

Ruminant Nutrition 4: Methane

354 Relationships between enteric methane emission, nutrient digestibility, and production efficiency in lactating dairy cows: A meta-regression. L. F. Martins^{*1}, N. Stepanchenko¹, A. Bannink², C. Benchaar³, A. F. Brito⁴, C. Cajarville⁵, M. M. Campos⁶, A. L. Carroll⁷, S. Colombini⁸, G. F. S. Congio⁹, L. Crompton¹⁰, S. C. da Silva⁹, M. M. Della Rosa¹¹, J. Dijkstra¹², L. Dong¹³, M. Eugène¹⁴, P. Fanti¹⁵, G. Giagnoni¹⁶, K. Goossens¹⁷, P. Huhtanen¹⁸, A. Jonker¹⁹, E. Kebreab²⁰, P. J. Konofo²¹, M. Kreuzer²², P. Lund¹⁶, M. Maigaard¹⁶, C. Martin²³, R. M. Mauricio^{24,25}, G. D. Melo²⁶, A. M. Moura²⁷, C. Muñoz²⁸, M. Niu²², M. Paz Tieni²⁹, N. Peiren¹⁷, D. Qiuy³⁰, M. Ramin¹⁵, R. Rauch²⁶, C. K. Reynolds³¹, P. Ricci³², A. Rytz²⁶, F. A. P. Santos^{33,34}, A. L. Silva³⁵, T. R. Tomich⁶, S. van Gastelen², L. Vandaele³⁶, M. Wang³⁷, M. R. Weisbjerg³⁸, S. R. O. Williams³⁹, T. Yan⁴⁰, and A. N. Hristov¹, ¹Department of Animal Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, ²Wageningen Livestock Research, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands, ³Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Sherbrooke Research and Development Centre, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada, ⁴Department of Agriculture, Nutrition, and Food Systems, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, ⁵Departamento de Producción Animal y Salud de los Sistemas Productivos (IPAV), Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad de la República Oriental del Uruguay, San José, Uruguay, ⁶Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, Embrapa Dairy Cattle, Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais, Brazil, ⁷Department of Animal Sciences, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, ⁸Department of Agricultural and Environmental Science, University of Milan, Milan, Italy, ⁹Department of Animal Science, Luiz de Queiroz College of Agriculture, University of Sao Paulo, Piracicaba, SP, Brazil, ¹⁰Centre for Dairy Research, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Earley Gate, Reading, United Kingdom, ¹¹Bioeconomy Science Institute, Grasslands Research Centre, Palmerston North, New Zealand, ¹²Animal Nutrition Group, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands, ¹³Institute of Feed Research, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences/Sino-US Joint Lab on Nutrition and Metabolism of Ruminant/Key Laboratory of Feed Biotechnology of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Beijing, People's Republic of China, ¹⁴INRAE, Université Clermont, VetAgroSup, Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France, ¹⁵Department of Applied Animal Science and Welfare, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Skogsmarksgränd, Umeå, Sweden, ¹⁶Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, Aarhus University, Tjele, Denmark, ¹⁷Animal Sciences Unit, Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Merelbeke-Melle, Belgium, ¹⁸Animal Nutrition, Production Systems, Natural Resources Institute Finland (LUKE), Jokioinen, Finland, ¹⁹Bioeconomy Science Institute, Grasslands Research Centre, Palmerston North, New Zealand, and School of Agriculture and Environment, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, ²⁰Department of Animal Science, University of California, Davis, CA, ²¹Department of Animal Science, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, ²²Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, ²³INRAE, Université Clermont, VetAgroSup, Herbivores, Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France, ²⁴Bio-Engineering Department, Federal University of São João Del Rei, São João Del Rei, Minas Gerais, Brazil, ²⁵Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, Embrapa Dairy Cattle, Juiz de Fora, Brazil, ²⁶Nestlé Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Nestlé Research, Lausanne, Switzerland, ²⁷Animal Production Department, Animal Science Institute, Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro, Seropédica, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ²⁸Centro Regional de Investigación Remehue, Instituto de Investigaciones

Agropecuarias, Osorno, Los Lagos, Chile, ²⁹Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria, INTA, Argentina, ³⁰Feed Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, ³¹Centre for Dairy Research, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Earley Gate, Reading, United Kingdom, ³²National Scientific and Technical Research Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina, ³³National Institute of Agricultural Technology, Balcarce, Argentina, ³⁴Department of Animal Science, Luiz de Queiroz College of Agriculture, University of Sao Paulo, Piracicaba, SP, Brazil, ³⁵Department of Animal Science, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, MG, Brazil, ³⁶Animal Sciences Unit, Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Merelbeke-Melle, Belgium, ³⁷State Key Laboratory of Forage Breeding-by-Design and Utilization, National Engineering Laboratory for Pollution Control and Waste Utilization in Livestock and Poultry Production, Institute of Subtropical Agriculture, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Changsha, China, ³⁸Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, Aarhus University, Tjele, Denmark, ³⁹Agriculture Victoria Research, Department of Energy Environment and Climate Action, Ellinbank, Victoria, Australia, ⁴⁰Sustainable Livestock Systems Branch, Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute, Hillborough, United Kingdom. *Current address: INRAE, ASSET, Centre Antilles-Guyane, Domaine Duclos, Prise d'Eau, Guadeloupe, France.

Interest in selecting cows for low enteric CH₄ emission has raised concerns about potential tradeoffs with nutrient digestibility and lactational performance. The objective was to quantify relationships among enteric CH₄ emission, production variables, and nutrient digestibility in dairy cows. Individual cow data (n = 5,146) from 163 studies were compiled. Cows averaged (mean ± SD) 22.7 ± 4.8 kg/d DMI, 32.5 ± 8.3 kg/d ECM, and 597 ± 109 kg BW. Response variables were daily enteric CH₄ production (CH₄P; g/d), CH₄ yield (CH₄Y; g/kg DMI), and CH₄ intensity (CH₄I; g/kg ECM). Linear mixed models included centered predictors, DMI (% BW) as a covariate, and study as random effect. Effect sizes reported here represent the expected change in each CH₄ response variable per unit increase in the predictor (e.g., kg/d, % BW, %). Methane production increased with DMI (% BW; 25.8 ± 3.51 g/d), milk yield (MY; kg/d; 1.8 ± 0.28 g/d), milk fat (% and kg/d; 21.6 ± 3.19 and 95.4 ± 6.57 g/d), and milk true protein (kg/d; 95.9 ± 9.11 g/d), but decreased with feed efficiency (FE; kg/kg; -35.7 ± 7.80 and -15.5 ± 8.44 g/d on MY and ECM bases; P ≤ 0.07). Methane yield decreased with MY (-0.054 ± 0.012 g/kg) and milk true protein (kg/d; -1.77 ± 0.407 g/kg) but increased with milk fat (% and kg/d; 0.95 ± 0.109 and 1.24 ± 0.294 g/kg; P < 0.01). Methane intensity decreased with DMI (% BW; -1.73 ± 0.154) and FE (kg/kg; -7.81 ± 0.278 and -8.79 ± 0.304 g/kg on MY and ECM bases; P ≤ 0.02). Methane production was positively associated (P ≤ 0.01) with OM (%; 1.25 ± 0.484 g/d), NDF (%; 1.64 ± 0.273 g/d), and ADF digestibility (%; 1.86 ± 0.324 g/d), and negatively associated (P < 0.01) with starch (%; -4.07 ± 1.387 g/d), ether extract (%; -1.33 ± 0.397 g/d), and CP digestibility (%; -1.43 ± 0.376 g/d). Similar but smaller effects were observed for CH₄Y and CH₄I (-0.13 to 0.08 g/kg). In conclusion, increased milk production reduced both CH₄Y and CH₄I, whereas improved FE reduced both CH₄P and CH₄I. Selection for production may reduce emission intensity despite the positive relationships between OM and fiber digestibility and CH₄P.

Key Words: milk production, greenhouse gas, feed efficiency, phenotype

355 Additive × additive interactions on enteric methane, digestibility, and rumen fermentation in lactating dairy cows using in