



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71317/kjard.2.5.2026.600>

Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development

Journal homepage: <https://rjsaonline.org/index.php/KJARD>



Enteric Methane Mitigation in Ruminants: From Hydrogen Metabolism and Microbiome Modulation to Precision Farm Management

Abdul Maalik

Institute of Animal and Dairy Sciences, Faculty of Animal Husbandry, University of Agriculture Faisalabad

Email: abdulmaalik615@gmail.com

Zeeshan Ahmad

Institute of Animal and Dairy Sciences, Faculty of Animal Husbandry, University of Agriculture Faisalabad

Email: zeeshanahmadsahi@gmail.com

Muhammad Danish Yaqoob

University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore (CVAS Campus, Jhang)

Email: zeeshanahmadsahi@gmail.com

Muhammad Shoaib

Institute of Animal and Dairy Sciences, Faculty of Animal Husbandry, University of Agriculture Faisalabad

Email: malikshoaibm323@gmail.com

Muhammad Zakria Rehman

Institute of Animal and Dairy Sciences, Faculty of Animal Husbandry, University of Agriculture Faisalabad

Email: Zakriarehman360@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received:

March 30, 2026

Revised:

April 12, 2026

Accepted:

April 27, 2026

Available Online:

May 12, 2026

Keywords:

enteric methane; rumen
hydrogen; methanogenesis; 3-
nitrooxypropanol; Asparagopsis;
rumen microbiome; precision
feeding; methane measurement

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Zakria Rehman

Email:

Zakriarehman360@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Enteric methane mitigation has moved from a narrow search for antimethanogenic compounds toward a systems problem involving ruminal hydrogen transfer, microbial ecology, animal variation, delivery technology and credible on-farm verification. This critical narrative review organizes current evidence around the rumen hydrogen network and evaluates whether interventions produce durable methane abatement without impairing intake, fiber digestion, productivity, product safety or whole-system environmental performance. Recent meta-analyses identify 3-nitrooxypropanol, nitrate, selected lipid sources and Asparagopsis-derived products as the most consistently effective nutritional interventions, but their responses are strongly conditioned by dose, basal diet, exposure duration and production system. Plant secondary compounds and probiotics can alter fermentation and microbial networks, yet pooled in vivo effects are generally smaller or less consistent than results from in vitro screening. Direct inhibition of methanogenesis also increases the need to account for the fate of excess hydrogen; failure to redirect reducing equivalents can limit energetic recovery and may explain why methane reduction does not consistently improve feed efficiency. Advances in metagenomics, metatranscriptomics and microbial network analysis indicate that functional guilds and interspecies hydrogen transfer are more informative than methanogen abundance alone. Precision feeding, sensor-derived phenotypes, mechanistic models and machine learning offer a pathway to match interventions to responsive animals, maintain effective exposure and verify outcomes under commercial conditions. We propose a mechanism-to-deployment framework in which mitigation options are compared using seven linked criteria: methane production and yield, hydrogen fate, rumen function, animal performance, persistence, safety and farm deliverability. Future progress will depend on long-duration, adequately powered studies that report harmonized methane metrics, hydrogen emissions, productivity, microbial function, economics and life-cycle consequences. Effective low-methane production will therefore require coordinated management of diet, microbiome and measurement rather than reliance on a single additive.

Introduction

Ruminants convert cellulose-rich forages, crop residues and other materials that humans cannot digest into milk and meat, but the same fermentative system produces enteric methane. Biogenic methane has a 100-year global-warming potential of approximately 27 relatives to carbon dioxide, and methane formation can account for roughly 2–12% of gross energy intake depending on diet and animal conditions (IPCC, 2021). The environmental objective is therefore not simply to suppress an archaeal end product, but to lower methane while retaining the digestive advantage of the rumen. The mitigation portfolio now includes forage and ration management, lipids, nitrate, plant bioactives, direct methanogenesis inhibitors, macroalgae and microbial products. Recent syntheses show that these interventions differ markedly in potency, consistency, safety and readiness for commercial delivery (Beauchemin et al., 2022). A high percentage reduction in a controlled study does not automatically translate into durable abatement in a grazing herd or into a positive economic return.

Context dependence is especially visible for the two most potent current options. Meta-analysis indicates that 3-nitrooxypropanol (3-NOP) generally produces a substantial and repeatable response in dairy cattle, but the magnitude varies with dose and dietary composition (Kebreab et al., 2023). Asparagopsis has produced very large reductions in some beef and short-term dairy studies, whereas longer dairy trials have reported declining efficacy, lower intake or reduced milk production at higher inclusion rates (Wasson et al., 2026). These contrasting outcomes make persistence and productive response as important as initial potency. The biological explanation lies in the rumen hydrogen economy. Hydrogen and formate are generated by numerous fermentative microorganisms and transferred to methanogens or to competing hydrogenotrophs; this network is broader than a simple association between one bacterial group and one archaeal group (Kelly et al., 2022). The key mitigation question is therefore where reducing equivalents move when methane formation is constrained.

Animal-to-animal variation further complicates intervention design. A core rumen microbiome is shared across hosts, yet diet and host factors alter community structure and function (Henderson et al., 2015). Metagenomic studies have also linked host genetic variation with microbial pathways associated with methane production, indicating that the same additive can act on different biological starting points in different animals (Martínez-Álvaro et al., 2022). A second gap separates biological discovery from farm implementation. Respiration chambers, the sulfur hexafluoride tracer technique and GreenFeed differ in throughput, animal disturbance and sources of error (Della Rosa et al., 2021). Recent direct comparisons confirm that repeated GreenFeed observations can detect treatment responses, but visit distribution and calibration remain critical (Bayat et al., 2025). Prediction and sensor systems are valuable only when they remain anchored to credible direct measurements.

This review develops a hydrogen-centered, mechanism-to-deployment framework for enteric methane mitigation. It explains the biochemical basis of hydrogen transfer, compares interventions according to their mechanistic target and evidence strength, examines microbiome and host variation, and evaluates how precision management can improve delivery and verification. The central argument is that a mitigation technology should be judged by methane abatement, hydrogen fate, productive performance, persistence, safety, scalability and measurement quality together.

Rumen hydrogen metabolism as the mechanistic foundation

Ruminal fermentation is a distributed redox process in which microorganisms oxidize carbohydrates while regenerating reduced cofactors. Fibrolytic and other fermentative organisms release hydrogen or formate, whereas other pathways retain reducing equivalents in products such as propionate (Greening et al., 2019). Diet can therefore select metabolically distinct communities with different patterns of hydrogen production and disposal (Li et al., 2022). Methanogenic archaea occupy a favorable thermodynamic niche because they maintain low hydrogen partial pressure by reducing carbon dioxide or methyl compounds to methane. Hydrogen and formate transfer between fermenters and methanogens sustains otherwise unfavorable oxidation reactions (Kelly et al., 2022). The final methane-forming reaction is catalyzed by methyl-coenzyme M reductase (MCR), a nickel-containing enzyme that is the specific molecular target of 3-NOP (Duin et al., 2016).

Methanogenesis is not the only available electron sink. Propionate formation, nitrate reduction, fumarate reduction and reductive acetogenesis can consume reducing equivalents that would otherwise support methane formation (Ungerfeld, 2020). Nitrate is a particularly strong competitor for hydrogen, whereas ruminal acetogens normally struggle to outcompete methanogens at the low hydrogen concentrations maintained in an uninhibited rumen (Pereira et al., 2022). Direct inhibition creates a redox-management problem rather than merely removing an unwanted product. Experiments that inhibited methanogenesis increased dissolved or gaseous hydrogen, and only part of the spared reducing power was recovered in alternative fermentation products (et al., 2017). Consequently, methane abatement and energy recovery are not synonymous.

The effect on digestion depends on how selectively the intervention changes electron flow. A specific inhibitor may suppress terminal methane formation while leaving primary fermentation largely intact, whereas broad antimicrobial plant compounds may also reduce fibrolytic activity. Mechanistic models should therefore balance methane, hydrogen, volatile fatty acids,

microbial growth and substrate disappearance instead of assuming that all spared methane energy becomes animal product (Pressman and Kebreab, 2024).

Table 1: Functional microbial guilds governing hydrogen production and utilization in the rumen

Functional guild	Representative members / routes	Hydrogen role	Relationship with CH ₄	Implication for Key references
Fibrolitic fermenters	Ruminococcus, Fibrobacter and anaerobic fungi	Generate H ₂ /formate during acetate- and butyrate-forming fermentation	Supply reducing equivalents methanogens	Preserve fiber while broad Kelly et al. (2022)
Starch and sugar fermenters	Prevotella, Selenomonas, Streptococcus and related taxa	Partition reducing equivalents among lactate, succinate, propionate and H ₂	Greater propionate formation generally lowers H ₂ available to methanogens	Balance fermentable starch with rumen pH and effective fiber Li et al. (2022)
Methanogenic archaea	Methanobrevibacter, Methanosphaera and Methanomicrobium	Consume H ₂ /formate or methyl compounds and maintain low H ₂ pressure	Direct CH ₄ producers	Specific inhibition is effective, but the fate of H ₂ must be quantified Duin et al. (2016)
Ciliate protozoa	Entodiniomorphs and holotrichs	Produce H ₂ and support associated methanogens	Often increase CH ₄ through interspecies transfer	Protozoal modulation may lower CH ₄ but can alter digestion and N turnover Xie et al. (2026)
Propionate producers	Succinate- and acrylate-pathway organisms	Consume reducing equivalents during propionate formation	Compete with methanogenesis and provide glucogenic substrate	Dietary formulation or consortia may favor these routes if pH remains stable Ungerfeld (2020)
Nitrate/nitrite reducers	Selenomonas and other nitrate-reducing bacteria	Use reducing equivalents to convert nitrate to ammonia	Strong alternative electron sink	Requires gradual adaptation and control of nitrite toxicity Pereira et al. (2022)
Reductive acetogens	Acetobacterium and related acetogens	Reduce CO ₂ with H ₂ to acetate	Potential sink but commonly outcompeted by methanogens	Ecological engineering is needed to improve competitiveness Greening et al. (2019)

Mechanism-Based Nutritional Interventions

Diet quality, fermentability and productive efficiency

Diet formulation establishes the substrate environment in which every additive operates. Earlier harvest, better forage preservation and balanced energy–nitrogen supply can improve digestibility and shorten retention time, thereby reducing methane per unit of product even when daily methane changes little (Beauchemin et al., 2022). Fiber-rich and starch-rich diets also select different hydrogen-producing and hydrogen-consuming pathways, which can modify the response to an inhibitor (Li et al., 2022).

Absolute methane production, methane yield and methane intensity should not be treated as interchangeable outcomes. Increasing productivity can lower emissions per kilogram of milk or gain while daily emissions remain unchanged or rise; only the daily value represents the atmospheric input from one animal (Arndt et al., 2022). For this reason, productivity-based dilution is useful but cannot replace direct abatement.

Diet composition also modifies targeted additive efficacy. In a dairy meta-analysis, 3-NOP responses varied with fiber and starch, nitrate effects varied with dose and diet, and lipid efficacy depended on dietary fat and carbohydrate composition (Martins et al., 2024b). Thus, an additive response should be described as conditional on the basal ration rather than as a fixed percentage.

Lipids and oilseeds

Lipids reduce methane by replacing fermentable carbohydrate, altering protozoal and fibrolytic activity, and in some cases accepting a limited amount of hydrogen during biohydrogenation. The dominant effect is usually less fermentable substrate and altered microbial fermentation rather than direct stoichiometric capture of all hydrogen (Beauchemin et al., 2020).

Across dairy datasets, oils and oilseeds generally produce a moderate response rather than the very high reductions seen with specific inhibitors. Meta-regression estimated reductions of up to about 15% across common methane metrics, with efficacy influenced by lipid form and basal diet (Martins et al., 2024b). A later systematic-review meta-analysis reached a similar conclusion that lipids are among the more dependable moderate interventions (Dalmonte et al., 2026).

The practical ceiling is set by intake, fiber digestion and product quality. High concentrations of unprotected fat can inhibit cellulolytic microorganisms, depress neutral-detergent-fiber digestibility and alter milk fat synthesis (Hristov, 2024). Lipid supplementation is therefore most defensible when it solves a nutritional need as well as contributing to methane mitigation.

Tannins, essential oils and other plant bioactives

Plant bioactives comprise chemically diverse compounds rather than one intervention class. Condensed and hydrolysable tannins, saponins, essential oils, flavonoids and organosulfur compounds can affect methanogens, protozoa, bacterial membranes, protein degradation and fiber fermentation. Their biological effects depend on molecular structure, extract standardization and dose, so botanical identity alone is an inadequate descriptor.

Condensed tannins have the clearest *in vivo* evidence among plant bioactives. Cattle meta-analyses indicate an average methane reduction around 9–11%, but the response is accompanied by dose-dependent changes in digestibility, intake and nitrogen use (Souza et al., 2026). A useful tannin product must therefore achieve adequate bioactivity without turning methane reduction into a consequence of depressed fermentation.

Essential oils show a pronounced *in vitro*–*in vivo* gap. *In vitro* synthesis identifies many oils with strong antimethanogenic activity, whereas pooled dairy-cow data show smaller and less consistent effects after adaptation (Dalmonte et al., 2026). Variation in chemical composition and rapid microbial adaptation limit the transferability of results between products.

Saponins commonly reduce protozoal activity and may indirectly decrease methanogens associated with protozoa. However, protozoal populations can recover and protozoa also contribute to starch turnover, bacterial predation and fiber digestion. Recent evidence that rumen ciliates directly modulate methane reinforces the need to measure digestive consequences rather than using defaunation as an automatic objective (Xie et al., 2026).

Nitrate and alternative electron acceptors

Nitrate diverts reducing equivalents through sequential reduction to nitrite and ammonia. This route competes effectively with methanogenesis and can provide non-protein nitrogen, but its benefit depends on a microbial population able to reduce nitrite rapidly (Feng et al., 2020). Safety is the defining constraint because nitrite accumulation oxidizes hemoglobin to methemoglobin and impairs oxygen transport. Gradual adaptation, controlled dose, sulfur balance and monitoring of methemoglobin are therefore integral parts of a nitrate protocol rather than optional precautions (Lee and Beauchemin, 2014).

Fumarate and malate can promote succinate and propionate pathways, although their *in vivo* effect is usually modest relative to the required dose. Reductive acetogenesis is more attractive conceptually because it produces acetate from carbon dioxide and hydrogen, but its thermodynamics and ecological competitiveness remain unfavorable under normal rumen conditions (Pereira et al., 2022).

3-Nitrooxypropanol

3-NOP is converted in the rumen to reactive intermediates that oxidize the catalytically active Ni(I) state of the F₄₃₀ cofactor in MCR. This blocks the terminal reaction between methyl-coenzyme M and coenzyme B while showing far greater specificity for methanogens than broad antimicrobial compounds (Duin et al., 2016). The *in vivo* evidence is extensive. A dairy meta-analysis estimated average reductions of approximately 30% in methane production, yield and intensity, with dose and diet explaining part of the remaining variation (Kebreab et al., 2023). Multi-study analyses also indicate that lactational performance is usually maintained at recommended doses, although a methane response should not be interpreted as proof of energy recovery.

Long-term studies do not show inevitable complete microbial adaptation, but they do show that efficacy can change with ration composition and time. A prolonged Holstein study maintained a meaningful response to 3-NOP, whereas hydrogen emission

increased as methane declined (van Gastelen et al., 2024). This supports continued monitoring of both efficacy and redox consequences. Delivery is easiest in total mixed rations and feedlots, where the active compound can be distributed throughout daily feed. Grazing systems present a harder pharmacokinetic problem because a once- or twice-daily supplement may create a pulse rather than sustained rumen exposure (Muetzel et al., 2024). Slow-release or frequent-delivery approaches therefore require animal-level intake verification.

Asparagopsis and bromoform-containing products

Asparagopsis species contain halogenated methane analogues, particularly bromoform. These compounds interfere with cobamide-dependent methyl transfer and terminal methanogenesis, while the rumen community can also dehalogenate bromoform over time (Romero et al., 2023). The active compound, not seaweed inclusion alone, should therefore be quantified. Animal trials demonstrate both high potential and substantial variability. Beef steers have shown reductions above 80% under controlled feeding (Roque et al., 2021), while a dairy crossover study reported a large response with accompanying changes in intake and fermentation (Stefenoni et al., 2021). In a 13-week dairy study, efficacy weakened after week 8 and the higher dose reduced dry matter intake (Angellotti et al., 2025) another 2026 trial reported lower intake and milk production (Wasson et al., 2026).

Commercial development must address active-compound stability, cultivation, processing, product homogeneity and residues. Bromoform and halogens have been detected in excreta and milk-related matrices under some feeding conditions, making residue and animal-health assessment essential (Muizelaar et al., 2021). Standardization should include bromoform concentration at manufacture, after storage and in the feed actually consumed.

Probiotics and targeted microbial consortia

Yeasts and direct-fed microbials are mainly fermentation modifiers rather than direct inhibitors. Meta-analysis suggests that probiotic responses depend strongly on microbial species, dose, basal diet and animal class, with average methane effects smaller and less consistent than those of 3-NOP or nitrate (Ncho et al., 2024). Their value may lie in maintaining rumen stability or enabling alternative hydrogen sinks. Products should therefore be evaluated at strain and functional levels. A *Saccharomyces* culture intended to stabilize rumen pH is biologically different from a bacterium selected to produce succinate or consume lactate. Pooling them under the word probiotic obscures both mechanism and expected response.

Targeted consortia may be more realistic than a single introduced strain because hydrogen transfer is a network property. Rumen metagenomics shows that hydrogenases and hydrogenotrophic pathways are distributed across many bacterial and archaeal lineages (Greening et al., 2019). A successful consortium would need to establish, compete for substrate and remain compatible with fiber digestion.

Combinations and controlled-delivery strategies

Combination strategies can target different points in the network, for example pairing terminal inhibition with a competitive electron sink. Isotope and fermentation studies show that the fate of hydrogen differs among nitrate, 3-NOP and other inhibitors, providing a mechanistic basis for testing rational combinations (Guyader et al., 2017).

Synergy cannot be inferred by adding the percentage reductions from separate experiments. One additive may remove the organisms required by another, duplicate the same target, alter feed intake or increase toxicity. Factorial designs with hydrogen, volatile fatty acids, digestibility and safety outcomes are required before a combination is described as synergistic (Belanche et al., 2025). Delivery technology may determine whether combination strategies become practical. Encapsulation, coated nitrate, stabilized extracts and automated micro-dosing can alter the site, timing and consistency of exposure. Product development should therefore connect formulation chemistry with rumen kinetics and individual treatment coverage rather than treating delivery as a later engineering detail (Durmic et al., 2025).

Table 2: Evidence-weighted comparison of major enteric methane interventions

Intervention	Primary mechanistic target	Typical response	in vivo Evidence strength	Main advantages	Principal limitations	Key references
Improved forage and balanced diet	Digestibility, passage rate and VFA pattern	Usually modest direct methane reduction; intensity may decline substantially	Moderate -high	Low technological barrier and possible production benefits	Absolute CH ₄ may not decline; excessive concentrate increases acidosis risk	Beauchemin et al. (2022)
Lipids / oilseeds	Substrate replacement, microbial effects and biohydrogenation	Approximately 5-15% reduction in dairy datasets	High for a moderate effect	Adds dietary energy and fits routine formulation	High doses may depress fiber digestion, intake or milk fat	Dalmonte et al. (2026)
Condensed tannins	Methanogens, protozoa and protein-fiber fermentation	Approximately 9-11% average reduction in cattle meta-analyses	Moderate	Natural products and possible improvement in N use	Bioactivity varies; effective doses can reduce fiber digestibility	Berça et al. (2023); Souza et al. (2026)
Essential oils / mixed plant bioactives	Broad antimicrobial modulation	Small nonsignificant in vivo effect	or pooled Low-moderate	Large candidate pool and possible co-benefits	Strong in vitro-in vivo gap, adaptation and variable composition	Dalmonte et al. (2026)
Nitrate	Alternative electron acceptor	Approximately 10-20%; dose dependent	High	Direct redirection and replacement of non-protein N	H ₂ Nitrite toxicity; partial adaptation and formulation are essential	Feng et al. (2020)
3-NOP	Methyl-coenzyme M reductase	Approximately 20-35% in dairy cattle; diet dependent	High	Specific and persistent in long trials with broad fermentation effects	Cost, continuous delivery, elevated H ₂ and grazing-system constraints	Duin et al. (2016); Kebreab et al. (2023); van Gastelen et al. (2024)
Asparagopsis-derived products	Bromoform-mediated inhibition of terminal methanogenesis	Approximately 20-80%+, with marked variability	Moderate	Very high short-term potency	Active-compound stability, residues, and supply-chain concerns	Roque et al. (2021); Stefanoni et al. (2021); Angellotti et al. (2025)
Probiotics targeted consortia	/ Rumen stability or promotion of competing sinks	Overall pooled effect often nonsignificant; some products are promising	Low-moderate	Potential benefits rumen function	Strain-specific response, colonization and limited long-term evidence	Ncho et al. (2024); Greening et al. (2019)

Intervention	Primary mechanistic target	Typical response	in vivo Evidence strength	Main advantages	Principal limitations	Key references
Combinations / controlled delivery	Multiple targets and exposure kinetics	Potentially greater than single interventions, but comparative evidence is limited	Emerging	May reduce individual doses stabilize efficacy	Synergy is not guaranteed; and greater cost and formulation complexity	Guyader et al. (2017); Belanche et al. (2025)

The response ranges summarize typical results from the listed syntheses and are not directly comparable because animal class, dose, basal diet, duration and methane metric differ. Evidence strength reflects the consistency of in vivo evidence rather than theoretical potency.

Microbiome modulation and host-microbiome interactions

High- and low-methane animals differ in community functions and interaction networks, but no universal low-methane microbiome has been identified. A global survey found a broadly shared core community while confirming strong effects of diet and host species on relative abundance (Henderson et al., 2015). Functional-network analysis further linked methane variation to coordinated niches involving hydrogen production, propionate pathways and methanogenesis (Martínez-Álvaro et al., 2020). The objective of microbiome modulation should be to change electron flow, not simply to lower the relative abundance of *Methanobrevibacter*. Metagenomic abundance describes potential, whereas transcripts, proteins and metabolites are needed to identify active pathways. Multi-omics integration has demonstrated that microbial and host metabolomes jointly explain animal phenotypes that cannot be inferred from taxonomy alone (Xue et al., 2020).

Host genetics contributes to methane variation through rumen physiology and microbial function. Sire-family and whole-genome studies have identified heritable microbial features associated with methane, feed conversion or both (Roehe et al., 2016; Martínez-Álvaro et al., 2022). More recently, a shared rumen metagenomic core was proposed as a genomic-selection target across dairy populations, although high-throughput phenotyping remains necessary for reliable breeding values (Sepulveda et al., 2025). Early-life programming is attractive because microbial succession is less stable before the adult rumen is established. Maternal diet, starter feed, inoculation and temporary methanogen inhibition may influence development, but adult communities often resist or reverse perturbation. Durable programming must be demonstrated after treatment withdrawal and across later diet changes, not inferred from a transient calf-stage difference (Waters et al., 2025).

Frontier approaches include anti-methanogen vaccines, archaeal viruses, bacteriophages, genome editing and synthetic microbial consortia. These remain research platforms because strain coverage, delivery, ecological stability, containment and regulatory acceptance are unresolved (González-Recio et al., 2023). They should not be presented as near-term substitutes for validated nutritional interventions.

Why Mitigation Results Differ Across Studies

Heterogeneity among methane studies is biologically expected. Basal fiber, starch and fat determine the quantity and timing of hydrogen production, while intake, body size, production stage and grazing behavior alter passage and substrate supply (Martins et al., 2024b; Starsmore et al., 2024). Experimental duration then determines whether the reported value represents an initial response or an adapted state. Dose should be expressed as active compound per kilogram of dry matter intake whenever possible. This is essential for seaweed, extracts and encapsulated products whose active concentration can change during production or storage. Delivery frequency, carrier, refusals and actual individual intake should also be reported because the nominal offered dose may not equal rumen exposure (Hristov et al., 2025).

Methane production, yield and intensity answer different questions. Production quantifies grams emitted per animal per day, yield relates methane to intake, and intensity relates it to milk or weight gain (del Prado et al., 2025). A robust intervention should lower production or yield while maintaining output; intensity alone can improve through greater production without any reduction in daily atmospheric input. Measurement systems impose different sampling structures. Respiration chambers provide near-complete gas capture but low throughput, SF₆ is adaptable to grazing but sensitive to tracer and background procedures, and GreenFeed relies on repeated short visits (Della Rosa et al., 2021). Direct comparisons show that GreenFeed can provide useful daily treatment estimates when visits are sufficiently frequent and distributed, although chamber and GreenFeed environments are not identical (Ma et al., 2024).

Minimum reporting should include the experimental unit, animal number, adaptation and measurement duration, ingredient and nutrient composition, additive identity and active concentration, dose per kilogram of intake, delivery schedule, methane

production, yield and intensity, dry matter intake, productive response, hydrogen where relevant, digestibility, adverse events and the statistical model. Crossover studies also require adequate washout and assessment of carryover (Hristov et al., 2025).

Table 3: Integrated framework for response heterogeneity, minimum reporting and methane measurement

Category	Factor method	or Scientific relevance / output	Minimum reporting or strength	Limitation / recommended design	Key references
Panel A. Determinants of response heterogeneity and minimum reporting					
Response determinant	Basal diet	Controls generation, passage additive efficacy	H ₂ Forage: concentrate ratio, NDF, starch, fat, CP and ingredients	Model diet interactions and avoid indiscriminate pooling of unlike diets	Martins et al. (2024b)
Response determinant	Active dose and product chemistry	Determines target exposure, and toxicity	Active compound per kg DMI, chemical concentration, stability and refusals	Use dose-response designs and chemically standardize products	Hristov et al. (2025)
Response determinant	Delivery pattern	Creates continuous or pulsed exposure	Frequency, carrier, timing and individual treatment coverage	Measure individual consumption and within-day exposure kinetics	Muetzel et al. (2024)
Response determinant	Animal and physiological stage	Changes retention output microbiome	intake, time, and phenotype	Block or randomize appropriately and report individual response distributions	Starsmore et al. (2024)
Response determinant	Duration and adaptation	Initial responses may attenuate after change or shift	Adaptation, or measurement, a carryover and withdrawal periods	Use longitudinal sampling across diet and physiological changes	van Gastelen et al. (2024)
Response determinant	Outcome metric	Production, yield and intensity can move in different directions	g/d, g/kg DMI and milk, ECM or gain with treatment means	Report absolute values and all relevant denominators	del Prado et al. (2025)
Panel B. Direct and indirect methane measurement approaches					
Measurement method	Respiration chamber	Continuous flux of CH ₄ and other gases	mass Near-complete capture and detailed diurnal data	High cost, low throughput and possible effects on behavior or intake	Ma et al. (2024)
Measurement method	SF ₆ tracer	Daily individual under movement	CH ₄ free Suitable for grazing and large areas	Requires permeation-tube calibration, background sampling and equipment control	Della Rosa et al. (2021)

Category	Factor method	or Scientific relevance / output	Minimum reporting or strength	Limitation / recommended design Key references
Measurement method	GreenFeed	Repeated short- duration mass-flux visits	Automated, restrictive medium throughput	less Requires enough well- and distributed visits and control of bait intake Bayat et al. (2025)
Measurement method	Sniffer breath ratio	/ Short concentration profiles or CH ₄ :CO ₂ ratio	Low cost and throughput calibration	high Position, airflow and after visit behavior influence data; usually a proxy Ghassemi Nejad et al. (2024)
Measurement method	Laser optical sensing	/ Path-integrated concentration or plume signal	Remote and contact potential	non- Environmental interference and uncertain conversion to individual mass flux Ross et al. (2024)
Measurement method	Prediction model	Estimated CH ₄ from intake, diet, milk or sensor traits	Scalable or inexpensive development	Domain shift and proxy error require after external validation and periodic direct calibration Ghassemi Nejad et al. (2024)

Precision Farm Management for Methane Mitigation

Precision management can address variable response, inconsistent delivery and limited verification. Commercial sensors already capture intake proxies, rumination, activity, milk yield, body weight and environmental conditions, while grazing studies demonstrate that animal traits can explain part of daily methane variation (Kleen and Guatteo, 2023; Starsmore et al., 2024). These data are useful predictors, but they do not replace direct methane calibration. Mechanistic models represent fermentation and nutrient flows, empirical equations summarize observed relationships, and machine-learning models can integrate nonlinear high-dimensional inputs. Each approach has a different failure mode: mechanistic models require accurate inputs, empirical equations may not transport beyond their development population, and machine learning can suffer from leakage and confounding (Muñoz-Tamayo et al., 2023). External validation across farms, diets and seasons is more informative than high within dataset accuracy. A closed-loop system senses animal and diet conditions, predicts methane response, acts through ration or dose adjustment, and then remeasures performance and emissions. Verification data update both the management decision and confidence in the model. This architecture could identify declining efficacy after a ration change or reveal that a subgroup is receiving too little carrier feed. Automated delivery is most relevant for products that require consistent exposure. Electronic identification and concentrate feeders can allocate a supplement according to estimated intake, whereas pasture systems may rely on milking-parlor supplements, blocks or slow-release devices. The operational metric should be the proportion of animals receiving an effective daily exposure, not the average dose offered to the herd (Muetzel et al., 2024). Digital twins combine a mechanistic representation with continuously updated farm data. Their near-term role is likely to be decision support—testing alternative rations, doses and costs—rather than unsupervised autonomous control. A credible system should also flag when current conditions fall outside the range used for model validation (Dijkstra et al., 2025). Precision tools can support measurement, reporting and verification by directing expensive direct measurements to representative animals and periods. Model-based routine estimates are defensible only when they are periodically calibrated and accompanied by uncertainty (Ghassemi Nejad et al., 2024; Ross et al., 2024). Precision management is therefore a method for using measurement more efficiently, not a substitute for measurement.

From Biological Efficacy to Farm and Climate Value

Biological efficacy is only one component of value. Methane inhibition does not automatically improve feed efficiency because reducing equivalents may be emitted as hydrogen, retained in unproductive metabolites or accompanied by lower intake or digestibility. A recent host-microbiome synthesis concluded that the expected link between lower methane and greater efficiency is not consistently observed (Badhan et al., 2025). Trials should therefore report energy-corrected milk or gain, feed efficiency and digestibility alongside methane. Safety assessment must be intervention-specific. Nitrate requires control of nitrite exposure and methemoglobin (Lee and Beauchemin, 2014); high lipid inclusion requires monitoring of fiber digestion and milk fat; tannins require evaluation of intake and nutrient availability; and Asparagopsis products require active-

compound, halogen and residue assessment (Glasson et al., 2022). Unchanged milk yield alone is not a complete safety or welfare assessment.

Economic feasibility depends on additive price, dose, carrier, labor, production response and the value assigned to verified abatement. A United States analysis of 3-NOP showed that strong methane efficacy does not guarantee positive income over feed cost because results depend on product, milk and feed prices (Pupo et al., 2025). Interventions that also solve a nutritional constraint may be adopted more readily. Production system determines the feasible portfolio. Total mixed ration dairy and feedlot systems provide controlled daily delivery, while pasture-based and extensive systems face uncertain supplement intake and limited methane phenotyping (Muetzel et al., 2024). Grazing strategies should therefore emphasize delivery coverage, forage quality and methods validated under free-ranging conditions rather than simply transferring confinement protocols. Life-cycle assessment is required because an enteric reduction can be offset by additive manufacture, feed production, transport, land-use effects or reduced productivity. Assessments should state the functional unit, system boundary, baseline and duration of the response (del Prado et al., 2025). Physical kilograms of methane abated should remain visible even when results are also converted to carbon-dioxide-equivalent or warming-equivalent metrics. Regulatory authorization requires consistent product identity, efficacy, target-animal safety, consumer safety, manufacturing quality and environmental assessment. Requirements differ among jurisdictions, so a product approved for one feeding system or claim cannot be assumed to have universal authorization (Tricarico et al., 2025). Harmonized experimental reporting can nevertheless reduce duplication and strengthen regulatory confidence. Farmer adoption is driven by operational simplicity, reliability and economic return. Demonstration trials should record labor, equipment downtime, product stability, refusals and treatment coverage rather than presenting only biological efficacy. Carbon incentives can support adoption, but they must be linked to transparent baselines and credible verification (Pupo et al., 2025).

Table 4: Production-system-specific decision matrix for current and emerging methane-mitigation options

Production context	Feasible current options	Delivery and verification pathway	Major constraint	Near-term priority	Key references
Intensive dairy TMR	3-NOP, selected lipids, nitrate, standardized tannins and validated combinations	TMR mixing; GreenFeed or calibrated models; milk and intake records	Cost, ration interactions and maintenance active concentration	Closed-loop dosing of linked to DMI and ration composition	Pupo et al. (2025)
Pasture-based dairy	Milking-parlor 3-NOP, strategic lipids and forage quality	Electronic concentrate feeders; SF ₆ or GreenFeed; pasture-intake estimation	Intermittent exposure variable supplement intake	Long-acting or frequent delivery with animal-level coverage data	Starsmore et al. (2024)
Feedlot beef	3-NOP, nitrate, lipids and standardized Asparagopsis products	Controlled delivery; GreenFeed chamber subsets; and intake	bunk or product consistency safety verification	Economic return, Factorial combination trials and with carcass residue assessment	Roque et al. (2021)
Small ruminants / semi-intensive systems	Forage improvement, local plant bioactives and strategic supplementation	Group delivery with periodic measurement or validated equations	Dose consistency and limited infrastructure	Low-cost delivery and locally validated active compounds	Beauchemin et al. (2022)
Extensive grazing	Forage management, breeding, long-acting formulations and low-cost phenotyping	Seasonal SF ₆ campaigns, portable sensing and inventory models	Irregular handling and weak control of individual intake	Persistent formulations and breeding linked to productivity	del Prado et al. (2025)
Research / seedstock herds	Microbiome and genomic selection plus direct phenotyping	Repeated methane linked with pedigree	high-quality phenotypes and omics and transferability	Cost and reference populations external validation	Sepulveda et al. (2025)

Priority Research Agenda

First, methane-inhibition studies should close the hydrogen balance. Methane, hydrogen, formate, volatile fatty acids, microbial biomass and digestibility should be measured sufficiently to determine whether reducing equivalents are productively redirected or lost through another route (Guyader et al., 2017). Second, response prediction should move from average efficacy to conditional efficacy. Multi-farm datasets should test interactions among active dose, fiber, starch, fat, intake, production stage and baseline phenotype, and the resulting models should be externally validated with uncertainty estimates (Dijkstra et al., 2025).

Third, persistence should be a primary outcome. Studies should extend across ration changes and physiological stages, and withdrawal periods should distinguish continuous inhibitor action from durable ecological modification. Long-term 3-NOP and Asparagopsis studies illustrate why a response measured in the first weeks cannot be assumed to persist unchanged (Angellotti et al., 2025). Fourth, combination strategies require factorial designs. Pairing a direct inhibitor with an alternative hydrogen sink is mechanistically attractive, but synergy must be demonstrated through interaction terms and redox measurements rather than inferred by adding results from separate studies (Belanche et al., 2025).

Fifth, microbial interventions should be evaluated at strain and pathway levels. Colonization, functional activity, ecological persistence and effects on fiber digestion are more informative than taxonomic abundance alone. Hydrogenase diversity and microbial cross-feeding should guide the design of consortia and other ecological interventions (Waters et al., 2025). Sixth, measurement protocols should be harmonized through method-specific quality control and cross-calibration. Core reporting should include production, yield, intensity, intake, productivity and uncertainty, with sufficient GreenFeed visits or SF6 sampling to represent diurnal variation (Bayat et al., 2025).

Seventh, grazing and smallholder systems require dedicated innovation. Solutions designed for continuous total mixed rations cannot simply be transferred to animals with irregular supplement access. Forage development, long-acting delivery, low-cost phenotyping and locally available feed resources should receive greater research investment (Muetzel et al., 2024). Finally, economic and life-cycle evaluation should be embedded in efficacy trials. A technology is successful only when verified methane abatement persists, animal performance and safety are protected, and the net farm and environmental outcomes justify adoption (Pupo et al., 2025).

Conclusion

Enteric methane is the terminal product of a microbial electron-disposal network rather than an isolated archaeal trait. Diet quality and lipids mainly alter substrate supply and hydrogen generation; nitrate, fumarate and propionate pathways redirect reducing equivalents; 3-NOP and bromoform-containing products inhibit methanogenic reactions; and microbiome interventions attempt to restructure the organisms producing and consuming hydrogen. This mechanistic classification is more informative than grouping strategies only as natural or synthetic.

Current evidence is strongest for 3-NOP as a consistent specific inhibitor in controlled feeding systems. Nitrate and selected lipids provide moderate, better-established responses, while Asparagopsis can be highly potent but still faces questions concerning persistence, intake, residues and product standardization (Kebreab et al., 2023). Plant bioactives and probiotics may be useful in defined contexts, but product chemistry and biological function must be specified.

The next advance will come from connecting mechanism with delivery and verification. Precision feeding can match an intervention to diet and animal conditions, while calibrated models and targeted direct measurements can reveal whether the intended exposure and methane response were achieved (Dijkstra et al., 2025). Durable low-methane systems will therefore require coordinated control of electron flow, animal performance, formulation, delivery and evidence quality rather than a universal additive.

References

- Angellotti, M., Lindberg, M., Ramin, M., Krizsan, S. J., & Danielsson, R. (2025). Asparagopsis taxiformis supplementation to mitigate enteric methane emissions in dairy cows—Effects on performance and metabolism. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108(3), 2503–
- Arndt, C., Hristov, A. N., Price, W. J., et al. (2022). Full adoption of the most effective strategies to mitigate methane emissions by ruminants can help meet the 1.5 °C target by 2030 but not 2050. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119, e2111294119.

- Badhan, A., Wang, Y., Terry, S., Gruninger, R., Guan, L. L., & McAllister, T. A. (2025). Invited review: Interplay of rumen microbiome and the cattle host in modulating feed efficiency and methane emissions. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 5489–5501.
- Bayat, A. R., Mäntysaari, P., Stefański, T., Negussie, E., Lidauer, M., & Huhtanen, P. (2025). Comparing carbon dioxide, oxygen, and methane exchanges, and heat production measured using GreenFeed and respiration chambers. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108(11), 12328–12339.
- Beauchemin, K. A., Ungerfeld, E. M., Eckard, R. J., & Wang, M. (2020). Review: Fifty years of research on rumen methanogenesis: Lessons learned and future challenges for mitigation. *Animal*, 14(S1), S2–S16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731119003100>
- Beauchemin, K. A., Ungerfeld, E. M., Abdalla, A. L., et al. (2022). Invited review: Current enteric methane mitigation options. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 105, 9297–9326.
- Belanche, A., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: A guideline to uncover the mode of action of antimethanogenic feed additives for ruminants. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 375–394.
- Berça, A. S., Tedeschi, L. O., Cardoso, A. S., & Reis, R. A. (2023). Meta-analysis of the relationship between dietary condensed tannins and methane emissions by cattle. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 298, 115564.
- Castillo, C., et al. (2025). Bridging research and practice using digital twin modeling to improve livestock systems. *Journal of Animal Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jas/skaf329>
- Dalmonte, T., Barbieri, N., Giacomozzi, S., et al. (2026). Use of feed additives to reduce enteric methane emissions in dairy cattle: Meta-analysis of data retrieved through a systematic review. *Frontiers in Animal Science*, 6, 1754069.
- del Prado, A., Vibart, R. E., Bilotto, F. M., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: Assessment and quantification of the mitigation potential of antimethanogenic feed additives. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 411–429.
- Della Rosa, M. M., Jonker, A., & Waghorn, G. C. (2021). A review of technical variations and protocols used to measure methane emissions from ruminants using respiration chambers, the SF6 tracer technique and GreenFeed. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 279, 115018.
- Dijkstra, J., Bannink, A., Congio, G. F. S., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: Modeling the impact of feed additives on enteric methane emission of ruminants—Approaches and recommendations. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 356–374.
- Duin, E. C., Wagner, T., Shima, S., et al. (2016). Mode of action uncovered for the specific reduction of methane emissions from ruminants by the small molecule 3-nitrooxypropanol. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 6172–6177.
- Durmic, Z., Bannink, A., Belanche, A., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: Recommendations for identification and selection of bioactive compounds. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 302–321.
- Feng, X. Y., Dijkstra, J., Bannink, A., van Gastelen, S., France, J., & Kebreab, E. (2020). Antimethanogenic effects of nitrate supplementation in cattle: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 103, 11375–11385.
- Ghassemi Nejad, J., Ju, M.-S., Jo, J.-H., et al. (2024). Advances in methane emission estimation in livestock: Data collection, model development and AI technologies. *Animals*, 14, 435.
- Glasson, C. R. K., Kinley, R. D., de Nys, R., King, N., Adams, S. L., Packer, M. A., Svenson, J., Eason, C. T., & Magnusson, M. (2022). Benefits and risks of including the bromoform-containing seaweed *Asparagopsis* in feed for the reduction of methane production from ruminants. *Algal Research*, 64, 102673.
- González-Recio, O., Martínez-Álvaro, M., Tiezzi, F., Saborío-Montero, A., Maltecca, C., & Roehe, R. (2023). Invited review: Novel methods and perspectives for modulating the rumen microbiome through selective breeding. *Livestock Science*, 269, 105171.
- Greening, C., Geier, R., Wang, C., et al. (2019). Diverse hydrogen production and consumption pathways influence methane production in ruminants. *ISME Journal*, 13, 2617–2632.
- Guyader, J., Ungerfeld, E. M., & Beauchemin, K. A. (2017). Redirection of metabolic hydrogen by inhibiting methanogenesis in the rumen simulation technique. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 8, 393.

- Hammond, K. J., Crompton, L. A., Bannink, A., et al. (2016). Review of current in vivo measurement techniques for quantifying enteric methane emission from ruminants. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 219, 13–30.
- Henderson, G., Cox, F., Ganesh, S., Jonker, A., Young, W., & Janssen, P. H. (2015). Rumen microbial community composition varies with diet and host, but a core microbiome is found across a wide geographical range. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 14567. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14567>
- Hristov, A. N. (2024). Invited review: Advances in nutrition and feed additives to mitigate enteric methane emissions. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107, 4129–4146.
- Hristov, A. N., Oh, J., Giallongo, F., et al. (2015). An inhibitor persistently decreased enteric methane emission from dairy cows with no negative effect on milk production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 10663–10668.
- Hristov, A. N., Bannink, A., Battelli, M., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: Recommendations for testing enteric methane-mitigating feed additives in ruminant studies. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 322–355.
- IPCC. (2021). *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kebreab, E., Bannink, A., Pressman, E. M., Walker, N., Karagiannis, A., van Gastelen, S., & Dijkstra, J. (2023). A meta-analysis of effects of 3-nitrooxypropanol on methane production, yield, and intensity in dairy cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 106, 927–936.
- Kelly, W. J., Mackie, R. I., Attwood, G. T., Janssen, P. H., McAllister, T. A., & Leahy, S. C. (2022). Hydrogen and formate production and utilisation in the rumen and the human colon. *Animal Microbiome*, 4, 22.
- Kleen, J. L., & Guatteo, R. (2023). Precision livestock farming: What does it contain and what are the perspectives? *Animals*, 13, 779.
- Lee, C., & Beauchemin, K. A. (2014). A review of feeding supplementary nitrate to ruminant animals: Nitrate toxicity, methane emissions, and production performance. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, 94, 557–570.
- Li, Q. S., Wang, R., Ma, Z. Y., et al. (2022). Dietary selection of metabolically distinct microorganisms drives hydrogen metabolism in ruminants. *ISME Journal*, 16, 2535–2546.
- Ma, X., Räisänen, S. E., Wang, K., et al. (2024). Evaluating GreenFeed and respiration chambers for daily and intraday measurements of enteric gaseous exchange in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107, 10913–10929.
- Martínez-Álvaro, M., Auffret, M. D., Stewart, R. D., et al. (2020). Identification of complex rumen microbiome interactions within diverse functional niches as mechanisms affecting methane emissions. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11, 659.
- Martínez-Álvaro, M., Auffret, M. D., Duthie, C.-A., et al. (2022). Bovine host genome acts on rumen microbiome function linked to methane emissions. *Communications Biology*, 5, 350.
- Martins, L. F., Cueva, S. F., Lage, C. F. A., et al. (2024a). A meta-analysis of methane-mitigation potential of feed additives evaluated in vitro. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107, 288–300.
- Martins, L. F., Cueva, S. F., Wasson, D. E., Almeida, C. V., Eifert, C., de Ondarza, M. B., Tricarico, J. M., & Hristov, A. N. (2024b). Effects of dose, dietary nutrient composition, and supplementation period on the efficacy of methane mitigation strategies in dairy cows: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107(11), 9289–9308.
- Mizrahi, I., Wallace, R. J., & Moraïs, S. (2021). The rumen microbiome: Balancing food security and environmental impacts. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 19, 553–566.
- Muetzel, S., Pacheco, D., Muñoz, C., & Waghorn, G. C. (2024). Practical implementation of methane-mitigating nutritional interventions in grazing ruminants. *Animal Production Science*, 64, 401–417.
- Muizelaar, W., Groot, M., van Duinkerken, G., Peters, R., & Dijkstra, J. (2021). Transfer of bromoform present in *Asparagopsis taxiformis* to milk, urine, feces, and animal tissue of dairy cows. *Foods*, 10, 584.
- Muñoz-Tamayo, R., Davoudkhani, M., Fakih, I., et al. (2023). Review: Towards next-generation models of the rumen microbiome for enhancing predictive power and guiding sustainable production strategies. *Animal*, 17, 100984.

- Ncho, C. M., Kim, S.-H., Rang, S. A., & Lee, S. S. (2024). A meta-analysis of probiotic interventions to mitigate ruminal methane emissions in cattle. *Animal*, 18, 101180.
- Pereira, A. M., Dapkevicius, M. L. N. E., & Borba, A. E. S. (2022). Alternative pathways for hydrogen sink originated from ruminal fermentation of carbohydrates. *Animal Microbiome*, 4, 5.
- Pressman, E. M., & Kebreab, E. (2024). Key microbial and nutritional elements for mechanistic modeling of rumen fermentation under methane inhibition. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 15, 1488370.
- Pupo, M. R., Ferraretto, L. F., & Nicholson, C. F. (2025). Effects of feeding 3-nitrooxypropanol for methane emissions reduction on income over feed costs in the United States. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 5061–5075.
- Roehe, R., Dewhurst, R. J., Duthie, C.-A., et al. (2016). Bovine host genetic variation influences rumen microbial methane production and feed conversion efficiency. *PLoS Genetics*, 12, e1005846.
- Romero, P., Belanche, A., Jiménez, E., et al. (2023). Rumen microbial degradation of bromoform from red seaweed and the impact on rumen fermentation and methanogenic archaea. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*, 14, 133.
- Roque, B. M., Venegas, M., Kinley, R. D., et al. (2021). Red seaweed supplementation reduces enteric methane by over 80 percent in beef steers. *PLoS ONE*, 16, e0247820.
- Ross, S., Shirali, M., Yan, T., et al. (2024). Approaches for predicting dairy cattle methane emissions: From traditional methods to machine learning. *Journal of Animal Science*, 102, skae219.
- Sepulveda, B. J., González-Recio, O., Chamberlain, A. J., Khansefid, M., Cocks, B. G., Wang, J., Prowse-Wilkins, C. P., Marett, L. C., Williams, S. R. O., Jacobs, J. L., García-Rodríguez, A., Jiménez-Montero, J. A., & Pryce, J. E. (2025). Rumen metagenome as a genomic selection target to reduce enteric methane emissions. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108(8), 8619–8636.
- Souza, V. C., Almeida, K. V., Rosenstein, P. K., Desrues, O., Panciroli, N., & Kebreab, E. (2026). Impact of tannin-based additives on animal performance and enteric methane emissions in dairy and beef cattle: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 109(3), 2383–2399.
- Starsmore, K., Lopez-Villalobos, N., Shalloo, L., Egan, M., Burke, J., & Lahart, B. (2024). Animal factors that affect enteric methane production measured using the GreenFeed monitoring system in grazing dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107(5), 2930–2940.
- Stefenoni, H. A., Räisänen, S. E., Cueva, S. F., et al. (2021). Effects of the macroalga *Asparagopsis taxiformis* and oregano leaves on methane emission, rumen fermentation, and lactational performance of dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 104, 4157–4173.
- Tedeschi, L. O., Muir, J. P., Naumann, H. D., & Norris, A. B. (2024). Precision nutrition approaches for improving feed efficiency while reducing enteric methane emissions in grazing ruminants. *Animal Frontiers*, 14, 52–61.
- Tricarico, J. M., Garcia, F., Bannink, A., et al. (2025). Feed additives for methane mitigation: Regulatory frameworks and scientific evidence requirements. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 395–410.
- Ungerfeld, E. M. (2015). Shifts in metabolic hydrogen sinks in the methanogenesis-inhibited ruminal fermentation: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6, 37.
- Ungerfeld, E. M. (2020). Metabolic hydrogen flows in rumen fermentation: Principles and possibilities of interventions. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11, 589.
- van Gastelen, S., Burgers, E. E. A., Dijkstra, J., de Mol, R., Muizelaar, W., Walker, N., & Bannink, A. (2024). Long-term effects of 3-nitrooxypropanol on methane emission and milk production characteristics in Holstein-Friesian dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 107(8), 5556–5573.
- van Zijderveld, S. M., Gerrits, W. J. J., Apajalahti, J. A., et al. (2010). Nitrate and sulfate: Effective alternative hydrogen sinks for mitigation of ruminal methane production in sheep. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 93, 5856–5866.
- Wasson, D. E., Stefenoni, H., Cueva, S. F., Brown, M., Melgar, A., Räisänen, S. E., Silvestre, T., Yarish, C., & Hristov, A. N. (2026). The macroalga *Asparagopsis taxiformis* decreases dry matter intake and milk production in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 109(4), 3914–3927.

Waters, S. M., Roskam, E., Smith, P. E., et al. (2025). The role of the rumen microbiome in the development of methane mitigation strategies for ruminant livestock. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 108, 7591–7606.

Xie, F., et al. (2026). Rumen ciliates modulate methane emissions in ruminants. *Science*, 392, eadv4244.

Xue, M.-Y., Sun, H.-Z., Wu, X.-H., Liu, J.-X., & Guan, L. L. (2020). Multi-omics reveals that the rumen microbiome and its metabolome together with the host metabolome contribute to individualized dairy cow performance. *Microbiome*, 8, 64.



2026 by the authors; Journal of The *Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development*. This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).