0.044 0.0033 0.059 Clab 0.042 0.042 0.038 0.059 0.044 0.0033 0.013 Di Clab 0.042 0.021 0.021 0.026 0.023 0.015 Di Clab 0.041 0.059 0.021 0.022 0.0025 0.027 0.016 Di Clab 0.041 0.057 0.048 0.017 0.048 0.0129 0.018 Di Clab 0.024 0.024 0.027 0.018	Item ¹	Diet ²				SEM	P-value
Instructure for J_{12} 15.81 16.78 16.64 15.62 0.746 0.977 Mappelling JODE FA 0.135 0.153 0.154 0.191 0.164 0.0113 0.354 C120 0.136 0.259 0.3423 0.316 0.0222 0.067 C120 0.136 0.259 0.3423 0.316 0.0222 0.067 C140 0.269 0.261 0.676 0.014 0.0033 0.577 C141 0.083 0.089 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.319 0.155 0.044 0.039 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.031 0.317 0.151 0.044 0.039 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.032 0.557 C1640 0.311 0.044 0.377 0.186 0.039 0.031 0.037 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376 0.0376<		CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
Indication of the project of the provide of	Intromuceular fet a /kg	15.01	16 79	16.64	15.60	0.746	0.027
Date Date Date Date Date Date Date Date C100 C100 C125 C126 C126 C121 C126 C126 C126 C126 C126 C126 C126 C126 C127 C127 C1	Intramuscular fat, g/kg	15.81	16.78	16.64	15.62	0.746	0.937
and be and be<	Cholesterol, g/Rg	0.639	0.054	0.040	0.051	0.0100	0.944
C120 C126 C027 C037 C037 <t< td=""><td>C10.0</td><td>0.135</td><td>0.163</td><td>0.191</td><td>0 164</td><td>0.0113</td><td>0.392</td></t<>	C10.0	0.135	0.163	0.191	0 164	0.0113	0.392
C13600.0210.0250.0310.0280.0260.0320.035(a C140)0.0410.0380.0600.0440.0330.597(c 141 col)0.0480.0380.0600.0440.0330.597(c 150)0.0440.1430.1840.1430.1450.00850.0117(c 150)0.0440.0290.0210.0210.0260.0250.077(c 150)0.0210.0210.0210.0200.0250.0790.485(c 150)0.0230.2150.1370.1470.2870.1480.1480.148(c 150)0.1380.1740.2270.1860.0790.4850.0790.485(c 150)0.1380.2460.3310.5010.01380.0290.031(c 170)0.5310.2660.0310.0130.0390.0320.011(c 170)0.5310.0540.0310.0120.0130.0120.0380.037(c 170)0.5310.0540.0380.0290.0390.0360.0310.0120.0380.037(c 170)0.5310.0540.0390.0360.0380.0390.0350.0380.0370.0310.0110.0220.039(c 170)0.5310.0540.0390.0560.0310.0540.0310.0570.0310.0510.0310.0510.0310.0510.0310.0510.0310.0510.0310.0	C12:0	0.196	0.239	0.342	0.316	0.0232	0.087
Ci 40 2.29 2.50 3.09 2.99 0.172 0.251 Ci 41 co ⁹ 0.081 0.099 0.129 0.104 0.0070 0.157 Ci 41 co ⁹ 0.042 0.394 0.484 0.146 0.0070 0.017 Ci 50 0.149 0.149 0.149 0.146 0.008 0.011 Ci 50 0.181 0.175 0.166 0.023 0.015 Ci 50 0.181 0.174 0.207 0.166 0.012 0.015 Ci 51 0.130 0.224 0.307 0.168 0.0126 0.158 Ci 61 0.181 0.172 0.168 0.0126 0.0126 0.0126 Ci 70 0.311 0.425 0.425 0.413 0.0139 0.317 Ci 71 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.0139 0.317 Ci 71 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.012 0.013 Ci 71 0.411 0.35	C13:0	0.021	0.025	0.031	0.028	0.0020	0.343
ár C1400.0410.0830.0590.0440.00330.597C1540.0850.0890.1290.1440.0130.0850.318iar C1500.0420.3440.1830.1860.0310.1670.0050.318iar C1500.0490.0910.1370.1660.0050.1170.1670.167iar C1500.2312.0152.0370.1860.00790.4550.1670.1650.1670.155 <td>C14:0</td> <td>2.29</td> <td>2.50</td> <td>3.09</td> <td>2.99</td> <td>0.172</td> <td>0.251</td>	C14:0	2.29	2.50	3.09	2.99	0.172	0.251
C1 41 crish0.0890.0890.1290.1040.00790.167C1500.1490.1430.1840.1630.00860.319cristo0.0490.0890.1200.1060.00860.117C1600.018120.1521.0321.420.2380.165C161 crowp0.1810.1770.1660.02260.185C161 crowp0.1810.1740.2070.1660.02260.058C161 crowp0.1870.2640.1760.1660.02260.058C161 crowp0.1291.1291.1291.1280.02990.031C161 crowp0.2810.2811.5271.1480.03990.039C1700.4110.5570.4250.4130.01390.012C1700.4110.5570.4250.4130.01390.012C1700.4110.5570.4250.4130.01390.014C1700.4110.5570.581.520.1770.014C181 trowp7.80.2230.0240.0220.0280.024C181 trowp0.0300.0350.0420.0240.0270.035C181 trowp0.0300.0350.0420.0420.0270.036C181 trowp0.0300.0350.0290.0240.0290.035C181 trowp0.0300.0350.0270.0300.036C181 trowp0.3640.7840.7560.766 <t< td=""><td>iso C14:0</td><td>0.041</td><td>0.038</td><td>0.050</td><td>0.044</td><td>0.0033</td><td>0.597</td></t<>	iso C14:0	0.041	0.038	0.050	0.044	0.0033	0.597
C150 0.402 0.394 0.488 0.448 0.490 0.318 iar C150 0.049 0.049 0.126 0.050 0.0661 0.117 C150 0.029 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.026 0.057 C160 20.31 20.124 0.126 0.165 0.028 0.167 C161 0.187 0.263 0.176 0.165 0.028 0.025 C161 c697 0.265 0.264 0.307 0.287 0.0076 0.058 C161 c697 0.265 0.254 0.307 0.287 0.0076 0.058 C161 c697 0.265 0.254 0.307 0.287 0.0076 0.058 C161 c697 0.261 0.297 0.418 0.413 0.0171 0.038 0.028 C170 0.418 0.357 0.458 0.413 0.0171 0.037	C14:1 cis9	0.083	0.089	0.129	0.104	0.0079	0.167
ameta0.1430.1840.1630.00850.0187C1510.0940.0220.0210.0000.00530.0017C1610.0220.0210.0200.00250.00750.0075bar C1600.1870.1760.2370.1280.0090.455bar C1600.1870.1760.2370.1280.0090.025C161 c1670.2650.2540.3770.2370.0290.00760.038C161 c1670.2851.2461.3791.2880.0290.0210.021C17.00.5310.4660.5310.6110.0130.0320.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0390.0120.0130.0120.0390.0120.0130.0120.0390.0120.0390.0220.0390.0120.0390.0340.0220.0390.0120.0130.0120.0390.0340.0220.0390.0340.0220.0390.0340.0220.0390.0340.0220.0390.0340.0210.0340.0310.0340.0310.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0340.0350.0340	C15:0	0.402	0.394	0.488	0.448	0.0200	0.319
isc 15.0 0.099 0.126 0.106 0.0061 0.117 C15.1 0.032 0.021 0.022 0.022 0.025 C16.0 2.0.31 20.31 20.35 21.42 0.238 0.077 C16.1 0.187 0.252 0.177 0.155 0.032 0.025 C16.1 0.187 0.235 0.177 0.155 0.033 0.032 C17.0 1.238 1.230 1.257 1.174 0.028 0.039 0.321 C17.0 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.013 0.029 C17.0 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.012 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.023 0.024 0.017 0.023 0.027 0.351 0.557 0.573 0.557 0.575 0.575 0.557 0.557 0.557 0.232 0.298 0.299 0.210 0.212 0.055 0.042 0.298 0.299 0.216 0.553 <td< td=""><td>anteiso C15:0</td><td>0.149</td><td>0.143</td><td>0.184</td><td>0.163</td><td>0.0085</td><td>0.318</td></td<>	anteiso C15:0	0.149	0.143	0.184	0.163	0.0085	0.318
C15.1 mm3100.0290.0210.0210.0200.00250.507L600.1810.1740.2070.1860.00790.485L61 frano0.1870.2350.2340.3070.3270.0050.038L61 frano0.2350.2340.3070.3270.0050.0380.005L61 frano0.2350.2340.3070.3270.0050.0380.028L61 frano0.2350.2340.5070.3770.00130.0210.0180.0130.0130.013L62 frano0.0210.0180.0120.0130.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0130.0120.0230.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0240.0230.0230.0230.0230.0230.0230.0230.0230.0230.0	iso C15:0	0.094	0.089	0.126	0.106	0.0061	0.117
Cl6:0 20.31 20.15 21.03 21.42 0.238 0.175 Cl6:1 0.187 0.235 0.176 0.165 0.075 0.0485 Cl6:1 0.255 0.234 0.307 0.163 0.0126 0.0138 Cl7:1 0.255 0.234 0.307 0.0138 0.0138 Cl7:1 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.0139 0.023 isc Cl7:0 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.013 0.037 Cl8:1 0.021 0.021 0.028 0.022 0.051 0.074 Cl8:1 0.337 0.326 0.028 0.022 0.017 0.328 Cl8:1 0.337 0.355 0.237 0.357 0.358 0.322 0.399 Cl8:1 0.347 0.357 0.455 0.354 0.359 0.244 0.355 0.364 0.354 0.355 0.364 0.355 0.364 0.354 0.355 0.364 0.	C15:1 trans10	0.029	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.0025	0.507
isc Cle00.1810.1740.2070.1850.00790.485Cle1 (ar)0.2640.2070.1850.01260.185Cle1 (ar)1.2391.2460.3070.2870.00760.038Cle1 (ar)1.2391.2460.5311.2880.02990.231Cle7 (ar)1.5311.2660.5311.1860.01390.029Cle7 (ar)0.4110.0570.4250.4130.01390.021Cle7 (ar)0.0210.0180.0120.0180.0740.074Cl8.10 (mash)0.6290.2230.2390.2100.2120.01170.253Cl8.10 (mash)1.6390.2560.4000.3040.02270.399Cl8.10 (mash)0.1370.3560.4000.3040.02270.399Cl8.10 (mash)0.1470.0560.2080.2290.2240.0050.3900.2160.00670.0640.0640.0040.0070.6430.0270.0850.2990.2240.0850.2990.2240.0850.2990.2440.3330.0360.0280.2070.0660.0610.0670.0090.0560.3900.2430.3930.4450.4450.4060.4060.4450.4650.3900.4250.476<	C16:0	20.31	20.15	21.03	21.42	0.238	0.176
Chef. Imma9 0.187 0.236 0.176 0.185 0.0126 0.0136 0.185 Chéi cla9 1.226 1.246 1.379 1.288 0.0299 0.321 Chéi cla9 1.289 1.120 1.277 1.174 0.0226 0.0005 ammis 0.128 0.0121 0.0	iso C16:0	0.181	0.174	0.207	0.186	0.0079	0.455
C161 cts ² 0.265 0.254 0.307 0.287 0.0076 0.088 C1710 1.289 1.120 1.257 1.174 0.0286 0.088 curries (17.0 0.311 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.0138 0.312 is (17.0 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.0139 0.312 is (17.0) 0.411 0.357 0.425 0.413 0.0139 0.312 C171 mun0 1.529 0.210 0.212 0.017 0.235 C181 russ - 7+8 0.228 0.259 0.210 0.212 0.017 0.255 C181 russ - 7+8 0.366 0.400 0.344 0.327 0.385 C181 russ - 7+8 0.376 0.753 0.855 0.0259 0.224 C181 russ - 11 1.432 1.391 1.414 0.393 0.433 C181 russ - 11 0.113 0.111 0.155 0.168 0.027 0.764 C181 russ - 12 0.150 0	C16:1 trans9	0.187	0.236	0.176	0.165	0.0126	0.185
Cheir (as) 1.285 1.246 1.379 1.288 0.0299 0.321 antenia (T)70 0.531 0.466 0.531 0.616 0.018 0.297 bic (T)70 0.531 0.466 0.531 0.646 0.112 0.018 0.297 bic (T)70 0.531 0.546 0.412 0.0178 0.1171 C181 0.039 0.036 0.028 0.028 0.022 0.117 0.253 C181 rensite 0.337 0.366 0.028 0.022 0.137 0.256 C181 rensite 0.337 0.366 0.023 0.0259 0.254 C181 rensite 0.337 0.365 0.0229 0.258 0.272 0.366 C181 rensite 0.334 0.756 0.753 0.855 0.229 0.258 C181 rensite 0.4747 0.382 0.475 0.576* 0.029 0.584 C181 rensite 0.474 0.475* 0.556* 0.0299 0.2043 0.0773	C16:1 <i>cis</i> 7	0.265	0.254	0.307	0.287	0.0076	0.058
C1/20 1.29 1.120 1.25 1.14 0.0286 0.0384 abctiso C1/20 0.531 0.466 0.531 0.013 0.0139 0.0137 abctiso C1/20 0.011 0.021 0.018 0.023 0.019 0.0117 0.025 C121 pransf 0.030 0.036 1.028 1.028 0.0023 0.0121 C181 pransf + 7 + 8 0.223 0.236 0.210 0.017 0.223 C181 pransf + 7 + 8 0.223 0.259 0.242 0.031 0.052 0.0227 0.039 C181 ransf + 7 + 8 0.228 0.85 0.029 0.284 0.855 0.0227 0.284 C181 ransf + 10 1.03 0.036 0.037 0.855 0.029 <0.001	C16:1 cis9	1.235	1.246	1.379	1.288	0.0299	0.321
additation (1.79) 0.531 0.486 0.531 0.501 0.0138 0.023 C17.1 mma10 0.021 0.021 0.018 0.012 0.015 0.071 C181 0.022 0.023 0.023 0.022 0.033 0.022 0.033 C181 margin + 7 + 8 0.022 0.259 0.030 0.034 0.0227 0.393 C181 margin + 7 + 8 0.22 0.259 0.035 0.304 0.0227 0.393 C181 margin + 7 + 8 0.137 0.356 0.082 0.304 0.0227 0.393 C181 margin + 7 + 8 0.374 0.756 0.733 0.855 0.129 0.893 C181 reard 0 1.03 0.55 0.733 0.855 0.0299 -0.204 C181 reard 0 0.133 0.55 0.733 0.855 0.0299 -0.201 C181 reard 0 0.133 0.111 0.105 0.048 0.0627 -0.001 C181 reard 0 0.239 0.238 0.227 0	C17:0	1.289	1.120	1.257	1.174	0.0286	0.088
abcl.7/ab 0.411 0.557 0.445 0.413 0.0139 0.0139 C171 rms10 0.021 0.021 0.018 0.012 0.0174 C181 rms5 0.030 0.036 0.028 0.028 0.029 0.539 C181 rms5 0.232 0.237 0.366 0.400 0.344 0.0227 0.399 C181 rms5 0.337 0.365 0.428 0.855 0.129 0.865 C181 rms10 1.43 1.55 0.82 0.855 0.029 0.281 C181 rms11 2.26 ⁸ 3.357 0.355 0.0259 0.284 C181 rms11 1.45 ⁶ 0.734 0.733 0.855 0.0299 0.281 C181 rms11 1.45 ⁶ 0.734 0.757 0.656 ⁹ 0.0309 0.043 C181 rms11 0.455 ⁴ 0.746 0.658 ⁹ 0.0309 0.033 C181 rms14 0.159 0.274 ⁹ 0.556 ⁹ 0.033 0.032 0.043 C181 rms1 <td>anteiso C17:0</td> <td>0.531</td> <td>0.466</td> <td>0.531</td> <td>0.501</td> <td>0.0138</td> <td>0.297</td>	anteiso C17:0	0.531	0.466	0.531	0.501	0.0138	0.297
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	150 C17:0	0.411	0.357	0.425	0.413	0.0139	0.312
Clib.010.5910.5910.5910.500.1780.1730.173Clis1 rmu5-7 + 80.2220.2590.2100.2120.01170.253Clis1 rmu50.1331.0560.4600.3440.0270.399Clis1 rmu51.0331.0570.8520.850.1290.898Clis1 rmu101.0331.0590.2360.3310.560.4600.3440.0270.399Clis1 rmu112.7640.3590.35330.940.650.3540.3940.364Clis1 cmu111.4073.05330.9420.4650.3540.3990.900Clis1 cmu121.458*0.798*0.475**0.578**0.0299-0.001Clis1 cmu130.1130.1130.1160.1080.0002-0.001Clis1 cmu140.609**0.794*0.558*0.508*0.00200.653Clis2 colorami10.672*7.2776.767.060.2330.883Clis2 colorami10.1030.0980.0710.0980.0030.032Clis1 cmu100.1030.0980.0710.0980.0050.221Clis1 cmu100.1030.0980.0710.0060.3340.035Clis1 cmu100.1030.0980.0710.0050.221Clis1 cmu100.1030.0980.0710.0050.032Clis1 cmu100.1030.0990.0350.0350.0350.032Clis1 cmu	C12:0	0.021	0.021	0.018	0.012	0.0015	0.074
Clis Lingués 0.223 0.259 0.250 0.212 0.112 0.127 0.239 Clis Lingués 0.317 0.366 0.400 0.034 0.0227 0.399 Clis Lingués 0.317 0.366 0.400 0.034 0.0227 0.399 Clis Lingués 0.374 0.753 0.855 0.0259 0.284 Clis Lingués 0.704 0.756 0.753 0.855 0.0259 0.284 Clis Lingués 0.794 0.756 0.756 th 0.375 th 0.075 th 0.079 0.001 Clis Lingués 0.518 th 0.796 th 0.756 th 0.029 <0001	C18:1 trans5	0.030	0.036	13.66	0.028	0.178	0.171
Clis. Insult	C18.1 trans6 \pm 7 \pm 8	0.030	0.050	0.028	0.028	0.0023	0.339
Clesi manulo1.031.050.820.850.1290.086Clesi manulo2.8 57 3.5 57 1.1 57 0.850.1720.086Clesi manulo3.0440.7350.0550.02500.024Clesi manulo3.1471.3823.0340.0450.03540.934Clesi manulo1.4471.3821.3911.44140.02900.02910.02900.02910.02900.0291<	C18:1 trans9	0.317	0.255	0.400	0.212	0.0227	0.200
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	C18.1 trans10	1.03	1.05	0.400	0.85	0.129	0.885
Cite Line 0.794 0.726 0.753 0.855 0.0299 0.284 Cite Ling 31.03 30.53 30.94 30.45 0.364 0.930 Cite Ling 0.554 ^h 0.798 ^a 0.475 th 0.079 th 0.0299 < 0.021	C18:1 trans11	2.28 ^b	3.59^{a}	2.13 ^b	1.87 ^b	0.172	0.006
C1E1.cb931.0330.5330.94 30.45 0.344 0.930 C1B1.cb111.471.3821.3911.440.63950.930C1B1.cb120.554 ^b 0.798 ^a 0.475 ^{bb} 0.576 ^{bb} 0.0299<0.001	C18:1 <i>cis</i> 6	0.784	0.736	0.753	0.855	0.0259	0.284
C181 cis111.4471.3821.911.4140.0950.929C181 cis120.576*0.078*0.778*0.576*0.029<0.001	C18:1 <i>cis</i> 9	31.03	30.53	30.94	30.45	0.364	0.930
C181.cia12 0.554 ^b 0.798' 0.475 ^{bb} 0.576 ^{bb} 0.0299 < 0.001	C18:1 cis11	1.447	1.382	1.391	1.414	0.0395	0.920
C181. cis130.1130.1110.1050.1080.00270.746C181. cis140.603 ^{ab} 0.2580.2720.2780.00300.463C18.2. cis9ran110.603 ^{ab} 0.784 ^a 0.563 ^b 0.508 ^b 0.03300.008C182. r.60.527.276.767.060.2330.833C183. r.60.520.4470.0450.0510.00200.653C183. r.60.1270.1100.1100.1200.00500.221C191. roms170.1270.1030.0980.0710.0980.00610.133C2000.1130.1170.1380.1180.00330.555C202. r.60.0580.0660.0540.0580.0620.221C203. r.60.1950.1930.1550.1850.01010.499C203. r.60.0580.0620.0530.0020.022C203. r.60.0590.0350.0320.0330.0250.222C2100.0620.0580.0670.0570.00300.042C224. r.60.0580.0420.0570.0330.4410.2500.718C225. r.60.5990.5730.4830.5570.0350.0420.047C225. r.60.5990.5730.4830.5740.0590.718C225. r.60.5990.5730.4830.5740.02500.578C24. t.6490.1260.5670.8090.7490.028	C18:1 cis12	0.554 ^b	0.798^{a}	0.475 ^{ab}	0.576 ^{ab}	0.0299	< 0.001
C18:1 cisl40.2900.2580.2720.2780.00700.463C18:2 cisPman110.603 ^{bb} 0.784*0.563 ^{bb} 0.563 ^{bb} 0.5030.03300.008C18:3 n-60.0520.0470.0450.0510.0200.653C18:3 n-60.1591.6991.9800.0430.07330.381C19:1 rums70.1270.1100.1010.1090.00600.213C19:1 rums100.1030.0980.0710.0980.00610.333C20:1 cisl10.1140.1320.1540.1380.00530.535C20:2 n-60.0580.0680.0540.0570.00300.380C20:3 n-30.0390.0350.0320.0330.00250.822C21:00.022 ^b 0.022 ^{rb} 0.06670.0590.0420.0350.225C21:00.022 ^b 0.022 ^{rb} 0.064 ^{ab} 0.030 ^b 0.0090.041C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.4830.5570.03390.711C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.4830.5570.03990.042C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.4830.3570.0390.711C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.4830.3570.0390.714C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.4510.1530.5720.3990.714C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.5570.0390.	C18:1 cis13	0.113	0.111	0.105	0.108	0.0027	0.746
C18:2 is 39rman110.603 ^{ab} 0.784 ^a 0.563 ^b 0.03800.03300.008C18:2 n-60.0520.0470.0450.0510.00200.653C18:3 n-50.0521.6991.9802.0430.07330.381C18:1 rms70.1270.1100.1010.1200.06500.221C19:1 rms70.1270.1130.1170.1380.00370.0737C20:00.1130.1170.1380.1180.00370.073C20:1 ci110.1410.1320.1540.1380.00330.535C20:2 n-60.0580.0540.0570.00300.830C20:3 n-60.1950.1930.1550.1850.01010.499C20:3 n-60.0520.0520.0330.00250.822C21:00.6620.0580.0670.0350.00330.042C22:4 n-60.5990.5730.0430.5570.0330.718C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.5570.0390.718C22:5 n-60.5990.5730.4830.5570.0350.0210.378C24:1 cis90.1440.1560.1270.1640.02100.346C24:1 cis90.3330.5570.0390.7490.2280.376C24:1 cis90.7260.6570.8090.7490.2280.366for A1.7051.5971.5971.6431.7070.4290.206G7A <td>C18:1 cis14</td> <td>0.290</td> <td>0.258</td> <td>0.272</td> <td>0.278</td> <td>0.0070</td> <td>0.463</td>	C18:1 cis14	0.290	0.258	0.272	0.278	0.0070	0.463
C18:2 n-6 6.72 7.27 6.76 7.06 0.233 0.833 C18:3 n-6 0.052 0.047 0.045 0.051 0.0020 0.653 C18:3 n-3 1.950 1.699 1.980 2.043 0.0733 0.381 C19:1 trans7 0.127 0.110 0.101 0.120 0.0050 0.232 C20:1 cirl1 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.018 0.0037 0.073 C20:1 cirl1 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.138 0.0030 0.380 C20:2 n-6 0.058 0.068 0.057 0.0030 0.380 C20:3 n-6 0.059 0.032 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C2:0 n-3 0.039 0.035 0.035 0.042 0.033 0.042 C2:0 n-3 0.028 0.027 th 0.066 ^{4*} 0.035 0.042 0.042 C2:0 n-4 0.788 0.657 0.035 0.718 0.042 0.042 0.042 0.042 0.0	C18:2 cis9trans11	0.603 ^{ab}	0.784 ^a	0.563^{b}	0.508^{b}	0.0330	0.008
C183 n-6 0.052 0.047 0.045 0.051 0.0020 0.653 C183 n-5 0.127 0.110 0.101 0.120 0.0050 0.221 C19:1 trans10 0.103 0.098 0.071 0.098 0.0061 0.133 C20:0 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.118 0.0053 0.535 C20:1 ck11 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.185 0.0003 0.380 C20:2 n-6 0.058 0.062 0.055 0.033 0.0101 0.499 C20:3 n-6 0.059 0.027 th 0.064 ⁴ 0.033 0.026 0.822 C21:0 0.62 0.058 0.067 0.033 0.741 C22:0 0.023 th 0.064 ⁴ 0.035 0.042 0.0045 0.295 C22:1 n-6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.033 0.718 C24:1 n/6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.035 0.178 C24:1 n/6 </td <td>C18:2 n-6</td> <td>6.72</td> <td>7.27</td> <td>6.76</td> <td>7.06</td> <td>0.233</td> <td>0.833</td>	C18:2 n-6	6.72	7.27	6.76	7.06	0.233	0.833
C18:3 n-3 1.950 1.699 1.980 2.043 0.0733 0.381 C19:1 trans10 0.103 0.098 0.071 0.098 0.0061 0.133 C20:1 trans10 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.0088 0.0061 0.133 C20:1 cis11 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.138 0.0030 0.355 C20:2 n-6 0.058 0.068 0.054 0.057 0.0030 0.356 C20:3 n-6 0.195 0.193 0.155 0.185 0.0011 0.499 C20:3 n-3 0.039 0.035 0.032 0.037 0.0033 0.741 C22:0 0.023 ^b 0.027 ^b 0.0664 ^a 0.030 ^b 0.0035 0.042 C2:10 0.023 ^b 0.077 0.0033 0.741 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252 0.252	C18:3 n-6	0.052	0.047	0.045	0.051	0.0020	0.653
C19:1 trans7 0.127 0.110 0.101 0.120 0.0050 0.221 C19:1 trans10 0.103 0.098 0.071 0.098 0.0051 0.133 C20:0 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.118 0.0033 0.075 C20:1 r.61 0.058 0.068 0.054 0.057 0.030 0.380 C20:2 r.6 0.039 0.035 0.032 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C21:0 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C21:0 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C2:1 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.033 0.0025 0.042 C2:2 n.6 0.059 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.0035 0.042 0.042 C2:2 n.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.033 0.042 0.057 C2:2 n.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.035 <td< td=""><td>C18:3 n-3</td><td>1.950</td><td>1.699</td><td>1.980</td><td>2.043</td><td>0.0733</td><td>0.381</td></td<>	C18:3 n-3	1.950	1.699	1.980	2.043	0.0733	0.381
C19:1 trans10 0.103 0.098 0.071 0.098 0.0061 0.133 C20c0 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.118 0.0037 0.075 C20:1 cis11 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.138 0.0030 0.380 C20:2 n-6 0.058 0.068 0.054 0.057 0.0030 0.380 C20:3 n-6 0.052 0.032 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C21:0 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.057 0.0033 0.741 C22:0 0.023 ^b 0.027 ^{ab} 0.064 ^a 0.030 ^b 0.0045 0.295 C22:5 n-6 0.599 0.573 0.0433 0.513 0.928 0.718 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.0359 0.718 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0089 0.931 Sims and calculations	C19:1 trans7	0.127	0.110	0.101	0.120	0.0050	0.221
C20:0 0.113 0.117 0.138 0.118 0.0037 0.075< C20:1 cis11 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.138 0.0053 0.535 C20:2 r.6 0.058 0.068 0.057 0.0030 0.380 C20:3 r.6 0.039 0.035 0.032 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C21:0 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.057 0.0033 0.741 C22:0 r.6 0.058 0.067 0.057 0.0039 0.042 C22:4 r.6 0.058 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.0059 0.042 C22:5 r.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.033 0.901 C22:5 r.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.520 0.878 C22:5 r.6 0.533 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.35 0.433 0.515 0.535 0.535 0.535 CE4A 1.775 <	C19:1 trans10	0.103	0.098	0.071	0.098	0.0061	0.133
L20:1 r811 0.141 0.132 0.154 0.188 0.0053 0.535 C20:2 r.6 0.058 0.068 0.054 0.077 0.0030 0.380 C20:2 r.6 0.195 0.193 0.155 0.185 0.0033 0.025 0.822 C20:3 r.6 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C2:2 r.6 0.023 ^b 0.027 ^{ab} 0.064 ^a 0.030 ^b 0.0059 0.042 C2:2 r.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.0359 0.718 C2:2 r.6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.0359 0.718 C2:2 r.6 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C2:1 r.6 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C2:2 r.6 0.128 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0089 0.931 C2:4 r.6 0.599 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0	C20:0	0.113	0.117	0.138	0.118	0.0037	0.075
L202 Ar-6 0.058 0.068 0.054 0.057 0.0030 0.380 C203 Ar-6 0.195 0.193 0.155 0.185 0.0101 0.499 C20:3 Ar-3 0.039 0.035 0.032 0.033 0.0025 0.822 C21:0 0.062 0.058 0.067 0.057 0.0033 0.741 C22:0 0.023 ^{ab} 0.064 ^a 0.030 ^b 0.0059 0.042 C22:4 n-6 0.058 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.035 ^b 0.042 C22:5 n-6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.0359 0.718 C22:5 n-6 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C24:0 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0489 0.317 Stms and calculations	C20:1 cis11	0.141	0.132	0.154	0.138	0.0053	0.535
122:5 л-3 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.011 0.1495 C21:3 n-3 0.032 0.035 0.032 0.035 0.057 0.0033 0.741 C2:0 n 0.023 ^b 0.027 ^{ab} 0.064 ^a 0.035 0.042 0.0055 0.042 C2:4 n-6 0.058 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.0055 0.042 0.035 0.042 C2:5 n-6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.0359 0.718 C2:4:0 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0280 0.873 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0089 0.931 Sum and calculations	$C_{20:2} = n - 6$	0.058	0.068	0.054	0.057	0.0030	0.380
C21:0 0.033 0.033 0.032 0.033 0.0421 C21:0 0.062 0.038 0.067 0.033 0.741 C22:0 0.023 ^b 0.027 ^{ab} 0.064 ^a 0.030 ^b 0.0059 0.042 C22:4 n-6 0.058 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.0059 0.718 C22:5 n-3 0.128 0.137 0.111 0.134 0.0133 0.901 C24:0 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C24:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0089 0.931 Sums and calculations	C20.3 = 70	0.195	0.195	0.133	0.185	0.0025	0.433
Lind Dotal Dotal <thd< td=""><td>C21.0</td><td>0.062</td><td>0.058</td><td>0.052</td><td>0.057</td><td>0.0023</td><td>0.022</td></thd<>	C21.0	0.062	0.058	0.052	0.057	0.0023	0.022
C2:4 n-6 0.022 0.022 0.032 0.035 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.035 0.042 0.035 C2:2: n-6 0.599 0.573 0.483 0.557 0.0359 0.718 C2:5: n-3 0.128 0.137 0.111 0.134 0.0133 0.901 C2:4:0 0.383 0.351 0.328 0.374 0.0250 0.878 C2:4:1 cis9 0.144 0.135 0.127 0.130 0.0089 0.931 Sums and calculations 1.707 0.0429 0.207 BCFA 1.406 1.266 1.524 1.413 0.0488 0.334 atteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA n-6/n-3 48.0 5.85 4.63 4.84	C22:0	0.023 ^b	0.020^{ab}	0.064 ^a	0.030 ^b	0.0059	0.042
C22:5 $n-6$ 0.5990.5730.4830.5570.03590.718C22:5 $n-3$ 0.1280.1370.1110.1340.01330.901C24:00.3830.3510.3280.3740.02500.878C24:1 cis90.1440.1350.1270.1300.00890.931Stams and calculationsSFA42.9241.8044.4243.850.4510.153OCFA1.7751.5971.8431.7070.04290.207BCFA1.4061.2661.5241.4130.04880.334anteiso FA0.6800.6090.7150.6640.02100.346iso FA0.7260.6570.8090.7490.02880.326MUFA40.4541.2140.0039.300.4420.506PUFA $n-6/n-3$ 4.805.854.634.840.1760.051PUFA $n-5/n-3$ 4.805.59°4.00°3.72°0.01080.692TFA4.39°5.59°4.00°3.72°0.01080.692TFA3.93°0.5640.6650.6550.6580.02230.001TFA $n (1, 2)^2$ 1.1981.2771.2640.02130.552h:H1.9051.9031.7581.7670.04110.356DSI _{C14} 0.0350.0340.00100.978PI2.0402.04919.002.510.7300.876 </td <td>C22:4 n-6</td> <td>0.058</td> <td>0.042</td> <td>0.035</td> <td>0.042</td> <td>0.0045</td> <td>0.295</td>	C22:4 n-6	0.058	0.042	0.035	0.042	0.0045	0.295
C22:5 n-30.1280.1370.1110.1340.01330.901C24:00.3830.3510.3280.3740.02500.878C24:1 cis90.1440.1350.1270.1300.00890.931Sums and calculations </td <td>C22:5 <i>n</i>-6</td> <td>0.599</td> <td>0.573</td> <td>0.483</td> <td>0.557</td> <td>0.0359</td> <td>0.718</td>	C22:5 <i>n</i> -6	0.599	0.573	0.483	0.557	0.0359	0.718
C24:00.3830.3510.3280.3740.02500.878C24:1 cis90.1440.1350.1270.1300.00890.931Sums and calculationsSFA24.9241.8044.4243.850.4510.153OCFA1.7751.5971.8431.7070.04290.207BCFA1.4061.2661.5241.4130.04880.334anteiso FA0.6800.6090.7150.6640.02100.346iso FA0.7260.6570.8090.7490.02880.356PUFA12.2512.7011.8112.490.3920.886PUFA n-6/n-34.805.854.634.840.1760.051PUFA -C18:1 trans112.112.241.861.850.1520.232AI0.5640.5660.6550.6580.02130.552h:H1.9051.9031.7581.7670.04110.556DSI _{C14} 0.0350.0340.0350.0340.00100.978	C22:5 n-3	0.128	0.137	0.111	0.134	0.0133	0.901
C24:1 cis90.1440.1350.1270.1300.00890.931Sums and calculationsSFA42.9241.8044.4243.850.4510.153OCFA1.7751.5971.8431.7070.04290.207BCFA0.6800.6090.7150.6640.02100.346iso FA0.6800.6090.7150.6640.02100.346iso FA0.7260.6570.8090.7490.02880.326PUFA12.2512.7011.8112.490.3920.886PUFA n-6/n-34.805.854.634.840.1760.051PUFA/SFA0.2880.3050.2670.2870.01080.692TFA - C18:1 trans112.112.241.861.850.1550.732AI0.5640.5660.6550.6580.02230.200TI1.2271.1981.2771.2640.02130.552h:H1.9051.9031.7581.7670.04110.356DSL_{C14}0.0350.0340.0050.0340.00100.978PI2.04020.4919.0020.510.7300.876	C24:0	0.383	0.351	0.328	0.374	0.0250	0.878
Sums and calculations SFA 42.92 41.80 44.42 43.85 0.451 0.153 OCFA 1.775 1.597 1.843 1.707 0.0429 0.207 BCFA 1.406 1.266 1.524 1.413 0.0488 0.334 anteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.166 0.051 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155	C24:1 cis9	0.144	0.135	0.127	0.130	0.0089	0.931
SFA 42.92 41.80 44.42 43.85 0.451 0.153 OCFA 1.775 1.597 1.843 1.707 0.0429 0.207 BCFA 1.406 1.266 1.524 1.413 0.0488 0.334 anteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.59° 0.267 0.287 0.0168 0.651 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.200 hH <	Sums and calculations						
OCFA 1.775 1.597 1.843 1.707 0.0429 0.207 BCFA 1.406 1.266 1.524 1.413 0.0488 0.334 anteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.886 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0213 0.552 HH	SFA	42.92	41.80	44.42	43.85	0.451	0.153
BCFA 1.406 1.266 1.524 1.413 0.0488 0.334 anteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.886 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0213 0.502 TI 1.207 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 bH <t< td=""><td>OCFA</td><td>1.775</td><td>1.597</td><td>1.843</td><td>1.707</td><td>0.0429</td><td>0.207</td></t<>	OCFA	1.775	1.597	1.843	1.707	0.0429	0.207
anteiso FA 0.680 0.609 0.715 0.664 0.0210 0.346 iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.886 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0213 0.527 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.556 DSI _{C14}	BCFA	1.406	1.266	1.524	1.413	0.0488	0.334
iso FA 0.726 0.657 0.809 0.749 0.0288 0.326 MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.861 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0213 0.524 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.556 DSIC ₁₄ 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	anteiso FA	0.680	0.609	0.715	0.664	0.0210	0.346
MUFA 40.45 41.21 40.00 39.30 0.442 0.506 PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.886 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.200 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.556 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	ISO FA	0.726	0.657	0.809	0.749	0.0288	0.326
PUFA 12.25 12.70 11.81 12.49 0.392 0.886 PUFA n-6/n-3 4.80 5.85 4.63 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.200 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.586 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0370 0.876 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876		40.45	41.21	40.00	39.30	0.442	0.506
PUFA (PURS) 4.80 5.85 4.65 4.84 0.176 0.051 PUFA/SFA 0.288 0.305 0.267 0.287 0.0108 0.692 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.011 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0213 0.552 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0411 0.356 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	r_{UFA}	12.20	12./0	11.01	12.49	0.392	0.886
FORMULAR 0.266 0.305 0.207 0.287 0.0108 0.092 TFA 4.39 ^b 5.59 ^a 4.00 ^b 3.72 ^b 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.205 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.356 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0730 0.876 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	г UFA /I-0/ /I-3 DI IEA /SEA	4.80	0.00E	4.03	4.84	0.170	0.051
TrA 7.57 5.57 7.00 5.72 0.219 0.001 TFA - C18:1 trans11 2.11 2.24 1.86 1.85 0.155 0.732 AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.200 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.356 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	TFA	4 30 ^b	5.503	4 00 ^b	0.207 3.70 ^b	0.0100	0.092
AI 0.564 0.566 0.655 0.658 0.0223 0.200 TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.556 b:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.356 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0370 0.876	TFA - C18.1 trans11	2.11	2.24	1.86	1.85	0.155	0.001
TI 1.227 1.198 1.277 1.264 0.0213 0.552 h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.355 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.030 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	AI	0.564	0.566	0.655	0.658	0.0223	0.200
h:H 1.905 1.903 1.758 1.767 0.0411 0.356 DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	TI	1.227	1.198	1.277	1.264	0.0213	0.552
DSI _{C14} 0.035 0.034 0.035 0.034 0.0010 0.978 PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	h:H	1.905	1.903	1.758	1.767	0.0411	0.356
PI 20.40 20.49 19.00 20.51 0.730 0.876	DSI _{C14}	0.035	0.034	0.035	0.034	0.0010	0.978
	PI	20.40	20.49	19.00	20.51	0.730	0.876

a, b, c Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different. ¹ FA, fatty acid; SFA, saturated fatty acids; OCFA, odd-chain fatty acids; BCFA, branched-chain fatty acids; MUFA, monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acids; TFA, trans fatty acids; AI, atherogenic index (Ulbricht & Southgate, 1991); TI, thrombogenic index (Ulbricht & Southgate, 1991); h:H,

hypocholesterolemic index, calculated as h:H= (C18:1 *cis*9 +PUFA)/(C12:0 +C14:0 +C16:0); DSI_{C14}, desaturation index, calculated as DSI_{C14}=C14:1 *cis*9/(C14:0 +C14:1 *cis*9); PI, peroxidability index, calculated as PI= Σ dienoic+ Σ trienoic× 2 + Σ tetraenoic× 3 + Σ pentaenoic× 4 + Σ hexaenoic× 5.

² CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

Table 8			
Fat-soluble	vitamins con	tents of lamb (µg/kg fresh matter).	
Item	Diet ¹	SEM	P-valu

Item	Diet	Diet ¹				P-value
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S		
α-tocopherol γ-tocopherol Retinol	$798^{ m b}\ 86.7^{ m b}\ 21.58^{ m a}$	866 ^b 133.5 ^a 18.57 ^{ab}	1350 ^a 124.1 ^a 17.18 ^b	1158 ^a 152.3 ^a 18.06 ^b	51.7 5.94 0.559	$< 0.001 \\ < 0.001 \\ 0.009$

^{a, b, c} Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different.

¹ CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

However, this did not limit the deposition of α -tocopherol in meat, which is crucial to protect lipids from oxidation. Indeed, the α -tocopherol content of CNS and C+S meats was similar to their respective counterparts from lambs that were not fed chestnut shells, namely CON and SFN meats. Probably, the phenolic compounds of chestnut shells exerted their antioxidant effect in the gastrointestinal tract, protecting tocopherols from the oxidation that naturally occurs during digestion (Soldado et al., 2021). Thus, a higher quota of tocopherols was available to build up in tissues and muscles, balancing the lower dietary intake. Concerning the lambs fed sainfoin (i.e., SFN and C+S groups), the high α -tocopherol content in meat was expected considering the higher intake of this vitamin. This could be due to either a higher content of α -tocopherol in sainfoin than in alfalfa or a higher preservation of the vitamin by the phenolic compounds of sainfoin, or even to the combination of these two factors.

Retinol is a vitamin of secondary importance in terms of antioxidant power that originates from the bioconversion of dietary carotenoids (Nozière et al., 2006). Probably, in the present experiment the native β -carotene content of feeds was drastically reduced by the pelletizing process (Nozière et al., 2006) and this, combined with the absence of vitamin supplements in the diet, led to the accumulation of a low amount of retinol in the muscle, compared to previous studies (Valenti et al., 2018; Luciano et al., 2019). Our results seem to suggest that dietary sainfoin might limit the accumulation of retinol in the muscle. Dietary phenolic compounds, such as those contained in sainfoin, have already been hypothesized to have a negative effect on vitamin accumulation in lamb (Luciano et al., 2019) and pork (Menci et al., 2022b), but targeted research is still needed to confirm this effect.

In the present experiment, the colour parameters changed during storage following the typical meat discoloration pattern (Luciano et al., 2009), and the malondialdehyde content of meat increased over time. Although the lambs of CNS, SFN, and C+S groups had a higher intake of phenolic compounds, the colour oxidation and TBARS development in raw meat were similar among treatments. This seems in contrast to the fact that dietary tannins would improve the oxidative stability of animal products (Soldado et al., 2021). However, the complexity of the biological mechanisms underlying oxidative stability often leads to contradictory results. For example, Luciano et al. (2019) observed no differences in TBARS development in raw meat over 7 days of refrigerated storage when feeding lambs with different tanniferous silages, including sainfoin. Chikwanha et al. (2019) studied dietary supplementation of up to 200 g/kg of grape pomace (containing 14 g/kg of total tannins) in lamb and reported no effect on raw meat colour over 9 days of retail display. Furthermore, Valenti et al. (2019) demonstrated that feeding either hydrolysable or condensed tannins at the dose of 2.3% had no effect on the oxidative stability of meat.

5. Conclusion

In the present experiment, chestnut shells, by-product of chestnut industry, were included in a pelleted feed as part of a balanced diet for finishing lambs. Chestnut shells can be fed to lambs with no adverse effects on growth performance and carcass characteristics. However, lower inclusion levels than those used in this study are recommended to avoid a decrease in feed efficiency. The inclusion of chestnut shells in the diet of finishing lambs improved the fatty acid profile of meat by increasing the content of C18:1 trans11, a fatty acid recognised for its beneficial effect on human health. This is likely the result of the modulation of ruminal biohydrogenation by the tannins contained in chestnut shells, although a vegetable oil supplement might be needed to highlight this effect. Furthermore, feeding lambs with chestnut shells did not affect the shelf-life of meat, considering discolouration and lipid oxidation. Basing on our results, no synergistic effect between the bioactive compounds of chestnut shells and sainfoin occurred. Farmers should be aware of the low content of crude protein and α-tocopherol in this by-product.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial

Table 9

Evolution of colour an	d lipid oxidation i	۱ lamb over 9 days ه	of refrigerated storage.
------------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

	1			•	0 1	,						
Item ¹	Diet ² (D)				Storage time	e, d (T)			SEM	P-value		
	CON	CNS	SFN	C+S	0 (2 h)	3	6	9		D	Т	$D{\times}T$
Colour												
L*	38.36	39.10	37.76	39.37	37.35 ^c	38.57^{b}	39.56 ^a	39.10 ^{ab}	0.245	0.155	< 0.001	0.283
a*	15.00	15.22	15.29	15.20	17.27^{a}	15.60^{b}	13.89 ^c	13.96 ^c	0.285	0.907	< 0.001	0.498
b*	16.57	16.42	16.20	16.65	13.59 ^c	17.15^{b}	16.89^{b}	18.22^{a}	0.206	0.389	< 0.001	0.970
C*	22.55	22.59	22.47	22.74	22.15^{bc}	23.25^{a}	21.92 ^c	23.02^{ab}	0.231	0.910	0.034	0.838
h _{ab} , rad	0.842	0.829	0.822	0.835	0.684 ^d	0.837 ^c	0.884 ^b	0.922^{a}	0.0117	0.494	< 0.001	0.297
I ₄₅₀₋₅₃₀	95.1	111.7	105.2	103.3	216.1 ^a	97.4 ^b	62.2 ^c	39.6 ^d	6.85	0.409	< 0.001	0.093
630/580	2.557	2.641	2.725	2.552	3.888 ^a	2.563^{b}	2.035 ^c	1.989 ^c	0.0847	0.392	< 0.001	0.423
ΔE	6.14	6.22	6.61	6.16	-	5.25^{b}	6.48 ^a	7.11 ^a	0.201	0.911	< 0.001	0.669
Lipid oxidation												
MDA, mg/kg	1.278	1.505	1.571	1.440	0.642 ^c	0.985 ^c	1.843^{b}	2.480 ^a	0.0861	0.455	< 0.001	0.964

^{a, b, c, d} Means within a row that do not share a superscript letter are statistically different for the storage time.

 1 L* , lightness; a* , redness; b* , yellowness; C* , chroma; h_{ab}, hue angle; I₄₅₀₋₅₃₀, integral value of the reflectance spectrum between 450 nm and 530 nm wavelengths; 630/580, ratio between the reflectance at 630 nm and 580 nm; ΔE , total colour change between each day of storage and the day 0, calculated as $\Delta E = [(\Delta L^*)^2 + (\Delta a^*)^2 + (\Delta b^*)^2]^{1/2}$, where ΔL^* , Δa^* and Δb^* are the differences in L*, a^* , and b^* , respectively, between day 0 and day 3, 6, or 9; MDA, malondialdehyde. ² CON, control; CNS, chestnut shells; SFN, sainfoin; C+S, chestnut shells and sainfoin.

interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the UE 1414 Herbipôle (Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France) staff for animal handling and slaughtering, the MG2MIX company (Châteaubourg, France) for providing the ingredients and helping in the formulation of the diets, and the INRAE UE 1421 (Saint-Gilles, France) staff for producing the pelleted feeds.

Funding details

This work was supported by the Institut Carnot France Futur Elevage (F2E) under Grant no. 00000268 "COMBITAN" (2016), and the University of Catania under grant "QUALIGEN" Linea 2 - Piano di Incentivi per la Ricerca di Ateneo 2020/2022 (principal investigator: Giuseppe Luciano). A. Natalello benefits from PON "RICERCA E INNOVAZIONE" 2014—2020 research contract (azione IV.6—CUP E61B21004280005) supported by Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca.

References

- Alves, S.P., Bessa, R.J.B., 2007. Identification of cis-12,cis-15 octadecadienoic acid and other minor polyenoic fatty acids in ruminant fat. Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol. 109 (8), 879–883. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.200700035.
- Alves, S.P., Francisco, A., Costa, M., Santos-Silva, J., Bessa, R.J.B., 2017. Biohydrogenation patterns in digestive contents and plasma of lambs fed increasing levels of a tanniferous bush (Cistus ladanifer L.) and vegetable oils. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 225, 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2017.01.018.
- Alves, S.P., Santos-Silva, J., Cabrita, A.R.J., Fonseca, A.J.M., Bessa, R.J.B., 2013. Detailed dimethylacetal and fatty acid composition of rumen content from lambs fed lucerne or concentrate supplemented with soybean oil. PLoS One 8 (3). https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0058386.
- AOAC International, 2005. Official Methods of Analysis, 18th ed. AOAC Int, Arlington, VA.
- Bertolín, J.R., Joy, M., Rufino-Moya, P.J., Lobón, S., Blanco, M., 2018. Simultaneous determination of carotenoids, tocopherols, retinol and cholesterol in ovine lyophilised samples of milk, meat, and liver and in unprocessed/raw samples of fat. Food Chem. 257, 182–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.02.139.
- Bessa, R.J.B., Alves, S.P., Santos-Silva, J., 2015. Constraints and potentials for the nutritional modulation of the fatty acid composition of ruminant meat. Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol. 117 (9), 1325–1344. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201400468.
- Biondi, L., Randazzo, C.L., Russo, N., Pino, A., Natalello, A., Van Hoorde, K., Caggia, C., 2019. Dietary supplementation of tannin-extracts to lambs: effects on meat fatty acids composition and stability and on microbial characteristics. Foods 8 (10), 469. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods8100469.
- Campidonico, L., Toral, P.G., Priolo, A., Luciano, G., Valenti, B., Hervás, G., Frutos, P., Copani, G., Ginane, C., Niderkorn, V., 2016. Fatty acid composition of ruminal digesta and longissimus muscle from lambs fed silage mixtures including red clover, sainfoin, and timothy. J. Anim. Sci. 94 (4), 1550–1560. https://doi.org/10.2527/ jas.2015-9922.
- Cardoso-Gutierrez, E., Aranda-Aguirre, E., Robles-Jimenez, L.E., Castelán-Ortega, O.A., Chay-Canul, A.J., Foggi, G., Angeles-Hernandez, J.C., Vargas-Bello-Pérez, E., González-Ronquillo, M., 2021. Effect of tannins from tropical plants on methane production from ruminants: A systematic review. Vet. Anim. Sci. 14, 100214 https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.vas.2021.100214.
- Castro, T., Manso, T., Mantecón, A.R., Guirao, J., Jimeno, V., 2005. Fatty acid composition and carcass characteristics of growing lambs fed diets containing palm oil supplements. Meat Sci. 69 (4), 757–764. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. meatsci.2004.11.008.
- Chikwanha, O.C., Moelich, E., Gouws, P., Muchenje, V., Nolte, J.V.E., Dugan, M.E.R., Mapiye, C., 2019. Effects of feeding increasing levels of grape (Vitis vinifera cv. Pinotage) pomace on lamb shelf-life and eating quality. Meat Sci. 157, 107887 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107887.
- Chilliard, Y., Glasser, F., Ferlay, A., Bernard, L., Rouel, J., Doreau, M., 2007. Diet, rumen biohydrogenation and nutritional quality of cow and goat milk fat. Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol. 109 (8), 828–855. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.200700080.
- Christie, W.W., 1982. A simple procedure for rapid transmethylation of glycerolipids and cholesteryl esters. J. Lipid Res 23 (7), 1072–1075. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2275(20)38081-0.
- Copani, G., Niderkorn, V., Anglard, F., Quereuil, A., Ginane, C., 2016. Silages containing bioactive forage legumes: a promising protein-rich feed source for growing lambs. Grass Forage Sci. 71 (4), 622–631. https://doi.org/10.1111/gfs.12225.
- Costa, M., Alves, S.P., Cappucci, A., Cook, S.R., Duarte, A., Caldeira, R.M., McAllister, T. A., Bessa, R.J.B., 2018. Effects of Condensed and Hydrolyzable Tannins on Rumen Metabolism with Emphasis on the Biohydrogenation of Unsaturated Fatty Acids. J. Agric. Food Chem. 66 (13), 3367–3377. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs. jafc.7b04770.

- de Vasconcelos, M. d C.B.M., Bennett, R.N., Quideau, S., Jacquet, R., Rosa, E.A.S., Ferreira-Cardoso, J.V., 2010. Evaluating the potential of chestnut (Castanea sativa Mill.) fruit pericarp and integument as a source of tocopherols, pigments and polyphenols. Ind. Crops Prod. 31 (2), 301–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. indcrop.2009.11.008.
- Faisant, N., Planchot, V., Kozlowski, F., Pacouret, M.P., Colonna, P., Champ, M., 1995. Resistant starch determination adapted to products containing high level of resistant starch. Sci. Des. Aliments 15 (1), 83–89.
- $\label{eq:FAOSTAT. Crops and livestock products. Accessed June 1, 2022. \\ $$ distat/en/#data/QCL/visualize$.$
- Frutos, P., Hervás, G., Natalello, A., Luciano, G., Fondevila, M., Priolo, A., Toral, P.G., 2020. Ability of tannins to modulate ruminal lipid metabolism and milk and meat fatty acid profiles. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 269, 114623 https://doi.org/10.1016/j. anifeedsci.2020.114623.

Gerber, P.J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G., 2013. Tackling Climate Change Through livestock – A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy.

- Hajam, Y.A., Rai, S., Kumar, R., Bashir, M., Malik, J.A., 2020. Phenolic COMPOUNDS FROM MEDICINAL HERBS: THEIR ROLE IN ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASES-A NEW APPROACH FOR SUSTAINABLE WELFARE AND DEVELOPment. In: Lone, R., Shuab, R., Kamili, A. (Eds.), Plant Phenolics in Sustainable Agriculture, 1. Springer, Singapore, pp. 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-4890-1_10.
- Herremans, S., Vanwindekens, F., Decruyenaere, V., Beckers, Y., Froidmont, E., 2020. Effect of dietary tannins on milk yield and composition, nitrogen partitioning and nitrogen use efficiency of lactating dairy cows: A meta-analysis. J. Anim. Physiol. Anim. Nutr. 104 (5), 1209–1218. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpn.13341.
- Huyen, N.T., Verstegen, M.W.A., Hendriks, W.H., Pellikaan, W.F., 2020. Sainfoin (Onobrychis viciifolia) silage in dairy cow rations reduces ruminal biohydrogenation and increases transfer efficiencies of unsaturated fatty acids from feed to milk. Anim. Nutr. 6 (3), 333–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aninu.2020.05.001.
- INRA 1988. Alimentation des bovins, ovins et caprins, R. Jarrige (ed.) INRA Publ., Paris, France.

INRA, 2018. INRA Feeding System for Ruminants. Wageningen Academic Publishers.

- Jerónimo, E., Alves, S.P., Dentinho, M.T.P., Martins, S.V., Prates, J.A.M., Vasta, V., Santos-Silva, J., Bessa, R.J.B., 2010. Effect of grape seed extract, Cistus ladanifer L., and vegetable oil supplementation on fatty acid composition of abomasal digesta and intramuscular fat of lambs. J. Agric. Food Chem. 58 (19), 10710–10721. https://doi. org/10.1021/jf1021626.
- Khiaosa-Ard, R., Bryner, S.F., Scheeder, M.R.L., Wettstein, H.R., Leiber, F., Kreuzer, M., Soliva, C.R., 2009. Evidence for the inhibition of the terminal step of ruminal α-linolenic acid biohydrogenation by condensed tannins. J. Dairy Sci. 92 (1), 177–188. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1117.
- Khliji, S., Van de Ven, R., Lamb, T.A., Lanza, M., Hopkins, D.L., 2010. Relationship between consumer ranking of lamb colour and objective measures of colour. Meat Sci. 85 (2), 224–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.01.002.
- Kramer, J.K.G., Hernandez, M., Cruz-Hernandez, C., Kraft, J., Dugan, M.E.R., 2008. Combining Results of Two GC Separations Partly Achieves Determination of All cis and trans 16:1, 18:1, 18:2 and 18:3 Except CLA Isomers of Milk Fat as Demonstrated Using Ag-Ion SPE Fractionation. Lipids 43 (3), 259–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11745-007-3143-4.
- Luciano, G., Monahan, F.J., Vasta, V., Biondi, L., Lanza, M., Priolo, A., 2009. Dietary tannins improve lamb meat colour stability. Meat Sci. 81 (1), 120–125. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2008.07.006.
- Luciano, G., Natalello, A., Mattioli, S., Pauselli, M., Sebastiani, B., Niderkorn, V., Copani, G., Benhissi, H., Amanpour, A., Valenti, B., 2019. Feeding lambs with silage mixtures of grass, sainfoin and red clover improves meat oxidative stability under high oxidative challenge. Meat Sci. 156, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. meatsci.2019.05.020.
- Maia, M.R.G., Chaudhary, L.C., Figueres, L., Wallace, R.J., 2007. Metabolism of polyunsaturated fatty acids and their toxicity to the microflora of the rumen. Antonie Van. Leeuwenhoek 91 (4), 303–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-006-9118-2.
- Makkar, H.P.S., Blümmel, M., Borowy, N.K., Becker, K., 1993. Gravimetric determination of tannins and their correlations with chemical and protein precipitation methods.
- J. Sci. Food Agric. 61 (2), 161–165. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2740610205. Menci, R., Coppa, M., Torrent, A., Natalello, A., Valenti, B., Luciano, G., Priolo, A., Niderkorn, V., 2021. Effects of two tannin extracts at different doses in interaction with a green or dry forage substrate on in vitro rumen fermentation and biohydrogenation. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 278, 114977 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
- anifeedsci.2021.114977.
 Menci, R., Martin, B., Werne, S., Bord, C., Ferlay, A., Lèbre, A., Leiber, F., Klaiss, M., Coppa, M., Heckendorn, F., 2022a. Supplementing goats' diet with sainfoin pellets (versus alfalfa) modifies cheese sensory properties and fatty acid profile. Int. Dairy J. 132, 105398 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2022.105398.
- Menci, R., Khelil-Arfa, H., Blanchard, A., Biondi, L., Bella, M., Priolo, A., Luciano, G., Natalello, A., 2022b. Effect of dietary magnolia bark extract supplementation in finishing pigs on the oxidative stability of meat. J. Anim. Sci. Biotechnol. 13, 89 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-022-00740-0.
- Morales, A., Gullón, B., Dávila, I., Eibes, G., Labidi, J., Gullón, P., 2018. Optimization of alkaline pretreatment for the co-production of biopolymer lignin and bioethanol from chestnut shells following a biorefinery approach. Ind. Crops Prod. 124, 582–592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.08.032.
- Morana, A., Squillaci, G., Paixão, S.M., Alves, L., Cara, F.L., Moura, P., 2017. Development of an Energy Biorefinery Model for Chestnut (Castanea sativa Mill.) Shells. Energies 10 (10). https://doi.org/10.3390/en10101504.

- Mozaffarian, D., Aro, A., Willett, W.C., 2009. Health effects of trans-fatty acids: experimental and observational evidence. Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 63 (2), S5–S21. https:// doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602973.
- Mizrahi, I., Wallace, R.J., Moraïs, S., 2021. The rumen microbiome: balancing food security and environmental impacts. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 19 (9), 553–566. https:// doi.org/10.1038/s41579-021-00543-6.
- Musati, M., Menci, R., Luciano, G., Frutos, P., Priolo, A., Natalello, A., 2023. Temperate nuts by-products as animal feed: A review. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 115787 https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2023.115787.
- Natalello, A., Khelil-Arfa, H., Luciano, G., Zoon, M., Menci, R., Scerra, M., Blanchard, A., Mangano, F., Biondi, L., Priolo, A., 2022. Effect of different levels of organic zinc supplementation on pork quality. Meat Sci. 186, 108731 https://doi.org/10.1016/j. meatsci.2021.108731.
- Natalello, A., Priolo, A., Valenti, B., Codini, M., Mattioli, S., Pauselli, M., Puccio, M., Lanza, M., Stergiadis, S., Luciano, G., 2020. Dietary pomegranate by-product improves oxidative stability of lamb meat. Meat Sci. 162, 108037 https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.108037.
- Natalello, A., Luciano, G., Morbidini, L., Valenti, B., Pauselli, M., Frutos, P., Biondi, L., Rufino-Moya, P.J., Lanza, M., Priolo, A., 2019. Effect of Feeding Pomegranate Byproduct on Fatty Acid Composition of Ruminal Digesta, Liver, and Muscle in Lambs. J. Agric. Food Chem. 67 (16), 4472–4482. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs. jafc.9b00307.
- Nozière, P., Graulet, B., Lucas, A., Martin, B., Grolier, P., Doreau, M., 2006. Carotenoids for ruminants: From forages to dairy products. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 131 (3–4), 418–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2006.06.018.
- Oliveira, M.A., Alves, S.P., Santos-Silva, J., Bessa, R.J.B., 2016. Effects of clays used as oil adsorbents in lamb diets on fatty acid composition of abomasal digesta and meat. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 213, 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. anifeedsci 2016 01 006
- Patra, A.K., Saxena, J., 2011. Exploitation of dietary tannins to improve rumen metabolism and ruminant nutrition. J. Sci. Food Agric. 91 (1), 24–37. https://doi. org/10.1002/jsfa.4152.
- Pinto, D., Cádiz-Gurrea, M. d I L., Vallverdú-Queralt, A., Delerue-Matos, C., Rodrigues, F., 2021a. Castanea sativa shells: A review on phytochemical composition, bioactivity and waste management approaches for industrial valorization. Food Res. Int. 144, 110364 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2021.110364.
- Pinto, G., De Pascale, S., Aponte, M., Scaloni, A., Addeo, F., Caira, S., 2021b. Polyphenol profiling of chestnut pericarp, integument and curing water extracts to qualify these food by-products as a source of antioxidants. Molecules 26 (8). https://doi.org/ 10.3390/molecules26082335.
- Ponnampalam, E.N., Norng, S., Burnett, V.F., Dunshea, F.R., Jacobs, J.L., Hopkins, D.L., 2014. The synergism of biochemical components controlling lipid oxidation in lamb muscle. Lipids 49 (8), 757–766. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11745-014-3916-5.
- Prache, S., Gatellier, P., Thomas, A., Picard, B., Bauchart, D., 2011. Comparison of meat and carcass quality in organically reared and conventionally reared pasture-fed lambs. Animal 5 (12), 2001–2009.
- Priolo, A., Prache, S., Micol, D., Agabriel, J., 2002. Reflectance spectrum of adipose tissue to trace grass feeding in sheep: influence of measurement site and shrinkage time after slaughter. J. Anim. Sci. 80 (4), 886–891. https://doi.org/10.2527/ 2002.804886x.
- Priolo, A., Valenti, B., Natalello, A., Bella, M., Luciano, G., Pauselli, M., 2021. Fatty acid metabolism in lambs fed hazelnut skin as a partial replacer of maize. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 272, 114794 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2020.114794.
- Rufino-Moya, P.J., Joy, M., Lobón, S., Bertolín, J.R., Blanco, M., 2020. Carotenoids and liposoluble vitamins in the plasma and tissues of light lambs given different maternal feedings and fattening concentrates. Animals 10 (10). https://doi.org/10.3390/ ani10101813.
- Salami, S.A., Luciano, G., O'Grady, M.N., Biondi, L., Newbold, C.J., Kerry, J.P., Priolo, A., 2019. Sustainability of feeding plant by-products: A review of the implications for ruminant meat production. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 251, 37–55. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2019.02.006.

- Santos-Silva, J., Bessa, R.J.B., Santos-Silva, F., 2002. Effect of genotype, feeding system and slaughter weight on the quality of light lambs: II. Fatty acid composition of meat. Livest. Prod. Sci. 77 (2), 187–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226(02) 00059-3.
- Shakeri, P., 2016. Pistachio by-product as an alternative forage source for male lambs: effects on performance, blood metabolites, and urine characteristics. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 211, 92–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2015.11.011.
- Soldado, D., Bessa, R.J.B., Jerónimo, E., 2021. Condensed tannins as antioxidants in ruminants—effectiveness and action mechanisms to improve animal antioxidant status and oxidative stability of products. Animals 11 (11). https://doi.org/10.3390/ ani11113243.
- Ulbricht, T.L.V., Southgate, D.A.T., 1991. Coronary heart disease: seven dietary factors. Lancet 338 (8773), 985–992. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(91)91846-M.
- Vahmani, P., Ponnampalam, E.N., Kraft, J., Mapiye, C., Bermingham, E.N., Watkins, P.J., Proctor, S.D., Dugan, M.E.R., 2020. Bioactivity and health effects of ruminant meat lipids. Invited review. Meat Sci. 165, 108114 https://doi.org/10.1016/j. meatsci.2020.108114.
- Valenti, B., Luciano, G., Pauselli, M., Mattioli, S., Biondi, L., Priolo, A., Natalello, A., Morbidini, L., Lanza, M., 2018. Dried tomato pomace supplementation to reduce lamb concentrate intake: effects on growth performance and meat quality. Meat Sci. 145, 63–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.06.009.
- Valenti, B., Natalello, A., Vasta, V., Campidonico, L., Roscini, V., Mattioli, S., Pauselli, M., Priolo, A., Lanza, M., Luciano, G., 2019. Effect of different dietary tannin extracts on lamb growth performances and meat oxidative stability: comparison between mimosa, chestnut and tara. Animal 13 (2), 435–443. https://doi.org/10.1017/ S1751731118001556.
- Valenti, B., Campidonico, L., Natalello, A., Lanza, M., Salami, S.A., Priolo, A., Serra, A., Pauselli, M., Luciano, G., 2021. Fatty acid metabolism in lambs supplemented with different condensed and hydrolysable tannin extracts. Plos One 16 (10), e0258265. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258265.
- Van Soest, P.V., Robertson, J.B., Lewis, B.A., 1991. Methods for dietary fiber, neutral detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. J. Dairy Sci. 74 (10), 3583–3597. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(91) 78551-2.
- Vargas-Bello-Pérez, E., Cancino-Padilla, N., Romero, J., Garnsworthy, P.C., 2016. Quantitative analysis of ruminal bacterial populations involved in lipid metabolism in dairy cows fed different vegetable oils. Animal 10 (11), 1821–1828.
- Vasta, V., Daghio, M., Cappucci, A., Buccioni, A., Serra, A., Viti, C., Mele, M., 2019. Invited review: Plant polyphenols and rumen microbiota responsible for fatty acid biohydrogenation, fiber digestion, and methane emission: Experimental evidence and methodological approaches. J. Dairy Sci. 102 (5), 3781–3804. https://doi.org/ 10.3168/jds.2018-14985.
- Vasta, V., Mele, M., Serra, A., Scerra, M., Luciano, G., Lanza, M., Priolo, A., 2009. Metabolic fate of fatty acids involved in ruminal biohydrogenation in sheep fed concentrate or herbage with or without tannins. J. Anim. Sci. 87 (8), 2674–2684. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2008-1761.
- Vázquez, G., Calvo, M., Sonia Freire, M., González-Alvarez, J., Antorrena, G., 2009. Chestnut shell as heavy metal adsorbent: Optimization study of lead, copper and zinc cations removal. J. Hazard. Mater. 172 (2), 1402–1414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jhazmat.2009.08.006.
- Vlaeminck, B., Fievez, V., Cabrita, A.R.J., Fonseca, A.J.M., Dewhurst, R.J., 2006. Factors affecting odd- and branched-chain fatty acids in milk: A review. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 131 (3–4), 389–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2006.06.017.
- Wang, Y., McAllister, T.A., Acharya, S., 2015. Condensed tannins in sainfoin: composition, concentration, and effects on nutritive and feeding value of sainfoin forage. Crop Sci. 55 (1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2014.07.0489.
- Zhao, Q., Feng, H., Wang, L., 2014. Dyeing properties and color fastness of cellulasetreated flax fabric with extractives from chestnut shell. J. Clean. Prod. 80, 197–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.05.069.