FEEDS & FEEDING

A TECHNICAL PUBLICATION OF THE ANIMAL NUTRITION ACADEMY
Volume 1 – Issue 52

Replacing ionophores takes several tools

Ioannis Mavromichalis, MSc, PhD

This issue explains why removing ionophores means replacing several biological and management functions and why no single alternative should be assumed to reproduce the entire package.

The question of whether ionophores can be replaced has followed me throughout my years working with feedlot systems. It sounds straightforward, but it often begins from the wrong premise. Ionophores are not simply another additive included to increase average daily gain. They alter rumen fermentation and can affect feed intake, feed efficiency, digestive stability, and the amount of energy lost during fermentation. They can also influence nitrogen metabolism, methane formation, and microbial pathways that determine how efficiently feed energy is captured.

Removing an ionophore, therefore, does not create one nutritional gap. It can remove several functions at the same time. This does not mean ionophores must be used in every system. Their approval, permitted claims, and practical application differ among countries. But where they are removed by regulation, market requirements, or production choice, the replacement strategy must begin by identifying exactly what has been lost. That distinction prevents a discussion about replacements from collapsing into a simple comparison of product claims. It requires deciding which functions remain essential for the cattle, diet, feeding system, and market. Only then can alternatives be judged against a defined biological target rather than against the name of the product being removed.

Ionophores reshape fermentation

Ionophores alter susceptible rumen microorganisms and generally shift fermentation toward greater propionate production relative to acetate. Propionate is an efficient energy source for the animal, so this shift helps cattle capture more useful energy from the same feed supply. Ionophores may also reduce less useful fermentation products. Changes in ruminal protein degradation and ammonia production may contribute to the overall response. The effect depends on the ionophore, dose, diet, and cattle, but this change in fermentation explains why their contribution extends beyond simple growth promotion.

Efficiency is the visible return

In finishing cattle, ionophores commonly improve feed efficiency through some combination of slightly greater gain and lower dry matter intake. The response may be economically important even when average daily gain changes very little. Evaluating an ionophore only by looking for additional live weight can therefore miss much of its value. Less feed required per unit of gain is itself a production response, particularly when feed is expensive. Across a large feedlot, a modest improvement in conversion can represent substantially more value than a small, inconsistent change in daily gain.

Intake moderation supports consistency
Monensin, the most extensively studied ionophore in feedlot cattle, can moderate dry matter intake and, depending on bunk management and diet, alter meal size and frequency. Under commercial conditions, that response may improve day-to-day intake control as cattle adapt to high-concentrate diets. Consistent intake matters because abrupt overconsumption followed by reduced intake can destabilize rumen fermentation and feed delivery decisions. The objective is not simply to make cattle eat less, but to obtain more controlled intake while preserving gain and improving feed use.

Digestive protection has limits
By influencing intake patterns and suppressing some bacteria associated with lactate production, ionophores can help reduce the risk of acidosis and bloat under certain feeding conditions. That is not complete protection. In subacute ruminal acidosis, volatile fatty acids, not only lactate, can accumulate when acid production exceeds absorption and passage. Adequate roughage, gradual adaptation, accurate mixing, and disciplined bunk management therefore remain essential. Removing ionophores from a high-concentrate program may require greater attention to these controls. Any alternative promoted as digestive protection should support good management, not provide permission to weaken it.

Methane is part of the energy story
Ionophores can reduce methane formation by changing rumen microbial populations and redirecting fermentation, but the response varies with diet, dose, and duration. They should not be presented as a complete methane solution. Their broader environmental contribution may come from feed efficiency: producing the same gain with less feed generally reduces the resources required per unit of beef. Biological and environmental efficiency can therefore move in the same direction.

Replace functions, not product names
Additives and better management may each replace one part of what an ionophore does. But a broad product class is not proof of equal results. Evidence must match the product, dose, diet, cattle, and goal, ideally with a direct test against the ionophore program. Coccidiosis control also needs its own decision. In the United States, monensin is labeled for the prevention and control of coccidiosis in feedlot cattle. Taking it out can therefore remove a health function as well as effects on nutrition and management. Better rumen stability is not proof of equal disease control. More than one tool may be needed, and cost and complexity can rise without the same result. The real test is not whether a tool changes fermentation or has a lower price. It is whether the full program protects health and gives an acceptable total cost of gain under the actual field conditions.

In Brief, taking an ionophore out of the formula is easy; proving that the new program preserves its key functions is much harder. First define the required outcomes: feed efficiency, intake control, digestive stability, coccidiosis control where relevant, fermentation, environmental performance, or some mix of them. Then judge the evidence and total cost of gain under the target feeding conditions.

BEED EDITION | 30 June 2026