

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Short communication: Characterization of molasses chemical composition

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Palmonari, A., Cavallini, D., Sniffen, C.J., Fernandes, L., Holder, P., Fagioli, L., et al. (2020). Short communication: Characterization of molasses chemical composition. JOURNAL OF DAIRY SCIENCE, 103(7), 6244-6249 [10.3168/jds.2019-17644].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/799986> since: 2021-02-16

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2019-17644>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1 ***Short communication: Characterization of Molasses chemical composition***

2 **Palmonari, A. et al.**

3

4 **INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY**

5 Molasses are widely used in ruminant nutrition. Despite their utilization in dairy cows' rations, their
6 characterization is not complete, and in literature they are partially described, reporting few
7 parameters (i.e., dry matter, total sugars, protein, and ash). **Our aim** was to properly characterize
8 cane and beet molasses, and to evaluate variability among different molasses. **The results showed**
9 **that more detailed analyses of individual molasses sources could improve their use in ration**
10 **formulation.**

11

12 RUNNING HEAD: Short communication: Chemical composition of cane and beet molasses

13

14 ***Short communication: Characterization of Molasses chemical composition***

15 A. Palmonari^{1*}, D. Cavallini¹, C.J. Sniffen², L. Fernandes³, P. Holder³, L. Fagioli⁴, I. Fusaro⁵, G.
16 Biagi¹, A. Formigoni¹, and L. Mammi¹.

17 ¹ DIMEVET, Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie, Università di Bologna, 40064 Ozzano
18 Emilia, Italy.

19 ² Fencrest L.L.C., 03245 Holderness (NH), USA.

20 ³ ED&F Man Liquid Products, 3 London Bridge Street, LondonUK.

21 ⁴ Studio Associato Campi – Fagioli, 44123 Ferrara, Italy.

22 ⁵ Facoltà di Medicina Veterinaria, Università di Teramo, 64100 Teramo.

23

24 *Corresponding author:

25 Alberto Palmonari, e-mail address: alberto.palmonari2@unibo.it

26 Present address: DIMEVET, Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Veterinarie, Università di Bologna,
27 40064 Ozzano Emilia, Italy.

28

29

ABSTRACT

30 Beet and cane molasses are produced worldwide, as a by-product of sugar extraction, and widely
31 used in animal nutrition. Due to their composition, they are fed to ruminants as an energy source.
32 However, molasses have not been properly characterized in the literature. Their description has often
33 been limited to the type (sugarcane or beet), or the sole amount of dry matter (DM), total or water
34 soluble sugars, crude protein (CP), and ash. Our objective was to better characterize cane and beet
35 molasses composition, examine possible differences, and obtain a proper definition of such feeds. For
36 this purpose, 16 cane and 16 beet molasses were sourced worldwide and analyzed for chemical
37 composition. The chemical analysis used in this trial was able to characterize 97.4% and 98.3% of
38 the compounds in the DM of cane and beet molasses, respectively. Cane molasses contained less DM
39 amount compared to beet molasses (76.8 ± 1.02 vs $78.3 \pm 1.61\%$), as well as CP content (6.7 ± 1.8 vs
40 $13.5 \pm 1.4\%$ of DM), with a minimum value of 2.2% of DM in cane to a maximum of 15.6% of DM
41 in beet molasses. The amount of sucrose differed among beet and cane molasses (60.9 ± 4.4 vs
42 $48.8 \pm 6.4\%$ of DM), but with high variability even within cane molasses (67.3 max to 39.2 min, % of
43 DM) and beet. Glucose and fructose were detected in cane molasses (5.3 ± 2.7 and $8.1 \pm 2.8\%$ of DM,
44 respectively), showing high variability. Organic acid composition differed as well. Lactic acid was
45 more concentrated in cane compared to beet (6.1 ± 2.8 vs $4.5 \pm 1.8\%$ of DM), varying from 12.8%
46 maximum to 1.6% of DM minimum within cane molasses. Dietary cation-anion difference showed

numerical differences among cane and beet molasses (7 ± 53 vs 66 ± 45 meq/100g of DM, on average). Within the cane group, it varied from +155 to -76 meq/100g of DM, while in beet from +162 to +0 meq/100g of DM. Data obtained in this study detailed source differences in molasses composition, and suggested that a more complete characterization of them could improve their use in ration formulation.

Key words: molasses, chemical composition, variability

SHORT COMMUNICATION

Beet and cane molasses are produced worldwide, as a by-product of sugar extraction, and they are widely used in animal nutrition. Due to their composition, they are fed to ruminants as an energy source, and the interest in their utilization is still current (Martel et al., 2011; Siverson et al., 2014). Previous studies showed positive effects of molasses addition on milk fat, FCM, ruminal ammonia, MUN, and fiber digestibility (Broderick and Radloff, 2004; Brito et al., 2015; de Ondarza et al., 2017). Moreover, they could be associated to nonnutritive and dietetic benefits: animals prefer sweetened diets (Murphy et al., 1997), thus molasses generally stimulate DMI. Related to this, field observations suggest that molasses, or molasses-based liquid feeds could impact animal sorting behavior, with a positive impact on the consumption of longer particles in total mixed rations (DeVries and Gill, 2012). A frequently used alternative is to add water whenever the diet is considered too dry (i.e., where hay instead of silages represents the main forage source). During the warmer months, however, water addition could lead to spoilage phenomena, decreasing the palatability of the diet, and causing health problems to the animal. In such conditions, molasses would act positively, since not associated with spoilage or molds. From a composition stand point, sugars represent the main component of molasses. Sugars are rapidly fermented in the rumen, but the end products differ from those obtained by starch fermentation (Penner and Oba, 2009). Previous studies indicate that replacing starch with molasses or molasses-based liquid feeds would result in positive effects on

72 rumen pH (Broderick and Radloff, 2004; Oelker et al., 2009; Brito et al., 2017). However, molasses
73 are in general not properly characterized in literature, and their description is related to the type
74 (sugarcane or beet), or the sole amount of DM, total or water soluble sugars, CP and ash (Broderick
75 and Radloff, 2004; Brito et al., 2015). Other authors made a better description of molasses, but the
76 final results still lack in several parameters, such as organic acids or DCAD (Olbrich, 2006; Bortolussi
77 and O'Neill, 2006). Consequently, by adding every single component cited in the characterization, a
78 representative part of the DM of molasses remains unknown, since sugars, CP and ash are barely
79 sufficient to reach 80% DM on average.

80 Objective of this study was to better characterize cane and beet molasses composition,
81 underline possible differences, and obtain a proper definition of such feeds.

82 For this purpose, 16 cane and 16 beet molasses were sourced worldwide and analyzed for
83 chemical composition. In particular, 7 cane molasses were sampled in Central / North America, 5
84 from Asia, 2 from Africa, and 1 in both Europe and Australia. Beet molasses were sampled in Europe
85 (12), North America (2), and Africa (2). Dry matter was determined according to AOAC 934.01
86 official method (AOAC International, 1990), except for dried quartz sand which was added to each
87 vessel. Ash content was calculated as reported in AOAC 900.02 method for this specific feed (AOAC
88 International, 1990). Crude Protein determination was carried out following the AOAC 990.03
89 method (AOAC International, 1990), while starch and other carbohydrates, such as dextran, levan
90 and araban, with polarimetric procedure (ISO 10520: 1997E). For sugar determination, samples were
91 clarified using a commercial kit based on Carrez reagents (Sigma-Aldrich S.r.l, Milan, Italy). After
92 this procedure, glucose, fructose, sucrose, galactose, raffinose, arabinose and xylose were extracted
93 and quantified using an enzymatic method, according to manufacturer manual (Megazyme
94 International Ltd., Bray, Ireland). Ash was recovered to quantify Ca, Mg, Na and K by ICP, while
95 organic acids (lactic, acetic, butyric, propionic, citric, malic, formic, aconitic, glycolic and oxalic)
96 and other components (sulphates, phosphates, chlorides and nitrates) were measured using ionic

97 HPLC (Metrohm Italiana Srl, Origgio, Italy), according to the methods UNI EN ISO 10304-1 and
98 14911-2001.

99 Statistical analysis was performed using the software JMP (version 12.0 pro, Statistical
100 Analysis Systems Institute Inc., Cary, NC). Then, a principal component analysis was carried out
101 using the FACTOR procedure of SAS (version 9.13, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC), as described by
102 Gallo et al (2015). The analysis was conducted to evaluate variability among and across cane or beet
103 molasses.

104 Overall, determinations of the different components were able to characterize, on average,
105 97.4% and 98.3% of the DM in cane and beet molasses, respectively. Analytical results are reported
106 in Tables 1 and 2. Within the cane molasses group, DM ranged from 79.56% to 75.72%, with an
107 average of 76.8%. An average 78.3% DM was observed in beet molasses, with a maximum of 78.9%
108 and a minimum of 74.1%. Ash was numerically higher in cane (13.1% of DM) than beet (11.7% of
109 DM) molasses, with a maximum value of 18.5% of DM and a minimum value of 6.5% of DM in beet
110 molasses. The CP concentration differed among and within group, being $6.7 \pm 1.8\%$ and $13.5 \pm 1.4\%$
111 of DM in cane and beet molasses, respectively, and ranged from a minimum value of 2.2% of DM in
112 cane to a maximum of 15.6% of DM in beet. This difference could be related to specific molecules
113 occurring in sugar beet, such as betaine. Betaine is a nitrogen compound, widely used in the cosmetic,
114 health and pharmaceutical industry as well as animal nutrition (Fernandez-Figares et al., 2002;
115 Escudero and Ruiz, 2011), being able to promote growth and modulate lipid accumulation.

116 Sugar profile differed among samples. Sucrose resulted as the most represented in both cane
117 and beet molasses, although its concentration varied even within group. In cane molasses, an average
118 of 48.8% of DM was observed, ranging from 67.3% to 39.2%. Beet molasses showed a numerically
119 higher sucrose concentration, 60.9% of DM on average, with 66.1% max and 46.5% min. Glucose
120 and fructose resulted in an average concentration of 8.1% for and 5.3% of DM, respectively, in cane
121 molasses, while barely detectable in beet molasses (0.3% of DM on average, for both). The ranges

122 for cane molasses were wide, with maximum values of 14.3% and 12.1% DM and minimum values
123 of 2.3% and 1.3% of DM for fructose and glucose, respectively. Other analyzed sugars (galactose,
124 raffinose, arabinose and xylose) were almost undetectable, and even the sum of maximum values
125 resulted lower than 1% of DM in cane molasses. The only exception was raffinose in beet molasses,
126 which resulted 0.6% of DM on average, but with a maximum value of 2.2% of DM. This finding is
127 in line to what observed by Olbrich (2006), who identified sucrose and raffinose as the two major
128 sugars in German beet molasses. Reasons for these differences could be related to the extraction
129 process applied, as well as the origin of the molasses. Sucrose is a disaccharide, composed by glucose
130 and fructose. Uptakes of these two sugars are usually associated, and both represent a major substrate
131 for microbial fermentations. However, glucose and fructose could undergo different fermentation
132 pathways (Luick et al., 1957). Thus, considering the variability observed within group (cane or beet),
133 these data suggest that a more accurate analysis is required to properly characterize the molasses.

134 Differences were observed also in organic acids. Lactic acid was more concentrated in cane
135 compared to beet (6.1% and 4.5% of DM), varying from 12.8% max. to 1.6% min. of DM among
136 cane molasses. Aconitic acid was found only in cane molasses (1.4% of DM on average), while
137 glycolic acid in beet (0.25% of DM on average). Other analyzed acids (acetic, butyric, propionic,
138 citric, malic, formic, glycolic and oxalic) were poorly represented in both cane and beet molasses.
139 The total sum of acids ranged from 2.4% to 18.7% of DM in cane, while it was 4.1% as minimum
140 and 11.9% maximum of DM in beet molasses. Organic acids are not so frequently quantified when
141 molasses are added to a diet. However, considering their variability, it should be recommended to
142 determine such fraction, since organic acids could impact rumen metabolism, leading to different
143 consequences in terms of animal health and performances, as underlined by other authors in respect
144 to silages (Kung et al., 2018).

145 Starch, dextran, levan and araban were 2.2% of DM on average in cane molasses, while their
146 content was <1% of DM in beet molasses. Due to the low concentration, also the variability range

147 was narrow. Sulfates, phosphates, and chlorides had a higher concentration in cane molasses, which
148 showed a numerically lower DCAD compared to beet (7 ± 53 vs 66 ± 45 meq/100g of DM). Within the
149 cane group, DCAD varied from +155 to -76 meq/100g of DM, while in beet from +162 to 0 meq/100g
150 of DM. The observed DCAD variability across samples underlines the importance of this
151 determination when molasses are added to the diet. Even with a similar amount of total sugars,
152 different molasses could have a completely different anion – cation ratio, with possible effects on
153 animal health and performance. For example, given a ration for close-up cows (270dd pregnancy)
154 formulated with corn silage, grass hay, corn meal, soybean meal and min. vit. supplement, such ration
155 would result in a DCAD = ~ 39 meq/100g. Substituting corn meal with the molasses at opposite values
156 (+155 and -76 meq/100g), final DCAD would result as +38 and +48 meq/100g. As reported in
157 literature, a proper balance is required to avoid the occurrence of health disease in different stage of
158 lactation (Block, 1984; Goff and Horst, 1997; Hu and Murphy, 2004) or in animals under stressful
159 environmental conditions (West et al., 1991 and 1992; Sanchez et al., 1994).

160 Samples distribution resulted from the principal component analysis, is reported in Figure 1.
161 Range of variability is wide among samples, and even within the same group, especially in cane
162 molasses. In conclusion the obtained results demonstrate that the differences in composition could
163 occur among molasses.

164 Defining a molasses as “cane” or “beet” is important, but not sufficient to properly evaluate
165 their potential nutritional role. As reported in several studies in which molasses are added to the diets,
166 determination of ash, CP, total sugars and few other components represents a partial identification,
167 and does not seem appropriate to characterize such feeds. Molasses are a good source of fermentable
168 sugars, but other components are present as well, with potential impacts on animal health status or
169 production performances. Moreover, from a scientific stand point, utilization of molasses which can
170 be similar in terms of amount of total sugars or protein, but different in organic acids or in minerals
171 could lead to different results across studies, as observed by other authors (Firkins, 2008; Baurhoo

172 and Mustafa, 2014; Ghedini et al., 2018). Thus, this study underlines that a more accurate description
173 and characterization of molasses is possible, and strictly required, especially if its use in animal feed
174 has to be fully optimized.

175

176

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

177 Authors would like to acknowledge EDF&Man company for supporting the study.

178

179

180

REFERENCES

181

182 AOAC International. 1990. Official Methods of Analysis. 15th ed. Vol. 1. AOAC International,
183 Gaithersburg, MD.

184

185 Baurhoo, B., and A. Mustafa. 2014. Short communication: Effect of molasses supplementation on
186 performance of lactating cows fed high-alfalfa silage diets. J. Dairy Sci. 97:1072-1076.
187 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6989>.

188

189 Block, E. 1994. Manipulation of dietary cation-anion difference on nutritionally related production
190 diseases, productivity, and metabolic responses of dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 77:1437-1450.

191

192 Bortolussi, G., and C.J. O'Neill. 2006. Variation in molasses composition from eastern Australian
 193 sugar mills. *Aust. J. Exp. Agric.* 46:1455-1463.

194

195 Brito, A. F., H. V. Petit, A. B. D. Pereira, K. J. Soder, and S. Ross. 2015. Interactions of corn meal
 196 or molasses with a soybean-sun-flower meal mix or flaxseed meal on production, milk fatty
 197 acid composition, and nutrient utilization in dairy cows fed grass hay-based diets. *J. Dairy Sci.*
 198 98:443–457.

199

200 Brito, A. F., K. J. Soder, P. Y. Chouinard, S. F. Reis, S. Ross, M. D. Rubano, and M. D. Casler.
 201 2017. Production performance and milk fatty acid profile in grazing dairy cows offered ground corn
 202 or liquid molasses as the sole supplemental nonstructural carbohydrate source. *J. Dairy Sci.*
 203 100:8146–8160.

204

205 Broderick, G. A., and W. J. Radloff. 2004. Effects of molasses supplementation on the production
 206 of lactating dairy cows fed diets based on alfalfa and corn silage. *J. Dairy Sci.* 87:2997–3009.

207

208 de Ondarza, M. B., S. M. Emanuele, and C. J. Sniffen. 2017. Effect of increased dietary sugar on
 209 dairy cow performance as influenced by diet nutrient components and level of milk production. *The*
 210 *Prof. Anim. Sci.* 33:700-707. <https://doi.org/10.15232/pas.2017-01648>.

211

212 DeVries, T. J., and Gill R. M. 2012. Adding liquid feed to a total mixed ration reduces feed sorting
 213 behavior and improves productivity of lactating dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 95:2648-2655.
 214 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4965>.

215

216 Escudero, I., and M. Olga Ruiz. 2011. Extraction of betaine from beet molasses using membrane
217 contactors. *J. Memb. Sci.* 372:258-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2011.02.008>.

218

219 Fernandez-Figares, I., D. Wray-Cahen, N. C. Steele, R. G. Campbell, D. D. Hall, E. Virtanen and T.
220 J. Caperna. 2002. Effect of dietary betaine on nutrient utilization and partitioning in the young
221 growing feed-restricted pig. *J. Anim. Sci.* 80:421-428.

222

223 Firkins, J. L., B. S. Oldick, J. Pantoja, C. Reveneau, L. E. Gilligan, and L. Carver. 2008. Efficacy of
224 liquid feeds varying in concentration and composition of fat, nonprotein nitrogen, and nonfiber
225 carbohydrates for lactating dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 91:1969-1984.
226 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2007-0868>.

227

228 Gallo, A, T. Bertuzzi, G. Giuberti, M. Moschini, S. Bruschi, C. Cerioli, and F. Masoero. 2015. New
229 assessment based on the use of principal factor analysis to investigate corn silage quality from
230 nutritional traits, fermentation end products and mycotoxins. *J. Sci. Food. Agric.*
231 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7109>.

232

233 Ghedini, C. P., D. C. Moura, R. A. V. Santana, A. S. Oliveira, and A. F. Brito. 2018. Replacing
234 ground corn with incremental amounts of liquid molasses does not change milk enterolactone but
235 decreases production in dairy cows fed flaxseed meal. *J. Dairy Sci.* 101:2096–2109.
236 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13689>.

237

238 Goff, J. P., and R. L. Horst. 1997. Effects of the addition of potassium or sodium, but not calcium, to
239 prepartum rations on milk fever in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 80:176–186.

240 .

241 HRN EN ISO 14911:2001 – Water quality-determination of dissolved Li⁺, Na⁺, NH₄⁺, K⁺, Mn²⁺,
242 Ca²⁺, Mg²⁺, Sr²⁺ and Ba²⁺ using ion chromatography- Method for water and waste water (ISO
243 14911:1998; EN ISO 14911:1999).

244

245 Hu, W., and M. R. Murphy. 2004. Dietary cation-anion difference effects on performance and acid-
246 base status of lactating dairy cows: a meta-analysis. *J. Dairy Sci.* 87:2222-2229.

247

248 Kung, L., R. D. Shaver, R. J. Grant, and R. J. Schmidt. 2018. Silage review: Interpretation of
249 chemical, microbial, and organoleptic components of silages. *J. Dairy Sci.* 101:4020–4033.
250 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13909>.

251

252 Luick., J. R., M. Kleiber, J. M. Lucas, and T. A. Rogers. 1957. Fructose Metabolism in Dairy Cows.
253 *Amer. J. Physiol.* 191:90-94.

254

255 Martel, C. A., E. C. Titgemeyer, L. K. Mamedova, and B. J. Brad-ford. 2011. Dietary molasses
256 increases ruminal pH and enhances ruminal biohydrogenation during milk fat depression. *J. Dairy*
257 *Sci.* 94:3995–4004.

258

259 Murphy, M. R., A. W. P. Geijssels, E. C. Hall, and R. D. Shanks. 1997. Dietary variety via sweetening
260 and voluntary feed intake by lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 80:894-897.

261

262 Native starch – Determination of starch content – Ewers polarimetric method, International Standard,
263 ISO 10520:1997(E).

264

265 Oelker, E. R., C. Reveneau, and J. L. Firkins. 2009. Interaction of molasses and monensin in alfalfa
266 hay- or corn silage-based diets on rumen fermentation, total tract digestibility, and milk production
267 by Holstein cows. J. Dairy Sci. 92:270–285.

268

269 Olbrich H. 2006. The Molasses. Berlin: Institut für Zuckerindustrie, 1963. Reedition Biotechnologie-
270 Kempe GmbH 2006. http://www.btkempe.de/Molasses_OLBRICH.pdf, 9.12.2010.

271

272 Penner, G. B., and M. Oba. 2009. Increasing dietary sugar concentration may improve dry matter
273 intake, ruminal fermentation, and productivity of dairy cows in the postpartum phase of the
274 transition period. J. Dairy Sci. 92:3341-3353. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1977>.

275

276 Sanchez, W. K., M. A. McGurie, and D. K. Beede. 1994. Macro mineral nutrition by heat stress
277 interactions in dairy cattle: review and original research. J. Dairy Sci. 77:2051-2079.

278

279 Siverson, A., C. F. Vargas-Rodriguez, and B. J. Bradford. 2014. Short communication: Effects of
280 molasses products on productivity and milk fatty acid profile of cows fed diets high in dried distillers
281 grains with solubles. *J. Dairy Sci.* 97:3860–3865. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-7902>.

282

283 West, J. W., K. D. Haydon, B. G. Mullinix, and T. G. Sandifer. 1992. Dietary cation-anion balance
284 and cation source effects on production and acid-base status of heat-stressed cows. *J. Dairy*
285 *Sci.* 75:2776–2786.

286

287 West, J. W., B. G. Mullinix, and T. G. Sandifer. 1991. Changing dietary electrolyte balance for dairy
288 cows in cool and hot environments. *J. Dairy Sci.* 74:1662–1674.

289

290 Table 1. Descriptive statistic of the chemical composition of cane molasses. Values are expressed
 291 as % D.M.

Measure, % D.M.	Cane Molasses			
	Avg.	Std. Dev.	Min. value	Max. value
DM	76.8	1.0	75.7	79.6
CP	6.65	1.79	2.22	9.31
Total Sugars	62.3	4.7	57.0	71.0
Sucrose	48.8	6.4	39.2	67.3
Glucose	5.29	2.69	1.30	12.07
Fructose	8.07	2.83	2.30	14.28
Raffinose	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.03
Galactose	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04
Arabinose	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.04
Xylose	ND	ND	ND	ND
Starch	0.33	0.25	0.06	1.07
Levans	0.86	0.26	0.26	1.21
Dextrans	0.79	0.42	0.27	1.63
Arabans	0.20	0.05	0.06	0.28
Aconitic Acid	1.42	0.85	0.24	3.78
Lactic Acid	6.10	2.82	1.62	12.75
Malic Acid	0.10	0.05	0.03	0.21
Citric Acid	0.13	0.04	0.08	0.22
Pyrocarbonic Acid	0.34	0.13	0.18	0.62
Oxalic Acid	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.09
Glycolic Acid	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Acetic Acid	0.44	0.28	0.16	1.04
Ash	13.1	1.5	10.2	16.3
Ca	1.39	0.55	0.82	3.13
Mg	0.43	0.14	0.19	0.63
Na	0.08	0.10	0.01	0.42
K	1.82	1.91	0.31	7.99
Sulphates	2.09	0.88	0.81	4.09
Sulfur ²	0.69	0.29	0.27	1.36
Phosphates	2.03	0.77	0.70	2.97
Nitrates, mg/kg	464	337	17	999
Chlorides, mg/kg	60	86	1	340
DCAD ¹ , meq/100g	7	53	-76	155

292 ¹ = Dietary cation-anion difference, calculated as: DCAD, meq/100g = (K, % DM / 0.039 + Na, % DM / 0.023) – (Cl,
 293 % DM / 0.0355 + S, % DM / 0.016).

294 ² = Sulfur obtained from sulphates considering their respective molecular weights.

295 Table 2. Descriptive statistic of the chemical composition of beet molasses. Values are expressed
 296 as % D.M.

Measure, % D.M.	Beet Molasses			
	Avg.	Std. Dev.	Min. value	Max. value
DM	77.6	3.2	67.0	80.9
CP	13.5	1.4	10.7	15.6
Total Sugars	62.1	3.9	50.6	68.4
Sucrose	60.9	4.4	46.5	66.1
Glucose	0.28	0.48	0.02	1.96
Fructose	0.29	0.30	0.01	0.87
Raffinose	0.60	0.56	0.12	2.18
Galactose	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.03
Arabinose	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.05
Xylose	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Starch	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.17
Levans	0.47	0.16	0.15	0.71
Dextrans	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.19
Arabans	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.10
Aconitic Acid	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lactic Acid	4.51	1.83	1.77	7.13
Malic Acid	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.13
Citric Ac.	0.30	0.12	0.11	0.50
Pyrocarbonic Acid	2.77	0.52	1.74	3.76
Oxalic Acid	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.05
Glycolic Acid	0.25	0.04	0.18	0.32
Acetic Acid	0.42	0.12	0.20	0.60
Ash	11.7	2.5	6.5	18.5
Ca	0.30	0.35	0.02	1.24
Mg	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.09
Na	0.62	0.43	0.05	1.45
K	2.44	1.33	0.65	5.54
Sulphates	0.61	0.41	0.17	1.84
Sulfur ²	0.20	0.14	0.06	0.61
Phosphates	0.76	0.38	0.31	1.65
Nitrates, mg/kg	55	29	16	116
Chlorides, mg/kg	3974	2236	411	8056
DCAD ¹ , meq/100g	66	45	0	162

297 ¹ = Dietary cation-anion difference, calculated as: DCAD, meq/100g = (K, % DM / 0.039 + Na, % DM / 0.023) – (Cl,
 298 % DM / 0.0355 + S, % DM / 0.016).
 299 ² = Sulfur obtained from sulphates considering their respective molecular weights.

300 Figure 1. Samples distribution. PCA results for molasses variability. Distance between dots is
301 inversely proportional to similarity among samples.

