

THE UTILIZATION OF *EUCALYPTUS* FOLIAGE BY THE GREATER GLIDER
(*Petauroides volans*) AND THE BRUSHTAIL POSSUM (*Trichosurus vulpecula*).

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the University of New England.

by

WILLIAM JOHN FOLEY

B. Nat. Res. Hons II(i)

The Department of Biochemistry
and Nutrition, The University
of New England, Armidale,
N.S.W., Australia

August, 1984.

PREFACE

The studies presented in this thesis were completed by the author while a postgraduate student in the Department of Biochemistry and Nutrition at the University of New England, Armidale, N.S.W., Australia. Assistance given by other persons is indicated in the text or in the list of acknowledgements. All references cited are included in a bibliography. The work is otherwise original.

* * *

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being currently submitted for any other degree. I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis and all sources used, have been acknowledged in the thesis.

AUGUST, 1984

W. J. FOLEY.

SUMMARY

The utilization of *Eucalyptus* foliage as a food source by Greater Gliders (*Petauroides volans*) and Brushtail Possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) was studied in captive animals fed diets of *E. radiata* and *E. melliodora* respectively.

The rate of passage of solute (^{51}Cr -EDTA) and particulate (^{103}Ru -Phenanthroline) digesta markers was slow in both species. The mean retention time (MRT) of the two markers was 50h and 46h in the Greater Gliders and 51h and 46h in the Brushtail Possums. The lack of separation between these two markers was consistent with the lack of selective retention of fine particles in the hindgut of the Brushtail Possum. However, fine particles occurred in greater quantities in caecal digesta of the Greater Glider (48% DM) than in the stomach (30% DM) or faeces (16% DM). The rate of passage of an alternative particle marker (^{51}Cr -mordanted large particles (<1.0mm>0.5mm)) in the Greater Gliders, was less than half that of ^{103}Ru -P. From this it was concluded that ^{103}Ru -P excretion reflected the excretion of fine digesta particles which were selectively retained in the caecum along with solute digesta.

The foliage fed to both species was relatively low in nitrogen compared with many other plant species, and although the NDF content was moderate, this fibre was highly lignified (lignin:NDF \approx 0.4-0.5). There was little seasonal variation in foliage composition. The digestibility of the fibre fraction of the leaves, although low, was similar to or higher than that found in a range of herbivores fed browse or foliage diets. Observations made of digesta fragments from the gut of both species with a scanning electron microscope showed that mesophyll and the less lignified parts of the vascular bundles were digested first. The epidermis and the more highly lignified tissues such as vessel elements proved most resistant to digestion. Bacteria were the only micro-organisms observed in the hindgut of either species, and many of these attached to plant particles by means of extracellular materials.

Both species maintained positive nitrogen balance on the foliage diets but maintenance nitrogen requirements were higher than those of other arboreal marsupials fed eucalypt diets. Greater Gliders required $0.56 \text{ g} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$ of truly digestible nitrogen while Brushtail Possums required $0.42 \text{ g N} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$. The major nitrogen loss in the Brushtails was faecal nitrogen and in particular NDFN. This was attributed to relatively low feed intakes, a low digestibility of fibre and to the lack of an effective mechanism for retaining fine particles such as bacteria in the caecum. In contrast, the high maintenance nitrogen requirement of the Greater Glider was due to the loss of more than 50% of the truly digestible nitrogen intake in the urine, principally as NH_4 . It was proposed that NH_4 was excreted to balance the urinary excretion of acidic detoxification products.

Supplementation of Brushtail Possums with polyethylene glycol (PEG) resulted in higher intakes of dry matter ($37 - 43 \text{ g} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$) metabolizable energy (ME) ($0.27 - 0.45 \text{ MJ} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$) and truly digestible nitrogen ($0.44 - 0.64 \text{ g N} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$) and higher digestibilities of neutral detergent fibre (27 - 48%). The overall dry matter digestibility of the diet was unchanged. These effects were attributed to the removal of the inhibitory effects of leaf tannins on microbial enzymes by PEG.

Although *E. radiata* contained significantly higher levels of essential oils than did *E. melliodora*, these were virtually completely absorbed in both species. Most of this oil was absorbed cranial to the hindgut and there seemed little possibility of significant interaction with the hindgut micro-organisms. Loss of terpenes during mastication occurred in Greater Gliders but was an insignificant route of loss compared to absorption from the stomach and small intestine.

The major factor limiting metabolizable energy intake in the Greater Glider was the high loss of energy in the urine. This was attributed to the excretion of essential oils and phenolic compounds, their detoxification products and nitrogen as NH_4 . The maintenance energy requirement of the Greater Glider was estimated to be $0.35 \text{ MJ} \cdot \text{kgW}^{0.75} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$. The lower intakes and digestibilities of *E. melliodora* dry matter in the

Brushtail Possum were the major reasons for the lower intake of digestible energy compared with the Greater Glider, but lower urinary energy losses meant that ME intake as a proportion of GE intake was similar in the two species.

Measurement of the concentration of short chain fatty acids (SCFA) throughout the gut confirmed that the caecum of the Greater Glider and the caecum and proximal colon of the Brushtail Possum were the principal sites of microbial activity. The rate of SCFA production *in vitro* was 33 mmol \cdot kgW^{0.75} \cdot d⁻¹ in the Greater Glider and 40 mmol \cdot kgW^{0.75} \cdot d⁻¹ in the Brushtail Possum. These rates were slow compared with most other herbivores and this was attributed to the high degree of lignification of the diets. Acetate was the principal SCFA produced in both species followed by propionate in the case of the Greater Glider and by butyrate in the case of the Brushtail Possum. SCFA production contributed 8% of the digestible energy intake (DEI) of the Greater Glider but 16% of the DEI of the Brushtail Possum.

The energy required for free existence of Greater Gliders was measured (using H³H¹⁸O) in mixed eucalypt forest in south-eastern Queensland. The field metabolic rate for males was 547 kJ \cdot kgW¹ \cdot d⁻¹. The major energy expenditure was for basal metabolism and heat increment (43%) followed by activity (26%) and thermoregulation (9%). Feed intake was estimated to be about 50g of dry matter per day. Intake of water was 87 ml \cdot kg⁻¹ \cdot d⁻¹ of which 61% came from preformed water in the leaves and 20% as oxidation water, with 16ml from sources such as dew or rainwater on leaves.

Efficient mastication and a relatively large hindgut, together with the selective retention of fine particles in the case of the Greater Glider, were important adaptations for utilizing *Eucalyptus* foliage diets. However, it seemed unlikely that either marsupial species could survive solely on these single species diets in the wild unless they were able to substantially increase their intake of easily digestible nutrients.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my supervisor, Associate Professor I.D. Hume for initially stimulating my interest in marsupial nutrition and for his guidance and advice in all stages of this study.

Greater Gliders were captured with the enthusiastic assistance of a large number of forestry workers but in particular I thank Messrs J. Brandis, J. Brandt, M. Inman, S. Sinclair, and D. Williams of the N.S.W. Forestry Commission and Mr C. Schubert of Allen Taylor Pty. Ltd. Mr and Mrs M. Ross of Ebor kindly allowed me to cut leaves from trees on their properties.

I am pleased to acknowledge the active collaboration of Dr E. Lassak (N.S.W. Department of Agriculture) and Dr J. Brophy, (University of New South Wales) in the studies described in Chapter 7 and Mr J. Kehl (Queensland Forestry Department) and Associate Professor K. Nagy (University of California, Los Angeles) in the studies described in Chapter 10.

Technical assistance was provided at various times by Mrs R. Busby, Mrs L. Jenkins, Mr J. Kent, Mr J. Lea and Ms A. Parker. Staff of the Faculty of Rural Science workshop and animal house, in particular Messrs H. Deiderick, M.E. Hope and D. Sharp. I extend my grateful thanks for the enthusiastic support of all these people. I would also like to thank the staff of the Electron Microscope Unit (Mr. M. Speak and Mr. P. Garlick) for their advice.

I am indebted to Dr S. Cork (CSIRO Wildlife and Rangelands Research), Mr M. Chilcott (University of New England), Dr D. Dellow, (DSIR Applied Biochemistry, New Zealand), Dr R. Jenness (University of Minnesota), Mr D. Tucker, (University of New England), Dr and Mrs K.

Rübsamen, (Universität Hohenheim, Federal Republic of Germany) and Dr R. White, (University of Alaska) for useful discussions and assistance when required. Dr V. Bofinger provided statistical advice whenever necessary.

I also thank all the other technical and academic staff and postgraduate students of the Department of Biochemistry and Nutrition for their help and for providing such a pleasant working environment. In particular, I thank the departmental secretaries, Mrs J. Hansford and Mrs B. Harrison for their typing skills.

I thank Ms A. Hennell for her continuing support and encouragement throughout the study. I am also grateful to my parents for their support throughout my time at university. The work was funded by a University of New England Postgraduate Research Scholarship and the Department of Social Security.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

SUMMARY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.1 <i>Eucalyptus</i> - Evolution and Life History	4
1.1.1 Distribution and leafing patterns	4
1.1.2 Evolution of <i>Eucalyptus</i>	5
1.1.3 Herbivory and <i>Eucalyptus</i>	6
1.1.4 Evolution of gliding mammals and <i>Eucalyptus</i> allelochemicals	7
1.2 Problems Faced by Arboreal Folivores	9
1.2.1 Characteristics of arboreal folivores	9
1.2.2 The problem of body size	11
1.2.3 Tree foliage as a food resource	12
1.2.4 Food choice by arboreal folivores	13
1.3 Adaptations of Arboreal Folivores	15
1.3.1 Metabolic rate	15
1.3.2 Rate of passage of digesta	17
1.3.3 Fermentation	18
1.3.4 Detoxification	21
1.3.5 Fermentation strategies and plant allelochemicals	22
1.4 <i>Eucalyptus</i> as a Food Resource	25
1.4.1 <i>Eucalyptus</i> primary nutrients	26
1.4.2 Allelochemical profile	26
1.4.2.1 Essential oils	26
1.4.2.2 Polyphenolics and tannins	28
1.4.2.3 Cyanide	31
1.4.2.4 Miscellaneous	32
1.4.2.5 Conclusion	32
1.4.3 Digestibility of eucalypt foliage	33
1.5 The Greater Glider and Brushtail Possum as Arboreal Folivores	34

1.5.1	Distribution and life history	34
1.5.2	Degree of arboreality and folivory	36
1.5.3	Structure of the digestive tract	36
1.5.4	Diet	37
1.5.5	Energetics	39
1.5.6	Response to primary nutrients	39
1.5.6.1	Early experiments	39
1.5.6.2	Rate of digesta passage	40
1.5.6.3	Nitrogen metabolism	41
1.5.6.4	Fibre digestibility	41
1.5.7	Response to allelochemicals	42
1.5.7.1	Essential oils	42
1.5.7.2	Other	43
1.6	Recapitulation	44
CHAPTER 2	GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	45
2.1	Animals	45
2.2	Animal Husbandry	45
2.2.1	Holding enclosures	45
2.2.2	Maintenance feeding	45
2.2.3	Collection of foliage	46
2.2.4	Disease and management	47
2.3	Experimental Conditions	47
2.3.1	Rooms and cages	47
2.3.2	Input/output measurements	48
2.4	Analytical	49
2.4.1	Dry matter	49
2.4.2	Ash and acid-insoluble ash	50
2.4.3	Gross energy	50
2.4.4	Nitrogen compounds	50
2.4.5	Crude lipid	51
2.4.6	Total non-structural carbohydrate	52
2.4.7	Dietary fibre	52
2.4.8	Phenolic compounds	52
2.4.9	Essential oils	53
2.5	Statistical	54
CHAPTER 3	THE RATE AND PATTERN OF DIGESTA FLOW THROUGH THE GUT OF THE GREATER GLIDER AND BRUSHTAIL POSSUM	55
3.1	Introduction	55
	PART A	
3.2	Materials and Methods	56
3.2.1	Design	56

3.2.2	Markers	57
3.2.3	Collection of faeces and urine	57
3.2.4	Analysis of markers	58
3.2.5	Statistical	58
3.2.6	Distribution of digesta particle sizes	59
3.3	Results	59
3.3.1	Marker behaviour	59
3.3.2	Marker excretion and retention times	59
3.3.3	Particle size distribution	60
3.4	Discussion	61
PART B		
3.5	Materials and Methods	65
3.5.1	Preparation of particles	65
3.5.2	Preparation of mordants	66
3.5.3	Administration of markers	66
3.5.4	Analysis	66
3.6	Results	67
3.6.1	Marker behaviour	67
3.6.2	Excretion of markers	67
3.7	Discussion	68
3.8	Mechanisms and Advantages of Selective Digesta Retention	70
3.9	Summary	73
CHAPTER 4 DIGESTION OF EUCALYPTUS FOLIAGE BY THE GREATER GLIDER AND BRUSHTAIL POSSUM		74
4.1	Introduction	74
PART A COMPOSITION OF THE DIET		
4.2	Materials and Methods	75
4.3	Results	76
4.4	Discussion	77
PART B DIGESTION OF FOLIAGE CONSTITUENTS		
4.5	Materials and Methods	79

4.6 Results	80
4.6.1 Dry matter and cell contents	80
4.6.2 Fibre digestibility	81
4.7 Discussion	82
4.7.1 Dietary bias	82
4.7.2 Intake and digestibility of dry matter and cell contents	83
4.7.3 Fibre digestibility	84
4.7.4 Lignin digestibility	87

PART C
MICROSCOPIC EVALUATION OF FOLIAGE DIGESTION

4.8 Materials and Methods	89
4.9 Results	89
4.9.1 Plant ultrastructure in intact and degraded tissues	89
4.9.2 Micro-organisms involved with degraded plant tissues	90
4.10 Discussion	91
4.11 Digestion of Eucalypt Foliage by Arboreal Marsupials	94
4.12 Summary	97

CHAPTER 5 NITROGEN AND UREA METABOLISM IN THE GREATER GLIDER AND BRUSHTAIL POSSUM	98
5.1 Introduction	98
5.2 Materials and Methods	99
5.2.1 Nitrogen intake and excretion	99
5.2.2 Urea metabolism	100
5.2.3 Composition of urinary nitrogen	101
5.2.4 Alteration of Greater Glider urinary urea:ammonia ratio	101
5.3 Results	101
5.3.1 Nitrogen intake and excretion	101
5.3.2 Non-dietary faecal nitrogen and the true digestibility of dietary nitrogen	103
5.3.3 Maintenance nitrogen requirement	103
5.3.4 Urea metabolism	104
5.3.5 Composition of urinary nitrogen	104
5.3.6 Greater Glider urinary nitrogen excretion	105
5.4 Discussion	105
5.5 Summary	113

CHAPTER 6 THE EFFECT OF TANNINS ON DIGESTION IN THE BRUSHTAIL POSSUM	114
6.1 Introduction	114
6.2 Materials and Methods	115
6.2.1 Leaf phenolics	115
6.2.2 PEG supplementation	115
6.2.3 Statistical	116
6.3 Results	117
6.3.1 Relationships between leaf phenolics and leaf intakes	117
6.3.2 Brushtail Possums: PEG supplementation	117
6.4 Discussion	119
6.5 Summary	125
CHAPTER 7 ESSENTIAL OIL METABOLISM	
7.1 Introduction	127
7.2 Materials and Methods	128
7.2.1 Experiment 1	128
7.2.2 Experiment 2	128
7.2.3 Experiment 3	128
7.2.4 Experiment 4	129
7.3 Results	129
7.3.1 Experiment 1	129
7.3.2 Experiment 2	130
7.3.3 Experiment 3	131
7.3.4 Experiment 4	131
7.4 Discussion	131
7.5 Summary	137
CHAPTER 8 ENERGY METABOLISM AND BALANCE IN THE GREATER GLIDER AND BRUSHTAIL POSSUM	139
8.1 Introduction	139
8.2 Materials and Methods	140
8.2.1 Energy intake and excretion	140
8.2.2 Heat production	140
8.2.2.1 Respirometers	140
8.2.2.2 Analysis	140
8.2.3 Fasting heat production	141
8.2.4 Energy retention	141
8.2.5 Methane production	142

8.2.6 Plant respiration	142
8.3 Results	143
8.3.1 Fasting heat production of Greater Gliders	143
8.3.2 Energy intake and excretion	143
8.3.3 Energy retention in Greater Gliders	144
8.3.4 Methane production	144
8.3.5 Plant respiration	144
8.4 Discussion	145
8.4.1 Fasting heat production	145
8.4.2 Energy intake and excretion	147
8.4.3 Energy retention in Greater Gliders	150
8.4.4 Maintenance energy requirement	153
8.5 Summary	154
CHAPTER 9 MICROBIAL DIGESTION IN THE GREATER GLIDER AND BRUSHTAIL POSSUM	155
9.1 Introduction	155
9.2 Materials and Methods	156
9.3 Results	157
9.3.1 Concentration of SCFA at different sites in the gut	157
9.3.2 SCFA production rates	157
9.4 Discussion	159
9.5 Summary	165
CHAPTER 10 ENERGY AND WATER METABOLISM IN FREE-LIVING GREATER GLIDERS	166
10.1 Introduction	166
10.2 Materials and Methods	167
10.2.1 The study area	167
10.2.2 Water turnover	167
10.2.3 Diet	168
10.2.4 Analytical	168
10.3 Results	169
10.3.1 Temperature and rainfall	169
10.3.2 Diet	169
10.3.3 Body weights and sex of captured animals	169
10.3.4 Water influx and efflux rates	170
10.3.5 CO ₂ production rates	170
10.3.6 Metabolic rates, feeding rates and water balance	170

10.4 Discussion	171
10.4.1 Validity of the doubly-labelled water method	171
10.4.2 Validity of assumptions	172
10.4.3 Field metabolic rate and energy budget	173
10.5 Summary	177
CHAPTER 11 GENERAL DISCUSSION	178
REFERENCES	185
APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

	Facing	
1.1	Composition of plant parts available to arboreal mammals.	12
3.1a	Measures of the retention of single oral doses of ^{51}Cr -EDTA and ^{103}Ru -P estimated by faecal collection in Greater Gliders.	59
3.1b	Measures of the retention of single oral doses of ^{51}Cr -EDTA and ^{103}Ru -P estimated by faecal collection in Brushtail Possums.	59
3.2a	Proportions of digesta from various gut segments of Greater Gliders retained on sieves of different sizes.	60
3.2b	Proportions of digesta from various gut segments of Brushtail Possums retained on sieves of different sizes.	60
3.3	Rate of passage of digesta markers in herbivores.	62
3.4	Summary of digesta passage studies in Brushtail Possums.	63
3.5	Measures of the retention of single oral doses of a ^{51}Cr -mordant of <i>E. radiata</i> cell walls ($\geq 0.5\text{mm}$ < 1.0mm) and ^{103}Ru -P estimated by faecal collection in Greater Gliders.	67
4.1A	Composition of <i>E. radiata</i> foliage eaten by Greater Gliders during different experiments.	76
4.1b	Composition of <i>E. melliadora</i> foliage eaten by Brushtail Possums during different experiments.	76
4.2	Variation in foliage constituents within a single <i>E. radiata</i> and a single <i>E. melliadora</i> tree.	76
4.3a	Effect of sequential extractions and sodium sulphite on the determination of cell wall constituents of <i>E. radiata</i> and Greater Glider faeces.	77
4.3b	Effect of sequential extractions and sodium sulphite on the determination of cell wall constituents of <i>E. melliadora</i> and Brushtail Possum faeces.	77
4.4	Composition of the mature foliage of diets offered to or selected by some arboreal folivores.	79
4.5	Body weight and body weight change of Greater Gliders and Brushtail Possums during feeding experiments.	79
4.6a	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of dry matter by Greater Gliders.	80

4.6b	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of dry matter by Brushtail Possums.	80
4.7a	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell contents by Greater Gliders.	80
4.7b	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell contents by Brushtail Possums.	80
4.8a	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell wall constituents of <i>E. radiata</i> foliage by Greater Gliders.	81
4.8b	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell wall constituents of <i>E. melliodora</i> foliage by Brushtail Possums.	82
4.9	Intake and digestibility of dry matter and digestibility of cell walls in marsupials fed eucalypt foliage diets.	83
4.10	Digestibility of the dry matter and fibre of foliage or browse diets by some herbivores.	85
5.1a	Intake, excretion, retention and apparent digestibility of nitrogen in Greater Gliders.	101
5.1b	Intake, excretion, retention and apparent digestibility of nitrogen in Brushtail Possums.	101
5.2a	Non-dietary faecal nitrogen (NDFN) excretion and the true digestibility of dietary nitrogen in Greater Gliders.	103
5.2b	Non-dietary faecal nitrogen (NDFN) excretion and the true digestibility of dietary nitrogen in Brushtail Possums.	103
5.3	Summary of techniques used to estimate NDFN excretion in the Greater Glider and the Brushtail Possum.	103
5.4	Kinetics of [¹⁴ C] urea in (a) Greater Gliders and (b) Brushtail Possums derived using a single injection of [¹⁴ C] urea.	104
5.5	Composition of urinary nitrogen.	105
5.6	Maintenance nitrogen requirements of several marsupial and eutherian herbivores.	105
5.7	Partitioning of nitrogen excretion in several species of herbivorous marsupials at similar levels of truly digestible nitrogen intake.	105
5.8	Non-dietary faecal nitrogen excretion in several eutherian and marsupial herbivores.	107
5.9	Parameters of urea kinetics in several marsupial and eutherian mammals fed low protein diets.	108

6.1	Content of total phenolics and leucoanthocyanidins and the astringency of methanolic extracts of <i>E. radiata</i> and <i>E. melliodora</i> foliage.	117
6.2	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of dry matter by Brushtail Possums supplemented with PEG.	117
6.3	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell contents by Brushtail Possums supplemented with PEG.	117
6.4	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of cell wall constituents by Brushtail Possums supplemented with PEG.	117
6.5	Intake, excretion and apparent digestibility of nitrogen in Brushtail Possums supplemented with PEG.	117
6.6	Intake and excretion of energy by Brushtail Possums supplemented with PEG.	117
6.7	Effect of PEG4000 on the determination of cell wall constituents of Brushtail Possum faeces.	117
6.8	Means of all feeding experiments with Brushtail Possums supplemented with or lacking PEG.	118
7.1	Yield of essential oil from the foliage and from different parts of the gut of the Greater Glider and Brushtail Possum.	129
7.2a	Major components of the steam volatile oil from <i>E. radiata</i> and the concentration in different parts of the gut of the Greater Glider.	130
7.2b	Major components of the steam volatile oil from <i>E. melliodora</i> and the concentration in different parts of the gut of the Brushtail Possum.	130
8.1	Body weight, heat production and respiratory quotients of fasted, resting, Greater Gliders.	143
8.2a	Intake and excretion of energy by Greater Gliders.	143
8.2b	Intake and excretion of energy by Brushtail Possums.	143
8.3	Energy intake, heat production and energy retention in Greater Gliders fed various levels of <i>E. radiata</i> foliage.	144
8.4	Standard metabolic rate in some arboreal mammals.	146
8.5	Digestible, metabolizable and net energy coefficients in several eutherian and marsupial herbivores.	148
8.6	Methane production in several non-domesticated herbivores.	149

9.1a	Concentration and molar proportions of SCFA in digesta from different sites in the gut of the Greater Glider.	157
9.1b	Concentration and molar proportions of SCFA in digesta from different sites in the gut of the Brushtail Possum.	157
9.2a	<i>In vitro</i> production rates of SCFA in the caecum of two Greater Gliders at each of three times of day.	158
9.2b	<i>In vitro</i> production rates of SCFA in the caecum and proximal colon of the Brushtail Possum.	158
9.3a	Weight of caecal digesta and the contribution of caecal SCFA to energy intake of Greater Gliders.	158
9.3b	Weight of digesta in the caecum and proximal colon and the contribution of digesta produced therein to energy intake in the Brushtail Possum.	158
9.4	Short chain fatty acid production in several eutherian and marsupial herbivores.	160
10.1	Diet and diet composition of Greater Gliders at Wongi, July 1982.	169
10.2	Details of body weight, water input and output rate and CO ₂ production rate of Greater Gliders at Wongi in winter.	169
10.3	Details of metabolic rate, feeding rate and water balance of Greater Gliders at Wongi in winter.	170
10.4	Effect of variation in assumed faecal and urinary energy loss on calculated gross energy intake.	172
10.5	Estimated field energy budget for male Greater Gliders at Wongi in winter.	174

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	The alimentary tract of (A) the Greater Glider and (B) the Brushtail Possum.	36
2.1	Metabolism cage and collection apparatus used in feeding experiments.	48
3.1a	Change in faecal concentration of ^{51}Cr and ^{103}Ru with time in one Greater Glider following an oral dose of ^{51}Cr -EDTA and ^{103}Ru -P.	59
3.1b	Change in faecal concentration of ^{51}Cr and ^{103}Ru with time in one Brushtail Possum following an oral dose of ^{51}Cr -EDTA and ^{103}Ru -P.	59
3.2	Relationships between body weight of Greater Gliders and (a) ^{51}Cr and (b) ^{103}Ru mean retention time.	60
3.3	(a) Cumulative faecal excretion and (b) change in faecal excretion of ^{51}Cr and ^{103}Ru with time in one Greater Glider following an oral dose of ^{51}Cr -mordanted cell walls and ^{103}Ru -P.	67
3.4	Change in faecal concentration of ^{51}Cr with time in one Greater Glider following an oral dose of ^{51}Cr -mordanted cell walls ($\leq 1.0\text{mm} \geq 0.5\text{mm}$).	67
4.1	U-V spectra of acetyl bromide-soluble lignin from (A) <i>E. radiata</i> , (B) Greater Glider faeces, (C) <i>E. melliodora</i> and (D) Brushtail Possum faeces.	78
4.2	Relationship between concentration of cell contents in the diet and apparent digestibility of cell contents by Greater Gliders.	81
4.3	Scanning electron micrographs of intact eucalypt leaf and sections from stomach contents.	89
4.4	Scanning electron micrographs of eucalypt fragments from the hindgut of the Greater Glider and the Brushtail Possum.	90
4.5	Scanning electron micrographs of eucalypt fragments from the faeces of the Greater Glider and the Brushtail Possum.	90
5.1	Relationship between nitrogen intake by Greater Gliders and (a) faecal nitrogen excretion and (b) urinary nitrogen excretion.	102

5.2	Relationship between nitrogen intake by Brushtail Possums and (a) faecal nitrogen excretion and (b) urinary nitrogen excretion.	102
5.3	Relationship between nitrogen intake and faecal nitrogen excretion in (a) Greater Gliders and (b) Brushtail Possums.	103
5.4	Relationship between dietary nitrogen intake and apparently digestible nitrogen in (a) Greater Gliders and (b) Brushtail Possums.	103
5.5	Relationship between nitrogen balance in Greater Gliders and (a) dietary nitrogen intake and (b) truly digestible nitrogen intake.	104
5.6	Relationships between nitrogen balance in Brushtail Possums and (a) dietary nitrogen intake and (b) truly digestible nitrogen intake.	104
5.7	Relationship between intake of digestible energy and nitrogen balance in (a) Greater Glider and (b) Brushtail Possums.	104
5.8	Effect of changing the diet of Greater Gliders from <i>E. radiata</i> to <i>Angophora floribunda</i> on the proportion of urinary nitrogen excreted as urea or NH_4 .	105
6.1	The effect of adding graded levels of eucalypt tannin on the optical density (578nm) of a solution of ovine blood in Tris-HCl buffer.	117
7.1a	GLC traces of steam volatile essential oils from (a) <i>E. radiata</i> foliage and (b) Greater Glider faeces.	130
7.1b	GLC traces of steam volatile essential oils from (a) <i>E. melliodora</i> foliage and (b) Brushtail Possum faeces.	130
7.2	Qualitative GLC trace of cyclohexane-soluble fraction from respired air of Greater Gliders eating <i>E. radiata</i> foliage.	131
8.1	Diagrammatic representation of a closed circuit respirometer used for measurement of heat production of Greater Gliders.	140
8.2	Relationship between \log_e body weight and \log_e fasting heat production in Greater Gliders.	143
8.3	Relationship between gross energy intake and faecal energy excretion in (a) Greater Gliders and (b) Brushtail Possums.	144
8.4	Relationship between metabolizable energy intake and energy retention in Greater Gliders.	144
8.5	Relationship between fresh weight <i>E. radiata</i> leaf and volume of CO_2 produced in respirometers.	144

- 9.1 The change in concentration with time of acetic, propionic and butyric acid during the *in vitro* incubation of caecal content of (a) one Greater Glider and (b) one Brushtail Possum. 157
- 10.1 Relationships between field CO₂ production rate in Greater Gliders and (a) body weight and (b) percentage daily body weight change. 170