

<https://doi.org/10.46344/JBINO.2025.v14i05.08>

MITIGATION STRATEGIES TO REDUCE METHANE EMISSION FROM LARGE RUMINANTS: SPECIFIC INTENTION TO DAIRY AND BEEF CATTLE

Ibrahim Mehdi

College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Department of Animal Science, Worabe University, Ethiopia; Email: ibromehdi203@gmail.com; Mob: +251920440878

Summary

Enteric methane emission is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and a loss of feed energy during production. The objective of this paper is to provide an update on current management practices and new dietary strategies recently proposed to reduce CH₄ emissions from ruminants. The existing mitigation strategies for dairy, i.e. the addition of ionophores, fats, use of high-quality forages, and increased use of grains, have been well researched and applied. These nutritional changes reduce CH₄ emissions by manipulating ruminal fermentation, directly inhibiting methanogens and protozoa, or by diverting hydrogen ions away from methanogens. Currently literature has been identified new CH₄ mitigation options. These include the addition of probiotics, acetogens, bacteriocins, archaeal viruses, organic acids, plant extracts (e.g., essential oils) to the diet as well as immunization and genetic selection of cows. These new strategies are promising, but more research is needed to validate these approaches and to assess in vivo their effectiveness in reducing CH₄ production by dairy cows. It is also important to evaluate CH₄ mitigation strategies in terms of the total greenhouse gas budget and to consider the cost associated with the various strategies. The more basic understanding of the natural differences in digestion efficiencies among animals as well as a better knowledge of methanogens and their interaction with other organisms in the rumen would enable us to exploit the potential of some of the new CH₄ mitigation strategies for dairy cattle production.

Keywords: Dairy cattle, Methane emission, Mitigation strategy, Rumen

1. Introduction

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas that contributes to a global warming. Over the past three centuries, the amount of atmospheric CH₄ has grown by 2.5 fold (Lassey, 2008). He estimated that the world's 1.3 billion cattle, 75% of which are found in developing countries, account for one-fourth of total CH₄ that arises from human activity. Most methane (CH₄) that is emitted from livestock originates in the fore-stomach called the rumen of ruminants. Only about 10% of the total CH₄ from ruminants in Canada is from manure. However, the digestion process enables ruminants to convert forages into usable energy; a portion of the feed energy (3-12%) is used to produce enteric CH₄, and is released into the atmosphere as the animal breathes. Minimizing the production of CH₄ can improve efficiency of livestock production and is an environmentally sound practice. About 25% of the enteric CH₄ produced by 16.25 million cattle in Canada, which generated by the dairy industry. The remaining 75% is produced by beef cattle, which comprise about 84% of the country's total cattle population.

Global warming and air quality concerns have focused attention on animal agriculture as one source contributing to these problems. Methane is the greenhouse gas that has received the most attention relative to emissions from animals. In 2005, the total greenhouse gas emissions in USA were 7,260Tg CO₂ equivalents (EPA, 2007). This value has increased by 16.3% from 1990 to 2005. Methane emissions were 539Tg on a CO₂ equivalents basis. This value has decreased

11.4% since 1990. Methane emissions from enteric fermentation were 112.1Tg on a CO₂ equivalent basis in 2005 versus 115.7 in 1990. This is a decrease of 3.1%. Thus, there has already been some decrease in both total and enteric fermentation methane emissions in the U.S., since 1990. Enteric methane emissions are produced in ruminant animals because of microbial degradation of carbohydrates in the rumen.

Enteric methane accounted for about 21% of the total U.S. CH₄ emissions in 2005. Methane emissions from dairy cattle represented about 25% of total enteric CH₄ emissions while beef cattle accounted for 71%. Methane emissions from all cattle in U.S. account for about 11% of the world methane emissions from cattle (Westberget.al, 2001). While carbon dioxide receives the most attention as a factor in global warming, there are other gases to consider including methane. Therefore, to combat global warming, reducing methane emissions is an attractive target. Primarily, methane has a global warming potential 21 times that of CO₂ (IPCC, 2001), and then it is broken down quite rapidly in the atmosphere within 9-15 years (FAO, 2006). Thus, a fall in methane emission would quickly result in a reduction in atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration. Methane production in digestive tract of ruminants called enteric fermentation is one of the major sources of global methane emissions.

According to FAO, 2006, report enteric methane emissions amount to almost 86 million tons of methane each year. With an extra 17.5 million tons of methane

produced from manure, livestock are responsible for 37% of anthropogenic methane with the total share of livestock in CO₂ emissions is 9%. Methane, which is produced in the rumen called enteric methane, CH₄ as part of the normal process of feed digestion. Typically, about 6-10% of the total gross energy consumed by the dairy cow is converted to CH₄, and it is released via the breath. In addition, CH₄ is a potent greenhouse gas contributes to global warming. Reducing CH₄ losses is an environmentally sound practice that can improve production efficiency (Karen *et al.*, 2008). Therefore, the aim of the review is the current management practices for mitigation and new strategies proposed to mitigate enteric CH₄ emissions from ruminants.

2. Methane Production in the Rumen

2.1. Methanogenesis

Enteric CH₄ emission is produced as a result of microbial fermentation of feed components. Methane is a colorless, odorless gas, which is produced predominantly in the rumen (87%) and to a small extent in large intestines. Rumen CH₄ is primarily emitted from the animal by eructation. The conversion of feed material to CH₄ in the rumen involves the integrated activities of different microbial species, with the final step carried out by methanogenic bacteria (Moss *et al.* 2000). Primary digestive microorganisms (bacteria, protozoa and fungi) hydrolyze proteins, starch and plant cell wall polymers into amino acids and sugars. These simple products are then fermented to volatile fatty acids (VFA), hydrogen (H₂), and CO₂ by both primary and secondary digestive

microorganisms. Acetate, propionate, and butyrate, which are the major VFA are then absorbed, and utilized by the host animal.

Even though H₂ is one of the major end products of fermentation by protozoa, fungi and bacteria, it does not accumulate in the rumen. Other bacteria mainly the methanogens, which are present in the mixed microbial ecosystem, use it. Moss *et al.* (2000), established that CH₄ production can be calculated from the stoichiometry of the main VFA formed during fermentation i.e., acetate (C-2), propionate (C-3) and butyrate (C-4) as follows: $CH_4 = 0.45C_2 - 0.275C_3 + 0.40C_4$. Thus, the molar percentage of VFA influences the production of CH₄. Acetate and butyrate production results in CH₄ production, while propionate formation serves as a competitive pathway for H₂ use in the rumen. With an increased molar proportion of propionate, the molar proportions of acetate and/or butyrate are reduced.

2.2. Methanogens

Methanogens represent a unique group of microorganisms. Methanogens in all habitats differ from almost all bacteria in cell envelope composition: there is no muramic acid in the cell wall, and the cell membrane lipids are composed of isoprenoids ether-linked to glycerol or other carbohydrates. Analyses of the nucleotide sequence of the 16S rRNA indicate their very early evolutionary divergence from all other forms of life studied so far. They have therefore been classified in a different domain named the Archae (formerly

Archaeobacteria) within the kingdom Euryarchaeota (Baker, 1999). Methanogens are nutritionally fastidious anaerobes and grow only in environments with a redox potential below -300mV (Stewart and Bryant, 1988). Most methanogens grow at neutral pH, between 6 and 8. Yet, some species can thrive in environments with pH extremes from 3-9.2 (Jones *et al.*, 1987).

Five methanogens species were reported to have been isolated in rumen as *M.ruminantium*, *M.barkeri*, *M.mazei*, *M.formicicum* and *M. mobile* (McAllister *et al.*, 1996). Only the first two have been found in the rumen at populations greater than 10^6 mL^{-1} , and are assumed to play a major role in ruminal methanogenesis. In recent years, phylogenetic analysis of Archaeal 16S rRNA genes cloned from the rumen showed that most of the organisms present differed from the cultivated species (Whitford *et al.*, 2001). It has been suggested that there may still be more methanogens not yet identified, and more will be identified as 16S rRNA analysis progresses.

Methanogens use the process of formation of CH_4 to generate energy for growth. Substrates used in the process include H_2 , CO_2 , formate, acetate, methanol, methylamines, dimethyl sulfide and some alcohols (McAllister *et al.*, 1996). In the rumen, methanogens primarily use H_2 , CO_2 and formate as substrates in methanogenesis (Jones, 1991). The unique biochemical ability of *Methanosarcina barkeri* to use methanol, methylamines, and acetate in addition to CO_2 and H_2 as substrates enables the slow

growing *Methanosarcina* organisms to flourish in ruminants fed diets containing ingredients like molasses that break down into methylamines, methanol and acetate. Only two species (*Methanosarcina* and *Methanosaeta*) are known to degrade acetate to CH_4 in the rumen (Jones, 1991).

The interaction of methanogens with other bacteria through interspecies H_2 transfer in the fermentation process allows methanogens to gain energy for their own growth, while the accumulation of H_2 and other intermediates is prevented, which benefits the growth of H_2 producing bacteria allowing further degradation of fibrous feed material (Hegarty and Gerdes, 1998). Methanogens are hydrophobic and therefore stick to feed particles as well as onto the surface of protozoa. Tokura *et al.*, (1997) observed that the number of methanogens associated with protozoa reached a maximum (10-100 times pre-feeding levels) after feeding, when the rate of fermentation is the highest. It was shown that the symbiotic relationship of methanogens and protozoa might generate 37% of rumen CH_4 emissions (Finlay *et al.*, 1994).

Although methanogens are only directly involved in the terminal stages of fermentation, they are very important because they are capable of effectively utilizing electrons in the form of H_2 to reduce CO_2 to CH_4 , thereby maintaining low H_2 pressure in the rumen. Thus, in their absence, organic matter could not be degraded as effectively in the gut (McAllister *et al.* 1996). However, since CH_4 has no nutritional value to the animal, its

production represents a loss of dietary energy to the animal. In general, CH₄ production in cattle constitutes about 2-12% of dietary GEI (Johnson and Johnson, 1995). Reduction in CH₄ production can result from a decreased extent of fermentation in the rumen or from a shift in

the VFA pattern towards more propionate and less acetate. Tamminga, (1992) noted that if decreased feed ruminal degradation is compensated for by an increased digestion in the small intestine instead of in the hindgut, it could be considered an advantage for the animal.




Fig. 1. The formation of methane in the rumen

2.3. Estimation of Enteric Methane Emission

The CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation for Canadian cattle are estimated by multiplying the population of various classes of animals by average emission factors derived for each type of domestic animal, which are set by the guidelines of IPCC (Neitzert *et al.*, 1999). The IPCC CH₄ emission values are based upon prediction equations and models, which are themselves based on the following relationship between CH₄ production, feed intake and digestibility (Blaxter and Clapperton, 1965)

$$\text{CH}_4 (\% \text{ of GEI}) = 1.3 + 0.112 D + L (2.37 - 0.05D)$$

Where

GEI = gross energy intake,

L = level of feed intake

D = dry matter digestibility.

The prediction equation was developed from respiration calorimetry chamber

experiments using mainly sheep, and is best suited for estimating CH₄ emissions when feed types and feeding levels are the same as those used to develop the model. The equation above predicts emission loss in the range of 5-8% of GEI. However, observed CH₄ emissions from a wide range of feeds and animals varied from 2-12% of GEI (Johnson and Johnson, 1995). Using an extensive database ($n=452$), Johnson and Johnson, (1995) showed that the ability of the Blaxter and Clapperton's equation to predict CH₄ emissions was weak. As the relationship between the predicted and observed CH₄ emissions was very poor ($r^2=0.23$). The literature also provides evidence that enteric fermentation can vary widely depending on factors such as the type of the animal, the amount and type of feed, environment and addition of dietary fat, feed additives and body weight of animal

(Moss *et al.*, 2000). Therefore, IPCC data, (1994) may over or under estimate emissions produced by Canadian cattle production systems where animals are under different feeding and environmental conditions from those under which IPCC data were derived.

3. Measurement of Methane Emission from Dairy Cattle

Different methods used to measure CH₄ from animals have been reported in the literature. These include use of respiration Calorimetry chambers (Murray *et al.*, 1999), isotopic techniques (France *et al.*, 1993), tracer techniques [SF₆], (Boadi and Wittenberg, 2002), and mass balance or micrometeorological techniques (Harper *et al.*, 1999). Equations for predicting CH₄ emissions were developed mostly from data using the respiration Calorimetry chamber to define the relationship between energy intake and CH₄ production, and are based mainly on the diet characteristics. The environment inside the respiration chamber is controlled and animals are under feed restriction during measurement. Therefore, data from the chamber cannot be applied under every farm situation, especially where animals are grazing and pasture quality is changing. Dynamic and mechanistic models to predict CH₄ from ruminants have also been established to simulate ruminal fermentation under a variety of nutritional conditions (Mills *et al.*, 2001).

Benchaaret *et al.*, (1998) showed that mechanistic models allow the prediction of CH₄ production more accurately than simple regression equations under a large variation of diet composition. Regression

analysis showed good agreement between observed and predicted results by modeling experimental data taken from the literature ($r^2=0.76$, root mean square prediction error=15.4%; Mills *et al.*, 2001). Although these models have usefulness in the prediction of CH₄ production from animals under the conditions from which the equations or models are developed, they are of limited use in the prediction of CH₄ production when intake is unknown or when the rumen is disturbed (Johnson *et al.*, 2001). Recent studies have been directed towards measurement of enteric CH₄ emissions under typical farm conditions in order to reflect existing feeding and management conditions. The variations can be seen in CH₄ emission measurements and efficiency of CH₄ production (lkg⁻¹ milk). These can be attributed to differences in diet quality and quantities fed, animal body weight, level of milk production and differences in methods used for estimating CH₄ emissions in each study.

4. Strategies for Reducing Methane Emissions from Dairy Cows

Environment Canada as part of the national greenhouse gas inventory (EC, 2008) calculates the enteric CH₄ emissions produced by the dairy sector annually. The calculation estimates gross energy intake of individual animals, applies a 6.5% CH₄ conversion rate (fraction of gross energy intake converted to CH₄), and then sums the daily emissions by animal category (lactating cows, replacement heifers, calves). Using this method of calculation, CH₄ reduction can be achieved either by reducing cow numbers or by reducing the

conversion of feed to CH₄ in the rumen. The Canadian dairy industry has decreased its CH₄ emissions by about 24% since 1990 because cow numbers have declined because of increased milk production per cow. Since, the increases in cow productivity have been accompanied by a decrease in cow numbers. Increasing animal productivity only reduces emissions if product output is capped (through supply management) because increased productivity increases CH₄ emissions per cow (due to increased feed intake).

Further reductions in CH₄ emissions from dairy cows can also occur by reducing the conversion of feed to CH₄ in the rumen (CH₄ conversion rate). Various research groups around the world are exploring the potential of strategically using feed ingredients and supplemental feed additives as a means of reducing conversion rates (Beauchemin *et al.*, 2008). In addition, non-dietary approaches are being examined including vaccination, biological controls (bacteriophage, bacteriocins), chemical inhibitors that directly target methanogens, and promotion of acetogenic populations in the rumen to lower the supply of metabolic hydrogen to methanogens (McAllister and

Newbold, 2008). While a number of ways of reducing CH₄ have been proposed that, they must meet the following criteria before being adopted on-farm: documented effectiveness in reducing emissions, profitable (or at least revenue neutral), and feasible to implement on-farm. In most cases, there is a lack of information for dairy producers to properly evaluate profitability of the mitigation strategies proposed.

4.1. Nutritional Strategies that Reduces Enteric CH₄ Production

Diet modifications reduce CH₄ emissions by decreasing the fermentation of feed in the rumen, shifting the site of digestion from the rumen to the intestines, diverting hydrogen away from CH₄ production during ruminal fermentation, or by inhibiting the formation of CH₄ by rumen bacteria. The strategies in the table below have varying degrees of uncertainty associated with their estimated reduction in CH₄. A brief discussion of these strategies follows, but a more complete review of the impact of diet on CH₄ production can be found elsewhere (McAllister and Newbold, 2008). In addition, various models have been developed to predict CH₄ emissions based on diet composition (Pelchen and Peters, 1998).

Table 1. Dietary strategies that reduce enteric CH₄ production

Strategies	Reduction in CH ₄		Comments
<i>Strategies with higher certainty of reducing CH₄ production</i>			
Fats and oil seeds	5-25	Level dependent	
Ionophores	0-10	Dose dependent, response may decline after several months	
Higher grain diets	5-20	Level dependent, increase the risks of acidosis	
Replacing barely with corn	0-7	Depend on grain processing	
Use of cereal and corn silages	5-10	Depend on grain content of silage	
Use of legumes	5-10	Response often confounded with stage of maturity	
Tannin containing forages	10-20	High potential but production often limited by agronomics	
<i>Strategies that are experimental</i>			
Condensed tannin extracts	0-15	Depend on source, high level decrease milk production	
Saponine	0-10	Depend on source	
	0-5	Depend on strain, commercial strain have not been tested for their effectiveness	
Essential oils	0-20	Promising results with garlic but further testing needed	
Fiber depending enzyme	0-10	Commercial products have not been tested for their effectiveness	

4.2. Feeding Fats and Oilseeds

Adding fats to the diet reduces CH₄ emissions by decreasing organic matter fermentation in the rumen, reducing the activity of methanogens and protozoal numbers and lipids rich in unsaturated fatty acids, through hydrogenation of fatty acids (Johnson and Johnson, 1995). The effectiveness of adding lipids to the diet to reduce CH₄ emissions depends on many factors including level of supplementation, fat source, fatty acid profile, form in which the fat is administered (i.e., either as refined oil or as full-fat oilseeds) and the type of diet. However, level of added fat is by far the most important factor. (Beauchemin *et al.*, 2008). Over a broad range of conditions, CH₄ (g/kg DMI) was reduced by 5.6% with each 1% addition of

supplemental fat. In most cases, 2-3% fat can be added to dairy cow diets without negative effects. The total amount of fat in the diet (added fat plus fat in the basal diet) should not exceed 6-7% of the diet otherwise, a depression in DMI may occur, negating the advantages of increased energy density of the diet.

There is considerable variation in CH₄ reductions observed among fat sources. Higher reductions can be achieved with fats that contain medium chain fatty acids (i.e., C12:0 and C14:0). Examples of these types of oils are: coconut oil, myristic acid, palm kernel oil, high-laurate canola oil, and some genetically modified canola oils. Sources of long-chain fatty acids that can be effective CH₄ suppressants include animal fats, oilseeds, and refined oils. Pure

oils are more effective against CH₄ than the same amount of lipid supplied via crushed oilseeds, but oilseeds are preferred because they have less adverse sideeffects on feed intake and fiber digestibility. Fats increase the energy density of the diet, which can improve cow productivity in some situations. However, high levels of added fat can reduce feed intake, fiber digestibility and milk fat percentage so care must be taken in choosing the appropriate level of supplementation.

4.3. Use of Ionophores

Ionophores such as monensin are antimicrobials typically used in dairy cattle diets to improve feed efficiency. Monensin decreases the proportion of acetate and increases the proportion of propionate in the rumen an effect that decreases CH₄ output. At times, monensin may also lower rumen protozoal numbers. This is important, as a direct relationship exists between rumen protozoal numbers and CH₄ formation in the rumen. Rumen protozoa are estimated to provide a habitat for up to 20% of ruminal methanogens while methanogens living on and within protozoa are thought to be responsible for about a third of the CH₄ emissions from ruminants.

The effect of monensin on lowering CH₄ production appears to be dosedependent. In recent studies, providing a dose of 10-15ppm had no effect on CH₄ production (g/d or g/kg DMI) in dairy cows (Waghorn *et al.*, 2008), while a dose of 15-20ppm either had no effect on CH₄ production or reduced total CH₄ but not CH₄ per kg of DMI in dairy

cows (VanVugtet *et al.*, 2005). The higher the doses (24-35ppm) fed to the dairy cows reduced the CH₄ production (g/d by 4-13% and g/kg DMI by 0-10% in beef cattle and dairy cows, respectively in North America (Odongo *et al.*, 2007). While this with the short-term decreases in CH₄ of up to 30% being reported in beef cattle when 33ppm of monensin was included in high or low forage diets (Guan *et al.*, 2006). Unfortunately, the inhibitory effects of ionophores on CH₄ production may not persist over time Guan *et al.* (2006) recently reported that monensin (33mg/kg) lowered CH₄ emissions in beef cattle by up to 30%, but levels were restored within 2 months. In that study, the effect of ionophores on CH₄ production was related to protozoal populations, which adapted to ionophores over time. In contrast, Odongo *et al.* (2007) provide evidence that adaptation to ionophores may not always occur; in their study monensin lowered CH₄ production in dairy cows over a 6-month period.

4.4. Feeding Higher Concentrate Diets

Increasing the grain content of total mixed rations (TMR) lowers the proportion of feed energy converted to CH₄ by decreasing the acetate: propionate ratio in the rumen fluid. Furthermore, methanogens are susceptible to the low pH conditions in the rumen that result from feeding high grain diets. However, the potential of using concentrates to lower CH₄ emissions from the dairy sector is limited because the increased incidence of rumen acidosis jeopardizes cow health and reduces milk fat content.

4.5. Forage-Related Strategies

Several forage-related strategies that reduce CH₄ emissions have been identified, but the CH₄ response to implementing these strategies can be variable as many interacting factors can arise. In general, replacing grass and legume forages with corn silage and whole crop small grain silages reduces CH₄ emissions because grain silages favor the production of propionate rather than acetate in the rumen. Improved forage quality typically results in greater CH₄ output per day because high-quality forages have a faster passage rate from the rumen, which leads to greater feed intake and more fermentable substrate in the rumen. The result is greater daily enteric CH₄ production per day. However, the amount of CH₄ produced per unit of energy consumed or kg⁻¹ of milk typically decreases as the quality of forages increases. Feeding legumes compared to grasses tends to reduce CH₄ but this relationship is also influenced by the maturity of the forage at the time of consumption. Legumes produce less CH₄ because they have lower NDF content and pass more quickly through the rumen.

4.5.Feed Additives

4.5.1.Condensed tannin extracts

Condensed tannins are phenolic compounds extracted from the bark of black wattle trees (*Acacia mearnsi*; grown in South Africa) and Quebracho-Colorado trees (grown in South America). Adding *Acacia* tannin extract powder to the diet of sheep at a rate of 2.5% of DMI decreased enteric CH₄ by about 12% with only a marginal decrease in fibre digestion (Carulla et al. 2005). However, Australian

researchers used this same source of tannin extract in a dairy cow study and observed negative effects on milk production (Grainger et al., unpublished). In that study, the extract was mixed with water and provided to the cows twice daily as a drench at 1.5 and 3.0% of DMI. Within a few days, cows receiving the high dose dropped sharply in milk production (4 kg/d) and showed signs of ill health.

Consequently, the high rate was reduced to 2.25% of DMI for the remainder of the study. Averaged over the 5-week experiment, the low and high tannin levels reduced CH₄ emissions by 16 and 28%. However, the reduction in CH₄ was accompanied by a drop in the digestibility of the feed and a negative effect on milk yield (4.9 and 9.7% reduction in milk yield for the low and high tannin levels, respectively) and fat and protein yield (8 and 11% reductions in milk solids for the low and high tannin levels). At the Lethbridge Research Centre, we supplemented the diet of growing beef cattle with up to 1.8% condensed tannin extracted from Quebracho-Colorado trees and observed no effects on enteric CH₄ or digestibility of the dietary DM (Beauchemin et al. 2007).

These studies show that tannins hold some promise in terms of CH₄ abatement, but the source and optimum level of tannin need considerable refinement to ensure CH₄ is lowered without negatively affecting milk production. Tannins have an additional advantage in that they are also highly reactive with protein and can affect the partitioning of nitrogen within the cow shifting the route of excretion away from urine towards feces. Reduced urinary

nitrogen excretion would result in reduced environmental losses through nitrate leaching, ammonia volatilization and nitrous oxide emissions.

4.5.2. Yeast

Yeast cultures of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* are widely used in ruminant diets to improve rumen function and milk production. Commercial products vary in the strain of yeast used and the number and viability of yeast cells present. Laboratory studies suggest that some live yeast strains can stimulate the use of hydrogen by acetogenic strains of ruminal bacteria, thereby enhancing the formation of acetate and decreasing the formation of CH₄ in the rumen. However, we conducted a study with growing beef cattle to evaluate two commercial yeast products, as commercial strains have not been selected for their effects on CH₄ (McGinnis *et al.* 2004). One product caused a 3% decrease in CH₄ production (g/g DMI) while the other product increased CH₄ production (g/g DMI) by 8%. These results indicate that while it may be possible to select

strains of yeast based on their anti-methanogenic effects, the commercially available strains of yeast likely have only minor, if any effects on CH₄. Because yeast products are modestly priced and used widely in ruminant production, acceptance of a CH₄-reducing yeast product would likely be high. However, considerable research and development would be needed to deliver such product to the marketplace. To date, commercial manufacturers have been reluctant to invest in such products because animal

performance rather than CH₄ abatement is the primary driver for product development.

4.5.3 Enzymes

Enzyme additives are concentrated fermentation products that contain fiber-digesting enzymes (cellulases, hemicellulases). The focus to date has been on developing enzyme additives that improve fiber digestion (Beauchemin *et al.* 2003), but it may also be possible to develop enzyme additives that reduce CH₄ emissions. In a recent *in vitro* study in their lab, one particular enzyme candidate increased fiber degradation of corn silage by 58%, with 28% less CH₄ produced per unit of fiber degraded (Beauchemin *et al.* unpublished). Furthermore, feeding dairy cows a diet containing corn silage with added enzyme reduced CH₄ production (g/g DMI) by 9%. Enzymes that improve fiber degradation typically decrease the acetate: propionate ratio in rumen fluid (Eun and Beauchemin, 2007), which is thought to be the primary mechanism whereby enzymes decrease CH₄ production. The potential of enzyme additives for CH₄ abatement warrants further research, because enzymes are likely to have positive effects both on milk production and on CH₄ abatement.

4.5.4. Defaunation

Defaunation, which is the elimination of protozoa from the rumen by dietary or chemical agents, has been shown to reduce ruminal CH₄ production by about 20 to 50% depending on the diet composition (Van Soest and Demeyer 1996). Whitelaw *et al.* (1984) observed that faunated cattle fed barley diets at

restricted levels lost about 12% of GEI as CH₄ compared to 6–8% of GEI in ciliate-free animals. Protozoa in the rumen are associated with a high proportion of H₂ production, and are closely associated with methanogens by providing a habitat for up to 20% of rumen methanogens (Newbold et al. 1995). Finlay et al. (1994) reported that protozoa could account for 37% of the total CH₄ production. It is assumed that there is a symbiotic H₂ transfer between anaerobic protozoa and methanogens (Ushida and Jouany 1996).

The reduced ruminal methanogenesis observed with defaunation can be attributed to factors such as a shift of digestion from the rumen to the hind gut (Van Nevel and Demeyer, 1996) or the loss of methanogens associated with protozoa during defaunation (Hegarty, 1999). It has been shown that defaunation may depress fiber digestion, thus complete elimination of protozoa (rather than selective defaunation) is not recommended as a method for reducing CH₄ (Itabashi 2001). On the other hand, protozoa have been reported to negatively affect ruminal protein metabolism through predation of bacteria, which reduces the flow of microbial protein leaving the rumen (Koenig et al. 2000).

Therefore, the use of defaunation to mitigate CH₄ production from ruminants should be weighed against its possible impact on the efficiency of the whole ruminal system. Defaunating agents or protozoal inhibitors are not currently available for commercial or practical use as many of the defaunating agents are toxic to the animal. The control of protozoa

is unlikely to lead to H₂ accumulation or inhibition of fermentation; therefore, it represents a promising method of CH₄ reduction. Further work is needed in this area to develop commercial means of controlling rumen protozoa (Klieve and Hegarty, 1999).

5. New Potential Mitigation Options

5.1. Probiotics

There is very little information on the effects of probiotics on CH₄ production in dairy cattle. The effects of the most widely used microbial feed additives, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae*, on rumen fermentation were earlier studied in vitro (Mutsvangwaet et al. 1992). *Aspergillus oryzae* was shown to reduce CH₄ by 50% as a result of a reduction in the protozoal population (Frumholtz et al. 1989). The addition of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* reduced CH₄ by 10% in vitro, but was not sustained over a long period (Mutsvangwaet et al. 1992). It has been shown that yeast culture influenced microbial metabolism and improved DMI, fiber digestion, and milk production in lactating cattle (Dannet et al. 2000).

However, the specific mode of action is still unknown. It has been proposed that probiotics provide nutrients, including metabolic intermediates and vitamins that stimulate the growth of ruminal bacteria, resulting in increased bacterial population (Newbold et al. 1996). Another theory indicates that probiotics stimulate lactic-acid-utilizing bacteria, resulting in a reduction of lactic acid and a more stable ruminal environment. A less acidic ruminal environment favors the growth of cellulolytic bacteria, which in turn improves

fiber digestion, feed intake, and production response (Yoon and Stern 1996).

Miller-Webster et al. (2002) recently showed that the inclusion of yeast culture products in a continuous culture system increased DM digestion and propionic acid production whereas it reduced acetic acid production and protein digestion compared with the control. Eunet al., (2003) reported that brewer's yeast culture enhanced the activity of bacteria that convert H₂ to acetate and decreased CH₄ output by 25% in a continuous culture of ruminal microorganisms. In a previous study, Chiquette and Benchaar, (1998) reported no effect on molar proportions of ruminal VFA when a mixture of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae* was added to the diet of dairy heifers. The effects of probiotics on fermentation pattern are not consistent across experiments and between strains of yeast (Newbold et al., 1995). Doreau and Jouany, (1998) found no effect of *S. cerevisiae* on fermentation in lactating dairy cows, while Takahashi et al., (1997) observed that a probiotic preparation significantly increased (+18%) CH₄ production in sheep. Producers are skeptical about the benefits of probiotics and there is a need to identify the dietary and management situations in which probiotics can give consistent production benefits as well as the added effect of reducing CH₄ emissions (Moss et al. 2000).

5.2. Bacteriocins

Direct suppression of methanogens may be possible through stimulation of natural

or introduced ruminal organisms to produce bacteriocins as a means of biological control (Klieve and Hegarty, 1999). Bacteriocins are bacteriocidal compounds that are peptide or protein in nature, and are produced by bacteria. However, little information is available concerning their effect on methanogenesis. They often display a high degree of target organism specificity, although many have a very wide spectrum of activity (Kalmokoff et al. 1996). Nisin, an exogenous bacteriocin produced by *Lactococcus lactis*, is the best studied and understood bacteriocin. It has similar actions to monensin and is widely used in the food industry as a preservative in controlling food borne pathogens (Lee et al. 2002). In vitro, nisin stimulated propionate production, increased the ratio of propionate to acetate and reduced methanogenesis by 36% (Callaway et al. 1997).

However, recent work indicated that some ruminal bacteria become nisin-resistant (Mantovani and Russell, 2001) and an in vivo feeding trial indicated that nisin could not decrease the acetate: propionate ratio as observed with cattle consuming the same amount of monensin (350 mg d⁻¹) (Russell and Mantovani, 2002). This suggests that nisin was either being degraded or the bacteria were becoming nisin-resistant. The HC5 bovicin bacteriocin from *Streptococcus bovis* (*S. bovis*) has also been shown to inhibit CH₄ by as much as 50% (Lee et al., 2002). Although exogenous bacteriocins may be safe and can be incorporated into feed, a limitation may be the degree of stability of these peptides in

the ruminal environment, as rapid degradation by proteolytic enzymes could reduce their effectiveness (Klieve and Hegarty, 1999).

Endogenous bacteriocins have been identified in the rumen (Teather and Forster, 1998). A survey of 50 strains of *Butyrivibriospp.* isolated from a variety of sources (sheep, deer and cattle) for bacteriocin production indicated a high incidence of bacteriocin-like activity (50%) (Kalmokoff *et al.*, 1996). Although the potential for ruminally-produced bacteriocins to suppress methanogens is unknown, their potential to improve ruminant production and modify microbial populations has been suggested by Teather and Forster, (1998). Bacteriocins may therefore provide an alternative to ionophore antibiotics for manipulation of ruminal microbial populations. They have advantages over other antibiotics in terms of target specificity, broad spectrum of activity, and possibility of genetic transfer and manipulation into other organisms (Kalmokoff *et al.* 1996).

Bacteriocins could possibly be delivered as microbial inoculants for in situ production of the bacteriocin in the rumen or in silage (Kalmokoff *et al.*, 1996). Given the fact that *S. bovis* produces a very potent bacteriocin (bovicin HC5), which reduces methanogenesis (Lee *et al.*, 2002) silage fermentation can be a vehicle for delivering bacteriocins to the rumen (Kalmokoff *et al.* 1996). Controlled colonization of the rumen by genetically engineered ruminal bacteria is a great challenge (Teather and Forster, 1998). In addition, there is a need to develop rapid

and accurate techniques to characterize the existing ruminal populations in terms of bacteriocin production and resistance. Efforts are under way to clone bacteriocin genes and develop DNA probes for the detection of these genes in rumen samples (Teather and Forster, 1998). Currently, the genomes of several lactic acid bacteria that produce bacteriocins have been sequenced (Koningset *al.* 2000). These organisms have found wide application in the manufacturing of fermented foods and drug industry. Recent progress has been made in the construction of genetically modified lactic acid bacteria used in food products (Koningset *al.* 2000). It can be concluded that bacteriocins have the potential to reduce CH₄ production, but further studies in vivo are needed to establish their adaptability and long-term effectiveness as a feed additive.

5.3.Immunization

In past 3 years, researchers in Australia have vaccinated sheep with a number of experimental vaccine preparations against methanogens, so that animals produce antibodies to methanogens (<http://www.csiro.au>). Methane production was reduced between 11 and 23% in vaccinated animals and productivity was improved. No long- or short-term adverse effects on sheep were found. Researchers anticipate that commercial vaccines will allow a 3% gain in animal productivity and a 20% reduction in CH₄ production (<http://www.csiro.au>). It is important to note that the vaccines currently under development are based on cultivable methanogens. However, the work of Whitford *et al.* (2001) showed that

most ruminal methanogens have not yet been cultivated. Hegarty, (2001) noted that vaccine preparations are likely to work on some methanogens and not on others; thus, monitoring and assessment of efficacy will be required for novel control measures such as vaccines.

5.4.Reductive Acetogenesis

A technology that may hold some promise in the long-term of diverting electrons from methanogens is the production of acetic acid by acetogens (Joblin, 1999). In the gut of termites and rodents, acetogens convert excess H_2 to acetic acid, which is then utilized by the host (Joblin, 1999). However, in the rumen, acetogens are few and cannot compete effectively with methanogens for H_2 ions, because they have a lower affinity for H_2 than methanogens (Nollet *et al.*, 1998). Carbon flux studies in the rumen of sheep revealed that rumen acetogenesis occurs in first 24hrs after birth, but is subsequently displaced by methanogenesis (Morvan *et al.*, 1994); methanogens easily out-compete the acetogens for the low concentration of H_2 normally encountered in the rumen (Joblin, 1999). Thus, methanogens have to be inhibited to allow H_2 pressure to rise before acetogenesis can be significant as an alternate H_2 sink in the rumen. Increasing the populations of acetogens through exogenous inoculations into the rumen could be useful for competing against methanogens (Joblin, 1999). However, previous attempts at inducing acetic acid by inoculation with acetogens were not successful (Nollet *et al.* 1998).

5.5.Methane Oxidizers

CH_4 oxidizing bacteria have been isolated from different environments, including the rumen (Moss *et al.*, 2000). In vitro studies with stable carbon isotopes suggest that the extent of CH_4 oxidation to CO_2 is quantitatively minor (0.3-8%) in the rumen (Kajikawa and Newbold, 2000). Valdez *et al.*, (1996) isolated a CH_4 oxidizing bacterium from the gut of young pigs, which decreased CH_4 accumulation when added to rumen fluid in vitro. However, this approach has not been validated in vivo. In the long-term, CH_4 oxidizers from gut sources could be screened for their activity in the rumen to reduce the proportion of ruminal gas in the form of CH_4 .

5.6.Propionate Enhancers

Because of the growing awareness of the threat of microbial resistance to antibiotics, there is an increasing interest in alternatives to antibiotics as growth promoters (Moss *et al.*, 2000). Dicarboxylic acids such as fumaric and malic acids have been studied in vitro as feed additives in ruminant diets (Asanuma *et al.*, 1999). Fumaric acid is an intermediate in the propionic acid pathway, in which it is reduced to succinic acid. In this reaction, H_2 ions are needed and therefore reducing fumaric acid may provide an alternative electron sink for H_2 . It was found that the addition of up to 500 mol of sodium fumarate in vitro decreased CH_4 production by 6% and increased DM digestibility of the basal diet by 6% after 48 h incubation (Lopez *et al.* 1999).

Asanuma *et al.*, (1999), showed that the addition of 20mM of fumarate to cultures that were fermenting hay powder and concentrate incubated for 6hrs

significantly decreased CH₄ production by 5% and increased propionate production by 56%, while with the addition of 30mM of fumarate, CH₄ declined by 11%, and propionate production increased by 58% compared to the control. Their data suggested that most of the fumarate consumed was metabolized to propionate with little production of acetate and succinate, whereas a much larger amount of succinate accumulated with the addition of 30 mM of fumarate. However, when incubation time was prolonged to 12 hrs, most of the succinate was metabolized to propionate.

There is little information available on the actual effects of fumaric acid on fermentation and animal performance in vivo. Isobe and Shibata, (1993) observed that the proportion of acetic acid and propionic acid increased following the addition of fumaric acid whereas the proportion of the higher acids decreased. The effects of salinomycin (15ppm) plus fumaric acid (2%) supplemented to diets of Holstein steers increased the molar proportion of propionic acid and decreased CH₄ production (lkgDMI⁻¹) by 16% and had no effect on DM digestibility (Itabashi *et al.* 2000). Bayaruet *al.*, (2001) found that CH₄ production was reduced by 23% when fumaric acid added to sorghum silage was fed to Holstein steers.

The authors observed that the addition of fumaric acid increased propionic acid formation and had no effect on DM digestibility. Fumaric acid was also shown to increase concentration of plasma glucose and milk protein synthesis in dairy

cows due to an increase in propionic acid production (Itabashi, 2001). The authors concluded that fumaric acid may be put to practical use for ruminant diets since it has the dual benefit of decreasing CH₄ production and increasing net energy retention. Malate, which is converted to propionate via fumarate, also increased propionate production and inhibited CH₄ production in vitro (Martin *et al.*, 1999). However, malate failed to increase ruminal propionate concentrations in feedlot cattle and did not affect CH₄ production (Montano *et al.*, 1999) although it stimulated daily gains in steers (Martin *et al.*, 1999). There is a need for further testing and evaluation of these enhancers in vivo to assess their potential as feed additives in the industry.

5.7. Essential Oils

There is an increasing interest in exploiting natural products as feed additives to manipulate enteric fermentation and possibly reduce CH₄ emissions from livestock production (Wenk, 2003). Essential oils are a group of plant secondary compounds that hold promise as natural additives for ruminants (Wallace *et al.*, 2002). Essential oils are any of a class of steam volatile oils or organic-solvent extracts of plants possessing the odor and other characteristic properties of the plant (antimicrobial), used chiefly in the manufacture of perfumes, flavors, food preservatives, and pharmaceuticals (Wenk, 2003). Essential oils are present in many plants and may play a protective role against bacterial, fungal, or insect attack. The antimicrobial activity of essential oils can be attributed to a

number of small terpenoids and phenolic compounds, e.g. monoterpenes, limonene, thymol, carvacrol (Wallace *et al.* 2002). The specific mode of action of essential oil constituents remains poorly characterized or understood (Helander *et al.*, 1998).

The antimicrobial properties of essential oils have been shown through in vitro and in vivo studies to inhibit a number of bacteria and yeasts and to control fermentation gases, VFA, livestock waste odors and human pathogenic bacteria such as *Escherichia coli* 0157:H7, *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Salmonella* sp. (Wallace *et al.*, 2002). For the purposes of controlling ruminal fermentation and CH₄ production, Lee and Ha, (2002), examined the effect of adding 0, 1 and 10% essential oil to 0.5 g of ground tall fescue and concentrate in the ratio of 2:8 or 8:2 on in vitro gas production and fermentation. The authors showed that supplementing 10% of essential oil increased ruminal pH and lowered NH₃-N, VFA concentration and cumulative CH₄ production over 48hrs of incubation, when compared with the 0 or 1% levels. There was no effect on CH₄ production following the addition of 1% essential oil to both substrates (Lee and Ha, 2002).

Broudiscouet *al.* (2000) screened 13 plant extracts for their action on fermentation in vitro and observed that protozoa numbers were little affected. On the other hand, methanogenesis decreased by 8.2% with *Salvia officinalis* and by 14.2% with *Equisetum arvense*, while it increased by 13.7% with *Lavandula officinalis* and 7.7% with *Solidago virgaurea*, indicative of diverse modes of action among plant extracts. When sheep diets (60:40

silage:concentrate) were supplemented with 100mg of essential oils head⁻¹d⁻¹, Wallace *et al.* (2002) reported no effects on ruminal concentration of VFA and protozoa numbers. Recently, Benchaaref *al.* (2003) did not observe any effects of dietary addition of essential oils on VFA concentrations, acetate:propionate ratio or rumen microbial counts in lactating cows. The potential of essential oils for modulating ruminal function on a long-term basis has not been evaluated. It is also important to know the most effective level of inclusion of essential oils in the diet, as well as the possible adaptation of ruminal microorganisms to this feed additive.

5.8. Genetic Selection

Robertson and Waghorn, (2002) observed that Dutch/US cross Holstein cows produced 8-11% less CH₄ (GEI%) than New-Zealand Friesian cows for about 150d post calving, either when grazing or receiving a TMR. Hegarty, (2001) noted that the natural variation among animals in the quantity of feed eaten per unit of liveweight gain could be exploited to breed animals that consume less feed than the unselected population while achieving a desired rate of growth. Accordingly, to exploit such traits, the concept of Residual (Net) Feed Intake (RFI) was developed and used (Basarab *et al.* 2003). The RFI is moderately heritable ($h^2=0.39$), and is independent of the rate of gain (Arthur *et al.* 2001). Okine *et al.* (2002) calculated annual CH₄ emissions from Canadian high NFE steers to be 21% lower than that for low NFE steers. Accordingly the selection for high NFE in beef cattle also decreased

manure N, P, K output due to a reduction in daily feed intake and more efficient use of feed, without any compromise in growth performance. The mean retention time of digesta has also been shown to be selectable among animals (Hegarty, 2001). Selecting animals for a faster passage rate of feed from the rumen would reduce CH₄ emissions per unit of food ingested. Faster passage rate of feed also affects propionate and microbial yield; thus, selection of animals for this would also have major production benefits. Selecting animals with high NFE offers an opportunity to reduce daily CH₄ emissions without reducing livestock numbers.

6. Conclusion

Mitigation of CH₄ emissions can be effectively achieved by strategies that improve the efficiency of animal production, reduce feed fermented per unit of product or change the fermentation pattern in the rumen. Many current and potential mitigation strategies have been evaluated, but not all of them can be applied at the farm level and in many cases, the potential negative effects and associated costs have not been fully researched. Strategies that are cost effective, improve productivity, and have no potential negative effects on livestock production hold a greater chance of being adopted by producers.

7. References

Arthur, P.F., Renand, G. and D. Krauss, 2001. Genetic and phenotypic relationships among different measures of growth and feed efficiency in young Charolais bulls. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 68: 131-139.

- Asanuma, N., Iwamoto, M. and Hino, T. 1999. Effect of the addition of fumarate on methane production by ruminal microorganisms in vitro. *J. Dairy Sci.* 82: 780-787.
- Baker, 1999. Rumen methanogens and inhibition of methanogenesis. *Aust. J. Agric Res.* 50: 1293-1298
- Basarab, J.A., Price, M.A., Aalhus, J.L., Okine, E.K., and K.L. Lyle, 2003. Residual feed intake and body composition in young growing cattle. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 83: 189-204.
- Nagara, K. and Isobe, Y. 2001. Effect of fumaric acid on methane production, rumen fermentation and digestibility of cattle fed roughages alone. *Anim. Sci. J.* 72: 139-146.
- Beauchemin, K.A., Kreuzer, M., O'Mara, F., and T.A. McAllister, 2008. Nutritional management for enteric methane abatement: a review. *Australian J. Expt. Agric.* 48: 21-27.
- Bencharr, C., Petit, H. V., Berthiaume, R., Ouellet, D. R. and Chiquette, J. 2003. Effects of essential oils on ruminal fermentation, rumen microbial populations and *in sacco* degradation of dry matter and nitrogen in the rumen of lactating dairy cows. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 83: 637
- Blaxter, K.L. and J.L. Clapperton, 1965. Prediction of the amount of methane produced by ruminants. *Br. J. Nutr.* 19: 511-522.
- Boadi, D.A. and K.M. Wittenberg, 2002. Methane production from dairy and beef heifers fed forages differing in nutrient density using the sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) tracer gas technique. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 82: 201-206.

- Callaway, T.R., CarneiroDeMelo, A. M.S. and Russell, J.B. 1997. The effect of nisin and monensin on ruminal fermentation *in vitro*. *Curr.Microbiol.*35: 90-96.
- Carulla, J.E., Kreuzer, M., Machmuller, and Hess, H.D. 2005. Supplementation of *A.mearnsi*tannins decreases methanogenesis and urinary N₂ in forage-fed sheep. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* 56:961-970
- Chiquette, J. and Benchaar, C. 1998. Effect of diet and probiotic addition on chemical composition of free or particle-associated bacterial populations of the rumen. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 78:115-120.
- Dann, H.M., Prockley, J.R., McCoy, G.C., Hutjens, M.F. and J.E. Garrett, 2000. Effects of yeast cultures (*S.cerevisiae*) on prepartum and postpartum intake and milk production of Jersey cow *J.Dairy Sci.*83: 123-127.
- Doreau, M. and Jouany, J. P. 1998. Effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* culture on nutrient digestion in lactating dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 81: 3214-3221.
- EPA. 2007. Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks: 1990-2005. Available at: www.epa.gov/climatechange/index.html.
- Eun, J.S. and K.A. Beauchemin, 2007. Assessment of the efficacy of varying experimental exogenous fibrolytic enzymes using *in vitro* fermentation characteristic. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.*132:298-315
- Eun, J.S., Fellner, V., Whitlow, L.W. and B.A. Hopkins, 2003. Influence of yeast culture on fermentation by ruminal microorganisms in continuous culture. Department of Animal Science Bulletin, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- FAO, 2006. Livestock's Long Shadow. Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative, Rome. Available at: http://www.virtualcentre.org/en/library/key_pub/longshad/A0701E00.pdf Accessed 12 Jan 06.
- Finlay, D.J., Esteban, G., Clarke, K.J., Williams, A.G., Embley, T.M. and R.P. Hirt, 1994. Some rumen ciliates have endosymbiotic methanogenesis. *FEMS Microbiol Lett.* 117: 157-162.
- France, J., Beever, D.E. and R.C. Siddons, 1993. Compartmental schemes for estimating methanogenesis in ruminants from isotope dilution data. *J. Theor. Biol.* 164: 206-218.
- Frumholtz, P.P., Newbold, C.J. and Wallace, R.J. 1989. Influence of *Aspergillus oryzae* fermentation extract on the fermentation of a basal ration in the rumen simulation technique (Rusitec). *J. Agric. Sci. (Camb.)* 113: 169-172.
- Grainger, C., Clarke, T., McGinn, S.M., Auldist, M.J., Beauchemin, K.A., Hannah, M.C.,
- Waghorn, G.C., Clark, H., and Eckard, R.J. 2007. Methane emissions from dairy cows measured using the sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) tracer and chamber techniques. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90:2755-2766.
- Guan, H., Wittenberg, K.M., Ominski, K.H., and Krause, D.O. 2006. Efficacy of ionophores in cattle diets for mitigation of enteric methane. *J. Anim. Sci.* 84:1896-1906.
- Hegarty, R. S. 2001. Greenhouse gas emissions from Australian livestock sector. What do we know, what can we do Greenhouse and Agriculture. Taskforce. pp. 1-32.

- Helander, I. M., Alakomi, H-L., Latva-Kala, K., Mattila- Sanholm, T., Pol, I., Smid, E. J., Gorris, G. M. and von Wright, A. 1998.Characterization of the action of selected essential oil components on Gram-Negative bacteria. J. Agric. Food Chem. 46:3590–3595.
- Helander, I. M., Alakomi, H-L., Latva-Kala, K., Mattila- Sanholm, T., Pol, I., Smid, E. J., Gorris, G. M. and von Wright, A. 1998.Characterization of the action of selected essential oil components on Gram-Negative bacteria. J. Agric. Food Chem. 46: 3590–3595.
- IPCC, 2001.Climate change 2001: The scientific basis. Contribution of Working Group 1 to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (JT Houghton, Y Ding, DJ Griggs, M Noguer, PJ van der Linden, X Dai, K Maskell and CA Johnson, eds). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Isobe, Y. and Shibata, F. 1993. Rumen fermentation in goats administered fumaric acid. Anim. Sci. Technol. (Jpn.). 64: 1024–1030.
- Itabashi, H., Bayaru, E., Kanda, S., Nishida, T., Ando, S., Ishida, M., Itoh, T., Isobe, Y., Nagara, K. and Takei, K. 2000.Effect of salinomycin (SL) plus fumaric acid on rumen fermentation and methane production in cattle. Asian Aust. J. Anim. Sci. 13 (Suppl.): 287
- Joblin, K. N. 1999. Ruminacetogens and their potential to lower ruminant methane emissions. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 50: 1307–1313.
- Johnson, K.A., and Johnson, D.E. 1995. Methane emissions from cattle. J. Anim. Sci.73: 2483-2492.
- Jones, W. J. 1991. Diversity and physiology of methanogens. Pages 39-54 in J. E. Roger and W. B. Whitman, eds. Microbial production and consumption of greenhouse gases: Methane, nitrous oxides and halomethane.. Academic Press Inc., New York, NY.
- Jones, W. J., Nagle, D. P. and Whitman, W. P. 1987. Methanogens and the diversity of archaebacteria.Microbiol.Rev. 53: 135–177.
- Kalmokoff, M. L., Bartlett, F. and Teather, R. M. 1996.Are ruminal bacteria armed with bacteriocins? J. Dairy Sci. 79: 2297–2306.
- Karen A. Beauchemin, Sean M. McGinn1 and Chris Grainger. 2008. Reducing Methane Emissions from Dairy Cows, WCDS Advances in Dairy Technology Volume 20: 79-93
- Klieve, A. V. and Hegarty, R. S. 1999.Opportunities for biological control of methanogenesis. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 50: 1315–1319.
- Konings, W. N., Kok, J., Kuipers, O. P. and Poolman, B. 2000.Lactic acid bacteria: the bugs of the new millennium. Curr.Opin.Microbiol.3: 276–282.
- Konings, W. N., Kok, J., Kuipers, O. P. and Poolman, B. 2000.Lactic acid bacteria: the bugs of the new millennium. Curr.Opin.Microbiol.3: 276–282.
- Lassey, K.R. 2008.Livestock methane emission and its perspective in the global methane cycle.Austr. J. Exp. Agric. 48: 114-118.
- Lee, S. Y. and Ha, J. K. 2002.Effects of essential oil on in vitro production and fermentation.Proc. 4th Korea-Japan Joint Symposium on Rumen Metabolism and Physiology.Jeju, Korea.
- Lopez, S., Valdes, C., Newbold, C. J. and Wallace, R. J. 1999.Influence of sodium

- fumarate on rumen fermentation in vitro. Br. J. Nutr. 81: 59–64.
- Mantovani, H. C. and Russel, J. B. 2001. Nisin resistance of *Streptococcus bovis*. Appl Environ Microbiol. 67: 808–813.
- Martin, S. A., Streeter, M. N., Nisbet, D. J., Hill, G. M. and Williams, S. E., 1999. Effects of DL-malate on ruminal metabolism and performance of cattle fed a high-concentrate diet. J. Anim. Sci. 77: 1008–1015.
- McAllister, T. A., Okine, E. K., Mathison, G. W. and Cheng, K. J. 1996. Dietary, environmental and microbiological aspects of methane production in ruminants. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 76: 231–243.
- McAllister, T.A., and Newbold, C.J. 2008. Redirecting rumen fermentation to reduce methanogenesis. Austr. J. Expt. Agric. 48:7-13.
- McGinn, S.M., Beauchemin, K.A., Coates, T., and Colombatto, D. 2004. Methane emissions from beef cattle: effect of monensin, sunflower oil, enzymes, yeast and fumaric acid. J. Anim. Sci. 82:3346-3356.
- Miller-Webster, T., Hoover, W. H., Holt, M. and Nocek, J. E. 2002. Influence of yeast culture on ruminal microbial metabolism in continuous culture. J. Dairy Sci. 85: 2009-2014.
- Mills, J.A. Dijkstra, J., Bannink, A. Cammell, S.B., Kebreab, E. and France, J. 2001. A mechanistic model of whole tract digestion and methanogenesis in the lactating dairy cow: model development, evaluation and application. J. Anim. Sci. 79: 1584–1597.
- Montano, M.F., Zinn-Ware T.E. and Zinn R.A. 1999. Influence of malic acid supplementation on ruminal pH, lactic acid utilization, and digestive function in steers fed high- concentrate finishing diets. J. Anim Sci. 77: 780-784.
- Morvan, B., Dore, J., Rieu-Lesme, F., Foucat, L., Fonty, G. and Gouet, P. 1994. Establishment of hydrogen-utilizing bacteria in the rumen of newborn lambs. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 117: 249-256.
- Moss, A. R., Jouany, J. P. and Newbold, J. 2000. Methane production by ruminants: its contribution to global warming. Ann. Zootech. 49: 231–253.
- Murray, P. J., Moss, A., Lockyer, D. R. and Jarvis, S. C. 1999. A comparison of systems for measuring methane emissions from sheep. J. Agric. Sci. (Camb.) 133: 439–444.
- Mutsvangwa, T., Edwards, I. E., Topps, J. H. and Paterson, G. F. M. 1992. The effects of dietary inclusion of yeast culture (Yea-Sacc) on patterns of rumen fermentation, food intake and growth of intensive fed bulls. Anim. Prod. 55: 35–40.
- Newbold C.J., Lassalas, B. and Jouany, J.P. 1995. The importance of methanogens associated with ciliate protozoa in ruminal methane production in vitro. Lett. Appl. Microbiol. 21: 230–234
- Newbold, C.J., Wallace, R.J. and McIntosh, F. M. 1996. Mode of action of the yeast *Sacchararomyces cerevisiae* as a feed additive for ruminants. Br. J. Nutr. 76: 249–261.
- Newbold, C.J., Wallace, R.J., Chen, X.B. and McIntosh, F.M. 1995. Different strains of *Sacchararomyces cerevisiae* differ in their effects on ruminal bacterial numbers in vitro and in sheep. J. Anim. Sci. 73: 1811-1819.

- Nollet, L., Mbanzamihigo, L., Demeyer, D. and Verstrete, W. 1998. Effect of the addition of *Peptostreptococcus productus* ATCC 35244 on reductive acetogenesis in the ruminal ecosystem after inhibition of methanogenesis by cell-free supernatant *Lactobacillus plantarum* 80. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 71: 49–66.
- Odongo, N.E., Bagg, R., Vessie, G., Dick, P., Or-Rashid, M.M., Hook, S., Gray, J. T., Kebreab, E., France, J., and McBride, B.W. 2007. Longterm effects of feeding monensin on methane production in lactating dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90:1781–1788.
- Okine, E. K., Basarab, J. A., Baron, V. and Price, M. A. 2002. Methane and manure production in cattle with different net feed intake. *J. Anim. Sci.* 80 (Suppl. 1): 206 (Abstr.).
- Pelchen, A., and Peters, K.J. 1998. Methane emissions from sheep. *Small Ruminant Res.* 27:137–150.
- Robertson, L. J. and Waghorn, G. C. 2002. Dairy industry perspectives on methane emissions and production from cattle fed pasture or total mixed rations in New Zealand. *Proc. N. Z. Soc. Anim. Prod.* 62: 213–218.
- Russell, J. B. and Mantovani, H. C. 2002. The bacteriocins of ruminal bacteria and their potential as an alternative to antibiotics. *J. Mol. Micro. Biotechnol.* 4: 347–355
- Stewart, C. S. and Bryant, M. P. 1988. The rumen bacteria. Pages 21–75 in P. N. Hobson, ed. *Anaerobic bacteria in habitats other than man*. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Palo Alto, CA.
- Takahashi, J., Chaudhry, A. S., Beneke, R. G. and Young, B. A. 1997. Modification of methane emission in sheep by cysteine and a microbial preparation. *Sci. Total Environ.* 204: 117–123.
- Tamminga, S. 1992. Nutrition management of dairy cows as a contribution to pollution control. *J. Dairy Sci.* 75: 345–357.
- Teather, R. M. and Forster, R. J. 1998. Manipulating the rumen microflora with bacteriocins to improve ruminant production. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 78 (Suppl.): 57–69.
- Tokura, M., Ushida, K., Miyazaki, K. and Kojima, Y. 1997. Methanogens associated with rumen ciliates. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol.* 22: 137–143.
- Torrent, J. and Johnson, D.E. 1994. Methane production in the large intestine of sheep. *Energy metabolism of farm animals*. EAAP Publication No.76. CSIC. Publishing Service. Granada, Spain in J. F. Aquilera, Pp 391–394
- Ushida, K. and Jouany, J. P. 1996. Methane production associated with rumen-ciliated protozoa and its effect on protozoan activity. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 23: 129–132.
- Valdez C., Newbold C. J., Hillman K. and Wallace R. J. 1996. Evidence for methane oxidation in rumen fluid in vitro. *Ann. Zootech.* 45(Suppl.): 351 (Abstr.).
- VanNevel, C.J. and Demeyer, D.I. 1996. Control of rumen methanogenesis. *Envi. Monit. Ass.* 42:3–97
- VanVugt, S.J., Waghorn, G.C., Clark, D.A., and S.L. Woodward, 2005. Impact of monensin on methane production and performance of cows fed forage diets. *Proc. Soc. Anim. Prod.* 65:362–366.
- Waghorn, G.C., Clark, H., Taufa, V., and A. Cavanagh, 2008. Monensin controlled-release capsules for methane mitigation in

- pasture-fed dairy cows. *Australian J. Expt. Agr.* 48:65-68
- Wallace, R.J., McEwan, N.R., McIntosh, F.M., Teferedegne, B. and Newbold, C.J. 2002. Natural products as manipulators of rumen fermentation. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 15: 1458-468.
- Wenk, C. 2003. Herbs and botanicals as feed additives in monogastric animals. *Asi-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 16: 282-289.
- Westberg, H.B. Lamb, K.A. Johnson and M. Huyler. 2001. Inventory of methane emissions from U.S. cattle. *J. Geophysical Res.* 106:12633-12642.
- Westberg, H., Lamb, B., Johnson, K.A. and Huyler, M. 2001. Inventory of methane emissions from U.S. cattle *J. Geophys. Res.* 106: 633-642.
- Whitelaw, F.G., Eadie, J.M., Bruce, L.A. and Shand, W.J. 1984. Methane formation in faunated and ciliate-free cattle and its relationship with rumen VFA proportions. *Br. J. Nutr.* 52: 261-275.
- Yoon, I.K. and Stern, M.D. 1996. Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae* cultures on ruminal fermentation in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 79: pp 411-417.