

1 **Gross, mineral and fatty acid composition of alpaca (*Vicugna pacos*) milk at 30 and**
2 **60 days of lactation**

3 MARTINI Mina ^{a*}, ALTOMONTE Iolanda^b, SANT'ANA Amanda Marilia da Silva ^c,
4 DEL PLAVIGNANO Giada^d, SALARI Federica^b

5 ^aDepartment of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pisa, Viale delle Piagge, 2, Pisa 56124,
6 Italy; Interdepartmental Research Center “Nutraceuticals and Food for Health”, via del
7 Borghetto, 80, Pisa 56124,Italy

8 ^bInterdepartmental Centre of Agro-Environmental Research “Enrico Avanzi” University
9 of Pisa, via Vecchia di Marina, 6, S.Piero a Grado, Pisa 56122,Italy

10 ^cDepartment of Food Engineering, Federal University of Paraíba, João Pessoa-PB 58051-
11 900, Brazil

12 ^dDepartment of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pisa, Viale delle Piagge, 2, Pisa 56124,
13 Italy

14 *Corresponding author: mina.martini@unipi.it +39 050 2216897

15 **ABSTRACT**

16 The aim of this study was to investigate the composition of alpaca milk in order to
17 improve knowledge of the nutritional needs of crias during their first months of life.
18 Analyses of alpaca milk were performed in terms of chemical, mineral composition and
19 fatty acid profile during the first two months of lactation. Percentages of fat, protein,
20 casein and ash did not change in the first two months of lactation. Alpaca milk showed a
21 similar protein content to sheep and camelid milk such as llama (*Lama glama*), lower
22 casein content compared to ruminants, and similar fat percentages to cow and goat milk.
23 The Ca and P content was similar to cow milk. Concerning the fatty acid profile, alpaca

24 milk had higher conjugated linoleic acid (C18:2 cis 9, trans 11) and unsaturated fatty acid
25 contents than ruminant milk, and a low percentage of fatty acids with chains <C14: 0. In
26 fact, during the first months of life, alpaca offspring may not sufficiently exploit these
27 fatty acids. Ruminant milk cannot be considered as an ideal surrogate for the nutritional
28 needs of crias.

29 Keywords: Alpaca, crias, milk quality, milk feeding, fatty acids.

30

31 **1. Introduction**

32 Alpacas (*Vicugna pacos*) are camelids originating from the highlands of Peru, Chile and
33 Bolivia, which are over 3800 meters above sea level (Parraguez et al., 2003).

34 South American camelids are classified in the order Artiodactyla, suborder Tylopoda, and
35 family Camelidae, but are subdivided into Lamini and Camelini at the tribe level. Two
36 New World genera, Lama and Vicugna, and one Old World genus, Camelus, are
37 recognized. They are considered as 'pseudoruminants' since they have a stomach with
38 three compartments rather than four, with similar functional properties to ruminant
39 stomachs (Wheeler, 2012)

40 The alpaca is the smallest of the South American camelids: llama (*Lama glama*), guanaco
41 (*Lama guanicoe*) and vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*). While llamas are mainly used as pack
42 animals in the areas of origin, and guanaco and vicuña live mainly in the wild (Pollard
43 and Pollard, 2008), alpacas continuously attract business interest in farmers, including
44 those far from their country of origin.

45 In fact, since the 1980s, alpacas have been exported from South America to other
46 continents including Europe where they are reared primarily for their wool. These animals
47 seem to adapt well to different environments (McGregor, 2002).

48 Research on alpaca has focused principally on the study of the wool and meat, and to date
49 information on milk production and composition is scarce and partial. In fact, unlike other
50 pseudoruminants such as camels, historically they have not been bred for dairy purposes
51 (Medhammar et al., 2011).

52 Alpaca milk is used almost exclusively for feeding their offspring (crias). Crias double
53 their weight in the first 60 days of life, when they are largely dependent on dam's milk to
54 meet their nutritional needs (Chad et al., 2014). The milk is fundamental to satisfy the
55 nutritional needs of crias during their first months of life, since feeding is one of the most
56 important factors in production systems and is necessary for expressing the animal's
57 production potential. Currently, there is a shortage of data on the amount of nutrients
58 needed for optimal weight gain in alpacas. Although recommendations for energy
59 requirements in llama have been published (National Research Council, 2007), they are
60 limited to lactating llamas and are based on extrapolations from sheep and goat data.

61 In the event of the death of the dam with the subsequent low availability of milk and / or
62 difficulty with sucking, it may be necessary to integrate the milk for crias. In these cases,
63 cow or goat milk or formulas for lambs or zoo animals are generally used as replacers
64 (Scroggins, 2012).

65 The aim of this preliminary investigation is to increase the knowledge of the composition
66 of alpaca milk in order to better understand the nutritional needs of crias during their first
67 months of life.

68 2. Materials and Methods

69 *2.1 Animals and sampling*

70 In October and November 2014, sixteen milk samples were collected from eight
71 pluriparous alpaca from the Huacaya breed, which were homogeneous in terms of
72 lactation phase. The alpacas were reared as fiber animals on the same farm in Tuscany
73 and grazed on pastureland, following a semi-extensive breeding system. The animals
74 were milked manually on the thirtieth and sixtieth day of lactation, at least four hours
75 after separation from the suckling cria. Approximately 80 ml of milk were collected from
76 both teats per individual. All the milk was evacuated. Milk letting agents were not used.

77 *2.2 Chemical Analysis*

78 The milk was transported to the laboratory in refrigerated tanks at -4°C. On each fresh
79 milk sample, the following chemical analyses were carried out according to AOAC
80 methods (2004): total fat, total protein, casein, ash, phosphorus by the colorimetric
81 method, and Ca, Mg, K, Na, Zn by atomic absorption spectrophotometry.

82 *2.3 Fatty acid profile*

83 Milk fat extraction and analysis were performed following Rose-Gottlieb's method. Fatty
84 acid methyl esters were prepared using methanolic sodium methoxide according to
85 Christie (1982), and one µl of fatty acid methyl esters for each sample was injected with
86 split injection mode into a Perkin Elmer Auto System (Norwalk, CT, USA). The
87 instrument was equipped with an automatic injector, a flame ionization detector (FID)
88 and a capillary column (Factor Four Varian, Middelburg, Netherlands; 30 m x 0.25 mm;
89 film thickness 0.25 µm Middelburg, Netherlands). Helium was used as a carrier gas with
90 a flow of 1 mL min⁻¹. The initial oven temperature was set at 50 °C, after 5 min the
91 temperature was increased at a rate of 3 °C min⁻¹ to 140 °C and held for 2 min; then
92 increased 1 °C min⁻¹ to 240 °C and held for 20 min. Injector and detector temperatures

93 were 270 °C and 300 °C, respectively. The peak areas of individual FAs were identified
94 by comparison with fatty acid standard injection (Sigma Aldrich Chemical Co., St. Louis,
95 MO, USA) and quantified as a percentage of the total fatty acids.

96 *2.4 Statistical analysis*

97 All the 16 milk samples (n=8x2) were analysed in duplicate and the data on quality
98 characteristics, fatty acid and mineral composition were statistically analysed by a
99 mathematical model for repeated measures, considering the day of lactation (30, 60 days)
100 as a fixed effect, and the subject as a random effect. Statistical analysis was performed by
101 JMP software (2002). The differences between the means were considered significant at
102 $P < 0.05$.

103 **3. Results and Discussion**

104 *3.1. Milk chemical composition*

105 No significant changes were found in the percentages of fat, protein, casein and ash
106 between 30 and 60 days of lactation (Table 1). However, a decreasing non-significant
107 trend was observed in the percentage of milk macro constituents in the second month of
108 lactation. Chad et al. (2014) also reported that the main components of milk did not
109 change much during lactation. Milk protein was higher than in ruminant milk, such as
110 cow and goat, and was more similar to sheep and camelid milk such as Llama (Park et
111 al., 2007; Mayer et al., 2012; Medhammar et al., 2011).

112 The correct protein content in milk is specifically required to sustain the desired daily
113 weight gain in animals reared for production, since proteins are fundamental for optimum
114 growth and development. The right protein ingestion is fundamental especially during the
115 first six weeks of the cria's life, when daily weight gain is highest (a desirable weight
116 gain is from 110 to 230 gr/day during the first month) (Scroggins, 2012). A reduction in

117 protein content in the diet of a rapidly growing cria could result in growth retardation
118 (Scroggins, 2012). Therefore, goat or cow milk may not be suitable as an exclusive
119 supplementation for crias.

120 Casein was on average 4.09% and 3.48% on the thirtieth and sixtieth days of lactation,
121 respectively, (73% and 72% of the proteins) and lower than that reported for cows (Park
122 et al., 2007). Casein content in milk is interesting due to its effects on the coagulation of
123 milk in the stomach, and on digestion and absorption. In the literature no values have
124 been reported concerning the amount of casein in alpaca milk.

125 As regards the nutritional requirements, milk fat content is important, since it ensures an
126 adequate energy intake.

127 Fat percentages were similar to the average values of alpaca milk from California (Chad
128 et al., 2014) and to cow and goat milk (Park et al., 2007; Martini et al., 2010), but lower
129 than sheep and llama milk (Martini et al., 2008; Mayer et al., 2012; Riek and Gerken,
130 2006).

131 Ash was 0.66% and 0.67% on the thirtieth and sixtieth days of lactation, which was
132 similar to llama (Schoos et al., 2008) but lower than alpaca milk from South America
133 (1.4%-1.7 %) (Parraguez et al. 2003).

134

135 **Here Table 1**

136

137 *3.2 Mineral composition*

138

139 Minerals are critical nutrients. In addition to their structural function, they are also
140 involved in the regulation of biochemical cellular equilibria. Both their excess and
141 deficiency have detrimental effects on the health and production of livestock (Khan et al.,
142 2012).

143 No significant changes were found in the mineral content during the period considered,
144 except for an increase in zinc ($P<0.05$) (Table 2). To date, the data in the literature
145 concerning the Zn content in alpaca milk show a lower average content than reported by
146 Park et al. (2007) for ruminants.

147 The importance of zinc is linked to its role in several enzymatic activities. Its deficiency
148 in farm animals could be also due to increased renal excretion during stress and disease
149 states, and could cause skin lesions in some areas subject to mechanical injuries (breast
150 and toenails).

151 In camelids idiopathic hyperkeratosis syndrome has been described, which is
152 characterized by lesions on hairless areas of the body with a thickening of the skin and
153 tightly adhering crusts (Van Saun, 2006).

154 The contents of calcium, magnesium and potassium were in agreement with Chad et al.
155 (2014), whereas phosphorus showed a higher content, similar to cow (1190 mg/kg) and
156 goat (1200mg/kg) (Park et al., 2007; Martini et al., 2010).

157 According to Van Saun (2008), phosphorus metabolism in ruminants and especially in
158 camelids is unique because blood phosphorus is recycled to the rumen through saliva,
159 providing the phosphorus needed for rumen microbes. Phosphorus is a critically limiting
160 mineral for grazing animals in soils low in phosphorus. In general, a high molar
161 calcium:phosphorus ratio in milk is recommended in order to maintain adequate calcium
162 levels and prevent bone resorption. The metabolism of calcium and phosphorus is linked

163 to vitamin D. In fact, the shortage of phosphorus in the diet of young animals leads to
164 delayed development and rickets in crias (Van Saun et al., 1996).

165 Sodium was within the values reported for ruminants, but unlike the values described for
166 alpacas by Chad et al. (2014); further research is needed to resolve these differences. In
167 our study the sodium:potassium ratio was similar to sheep milk, in which potassium is
168 about two or three times greater than sodium. Llama milk, on the other hand, contains
169 four times more potassium than sodium (Medhammar et al., 2011). Sodium:potassium
170 ratio in milk reflect the physiological status of the mammary gland and increase during
171 the involution at the end of lactation in ruminant (Silanikove et al., 2013). In our study no
172 changes in the sodium:potassium ratio between 30 and 60 days post lactation were found.
173 Our results indicate that the metabolic adaptive response of the mammary gland to milk
174 production in alpaca is similar to ruminants, in fact the tight junctions between the
175 mammary epithelial cells are sealed at 30 and 60 days post lactation.

176 **Here Table 2**

177

178 *3.3 Fatty acid profile*

179 Table 3 reports the fatty acid profile of the milk alpaca at 30 and 60 days of lactation.

180 The fatty acid profile showed a few significant changes in the period of the study. The
181 changes took place in C18:1 trans-11, C18:2 trans-9,12, C18:2 cis-9, cis-12 and C22:6
182 fatty acids, which increased ($P<0.05$) at sixty days of lactation. The balanced content of
183 long chain unsaturated fatty acids in milk should be considered when choosing a milk
184 replacer. However milk replacers often use vegetable oils as sources of fat and have a
185 larger amount of C18:1 cis-9 and C18:2 cis-9, 12.

186 The proportions of saturated fatty acids (SFAs) were similar to other camelids, such as
187 llama and dromedary, which have been reported at between 60% and 65% (Schoos et al.,
188 2008; Medhammar et al., 2011), while the content of unsaturated fatty acids (UFAs) was
189 higher than the average content of ruminant milk (Shingfield, 2005).

190 Similarly to Chad et al. (2014), we found lower short-chain fatty acids (with a carbon
191 chain length shorter than 14) compared to ruminant and llama milk (Schoots et al., 2008;
192 Medhammar et al., 2011). SCFA have also been reported at low or non-detectable
193 concentrations in dromedary milk. It has been suggested that fatty acids with a carbon
194 chain length of <C14 produced by cellulose fermentation in the rumen may be rapidly
195 metabolized by tissue and are therefore excreted less in the milk (Medhammar et al.,
196 2011). The low content of short fatty acids in alpaca milk could also be linked to
197 differences in the expression of certain enzymes. In fact, it seems that camelids express
198 the enzyme thioesterase II instead of the fatty acids synthetase (Grunnet and Knudsen,
199 1979). Currently, there are no reports in the literature on thioesterase II and FA synthetase
200 for alpacas.

201 Since alpaca milk contains few short chains fatty acids the cria may have poor capacity
202 to exploit them.

203 In addition, long chains constituted more than 40% of the total fatty acids. Concerning
204 the individual fatty acids, to our knowledge there is only one study in the literature on
205 Alpaca milk (Chad et al., 2014), which our results are in agreement with. However, there
206 were some exceptions for some fatty acids (C18:1 trans-11, C18:2 cis-9, trans-11 and
207 C18:2 cis 9, 12) registering higher values.

208 In agreement with the literature regarding llama and similarly to ruminant milk (Schoos
209 et al., 2008; Park et al., 2007), the most representative fatty acid in alpaca milk was
210 palmitic acid (C16:0).

211 In addition, the content of C17:0 was similar to cow milk (0.70%) (Vlaeminck et al.,
212 2006), whereas C18:0 and C18:1 cis-9 were similar to llama and higher than goat, sheep
213 and cow milk (Soyeurt et al., 2007; Schoos et al., 2008; Talpur, 2009).

214 CLA (conjugated linoleic acid) C18:2 cis-9, trans-11 was higher than cow milk and llama
215 (0.4 g and 0.70 g 100 g⁻¹ total FA, respectively) (Shingfield et al., 2006; Schoots et al.,
216 2008; Medhammar et al., 2011).

217 CLA originates from the incomplete ruminal biohydrogenation of linoleic acid in feeding.
218 CLA is absorbed from the small intestine, transported to the udder and included in the fat
219 synthesis (Haug et al., 2007). In addition, most of the CLA cis-9, trans-11 in milk
220 originates from vaccenic acid (C18:1 trans-11), which is an intermediate product from
221 the biohydrogenation of unsaturated fatty acids in the rumen. After absorption and
222 transportation by the blood to the udder, a portion of the vaccenic acid is desaturated by
223 delta-9-desaturase to CLA (Kay et al., 2004). Since the alpaca is a pseudo-ruminant,
224 similar biochemical reactions may also occur within the C1 stomach of this animal.

225 The n6/n3 ratio was more similar to the values reported by Jensen (1992) in cow milk
226 (1.97) than goat and sheep milk (3.73 and 2.11 respectively) (Dønnem et al., 2011; Nudda
227 and Pulina, 2014).

228 **Here table 3**

229

230 **3. Conclusions**

231

232 Alpaca milk showed a few similarities with the milk from commonly-reared species. The
233 high percentage of protein suggests the need for a suitable protein level for the crias'
234 growth. In addition, the low percentage of fatty acids <C14 would seem to indicate that
235 the offspring of alpaca have a limited ability to use these fatty acids. In addition, a higher
236 content of unsaturated fatty acids and CLA was found compared to the milk of ruminants.
237 In conclusion, a good substitute for milk should take into account the nutritional needs of
238 the crias, and ruminant milk cannot be considered as an ideal surrogate.

239

240 References

241

242 AOAC, 2004. Official methods of analysis of the Association of Official Analytical
243 Chemists Gaithersburg.

244 Chad, E.K., De Peters, E.J., Puschner, B., Taylor, S.J., Robison, J., 2014. Preliminary
245 investigation on the composition of alpaca (*Vicugna pacos*) milk in California. *Small*
246 *Rumin. Res.* 117, 165-168.

247 Christie, W.W., 1982. A simple procedure of rapid transmethylation of glycerolipids and
248 cholesteryl esters. *J Lipid Res.* 23, 1072-1075.

249 Dønnem, I., Randby, Å.T., Eknæs, M., 2011. Effect of grass silage harvesting time and
250 level of concentrate supplementation on goat milk quality. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 163,
251 118-129.

252 Grunnet, I., Knudsen, J., 1979. Fatty-acid synthesis in lactating goat mammary gland. 2.
253 Medium-chain fatty-acid synthesis. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 95,503–507.

254 Haug, A., Høstmark, A.T., Harstad, O. M. 2007. Bovine milk in human nutrition – a
255 review. *Lipids Health Dis* 6, 1-16.

256 Jensen, R.G., Jensen G.L., 1992. Specialty lipids for infant nutrition. I. Milks and
257 formulas *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* 15, 232-245.

258 J.M.P., 2002. User's Guide ver. 5.0 S.A.S. Institute Inc., Ed. Cary (NC) U.S.A.

259 Kay, J.K., Mackle, T.R., Auldist, M.J., Thomson, N.A., Bauman, D.E., 2004. Endogenous
260 synthesis of cis-9, trans-11 conjugated linoleic acid in dairy cows fed fresh pasture. *J.*
261 *Dairy Sci.* 87, 369-378.

262 Khan, M.Z., Pasha, T.N., Farooq, U., Ditta, Y. A., Ilyas, M., Ahmad, H., 2012. Mapping
263 of calcium and phosphorus status of buffaloes in different cropping zone of Punjab
264 Province. *J Anim Plant Sci* 22, 315-318.

265 Martini, M., Mele, M., Scolozzi, C., Salari, F., 2008. Cheese making aptitude and the
266 chemical and nutritional characteristics of milk from Massese ewes. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* 7,
267 419-437.

268 Martini, M., Salari, F., Altomonte, I., Rignanese, D., Chessa, S., Gigliotti, C., Caroli, A.,
269 2010. The Garfagnina goat: A zootechnical overview of a local dairy population. *J. Dairy*
270 *Sci.* 93, 4659-4667.

271 Mayer, H.K., Fiechter, G., 2012. Physical and chemical characteristics of sheep and goat
272 milk in Austria. *Int Dairy J* 24, 57-63.

273 McGregor, B. A., 2002. Comparative productivity and grazing behaviour of Huacaya
274 alpacas and Peppin Merino sheep grazed on annual pastures. *Small Rumin. Res.* 44, 219-
275 232.

276 Medhammar, E., Wijesinha-Bettoni, R., Stadlmayr, B., Nilsson, E., Charrondiere, U. R.,
277 Burlingame, B., 2011. Composition of milk from minor dairy animals and buffalo breeds:
278 a biodiversity perspective. *J Sci Food Agric* 92, 445-474.

279 National Research Council, 2007. *The Nutrient Requirements of Small Ruminants:*
280 *Sheep, Goats, Cervids and New World Camelids.* Natl. Acad. Press, Washington, DC.

281 Nudda, A., Pulina, G., 2014. Influenza dell'alimentazione sul miglioramento delle
282 caratteristiche nutraceutiche dei prodotti ovini (latte, carne)[Influence of feeding on
283 improvement of nutraceutical characteristics of sheep products (milk, meat)]. *Large*
284 *animal review* 1, 20-22.

285 Park, Y.W., Juárez, M., Ramos, M., Haenlein, G.F.W., 2007. Physico-chemical
286 characteristics of goat and sheep milk. *Small Rumin. Res* 68, 88-113.

287 Parraguez, V., Thénot, M., Latorre, E., Ferrando, G., Raggi, L., 2003. Milk composition
288 in alpaca (*Lama pacos*): comparative study in two regions of Chile. *Archivos de*
289 *Zootecnia* 52, 431-439.

290 Pollard, R.J., Pollard, S.D., 2008. South American Camelids p. 39-42. In *Hand-Rearing*
291 *Wild and Domestic Mammals*. Gage L. J. DVM Blackwell Publishing Ltd

292 Riek, A.M., Gerken, M., 2006. Changes in Llama (*Lama glama*) Milk Composition
293 During Lactation. *J. Dairy Sci.* 89, 3484–3493.

294 Schoos, V., Medina, M., Saad, S., Ven Nieuwenhove, C.P., 2008. Chemical and
295 microbiological characteristics of Llama's (*Lama glama*) milk from Argentina.
296 *Milchwissenschaft* 63, 398-401.

297 Scroggins, S., 2012. What should I put in the Cria Baby bottle? *Alpacas Magazine*,
298 Spring, 2012, 114-117.

299 Silanikove, N., Merin, U., Shapiro, F., Leitner, G., 2013. Early mammary gland metabolic
300 and immune responses during natural-like and forceful drying-off in high-yielding dairy
301 cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 96, 6400–6411.

302 Shingfield, K.J., Reynolds, C.K., Hervás, G., Griinari, J.M., Grandison, A.S., Beaver,
303 D.E., 2006. Examination of the persistency of milk fatty acid composition responses to
304 fish oil and sunflower oil in the diet of dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci.* 89, 714–732.

305 Shingfield, K.J., Reynolds, C.K., Lupoli, B., Toivonen, V., Yurawecz, M.P., Delmonte
306 P., Griinari, J.M., Grandison A.S., Beaver, D.E., 2005. Effect of forage type and

307 proportion of concentrate in the diet on milk fatty acid composition in cows fed sunflower
308 oil and fish oil. *Anim. Sci.* 80, 225–238.

309 Soyeurt, H., Gillon, A., Vanderick, S., Mayeres, P., Bertozzi, C., Gengler, N. 2007.
310 Estimation of Heritability and Genetic Correlations for the Major Fatty Acids in Bovine
311 Milk. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90:4435–4442

312 Talpur F.N., Bhangar, M.I., Memon N.N., 2009. Milk fatty acid composition of
313 indigenous goat and ewe breeds from Sindh, Pakistan, *Journal of Food Composition and*
314 *Analysis* 22, 59-64.

315 Van Saun, R.J., Smith, B.B., Watrous, B.J., 1996. Evaluation of vitamin D status in llamas
316 and alpacas with hypophosphatemic rickets. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.* 209, 1128–1133.

317 Van Saun, R.J., 2006. Nutritional diseases of South American camelids. *Small Rumin.*
318 *Res.* 61, 153–164.

319 Van Saun, R.J., 2008. Effect of nutrition on reproduction in llamas and alpacas.
320 *Theriogenology* 70, 508–514.

321 Vlaeminck, B., Fievez, V., Cabrita, A.R.J., Fonseca, A.J.M., Dewhurst, R.J., 2006.
322 Factors affecting odd- and branched -chain fatty acids in milk: A review. *Anim. Feed Sci.*
323 *Technol.*, 131, 389-417.

324 Wheeler, J.C., 2012. South American camelids - past, present and future. *Journal of*
325 *Camelid Science* 5, 1-24.

326

327 Table 1. Gross composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of lactation (mean
328 \pm SE). Data on gross composition of cow, goat, sheep, llama and alpaca milk is
329 added for comparison.

330 Table 2. Average mineral composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of
331 lactation (mean \pm SE). Data on mineral composition of cow, goat, sheep, llama and
332 alpaca milk is added for comparison.

333 Table 3. Average fatty acid composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of
334 lactation. (mean \pm SE).

335

336 Table 1. Gross composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of lactation (mean±SE).
 337 Data on gross composition of cow, goat, sheep, llama and alpaca milk is added for
 338 comparison.

| Parameter† (%) | Days of lactation | | | | SEM |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|
| | 30 | | 60 | | |
| | Least square mean | SE | Least square mean | SE | |
| Fat | 3.35 | 0.558 | 3.29 | 0.755 | 1.347 |
| Protein | 5.62 | 0.758 | 4.86 | 0.925 | 1.542 |
| Casein | 4.09 | 0.069 | 3.48 | 0.049 | 0.085 |
| Ash | 0.67 | 0.086 | 0.66 | 0.086 | 0.128 |

| Parameter (%) | Milk | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| | Cow ¹ | Goat ² | Sheep ³ | Llama ⁴ | Alpaca ^{5,6,7} |
| Protein | 3.20 | 3.32 | 5.71 | 4.23 | 4.53-5.58 |
| Fat | 3.60 | 3.97 | 6.44 | 4.70 | 3.68 |
| Ash | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.90 | 0.76 | 1.4 – 1.7 |
| Casein | 2.60 | 2.80 | 4.73 | - | - |

339 †Values are expressed as least square means of the duplicate analysis (n=8x2)

340 LMS: least square means; SE: standard error; SEM: standard error of the model

341 ¹Park et al., 2007; ²Martini et al., 2010; ³Martini et al., 2008; ⁴Riek and Gerken, 2006; ⁵Chad et
 342 al., 2014; ⁶Medhammar et al., 2011; ⁷Parraguez et al., 2003

343

344

345

346

347 Table 2. Average mineral composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of lactation
 348 (mean±SE). Data on mineral composition of cow, goat, sheep, llama and alpaca milk is
 349 added for comparison.

| Parameter† (mg/kg) | Days of lactation | | | | SEM |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|-------|
| | 30 | | 60 | | |
| | Least square mean | SE | Least square mean | SE | |
| Ca | 1200 | 160.00 | 1100 | 160.00 | 0.057 |
| P | 1195 | 168.00 | 1229 | 182.00 | 0.046 |
| Mg | 200 | 18.70 | 100 | 20.30 | 0.005 |
| K | 1300 | 260.00 | 1560 | 270.00 | 0.07 |
| Na | 860 | 250.00 | 559 | 270.00 | 0.061 |
| Zn | 0.83 ^b | 0.076 | 1.08 ^a | 0.082 | 0.195 |
| Ca:P ratio | 1.10 | 0.106 | 0.91 | 0.115 | 0.270 |
| Na:K ratio | 0.32 | 0.068 | 0.26 | 0.068 | 1.910 |

350

| Parameter (mg/kg) | Milk | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Cow ¹ | Goat ^{1, 2} | Sheep ^{1,4} | Llama ⁴ | Alpaca ⁵ |
| Ca | 1220 | 1800 | 2000 | | 1383 |
| P | 1190 | 1200 | 1500 | 1122 | 981 |
| Mg | 120 | 160 | 180 | 150 | 126 |
| K | 1520 | 1810 | 1360 | 1120 | 1302 |
| Na | 580 | 410 | 440 | 272 | 200 |
| Zn | 5.30 | 5.60 | 5.70 | | - |
| Ca:P ratio | 1.02 | 1.58 | 1.33 | | 1.41 |
| Na:K ratio | 0.38 | 0.23 | 0.32 | 0.24 | 0.15 |

351 †Values are expressed as least square means of the duplicate analysis (n=8x2)

352 a, b: Within a row, means without a common superscript differ at P<0.01

353 LMS: least square means; SE: standard error; SEM: standard error of the model

354 ¹ Park et al., 2007; ² Martini et al., 2010; ³ Martini et al., 2008; ⁴ Medhammar et al., 2011; ⁵ Chad et al., 2014

355

356 Table 3. Average fatty acid composition of alpaca milk at 30 and 60 days of lactation
 357 (mean \pm SE).

358

| Fatty acid (g/100g of fatty acid methyl esters) | Days of lactation | | | | SEM |
|--|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|
| | 30 | | 60 | | |
| | LMS | SE | LMS | SE | |
| C4:0 | 0.05 | 0.009 | 0.03 | 0.012 | 0.026 |
| C6:0 | 0.23 | 0.027 | 0.20 | 0.037 | 0.078 |
| C8:0 | 0.26 | 0.035 | 0.25 | 0.047 | 0.097 |
| C10:0 | 0.79 | 0.106 | 0.61 | 0.143 | 0.327 |
| C11:0 | 0.05 | 0.015 | 0.02 | 0.021 | 0.048 |
| C12:0 | 0.55 | 0.049 | 0.53 | 0.067 | 0.131 |
| C13:0 | 0.11 | 0.010 | 0.11 | 0.013 | 0.027 |
| C14:0 | 8.00 | 0.377 | 7.72 | 0.510 | 1.048 |
| C14:1 | 0.97 | 0.058 | 0.96 | 0.079 | 0.162 |
| C15:0 | 1.64 | 0.112 | 1.3 | 0.151 | 0.318 |
| C15:1 | 0.56 | 0.024 | 0.61 | 0.033 | 0.072 |
| C16:0 | 33.92 | 0.657 | 33.00 | 0.889 | 1.936 |
| C16:1 | 8.19 | 0.640 | 7.48 | 0.867 | 1.845 |
| C17:0 | 0.69 | 0.059 | 0.69 | 0.080 | 0.164 |
| C17:1 | 0.59 | 0.024 | 0.54 | 0.032 | 0.068 |
| C18:0 | 13.80 | 0.706 | 15.00 | 0.956 | 2.172 |
| C18:1 <i>trans-11</i> | 3.95 ^b | 0.303 | 4.55 ^a | 0.411 | 0.926 |
| C18:1 <i>cis-9</i> | 16.84 | 0.447 | 16.25 | 0.605 | 1.275 |
| C18:2 <i>trans-9,12</i> | 0.35 ^b | 0.045 | 0.40 ^a | 0.060 | 0.089 |
| C18:2 <i>cis-9,12</i> | 2.24 ^b | 0.139 | 2.84 ^a | 0.188 | 0.392 |
| C18:3n3 | 1.87 | 0.088 | 2.01 | 0.118 | 0.246 |
| C20:0 | 0.19 | 0.021 | 0.20 | 0.029 | 0.060 |
| C20:1 | 0.14 | 0.018 | 0.10 | 0.025 | 0.051 |
| CLA <i>cis-9trans11</i> | 1.83 | 0.119 | 1.67 | 0.161 | 0.359 |
| C21:0 | 0.20 | 0.012 | 0.23 | 0.016 | 0.034 |
| C20:2 | 0.02 | 0.003 | 0.02 | 0.004 | 0.007 |
| C20:3n3 | 0.08 | 0.013 | 0.08 | 0.018 | 0.037 |
| C20:3n6 | 0.07 | 0.007 | 0.07 | 0.009 | 0.019 |
| C22:0 | 0.18 | 0.014 | 0.22 | 0.019 | 0.039 |
| C22:1 | 0.09 | 0.009 | 0.10 | 0.013 | 0.027 |
| C20:4n6 | 0.01 | 0.002 | 0.01 | 0.003 | 0.007 |
| C23:0 | 0.13 | 0.014 | 0.12 | 0.019 | 0.039 |
| C22:2 | 0.10 | 0.013 | 0.14 | 0.017 | 0.039 |
| C20:5 | 0.03 | 0.013 | 0.04 | 0.017 | 0.035 |
| C24:0 | 0.13 | 0.014 | 0.15 | 0.019 | 0.038 |
| C24:1 | 0.04 | 0.012 | 0.06 | 0.016 | 0.034 |
| C22:5 | 0.19 | 0.019 | 0.20 | 0.026 | 0.053 |
| C22:6 | 0.03 ^b | 0.007 | 0.06 ^a | 0.009 | 0.020 |
| SCFA (\leq C10) | 1.33 | 0.152 | 0.99 | 0.206 | 0.528 |
| MCFA (\geq C11 \leq C17) | 55.70 | 0.985 | 55.76 | 1.333 | 3.832 |
| LCFA (\geq C18) | 42.93 | 1.077 | 43.86 | 1.458 | 4.199 |
| SFA | 60.93 | 0.997 | 61.10 | 1.350 | 2.808 |
| MUFA | 32.09 | 0.921 | 31.11 | 1.247 | 2.577 |
| PUFA | 6.95 | 0.246 | 7.74 | 0.333 | 0.701 |
| n6/n3 ratio | 1.28 | 0.084 | 1.47 | 0.113 | 0.237 |

359 † Values are expressed as least square means of the duplicate analysis (n=8x2)

360 A,B: Within a row, means without a common superscript differ at P<0.05

361 a,b: Within a row, means without a common superscript differ at P<0.01

362 LMS: least square means; SE: standard error; SEM: standard error of the model; SCFA: Short Chain Fatty Acids;
363 MCFA: Medium Chain Fatty Acids; LCFA: Long Chain Fatty Acids; SFA: Saturated Fatty Acids; MUFA:
364 Monounsaturated Fatty Acids; PUFA: Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids
365