

# Hay vs. haylage: forage type influences the equine urinary metabonome and faecal microbiota

Article

Accepted Version

Leng, J., McNally, S., Walton, G. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5426-5635, Swann, J., Proudman, C., Argo, C., Emery, S., La Ragione, R. and Eustace, R. (2022) Hay vs. haylage: forage type influences the equine urinary metabonome and faecal microbiota. Equine Veterinary Journal, 54 (3). pp. 614-625. ISSN 2042-3306 doi: 10.1111/evj.13456 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/98320/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See <u>Guidance on citing</u>.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/evj.13456

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <u>End User Agreement</u>.



## www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

### CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading Reading's research outputs online

#### 1 SUMMARY

Background: Microbial communities are increasingly being linked to diseases in animals and
humans. Obesity and its associated diseases are a concern for horse owners and veterinarians, and
there is a growing interest in the link between diet, the intestinal microbiota and metabolic disease.

**Objectives:** Assess the influence of long-term hay or haylage feeding on the microbiota and
metabolomes of 20 Welsh mountain ponies.

7 Study design: Longitudinal study.

Methods: Urine, faeces and blood was collected from 20 ponies on a monthly basis over a 13 month
 period. Urine and faeces were analysed using proton magnetic resonance (<sup>1</sup>H NMR) spectroscopy
 and faecal bacterial DNA underwent 16S rRNA gene sequencing.

**Results:** Faecal bacterial community profiles were observed to be different for the two groups, with discriminant analysis identifying 102 bacterial groups (or operational taxonomic units, OTUs) that differed in relative abundance in accordance with forage type. Urinary metabolic profiles of the hay and haylage fed ponies were significantly different during 12 of the 13 months of the study. Notably, the urinary excretion of hippurate was greater in the hay fed ponies for the duration of the study, while ethyl-glucoside excretion was higher in the haylage fed ponies.

Main limitations: The study was undertaken over a 13 month period and both groups of ponies had
access to pasture during the summer months.

**Conclusions:** The data generated from this study, suggests that the choice of forage may have implications for the intestinal microbiota and metabolism of ponies and therefore, potentially their health status. Understanding the potential implication of feeding a particular type of forage will enable horse owners to make more informed choices with regard to feed, especially if their horse or pony is prone to weight gain.

24 Keywords: equine, forage, hay, haylage, microbiota, metabonomics

#### 26 INTRODUCTION

27 Obesity is of rising concern for the health and well-being of the horse, with a reported prevalence of 28 31% in the United Kingdom [1]. This has led to an increase in the occurrence of laminitis, pituitary 29 pars intermedia dysfunction (PPID) and equine metabolic syndrome (EMS) [2], which all have 30 economic and welfare implications. EMS has been described as an endocrinopathy grouping insulin 31 dysregulation, obesity or regional adiposity and a predilection to laminitis in the equine species [3]. 32 However, more recently the definition has been adapted, since insulin dysregulation can occur with or 33 without obesity or regional adiposity [4]. At present the definition of EMS refers to a group of 34 endocrine abnormalities including abnormal glucose homeostasis, insulin dysregulation, 35 dyslipidaemia (with or without obesity or regional adiposity), dynamic adipokine concentrations and a 36 predilection to laminitis [5,6].

Ponies and horses that are overweight are at increased risk of developing EMS [7]. However, currently there is a paucity of data regarding whether forage choice and the relationship with the intestinal microbiota has implications on equine obesity or the potential for development of metabolic disease. Interestingly, numerous studies have reported a correlation between diet and metabolic disease syndromes in humans [8,9]. Despite dietary and digestive differences, the microbial community of the equine intestine has some similarities to that of humans and is dominated by bacteria belonging to the phyla *Firmicutes* and *Bacteroidetes* [10][11].

44 The intestinal bacterial community within the equine hindgut has previously been shown to be stable 45 However, diet has the potential to influence the composition of the equine intestinal bacterial 46 community, as previously it has been recognised as a major factor influencing the bacterial 47 community of the intestine of humans [12,13]. The majority of the bacteria that reside in the intestine 48 are obligate anaerobes and therefore, cannot always be analysed using culture techniques [14]. 49 However, sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene present in bacteria allows for an overview of the 50 bacterial community. Using this approach, differences in bacterial community profiles have previously 51 been observed, between healthy horses and those with intestinal disease [15–19].

52 Metabolites that are produced from co-metabolism between bacteria and the equine host are present 53 in the biofluids of horses and can be measured using metabolic profiling techniques such as proton 54 nuclear magnetic resonance (<sup>1</sup>H NMR) spectroscopy. Previously, metabonomic approaches have been used to identify changes in bacterial metabolites within the urine of horses with equine grass 55 56 sickness [18], in faecal water in relation to impact of age and obesity on the microbiome [20] and in 57 the lipid composition of horse blood following induction of laminitis using oligofructose [21]. In 58 combination, these analytical techniques empower our understanding of the relationship between the equine intestinal microbiota, diet and disease. 59

60 The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of long-term hay or haylage feeding on 61 the equine faecal microbiota and associated metabolome. A group of 20 Welsh Mountain ponies 62 maintained in separate hay and haylage groups for the preceding five years were studied monthly 63 over a 13 month period (July 2016 to July 2017). This native UK breed was selected as they are 64 known to be predisposed to obesity and to obesity-related diseases, such as laminitis, PPID and EMS 65 [4,22,23]. High-resolution metabolic and bacterial profiling techniques were applied in parallel to 66 identify variation in the intestinal microbiota and the metabolic system of the ponies receiving two 67 different forage types (hay and haylage).

68

#### 69 METHODS

#### 70 Animals and husbandry

Twenty Welsh Mountain ponies (aged 7-9 years at the start of the study) were included in the study. Animals were divided into two equally-sized and gender-balanced (geldings and mares) groups 5 years prior (2011) to the onset of the study. From the point at which these groups were established, the animals were group housed and turned out to pasture as separate groups. No direct interactions between animals in the separate groups were permitted.

When not at pasture, both pony groups were loose-housed within the same spacious, well-ventilated barn. Group pens allowing adequate space for free movement, modest exercise and social interactions. From the time of group establishment (5 years prior to the study), One group was fed

exclusively haylage, commercially produced from short-term rye grass leys made by the same company. For the purposes of this study, all haylage offered was from the same batch. The second group only received hay grown on the study site (Wiltshire, UK) during the previous year.

During the winter (October – March), when the pasture was too wet to allow access, each group was
fed its relevant forage, hay or haylage. Between April and September ponies were turned out to graze
for ~ 8 hours daily, *ad libitum* in adjacent paddock systems that maintained group separation at all
times. Group-specific forages were available during the nocturnal housed periods.

Any illness, changes in demeanour or laminitis (diagnosed by a veterinary surgeon using established criteria including measuring the intensity of the digital pulse technique [24]) were noted. This information, alongside any medication administered, age and group assignment of each study pony is listed in Table S1. This study was conducted under the jurisdiction of the ASPA (1986), Home Office licence number 30/3370.

91

#### 92 Equine biofluid sample acquisition

93 Once a month, over the duration of the study (July 2016 – July 2017), urine, faeces and blood 94 samples were collected from all ponies. Mid-stream urine was collected between 8am and 2pm and 95 stored at -80°C in 2 ml aliquots. Fresh faeces were collected between 8am and 12pm, no more than 96 five minutes after evacuation from multiple sites in the faecal ball. Blood samples were collected 97 between 8am and 9 am (not used for this part of the study) from the jugular vein directly into the 98 respective vacutainers. Following collection, all samples were immediately frozen at -80°C, until 99 required for analyses.

100

#### 101 Equine biofluid analysis by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy

Urine samples were prepared for <sup>1</sup>H NMR analysis by adding 200  $\mu$ l of phosphate buffer (pH 7.4; 103 100% D<sub>2</sub>O) containing 1 mM of the internal standard 2-trimethylsilyl-1-[2,2,3,3,-<sup>2</sup>H<sub>4</sub>] propionate (TSP) 104 to 400  $\mu$ l of each sample. Faecal samples (100 mg) were combined with 1.7 mm Zirconia beads and

105 700  $\mu$ l phosphate buffer and subjected to lysis by bead-beating for 10 minutes. The homogenate was 106 centrifuged for 30 minutes at 10,000 *g* at 4°C and the supernatant (600  $\mu$ l) was transferred to 5 mm 107 NMR tubes prior to <sup>1</sup>H NMR analysis. Spectroscopic analysis of all samples was performed using a 108 600 MHz Bruker NMR spectrometer operating at 300 K for urine and faeces. Standard 1D <sup>1</sup>H NMR 109 spectra were acquired for all urine and faecal samples. For all samples, 8 dummy scans were 110 followed by 32 scans and these were collected in 64 K data points.

111

#### 112 Multivariate statistical analysis of <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra

113 Multivariate statistical models were built in the Matlab environment (R2014a, Mathsworks) using in-114 house scripts to identify metabolic variation in the biofluids between the two groups of ponies. Principle component analysis (PCA) was initially used to identify metabolic variation between the two 115 groups. Pair-wise orthogonal projection to latent structures-discriminant analysis (OPLS-DA) models 116 117 were then constructed to compare the metabolic profiles of each dietary group at each month. Metabolites were assigned to peaks identified by models using the database of equine metabolites 118 119 found in the study published by Escalona et al. 2015 [25] and Chenomx (NMR suite 8.2). Metabolic 120 time series plots were generated in R using the SANTA-R package.

121

#### 122 Faecal sample DNA extraction and submission for 16S bacterial gene sequencing

DNA was extracted from all faecal samples collected using the PSP® Spin Stool DNA Kit (Stratech). 123 124 Extractions were performed with the manufactures instructions and DNA concentrations were 125 quantified. All extracts were sent to the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA, Weybridge, UK) for 126 sequencing on the Miseg Illumina platform. The V4 and V5 regions of the 16S rRNA gene were amplified using the following primers: U515F (GTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTA) and U927R 127 (CCCGYCAATTCMTTTRAGT), which produced a fragment 300 base pairs in length [26]. 128 129 Amplification was performed using the following conditions: 95°C for 3 minutes, 25 cycles of 95°C for 30 seconds, 55°C for 35 seconds and 72°C for one minute, followed by 72°C for 8 minutes. 130 Amplicons were purified using Ampure XP magnetic beads (Beckman Coulter). Each sample was 131

subsequently tagged with a unique pair of indices and sequencing primer using Nextera XT v2 Index kits and 2x KALPA HiFi HotStart ReadyMix. The following PCR conditions were used for this: 95°C for 30 seconds, 55°C for 30 seconds, 72°C for 30 seconds, followed by 72°C for 5 minutes. The resulting amplicons were purified using Ampure XP magnetic beads. The concentration of each sample was quantified using the Quantiflour assay (Promega) and concentrations were normalised before pooling all samples. Sequencing was performed on an Illumina MiSeq with 2 x 300 base reads according to the manufacturer's instructions (Illumina, Cambridge, UK).

139

#### 140 Analysis of 16S sequencing files

141 Sequence files were uploaded onto a remote linux server and quantitative insights into microbial ecology 2 (QIIME2) was used for all processing and analyses carried out (giime2-2018.4) [27]. Files 142 143 were imported and converted into a QIIME2 file (giime tools import). Quality control programme 144 DADA2 [28] was used to trim reads at positions 6 and 260 to remove low quality reads. Alignment was performed on the sequences (gime alignment mafft) and this alignment was masked to remove 145 146 positions that were highly variable (giime alignment mask). FasTtree was used to generate a 147 phylogenetic tree from this masked alignment (gime phylogeny fastree) and midpoint rooting was 148 applied (gime phylogeny midpoint-root). Core metrics were generated at a sampling depth of 30,000 149 reads. Alpha rarefaction boxplots using the observed otus measure were generated and significant 150 differences in alpha rarefaction between groups assessed (gime diversity alpha-group-significance). 151 The reference database greengenes [29] was utilised and trained on the sequences generated from 152 the study (giime feature-classifier classify-sklearn). Taxonomic composition of all samples and 153 samples by groups were generated (giime taxa barplot). Any differences observed within taxa 154 summary plots were confirmed using Mann-Whitney U test for significance. To identify bacterial 155 groups that differed between groups of samples the BIOM table was downloaded as text and 156 analysed using linear discriminate analysis effect size (LEfSe) [30]. The data from this study are 157 available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy 158 or ethical reasons.

159

#### 160 **RESULTS**

161 The faecal bacterial communities of ponies fed on hay or haylage did not differ significantly in diversity

A total of 260 faecal samples were subjected to bacterial DNA sequencing, which returned a total of 162 18,287,205 sequences, with a mean of 65,533 sequences per sample. Sequence files from four of the 163 164 samples were not taken forward for further analyses as they returned less that 30,000 sequences per 165 sample (P8 - month 12, P11 - month 11 and P13 - month 11). Boxplots were drawn to identify any 166 differences in alpha diversity (measured as observed OTUs) between the different groupings of 167 samples. When samples were grouped by hay or haylage group and month there was no significant 168 differences between the bacterial diversity of the hay and haylage groups in any of the 13 months of 169 the study (p > 0.05, Figure 1). Additional boxplots were constructed to explore whether other variables 170 were linked to differences in the diversity of faecal bacterial communities. No differences in bacterial 171 diversity were observed when samples were grouped by forage and by the presence of laminitis (p > p0.05, Figure S1A and B). When samples were grouped by pony, significant differences were observed 172 173 between several ponies (p < 0.05, see asterisks in Figure S1C). Bacterial diversity of faecal samples 174 taken from all ponies was significantly higher in month 6 (December 2016, p < 0.05) when all samples 175 from this month were grouped together (Figure S1D).

176

#### 177 Faecal bacterial community profiles oscillate throughout the year, irrespective of forage fed

178 Bacterial community profiles were drawn as a mean for the two groups of ponies at class (Figure 2A 179 and 2B), order and family level (Figure S2) of taxonomic classification. Overall, there was little 180 difference between the percentage abundance of the two dominant classes, Clostridia and 181 Bacteroidia, in the hay or haylage fed ponies. However, when the number of reads for Clostridia for all 182 samples were compared between the two groups of ponies there was a significant difference between 183 the hay and haylage fed ponies (p < 0.05), whereas there was no significant difference for Bacteroidia 184 reads (p > 0.05). When the number of reads for *Clostridia* and for *Bacteroidia* were compared 185 between hay fed and haylage fed ponies for each month of the study no significant differences were

186 observed (p > 0.05). Overall, there were significantly more reads identified belonging to the bacterial 187 classes Alphaproteobacteria, Planctomycetia and Mollicutes in the ponies fed haylage, compared to 188 those fed hay. In addition, significantly more reads were identified as belonging to Verruco5 in the 189 ponies fed hay (p < 0.05) compared to those fed haylage. Bacterial community profiles at order and 190 family levels demonstrated a similar trend to those at phyla and class level. The bacterial order 191 Bacteroidales and bacterial family Lachnospiraceae were at a higher percentage abundance in the 192 hay fed ponies, whereas the order Clostridiales and family Rumminococcaceae were at a higher 193 percentage abundance in the haylage fed ponies.

194 Over the 13 month duration of the study the percentage of reads identified as Bacteroidia and 195 Clostridia fluctuated in both groups of ponies (Figure 2A and 2B). The percentage of reads identified 196 as belonging to Bacteroidia was, on average, the highest in the hay fed and haylage fed ponies in 197 month 4 (October 2016, 40 % and 38 %, respectively), whereas this bacterial class was at the lowest 198 percentage in the hay fed ponies in month 7 (January 2017, 31 %) and lowest for the haylage fed 199 ponies in month 1 (July 2016, 29 %). The percentage of reads identified as belonging to Clostridia 200 was, on average, the highest in the hay fed ponies in month 7 (January 2017, 56 %) and in the 201 haylage fed ponies in month 13 (July 2017, 58 %). However, this bacterial class was at the lowest 202 percentage in the hay fed and haylage fed ponies in month 6 (December 2016, 44 % and 46 %, 203 respectively). When the raw number of reads for the two groups of ponies were analysed, the highest 204 number assigned to Bacteroidia and Clostridia were identified in the samples from month 6 205 (December 2016). The mean bacterial community profiles at phyla level for month 1 (July 2016) 206 revealed the presence of the bacterial class Bacilli in both hay (2%) and haylage fed ponies (4%). 207 However, this bacterial class was observed at < 1% of the overall bacterial profile for both groups in 208 the remainder of the 12 study months.

Similar oscillations were observed in the dominant bacterial orders (*Clostridiales and Bacteroidales*), and a higher average relative abundance of the bacterial family *Bacillales* in the haylage fed group in July 2016 (month 1, 4 %) compared to the hay fed group in the same month (< 1 %), but this was not significant (p > 0.05, Figure S3A). At the family level the bacterial communities became more complex with the two dominant phyla splitting into a number of different bacterial families (Figure S3B). A

noticeable difference was observed at family level and this was associated with the higher abundance of *Planococcaceae* in month 7 (January 2016) in haylage fed ponies (3 %) compared to hay fed ponies (< 1 %), but this difference was not significant (p > 0.05).

217

Faecal bacterial groups differed between the hay fed and haylage fed ponies, but these differenceswere not universal

220 LEfSe analysis (Figure 3) identified 61 OTUs that were significantly higher in relative abundance in 221 samples from the hay ponies and 41 OTUs that were significantly higher in the haylage fed ponies. 222 The bacterial phyla that had the highest percentage of these discriminatory bacterial groups for the 223 hay fed group were Firmicutes (36 %), Bacteroidetes (14 %) and Tenericutes (11 %). For the haylage 224 fed group the highest percentage of discriminatory bacterial groups belonged to Firmicutes (36 %), 225 Proteobacteria (34 %) and Bacteroidetes phyla (12 %). There were a number of bacterial groups 226 belonging to the classes Fibrobacteria and Spirochaetes associated with the hay fed ponies and the bacterial classes Epsilonproteobacteria and Gammaproteobacteria associated with the ponies fed 227 228 haylage (Figure 3A). The relative abundance of the two bacterial groups with the strongest 229 association with hay or haylage fed ponies is visualised in Figures 3B and C. These figures illustrate 230 that differential bacterial groups were not highly abundant in all samples, but there were a small 231 number of samples which exhibited very high relative abundance of these bacterial groups.

232

#### 233 Forage supplementation with hay or haylage resulted in a shift in the urinary metabolome

Metabolic signatures were captured from urine and faecal samples collected from all ponies over the 13 month duration of the study. Multivariate modelling revealed urinary metabolic differences between ponies fed hay or haylage (Figure S3A). Ponies fed haylage excreted higher quantities of creatinine while those fed hay excreted higher amounts of hippurate in their urine (Figure S3B). A supervised OPLS-DA model was constructed to further investigate the biochemical differences in urinary metabolic profiles between hay and haylage fed groups. This model highlighted that feeding hay resulted in a greater urinary excretion of hippurate and trimethylamine-*N*-oxide (TMAO), whereas haylage intake resulted in a greater urinary excretion of ethyl glucoside ( $Q^2Y = 0.60$ ; Figure S3C).

242 PCA models were constructed using the urinary metabolic spectra from samples taken each month to 243 investigate urinary metabolic variation between the dietary groups by month. Separation was 244 observed between the two groups in the scores plots for every month except for month 12 (June 245 2017, Figure S4). OPLS-DA models were then built on the urinary profiles comparing the treatment 246 groups at each month. An example for month 9 (March 2017) is provided in Figure 4A. During this 247 month haylage ponies excreted higher ethyl-glucoside and p-cresol sulfate, whereas the hay fed 248 ponies excreted greater amounts of hippurate, p-cresol glucuronide, TMAO and dimethyl sulfone. The 249 urinary metabolites identified by the OPLS-DA models to differ between the two groups are provided 250 in Table S2 along with the predictive ability (Q<sup>2</sup>Y value) of the model. Hippurate was found to be 251 excreted in higher amounts in the urine of ponies fed on hay compared to haylage for every month of 252 the study (13 months total) except for month 12 (June 2017) where no metabolic differences were 253 observed. Other metabolites that were observed in higher abundance in the urine of hay fed ponies at 254 specific points over the 13 months were TMAO, phenylacetylglycine (PAG), dimethyl sulfone, and p-255 cresol glucuronide. Metabolites that were found to be increased in the urine of haylage fed ponies 256 were PAG, glucose, creatinine, p-hydroxyphenylacetate, p-cresol sulphate and guinate. The model 257 constructed with the strongest predictive ability was with the samples collected in month 6 (December 2016,  $Q^2Y = 0.94$ ) and the weakest predictive ability was with the samples collected in month 11 258 (June 2017,  $Q^2Y = 0.22$ ). 259

260 To further analyse the temporal changes in the metabolites, the peaks that represent metabolites 261 identified as differing between two groups were integrated. Integrals for these metabolites were plotted as an average of the two groups of ponies over the 13 months of the study. The relative 262 263 abundance of these metabolites differed from month to month throughout the study (Figure 4B). 264 Metabolites identified in higher abundance in the urine of hay fed ponies (hippurate, PAG, dimethyl 265 sulfone and p-cresol glucuronide) peaked at month 10 (April 2017). Ethyl-glucoside was higher in the 266 urine of the haylage fed ponies at all months compared to the hay fed ponies and was at its highest in 267 month 7 (January 2017). Urinary glucose was highest in the haylage fed ponies at months: 1, 7 and

12 (July 2016, January and June 2017). Although *p*-hydroxy-phenylacetate and *p*-cresol sulphate
were identified as significantly higher in the urine of haylage fed ponies in months 5, 6 and 9
(November 2016, December 2016 and March 2017) of the study, the highest mean integrals of these
metabolites could be seen in hay fed ponies in month 10 (April 2017).

272

273 Differences in faecal metabolome between ponies fed on hay or haylage were only observed in three274 sample months

275 A PCA model was constructed using all faecal NMR spectra and showed no separation between 276 samples from the hay fed and haylage fed ponies (Figure S5). PCA models were also built on the 277 monthly sample sets and separation was only observed in the PCA scores plot between the dietary groups at month 9 (March 2017). From the OPLS-DA models comparing the metabolic profiles at 278 279 each month, a significant model was obtained for six of the study months (months 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 280 13; Table S3). From these models, the faeces of the haylage fed ponies were noted to contained higher quantities of acetate in month 9 (March 2017), whereas the faeces of the hay fed ponies 281 282 contained higher quantities of acetate in month 13 (July 2013), malonate in months 9 and 10 (March 283 and April 2017) and propionate in months 10 and 13 (April and July 2017), respectively.

284

#### 285 Correlations present between bacterial groups and biofluid metabolites

286 A correlogram was constructed using the number of counts for the ten OTUs with the highest LDA 287 score for the two groups of ponies and the integrals of the metabolites identified by the monthly 288 OPLS-DA models (Figure 5). Strong positive correlations could be seen between bacterial groups of 289 the same taxonomic lineage and between aromatic urinary metabolites (PAG, p-cresol sulphate, 290 hippurate and *p*-hydroxy phenylacetate). Faecal propionate was found to be negatively correlated with 291 faecal acetate and malonate. There were a number of weaker negative correlations including: urinary 292 metabolites (including hippurate and PAG) to a number of bacterial groups (including Oscillospira and 293 Eubacterium) and faecal metabolites (acetate and malonate) to Bacteroidia bacterial groups.

294

#### 295 Laminitis was diagnosed in three of the study ponies

Three ponies were diagnosed with laminitis following examination by a veterinary surgeon (RAE), during the 13 month duration of the study: P12 (months 8 and 9), P13 (months 2, 3 and 10) and P17 (months 3 and 4). Interestingly, these ponies all belonged to the group of ponies fed haylage as forage (Table S1).

300

#### 301 DISCUSSION

302 This study identified no statistically significant differences in bacterial community profile (at class 303 level) or bacterial diversity of equine faeces from ponies fed on hay vs those fed on haylage. 304 However, taxonomic resolution to the level of bacterial order revealed an increased abundance of 305 Bacteroidales (Lachnospiraceae) in the faeces of hay fed ponies and an increased abundance of 306 Clostridiales (Rumminococcaceae) in the faeces of haylage fed ponies. Distinct urinary metabolic 307 phenotypes were associated with each of the two forage types; hay fed ponies had consistently 308 higher abundance of urinary Hippurate and haylage fed ponies had consistently higher abundance of 309 urinary ethyl glucoside. These data indicate significant differences in host-microbial co-metabolism 310 associated with feeding the two different types of forage (hay vs haylage).

Haylage is an ensiled hay product created to allow bacterial fermentation of the grasses' natural sugars and the subsequent production of lactate. Haylage is cost effective and of a higher nutritional value (higher in readily available sugars) compared to hay. Moreover, the high moisture content and low dust content of haylage makes it the forage of choice for horses with dust allergies and those that prefer moist feed. Although an abrupt change to a haylage diet has previously been shown to increase the numbers of lactobacilli in the intestinal microbiota of horses [31], few studies have explored the influence of feeding ponies hay or haylage on the faecal microbiota.

Faecal bacterial diversity and community profiles of the two groups of ponies oscillated over the 13 month duration of the study. There was a significant increase in the faecal bacterial diversity of the

ponies in month six, however this could not be explained by changes to the ponies' management or diet. Equine faecal bacterial communities have previously been reported to change over the course of a year [32]. These changes are likely to be associated with seasonal variations in the nutritional content of the grass from the pasture, including grass used to make hay and haylage which is fed during winter months.

325 A large number of differences in the relative abundance of bacterial groups between the hay fed and 326 the haylage fed ponies were identified by discriminant analysis (LEfSe). The Bacteroidia class and 327 Bacteroidales order of bacteria were most strongly associated with hay fed ponies, with a number of 328 bacterial groups belonging to the Fibrobacteria and Spirochaetes. Fibrobacteria bacteria within the 329 horse intestine are essential for horses to breakdown their highly fibrous diets and have previously 330 been reported to increase in relative abundance when forage was introduced to a population of 331 horses [32]. The association of this group of bacteria with ponies fed hay illustrates that there are 332 greater numbers of bacteria breaking down cellulose within the large intestine of these ponies, which 333 may influence the relative abundance of dietary by-products. The Oscillospira genus, belonging to the 334 Clostridia class of bacteria, was more abundant in haylage fed ponies than hay fed. This genus of 335 bacteria has previously been reported to be increased in the faecal microbiota of obese humans 336 consuming a low fat, high carbohydrate diet [33]. Ponies fed on haylage may have a higher 337 abundance of Oscillospira due to the increased availability of sugars in this forage type.

*Epsilonproteobacteria* and *Gammaproteobacteria* are classes of *Proteobacteria* that we found to be associated with feeding haylage. Both have previously been reported to be present in the faeces of healthy horses [33,34], but in increased relative abundance after anthelmintic treatment [35], preceding a colic episode [36] and in elderly horses [20]. However, the reasons underlying these associations are currently unknown.

Multivariate models identified metabolic profiles that differed between hay and haylage fed ponies in each month of the study. Over the 13 months ponies fed on hay excreted higher quantities of urinary hippurate, TMAO, PAG, p-cresol glucuronide and dimethyl sulfone whereas the haylage fed group excreted more ethyl glucoside, PAG, glucose *p*-hydroxy-phenylacetate, creatinine, *p*-cresol sulphate and quinate. Differences in urinary hippurate and ethyl glucoside were consistently detected

348 throughout the study period, when comparing urine samples from hay and haylage fed ponies 349 sampled in the same month. Both hippurate and TMAO are the products of bacterial-host co-350 metabolism. Hippurate has previously been reported as a marker of "healthy microbiota" [37] and has 351 been found in reduced abundance in the urine of horses with equine grass sickness compared to 352 healthy matched controls [18]. The current study identified reduced hippurate excretion in the urine of 353 haylage fed ponies compared to those fed hay. Ethyl glucoside is a metabolite that is derived from the diet [38] and so the difference in forage supplementation may have resulted in the higher 354 excretion of this metabolite in the urine of the haylage fed ponies. Interestingly, glucose was found to 355 356 be at a higher concentration in the urine of the haylage fed ponies in one of the study months. This 357 may suggest that these ponies have higher levels of circulating glucose which could lead to the 358 development of PPID and EMS [39].

Oscillations in the abundance of urinary metabolites throughout the thirteen month study period were most likely associated with changes in feeding and changes in pasture nutritional content. Examination of urinary metabolic profiles by month revealed clear separation of hay fed ponies vs haylage fed ponies for all months except month 12. Exploration of metadata failed to reveal any confounding factors that might explain this finding.

Faecal metabolite profiles demonstrated no clear differences between hay fed and haylage fed ponies. This is consistent with other studies which suggest that faeces is an insensitive matrix for metabolic profiling [25]. However, the negative correlation between acetate/malonate and propionate does suggest functional variation in SCFA production by hindgut bacteria.

368 The results presented here, though interesting and potentially meaningful for understanding the role 369 of forage in EMS, are preliminary and there are several limitations to the current study. The study we 370 report here benefited from age and breed matched ponies maintained in tightly controlled conditions. 371 However, ponies had access to pasture during the summer months, whereas in the winter they were 372 housed environment with controlled feeding and this may have influenced the results. Moreover, if 373 resource had permitted, it would have been useful to have sampled faeces from the ponies more 374 frequently and over a longer period of time. This would have allowed for the detection of any further 375 oscillations in bacterial communities and metabolite concentrations between current sample points.

Moreover, it would have helped elucidate if differences identified between the two groups persisted longer than the 13 month study reported here. The 16S data generated from the faecal samples provides a clear overview of the bacterial communities present in the ponies, but in order to detect more subtle differences a shotgun metagenomics approach would have been useful.

380

#### 381 CONCLUSION

382 This study has demonstrated the potential impact of forage choice on the metabolic phenotype of 383 ponies maintained under controlled conditions. Although significant differences in the diversity and 384 high-level taxonomic composition of the faecal microbiota were not detected, discriminant analysis 385 was able to identify a large number of bacterial groups in the faeces that varied between the two 386 forage type groups. Furthermore, metabonomic analysis demonstrated that forage type had a 387 consistent and measurable effect on host-microbial metabolism. Interestingly, glucose was found to 388 be at a higher concentration in the urine of the haylage fed ponies in one of the study months, 389 suggesting that forage type may impact on the potential development of obesity-related diseases, 390 such as laminitis and equine metabolic syndrome. However, as this was only detected in one of the 391 study months, further studies are required to verify this finding.

392

#### 393 FIGURE LEGENDS



Figure 1: Alpha diversity as boxplots showing samples by group (hay/haylage) and the month the sample was collected. The number of observed OTUs per sample was taken at 30,000 reads per sample. Differences in bacterial diversity between hay and haylage groups when comparing observed OTUs per month were not significant (p > 0.05).



405 Figure 2: Mean bacterial community profiles at class level over the 13 months of the study. A) As406 means for the hay fed ponies and B) as means for the haylage fed ponies.



**Figure 3:** OTUs that were identified by LEfSe analysis as significantly different when comparing the faecal microbiota of the ponies fed on hay or haylage. A) LDA scores plot indicating the strength of the association of an OTU with the two groups, B) relative abundance in all samples for the two OTUs

with the strongest association to the haylage group and C) the two OTUs with the strongestassociation to the hay fed ponies.



Figure 4: A) Example of an OPLS-DA model built with urinary spectra from each month; this model was built with the samples taken from hay fed and haylage fed ponies in month 9 (March 2017). B) The integrals for each metabolite found to be different between the ponies in the hay and haylage fed groups by the monthly OPLS-DA models. Lines illustrate the mean for the hay (blue) and the haylage (red) groups and shaded areas around the mean lines represent bands of confidence. Integrals were significantly different between the two groups for all metabolites (p < 0.05), except those for glucose, p-hydroxy phenylacetate and p-cresol sulphate (p > 0.05).



Figure 5: Correlogram identifying correlations (p < 0.05) between the bacterial counts for the ten most strongly correlated OTUs with the two groups of ponies from LEfSe analysis and integrals of urinary and faecal metabolites found to be different between the two groups. The dendrogram at the top of the figure shows how closely related the quantity of a metabolite or number of reads were for a specific bacterium.

426 SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS



Figure S1: Boxplots illustrating the bacterial diversity (measured as observed OTUs) for all ponies
when samples were grouped by A) hay or haylage group, B) the presence of laminitis, C) pony and D)

429 sample month. \*Indicates boxplots that were found to be significantly different (p < 0.05) by pairwise 430 Kruskal- Wallis tests.



432 the study. A) Means for each month for the hay fed ponies at the order level, B) haylage fed ponies at

433 order level, C) hay fed ponies at the family level and D) haylage fed ponies at the family level.



Figure S3: Multivariate models built with all the study urinary metabolic spectra. A) The scores plot of a PCA model built with all the study urinary metabolic spectra ( $R^2 = 0.39$ ), B) the loadings plot for PC1

- 438 of the PCA model and C) an OPLS-DA model built with all study urinary metabolic spectra ( $Q^2Y =$
- 439 0.60). TMAO, trimethylamine-*N*-oxide.



**Figure S4:** Scores plots for the PCA models constructed with the urinary metabolic profiles from each



441 month. Points are coloured by whether the respective pony was fed hay or haylage. The R<sup>2</sup> values for
442 these models are detailed in Table S2.

Figure S5: Scores plots for the PCA models constructed with the faecal metabolic profiles from each
month and for all months together. Points are coloured by whether the respective pony was fed on
hay or haylage. The R<sup>2</sup> values for these models are detailed in Table S2.

**Table S1:** Information on age, group, incidence of laminitis and general health status of the 20 study

464 ponies.

Pony Name	Pony ID	Born	Group	Laminitic	Illness/drugs	Extra information
Blondie	P1	2009	Hay	No	Sedation, equipalazone + gentamyxin in month 2	Snotty nose month 1
Branston	P2	2008	Haylage	No		Reduced appetite month 8
Cedric	P3	2008	Haylage	No		
Clint	P4	2008	Hay	No		
Dalai	P5	2008	Haylage	No		Reduced appetite month 8
Dan	P6	2007	Hay	No		
De Niro	P7	2009	Haylage	No		
Dixie	P8	2008	Hay	No		
Gypsy	P9	2009	Haylage	No	Pyrexic + equipalazone month 8	
Jensen	P10	2008	Hay	No		Reduced appetite month 8
Kerry	P11	2009	Hay	No		
Lewis	P12	2009	Haylage	Yes - months 8 + 9		
Lippy	P13	2009	Haylage	Yes - months 2, 3 + 10		On box rest - month 1
Lizzie	P14	2009	Haylage	No		
Luna	P15	2009	Hay	No		Reduced appetite month 8
Mouse	P16	2009	Hay	No	Teeth problems and domosedan month 6	
Sally	P17	2009	Haylage	Yes - months 3 + 4		
					Teeth problems month 2, 3, 4 +7. Gentamycin, crystapen + in month 4. Swollen jaw month 10.	
Pip	P18	2009	Hay	No	Impaction colic month 12	
Popeye	P19	2008	Hay	No		
Willow	P20	2007	Haylage	No		Feed reduced month 9

- **Table S2:** PCA R<sup>2</sup> and OPLS-DA Q<sup>2</sup>Y value for models built to compare the urinary metabolic profiles
  479 of ponies fed on hay or haylage. The metabolites that were identified by OPLS-DA model to be
- 480 increased in the ponies maintained on hay or haylage.

M1 July 20160.560.67hippurateethyl glucosideM2 August 20160.530.41hippurateethyl glucosideM30.520.85hippurate, TMAOPAG, glucose, ethyl glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM40.500.88hippurate, TMAOPAG, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM50.580.76hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM60.570.94hippurate, PAG, glucose, ethyl glucose, ethyl glucosidep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM60.570.94hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM70.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM80.490.90hippurate, PAG cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurate, TMAO, differencesquinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurate, TMAO, differencesquinate, ethyl glucosideM12No differences0.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	Sample month	PCA R <sup>2</sup> value	OPLS-DA Q <sup>2</sup> Y value	Metabolites	Metabolites
M2 August 20160.530.41hippurateethyl glucosideM30.520.85hippurate, TMAOPAG, glucose, ethyl glucosideM40.500.88hippurateglucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM50.580.76hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM60.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, 	M1 July 2016		•		
M3 September 20160.520.85hippurate, TMAOPAG, glucose, ethyl glucosideM4 October 20160.500.88hippurateglucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM5 November 20160.580.76hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM6 December 20160.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, ethyl glucosideM6 December 20160.570.94hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, cresol glucosideethyl glucosideM8 M9 April 20170.490.90hippurate, p- cresol glucornide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, differences - 0.60quinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 20170.560.80hippurate glucosideglucosideM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					, ,
September 2016Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark	¥				· ·
October 2016Image: Constraint of the set					
M5 November 20160.580.76hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM6 December 20160.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucosideM6 December 20160.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAG glucuronide, glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 March 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl		0.50	0.88	hippurate	
November 2016november 2017november 2017novemb					
M6 December 20160.570.94hippurateglucose, creatinine, ethyl glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, p- cresol glucornide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 20170.560.80hippurate glucosideglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12 M13No differences 0.800.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl		0.58	0.76	hippurate	
M6 December 20160.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucose, ethyl glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAG TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 M9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, differences - 0.60N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	November 2016				
M6 December 20160.570.94hippuratep-hydroxy- phenylacetate, glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAG rtMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 M9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, differences - 0.60quinate, ethyl glucosideM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					
December 2016nnnphenylacetate, glucose, ethyl glucosideM7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAG TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucurnide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM12 M13No ol.450.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					
M7 January 20170.59 0.590.92 0.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAG sulphoneethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.560.83hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl		0.57	0.94	hippurate	
M7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAGethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.560.83hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM11 M12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	December 2016				
M7 January 20170.590.92hippurate, PAG, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneethyl glucosideM8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAGethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate glucosideglucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.91N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					glucose, ethyl
January 2017TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneTMAO, dimethyl sulphoneM80.490.90hippurate, PAGethyl glucosideM90.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethylM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					glucoside
M80.490.90hippurate, PAGethyl glucosideM90.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM110.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucosideM12No differences - 0.600.91N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	M7	0.59	0.92	hippurate, PAG,	ethyl glucoside
M8 February 20170.490.90hippurate, PAGethyl glucosideM9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate sulphoneglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	January 2017			TMAO, dimethyl	
February 2017No0.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethyl				sulphone	
M9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate glucosideglucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl glucoside	M8	0.49	0.90	hippurate, PAG	ethyl glucoside
M9 March 20170.560.83hippurate, p- cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonep-cresol sulphate, ethyl glucosideM10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurate glucosideglucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl glucoside	February 2017				
March 2017Cresol glucuronide, TMAO, dimethyl sulphoneglucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	M9	0.56	0.83	hippurate, p-	<i>p</i> -cresol sulphate, ethyl
M100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	March 2017				
M100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethyl				alucuronide.	C
M100.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.600.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					
M10 April 20170.490.85hippurate, TMAO, dimethyl sulphonequinate, ethyl glucosideM11 May 20170.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideM12 June 2017No differences - 0.600.22N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl glucoside				, ,	
April 2017dimethyl sulphoneglucosideM110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideMay 2017No0.22N/AN/AM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.60- 0.60- 0.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	M10	0.49	0.85		quinate, ethyl
M110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideMay 2017No0.22N/AN/AM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.60- 0.60- 0.91hippuratequinate, ethyl	April 2017				· · ·
M110.560.80hippurateglucose, quinate, ethyl glucosideMay 2017No0.22N/AN/AM12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences - 0.60- 0.60- 0.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					9
May 2017glucosideM12No0.22N/AJune 2017differences - 0.60N/AM130.450.91hippurate	M11	0.56	0.80		glucose, guinate, ethvl
M12No0.22N/AN/AJune 2017differences- 0.60N/AN/AM130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl					
June 2017differences - 0.60M130.450.91hippuratequinate, ethyl		No	0.22	N/A	¥
- 0.60         hippurate         quinate, ethyl           M13         0.45         0.91         hippurate         quinate, ethyl	June 2017				
M13 0.45 0.91 hippurate quinate, ethyl					
	M13		0.91	hippurate	quinate, ethyl
	July 2017				glucoside

**Table S3:** PCA R<sup>2</sup> and OPLS-DA Q<sup>2</sup>Y value for models built to compare the faecal metabolic profiles of ponies fed on hay or haylage. A number of OPL-DA models with good predictive power (Q<sup>2</sup>Y > 0.40) did not indicate any metabolites associated with the hay or haylage groups when the corresponding coefficients plot was drawn, indicated below by "no metabolites on OPLS-DA".

Sample month	PCA R <sup>2</sup> value	OPLS-DA Q <sup>2</sup> Y value	Metabolites increased in hay	Metabolites increased in haylage
M1 July 2016	0.60	-0.60		-
M2 August 2016	0.58	-0.05	-	
M3 September 2016	0.38	-0.03	-	-
			-	-
M4 October 2016	0.73	0.05	-	-
M5 November 2016	0.49	-0.59	-	-
M6 December 2016	0.55	0.42	no metabol	ites on OPLS-DA
M7 January 2017	0.70	-0.10	-	-
M8 February 2017	0.51	0.79	no metabol	ites on OPLS-DA
M9 March 2017	0.83	0.63	malonate	acetate
M10	0.74	0.74	malonate,	-
April 2017			propionate	
M11 May 2017	0.66	0.64	no metabol	ites on OPLS-DA
M12 June 2017	0.78	-0.84	-	_
M13 July 2017	0.76	0.51	acetate,	-
			propionate	

487

#### 488 **REFERENCES**

489 1. Stephenson, H.M., Green, M.J. and Freeman, S.L. (2010) Prevalence of obesity in a

490 population of horses in the UK. *Vet. Rec.* 6281.

- 491 2. Johnson, P.J., Wiedmeyer, C.E., Messer, N.T. and Ganjam, V.K. (2009) Medical Implications
- 492 of Obesity in Horses—Lessons for Human Obesity. J. Diabetes Sci. Technol. 3, 163–174.
- 493 3. Johnson, P.J. (2002) The equine metabolic syndrome Peripheral Cushing's syndrome. *Vet.*

494 *Clin. North Am. - Equine Pract.* **18**, 271–293.

- 495 4. Bamford, N.J., Potter, S.J., Harris, P.A. and Bailey, S.R. (2014) Domestic Animal
- 496 Endocrinology Breed differences in insulin sensitivity and insulinemic responses to oral
- 497 glucose in horses and ponies of moderate body condition score. *Domest. Anim. Endocrinol.*

**4**98 **47**, 101–107.

- Frank, N. and Walsh, D.M. (2017) Repeatability of Oral Sugar Test Results, Glucagon-Like
  Peptide-1 Measurements, and Serum High-Molecular-Weight Adiponectin Concentrations in
  Horses. J. Vet. Intern. Med. Intern. Med. 31, 1178–1187.
- Cantarelli, C., Dau, S.L., Stefanello, S., Azevedo, M.S., Bastiani, G.R. De, Palma, H.E., Brass,
   K.E. and Côrte, F.D.D. La (2018) Domestic Animal Endocrinology Evaluation of oral sugar test
   response for detection of equine metabolic syndrome in obese Crioulo horses. *Domest. Anim. Endocrinol.* 63, 31–37.
- Johnson, P.J., Wiedmeyer, C.E., LaCarrubba, A., Ganjam, V.K. and Messer IV, N.T. (2012)
   Diabetes, insulin resistance, and metabolic syndrome in horses. *J. Diabetes Sci. Technol.* 6,
   534–540.
- 509 8. Paniagua, J.A. (2016) Nutrition, insulin resistance and dysfunctional adipose tissue determine
  510 the different components of metabolic syndrome. *World J. Diabetes* **7**, 483.
- Di Daniele, N.D., Noce, A., Vidiri, M.F., Moriconi, E., Marrone, G., Annicchiarico-Petruzzelli,
   M., D'Urso, G., Tesauro, M., Rovella, V. and De Lorenzo, A.D. (2017) Impact of Mediterranean
   diet on metabolic syndrome, cancer and longevity. *Oncotarget* 8, 8947–8979.
- Dougal, K., de la Fuente, G., Harris, P.A., Girdwood, S.E., Pinloche, E. and Newbold, C.J.
   (2013) Identification of a Core Bacterial Community within the Large Intestine of the Horse.
   *PLoS One* 8, 1–12.
- 517 11. Dougal, K., Harris, P.A., Girdwood, S.E., Creevey, C.J., Curtis, G.C., Barfoot, C.F., Argo, C.M.
  518 and Newbold, C.J. (2017) Changes in the total fecal bacterial population in individual horses
  519 maintained on a restricted diet over 6 weeks. *Front. Microbiol.* 8.
- 520 12. David, L.A., Maurice, C.F., Carmody, R.N., Gootenberg, D.B., Button, J.E., Wolfe, B.E., Ling,
- A. V., Devlin, A.S., Varma, Y., Fischbach, M.A., Biddinger, S.B., Dutton, R.J. and Turnbaugh,
- 522 P.J. (2014) Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters the human gut microbiome. *Nature* **505**, 559–
- 523 563. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature12820.
- 13. Wu, G.D., Chen, J., Hoffmann, C., Bittinger, K., Chen, Y.Y., Keilbaugh, S.A., Bewtra, M.,

525		Knights, D., Walters, W.A., Knight, R., Sinha, R., Gilroy, E., Gupta, K., Baldassano, R., Nessel,
526		L., Li, H., Bushman, F.D. and Lewis, J.D. (2011) Linking long-term dietary patterns with gut
527		microbial enterotypes. Science (80 ). 334, 105–108.
528	14.	Daly, K., Stewart, C.S., Flint, H.J. and Shirazi-Beechey, S.P. (2001) Bacterial diversity within
529		the equine large intestine as revealed by molecular analysis of cloned 16S rRNA genes. FEMS
530		<i>Micro Ecolo</i> <b>38</b> , 141–151.
531	15.	Costa, M.C., Arroyo, L.G., Allen-Vercoe, E., Stämpfli, H.R., Kim, P.T., Sturgeon, A. and
532		Weese, J.S. (2012) Comparison of the fecal microbiota of healthy horses and horses with
533		colitis by high throughput sequencing of the V3-V5 region of the 16s rRNA gene. PLoS One 7,
534		e41484.
535	16.	Dougal, K., Harris, P.A., Edwards, A., Pachebat, J.A., Blackmore, T.M., Worgan, H.J. and
536		Newbold, C.J. (2012) A comparison of the microbiome and the metabolome of different
537		regions of the equine hindgut. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 82, 642–652.
538	17.	Ericsson, A.C., Johnson, P.J., Lopes, M.A., Perry, S.C. and Lanter, R. (2016) A Microbiological
539		Map of the Healthy Equine Gastrointestinal Tract. <i>PLoS One</i> <b>11</b> , 1–17.
540	18.	Leng, J., Proudman, C., Darby, A., Blow, F., Townsend, N., Miller, A. and Swann, J. (2018)
541		Exploration of the Fecal Microbiota and Biomarker Discovery in Equine Grass Sickness. J.
542		Proteome Res. 17.
543	19.	Stewart, H.L., Pitta, D., Indugu, N., Vecchiarelli, B., Engiles, J.B. and Southwood, L.L. (2018)
544		Characterization of the fecal microbiota of healthy horses. Am. J. Vet. Res. 79, 811-819.
545	20.	Morrison, P.K., Newbold, C.J., Jones, E., Worgan, H.J., Grove-white, D.H., Dugdale, A.H.,
546		Barfoot, C., Harris, P.A. and Argo, C.M. (2018) The Equine Gastrointestinal Microbiome:
547		Impacts of Age and Obesity. Front. Microbiol. 9, 1–13.
548	21.	Keller, M.D., Pollitt, C.C. and Marx, U.C. (2011) Nuclear magnetic resonance-based
549		metabonomic study of early time point laminitis in an oligofructose-overload model. Equine
550		Vet. J. <b>43</b> , 737–743.

- Alford, P., Geller, S., Richrdson, B., Slater, M. and Honnas, C. (2001) A multicenter, matched
  case-control study of risk factors for equine laminitis. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 49, 209–222.
- Karikoski, N.P., Horn, I., Mcgowan, T.W. and Mcgowan, C.M. (2011) The prevalence of
  endocrinopathic laminitis among horses presented for laminitis at a first-opinion/referral equine
  hospital. *Domest. Anim. Endocrinol.* 41, 111–117.
- Orsini, J.A., Parsons, C.S., Capewell, L. and Smith, G. (2010) Prognostic indicators of poor
  outcome in horses with laminitis at a tertiary care hospital. *Can. Vet. J.* 51, 623–628.
- Escalona, E.E., Leng, J., Dona, A.C., Merrifield, C.A., Holmes, E., Proudman, C.J. and Swann,
  J.R. (2015) Dominant components of the Thoroughbred metabolome characterised by 1Hnuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy: A metabolite atlas of common biofluids. *Equine Vet. J.* 47, 721–730.
- 562 26. Ellis, R.J., Bruce, K.D., Jenkins, C., Stothard, J.R., Ajarova, L., Mugisha, L. and Viney, M.E.
  563 (2013) Comparison of the Distal Gut Microbiota from People and Animals in Africa. *PLoS One*564 8, e54783.
- 565 27. Bolyen, E., Rideout, J., Dillon, M., Bokulich, N., Abnet, C., Al-Ghalith, G., Alexander, H., Alm,
- 566 E., Arumugam, M., Asnicar, F., Bai, Y., Bisanz, J., Bittinger, K., Brejnrod, A., Brislawn, C.,
- 567 Brown, C., Callahan, B., Caraballo-Rodríguez, A., Chase, J., Cope, E., Da Silva, R.,
- 568 Dorrestein, P., Douglas, G., Durall, D., Duvallet, C., Edwardson, C., Ernst, M., Estaki, M.,
- 569 Fouquier, J., Gauglitz, J., Gibson, D., Gonzalez, A., Gorlick, K., Guo, J., Hillmann, B., Holmes,
- 570 S., Holste, H., Huttenhower, C., Huttley, G., Janssen, S., Jarmusch, A., Jiang, L., Kaehler, B.,
- 571 Kang, K., Keefe, C., Keim, P., Kelley, S., Knights, D., Koester, I., Kosciolek, T., Kreps, J.,
- 572 Langille, M., Lee, J., Ley, R., Liu, Y., Loftfield, E., Lozupone, C., Maher, M., Marotz, C., Martin,
- 573 B., McDonald, D., McIver, L., Melnik, A., Metcalf, J., Morgan, S., Morton, J., Naimey, A.,
- 574 Navas-Molina, J., Nothias, L., Orchanian, S., Pearson, T., Peoples, S., Petras, D., Preuss, M.,
- 575 Pruesse, E., Rasmussen, L., Rivers, A., Robeson, I., Rosenthal, P., Segata, N., Shaffer, M.,
- 576 Shiffer, A., Sinha, R., Song, S., Spear, J., Swafford, A., Thompson, L., Torres, P., Trinh, P.,
- 577 Tripathi, A., Turnbaugh, P., Ul-Hasan, S., van der Hooft, J., Vargas, F., Vázquez-Baeza, Y.,

578		Vogtmann, E., von Hippel, M., Walters, W., et al. (2018) QIIME 2: Reproducible, interactive,
579		scalable, and extensible microbiome data science. PeerJ Prepr. 6, e27295v2.
580	28.	Callahan, B.J., Mcmurdie, P.J., Rosen, M.J., Han, A.W., Johnson, A.J.A. and Holmes, S.P.
581		(2016) DADA2: High resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat. Methods
582		<b>13</b> , 581–583.
583	29.	Desantis, T.Z., Hugenholtz, P., Larsen, N., Rojas, M., Brodie, E.L., Keller, K., Huber, T.,
584		Dalevi, D., Hu, P. and Andersen, G.L. (2006) Greengenes, a Chimera-Checked 16S rRNA
585		Gene Database and Workbench Compatible with ARB. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 72, 5069-
586		5072.
587	30.	Segata, N., Izard, J., Waldron, L., Gevers, D., Miropolsky, L., Garrett, W.S. and Huttenhower,
588		C. (2011) Metagenomic biomarker discovery and explanation. Genome Biol. 12, R60.
589		http://genomebiology.com/2011/12/6/R60.
590	31.	Muhonen, S., Julliand, V., Lindberg, J.E., Bertilsson, J. and Jansson, A. (2009) Effects on the
591		equine colon ecosystem of grass silage and haylage diets after an abrupt change from hay. J.
592		Anim. Sci. <b>87</b> , 2291–2298.
593	32.	Salem, S.E., Maddox, T.W., Berg, A., Antczak, P., Ketley, J.M., Williams, N.J. and Archer,
594		D.C. (2018) Variation in faecal microbiota in a group of horses managed at pasture over a 12-
595		month period. Sci. Rep. 8, 1–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-26930-3.
596	33.	Dougal, K., De La Fuente, G., Harris, P.A., Girdwood, S.E., Pinloche, E., Geor, R.J., Nielsen,
597		B.D., Schott, H.C., Elzinga, S. and Jamie Newbold, C. (2014) Characterisation of the faecal
598		bacterial community in adult and elderly horses fed a high fibre, high oil or high starch diet
599		using 454 pyrosequencing. <i>PLoS One</i> <b>9</b> .
600	34.	Shepherd, M.L., Jr, W.S.S., Jensen, R. V and Ponder, M.A. (2012) Characterization of the
601		fecal bacteria communities of forage-fed horses by pyrosequencing of 16S rRNA V4 gene
602		amplicons. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 326, 62–68.

603 35. Walshe, N., Duggan, V., Cabrera-rubio, R., Crispie, F., Cotter, P., Feehan, O. and Mulcahy, G.

- 604 (2019) Removal of adult cyathostomins alters faecal microbiota and promotes an inflammatory
  605 phenotype in horses. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 49, 489–500.
- Weese, J.S., Holcombe, S.J., Embertson, R.M., Kurtz, K.A., Roessner, H.A., Jalali, M. and
  Wismer, S.E. (2015) Changes in the faecal microbiota of mares precede the development of
  post partum colic. *Equine Vet. J.* 47, 641–649.
- 609 37. Pallister, T., Jackson, M.A., Martin, T.C., Zierer, J., Jennings, A., Mohney, R.P., Macgregor, A.,
- 610 Steves, C.J., Cassidy, A., Spector, T.D. and Menni, C. (2017) Hippurate as a metabolomic

611 marker of gut microbiome diversity: Modulation by diet and relationship to metabolic syndrome.

612 Sci. Rep. 7, 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13722-4.

- 38. Teague, C., Holmes, E., Maibaum, E., Nicholson, J., Tang, H., Chan, Q., Elliott, P. and Wilson,
- 614 I. (2004) Ethyl glucoside in human urine following dietary exposure: detection by 1H NMR

615 spectroscopy as a result of metabonomic screening of humans. *Analyst* **129**, 259–264.

616 39. Morgan, R., Keen, J. and Mcgowan, C. (2015) Equine Metabolic Syndrome. *Vet. Rec.* 177,
617 173–179.