



HAL
open science

Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database

Henk J. Van Lingen, Mutian Niu, Ermias Kebreab, Sebastião C. Valadares Filho, John Rooke, Carol-Anne Duthie, Angela Schwarm, Michael Kreuzer, Phil I. Hynd, Mariana Caetanof, et al.

► To cite this version:

Henk J. Van Lingen, Mutian Niu, Ermias Kebreab, Sebastião C. Valadares Filho, John Rooke, et al.. Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 2019, 283, pp.106575. 10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575 . hal-02159608

HAL Id: hal-02159608

<https://hal.science/hal-02159608>

Submitted on 18 Jun 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com

Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database

Henk J. van Lingen^{a,*}, Mutian Niu^{a,b}, Ermias Kebreab^a, Sebastião C. Valadares Filho^c, John A. Rooke^d, Carol-Anne Duthie^d, Angela Schwarm^{e,1}, Michael Kreuzer^e, Phil I. Hynd^f, Mariana Caetano^f, Maguy Eugène^g, Cécile Martin^g, Mark McGee^h, Padraig O'Kiely^h, Martin Hünerberg^{i,j}, Tim A. McAllisterⁱ, Telma T. Berchielli^k, Juliana D. Messana^k, Nico Peiren^l, Alex V. Chaves^m, Ed Charmleyⁿ, N. Andy Cole^o, Kristin E. Hales^p, Sang-Suk Lee^q, Alexandre Berndt^r, Christopher K. Reynolds^s, Les A. Crompton^s, Ali-Reza Bayat^t, David R. Yáñez-Ruiz^u, Zhongtang Yu^v, André Bannink^w, Jan Dijkstra^x, David P. Casper^y, Alexander N. Hristov^z

^a Department of Animal Science, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

^b Farmer's Business Network Inc., San Carlos, CA 94070, USA

^c Animal Science Department, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil

^d SRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JG, UK

^e ETH Zurich, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland

^f Department of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience, The University of Adelaide, Roseworthy Campus, Roseworthy, SA 5371, Australia

^g INRA, UMR Herbivores, VetAgro Sup, Université Clermont Auvergne, F-63122 Saint-Genès-Champagnelle, France

^h Teagasc, Grange, Dunsany, Co. Meath, Ireland

ⁱ Department of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

^j Lethbridge Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, AB, Canada

^k Animal Science Department, São Paulo State University, UNESP, Jaboticabal, SP 14884-900, Brazil

^l Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Animal Sciences Unit, Scheldeweg 68, Melle 9090, Belgium

^m The University of Sydney, Faculty of Science, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Sydney, NSW, Australia

ⁿ CSIRO Agriculture and Food, Private Mail Bag, PO Aitkenvale, Qld 4814, Australia

^o USDA-ARS, Bushland, TX 79012, USA

^p USDA-ARS, Clay Center, NE 68933, USA

^q Department of Animal Science and Technology, Suncheon National University, Suncheon, South Korea

^r Research and Development, EMBRAPA Southeast Livestock, Rod Washington Luiz, km 234, PO Box 339, 13560-970 Sao Carlos, SP, Brazil

^s School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Reading, UK

^t Milk Production, Production Systems, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Jokioinen, Finland

^u Estación Experimental del Zaidín (CSIC), Granada, Spain

^v Department of Animal Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

^w Wageningen Livestock Research, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands

^x Animal Nutrition Group, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands

^y Furst McNess Company, Freeport, IL, 61032, USA

^z Department of Animal Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park 16802, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Empirical modeling
Geographical region
Forage content
Dietary variables
Methane emission

ABSTRACT

Enteric methane (CH₄) production attributable to beef cattle contributes to global greenhouse gas emissions. Reliably estimating this contribution requires extensive CH₄ emission data from beef cattle under different management conditions worldwide. The objectives were to: 1) predict CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), yield [g (kg dry matter intake; DMI)⁻¹] and intensity [g (kg average daily gain)⁻¹] using an intercontinental database (data from Europe, North America, Brazil, Australia and South Korea); 2) assess the impact of geographic region, and of higher- and lower-forage diets. Linear models were developed by incrementally adding covariates. A K-fold cross-validation indicated that a CH₄ production equation using only DMI that was fitted to all available data had a root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of observed mean) of 31.2%. Subsets containing data with

* Corresponding author.

Email address: hjvanlingen@ucdavis.edu (H.J. van Lingen)

¹ Present address: Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, 1433 Ås, Norway.

$\geq 25\%$ and $\leq 18\%$ dietary forage contents had an RMSPE of 30.8 and 34.2%, with the all-data CH_4 production equation, whereas these errors decreased to 29.3 and 28.4%, respectively, when using CH_4 prediction equations fitted to these subsets. The RMSPE of the $\geq 25\%$ forage subset further decreased to 24.7% when using multiple regression. Europe- and North America-specific subsets predicted by the best performing $\geq 25\%$ forage multiple regression equation had RMSPE of 24.5 and 20.4%, whereas these errors were 24.5 and 20.0% with region-specific equations, respectively. The developed equations had less RMSPE than extant equations evaluated for all data (22.5 vs. 23.2%), for higher-forage (21.2 vs. 23.1%), but not for the lower-forage subsets (28.4 vs. 27.9%). Splitting the dataset by forage content did not improve CH_4 yield or intensity predictions. Predicting beef cattle CH_4 production using energy conversion factors, as applied by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, indicated that adequate forage content-based and region-specific energy conversion factors improve prediction accuracy and are preferred in national or global inventories.

1. Introduction

The livestock sector emits about 7.1 gigatonnes of CO_2 equivalents of greenhouse gases per year, which represented approximately 14.5% of total global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions in 2005 (Gerber et al., 2013). Cattle emitted 4.6 gigatonnes CO_2 equivalents, of which 2.5 gigatonnes originated from beef and 2.1 gigatonnes from dairy cattle, whereas small ruminants and buffalos emitted 0.47 and 0.62 gigatonnes CO_2 equivalents, respectively. Methane from enteric fermentation contributed about 45% of the combined CO_2 equivalents emissions from the two cattle types. World-wide beef cattle systems produced 35 million tonnes of meat, whereas dairy cattle systems produced 27 million tonnes. Meat protein greenhouse gas emission intensity from beef cattle, and combined meat and milk protein intensity from dairy cattle vary from about 200 to 1100, and 50 to 350 kg CO_2 equivalents per kg edible protein, respectively, depending on the region of the world (Opio et al., 2013). Based on expected farming and consumer lifestyle practices and the predicted world population growth, compared to 1995, global enteric CH_4 emissions are predicted to increase by 70% by 2055 (Popp et al., 2010). To offset this increase and to deal with the highly variable and typically greater CH_4 emission intensity of beef cattle systems, accurate prediction of beef cattle CH_4 emissions across regions are urgently required.

Various beef cattle CH_4 prediction equations, for which a variety of diet and animal characteristics were used as covariates, based on treatments means (e.g., Ellis et al., 2009; Escobar-Bahamondes et al., 2017a) or individual animal data (Ellis et al., 2007; Moraes et al., 2014) have been published. Although the use of individual animal data as applied in the latter two studies contributes to more explained variation of CH_4 production due to dry matter intake (DMI) differences at the animal level, all previously mentioned studies only comprised data from specific geographical locations. In contrast to these equations, which may be appropriate for cattle systems under similar regional conditions, the widely used Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) methodology recommends a generic CH_4 energy conversion factor (Y_m) without any adjustment for different geographical locations (IPCC, 2014). The Y_m quantifies enteric CH_4 emission as a fraction of the gross energy intake and discriminates between diets with forage contents of ≤ 10 and $> 10\%$ DM, with Y_m being 3.0% and 6.5% of the gross energy intake, respectively. However, more complex equations accounting for dietary nutrient composition and individual animal characteristics in addition to total feed intake may perform better than those that ignore these covariates for various cattle categories (Ellis et al., 2007, 2009; Moraes et al., 2014; Santiago-Suarez et al., 2016). Therefore, more complex beef cattle CH_4 prediction equations that draw from databases with a broad range of diets and geographic conditions may more accurately predict global CH_4 emissions. Publications of inventories that investigated cattle enteric CH_4 emissions in certain countries or regions (e.g., Basarab et al., 2005; Kebreab et al., 2008; Bannink et al., 2011; Castelan-Ortega et al., 2014; Charmley et al., 2016) compared to an in-

tercontinental evaluation (e.g., Niu et al., 2018) confirm the utility of the latter approach.

The objectives of the current study were: 1) to collate an intercontinental database of enteric CH_4 production of individual animal records of beef cattle; 2) to determine the key variables for predicting beef cattle enteric CH_4 production ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$), yield [g (kg DMI)^{-1}] and intensity [$\text{g (kg average daily body weight gain)}^{-1}$] and their respective relationships; 3) to develop and cross-validate intercontinental and region-specific models, and models for lower- and higher-forage diets.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Database

The 'GLOBAL NETWORK' project is an international collaborative initiative of animal scientists (<http://animalscience.psu.edu/fnn>; accessed May 16, 2017). All animal scientists with an interest in greenhouse gas research and with access to CH_4 measurements from beef cattle were invited to collaborate and contribute data to this collaborative CH_4 mitigation data analysis. The resultant beef cattle CH_4 database that was developed from this initiative contains 2015 individual beef cattle records from 52 studies conducted from 1969 to 2015 by research entities from Europe ($n = 869$ from 18 studies), North America ($n = 649$ from 14 studies), Brazil ($n = 313$ from 12 studies), Australia ($n = 174$ from 7 studies) and South Korea ($n = 10$ from 1 study). The European studies were conducted in the UK ($n = 313$ from 7 studies), Switzerland ($n = 96$ from 1 study), Belgium ($n = 72$ from 4 studies), Ireland ($n = 147$ from 2 studies) and France ($n = 241$ from 4 studies). Eleven North American studies were from the United States ($n = 492$), and 3 were conducted in Canada ($n = 157$). The database includes records of enteric CH_4 production along with corresponding DMI, dietary gross energy, crude protein, ether extract (EE), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), starch, ash and forage contents, average daily body weight gain (ADG) and body weight (BW). The database comprised a broad variety of beef cattle that included growing and finishing steers, bulls and heifers, pregnant heifers, and pregnant, non-pregnant, dry and lactating beef cows. Various pure beef breeds and crossbreeds were included, *viz.*, Aberdeen Angus, Blonde d'Aquitaine, Belgian Blue, Brahman, Brown Swiss \times Limousin, Charolais, Hanwoo, Holstein \times Zebu, Hereford \times Angus, Luing and Nellore.

The original studies in the database (complete data bibliography is provided in Supplementary information) investigated the impact of diet composition on enteric CH_4 production or cattle metabolism. However, some studies tested the effect of a specific feed additive, nutrient or the use of hormone supplementation, and the data from these treatments were excluded. The excluded treatments included rapeseed cake and nitrate (Troy et al., 2015), limestone (Zanetti et al., 2017), Acacia tannins, maca, garlic and lupine seeds (Staerfl et al., 2012), monensin (Caetano et al., 2016, 2018), organosulfur compounds (garlic extracts) (Peiren et al., unpublished) and essential oils (Castro Montoya et al., 2015), lipids (Duthie et al., 2015), dried corn distillers grains (Hünerberg et al., 2013a, b), linseed oil and protected fat (Fiorentini et al.,

2014), soybean oil and protected fat (Silva et al., 2018), glycerin (Lage et al., 2016), whole soybeans (Rossi et al., 2017), monensin (Hales et al., 2012; Hales et al., 2013, 2014 2015, unpublished; Berndt et al., unpublished), diethylstilbestrol (Rumsey et al., 1981) and growth hormone-releasing factor (Lapierre et al., 1992). After removal of data associated with the aforementioned treatments, 1413 individual records were retained.

Records with missing CH₄ or DMI values were removed from the database; records from respiration chambers in which two animals were housed simultaneously were combined by averaging the CH₄ and DMI and all other variables regarding the two animals; records from repeated measurements within the same experimental period were averaged over the individual measurements recorded. In total, 1366 individual animal records were subsequently retained. In addition, records from growing cattle with negative ADG, and a study for which DMI varied from 9.0 to 32.5 kg d⁻¹ (Rooke et al., 2015, unpublished) were discarded from the dataset, leaving 1257 records retained. Finally, studies were screened on the basis of mean CH₄ yield after which two studies, for which the control treatments contained 60 and 82% forage had unrealistically low CH₄ yields of 10.3 and 11.3 g (kg DMI)⁻¹ (San Vito et al., 2016; De Carvalho et al., 2016), respectively, were considered outliers and removed from the dataset. This resulted in the retention of 1248 records.

2.2. Model development

Production, yield and intensity of CH₄ were predicted by fitting mixed-effects models according to:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij1} + \beta_2 x_{ij2} + \dots + \beta_k x_{ijk} + s_i + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where y_{ij} denotes the j^{th} response variable of CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), CH₄ yield [g (kg DMI)⁻¹] or CH₄ intensity [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] from the i^{th} study; β_0 denotes the fixed effect of intercept; x_{ij1} to x_{ijk} denote the fixed effects of predictor variables and β_1 to β_k are the corresponding slopes; s_i and ε_{ij} denote the random effect of study and residual error, respectively, distributed as $s_i \sim N(0, \sigma_s^2)$, $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, y_{ij}\sigma_e^2)$ for CH₄ production, and $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$ for CH₄ yield and intensity; σ_s^2 is the between-study variance, σ_e^2 is the residual variance, and $y_{ij}\sigma_e^2$ is the residual error variance being proportional to the dependent variable.

In order to provide equations that depend on various predictor variables, eight categories of CH₄ production models were developed, of which four used a fixed and another four a selected combination of covariates: DMI only (DMI_C), DMI and dietary NDF content (DMI + NDF_C), DMI and dietary starch content (DMI + STA_C), DMI and dietary EE content (DMI + EE_C); a selection of DMI and the dietary NDF, starch, forage, EE, crude protein and ash contents (Diet_C), the Diet_C covariates plus BW (Animal_C), the Animal_C covariates except DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), and DMI, the dietary NDF and crude protein contents, and BW (Global_C). Global_C was exclusively associated with covariates that had few or no missing data points. In addition to these eight categories, CH₄ production was predicted using Y_m only. The mixed-effects model to estimate Y_m of this GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equation only included y_{ij} , β_0 , s_i and ε_{ij} of the previously shown model, with $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$. According to the CH₄ production models, six categories of CH₄ yield prediction models were developed: dietary NDF content only (NDF_C), dietary starch content only (STA_C), dietary EE content only (EE_C); a selection of the dietary NDF, starch, forage, EE, crude protein and ash contents (Diet_no_DMI_C), the Animal_no_DMI_C covariates, and dietary NDF, forage and crude protein contents and BW (Global_no_DMI_C). Finally, eight categories of CH₄ intensity prediction models were developed: DMI_C, DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C, DMI + EE_C, Diet_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C.

Covariates that play a key role in predicting CH₄ production were selected for Diet_C, Diet_no_DMI_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C, Glob-

al_C and Global_no_DMI_C using a multistep selection approach. Model selection started with all potential covariates associated with the particular model category. Subsequently, one or more next selection steps were performed if not all records without missing values for the selected covariates were used in the previous step. A backward selection approach was applied throughout the different steps, *i.e.*, only covariates selected in a previous step could be selected for the next step. The model selection procedure stopped when the selected covariates were the same as the ones selected in the previous step. With this procedure, a model equation was constructed based on records that contained no missing values for the final selection of covariates and data sufficiency was maximized for the development of model equations throughout the different categories.

The Bayesian information criterion (BIC; *e.g.*, James et al., 2014) was computed for all fitted models. The BIC is a well-known quantitative approach to model selection that favors more parsimonious models over more complex models by penalizing the number of parameters included in the model. Models with the smallest BIC were selected, as a smaller BIC indicates a better tradeoff between the goodness of fit and the number of model parameters. In addition, the presence of multicollinearity of fitted models was examined based on the variance inflation factor. The largest variance inflation factor among all predictor variables was considered as an indicator of multicollinearity (Kutner et al., 2005). The identified predictor variables were removed from the model one at a time using a stringent variance inflation factor cutoff value of 3 (Zuur et al., 2010). All models were fitted using the *lme* function (Pinheiro and Bates, 2000) of R language and environment for statistical computing (R Core Team, 2017; version 3.5.2).

2.3. Data handling

The entire database contained a wide variety of dietary forage contents (57.6 ± 29.8% DM; average ± SD), ranging from 8 to 100% DM. The database was split into a higher-forage subset containing the records with ≥25% forage, and a lower-forage subset containing all data with ≤18% forage. No studies tested forage contents between 18 and 25%. Because of the small coefficient of variation, dietary starch could not be selected for the lower-forage Diet_C, Animal_C, and Animal_no_DMI_C equations. To explore the geographical impact of CH₄ production, all European, North American and Brazilian higher-forage data were also used as separate subsets. Because of the scarcity of data from Australia and South Korea, no specific equations for the latter two regions were developed. Data from growing and finishing cattle for which ADG was measured were selected for a growing cattle subset, which enabled the development of CH₄ intensity [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] equations. Other outliers were identified using the interquartile range method (Zwillinger and Kokoska, 2000) based on all dependent and independent variables as in Niu et al. (2018). A factor of 1.5 for extremes was used in constructing boundaries to identify outliers for dependent variables and a factor of 2.5 for independent variables. Outliers were identified only for the complete database. The CH₄ intensity [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] values were log transformed to stabilize normality before outlier identification. After removal of records with interquartile range identified outliers in the CH₄ production and variables, 1021 records from 114 dietary treatments and 39 studies were retained. Of these records 882 were from 104 treatments and 38 studies in the higher-forage subset, 139 from 10 treatments and 8 studies from the UK, Ireland, France, Canada and Brazil in the low-forage subset, 307 from 28 treatments and 15 studies in the European higher-forage subset, 394 from 36 treatments and 10 studies the North American higher-forage subset, 104 from 17 treatments and 7 studies the Brazilian higher-forage subset, 72 from 22 treatments and 5 studies from Australia, and 5 from 1 treatment and 1 study from South Korea.

The cleaned dataset used for analysis comprised measurements of enteric CH₄ emission that were obtained from respiration chambers ($n = 676$), the GreenFeed system ($n = 87$), and the sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) tracer technique ($n = 258$). Animals were either kept in confinement or on pasture ($n = 991$ vs. 30, respectively). Types of forage frequently used in higher-forage diets included fresh alfalfa, sugarcane, sugarcane bagasse, corn silage, barley straw, whole-crop barley silage, whole-crop wheat silage, grass herbage, elephant grass, grass silage, grass seed hay, grass hay wrapping, timothy and natural grassland hay. Types of forage frequently used in lower-forage diets were barley straw, wheat straw, whole-crop wheat silage, corn silage and whole-crop barley silage. Concentrate ingredients in higher-forage and lower-forage diets included dried distillers grains, barley, canola meal, soybean meal, soybean hulls, crude glycerin, corn grain, cereal by-products, dehydrated alfalfa, dehydrated beet pulp, citrus pulp, wheat distillers grains, whole grain oats and minerals.

2.4. Cross-validation and model evaluation

The predictive accuracy of the developed CH₄ prediction models was evaluated using a leave-one-out cross-validation (e.g., James et al., 2014), in which all individual studies were consecutively taken as the testing set for model evaluation, while all remaining studies were taken as the training set for model fitting. Currently, most national enteric CH₄ inventories are based on energy conversion factors recommended by the IPCC (2006), which were evaluated, *i.e.*, not cross-validated. The IPCC models and the developed models throughout all categories were, if applicable, evaluated on the various (sub)sets using a combination of model evaluation metrics. Furthermore, equations from Yan et al. (2000, 2009) based on data from Northern Ireland, Ellis et al. (2007) based on data from North America, Ellis et al. (2009) based on data from Canada, Patra (2017) based on data from Brazil, India, Australia and Zimbabwe, Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) based on data from North America, Europe, Australia, Japan and New Zealand, Charmley et al. (2016) based on data from Australia, and the Mitscherlich equation from Mills et al. (2003) based on data from the UK were evaluated given that the covariates used in these published equations were available in the present database. Of these previously published equations, the equation that performed the best using our data and the single regression equation that only depended on DMI and performed the best using our data were reported in the present study. Data from studies included in the present database used for the development of these extant equations were excluded from evaluations of those extant equations to ensure independent evaluation.

First, the mean square prediction error (MSPE) was calculated according to Bibby and Toutenburg (1977) as:

$$\text{MSPE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (O_i - P_i)^2}{n},$$

where O_i and P_i denote the observed and predicted value of the response variable for the i^{th} observation, respectively, and n denotes the number of observations. The square root of the mean square prediction error (RMSPE) was used to assess overall model prediction error. In the present study, RMSPE was expressed as a proportion of observed CH₄ production, yield or intensity means. The MSPE was decomposed into mean bias (MB), slope bias (SB) and random bias to identify systematic biases, of which the MB and SB were calculated as follows:

$$\text{MB} = (\bar{O} - \bar{P})^2$$

$$\text{SB} = (s_p - r s_o)^2$$

where \bar{O} and \bar{P} denote the predicted and observed means, s_p denotes the standard deviation of predicted values, s_o denotes the standard de-

viation of observed values, and r denotes the Pearson correlation coefficient. Second, the ratio of RMSPE and s_o , namely RMSPE-observations standard deviation ratio (RSR), which accounts for the specific variability of the data used for evaluation (Moriassi et al., 2007), was used to compare the performance of models based on data from different (sub)sets. Smaller values of RSR indicate less prediction error compared to the standard deviation of the observations, with RSR = 1 indicating the RMSPE is equal to observed data variance. If RSR > 1, \bar{O} is a better predictor than P_i . Third, the concordance correlation coefficient (CCC; Lin, 1989), which quantifies both accuracy and precision based on the bias correction factor (C_b) and r by comparing the best-fit line and observations to the identity line ($y = x$), respectively, was calculated. The CCC is given as:

$$\text{CCC} = r \cdot C_b,$$

The closer the CCC of a model to 1, the better the model performance.

Different forage proportion cutoff values with increments of 5% from 15 to 50% were tested to evaluate the effect of the cutoff for splitting the database into higher-forage and lower-forage subsets on equation performance. Cutoff values of 0, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50% forage DM were used for evaluation. Per cutoff value, an RSR weighted to the number of observations for the DMI_C equation was calculated for the higher-forage and lower-forage CH₄ production equations, after which the optimal cutoff value could be determined.

3. Results

The inclusion criterion for dietary treatment had different effects on the variables means, *viz.*, DMI (8.13 vs. 8.06 kg d⁻¹; cleaned vs. uncleaned averages, respectively), and NDF (35.0 vs. 35.0% of DM), starch (34.0 vs. 30.5% of DM), EE (3.02 vs. 3.52% of DM), ash (6.29 vs. 7.26% of DM), and forage (51.0 vs. 58.1% of DM) content of the diet, BW (478 vs. 487 kg), CH₄ production (161 vs. 164 g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), CH₄ yield [20.0 vs. 20.4 g (kg DMI)⁻¹], CH₄ intensity [145 vs. 207 g (kg ADG)⁻¹] and Y_m (6.0 vs. 6.0% of the gross energy intake). Summary statistics for the (sub)sets of the present cleaned database that included intake, dietary nutrient composition, BW, ADG and CH₄ variables are presented in Tables 1 and S1.

3.1. Methane production equations

The DMI_C all-data CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) equation indicated a positive relationship of DMI with CH₄ production (Eq. 1; Table 2; regression coefficient \pm 2-SE gives a rough estimate of the 95% confidence interval boundaries that correspond to a P -value of 0.05, all P -values < 0.05 were not reported). The DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C and DMI + EE_C equations had positive, negative and negative regression coefficients for dietary NDF, starch and EE in relation to CH₄ production, respectively (Eqns. 2–4). The RSR, which is the most appropriate statistic for evaluating equations based on different numbers of observations, for the DMI_C, DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C and DMI + EE_C equations indicated similar predictive performance, whereas the CCC indicated the DMI + NDF_C equation performed better than the DMI_C and DMI + EE_C equations (0.63 vs. 0.60 and 0.61, respectively). Dietary forage content and DMI were selected for the Diet_C and Animal_C equations (Eqns. 5–6), with BW also selected for the Animal_C equation. Dietary forage and ash and BW were selected for the Animal_no_DMI_C equation (Eq. 7). The Animal_C was the best performing all-data equation developed in the present analysis, with RSR and CCC of 0.61 and 0.76, respectively. Across the developed all-data equations, slope bias ranged from 1.01 to 12.7%, which was consistently associated with under-prediction at the high end and over-prediction at the low end of production (Fig. 1). Overall, models with a

Table 1

Variable summary statistics for all data, higher-forage (data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$), lower-forage (data associated with a forage content $\leq 18\%$), European higher-forage (EUR-HF) and North American higher-forage (NrAm-HF) entries of the GLOBAL NETWORK beef cattle database.

Item*	All data (n = 1021)				Higher-forage (n = 882)				Lower-forage (n = 139)				EUR-HF (n = 307)				NrAm-HF (n = 394)			
	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD
DMI (kg d ⁻¹)	8.13	2.26	17.5	2.82	7.81	2.26	17.5	2.86	10.1	4.77	15.6	1.89	9.46	3.17	15.7	2.12	6.16	2.26	14.1	2.51
GEI (MJ d ⁻¹)	150	42.6	317	53.7	144	42.6	317	53.1	191	88.2	300	37.1	177	57.8	299	42.0	114	42.6	254	45.4
Diet composition (% of DM)																				
CP	14.6	6.19	22.5	2.56	14.6	6.19	21.3	2.60	14.6	11.4	22.5	2.35	14.3	7.80	19.2	1.84	15.6	10.0	21.3	2.52
EE	3.02	0.372	7.02	1.20	2.87	0.372	7.02	1.05	3.90	0.377	5.63	1.57	3.65	0.372	5.80	1.40	2.58	0.669	5.50	0.825
Ash	6.29	3.22	13.7	2.11	6.52	3.22	13.7	2.13	4.85	3.50	8.00	1.24	6.06	3.40	11.4	1.80	6.51	3.22	13.7	2.29
NDF	35.0	17.2	73.9	11.2	36.6	17.2	73.9	11.2	24.7	19.8	33.3	3.12	37.5	26.1	68.4	7.25	32.9	17.5	67.8	9.76
ADF	19.3	6.92	50.8	8.13	20.6	7.50	50.8	8.06	11.6	6.92	14.5	1.99	21.7	14.0	40.3	5.15	17.5	7.50	36.5	7.28
STA	34.0	2.50	64.1	13.6	32.2	2.50	64.1	14.3	42.0	32.0	56.9	4.52	25.3	2.50	40.3	10.3	41.2	16.8	64.1	12.6
For	51.0	8.0	100	27.7	57.7	25.0	100	24.0	9.8	8.0	18.1	3.18	64.6	31.0	100	16.9	47.9	25.0	100	23.6
ADG (kg d ⁻¹)	1.25	0.060	3.38	0.431	1.19	0.060	3.38	0.438	1.46	0.552	2.22	0.330	1.22	0.088	1.99	0.348	NA	NA	NA	NA
BW (kg)	478	133	791	148	454	133	791	144	625	376	734	76.5	571	133	791	128	391	196	699	116
Methane emissions																				
CH ₄ (g d ⁻¹)	161	37.0	372	70.5	162	37.0	372	73.5	153	45.1	310	46.4	215	40.9	372	71.8	125	37.0	313	57.5
CH ₄ /DMI (g kg ⁻¹)	20.0	6.29	35.1	5.05	20.7	6.29	35.1	4.75	15.2	7.50	30.9	4.29	22.5	6.64	35.1	5.19	20.3	6.29	33.3	4.21
CH ₄ /ADG (g kg ⁻¹) †	4.98	3.31	6.68	0.522	5.08	3.31	6.68	0.528	4.68	3.84	5.71	0.362	5.20	3.31	6.68	0.517	NA	NA	NA	NA
Y _m (% of GEI) §	6.0	1.9	10.4	1.5	6.3	1.9	10.4	1.4	4.5	2.3	8.7	1.2	6.7	2.0	10.3	1.5	6.2	1.9	10.4	1.3

*DM = dry matter, DMI = dry matter intake, GEI = gross energy intake, CP = dietary crude protein, EE = dietary ether extract, NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber, ADF = dietary acid detergent fiber, STA = dietary starch, For = dietary forage, ADG = average daily body weight gain, BW = body weight.

†Min = minimum, Max = maximum, SD = standard deviation.

‡In transformed values.

§Methane conversion factor (%): energy of CH₄ as a proportion of GEI; the specific energy of CH₄ is 55.65 MJ kg⁻¹.

Table 2

All-data CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance across the data (sub)sets based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Model development		Model performance							
	Category [§]	Prediction equation [*]	n [†]	(Sub)set [‡]	p [†]	RMSPE	RSR	MB	SB	CCC
[1]	DMI_C	54.2 (7.6) + 12.6 (0.6) × DMI	1021	All-data	991	31.2	0.71	0.69	12.55	0.60
				Higher-forage	852	30.8	0.67	3.86	27.26	0.64
				Lower-forage	139	33.9	1.12	34.96	0.59	0.27
[2]	DMI + NDF_C	-16.4 (9.0) + 12.1 (0.6) × DMI + 2.10 (0.16) × NDF	1021	All-data	991	31.4	0.71	0.92	1.99	0.63
				Higher-forage	852	31.8	0.69	1.82	2.81	0.65
				Lower-forage	139	28.7	0.94	3.45	2.10	0.32
[3]	DMI + STA_C	126 (11) + 11.5 (0.9) × DMI - 1.75 (0.16) × STA	704	All-data	704	28.9	0.71	6.09	1.01	0.65
				Higher-forage	575	28.7	0.70	13.87	1.80	0.68
				Lower-forage	129	30.1	0.96	15.77	0.64	0.35
[4]	DMI + EE_C	83.0 (9.8) + 11.9 (0.6) × DMI - 7.31 (1.69) × EE	754	All-data	754	29.4	0.71	1.35	8.83	0.61
				Higher-forage	644	29.2	0.67	0.08	19.59	0.64
				Lower-forage	110	30.3	1.21	37.59	4.20	0.25
[5]	Diet_C	-0.767 (7.493) + 12.0 (0.5) × DMI + 1.12 (0.06) × For	1021	All-data	991	29.5	0.67	2.39	1.24	0.70
				Higher-forage	852	29.5	0.64	1.30	2.12	0.72
				Lower-forage	139	29.8	0.98	17.57	0.30	0.32
[6]	Animal_C, Global_C	-28.3 (8.3) + 10.3 (0.6) × DMI + 1.12 (0.06) × For + 0.0885 (0.0150) × BW	1003	All-data	991	26.9	0.61	2.20	1.37	0.76
				All-data ^{‡,§}	646	22.5	0.52	3.05	0.41	0.84
				Higher-forage	852	26.8	0.58	2.00	1.83	0.78
				Lower-forage	139	27.8	0.91	3.72	0.65	0.35
[7]	Animal_no_DMI_C	6.03 (10.40) + 1.25 (0.07) × For - 2.29 (0.77) × Ash + 0.212 (0.015) × BW	992	All-data	991	30.9	0.70	0.55	1.98	0.65
				Higher-forage	852	30.9	0.67	0.23	3.04	0.68
				Lower-forage	139	31.3	1.03	5.86	3.26	0.11
[8]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.061 (0.001) × GEI] / 0.05565	1021	All-data	991	28.5	0.64	0.59	0.27	0.75
				All-data ^{‡,§}	991	28.3	0.64	0.23	0.87	0.76
[9]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) [¶]	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	All-data [‡]	991	29.9	0.68	7.97	3.04	0.75
[10]	Charmley et al. (2016)	-6.10 + 20.6 × DMI	-	All-data ^{‡,¶}	939	28.9	0.66	0.00	1.15	0.74
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a)	-35.0 + 0.08 × BW + 1.2 × For - 69.8 × EEI ³ + 3.14 × GEI	-	All-data ^{‡,§}	646	23.2	0.54	11.66	2.12	0.85

[§] Category acronyms (e.g., DMI_C) are explained in the 'Model development' subsection of the 'Methods and Materials' section.

^{*} Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), Ash = dietary ash (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

[†] n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

[‡] All-data = all data collected for analysis, Higher-forage = data associated with a forage content ≥25%, Lower-forage = data associated with a forage content ≤18%.

[†] p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

[¶] IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

[‡] Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

[‡] No independent evaluation.

[†] The 991 data points minus data from Tomkins et al. (2011) and Kennedy and Charmley (2012) to ensure independent evaluation.

[‡] The 991 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño et al. (2003), Chaves et al. (2006), McGeough et al. (2010a, b), Doreau et al. (2011), Staerfl et al. (2012), Hünerberg et al. (2013ab) and Troy et al. (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

higher number of covariates tended to have less slope bias and had less between-study variance (σ_s^2 not shown).

The RSR of the all-data DMI_C CH₄ production equation was 0.71 (Table 3). Splitting the database into higher-forage and lower-forage subsets at cutoffs of 15 to 50% resulted in very similar weighted average RSR values of 0.68 to 0.69. The cutoff of 20% that was applied resulted in an RSR of 0.94 for the lower-forage subset at this cutoff value, whereas the cutoff values from 25 to 50% had all lower RSR values for the lower-forage subset. This might suggest that the lower-forage subset is a better predictor at a higher cutoff. However, the prediction of

the data associated with ≤20% forage did not improve at cutoff values >20% (results not shown), indicating that data with >20% forage decreased the RSR of the lower-forage subset, but not the data associated with ≤20% forage. Based on these differences in performance and the fact that diets containing ≤20% forage are commonly fed to cattle in intense feedlot production systems, the data were split at 20% forage throughout the present study, which made all lower-forage data contain ≤18% forage and the higher-forage ≥25% forage.

The higher-forage CH₄ production equations overlapped with the all-data equations, where DMI and dietary NDF, starch and EE in the




Fig. 1. Observed vs. predicted plots for all-data methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI + NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI + STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI + EE_C), diet (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley et al. (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

DMI_C, DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C and DMI + EE_C equations showed regression coefficients with the same sign (Eqns. 12–15; Table 4). Moreover, similar covariates were selected for the Diet_C, Animal_C and Animal_no_DMI_C equations as for the all-data equations, although the Animal_no_DMI_C equation did not contain dietary ash (Eqns. 16–18). The higher-forage equations predicted the higher-forage subset better than the all-data equations, with mean RSR of 0.62 vs. 0.66 and CCC of 0.70 vs. 0.68, respectively, for the DMI_C, DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C, DMI + EE_C, Diet_C, Animal_C and Animal_no_DMI_C

equations. The developed higher-forage equations under-predicted CH_4 production at the high end and over-predicted it at the low end of production, with the multiple regression equations having less slope bias than the DMI_C equation (Fig. 2). In line with the all-data equations, models with a higher number of covariates had less between-study variance.

In accordance with the all-data and the higher-forage equations, DMI was positively related to CH_4 production in the lower-forage DMI_C equation (Eq. 20; Table 5). The DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C

Table 3

Root mean square prediction error-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR) of the DMI_C CH₄ production (g d⁻¹) equations based on lower-forage (\leq forage content cutoff) and higher-forage ($>$ forage content cutoff) subsets, their number of observations (n), and the average RSR weighted to the number of higher- and lower-forage observations (All) for various diet forage content cutoff values to split the entire dataset into lower-forage and higher-forage subsets.

(Sub)set	Forage content cutoff (% of DM)									
	0	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	
Higher-forage	NA	0.65	0.64	0.65	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.70	0.62	
n	NA	902	882	783	672	664	602	579	474	
Lower-forage	NA	0.95	0.94	0.78	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.68	0.73	
n	NA	119	139	238	349	357	419	442	547	
All	0.71	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.68	

and DMI + EE_C equations indicated no significant relationships between the corresponding dietary NDF, starch and EE contents with CH₄ production (Eqns. 21–23; P -values of 0.14, 0.10 and 0.57, respectively). The lower-forage DMI_C equation predicted the lower-forage subset better than the all-data equations based on RSR, whereas the highest CCC of 0.35 for the lower-forage subset were obtained from the all-data DMI + STA_C and Animal_C equations (Eqns. 3, 6; Table 2). Systematic bias, that is the sum of mean and slope bias, was less than 5.75% for these developed lower-forage equations (Table 5), except for the DMI + STA_C equation that had 3.70 and 20.18% mean and slope bias, respectively. The minor slope bias of the lower-forage DMI_C equation ($\leq 0.03\%$) was due to under-prediction of CH₄ production at the high end and over-prediction at the low end (Fig. 3).

In contrast to the higher-forage equations, dietary NDF and starch contents in the European higher-forage DMI + NDF_C and DMI + STA_C equations were not related to CH₄ production (Eqns. 29–30, Table 6; P -values of 0.20 and 0.69, respectively). Furthermore, DMI, dietary NDF and EE were selected for the Diet_C equation (Eq. 32) with BW also being selected for the Animal_C equation (Eq. 33), whereas DMI and BW, and BW were selected for the Global_C and Animal_no_DMI_C equations, respectively (Eqns. 34–35). The North American higher-forage equations were largely in line with the higher-forage equations. However, the Animal_no_DMI_C equation also contained dietary ash (Eq. 44; Table 7) as obtained for the all-data equation, and the Global_C equation also contained dietary crude protein (Eq. 45). The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage equations under-predicted CH₄ at the high end and over-predicted it at the low end of production, except for the European higher-forage DMI + EE_C equation, which under-predicted CH₄ at the low end and over-predicted at the high end (Figs. 4 and 5). Dietary NDF and EE contents in the Brazilian higher-forage DMI + NDF_C and DMI + EE_C equations were not significantly related to CH₄ production (Eqns. 49–50, Table S2; P -values of 0.28 and 0.05, respectively), the Diet_C equation contained DMI and dietary ash (Eq. 51), whereas the Animal_no_DMI_C equation contained dietary forage (Eq. 52). Slope bias varied from 9.05 to 18.9% for the developed Brazilian higher-forage equations, except for the Animal_no_DMI_C equation for which 32.9% slope bias was obtained. Equations under-predicted CH₄ production at the low end and over-predicted at the high end, whereas the Animal_no_DMI_C equation showed a negative observed vs. predicted correlation (Fig. S1). Compared to the higher-forage equations, the European higher-forage, North American higher-forage and Brazilian higher-forage data were more adequately predicted by the European higher-forage (mean RSR of 0.80 vs. 0.85, mean CCC of 0.50 vs. 0.48; respectively; Tables 4 and 6), North American higher-forage (mean RSR of 0.53 vs. 0.57, mean CCC of 0.80 vs. 0.77; respectively; Tables 4 and 7) and Brazilian higher-forage (mean RSR of 1.13 vs. 1.35, respectively; Tables 4, S2), although mean CCC indicated Brazilian higher-forage data was more adequately predicted using the higher-forage than the

Brazilian higher-forage equations (0.17 vs. 0.11, respectively; Tables 4, S2).

The IPCC (2006) Tier 2 higher-forage equation had an RSR of 0.68 and a CCC of 0.75 when evaluated using all data (Eq. 9; Table 2). Predicting the higher-forage subset with this equation resulted in RSR and CCC of 0.53 and 0.84, respectively (Eq. 9; Table 4). Despite this high accuracy of prediction of the Tier 2 approach, increased variance appeared along the unity line of the predicted vs. observed plots (Figs. 1 and 2). The IPCC Tier 2 (2006) lower-forage equation had an RSR of 1.38, a CCC of 0.17 and 59.6% mean bias for the lower-forage subset (Eq. 25; Table 5). The GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations with Y_m of 6.1% and 6.3% (Eqns. 8, 19; Tables 2 and 4) performed slightly better than the IPCC Tier 2 (2006) equation for the all-data and higher-forage (sub)sets, respectively [note that the IPCC equations were validated, the GLOBAL NETWORK equations were cross-validated], whereas the lower-forage GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equation with Y_m of 4.5% resulted in RSR of 0.90, a CCC of 0.43 and 0.47% of mean bias (Eq. 24) performed obviously better than the lower-forage IPCC Tier 2 equation. Although the IPCC currently uses a 10% forage cutoff, a Y_m of 4.5% is still more accurate than a Y_m of 3.0% for the present data, with RSR being 0.98 and 1.51, and CCC being 0.40 and 0.16 for the GLOBAL NETWORK and IPCC Tier 2 lower-forage equations, respectively (Eqns. 24–25). The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subsets were associated with RSR of 0.66 and 0.48, and CCC of 0.71 and 0.88 for the IPCC Tier 2 (2006) equation, respectively (Eq. 9; Tables 6 and 7), whereas RSR of 1.81 and CCC of 0.21 were obtained for the Brazilian higher-forage subset (Eq. 9; Table S2). Compared to the latter equation, the GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations with Y_m of 6.6 and 6.3% performed similarly based on RSR and CCC for the European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subset (Eqns. 36, 46; Tables 6 and 7), whereas less mean bias was obtained with 1.89 vs. 3.54% and 2.51 vs. 8.70%, respectively. The Brazilian higher-forage subset was better predicted when using the GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 approach resulted in a Y_m of 5.5%, an RSR of 1.29, and a CCC of 0.28 (Eq. 53; Table S2).

Equations developed by Ellis et al. (2009); Charmley et al. (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) were among the best performing extant equations and outperformed the Yan et al. (2000, 2009), Mills et al. (2003); Ellis et al. (2007) and Patra (2017) equations for all (sub)sets. The best performing equation of Charmley et al. (2016) performed better than the all-data DMI_C equation (Eqns. 1, 10; Table 2). The all-forage equation of Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) appeared to perform most accurately among all of the equations (Eq. 11). However, only 646 data points were available for independent evaluation. Based on RSR, it did not outperform the Animal_C equation for these 646 data points. For the higher-forage subset, the best Charmley et al. (2016) and the Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) equations performed the best based on CCC (Eqns. 20, 11; Table 4), but not on RSR. The Ellis et al. (2009) equation that also depended on the NDF:starch ratio (Eq. 26; Table 5) performed the best for the lower-forage data with RSR of 0.89 and CCC of 0.41. For the European higher-forage sub-

Table 4

Higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance across the data subsets based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Model development		Model performance							
	Category [§]	Prediction equation [*]	n [†]	(Sub)set [‡]	p [†]	RMSPE	RSR	MB	SB	CCC
[12]	DMI_C	52.8 (7.5) + 13.8 (0.6) × DMI	882	Higher-forage	852	29.3	0.64	0.28	22.78	0.68
				EUR-HF	307	29.3	0.88	26.42	15.91	0.43
				NrAm-HF	394	27.3	0.59	16.37	27.26	0.75
				BRZ-HF	75	26.1	1.40	31.70	22.96	0.23
				Higher-forage	852	29.1	0.64	0.20	17.83	0.69
[13]	DMI + NDF_C	23.8 (9.1) + 13.5 (0.6) × DMI + 0.844 (0.165) × NDF	882	Higher-forage	852	29.1	0.64	0.20	17.83	0.69
				EUR-HF	307	29.0	0.87	27.08	14.11	0.45
				NrAm-HF	394	25.2	0.55	13.46	21.70	0.80
				BRZ-HF	75	24.9	1.34	24.24	26.05	0.25
				Higher-forage	852	26.6	0.65	1.42	16.37	0.68
[14]	DMI + STA_C	83.4 (11.4) + 13.6 (0.8) × DMI - 0.594 (0.161) × STA	575	Higher-forage	575	26.6	0.65	1.42	16.37	0.68
				EUR-HF	273	26.0	0.93	21.41	4.37	0.35
				NrAm-HF	269	24.7	0.56	16.08	20.02	0.78
				BRZ-HF	14	29.2	2.47	77.05	9.49	-0.04
				Higher-forage	575	27.8	0.64	1.32	15.45	0.69
[15]	DMI + EE_C	66.4 (9.5) + 13.3 (0.6) × DMI - 3.69 (1.56) × EE	644	Higher-forage	644	27.8	0.64	1.32	15.45	0.69
				EUR-HF	122	26.1	1.00	43.22	6.45	0.39
				NrAm-HF	394	28.4	0.61	18.29	28.79	0.73
				BRZ-HF	104	24.0	1.33	30.48	19.06	0.23
				Higher-forage	644	27.9	0.61	0.49	15.52	0.72
[16]	Diet_C	23.4 (8.1) + 13.2 (0.5) × DMI + 0.571 (0.080) × For	882	Higher-forage	852	27.9	0.61	0.49	15.52	0.72
				EUR-HF	307	27.9	0.84	25.38	12.04	0.49
				NrAm-HF	394	23.1	0.50	8.40	17.91	0.83
				BRZ-HF	75	22.6	1.21	14.48	25.25	0.28
				Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	0.80	14.74	0.80
[17]	Animal_C, Global_C	-6.41 (8.31) + 11.3 (0.6) × DMI + 0.557 (0.077) × For + 0.0996 (0.0142) × BW	864	Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	0.80	14.74	0.80
				Higher-forage [‡]	567	21.2	0.47	0.11	10.43	0.86
				EUR-HF	307	24.5	0.73	18.25	11.11	0.61
				NrAm-HF	394	20.3	0.44	3.82	11.92	0.88
				BRZ-HF	75	21.2	1.14	1.36	27.11	0.22
[18]	Animal_no_DMI_C	17.9 (10.4) + 0.732 (0.091) × For + 0.226 (0.015) × BW	864	Higher-forage	852	30.8	0.67	0.01	13.23	0.65
				EUR-HF	307	26.3	0.79	14.80	11.89	0.52
				NrAm-HF	394	33.1	0.72	18.90	5.82	0.65
				BRZ-HF	75	27.0	1.45	31.74	25.94	-0.14
				Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	2.12	1.37	0.82
[19]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.063 (0.002) × GEI] / 0.05565	882	Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	2.12	1.37	0.82
				Higher-forage ^{‡,‡}	852	24.0	0.52	0.14	0.62	0.83
[9]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) [¶]	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	Higher-forage [‡]	852	24.1	0.53	1.19	0.06	0.84
[20]	Charmley et al. (2016)	21.0 × DMI	-	Higher-forage [‡]	829	25.4	0.57	0.10	0.05	0.81
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a)	-35.0 + 0.08 × BW + 1.2 × For - 69.8 × EEI ³ + 3.14 × GEI	-	Higher-forage ^{‡,‡}	567	23.1	0.51	9.61	1.56	0.86

[§] Category acronyms (e.g., DMI_C) are explained in the 'Model development' subsection of the 'Methods and Materials' section.

^{*} Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

[†] n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

[‡] Higher-forage = data associated with a forage content ≥25%, EUR-HF = European data associated with a forage content ≥25%, NrAm-HF = North American data associated with a forage content ≥25%, BRZ-HF = Brazilian data associated with a forage content ≥25%.

[†] p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

[¶] IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

[‡] Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

[‡] No independent evaluation.

[‡] The 852 data points minus data from Tomkins et al. (2011) and Kennedy and Charmley (2012) to ensure independent evaluation.

[‡] The 852 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño et al. (2003), Chaves et al. (2006), McGeough et al. (2010a, b), Doreau et al. (2011), Staerfl et al. (2012), Hünerberg et al. (2013a, b) and Troy et al. (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

set, the best Charmley et al. (2016) and the Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) equations (Eqns. 37, 11; Table 6) did not perform better than the Animal_C equation when just considering RSR and CCC values, although the Animal_C equation was evaluated using fewer data points. For the North American higher-forage subset, the best performing Charmley et al. (2016) equation (Eq. 47; Table 7) performed similarly to the Global_C equation based on RSR, whereas the Charmley et al.

(2016) equation performed even slightly better based on CCC. Despite the accuracy of the various equations of Charmley et al. (2016) and in contrast to the Animal_C equations, the predicted vs. observed plots showed increasing variation along the unity line for all-data in particular (Fig. 1). However, the best-performing equations that were developed, which was the Animal_C equation for most subsets, did not show increasing variation along the unity line. This indicates that the best




Fig. 2. Observed vs. predicted plots for higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI + NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI + STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI + EE_C), diet (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley et al. (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

performing equations that were developed explain variation that is not captured by the Charmley et al. (2016) equations. These higher precisions obtained from the best performing equations is also indicated by the correlation coefficients of predicted vs. observed values on which the CCC is calculated (result not shown).

3.2. Methane yield equations

Positive, negative and negative slope regression coefficients were obtained for the NDF_C, STA_C and EE_C all-data CH_4 yield [$\text{g} (\text{kg DMI})^{-1}$] equations (Eqns. 54–56, Table S3), respectively, which aligned with the all-data CH_4 production equations. The Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C equations selected dietary forage (Eqns. 57–58), whereas dietary EE and ash were also selected for the Diet_no_DMI_C

Table 5

Lower-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations and model performance using the lower-forage subset based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Model development		Model performance							
	Category [§]	Prediction equation [*]	n [†]	(Sub)set [‡]	p [†]	RMSPE	RSR	MB	SB	CCC
[20]	DMI_C, Diet_C, Animal_C, Global_C	46.6 (19.4) + 9.54 (1.80) × DMI	139	Lower-forage	139	28.4	0.94	4.81	0.03	0.26
[21]	DMI + NDF_C	112 (47) + 9.46 (1.79) × DMI - 2.58 (1.72) × NDF	139	Lower-forage	139	29.3	0.96	4.74	1.34	0.25
[22]	DMI + STA_C	42.0 (38.9) + 9.85 (1.88) × DMI + 0.0331 (0.7546) × STA	129	Lower-forage	129	34.5	1.11	3.70	20.18	0.23
[23]	DMI + EE_C	57.0 (18.1) + 8.84 (1.74) × DMI - 1.17 (2.03) × EE	110	Lower-forage	110	24.1	0.96	4.54	1.22	0.26
[24]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.045 (0.002) × GEI] / 0.05565	139	Lower-forage	139	27.9	0.92	3.13	3.02	0.39
				Lower-forage ^{‡,§}	139	27.3	0.90	0.47	3.99	0.43
				Lower-forage ^{‡,§,}	101	25.2	0.98	2.27	12.91	0.41
[25]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) Lower-forage [¶]	(0.030 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	Lower-forage [‡]	139	42.1	1.38	59.60	0.08	0.17
				Lower-forage ^{‡,}	101	39.0	1.51	64.08	0.35	0.16
[26]	Ellis et al. (2009); Eq. N	48.2 + 14.1 × DMI - 20.5 × (STA/NDF)	-	Lower-forage [‡]	129	27.8	0.89	0.26	2.04	0.41
[27]	Ellis et al. (2009); Eq. A	41.2 + 12.0 × DMI	-	Lower-forage [‡]	139	27.9	0.92	6.19	0.15	0.34

[§] Category acronyms (e.g., DMI_C) are explained in the 'Model development' subsection of the 'Methods and Materials' section; no Animal_no_DMI_C equation available.

^{*} Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹).

[†] n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

[‡] Lower-forage = data associated with a forage content ≤18%.

[†] p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

[¶] IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

[‡] Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

^{||} No independent evaluation.

^{||} A subset containing ≤10% forage records only was used (as recommended by the IPCC, 2006).

equation, and dietary crude protein for the Global_no_DMI_C equation. The NDF_C, STA_C, EE_C, Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C equations had RSR values of 0.98, 1.06, 1.01, 0.97 and 0.96, respectively. The NDF_C, STA_C and EE_C higher-forage CH₄ yield equations indicated positive, negative and negative relationships to CH₄ yield, respectively (Eqns. 59–61, Table S4), whereas only dietary forage content was selected for the Diet_no_DMI_C equation (Eq. 62). The higher-forage CH₄ yield was associated with RSR of 1.03 to 1.21 (Table S3) when predicted by the all-data equations, whereas the higher-forage equations predicted CH₄ yield of this subset with RSR values from 0.98 to 1.04 (Table S4). The higher-forage equations reproduced the observed variation in CH₄ yield less adequately than the all-data equations, with even a negative observed vs. predicted relationship for the higher-forage STA_C and EE_C equations (Figs. S2–S3).

3.3. Methane intensity equations

In contrast to the CH₄ production equations, the DMI regression coefficients in the all-data DMI_C and DMI + EE_C CH₄ intensity equations [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] contained zero in their confidence intervals (P-values of 0.14 and 0.22, respectively), whereas the DMI + NDF_C and DMI + STA_C equations had a positive regression coefficient for DMI (Eqns. 63–66; Table S5). In line with the CH₄ production equations, dietary NDF, starch and EE contents in the DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C and DMI + EE_C equations had positive, negative and negative relationships with CH₄ intensity, respectively. Dietary forage content was selected for the Diet_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations (Eqns. 67–69), with DMI also being selected for the Diet_C equation and BW also being selected for the Global_C equation. The Diet_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations had RSR values of 0.99, 1.00 and 0.96, respectively, and appeared to predict the variation in CH₄ intensity most adequately (Fig. S4), whereas the other all-data CH₄ intensity equations had RSR greater than 1 and appeared to predict the variation in CH₄ intensity less adequately.

The higher-forage DMI_C, DMI + STA_C and DMI + EE_C equations did not indicate that DMI was related to CH₄ intensity (Eqns. 70, 72–73, Table S6; P-values of 0.06, 0.52 and 0.93, respectively). Dietary NDF was positively related to CH₄ intensity (Eq. 71), whereas dietary starch and EE contents were not related to CH₄ intensity (Eqns. 72–73; P = 0.32). Dietary ash content was selected for the Diet_C equation (Eq. 74), whereas BW were selected for the Animal_C and Global_C equations (Eqns. 75–76), with dietary NDF also being selected for the Global_C equation. All higher-forage CH₄ intensity equations had RSR ≥ 1.03. Furthermore, as also obtained for the higher-forage CH₄ yield equations, the higher-forage CH₄ intensity equations did not reproduce the observed variation in CH₄ intensity of the higher-forage subset more adequately than the all-data CH₄ intensity equations (Figs. S4–S5), which was also indicated by the RSR and CCC values.

4. Discussion

Global applicability is an important attribute of prediction equations of beef cattle enteric CH₄ emission. Various beef cattle systems that are applied world-wide may fit in our analysis. For more details about these beef cattle fattening systems, we refer to e.g., De Vries et al. (2015); Gerssen-Gondelach et al. (2017) and Drouillard (2018). Our database, in which data (1021 individual records) from a variety of geographical regions across the world is represented, therefore, contributes to the overall robustness and global applicability of our all-data and higher-forage equations in particular. Hence, CH₄ production of beef cattle will be accurately predicted for data samples that represent a wider set of conditions throughout the world, which is a unique feature of the present equations. Several CH₄ prediction equations for beef cattle have been published previously, but they were developed from relatively small databases and only for one specific geographic region, such as Yan et al. (2009) using 108 individual animal records from 5 studies from Northern Ireland, Ellis et al. (2007) using 83 treatment means from 14 studies from North America, Ellis et al. (2009) us-




Fig. 3. Observed vs. predicted plots for lower-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI + NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI + STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI + EE_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Ellis et al. (2009) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

ing 872 individual animal records from 12 studies from Alberta (Canada), and Moraes et al. (2014) using individual records from 414 heifers and 458 steers housed at one research station in the United States.

In the present study, we collated a wide-ranging database that included a large number of studies from Europe, North America, Brazil, Australia and South Korea, which represented diverse global beef production systems. Studies from tropical areas were, however, not predominant in the present analysis, for which we refer to Charmley et al. (2016) who included studies from tropical Australia, and Patra (2017) who included studies from India, Zimbabwe, Australia and Brazil. Furthermore, Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) had a database comprising 148 treatment means from 38 studies with diets containing $>40\%$ forage, and a database comprising 43 treatment means from 17 studies with diets containing $<20\%$ forage. Therefore, their analysis for lower-forage diets, in particular, included more data from more studies than ours, but their cutoff values for lower and higher forage were based on differences in microbiome composition rather than the prediction error used in the present analysis. Furthermore, their analysis did not explore intercontinental variation in beef cattle CH_4 emissions and did not have the benefit of using individual animal records. Other unique strengths of the present study are the development of CH_4 yield and intensity equations, whereas beef cattle studies are commonly limited to only total CH_4 production, and the inclusion of dietary forage content as a covariate of the three CH_4 emission metrics.

Our database includes data obtained with different CH_4 (viz., respiration chambers, GreenFeed system, SF_6) and DMI (viz., weighing and estimating using marker techniques) measurement methods. The different CH_4 measurement techniques have their strengths and weaknesses (Hammond et al., 2016; Hristov et al., 2018), whereas directly weighing the amount of feed offered and refusals and their dry matter content is regarded as more accurate than the ytterbium and *n*-alkane markers used for some studies in the present database, which may over- or underestimate DMI (Pérez-Ramírez et al., 2012). However, the development of a DMI_C CH_4 production equation specific for respiration chamber, GreenFeed system and SF_6 subsets did not consistently improve the RSR and CCC of the corresponding subsets compared with the all-data DMI_C equation (results not shown). Furthermore, including CH_4 measurement method as a covariate in the statistical model of an all-data DMI_C equation did not improve the model fit. Similar results were obtained for measurement method of DMI. Therefore, CH_4 and DMI measurement methods did not have a major effect on the performance of the equations developed in the present analysis. However, the relatively high and low accuracies with which the region-specific subsets could be predicted may be related to the CH_4 measurement methods, because the percentage of use of respiration chambers in the European higher-forage, North American higher-forage and Brazilian higher-forage subsets differed substantially (48, 95 and 0%, respectively). Finally, statistically accounting for cattle breed or cattle type (e.g., steers, heifers, cows) was considered, but did not or not consi-




Fig. 4. Observed vs. predicted plots for European higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI + NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI + STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI + EE_C), dietary (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), global (Global_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, and IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley et al. (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

tently improve the prediction of CH_4 production throughout the subsets.

Non-linear CH_4 prediction equations such as the Mitscherlich equation were previously found to outperform linear equations in some studies (e.g., Mills et al., 2003; Patra, 2017). However, for the present database, fitting non-linear equations, viz., Monomolecular, Exponential, Mitscherlich and Power forms, did not result in improved prediction of CH_4 production compared to the linear DMI_C equations (result

not shown). The latter result is in line with the non-linear Mills et al. (2003) and Patra (2017) equations that did not outperform the linear Charmley et al. (2016) equations. This suggests that a multiple linear regression approach, as used for the development of our Animal_C and Global_C equations rather than non-linear approaches, improves the precision and accuracy of prediction of CH_4 production. The utility of ADG and digestibility of EE, NDF, nitrogen, gross energy, DM and organic matter for predicting CH_4 was also evaluated, but these covari-




Fig. 5. Observed vs. predicted plots for North American higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI + NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI + STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI + EE_C), dietary (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), global (Global_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 (2006), IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley et al. (2016) equation. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

ates did not result in better prediction of CH_4 production than achieved by the various equations that are presented.

The linear regression equations of Charmley et al. (2016) that depended on DMI and outperformed our DMI_C equations were fitted using models that included more terms than just DMI, which resulted in nearly unbiased predictions of CH_4 . Furthermore, the data Charmley et al. (2016) used were only from certain regions in Australia and may have been relatively homogeneous. The equations developed using these data may then result in accurate prediction of CH_4 production

based on only DMI. Therefore, the prediction bias for our various Animal_C and Global_C equations and some potential overestimation of between-study variance that remained may vanish by the inclusion of even more covariates in the statistical model. The negligible bias obtained for the European higher-forage Animal_C equation, for which dietary crude protein and EE contents were available for all individual animal records used for fitting this model, and suggests that multiple regression equations are associated with less bias. Despite prediction biases of mixed-effects models being associated with the inclusion of

Table 6

European higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Model development		Model performance							
	Category [§]	Prediction equation [*]	<i>n</i> [†]	(Sub)set [‡]	<i>p</i> [†]	RMSPE	RSR	MB	SB	CCC
[28]	DMI_C	60.5 (16.4) + 15.0 (1.4) × DMI	307	EUR-HF	307	26.3	0.79	4.86	15.69	0.48
[29]	DMI + NDF_C	38.1 (23.3) + 14.9 (1.4) × DMI + 0.598 (0.470) × NDF	307	EUR-HF	307	25.9	0.77	5.21	13.15	0.51
[30]	DMI + STA_C	92.4 (21.7) + 11.7 (2.0) × DMI + 0.113 (0.285) × STA	273	EUR-HF	273	25.6	0.92	9.92	2.20	0.30
[31]	DMI + EE_C	133 (34) + 14.5 (2.0) × DMI - 18.4 (6.6) × EE	122	EUR-HF	122	23.7	0.91	1.86	13.87	0.54
[32]	Diet_C	-20.9 (43.6) + 14.3 (2.0) × DMI + 4.04 (1.06) × NDF - 15.4 (3.8) × EE	122	EUR-HF	122	18.4	0.70	5.57	0.97	0.70
[33]	Animal_C	-102 (40.5) + 11.6 (2.1) × DMI + 3.74 (0.79) × NDF - 11.1 (3.0) × EE + 0.164 (0.054) × BW	122	EUR-HF	122	16.7	0.64	3.49	0.00	0.75
[34]	Animal_no_DMI_C	34.1 (18.7) + 0.287 (0.028) × BW	307	EUR-HF [‡]	109	15.5	0.58	1.31	0.13	0.79
[35]	Global_C	24.3 (17.7) + 9.37 (2.06) × DMI + 0.153 (0.040) × BW	307	EUR-HF	307	27.0	0.81	10.37	3.73	0.50
[36]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.066 (0.003) × GEI] / 0.05565	307	EUR-HF	307	24.5	0.73	8.88	11.91	0.58
[9]	IPCC Tier 2, 2006 [¶]	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	EUR-HF ^{‡,§}	307	21.8	0.65	1.89	1.34	0.71
[37]	Charmley et al. (2016)	-15.3 + 24.7 × DMI	-	EUR-HF [‡]	307	22.0	0.66	3.54	1.61	0.71
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a)	-35.0 + 0.08 × BW + 1.2 × For - 69.8 × EEI ³ + 3.14 × GEI	-	EUR-HF ^{‡,§}	109	19.7	0.75	2.09	3.18	0.66
						16.0	0.60	0.61	0.37	0.77

[§] Category acronyms (e.g., DMI_C) are explained in the 'Model development' subsection of the 'Methods and Materials' section.

^{*} Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

[†] *n* = number of observations used to fit model equations.

[‡] EUR-HF = European data associated with a forage content ≥25%.

[‡] *p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

[¶] IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

[‡] Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

[‡] No independent evaluation.

[‡] The 307 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño et al. (2003), McGeough et al. (2010ab), Doreau et al. (2011), Staerfl et al. (2012) and Troy et al. (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

the random study effect (see also White et al., 2017), which applies to models with fewer covariates in particular, omission of the random study effect will affect the inference made on the covariates and may result in type II errors (St-Pierre, 2001). Therefore, for achieving unbiased predictions, mixed-effects models are ideally applied to datasets without missing values throughout the different covariates. Such datasets will result in greater variation of the dependent variable explained by multiple fixed-effects terms and less overestimation of the random study effect.

4.1. Key predictor variables

Dry matter intake was the most important predictor of enteric CH₄ production as it was significantly and positively related to CH₄ production for all-data and the higher-forage, lower-forage, European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subsets. A positive relationship between DMI and CH₄ production is in agreement with previous dairy and beef cattle studies (e.g., Ellis et al., 2007; Hristov et al., 2013a; Richmond et al., 2015; Bell et al., 2016; Charmley et al., 2016; Niu et al., 2018) and this is because more CH₄ is produced when more substrate is available for microbial fermentation and in turn methanogenesis. In addition, all Diet_C and Animal_C models based on these five (sub)sets selected DMI for the prediction of CH₄ production, and the Animal_no_DMI_C equations did not perform as well as the Animal_C equations, indicating the importance of DMI relative to other covariates.

The positive relationship between the all-data CH₄ production and dietary NDF content also aligns with previous results (e.g., Ellis et al., 2007; Yan et al., 2009; Niu et al., 2018). The coefficients of variation were 43.8, 45.4 and 30.3% for CH₄ production, and 32.0, 30.6 and 8.6% for dietary NDF content for the all-data and the higher-forage and lower-forage subsets, respectively. This decrease in variation is in line

with the disappearance of this positive relationship for the all-data and higher-forage vs. the lower-forage equations. Therefore, developing subsets with limited variation in forage percentage seems to have masked the positive relationship between CH₄ production and dietary NDF content. Furthermore, dietary nutrient contents change at the expense of other nutrients. Dietary NDF content may increase at the expense of more rapidly fermentable carbohydrates, which is positively associated with CH₄ production (Hatew et al., 2015). The latter hypothesis aligns with a model with DMI and dietary NDF and starch fitted to all data having regression coefficients that were positive, positive and not different from zero for DMI and dietary NDF and starch, respectively (result not shown). However, the lignin fraction of NDF being undegradable indicates that increased dietary NDF may not result in more CH₄ production in case of high lignin contents. Warner et al. (2016) observed lower CH₄ production but higher CH₄ yield per unit of digestible organic matter for dairy cattle fed grass silage of high lignin and NDF content, compared with grass silage of low lignin and NDF content. The observation of Na et al. (2017) who found different CH₄ yields per unit of DMI for deer and goats, but not per unit of digestible DMI may also support this hypothesis.

Dietary starch content is negatively related to CH₄ production as it typically increases propionate production in the rumen, yielding less H₂ for the reduction of CO₂ to CH₄ (Martin et al., 2010; Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). The effect of dietary starch on CH₄ production appeared to be less pronounced for higher-forage diets in dairy cows (Van Gastelen et al., 2015), which may explain why no relationship between dietary starch content and CH₄ production was found for the European higher-forage subset, which had the highest forage content of all subsets. Furthermore, it was suggested that a critical dietary content of starch is required to decrease CH₄ production (Martin et al., 2010; Van Gastelen et al., 2015), possibly more than approximately 20% of DM, and that slight differences in intakes of starch, and other major carbo-

Table 7
North American higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Model development		n [†]	(Sub)set [‡]	Model performance					
	Category [§]	Prediction equation [*]			p [†]	RMSPE	RSR	MB	SB	CCC
[38]	DMI_C	33.9 (7.7) + 14.7 (0.6) × DMI	394	NrAm-HF	394	25.3	0.55	0.00	26.45	0.78
[39]	DMI + NDF_C	1.58 (8.30) + 14.2 (0.6) × DMI + 1.05 (0.16) × NDF	394	NrAm-HF	394	23.8	0.52	0.02	16.29	0.82
[40]	DMI + STA_C	89.7 (10.7) + 14.2 (0.8) × DMI - 1.17 (0.17) × STA	269	NrAm-HF	269	21.4	0.49	1.90	9.73	0.84
[41]	DMI + EE_C	43.7 (8.8) + 14.7 (0.6) × DMI - 3.72 (1.52) × EE	394	NrAm-HF	394	25.0	0.54	0.01	25.47	0.78
[42]	Diet_C	7.41 (7.12) + 14.1 (0.6) × DMI + 0.632 (0.069) × For	394	NrAm-HF	394	22.2	0.48	0.01	11.10	0.85
[43]	Animal_C,	-15.1 (7.5) + 12.7 (0.6) × DMI + 0.644 (0.066) × For + 0.0779 (0.0134) × BW	394	NrAm-HF	394	20.1	0.43	0.02	6.12	0.88
[44]	Animal_no_DMI_C	14.0 (12.3) + 0.965 (0.104) × For + 0.207 (0.018) × BW - 3.02 (0.95) × Ash	394	NrAm-HF	394	32.2	0.70	0.32	5.45	0.63
[45]	Global_C	-38.8 (10.9) + 12.7 (0.6) × DMI + 0.605 (0.066) × For + 1.61 (0.56) × CP + 0.0779 (0.0133) × BW	394	NrAm-HF	394	20.0	0.43	0.04	3.03	0.89
[46]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.063 (0.003) × GEI] / 0.05565	394	NrAm-HF	394	21.9	0.48	0.81	0.03	0.87
				NrAm-HF ^{‡,§}	394	21.4	0.46	2.51	0.02	0.88
[9]	IPCC Tier 2, 2006 [¶]	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	NrAm-HF [‡]	394	22.2	0.48	8.70	0.50	0.88
[47]	Charmley et al. (2016)	20.5 × DMI	-	NrAm-HF [‡]	394	20.0	0.43	0.45	0.02	0.90

[§] Category acronyms (e.g., DMI_C) are explained in the 'Model development' subsection of the 'Methods and Materials' section.

^{*} Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), BW = body weight (kg).

[†] n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

[‡] NrAm-HF = North American data associated with a forage content ≥25%.

[†] p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

[¶] IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

[‡] Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

[‡] No independent evaluation.

hydrates (e.g., hemicellulose, cellulose and lignin) cannot explain the difference in CH₄ emissions of cattle (Moe and Tyrrell, 1979; Moate et al., 2019). This may also explain why no relationship between dietary starch content and CH₄ production was obtained based on the European higher-forage subset. The lack of a relationship between CH₄ production and dietary starch content for the lower-forage subset may be related to the small variation in starch content (coefficient of variation is 13.1%).

The positive relationship that was obtained between CH₄ production and dietary forage aligns with previously published studies (e.g., Yan et al., 2000; Hristov et al., 2013) stating that either increased forage or decreased concentrate proportion in the diet yielded more CH₄. Johnson and Johnson (1995) referred to cattle fed more than 90% concentrate producing only half of the CH₄ produced by cattle fed more common concentrate proportions, and Aguerre et al., 2011 observed a linear increase in CH₄ yield upon increasing dietary forage content from 47 to 68%. Nevertheless, a modeling study by Sauvant and Giger-Reverdin (2009) predicted that a decrease in CH₄ yield is only observed for dietary forage contents less than 65%. Despite the latter prediction, the frequent appearance of dietary forage in the equations developed in the present study indicates dietary forage content is a decent predictor of CH₄ emission, possibly more robust than dietary NDF content that was less frequently selected for the developed equations.

Dietary lipid content is commonly negatively related to CH₄ production (Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). Lipids may inhibit cellulolytic bacteria, protozoal and archaeal activity, decrease NDF digestibility, and supply non-fermentable energy to the rumen, outcomes that can decrease CH₄ production (Maia et al., 2007; Beauchemin et al., 2008; Guyader et al., 2014). Long-chain saturated fatty acids may have a minimal inhibitive effect on archaeal activity and CH₄ production,

whereas fatty acids such as C12:0 and C18:3 were found to be relatively potent reducers (Machmüller and Kreuzer, 1999; Patra, 2013). Therefore, the actual decrease in CH₄ production obtained from lipids may depend on their fatty acid composition, although this is not confirmed by all *in vivo* studies (e.g., Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). More importantly, the removal of data associated with dietary lipid and oil supplements excluded data with higher dietary EE contents, which more potently decrease CH₄ production (Patra, 2013), may explain why DMI + EE_C equations did not perform better than the DMI_C equations, despite the significant relationships that were obtained for CH₄ production and yield with dietary EE content.

Dietary crude protein content being positively associated with the all-data CH₄ yield in the present analysis aligns with the observation that dietary nitrogen content is positively related to fiber digestibility (Dijkstra et al., 1996). However, decreased CH₄ production may only be observed from cattle fed a diet that is deficient in rumen degradable protein (Sutter et al., 2017). In the present study, we did not observe any relationship between crude protein content and NDF digestibility, $r = 0.04$. However, we did observe a correlation between crude protein content and organic matter and dry matter digestibility, $r = 0.42$ and $r = 0.37$, respectively. This is possibly due to higher starch degradability, which could not be verified because of the lack of starch degradability data. Van Lingen et al. (2018) applying a multivariate regression approach found that the methodological issues such as the structure of random-effects (co)variance matrices and the combination of fixed-effects variables affect the statistical inference regarding the relationship between dietary crude protein and CH₄ production or yield. Therefore, also based on dietary crude protein selected for only one equation, the latter relationship may not be commonly strong as well as it may not generally exist. Dietary crude protein may actually

be associated with lesser CH₄ production when sufficient rumen degradable protein is fed so as not to limit fermentation in the rumen due to N shortage (Dijkstra et al., 2011), and may be considered a less robust predictor of CH₄ production than dietary NDF and starch.

A positive relationship between BW and CH₄ production observed in various equations in the present analysis aligns with previous cattle research (Yan et al., 2009; Moraes et al., 2014; Escobar-Bahamondes et al., 2017a). Demment and Van Soest (1985) and Smith and Baldwin (1974) observed rumen volume and weight proportional to BW of animals. Consequently, smaller animals ingest less feed and emit less CH₄ (Hristov et al., 2013b). In addition, empirical modeling (Sauvant and Nozière, 2016) and mechanistic model simulations (Huhtanen et al., 2015, 2016) indicated the DMI/BW ratio to be an important factor for CH₄ yield. At similar DMI, smaller cattle tend to produce less CH₄ as the passage rate from the rumen to the intestine may be higher due to a greater DMI/BW ratio. This has been confirmed in sheep for which animals yielding less CH₄ had smaller rumen size (Goopy et al., 2014). Therefore, BW influences DMI, and DMI and rumen volume determine the passage rate of ruminal digesta, which affects feed digestibility, rumen fermentation conditions, and ultimately CH₄ production and yield.

4.2. Best performing equations

Various equations and model categories for predicting beef cattle CH₄ emission have been applied on various subsets in the present study. The Y_m models have only one parameter and are the simplest models, the DMI_C models are still fairly simple, whereas the Animal_C models are potentially the most complex. The Animal_C model commonly performed best among all models and outperformed the GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations, except for the European higher-forage subset. The DMI appeared to be the major predictor of enteric CH₄ production in beef cattle, but may not always be available for individual animals on commercial farms, which points to the value of the Animal_no_DMI_C models. Using dietary forage content and BW as a covariate commonly improved the prediction of CH₄ compared with a DMI_C equation. Therefore, the on-farm availability of all previously mentioned variables is recommended. This availability also enables the evaluation of the effect of dietary nutrient composition on CH₄ production. Moreover, the DMI + STA_C equation (Eq. 3) appeared to perform well, and might also be used for the prediction of beef cattle CH₄ production, although this equation was based on fewer observations. Nevertheless, dietary starch content was never selected for the Diet_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations, whereas NDF content was, indicating that DMI + STA_C equations may be slightly less robust than Diet_C and Animal_C equations.

If dietary forage content is known to be >25%, we recommend the use of the higher-forage equations, because the RSR and CCC of these equations are lower and higher, respectively, compared to the higher-forage subset evaluation of the all-data equations. Based on their predictive performance, the higher-forage Animal_C and the Escobar-Bahamondes et al. (2017a) equations (Eqns. 17, 11; Table 4) are specifically recommended. Despite its lower precision, the Charmley et al. (2016) equation (Eq. 20) will still give an accurate estimate of CH₄ production if only DMI is available. If dietary forage percentage is ≤18%, we recommend the Ellis et al. (2009) equations (Eqns. 26–27; Table 5). In addition, we recommend the lower-forage DMI_C or all-data DMI + NDF_C, DMI + STA_C and Animal_C equations that performed relatively well (Eqns. 20, 2–3, 6; Tables 2 and 5). If dietary forage content is between 18 and 25%, we suggest an all-data equation that includes dietary forage, or dietary NDF or starch, because of the forage content that is commonly related to the latter two carbohydrate fractions. The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage equations performed somewhat better on RSR and CCC than the higher-forage equations for the European higher-forage and North

American higher-forage subsets, and less systematic bias was obtained for the region-specific equations. Therefore, we most strongly recommend the Diet_C, Animal_C and Charmley et al. (2016) equations (Eq. 32–33, 37; Table 6). For North American higher-forage data, the Global_C and Charmley et al. (2016) equations are recommended in particular (Eqns. 45, 47; Table 7).

Models that assumed a fixed Y_m , such as the IPCC and GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations, performed nearly as good as the developed more complex best performing equations in most cases. The Tier 2 equations may, therefore, have a high potential for predicting beef cattle CH₄ production as well, in particular for higher-forage diets, although the higher variance along the unity lines of the predicted vs. observed plots indicates a lack of precision. Moreover, the substantial mean bias that was obtained for the lower-forage subset in particular emphasizes the importance of an accurate estimate of Y_m . In cases where dietary forage contents are not close to the means of the present data (sub)sets, we do not recommend the use of the Y_m equations considered in the present study, but an equation that contains dietary forage, NDF or starch. A Y_m of 4.5% that was obtained for lower-forage diets may be fairly accurate given a Y_m of 5.2% that was reported for 42 treatments means with ≤17% forage (Escobar-Bahamondes et al., 2017b), and a Y_m of 3.8% for 34 treatments means with ≤18% forage (Escobar-Bahamondes et al., 2017a). Both of these studies reported 9.5% forage on average for studies collected from multiple continents. These Y_m values are all higher than the 3.0%, which the IPCC uses for ≤10% forage diets. The ≤10% forage records in the present analysis, which also had a Y_m of 4.5% suggests that the Y_m value for lower-forage diets used by the IPCC needs to be reconsidered. However, practices such as feeding steam-flaked corn (Hales et al., 2012) and dietary supplementation with monensin (Appuhamy et al., 2013) may require alternative prediction as these diets may have a Y_m value of 3.0%. This also applies to fat supplemented diets (Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011; Patra, 2013).

For CH₄ yield predictions, the all-data NDF_C, Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C CH₄ yield equations (Eqns. 54, 57–58) had RSR values <1 and are suitable for use if dietary forage content is unknown. The Global_no_DMI_C equations may also be used if dietary forage content is known to be ≤18%. The higher-forage Diet_no_DMI_C CH₄ yield equation is the only equation to consider for forage contents >25% (Eq. 62; Table S4), based on RSR values >1 for the other higher-forage CH₄ yield equations. For forage contents between 18 and 25% we recommend an all-data equation with RSR <1 and the highest CCC value when evaluated with all data, which is the Global_no_DMI_C yield equation (Eq. 58). Given that all CH₄ intensity equations were associated with an RSR value >1 for the higher- and lower-forage subsets, we recommend the observed average values of 108 and 161 [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] for dietary forage contents of ≤18% and ≥25%, respectively. For dietary contents between 18 and 25% or if forage content is unknown we recommend the all-data Global_C equation (Eq. 69; Table S5).

5. Conclusion

Our analysis is based on the large GLOBAL NETWORK dataset comprising data from several continents and a wide variety of forage contents. As observed previously, DMI is the key factor for predicting beef cattle enteric CH₄ production. Non-linear models with DMI as the only independent variable did not outperform their counterpart linear models. However, linear models depending on DMI and dietary forage content or these two covariates plus BW commonly had an improved predictive ability. Separate equations for lower-forage (≤18%) and higher-forage (≥25%) data also improved predictive ability. Model evaluation specific to European higher-forage, North American higher-forage and Brazilian higher-forage diets compared with that of intercontinental

higher-forage diet models suggests that overall enteric CH₄ production is more accurately predicted by region-specific models, although in many cases the best intercontinental and region-specific models may perform similarly. The equations developed in the present study commonly had higher precision and less prediction error with similar accuracy compared to the extant equations that were evaluated. Evaluation of CH₄ emission conversion factors indicated that region-specific and in particular dietary forage content-based Y_m values are required for adequately predicting beef cattle CH₄ production in national or global inventories.

Uncited reference

Benchaar et al. (2015).

Acknowledgments

Authors gratefully acknowledge project funding from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Federal Appropriations under Project PEN 04539 and Accession number 1000803; the Joint Programming Initiative on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change (FACCE-JPI)'s 'GLOBAL NETWORK' project and the 'Feeding and Nutrition Network' (<http://animalscience.psu.edu/fnn>) of the Livestock Research Group within the Global Research Alliance for Agricultural Greenhouse Gases (www.globalresearchalliance.org); the Sesnon Endowed Chair program (UC Davis); the Swiss Federal Office of Agriculture, Berne, Switzerland; AHDB Beef and Lamb, the Scottish Government, Defra and the devolved administrations through the UK Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Platform; French National Research Agency through the FACCE-JPI program (ANR-13-JFAC-0003-01); the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science, (Project No. PJ013448012018), RDA, Republic of Korea; the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Carbon Farming Futures Action on the Ground program; AOTGR2-0400); the financial support of the Reducing Emissions from Livestock Research Program, the National Livestock Methane Program, Meat and Livestock Australia, CSIRO and Ridley AgriProducts Pty, Ltd; the Institute of Science and Technology in Animal Science (INCTCA 465377/2014-9), the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM), Ireland (AGRI-I project); European Commission through SMethane (FP7-SME-262,270); Beef Cattle Research Council of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association; the Cofund for Monitoring & Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases from Agri- and Silvi-culture (FACCE ERA-GAS)'s project Capturing Effects of Diet on Emissions from Ruminant Systems and the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (AF-EU-18010 & BO-4400159-01).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575>.

References

Aguerre, M.J., Wattiaux, M.A., Powell, J.M., Broderick, G.A., Arndt, C., 2011. Effect of forage-to-concentrate ratio in dairy cow diets on emission of methane, carbon dioxide, and ammonia, lactation performance, and manure excretion. *J. Dairy Sci.* 94, 3081–3093. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2010-4011>.

Appuhamy, J.A.D.R.N., Strathe, A.B., Jayasundara, S., Wagner-Riddle, C., France, J., Dijkstra, J., Kebreab, E., 2013. Anti-methanogenic effects of monensin in dairy and beef cattle: a meta-analysis. *J. Dairy Sci.* 96, 5161–5173. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-5923>.

Bannink, A., Schjndel, M.W. van, Dijkstra, J., 2011. A model of enteric fermentation in dairy cows to estimate methane emission for the Dutch National Inventory Report using the IPCC Tier 3 approach. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 166–167, 603–618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeeds.2011.04.043>.

Basarab, J.A., Okine, E.K., Baron, V.S., Marx, T., Ramsey, P., Ziegler, K., Lyle, K., 2005. Methane emissions from enteric fermentation in Alberta's beef cattle population. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 85, 501–512. <https://doi.org/10.4141/A04-069>.

Beauchemin, K.A., Kreuzer, M., O'Mara, F.O., McAllister, T.A., 2008. Nutritional management for enteric methane abatement: a review. *Aust. J. Exp. Agric.* 48, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1071/EA07199>.

Bell, M., Eckard, R., Moate, P.J., Yan, T., 2016. Modelling the effect of diet composition on enteric methane emissions across sheep, beef cattle and dairy cows. *Animals* 6, 54. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani6090054>.

Benchaar, C., Hassanat, F., Martineau, R., Gervais, R., 2015. Linseed oil supplementation to dairy cows fed diets based on red clover silage or corn silage: effects on methane production, rumen fermentation, nutrient digestibility, N balance, and milk production. *J. Dairy Sci.* 98, 7993–8008. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9398>.

Bibby, J., Toutenburg, T., 1977. Prediction and Improved Estimation in Linear Models. John 785 Wiley Sons, Chichester.

Castelan-Ortega, O.A., Ku-Vera, J.C., Estrada-Flores, J.G., 2014. Modeling methane emissions and methane inventories for cattle production systems in Mexico. *Atmosfera* 27, 185–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0187-6236\(14\)71109-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0187-6236(14)71109-9).

Charmley, E., Williams, S.R.O., Moate, P.J., Hegarty, R.S., Herd, R.M., Oddy, V.H., Reyenga, P., Staunton, K.M., Anderson, A., Hannah, M.C., 2016. A universal equation to predict methane production of forage-fed cattle in Australia. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 56, 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15365>.

de Vries, M., van Middelaar, C.E., de Boer, I.J.M., 2015. Comparing environmental impacts of beef production systems: a review of life cycle assessments. *Livest. Sci.* 178, 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.06.020>.

Demment, M.W., Van Soest, P.J., 1985. A nutritional explanation for body-size patterns of ruminant and non-ruminant herbivores. *Am. Nat.* 125, 641–672. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284369>.

Dijkstra, J., France, J., Assis, A.G., Neal, H.D.St.C., Campos, O.F., Aroeira, L.J.M., 1996. Simulation of digestion in cattle fed sugarcane: prediction of nutrient supply for milk production with locally available supplements. *J. Agric. Sci.* 127, 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600078023>.

Dijkstra, J., Onema, O., Bannink, A., 2011. Dietary strategies to reducing N excretion from cattle: implications for methane emissions. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 3, 414–422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2011.07.008>.

Drouillard, J.S., 2018. Current situation and future trends for beef production in the United States of America - A review. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 31, 1007–1016. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.18.0428>.

Ellis, J.L., Kebreab, E., Odongo, N.E., McBride, B.W., Okine, E.K., France, J., 2007. Prediction of methane production from dairy and beef cattle. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90, 3456–3467. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-675>.

Ellis, J.L., Kebreab, E., Odongo, N.E., Beauchemin, K.A., McGinn, S., Nkrumah, J.D., Moore, S.S., Christopherson, R., Murdoch, G.K., McBride, B.W., Okine, E.K., France, J., 2009. Modeling methane production from beef cattle using linear and nonlinear approaches. *J. Anim. Sci.* 87, 1334–1345. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2007-0725>.

Escobar-Bahamondes, P., Oba, M., Beauchemin, K.A., 2017. Universally applicable methane prediction equations for beef cattle fed high- or low-forage diets. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 97, 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjas-2016-0042>.

Escobar-Bahamondes, P., Oba, M., Beauchemin, K.A., 2017. An evaluation of the accuracy and precision of methane prediction equations for beef cattle fed high-forage and high-grain diets. *Animal* 11, 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173111600121X>.

Gastelen, S. van, Antunes-Fernandes, S.C., Hettinga, K.A., Klop, G., Alferink, S.J.J., Hendriks, W.H., Dijkstra, J., 2015. Enteric methane production, rumen volatile fatty acid concentrations, and milk fatty acid composition in lactating Holstein-Friesian cows fed grass silage- or corn silage-based diets. *J. Dairy Sci.* 98, 1915–1927. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8552>.

Gerber, P.J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falucci, A., Tempio, G., 2013. Tackling Climate Change through Livestock – a Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

Gerssen-Gondelach, S.J., Lauwerijssen, R.B.G., Havlík, P., Herrero, M., Valin, H., Faaij, A.P.C., Wicke, B., 2017. Intensification pathways for beef and dairy cattle production systems: impacts on GHG emissions, land occupation and land use change. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 240, 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.02.012>.

Goopy, J., Donaldson, A., Hegarty, R., Vercoe, P., Haynes, F., Barnett, M., Oddy, V., 2014. Low-methane yield sheep have smaller rumsen and shorter rumen retention time. *Brit. J. Nutr.* 111, 578–585. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114513002936>.

Grainger, C., Beauchemin, K.A., 2011. Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants be lowered without lowering their production?. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 166–167, 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeeds.2011.04.021>.

Guyader, J., Eugène, M., Nozière, P., Morgavi, D., Doreau, M., Martin, C., 2014. Influence of rumen protozoa on methane emission in ruminants: a meta-analysis approach. *Animal* 8, 1816–1825. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731114001852>.

Hales, K.E., Cole, N.A., MacDonald, J.C., 2012. Effects of corn processing method and dietary inclusion of wet distillers grains with solubles on energy metabolism, carbon-nitrogen balance, and methane emissions of cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 90, 3174–3185. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2011-4441>.

Hammond, K.J., Crompton, L.A., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., O'Kiely, P., Kebreab, E., Eugène, M.A., Yu, Z., Shingfield, K.J., Schwarm, A., Hristov, A.N., Reynolds, C.K., 2016. Review of current in vivo measurement techniques for quantifying enteric methane emission from ruminants. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 219, 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeeds.2016.05.018>.

Hatew, B., Cone, J.W., Pellikaan, W.F., Podesta, S.C., Bannink, A., Hendriks, W.H., Dijkstra, J., 2015. Relationship between in vitro and in vivo methane production measured simultaneously with different dietary starch sources and starch levels in dairy cattle. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 202, 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeeds.2015.01.012>.

Hristov, A.N., Oh, J., Firkins, J., Dijkstra, J., Kebreab, E., Waghorn, G., Makker, M.P.S., Adesogan, A.T., Yang, W., Lee, C., Gerber, P.J., Henderson, B., Tricarico, J.M., 2013.

- SPECIAL TOPICS - Mitigation of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from animal operations: I. A review of enteric methane mitigation options. *J. Anim. Sci.* 91, 5045–5069. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-6583>.
- Hristov, A.N., Ott, J., Tricarico, J.M., Rotz, A., Waghorn, G., Adesogan, A.T., Dijkstra, J., Montes, F., Oh, J., Kebreab, E., Oosting, S.J., Gerber, P.J., Henderson, B., Makker, H.P.S., Firkins, J., 2013. SPECIAL TOPICS - Mitigation of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from animal operations: III. A review of animal management mitigation options. *J. Anim. Sci.* 91, 5095–5113. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-6585>.
- Hristov, A.N., Kebreab, E., Niu, M., Oh, J., Bannink, A., Bayat, A.R., Boland, T., Brito, A.F., Casper, D., Crompton, L.A., Dijkstra, J., Eugène, M.A., Garnsworthy, Ph.C., Haque, M.N., Hellwing, A.L.F., Huhtanen, P., Kreuzer, M., Kuhla, B., Lund, P., Madsen, J., Martin, C., Moate, P.J., Muetzel, S., Muñoz, C., Peiren, N., Powell, J.M., Reynolds, C.K., Schwarm, A., Shingfield, K.J., Storlien, T.M., Weisbjerg, M.R., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., Yu, Z., 2018. Symposium review: uncertainties in enteric methane inventories, measurement techniques, and prediction models. *J. Dairy Sci.* 101, 6655–6674. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13536>.
- Huhtanen, P., Ramin, M., Udén, P., 2015. Nordic dairy cow model Karoline in predicting methane emissions: 1. Model description and sensitivity analysis. *Livest. Sci.* 178, 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.009>.
- Huhtanen, P., Ramin, M., Cabezas-García, E.H., 2016. Effects of ruminal digesta retention time on methane emissions: a modelling approach. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 56, 501–506. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15507>.
- IPCC, 2006. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IGES, Kanagawa, Japan.
- IPCC, 2014. In: Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M., Troxler, T.G. (Eds.), 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol. IPCC, Switzerland.
- James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., 2014. An Introduction to Statistical Learning: With Applications in R. Springer New York, US.
- Johnson, K.A., Johnson, D.E., 1995. Methane emissions from cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 73, 2483–2492. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1995.7382483x>.
- Kebreab, E., Johnson, J.A., Archibeque, S.L., Pape, D., Wirth, T., 2008. Model for estimating enteric methane emissions from United States dairy and feedlot cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 86, 2738–2748. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2008-0960>.
- Kutner, M.H., Nachtsheim, C., Neter, J., Li, W., 2005. Applied Linear Statistical Models. McGraw-Hill Irwin. New York, US, Boston.
- Lin, L.I., 1989. A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility. *Biometrics* 45, 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2532051>.
- Lingen, H.J. van, Fadel, J.G., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., Tricarico, J., Pacheco, D., Casper, D.P., Kebreab, E., 2018. Multi-criteria evaluation of dairy cattle feed resources and animal characteristics for nutritive and environmental impacts. *Animal* 12, s310–s320. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731118001313>.
- Machmüller, A., Kreuzer, M., 1999. Methane suppression by coconut oil and associated effects on nutrient and energy balance in sheep. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 79, 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.4141/A98-079>.
- Maia, M.R.G., Chaudhary, L.C., Figueres, L., Wallace, R.J., 2007. Metabolism of polyunsaturated fatty acids and their toxicity to the microflora of the rumen. *Anton. Leeuw.* 91, 303–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-006-9118-2>.
- Martin, C., Morgavi, D.P., Doreau, M., 2010. Methane mitigation in ruminants: from microbe to the farm scale. *Animal* 4, 351–365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731109990620>.
- Mills, J.A.N., Kebreab, E., Yates, C.M., Crompton, L.A., Cammell, S.B., Dhanoa, M.S., Agnew, R.E., France, J., 2003. Alternative approaches to predicting methane emission from dairy cows. *J. Anim. Sci.* 81, 3141–3150. <https://doi.org/10.2527/2003.81123141x>.
- Moate, P.J., Williams, S.R.O., Deighton, M.H., Hannah, M.C., Ribaux, B.E., Morris, G.L., Jacobs, J.L., Hill, J., Wales, W.J., 2019. Effects of feeding wheat or corn and of rumen fistulation on milk production and methane emissions of dairy cows. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 59, 891–905. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN17433>.
- Moe, P.W., Tyrrell, H.F., 1979. Methane production in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 62, 1583–1586. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(79\)83465-7](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(79)83465-7).
- Moraes, L.E., Strathe, A.B., Fadel, J.G., Casper, D.P., Kebreab, E., 2014. Prediction of enteric methane emissions from cattle. *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy* 20, 2140–2148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12471>.
- Moriassi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L., 2007. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. *T. ASABE* 50, 885–900. <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.23153>.
- Na, Y., Li, D.H., Lee, S.R., 2017. Effects of dietary forage-to-concentrate ratio on nutrient digestibility and enteric methane production in growing goats (*Capra hircus hircus*) and Sika deer (*Cervus nippon hortulorum*). *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 7, 967–972. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.16.0954>.
- Niu, M., Kebreab, E., Hristov, A.N., Oh, J., Arndt, C., Bannink, A., Bayat, A.R., Brito, A.F., Boland, T., Casper, D.P., Crompton, L.A., Dijkstra, J., Eugène, M.A., Garnsworthy, Ph.C., Haque, M.N., Hellwing, A.L.F., Huhtanen, P., Kreuzer, M., Kuhla, B., Lund, P., Maden, J., Martin, C., McClelland, S.C., McGee, M., Moate, P.J., Muetzel, S., Muñoz, C., O'Kiely, P., Peiren, N., Reynolds, C.K., Schwarm, A., Shingfield, K.J., Storlien, T.M., Weisbjerg, M.R., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., Yu, Z., 2018. Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity in dairy cattle using an intercontinental database. *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy* 24, 3368–3389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14094>.
- Opio, C., Gerber, P., Mottet, A., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G., MacLeod, M., Vellinga, T., Henderson, B., Steinfeld, H., 2013. Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Ruminant Supply Chains – a Global Life Cycle Assessment. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.
- Patra, A.K., 2013. The effect of dietary fats on methane emissions, and its other effects on digestibility, rumen fermentation and lactation performance in cattle: a meta-analysis. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 155, 244–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2013.05.023>.
- Patra, A.K., 2017. Prediction of enteric methane emission from cattle using linear and non-linear statistical models in tropical production systems. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* 22, 629–650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-015-9691-7>.
- Pérez-Ramírez, E., Peyraud, J.L., Delagarde, R., 2012. N-alkanes v. ytterbium/faecal index as two methods for estimating herbage intake of dairy cows fed on diets differing in the herbage:maize silage ratio and feeding level. *Animal* 6, 232–244. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731111001480>.
- Pinheiro, J.C., Bates, D.M., 2000. Mixed-effects Models in S and S-PLUS. Springer Verlag, New York, Inc..
- Popp, A., Lotze-Campen, H., Bodirsky, B., 2010. Food consumption, diets shifts and associated non-CO₂ greenhouse gases from agricultural production. *Glob. Environ. Change* 20, 451–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.02.001>.
- R Core Team, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. URL R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Richmond, A.S., Wylie, A.R.G., Laidlaw, A.S., Lively, F.O., 2015. Methane emissions from beef cattle grazing on semi-natural upland and improved lowland grasslands. *Animal* 9, 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731114002067>.
- Santiago-Suarez, B., Moraes, L.E., Appuhamy, J.A.D.R.N., Pellikaan, W.F., Casper, D.P., Tricarico, J., Kebreab, E., 2016. Prediction and evaluation of enteric methane emissions from lactating dairy cows using different levels of covariate information. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 56, 557–564. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15496>.
- Sauvant, D., Giger-Reverdin, S., 2009. Modélisation des interactions digestives et de la production de méthane chez les ruminants. (In French) *INRA Prod. Anim.* 22, 375–384.
- Sauvant, D., Nozière, P., 2016. Quantification of the main digestive processes in ruminants: the equations involved in the renewed energy and protein feed evaluation systems. *Animal* 10, 755–770. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731115002670>.
- St-Pierre, N.R., 2001. Invited Review: integrating quantitative findings from multiple studies using mixed model methodology. *J. Dairy Sci.* 84, 741–755. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(01\)74530-4](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(01)74530-4).
- Sutter, F., Schwarm, A., Kreuzer, M., 2017. Development of nitrogen and methane losses in the first eight weeks of lactation in Holstein cows subjected to deficiency of utilisable crude protein under restrictive feeding conditions. *Arch. Anim. Nutr.* 71, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2016.1258880>.
- Warner, D., Hatew, B., Podesta, S.C., Klop, G., van Gastelen, S., van Laar, H., Dijkstra, J., Bannink, A., 2016. Effects of nitrogen fertilisation rate and maturity of grass silage on methane emission by lactating dairy cows. *Animal* 10, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731115001640>.
- White, R.R., Roman-García, Y., Firkins, J.L., VanDeHaar, M.J., Armentano, L.E., Weiss, W.P., McGill, T., Garnett, R., Hanigan, M.D., 2017. Evaluation of the National Research Council (2001) dairy model and derivation of new prediction equations. 1. Digestibility of fiber, fat, protein, and non-fiber carbohydrate. *J. Dairy Sci.* 100, 3591–3610. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-10800>.
- Yan, T., Agnew, R.E., Gordon, F.J., Porter, M.G., 2000. Prediction of methane energy output in dairy and beef cattle offered grass silage-based diets. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 64, 253–263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226\(99\)00145-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226(99)00145-1).
- Yan, T., Porter, M.G., Mayne, C.S., 2009. Prediction of methane emission from beef cattle using data measured in indirect open-circuit respiration calorimeters. *Animal* 3, 1455–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173110900473X>.
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common statistical problems. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 1, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2009.00001.x>.
- Zwillinger, D., Kokoska, S., 2000. CRC Standard Probability and Statistics Tables and Formulae. CRC Press, Boca Raton, US.