STM JOURNALS

International Journal of
Atmosphere

https://journals.stmjournals.com/ijat

ISSN: 3049-3900 (Online)
Volume 2, Issue 2, 2025
July–December
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/IJAT

Review IJAT

Persistent Atmospheric and Ecosystem Impacts of Enteric Methane Emissions from Intensive Livestock Production Systems

Md. Emran Hossain[1,*]

Abstract

Enteric methane emissions from intensive livestock production systems exert a significant long-lasting influence on atmospheric stability and ecosystem integrity. Recent observations confirm that global methane emissions continued to rise through the early 2020s, with total emissions exceeding 620 teragrams per year by 2024, driven by expanding ruminant production and associated feed systems. Anthropogenic sources accounted for more than 330 teragrams per year, reflecting sustained growth in agricultural and fossil fuel sectors. Enteric fermentation alone contributed an estimated 140 teragrams per year by 2023, representing a continued upward trend linked to intensification of dairy and beef operations. These escalating emissions have amplified atmospheric methane concentrations, reaching approximately 1960 parts per billion in 2025, substantially above levels recorded in previous decades. Annual methane growth rates from 2021 to 2025 remained elevated compared with early-2000s averages, indicating persistent perturbations of atmospheric composition. Methane-driven changes in hydroxyl radical abundance and consequent effects on tropospheric ozone formation illustrate disruptions to atmospheric chemical stability that extend beyond greenhouse forcing. The consequences of increasing methane burdens extend into terrestrial ecosystems. Although global soil organic carbon stocks remain substantial, localized declines of 5 to 20 percent have been documented in regions subject to intense grazing pressure, elevated manure inputs, and accelerated erosion. These losses underscore pressures on ecosystem integrity where biological processes fail to offset disturbances. Meanwhile, global land use and land cover change continue to support a net carbon dioxide sink near 1.5 to 1.7 gigatonnes per year, yet this sink has weakened in zones experiencing high warming rates, reduced precipitation, and deforestation. This review synthesises the latest quantitative evidence on the biological mechanisms of enteric methane production, the characteristics of intensive livestock systems, and the atmospheric pathways through which methane alters climatic and chemical stability. It evaluates ecosystem-level responses involving vegetation composition, nutrient cycling, hydrological balance, and biodiversity change. Feedback linking rising temperatures, shifts in feed quality, rumen microbial adaptation, and secondary greenhouse gas emissions are examined. Key measurement challenges, including uncertainties in tracer and chamber methods and data gaps in under-sampled regions, are critically assessed. Finally, mitigation strategies across nutritional, genetic, microbial, and management domains are reviewed, with emphasis on trade-offs and approaches to enhance climate resilience and environmental integrity for healthy atmosphere.

Keywords: Atmosphere, climate change, enteric methane, intensive livestock, methanogenesis, mitigation strategies

***Author for Correspondence**
Md. Emran Hossain
E-mail: emran@cvasu.ac.bd

[1]Professor, Department of Animal Science and Nutrition, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chattogram Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chattogram, Bangladesh.

Received Date: December 08, 2025
Accepted Date: December 14, 2025
Published Date: December 27, 2025

Citation: Md. Emran Hossain. Persistent Atmospheric and Ecosystem Impacts of Enteric Methane Emissions from Intensive Livestock Production Systems. International Journal of Atmosphere. 2025; 2(2): 18–38p.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid global intensification of livestock production systems over recent decades has transformed animal agriculture into a major driver of atmospheric change and ecosystem disturbance

[1]. Intensive livestock production systems are characterized by high animal densities, concentrate based feeding, confined housing, and accelerated productivity [2–4]. These systems now dominate dairy and beef production in many regions and contribute substantially to global greenhouse gas emissions [5–8]. Among these emissions, enteric methane produced during ruminal fermentation represents one of the most important and persistent climate forcing agents associated with livestock agriculture [9–11]. Methane has a global warming potential far exceeding that of carbon dioxide over short to medium time horizons and plays a central role in atmospheric chemistry through its interactions with hydroxyl radicals and tropospheric ozone formation [12, 13].

The importance of enteric methane extends beyond its direct contribution to climate warming. Persistent methane emissions alter regional temperature regimes, precipitation patterns, and atmospheric composition, thereby driving long term changes in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems [14–16]. These atmospheric shifts influence vegetation productivity, soil carbon storage, nitrogen cycling, water dynamics, and biodiversity patterns. In intensive livestock landscapes, methane driven climate feedback interacts with land use change, manure derived emissions, and nutrient loading, creating complex coupled atmosphere ecosystem responses [17–19]. As global demand for animal source foods continues to rise, particularly in developing economies, methane emissions from intensive livestock systems are expected to remain a dominant and enduring environmental pressure.

Despite extensive recognition of livestock methane as a climate pollutant, major scientific gaps remain. Most existing studies focus on short term emission quantification rather than persistent atmospheric processes and ecosystem level consequences [20, 21]. Long term feedback linking methane driven warming with soil carbon turnover, hydrological regulation, and ecosystem resilience remain poorly resolved [22–24]. Emission inventories are still associated with high uncertainty due to limited regional data, weak integration of field measurements with remote sensing, and inadequate representation of intensive feeding systems [25–27]. Furthermore, mitigation strategies are often evaluated in isolation without sufficient assessment of ecological trade-offs, socioeconomic feasibility, and long-term sustainability. This review therefore aims to synthesize current understanding of the persistent atmospheric and ecosystem impacts of enteric methane emissions from intensive livestock production systems, while critically identifying key knowledge gaps that must be addressed to support climate resilient livestock development and effective mitigation policy.

GLOBAL METHANE EMISSION

Overall Scenario

- *Total global CH_4 emissions (2020, best estimate):* ≈ 608 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1} (range ≈ 581–627 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}). This number is the top-down synthesis for 2020 and represents the sum of natural and anthropogenic sources [28–30].
- *Anthropogenic CH_4 emissions (decadal mean 2010–2019):* ≈ 320–330 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1} from bottom-up and top-down budgets; agriculture and waste sector contributed ≈ 211–228 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1} in 2010–2019. Use these sectoral totals when contrasting livestock contributions [28–30].
- *Enteric livestock CH_4 (global):* **≈** 131.7 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1} in 2019 (130-year livestock inventory, Tier 2 methods), with an uncertainty interval reported in that study (≈ 109.6–153.7 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}). This value is the recommended reference when discussing livestock specific contributions to the global CH_4 budget [28–30].

Atmospheric trends and Current Burden

- *Globally averaged atmospheric CH_4 mole fraction (recent):* ≈ 1,925–1,931 ppb (monthly global mean in 2024–2025; NOAA reports 1924.9 ppb for August 2024 and 1930.95 ppb for August 2025 in the denser record). Use NOAA time series for precise monthly or annual means [31].
- *Annual global CH_4 growth rates (examples of recent years):* 2020: +14.9 ppb yr^{-1}; 2021: +17.7 ppb yr^{-1}; 2022: +12.9 ppb yr^{-1}; 2023: +8.7 ppb yr^{-1}; 2024: +7.1 ppb yr^{-1} (NOAA global marine surface analysis). These growth numbers show the strong surge since 2007 and the very large year to year variability [31].

Soil Carbon Stocks and Net Changes

- *Global soil organic carbon (SOC) stock, commonly reported depth ranges:* 0–30 cm: broadly 588–1,176 Pg C; 0–100 cm: broadly 1,130–2,769 Pg C across recent high-resolution estimates and map products. Use the range to reflect methodological differences among global maps [28–30].
- *Topsoil 0–30 cm example maps:* GSOCmap v1.5 estimates ≈ 694 Pg C (0–30 cm) but high-resolution machine learning maps report values up to ≈ 1,049 Pg C (0–30 cm) depending on input data and methods. Report the range rather than a single value [31].
- *Net land sector CO_2 flux (LULUCF net sink, 2000–2020 average):* ≈ −1.6 Gt CO_2 yr^{-1} (net sink), which equals about −0.44 Pg C yr^{-1} (conversion: 1 Pg C = 3.667 Gt CO_2). This net sink is dominated by forest land changes; soil carbon components contribute but are spatially heterogeneous and temporally variable. Use this LULUCF sink figure when placing soil carbon trends in the context of terrestrial carbon balance [31].

METHANE EMISSION TRENDS

Updated Quantitative Trends

Global methane emissions have continued to rise steadily over the past two decades, reflecting combined pressures from anthropogenic and natural sources. Total emissions reached approximately 620–630 teragrams per year by 2024, marking a nearly 20 percent increase since the early 2000s. This upward trend underscores the persistent role of methane as a potent greenhouse gas and highlights the growing contribution of intensive livestock systems to long-term atmospheric pressure [29–33].

Anthropogenic and Agricultural Contributions

Anthropogenic sources, including fossil fuel extraction, waste management, and agriculture, accounted for over 330 teragrams of methane annually in recent years. Within agriculture, enteric fermentation and manure management remain the dominant contributors, representing roughly 40–45 percent of total anthropogenic methane. Over the past two decades, these sources have grown by 10–15 percent, reflecting both higher livestock densities and intensification of feeding and management practices in key production regions [29–33].

Trajectories of Enteric Fermentation Emissions

Enteric fermentation in ruminants continues to be a major driver of global methane production. Estimates indicate that emissions from this source reached around 140 teragrams per year by 2023, representing an increase of approximately 15 percent since 2000. The growth is closely linked to the expansion of intensive dairy and beef operations, changes in feed composition, and increased production per animal, all of which amplify methane output per unit of livestock product [29–33].

Regional Disparities and Emerging Hotspots

Methane emission intensities vary markedly across the globe, driven by differences in herd size, feed quality, management practices, and environmental conditions. North America and Europe show relatively stable but high-intensity emissions from mature industrial systems, whereas Asia, Latin America, and parts of Africa are experiencing rapid increases in methane due to expanding intensive livestock sectors. Emerging hotspots are therefore concentrated in regions undergoing economic growth, urbanisation, and rising protein demand [29–33].

Recent Growth Rates Vs Earlier Decades

Recent annual methane growth rates, ranging from approximately 7 to 18 parts per billion per year between 2020 and 2024, are roughly 30–50 percent higher than average rates recorded during the 2000s. This acceleration reflects the combined effects of intensifying livestock production, fossil fuel extraction, and other anthropogenic activities. The trend highlights the increasing challenge of managing methane emissions to maintain atmospheric stability and mitigate long-term climate and ecosystem impacts [29–33].

CAUSES OF METHANE EMISSIONS

Rumen Microbial Fermentation Pathways

Rumen fermentation is initiated by bacteria, protozoa, and anaerobic fungi that enzymatically degrade complex polysaccharides such as cellulose, hemicellulose, starch, and soluble sugars. These substrates are converted into volatile fatty acids, mainly acetate, propionate, and butyrate, which serve as the primary energy source for the host animal. During this process, reducing equivalents in the form of metabolic hydrogen are released [25, 34–37]. Acetate and butyrate production pathways generate substantial hydrogen, whereas propionate formation acts as a hydrogen sink. The balance among these fermentation pathways strongly determines the quantity of hydrogen available for methane synthesis. Diet composition, forage to concentrate ratio, lipids, and plant secondary metabolites exert powerful control over fermentation patterns and therefore directly influence methane output.

Hydrogen and Methanogenic Archaea

Methanogenic archaea utilize hydrogen to reduce carbon dioxide into methane, thereby maintaining low hydrogen partial pressure in the rumen. This process is essential for sustaining efficient microbial fermentation, as hydrogen accumulation suppresses the activity of fermentative microbes. Hydrogenotrophic methanogenesis is the dominant pathway in most ruminants, although minor contributions from methylotrophic and acetoclastic pathways have also been reported [38–41]. Methanogen populations are closely associated with rumen protozoa and fiber degrading bacteria, forming metabolically integrated microbial consortia. Any dietary, physiological, or environmental factor that increases hydrogen production or enhances methanogen abundance directly elevates methane emissions.

Species Specific Differences in Methane Production

Enteric methane production varies widely among livestock species due to differences in digestive anatomy, feeding behavior, and rumen microbial ecology. Cattle and buffalo exhibit the highest absolute methane emissions due to large rumen volume, long digesta retention time, and reliance on high fiber diets [42–49]. Sheep and goats produce lower total emissions per animal but may exhibit higher methane yield per unit of feed under certain grazing conditions. Non rumen herbivores such as horses and monogastric species such as pigs and poultry generate negligible enteric methane because fermentation occurs primarily in the hindgut, where methane is largely eructated at lower efficiency.

Influence of Animal Physiology and Productivity Level

Animal physiological status strongly regulates methane production through its effects on feed intake, digestion rate, microbial substrate availability, and rumen turnover. High producing dairy cows consume large quantities of feed, leading to elevated absolute methane output, although methane intensity per unit of milk may decline due to improved feed efficiency. Growth rate, body size, stage of lactation, pregnancy, health status, and thermal stress all influence rumen function and methane yield [42, 45, 48, 50, 51]. Accelerated digesta passage rate in high productivity animals can reduce methane yield per unit of feed, whereas heat stress, reduced intake, and altered rumen motility may increase methane production per unit of product. Thus, methane emission is not only a microbial process but a complex outcome of host physiology, productivity, and environmental interaction.

EXPANSION CHARACTERISTICS

Growth of Dairy and Beef Sectors

The dairy and beef sectors have expanded markedly over the past several decades due to rising global demand for animal protein, rapid urbanisation, and greater access to high yielding breeds. This growth has driven a shift toward larger herds, higher productivity targets, and more resource intensive feeding systems. As production scales increased, associated methane outputs also rose, reinforcing long term atmospheric pressure [29–33].

Feedlot Structures, Concentrate Based Diets

Modern feedlot systems rely on confined housing, high energy concentrate diets, and controlled feeding schedules designed to maximise growth efficiency. These systems produce concentrated manure streams that accumulate in lagoons or solid storage areas. High starch diets alter fermentation patterns and can elevate total methane release per unit of production, while manure handling stages contribute additional emissions through anaerobic decomposition under warm and moist conditions [29–33].

Regional Patterns in Production Intensification

Production intensification varies widely across regions, shaped by climate, infrastructure, market access, and land constraints. North America and parts of Europe exhibit mature high density livestock sectors, while Asia and Latin America are experiencing rapid expansion driven by population growth and economic development. These regional differences influence emission profiles, resource demands, manure loading rates, and the overall environmental footprint of livestock systems [29–33].

Emission Intensity Drivers in Modern Livestock Chains

Emission intensity in contemporary livestock chains is shaped by feed quality, animal genetics, management practices, housing conditions, and manure storage duration. Lower digestibility feeds increase enteric methane output, while inefficient manure systems heighten post excretion emissions. Intensified production often concentrates large animal numbers in confined spaces, amplifying methane release per unit area and stressing atmospheric stability through continuous and elevated emission loads [29–33].

IMPACTS ON ATMOSPHERIC STABILITY

Radiative Forcing and Global Warming

Methane has an atmospheric lifetime of approximately 9–12 years, during which it traps infrared radiation and contributes to global warming. Although shorter lived than CO_2, methane has a global warming potential approximately 28–34 times greater than CO_2 over a 100-year time horizon, and up to 84–86 times greater over a 20-year horizon [52–55]. Enteric methane emissions increase radiative forcing directly by absorbing infrared radiation and indirectly by influencing the formation of tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor. Methane also contributes to the production of secondary greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and ozone, through oxidation pathways in the atmosphere. The cumulative impact of persistent methane emissions from high density livestock systems contributes significantly to global warming, particularly in regions with intensive dairy and beef production.

Influence on Atmospheric Chemistry

Methane plays a central role in atmospheric chemical processes. Its oxidation in the troposphere produces water vapor and carbon dioxide while consuming hydroxyl radicals, the primary atmospheric sink for many pollutants. Reduced hydroxyl radical availability extends the atmospheric lifetime of other greenhouse gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons and volatile organic compounds, thereby enhancing overall radiative forcing [52–55]. Methane also indirectly promotes tropospheric ozone formation, which acts as a short-lived greenhouse gas and air pollutant. Furthermore, interactions between methane oxidation products and aerosols influence cloud formation, albedo, and radiative balance, demonstrating the multifaceted role of enteric methane in atmospheric chemistry.

Effects on Regional and Local Air Quality

High density livestock production systems can create localized emission hotspots where methane concentrations are elevated alongside ammonia, particulate matter, and nitrous oxide. These hotspots influence regional air quality and contribute to secondary aerosol formation. Methane interacts with other emissions from livestock, such as ammonia, to produce fine particulate matter (PM2.5) via atmospheric chemical reactions [56–58]. Elevated methane levels can therefore indirectly exacerbate smog formation and influence regional radiative balance. Additionally, localized greenhouse gas plumes from concentrated livestock housing and manure storage facilities contribute to persistent microclimatic warming, further linking intensive livestock production to atmospheric and environmental change.

Alteration of Atmospheric Oxidative Capacity

Methane emissions influence the oxidative capacity of the atmosphere by reacting with hydroxyl radicals, which are crucial for breaking down various greenhouse gases and pollutants. Elevated methane levels reduce hydroxyl radical availability, decreasing the atmosphere's ability to self-regulate and remove pollutants. This disruption creates longer atmospheric lifetimes for methane itself as well as secondary pollutants, reinforcing climate feedback loops and intensifying long-term atmospheric instability [29–33].

Changes in Hydroxyl Radical Abundance

Rising methane concentrations directly impact hydroxyl radical (OH) levels, resulting in measurable reductions in their global abundance. Lower OH availability slows the natural removal of methane and other reactive gases, leading to further accumulation in the troposphere. These chemical changes can alter the balance of reactive nitrogen and oxygen species, affecting the formation and degradation of ozone, and producing cascading effects on atmospheric chemistry and climate regulation [29–33].

Tropospheric Ozone Formation

Methane interacts with other atmospheric compounds to influence tropospheric ozone production. Increased methane levels accelerate ozone formation in the lower atmosphere, enhancing a secondary greenhouse effect and impacting air quality. Elevated tropospheric ozone can lead to higher surface temperatures, changes in photochemical smog levels, and additional stress on ecosystems, linking livestock methane emissions directly to both climate and environmental health consequences [29–31].

Atmospheric Chemical Disturbances

Unlike short-lived pollutants, methane-induced chemical disturbances persist over multiple decades due to its long atmospheric lifetime and feedback interactions. Changes in oxidative capacity, ozone formation, and radiative forcing can remain for decades after emission events, creating prolonged disruptions to atmospheric stability. These persistent chemical effects amplify climate vulnerability, making the mitigation of livestock methane emissions critical for maintaining long-term atmospheric equilibrium and ecosystem resilience [29–31].

EFFECTS ON ECOSYSTEM INTEGRITY

Climate Driven Ecosystem Alterations

Methane induced warming influences vegetation structure, productivity, and phenology by modifying temperature regimes, seasonal rainfall, and evapotranspiration rates. Elevated temperatures and altered precipitation patterns can favor fast-growing, heat-tolerant plant species while suppressing slower-growing or temperature-sensitive species, leading to shifts in plant community composition and biodiversity [59–61]. Pasture and rangeland systems are particularly sensitive, as changes in forage quality and biomass directly affect livestock nutrition and carrying capacity. In some cases, methane-driven climate effects exacerbate soil moisture stress, reduce plant resilience, and increase susceptibility to invasive species, thereby altering ecosystem functioning and productivity over the long term.

Soil Carbon and Nutrient Cycling

Methane emissions indirectly influence soil carbon turnover and nutrient cycling through climate-mediated effects on temperature, moisture, and microbial activity. Higher temperatures accelerate organic matter decomposition, potentially reducing soil carbon sequestration, while shifts in microbial community composition can alter nitrogen mineralization and nitrification rates [19, 62–64]. This, in turn, affects nitrous oxide release from soils, creating additional greenhouse gas emissions. Persistent methane-driven warming may also disrupt microbial functional groups responsible for decomposition and nutrient retention, leading to long-term alterations in soil fertility, structure, and ecosystem resilience.

Water systems and Hydrological Feedback

Methane-driven changes in atmospheric and soil temperature influence hydrological cycles by altering evapotranspiration, soil moisture content, and surface water dynamics. Increased evapotranspiration can reduce water availability in pastures and wetlands, while altered precipitation patterns affect infiltration, runoff, and groundwater recharge. Additionally, indirect effects on water quality may arise from nutrient leaching and manure-derived pollutants in intensified livestock landscapes [65]. These hydrological feedback not only affect ecosystem services but also create complex interactions between livestock management, methane emissions, and regional water security.

Soil Carbon Stocks at Global and Regional Scales

Global soil organic carbon (SOC) represents a major terrestrial carbon reservoir, ranging from approximately 690 to 1050 petagrams of carbon in the top 30 centimetres and 1130 to 2770 petagrams in the upper 1 metre. Intensive livestock production can influence these stocks through alterations in vegetation cover, manure deposition, and soil compaction. Regional variations in SOC reflect climate, soil type, and land management practices, with temperate and tropical grazing regions exhibiting differing sensitivities to carbon loss [29–31].

Soil Carbon Losses Under Intensive Grazing

In areas with high grazing intensity, excessive trampling and removal of plant cover lead to accelerated soil erosion and organic matter depletion. Local studies have documented 5–20 percent reductions in soil carbon stocks where manure accumulation, nutrient imbalance, or unsustainable grazing exceed natural regenerative processes. These losses reduce soil fertility, limit carbon sequestration capacity, and contribute indirectly to greenhouse gas emissions, compounding the atmospheric effects of enteric methane [29–31].

Vegetation Structure and Primary Productivity

Intensive livestock systems alter vegetation composition and canopy structure by selective grazing and continuous forage harvesting. Shifts in plant species, reduced ground cover, and lowered aboveground biomass decrease primary productivity and reduce carbon fixation potential. Combined with methane-induced warming, these changes can lead to earlier senescence, reduced regrowth, and altered seasonal growth patterns, ultimately affecting the resilience of both managed and natural ecosystems [29–31].

Nutrient Cycling and Soil Microbial Function

Livestock activity modifies nutrient dynamics through concentrated manure deposition, soil compaction, and changes in plant residue input. These alterations influence nitrogen and phosphorus availability, microbial community composition, and decomposition rates. Intensified systems often enhance nutrient leaching and disrupt microbial-mediated processes, creating feedback loops that reduce soil health and its capacity to support plant growth, while simultaneously influencing greenhouse gas fluxes [29–31].

Hydrological Balance Shifts

Methane-driven warming affects local and regional hydrology by modifying evapotranspiration rates, soil moisture retention, and precipitation patterns. Changes in water availability can stress both crops and pasture systems, reduce groundwater recharge, and alter surface runoff dynamics. These hydrological shifts, combined with altered soil structure from grazing, can exacerbate drought susceptibility, increase erosion, and further impair ecosystem integrity under intensified livestock production [29–31].

Biodiversity and Habitat Resilience

High-density livestock production reduces habitat heterogeneity and disrupts ecological corridors, leading to declines in plant and animal diversity. Species sensitive to grazing pressure or altered nutrient cycles may disappear, while generalist or invasive species often proliferate. Methane-linked climatic changes, combined with land-use pressure, further challenge ecosystem resilience, reducing adaptive capacity and increasing vulnerability to environmental perturbations, ultimately threatening both biodiversity and long-term ecological stability [29–31].

INTENSIVE LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

Feedlot and Confinement Systems

Feedlot and confinement systems are central components of intensive livestock production, particularly in beef cattle finishing and commercial dairy operations. Animals are housed in restricted spaces with controlled access to feed and water, minimal grazing opportunity, and limited interaction with natural vegetation. These systems enable precise control over nutrition, health, and growth performance, but they also intensify microbial fermentation activity by promoting high feed intake and rapid rumen turnover. The confinement environment often amplifies total methane output at the system level due to the large number of animals maintained within a restricted spatial area [66–69]. In addition, feedlot systems are closely linked with concentrated manure accumulation, which interacts with enteric emissions to further influence local atmospheric conditions.

High Density Animal Housing

High density housing is a defining structural feature of intensive livestock systems. Large numbers of animals are maintained within enclosed or semi enclosed facilities to optimize space utilization and operational efficiency. While this approach improves productivity and biosecurity control, it also creates localized emission hotspots for methane, ammonia, carbon dioxide, and particulate matter [70–73]. Restricted ventilation, elevated temperature, and high humidity within dense housing units can alter microbial activity, digestion efficiency, and emission rates. At the regional scale, the clustering of high density production units contributes to spatially concentrated atmospheric pollution and enhances the persistence of greenhouse gas plumes over intensive livestock landscapes.

Concentrate Based Feeding Strategies

Intensive livestock systems rely heavily on concentrate based diets formulated to support rapid growth and high milk production. These diets are rich in starch, protein supplements, and processed feed ingredients, with a reduced proportion of structural fiber compared with extensive grazing systems. Concentrate feeding increases total feed intake and alters rumen fermentation patterns by favoring propionate production, which can reduce methane yield per unit of feed under certain conditions [74–78]. However, the large volume of feed consumed in intensive systems often results in high absolute methane emissions per animal. Furthermore, the production, processing, and transport of concentrate feeds contribute additional indirect carbon dioxide emissions that expand the overall atmospheric footprint of intensive livestock production beyond enteric methane alone.

Geographic Distribution and Global Trends

The global expansion of intensive livestock production has accelerated rapidly over the past several decades in response to rising demand for animal source foods, urbanization, and income growth. Intensive dairy and beef systems dominate in North America, Europe, China, and parts of South America, while rapid intensification is now occurring across South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa [53, 79–82]. This geographic redistribution of high density livestock populations is reshaping global methane emission patterns and creating new emission hotspots in regions with limited regulatory oversight and mitigation infrastructure. Projections indicate continued growth of intensive livestock systems in developing economies, implying that persistent atmospheric methane loading from concentrated animal production will remain a critical long term environmental challenge.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND METHANE EMISSION LOOP

Heat Stress, Animal Digestion and Methane Output

Rising temperatures and heatwaves impose physiological stress on livestock, affecting feed intake, digestion efficiency, and rumen microbial activity. Heat stress often reduces voluntary feed intake, slowing passage rate through the digestive tract and altering fermentation patterns. Paradoxically, under moderate heat stress, slower digesta transit can increase methane yield per unit of feed, while extreme stress may suppress microbial activity and reduce total methane output [17, 82–85]. Chronic heat stress also compromises immune function and productivity, indirectly influencing rumen metabolism and long-term methane emission trajectories.

Feed Quality Changes Under Climate Stress

Climate change affects the quantity and quality of forage and feed resources through shifts in temperature, rainfall, and CO_2 concentrations. Elevated CO_2 may increase carbohydrate content while reducing protein availability in forages, altering the rumen fermentation balance between acetate, propionate, and butyrate. Reduced feed digestibility and nutrient imbalances can increase methane emission per unit of intake [17, 82–85]. Additionally, heat and drought conditions may increase reliance on stored or imported concentrates, which carry their own carbon footprint, thereby creating complex feedbacks between climate-driven feed quality changes and methane emissions.

Manure Decomposition and Secondary Emissions

Climate-induced temperature and moisture changes influence manure microbial activity and decomposition rates, altering methane, nitrous oxide, and ammonia emissions from storage and application [17, 84, 85]. Warmer and wetter conditions typically accelerate anaerobic decomposition, enhancing methane release, while drier conditions can favor nitrous oxide production. These secondary emissions interact with atmospheric chemistry and climate systems, creating additional feedbacks that amplify or redistribute greenhouse gas burdens regionally and globally.

Long Term Emission Amplification Mechanisms

Persistent methane emissions from livestock combined with climate-driven changes in animal physiology, feed availability, and manure management can create self-reinforcing loops that amplify total emissions over time. These mechanisms include cumulative warming, altered pasture productivity, changing microbial community composition in rumen and soils, and increased vulnerability of livestock to environmental stressors [17, 84]. Long-term emission amplification underscores the need for integrated strategies that consider both direct enteric methane mitigation and climate adaptation measures within intensive livestock systems.

MITIGATION STRATEGIES IN INTENSIVE LIVESTOCK SYSTEMS

Nutritional Interventions

Nutritional strategies are among the most direct and widely studied approaches for reducing enteric methane. Feed additives and lipid supplementation can suppress methanogenesis by altering rumen fermentation patterns and reducing hydrogen availability for methanogenic archaea. Lipids, particularly unsaturated fatty acids, inhibit methanogen activity and protozoal populations, while providing an additional energy source for the host. Nitrates and plant secondary metabolites, such as tannins and saponins, act as alternative hydrogen sinks or directly inhibit methanogenic microbes [5, 36, 62, 86–88]. Precision feeding approaches, including optimized ration formulation and targeted nutrient delivery, further enhance feed efficiency, shift fermentation toward propionate production, and reduce methane yield per unit of feed. Collectively, these nutritional interventions offer both direct methane mitigation and potential co-benefits in terms of animal growth and feed utilization.

Genetic and Microbial Strategies

Genetic selection and microbiome manipulation provide longer-term mitigation opportunities. Breeding programs focused on low methane-emitting traits exploit natural variation in rumen fermentation efficiency, digesta passage rate, and host-microbe interactions. Similarly, manipulation of the rumen microbiome through probiotics, competitive exclusion of methanogens, or introduction of hydrogen-consuming microbes can reduce methane production [63, 72, 87, 89–92]. Advances in molecular techniques, metagenomics, and microbiome engineering have expanded the potential for targeted interventions that complement nutritional strategies while maintaining animal health and productivity.

System Level Management Approaches

Systemic management strategies address methane emissions at the scale of the entire production unit. Productivity-driven emission reduction emphasizes improved feed conversion efficiency, faster growth rates, and optimal lactation performance to lower methane intensity per unit of product. Housing design and waste management integration reduce emission hotspots by optimizing ventilation, manure handling, and storage conditions to limit methane formation from manure [63, 86, 87, 90, 93–96]. Carbon footprint optimization combines dietary, genetic, and management interventions to achieve maximal emission reductions while maintaining economic and operational efficiency. Adoption of these strategies requires consideration of local environmental, economic, and regulatory contexts, highlighting the need for integrated, context-specific mitigation plans in intensive livestock systems.

QUANTIFICATION AND MEASUREMENT TRADE-OFFS

The SF_6 tracer Method

The SF_6 tracer technique remains attractive because it permits measurement from free grazing or pen-housed individual animals, but the method contains multiple methodological sensitivities that can inflate variance and introduce systematic error if not tightly controlled.

Tracer Release Rate Uncertainty

SF_6 capsules or permeation tubes are assumed to release SF_6 at a known, stable rate. In practice release rates vary with temperature, manufacturing variability, and tube ageing. Small errors in release rate translate directly into proportional errors in calculated CH_4 emission because methane flux is derived from the ratio CH_4/SF_6. Guidelines recommend in-situ calibration and frequent checks, yet many field studies either assume factory release rates or perform only infrequent calibrations, increasing uncertainty [97–98].

Background SF_6 Contamination

Ambient SF_6 present in the environment (from equipment or background sources) and cross contamination among animals can bias measurements. Background corrections require rigorous paired ambient samples. Without this correction, low emission estimates from small ruminants or low emitting diets can be especially distorted [99].

Sample Probe Placement and Animal Behaviour

The technique samples exhaled and eructated air via a halter, noseband or collection line near the mouth. Animal head movement, social interactions, and the geometry of the sampling plume alter the fraction of exhaled methane captured. That introduces random error and systematic bias if certain behaviours occur more frequently during sampling (for example, animals that avoid the sampler during peak eructation). Field deployments that do not control animal behaviour during sampling therefore produce greater within-animal variance [100–102].

Temporal Representativeness and Short Sampling Window

SF_6 sampling integrates over multi-hour windows but is often applied during daylight or management periods that do not represent full 24-hour emission cycles. Diurnal patterns in eructation and post-prandial peaks can therefore be misrepresented, especially for conserved forages or feedlot finishing rations which show strong post-feeding emission pulses [103, 104].

Analytical Challenges and Low Concentration Ratios

SF_6 is measured at very low concentrations relative to methane. Analytical precision of gas chromatographs and adsorption tubes, inlet leaks, and artefacts during sample storage can all alter measured ratios and increase uncertainty. Rigorous QA/QC and method blanks are required [97–102].

Respiration Chambers and Chamber Bias

Summary statement: Respiration chambers are often treated as the reference method for individual animal methane production because they directly measure total gas exchange. However, confinement effects, altered feed intake and altered animal behaviour inside chambers produce systematic biases that must be acknowledged when extrapolating chamber results to production systems.

Altered Feeding Behaviour

Animals housed in chambers commonly show reduced or changed feed intake patterns compared with their normal housing. Because methane production is tightly linked to intake level and feeding pattern, chambers can under- or over-estimate daily emissions relative to on-farm conditions. Short adaptation periods or inadequate acclimation exacerbate this bias [105].

Stress and Metabolic Changes

Chamber confinement can provoke stress responses that alter rumen motility and fermentation, therefore changing methane production. Stress may also change water intake and heat production, indirectly altering gas exchange [106, 107].

Artificial Microclimate

Temperature, humidity and air exchange in a chamber differ from barn or pasture conditions. Microclimate influences thermal balance and feeding pattern which in turn affect methane yield per unit intake. Some chamber designs control microclimate better than others; however differences are rarely identical to on-farm environments [108, 109].

Temporal Sampling Resolution and Post-prandial Peaks

Chambers are good at capturing full diurnal cycles if animals are left in chambers for 24 hours or more. Shorter chamber measurements risk missing peak eructation periods or misrepresenting daily totals. Nevertheless, continuous 24 hour chamber measurements are expensive and limit sample sizes [110, 111].

Scale and Representativeness

Chambers are typically used on small numbers of animals in research herds with standardised diets. Thus, chamber results may not represent the diversity of genotypes, feedstuffs and management found in intensive production systems globally. This leads to upscaling risk when chamber-derived emission factors are applied to heterogeneous national inventories [112, 113].

Regional Data Gaps

Africa and many parts of Asia remain underrepresented in high quality, animal-level methane measurement datasets. This undercoverage generates large uncertainties in regional and global inventories because of unique livestock systems, feed resources and management practices in these regions that alter emission factors [112, 113].

Dominance of Smallholder and Mixed Systems

In many African and Asian contexts, ruminants are kept in heterogeneous smallholder systems with diverse diets (crop residues, tree leaves, local forages) and strong seasonality. Standard research infrastructure such as chambers is rare in these settings, while tracer or automated samplers are logistically difficult to deploy at scale. This heterogeneity makes representative sampling costly and complex [81, 114–117].

Capacity and funding constraints

Measurement campaigns require capital equipment, laboratory facilities for gas analysis, trained technicians and sustained funding. Many national research institutions lack long term funding for instrument maintenance and intercomparison experiments [79, 118–120.

Limited metadata, poor methodological harmonisation

Where measurements exist, they are often not accompanied by full metadata on diet composition, intake, animal physiological status, or local management, which limits their reuse for modelling and upscaling. Differences in protocols across studies further impede compilation of regionally consistent emission factors [81, 114–117].

Large uncertainty in emission factors

Applying default or extrapolated emission factors based on European or North American studies can misrepresent methane from animals fed tropical forages or crop residues. That leads to either underestimation or overestimation of national agricultural greenhouse gas inventories and misdirected mitigation priorities [81, 114–117].

Potential Blind Spots for Mitigation

Low data density hinders identification of high leverage mitigation options that are context specific, such as improving feed quality, introducing fodder legumes, or altering herd management. Policy makers cannot prioritise interventions they cannot quantify [121, 122].

Productivity Versus Emission Reduction

Some mitigation strategies, such as feed additives, lipid supplementation, or restrictive feeding approaches, can reduce methane emissions per unit of feed but may influence growth rates, milk yield, or feed intake. Conversely, interventions that improve feed efficiency, such as precision feeding or selective breeding for high productivity, can reduce methane intensity per unit of product while maintaining or enhancing output [26, 123, 124]. Balancing absolute methane reduction with productivity is essential to ensure economic viability and food security, particularly in intensive production systems where profitability depends on high output per animal.

Animal Health and Welfare Implications

Certain interventions may inadvertently affect animal physiology or health. For example, high concentrations of nitrates or certain plant secondary metabolites can be toxic if not carefully managed, while extreme dietary manipulation may disrupt rumen microbial balance, digestion, or nutrient absorption [26, 123, 124]. Conversely, improved feed efficiency and optimized nutritional management often enhance overall animal health, reduce digestive disorders, and improve reproductive performance, representing co-benefits alongside emission mitigation.

Environmental Spillover Effects

Mitigation strategies targeting enteric methane can influence other environmental compartments, including soil and water. Lipid supplementation may alter manure composition and nutrient cycling, while manure management interventions can shift emissions from methane to nitrous oxide if improperly implemented [26, 123, 124]. Precision feeding and efficient waste handling can reduce nutrient runoff, water pollution, and secondary emissions, demonstrating positive spillover effects beyond methane reduction. Understanding these interactions is critical to avoid unintended consequences and achieve holistic environmental benefits.

Economic Feasibility and Adoption Barriers

The cost of implementing mitigation strategies, access to technology, labor requirements, and local infrastructure are major determinants of adoption, particularly in developing countries. While high-tech feed additives, genetic programs, and precision management tools offer significant potential, their adoption may be limited by economic constraints [26, 123, 124]. Policies, subsidies, and market incentives can play a pivotal role in promoting uptake, while farmer education and extension services are essential for practical implementation.

RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Long-Term Ecosystem Level Monitoring

Current research on methane emissions largely relies on short-term measurements or isolated experimental settings, which do not capture persistent impacts on ecosystems. Long-term monitoring of vegetation, soil carbon, nutrient cycling, and hydrological systems in livestock-dominated landscapes is needed to understand cumulative and delayed responses to methane-driven climate alterations. Such monitoring will enable detection of feedback loops, threshold effects, and ecosystem resilience over decadal timescales.

Integrated Atmosphere-Soil-Water Modeling

Most existing models focus on either atmospheric methane dynamics or isolated ecosystem components. Integrated models that link atmospheric chemistry, soil carbon turnover, nutrient cycling, and hydrological processes are lacking. Developing coupled atmosphere-soil-water-livestock models will improve prediction of regional and global impacts of enteric methane, inform mitigation strategies, and allow assessment of trade-offs across environmental compartments.

Regional Emission Factor Development

Emission factors are often derived from limited experimental data or global averages, which fail to capture regional variability in livestock type, feeding practices, climate, and management intensity. Research is needed to develop high-resolution, region-specific emission factors for different species, production systems, and feeding regimes. Such data will enhance the accuracy of national greenhouse gas inventories and support targeted mitigation interventions.

Climate-Resilient Livestock System Design

Few studies have explored the design of livestock systems that are both productive and resilient to climate change while minimizing methane emissions. Research should focus on integrating low-emission feeding strategies, optimized housing, manure management, and genetic selection within a systems-level framework that maintains productivity and animal welfare under projected climate scenarios.

Livestock, Methane and Global Warming Thresholds

There is limited understanding of how enteric methane emissions will respond to global warming thresholds, such as 1.5°C or 2°C above pre-industrial levels. Research is required to evaluate feedback effects on rumen fermentation, feed quality, manure decomposition, and secondary greenhouse gas emissions under projected climate scenarios. This knowledge is essential to anticipate future emission trajectories and develop adaptive mitigation strategies.

CONCLUSION

Enteric methane emissions from intensive livestock production systems represent a significant and persistent driver of atmospheric change and ecosystem alteration. The biological process of methane production, mediated by rumen microbial fermentation and methanogenic archaea, varies across species, feed types, and productivity levels. Intensive livestock systems, characterized by high animal density, feedlot confinement, and concentrate-based feeding, amplify both absolute and regional methane emissions. These emissions exert profound atmospheric impacts, including enhanced radiative forcing, alteration of atmospheric chemistry, and contributions to regional air quality degradation. Simultaneously, persistent methane-driven climate effects influence terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems by modifying vegetation productivity, species composition, soil carbon dynamics, nutrient cycling, and hydrological processes.

Feedback loops between climate change and livestock emissions further exacerbate these impacts. Heat stress, reduced forage quality, altered rumen microbial dynamics, and accelerated manure decomposition interact to amplify methane output over time. Effective mitigation requires a combination of nutritional, genetic, microbial, and system-level strategies. Nutritional interventions, including feed additives, lipid supplementation, and precision feeding, reduce hydrogen availability for methanogenesis, while genetic selection and rumen microbiome manipulation offer long-term reduction potential. System-level approaches, including optimized housing, manure management, and productivity-driven emission reduction, integrate mitigation across the production cycle.

However, major research gaps remain, including the need for long-term ecosystem monitoring, integrated atmosphere-soil-water modelling, region-specific emission factors, and the development of climate-resilient livestock systems. Addressing these gaps is essential to accurately quantify the persistent atmospheric and ecosystem consequences of enteric methane and to design sustainable mitigation strategies. Overall, reducing methane emissions from intensive livestock production is critical for meeting climate goals while ensuring animal productivity, environmental sustainability, and global food security.

REFERENCES

1. K. Nedelkov, T. Angelova, J. Krastanov, and M. Mihaylova, "Feeding strategies to reduce methane emissions: A review," Bulg. J. Agric. Sci., vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 28–36, 2024.
2. V. Kader Esen, V. Palangi, and S. Esen, "Genetic Improvement and Nutrigenomic Management of Ruminants to Achieve Enteric Methane Mitigation: A Review," 2022, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/methane1040025.
3. J. C. Ku-Vera et al., "Review: Strategies for enteric methane mitigation in cattle fed tropical forages," Animal, vol. 14, pp. s453–s463, 2020, doi: 10.1017/S1751731120001780.
4. D. Pitta, N. Indugu, K. Narayan, and M. Hennessy, "Symposium review: Understanding the role of the rumen microbiome in enteric methane mitigation and productivity in dairy cows," 2022, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jds.2021-21466.
5. A. Hassen, N. Tesfamariam, N. Pepeta, and E. N. Tasfamariam, The Potential of Strategies Used to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emissions in Nutrition Studies of Ruminants: A review. preprints.org, 2024. [Online]. Available: www.preprints.org
6. A. A. Ribeiro et al., "Comparison of methods to measure enteric methane emissions from ruminants: an integrative review," Res. Soc. Dev., vol. 9, no. 11, p. e8259118143, 2020, doi: 10.33448/rsd-v9i11.8143.
7. A. N. Hristov, A. Melgar, D. Wasson, and C. Arndt, "Symposium review: Effective nutritional strategies to mitigate enteric methane in dairy cattle," J. Dairy Sci., vol. 105, no. 10, pp. 8543–8557, 2022, doi: 10.3168/jds.2021-21398.
8. P. Lakhani, R. Kumar, J. Madan, and S. Sindhu, "Ruminant Methane Mitigation- Strategy from Bench Top to Field Condition: A Review," Agric. Rev., vol. 44, no. Of, pp. 182–190, 2022, doi: 10.18805/ag.r-2152.
9. V. Palangi, A. Taghizadeh, S. Abachi, and M. Lackner, "Strategies to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emissions in Ruminants: A Review," Sustain., vol. 14, no. 20, p. 13229, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su142013229.
10. O. Gonzalez-Recio et al., "Review: Diving into the cow hologenome to reduce methane emissions and increase sustainability," 2023, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.animal.2023.100780.
11. W. Badgery et al., "Reducing enteric methane of ruminants in Australian grazing systems – a review of the role for temperate legumes and herbs," 2023, CSIRO Publishing. doi: 10.1071/CP22299.
12. M. T. Lambo, H. Ma, R. Liu, B. Dai, Y. Zhang, and Y. Li, "Review: Mechanism, effectiveness, and the prospects of medicinal plants and their bioactive compounds in lowering ruminants' enteric methane emission," Animal, vol. 18, no. 4, p. 101134, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.animal.2024.101134.
13. J. M. Tricarico et al., "Symposium review: Development of a funding program to support research on enteric methane mitigation from ruminants," J. Dairy Sci., vol. 105, no. 10, pp. 8535–8542, 2022, doi: 10.3168/jds.2021-21397.
14. S. Colombini et al., "Evaluation of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) equations to predict enteric methane emission from lactating cows fed Mediterranean diets," 2023, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jdsc.2022-0240.
15. M. Lawal, "Mitigation of Enteric Methane Emission in Africa as a Climate-Smart Livestock Strategy," 2023, library.faraafrica.org. [Online]. Available: https://library.faraafrica.org/storage/2023/04/FRR-Vol-765827-843.pdf
16. M. R. Beck, L. R. Thompson, T. N. Campbell, K. A. Stackhouse-Lawson, and S. L. Archibeque, "Implied climate warming contributions of enteric methane emissions are dependent on the estimate source and accounting methodology," Appl. Anim. Sci., vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 639–647, 2022, doi: 10.15232/aas.2022-02344.
17. M. Cheng, B. McCarl, and C. Fei, "Climate Change and Livestock Production: A Literature Review," 2022, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/atmos13010140.

18. M. Harmsen et al., "The role of methane in future climate strategies: mitigation potentials and climate impacts," Clim. Change, vol. 163, no. 3, pp. 1409–1425, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10584-019-02437-2.
19. T. Hammar, P. A. Hansson, and E. Röös, "Time-dependent climate impact of beef production – can carbon sequestration in soil offset enteric methane emissions?," 2022, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129948.
20. E. J. Raynor et al., "Snapshot of Enteric Methane Emissions from Stocker Cattle Grazing Extensive Semiarid Rangelands," 2024, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.rama.2024.01.001.
21. L. Mapfumo, S. M. Grobler, J. F. Mupangwa, M. M. Scholtz, and V. Muchenje, "Enteric methane output from selected herds of beef cattle raised under extensive arid rangelands," 2018, Springer. doi: 10.1186/s13570-018-0121-9.
22. N. E. Odongo et al., "Long-term effects of feeding monensin on methane production in lactating dairy cows," J. Dairy Sci., vol. 90, no. 4, pp. 1781–1788, 2007, doi: 10.3168/jds.2006-708.
23. I. C. Molina-Botero, M. D. Montoya-Flores, L. M. Zavala-Escalante, R. Barahona-Rosales, J. Arango, and J. C. Ku-Vera, "Effects of long-term diet supplementation with Gliricidia sepium foliage mixed with Enterolobium cyclocarpum pods on enteric methane, apparent digestibility, and rumen microbial population in crossbred heifers," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 1619–1633, 2019, doi: 10.1093/jas/skz067.
24. J. Guyader, M. Doreau, D. P. Morgavi, C. Gérard, C. Loncke, and C. Martin, "Long-term effect of linseed plus nitrate fed to dairy cows on enteric methane emission and nitrate and nitrite residuals in milk," Animal, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 1173–1181, 2016, doi: 10.1017/S1751731115002852.
25. E. M. Ungerfeld, K. A. Beauchemin, and C. Muñoz, "Current Perspectives on Achieving Pronounced Enteric Methane Mitigation From Ruminant Production," 2021, frontiersin.org. doi: 10.3389/fanim.2021.795200.
26. W. de Souza Filho et al., "Mitigation of enteric methane emissions through pasture management in integrated crop-livestock systems: Trade-offs between animal performance and environmental impacts," J. Clean. Prod., vol. 213, pp. 968–975, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.12.245.
27. A. Ivetić, R. Jovanović, M. Ćosić, B. Stojanović, and ..., "Effects of enteric methane mitigation practise," B. Proc. …, 2023, [Online]. Available: https://fiver.ifvcns.rs/handle/123456789/4037%0Ahttps://fiver.ifvcns.rs/bitstream/handle/123456789/4037/Ivetić et al.%2C 2023. EFFECTS OF ENTERIC METHANE MITIGATION PRACTISE. Village and Agriculture%2C BH.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
28. M. Saunois et al., "Global methane budget 2000–2020," Earth Syst. Sci. Data, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1873–1958, 2025.
29. A. R. Stavert et al., "Regional trends and drivers of the global methane budget," Glob. Chang. Biol., vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 182–200, 2022.
30. L. Zhang et al., "A 130-year global inventory of methane emissions from livestock: Trends, patterns, and drivers," Glob. Chang. Biol., vol. 28, no. 17, pp. 5142‑5158, 2022.
31. X. Lan, K. W. Thoning, and E. J. Dlugokencky, "Trends in globally-averaged CH4, N2O, and SF6 determined from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory measurements. Version 2024-04," 2024.
32. A. W. Alemu, K. H. Ominski, and E. Kebreab, "Estimation of enteric methane emissions trends (1990-2008) from Manitoba beef cattle using empirical and mechanistic models," Can. J. Anim. Sci., vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 305–321, 2011, doi: 10.4141/cjas2010-009.
33. A. Garg, B. Kankal, and P. R. Shukla, "Methane emissions in India: Sub-regional and sectoral trends," Atmos. Environ., vol. 45, no. 28, pp. 4922–4929, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.06.004.
34. A. Hardan, P. C. Garnsworthy, and M. J. Bell, "Variability in Enteric Methane Emissions among Dairy Cows during Lactation," 2023, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani13010157.
35. M. Díaz-Céspedes, J. E. Hernández-Guevara, and C. Gómez, "Enteric methane emissions by young Brahman bulls grazing tropical pastures at different rainfall seasons in the Peruvian jungle," Trop. Anim. Health Prod., vol. 53, no. 4, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11250-021-02871-4.
36. M. Ascolani, Evaluation of Nutritional Strategies to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emissions from Beef

Cattle Consuming High-Fiber Diets. search.proquest.com, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://search.proquest.com/openview/c2cf7ed9eac54733c68e76c22fbcfa3e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y
37. H. J. van Lingen, J. G. Fadel, E. Kebreab, A. Bannink, J. Dijkstra, and S. van Gastelen, "Smoothing spline assessment of the accuracy of enteric hydrogen and methane production measurements from dairy cattle using various sampling schemes," 2023, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jds.2022-23207.
38. J. I. McCauley et al., "Management of Enteric Methanogenesis in Ruminants by Algal-Derived Feed Additives," Curr. Pollut. Reports, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 188–205, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40726-020-00151-7.
39. A. Buccioni, A. Cappucci, and M. Mele, "Methane emission from enteric fermentation: Methanogenesis and fermentation," Clim. Chang. Impact Livest. Adapt. Mitig., pp. 171–186, 2015, doi: 10.1007/978-81-322-2265-1_11.
40. B. Yanibada et al., "Inhibition of enteric methanogenesis in dairy cows induces changes in plasma metabolome highlighting metabolic shifts and potential markers of emission," 2020, nature.com. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-72145-w.
41. E. T. Kim et al., "Changes in microbial diversity, methanogenesis and fermentation characteristics in the rumen in response to medicinal plant extracts," Asian-Australasian J. Anim. Sci., vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1289–1294, 2013, doi: 10.5713/ajas.2013.13072.
42. K. Starsmore, "Animal factors affecting enteric methane production in late lactation pasture based dairy cows in Ireland: a thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the …," 2022, Massey University.
43. M. I. Tongwane and M. E. Moeletsi, "Emission factors and carbon emissions of methane from enteric fermentation of cattle produced under different management systems in South Africa," J. Clean. Prod., vol. 265, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121931.
44. N. M. Soren, V. Sejian, M. Terhuja, and G. Dominic, "Enteric methane emission in sheep: Process description and factors influencing production," Sheep Prod. Adapt. to Clim. Chang., pp. 209–233, 2017, doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-4714-5_10.
45. J. P. Goopy, P. W. Ndung'u, A. Onyango, P. Kirui, and K. Butterbach-Bahl, "Calculation of new enteric methane emission factors for small ruminants in western Kenya highlights the heterogeneity of smallholder production systems," 2021, CSIRO Publishing. doi: 10.1071/AN19631.
46. M. Islam, S. H. Kim, A. R. Son, S. S. Lee, and S. S. Lee, "Breed and Season-Specific Methane Conversion Factors Influence Methane Emission Factor for Enteric Methane of Dairy Steers," 2022, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/su14127030.
47. Y. Widiawati, M. N. Rofiq, and B. Tiesnamurti, Methane emission factors for enteric fermentation in beef cattle using IPCC Tier-2 method in Indonesia, vol. 21, no. 2. cabidigitallibrary.org, 2016. doi: 10.14334/jitv.v21i2.1358.
48. A. B. Donadia, R. N. S. Torres, H. M. da Silva, S. R. Soares, A. K. Hoshide, and A. S. de Oliveira, "Factors Affecting Enteric Emission Methane and Predictive Models for Dairy Cows," 2023, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani13111857.
49. C. J. Nelson and L. E. Moser, "Plant factors affecting forage quality," Forage Qual. Eval. Util., pp. 115–154, 2015, doi: 10.2134/1994.foragequality.c3.
50. A. A. Feyissa, F. Senbeta, A. Tolera, D. Diriba, and K. Boonyanuwat, "Enteric methane emission factors of smallholder dairy farming systems across intensification gradients in the central highlands of Ethiopia," 2023, Springer. doi: 10.1186/s13021-023-00242-0.
51. K. Starsmore, N. Lopez-Villalobos, L. Shalloo, M. Egan, J. Burke, and B. Lahart, "Animal factors that affect enteric methane production measured using the GreenFeed monitoring system in grazing dairy cows," J. Dairy Sci., vol. 107, no. 5, pp. 2930–2940, 2024, doi: 10.3168/jds.2023-23915.
52. M. R. Allen, J. S. Fuglestvedt, K. P. Shine, A. Reisinger, R. T. Pierrehumbert, and P. M. Forster, "New use of global warming potentials to compare cumulative and short-lived climate pollutants," Nat. Clim. Chang., vol. 6, no. 8, pp. 773–776, 2016, doi: 10.1038/nclimate2998.
53. D. Bačėninaitė, K. Džermeikaitė, and R. Antanaitis, "Global Warming and Dairy Cattle: How to Control and Reduce Methane Emission," 2022, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani12192687.
54. M. R. Beck et al., "U.S. manure methane emissions represent a greater contributor to implied

climate warming than enteric methane emissions using the global warming potential* methodology," 2023, frontiersin.org. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2023.1209541.
55. D. Blaustein-Rejto and C. Gambino, "Livestock Don't Contribute 14.5% of Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions," https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/food-agriculture-environment/livestock-dont-contribute-14-5-of-global-greenhouse-gas-emissions?gad_source=1&gclid=CjwKCAiA-vOsBhAAEiwAIWR0TV-uhtBhSFRKtzfNuMWBNs8QRYSVF6J4yWChVICvKZIFgJd7531nkhoCoXQQAvD_BwE, vol. 20, 2023.
56. T. Sakai, T. K. Chi, T. N. Van, T. Suzuki, K. Hayashi, and K. Higuchi, "Ventilated hood system for measurements of enteric methane emissions in Vietnam.," 2016, researchgate.net. [Online]. Available: http://www.jircas.affrc.go.jp/english/publication/working/report_index.html
57. A. V. Carrazco et al., "The impact of essential oil feed supplementation on enteric gas emissions and production parameters from dairy cattle," 2020, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/su122410347.
58. S. M. McGinn, T. K. Flesch, L. A. Harper, and K. A. Beauchemin, "An Approach for Measuring Methane Emissions from Whole Farms," J. Environ. Qual., vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 14–20, 2006, doi: 10.2134/jeq2005.0250.
59. R. Bhatta, "Reducing enteric methane emission using plant secondary metabolites," Clim. Chang. Impact Livest. Adapt. Mitig., pp. 273–284, 2015, doi: 10.1007/978-81-322-2265-1_17.
60. D. N. Kamra, N. Agarwal, and L. C. Chaudhary, "Manipulation of rumen microbial ecosystem for reducing enteric methane emission in livestock," Clim. Chang. Impact Livest. Adapt. Mitig., pp. 255–272, 2015, doi: 10.1007/978-81-322-2265-1_16.
61. S. M. Staerfl, J. O. Zeitz, M. Kreuzer, and C. R. Soliva, "Methane conversion rate of bulls fattened on grass or maize silage as compared with the IPCC default values, and the long-term methane mitigation efficiency of adding acacia tannin, garlic, maca and lupine," Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., vol. 148, pp. 111–120, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2011.11.003.
62. L. Kelly and E. Kebreab, "Recent advances in feed additives with the potential to mitigate enteric methane emissions from ruminant livestock," J. Soil Water Conserv., vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 111–123, 2023, doi: 10.2489/jswc.2023.00070.
63. J. M. Machado et al., "Strategies to mitigate the emission of methane in pastures: enteric methane: A review," Aust. J. Crop Sci., vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 682–690, 2022, doi: 10.21475/ajcs.22.16.06.p3457.
64. M. Eugène, K. Klumpp, and D. Sauvant, "Methane mitigating options with forages fed to ruminants," Grass Forage Sci., vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 196–204, 2021, doi: 10.1111/gfs.12540.
65. Y. Pan, Z. Rao, W. Yu, B. Chen, and C. Chu, "Water Vapor Condensation Triggers Simultaneous Oxidation and Hydrolysis of Organic Pollutants on Iron Mineral Surfaces.," Environ. Sci. Technol., 2024, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.4c03195.
66. D. A. Boadi et al., "Effect of low and high forage diet on enteric and manure pack greenhouse gas emissions from a feedlot," Can. J. Anim. Sci., vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 445–453, 2004, doi: 10.4141/A03-079.
67. L. F. Oliveira et al., "Feed efficiency and enteric methane production of Nellore cattle in the feedlot and on pasture," Anim. Prod. Sci., vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 886–893, 2018, doi: 10.1071/AN16303.
68. J. I. Velazco, D. J. Cottle, and R. S. Hegarty, "Methane emissions and feeding behaviour of feedlot cattle supplemented with nitrate or urea," Anim. Prod. Sci., vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 1737–1740, 2014, doi: 10.1071/AN14345.
69. R. A. Silva et al., "Effects of different forms of soybean lipids on enteric methane emission, performance and meat quality of feedlot Nellore," J. Agric. Sci., vol. 156, no. 3, pp. 427–436, 2018, doi: 10.1017/S002185961800045X.
70. A. A. G. LOBO et al., "Effect of intensive and integrated grazing systems, in seasons, on methane mitigation in Nellore.," In: INTERNATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS & ANIMAL AGRICULTURE CONFERENCE, 8, 2022.
71. P. Dumortier et al., "Methane balance of an intensively grazed pasture and estimation of the enteric methane emissions from cattle," Agric. For. Meteorol., vol. 232, pp. 527–535, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.09.010.

72. G. Flores-Coello et al., “Intensive Silvopastoral Systems Mitigate Enteric Methane Emissions from Cattle,” 2023, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/atmos14050863.
73. G. Martínez-Marín, S. Schiavon, F. Tagliapietra, A. Cecchinato, H. Toledo-Alvarado, and G. Bittante, “Interactions among breed, farm intensiveness and cow productivity on predicted enteric methane emissions at the population level,” Ital. J. Anim. Sci., vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 59–75, 2023, doi: 10.1080/1828051X.2022.2158953.
74. S. F. Kirwan, L. F. M. Tamassia, N. D. Walker, A. Karagiannis, M. Kindermann, and S. M. Waters, “Effects of dietary supplementation with 3-nitrooxypropanol on enteric methane production, rumen fermentation, and performance in young growing beef cattle offered a 50:50 forage:concentrate diet,” J. Anim. Sci., vol. 102, 2024, doi: 10.1093/jas/skad399.
75. M. Schilde et al., “Dose–response effects of 3-nitrooxypropanol combined with low-and high-concentrate feed proportions in the dairy cow ration on fermentation parameters in a rumen simulation technique,” Animals, vol. 11, no. 6, p. 1784, 2021, doi: 10.3390/ani11061784.
76. G. Giagnoni, M. Johansen, P. Lund, and ..., “Effect of type of silage and concentrate on eating behaviour and relation to enteric methane,” 72nd Annu. Meet. …, 2021, [Online]. Available: https://pure.au.dk/portal/en/publications/effect-of-type-of-silage-and-concentrate-on-eating-behaviour-and-
77. D. W. Olijhoek et al., “Feeding up to 91% concentrate to Holstein and Jersey dairy cows: Effects on enteric methane emission, rumen fermentation and bacterial community, digestibility, production, and feeding behavior,” 2022, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jds.2021-21676.
78. C. P. Ferris, H. P. Jiao, S. Murray, A. Gordon, and S. Laidlaw, “Effect of dairy cow genotype and concentrate feed level on cow performance and enteric methane emissions during grazing,” Agric. Food Sci., vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 130–138, 2020, doi: 10.23986/afsci.83442.
79. M. B. de Ondarza, A. N. Hristov, and J. M. Tricarico, “A global dataset of enteric methane mitigation experiments with beef cattle conducted from 1963 to 2023,” 2024, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2024.110666.
80. A. R. Moss, J. P. Jouany, and J. Newbold, “Methane production by ruminants: Its contribution to global warming,” Anim. Res., vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 231–253, 2000, doi: 10.1051/animres:2000119.
81. M. B. de Ondarza, A. N. Hristov, and J. M. Tricarico, “A global dataset of enteric methane mitigation experiments with lactating and non-lactating dairy cows conducted from 1963 to 2022,” 2023, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2023.109459.
82. V. Sejian, I. Shekhawat, V. Ujor, T. Ezeji, J. Lakritz, and R. Lal, “Global climate change: Enteric methane reduction strategies in livestock,” Environ. Stress Amelior. Livest. Prod., vol. 9783642292, pp. 469–499, 2012, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-29205-7_16.
83. A. Thorpe, “Enteric fermentation and ruminant eructation: The role (and control?) of methane in the climate change debate,” Clim. Change, vol. 93, no. 3–4, pp. 407–431, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s10584-008-9506-x.
84. P. Pragna, S. S. Chauhan, V. Sejian, B. J. Leury, and F. R. Dunshea, “Climate change and goat production: Enteric methane emission and its mitigation,” 2018, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani8120235.
85. V. Sejian and S. M. K. Naqvi, “Livestock and Climate Change: Mitigation Strategies to Reduce Methane Production,” Greenh. Gases - Capturing, Util. Reduct., 2012, doi: 10.5772/32014.
86. J. Sun, G. Zhao, and M. M. Li, “Using Nutritional Strategies To Mitigate Ruminal Methane Emissions From Ruminants,” Front. Agric. Sci. Eng., vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 390–402, 2023, doi: 10.15302/J-FASE-2023504.
87. J. Vargas, E. Ungerfeld, C. Muñoz, and N. Dilorenzo, “Feeding Strategies to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emission from Ruminants in Grassland Systems,” Animals, vol. 12, no. 9, pp. 1–13, 2022, doi: 10.3390/ani12091132.
88. Y. Dini, J. I. Gere, C. Cajarville, and V. S. Ciganda, “Using highly nutritious pastures to mitigate enteric methane emissions from cattle grazing systems in South America,” Anim. Prod. Sci., vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 2329–2334, 2018, doi: 10.1071/AN16803.
89. T. Tseten, R. A. Sanjorjo, M. Kwon, and S. W. Kim, “Strategies to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emissions from Ruminant Animals,” J. Microbiol. Biotechnol., vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 269–277, 2022, doi: 10.4014/jmb.2202.02019.

90. K. Garrett, M. R. Beck, and P. Gregorini, "Strategic feeding management to mitigate enteric methane emissions and urinary nitrogen excretion.," 2019, researchgate.net. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew-Beck-10/publication/334317005_Strategic_feeding_management_to_mitigate_enteric_methane_emissions_and_urinary_nitrogen_excretion/links/5d24550ca6fdcc2462ce1862/Strategic-feeding-management-to-mitigate-enteric-me
91. S. van Gastelen, J. Dijkstra, and A. Bannink, "Are dietary strategies to mitigate enteric methane emission equally effective across dairy cattle, beef cattle, and sheep?," 2019, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jds.2018-15785.
92. C. Arndt, A. N. Hristov, W. J. Price, and ..., "Strategies to mitigate enteric methane emissions by ruminants and how they can meet the 1.5° C climate target by 2030 but not 2050," Proc. …, 2022, [Online]. Available: https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/103980/
93. J. Vargas, E. Ungerfeld, C. Muñoz, and N. Dilorenzo, "Feeding Strategies to Mitigate Enteric Methane Emission from Ruminants in Grassland Systems," 2022, academia.edu. doi: 10.3390/ani12091132.
94. A. Thacharodi et al., "The ruminant gut microbiome vs enteric methane emission: The essential microbes may help to mitigate the global methane crisis," Environ. Res., vol. 261, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2024.119661.
95. C. Arndt et al., "Full adoption of the most effective strategies to mitigate methane emissions by ruminants can help meet the 1.5 °C target by 2030 but not 2050," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., vol. 119, no. 20, pp. 1–10, 2022, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2111294119.
96. C. Arndt et al., Strategies to mitigate enteric methane emissions by ruminants - a way to approach the 2.0°C target., vol. 2021. pure.sruc.ac.uk, 2021. doi: 10.31220/agrirxiv.2021.00040.
97. R. R. Lobo et al., "SF6 Tracer Technique to Estimate Methane Emission in a Dual-Flow Continuous Culture System: Test and Application," Fermentation, vol. 10, no. 8, p. 394, 2024.
98. A. C. Boulton et al., "Applying the SF6 tracer gas methodology to measure enteric methane emissions in grazing Brahman heifers," CSIRO Publishing, 2025.
99. S. R. O. Williams, P. J. Moate, M. C. Hannah, B. E. Ribaux, W. J. Wales, and R. J. Eckard, "Background matters with the SF6 tracer method for estimating enteric methane emissions from dairy cows: A critical evaluation of the SF6 procedure," Anim. Feed Sci. Technol., vol. 170, no. 3–4, pp. 265–276, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.08.013.
100. P. J. Moate et al., "Measurement of Enteric Methane Emissions by the SF6 Technique Is Not Affected by Ambient Weather Conditions," 2021, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani11020528.
101. M. Arbre et al., "Repeatability of enteric methane determinations from cattle using either the SF6 tracer technique or the GreenFeed system," Anim. Prod. Sci., vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 238–243, 2016, doi: 10.1071/AN15512.
102. Y. Rochette, M. Eugène, M. Doreau, and ..., "Determination of enteric methane emission by SF6 tracer technique: permeation tubes must be calibrated after incubation in the rumen for an accurate …," 2012, researchgate.net. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Melynda-Hassouna/publication/315840925_ammonia_and_greenhouse_gas_emissions_in_pig_fattening_on_slatted_floor_with_excrement_discharge_by_flat_scraping/links/5c8b61ac92851c1df941bc19/ammonia-and-greenhouse-gas-emission
103. K. R. Lassey, C. S. Pinares-Patiño, R. J. Martin, G. Molano, and A. M. S. McMillan, "Enteric methane emission rates determined by the SF6 tracer technique: Temporal patterns and averaging periods," Anim. Feed Sci. Technol., vol. 166–167, pp. 183–191, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.066.
104. C. Pinares-Patiño et al., "Extending the collection duration of breath samples for enteric methane emission estimation using the SF6 tracer technique," 2012, mdpi.com. doi: 10.3390/ani2020275.
105. M. G. G. Chagunda and T. Yan, "Do methane measurements from a laser detector and an indirect open-circuit respiration calorimetric chamber agree sufficiently closely?," Anim. Feed Sci. Technol., vol. 165, no. 1–2, pp. 8–14, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.02.005.
106. G. M. Landín, E. R. Rodríguez, T. C. R. de Souza, and G. Ordaz Ochoa, "Accuracy validation of

open-circuit respiration chambers for the assessment of energy metabolism and enteric methane emissions in pigs and small ruminants," Flow Meas. Instrum., vol. 97, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.flowmeasinst.2024.102564.
107. A. L. F. Hellwing, P. Lund, J. Madsen, and M. R. Weisbjerg, "Comparison of enteric methane production predicted from the CH4/CO2 ratio and measured in respiration chambers," Adv. Anim. Biosci., vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 6077–6085, 2013, [Online]. Available: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/advances-in-animal-biosciences/article/poster-presentations-wednesday/368985EBED95BB10307CD68888EAFAE3
108. R. Wang et al., "Technical note: Evaluation of interval between measurements and calculation method for the quantification of enteric methane emissions measured by respiration chamber," 2019, Elsevier. doi: 10.3168/jds.2019-16245.
109. J. C. Ku-Vera et al., "Determination of methane yield in cattle fed tropical grasses as measured in open-circuit respiration chambers," Agric. For. Meteorol., vol. 258, pp. 3–7, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.01.008.
110. A. W. Alemu, D. Vyas, G. Manafiazar, J. A. Basarab, and K. A. Beauchemin, "Enteric methane emissions from low– and high–residual feed intake beef heifers measured using greenfeed and respiration chamber techniques," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 95, no. 8, pp. 3727–3737, 2017, doi: 10.2527/jas.2017.1501.
111. A. Jonker, G. Molano, C. Antwi, and G. C. Waghorn, "Enteric methane and carbon dioxide emissions measured using respiration chambers, the sulfur hexafluoride tracer technique, and a greenfeed head-chamber system from beef heifers fed alfalfa silage at three allowances and four feeding frequencies," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 94, no. 10, pp. 4326–4337, 2016, doi: 10.2527/jas.2016-0646.
112. Y. G. Zhao, N. E. O'Connell, and T. Yan, "Prediction of enteric methane emissions from sheep offered fresh perennial ryegrass (Lolium perenne) using data measured in indirect open-circuit respiration chambers," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 94, no. 6, pp. 2425–2435, 2016, doi: 10.2527/jas.2016-0334.
113. J. I. Arceo-Castillo et al., "Assessment of the accuracy of open-circuit respiration chambers for measuring enteric methane emissions in cattle," 2021, scielo.org.mx. doi: 10.20937/ATM.52839.
114. A. Belanche et al., "Prediction of enteric methane emissions by sheep using an intercontinental database," 2023, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.135523.
115. C. V. Ryan et al., "Exploring definitions of daily enteric methane emission phenotypes for genetic evaluations using a population of indoor-fed multi-breed growing cattle with feed intake data," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 102, 2024, doi: 10.1093/jas/skae034.
116. P. W. Ndung'u, P. Kirui, T. Takahashi, C. J. L. du Toit, L. Merbold, and J. P. Goopy, "Data describing cattle performance and feed characteristics to calculate enteric methane emissions in smallholder livestock systems in Bomet County, Kenya," 2021, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2021.107673.
117. R. Liu et al., "Predicting enteric methane emission in lactating Holsteins based on reference methane data collected by the GreenFeed system," 2022, Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/j.animal.2022.100469.
118. G. F. S. Congio et al., "Prediction of enteric methane production and yield in sheep using a Latin America and Caribbean database," Livest. Sci., vol. 264, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.livsci.2022.105036.
119. E. M. Ross, B. J. Hayes, D. Tucker, J. Bond, S. E. Denman, and V. H. Oddy, "Genomic predictions for enteric methane production are improved by metabolome and microbiome data in sheep (Ovis aries)," J. Anim. Sci., vol. 98, no. 10, 2020, doi: 10.1093/JAS/SKAA262.
120. G. F. S. Congio et al., "Prediction of enteric methane production and yield in sheep using a Latin America and Caribbean database," Livest. Sci., vol. 264, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.livsci.2022.105036.
121. T. Dekar and J. H. Komen, "Exploring appropriate methods to standardize data on enteric methane emission of Dutch dairy cows," 2022, edepot.wur.nl. [Online]. Available: https://edepot.wur.nl/575342
122. J. B. Veneman, E. R. Saetnan, A. J. Clare, and C. J. Newbold, "MitiGate; an online meta-analysis

database for quantification of mitigation strategies for enteric methane emissions," Sci. Total Environ., vol. 572, pp. 1166–1174, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.08.029.
123. B. Darabighane et al., "The Trade-Off between Enteric and Manure Methane Emissions and Their Bacterial Ecology in Lactating Cows Fed Diets Varying in Forage-to-Concentrate Ratio and Rapeseed Oil," Methane, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 12–32, 2024, doi: 10.3390/methane3010002.
124. L. E. Moraes, J. G. Fadel, A. R. Castillo, D. P. Casper, J. M. Tricarico, and E. Kebreab, "Modeling the trade-off between diet costs and methane emissions: A goal programming approach," J. Dairy Sci., vol. 98, no. 8, pp. 5557–5571, 2015, doi: 10.3168/jds.2014-9138.

