

## New Zealand Society of Animal Production online archive

This paper is from the New Zealand Society for Animal Production online archive. NZSAP holds a regular annual conference in June or July each year for the presentation of technical and applied topics in animal production. NZSAP plays an important role as a forum fostering research in all areas of animal production including production systems, nutrition, meat science, animal welfare, wool science, animal breeding and genetics.

An invitation is extended to all those involved in the field of animal production to apply for membership of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production at our website [www.nzsap.org.nz](http://www.nzsap.org.nz)

[View All Proceedings](#)

[Next Conference](#)

[Join NZSAP](#)

The New Zealand Society of Animal Production in publishing the conference proceedings is engaged in disseminating information, not rendering professional advice or services. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production and the New Zealand Society of Animal Production expressly disclaims any form of liability with respect to anything done or omitted to be done in reliance upon the contents of these proceedings.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



You are free to:

**Share**— copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

Under the following terms:

**Attribution** — You must give [appropriate credit](#), provide a link to the license, and [indicate if changes were made](#). You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

**NonCommercial** — You may not use the material for [commercial purposes](#).

**NoDerivatives** — If you [remix, transform, or build upon](#) the material, you may not distribute the modified material.

<http://creativecommons.org.nz/licences/licences-explained/>

## Methane output and rumen microbiota in dairy cows in response to long-term supplementation with linseed or rapeseed of grass silage- or pasture-based diets

C. MARTIN<sup>1\*</sup>, D. POMIÈS<sup>2</sup>, A. FERLAY<sup>1</sup>, Y. ROCHETTE<sup>1</sup>, B. MARTIN<sup>1</sup>, Y. CHILLIARD<sup>1</sup>,  
D.P. MORGAVI<sup>1</sup> and M. DOREAU<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), UR1213 Herbivores, F-63122 Saint-Genès Champanelle, France

<sup>2</sup>Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), UE1296 Monts d'Auvergne, F-63210 Orcival, France

\*Corresponding author: cecile.martin@clermont.inra.fr

### ABSTRACT

The long-term (>12 months) effect of fat supplementation on methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) output and rumen microbiota was measured in dairy cows. Twenty lactating dairy cows were fed indoor with grass silage/hay (Period 1), then outdoor with pasture-based diets (Period 2), and allocated to three dietary treatments for two consecutive entire lactations. Diets were not supplemented (C) or supplemented with 2-3% dry matter of extruded linseed (EL) or extruded rapeseed (ER). Individual intake, milk and CH<sub>4</sub> production (sulphur hexafluoride tracer technique) were measured on five consecutive days in both periods. Rumen pH, volatile fatty acid (VFA) concentrations and microbial numbers were measured on rumen fluid samples collected before feeding. For both periods, CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g/kg dry matter intake) was lower for EL (-15%; P <0.001), and numerically higher for ER (+14%) compared to C. The unexpected effect of ER on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions remains difficult to explain. Measured as g/kg fat corrected milk, CH<sub>4</sub> output remained lower for EL (-26%, P <0.05) than for C and ER, for both periods. Diet EL did not modify rumen VFA profiles and microbial numbers compared to C. Our work highlights the long term efficacy of EL supplementation of grass-based diets as a CH<sub>4</sub> mitigation option.

**Keywords:** dietary fat; linseed; rapeseed; methane; long-term supplementation; dairy cow.

### INTRODUCTION

Enteric methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) production represents a major contribution to greenhouse gas emissions by ruminants. Supplementation with fat is the most effective dietary strategy to mitigate ruminal methanogenesis (Beauchemin *et al.*, 2009a; Martin *et al.*, 2010; Grainger & Beauchemin, 2011). There have been few direct comparisons between different fat sources when added to different basal diets. Linseed, which is rich in linolenic acid (C18:3 n-3), is often used as a supplement due to its nutritional benefits and antimethanogenic effect. Linolenic acid decreased the number or activity of protozoa, cellulolytic bacteria and methanogens, directly or indirectly affecting methanogenesis (Morgavi *et al.*, 2010). Rapeseed, which is rich in C18:1 n-9, also reduces CH<sub>4</sub> production in vivo (Machmüller *et al.*, 2000; Beauchemin *et al.*, 2009b), but the ruminal mechanisms are unknown. Studies reporting a persistent effect of lipids on CH<sub>4</sub> yield have been carried out, with coconut oil, which is rich in C12:0 and C14:0 (Jordan *et al.*, 2006) or cottonseeds which are rich in C18:2n-6 (Holter *et al.*, 1992; Grainger *et al.*, 2010), supplemented for one to four months. Woodward *et al.* (2006) reported no effect on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions of a mixture of linseed/fish oil added to a pasture diet for three months. The effect of fat sources rich in linolenic or oleic acids on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions has not been tested for periods longer than 12 months. The aim of this experiment was to measure the effect on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions of long-term

(>12 months) supplementation of fat as linseed and rapeseed, added to lactating cow diets based on grass silage or pasture. A secondary aim was to measure the effect on selected microbial communities.

### MATERIAL AND METHODS

#### Animals, experimental design and diets

Twenty Holstein dairy cows were allocated to three dietary treatments during two successive lactations. Diets were not supplemented (C, n = 8) or supplemented with extruded linseed (EL, n = 8) or with extruded rapeseed (ER, n = 4). The measurement periods took place indoor, 15 months after the beginning of the experiment on animals fed grass silage/hay (P1), and outdoor two months later on cows fed pasture-based diets (P2).

During P1, all cows received 48% cocksfoot (*Dactylis glomerata*) first-cut silage, 12% second-cut cocksfoot hay, and 40% concentrates on a dry matter (DM) basis. The proportion of concentrates was maintained at a constant level by adjustment of the offered amounts to forage intake on the previous week. The composition of concentrates was calculated to provide approximately 3% added fat to diets EL and ER. Animals received forage *ad libitum* at 10:00 h and concentrates twice daily in equal amounts at 10:00 h and 17:30 h.

During P2, all cows were managed on the same paddock of cocksfoot grass and grazed 20 hours a day. They received individually a total of 4.5 kg

**TABLE 1:** Ingredients and chemical composition of experimental diets. C = Control diet; EL = Diet supplemented with extruded linseed; ER = Diet supplemented with extruded rapeseed.

Component	Grass silage-based diets			Pasture-based diets		
	Indoor (Period 1)			Outdoor (Period 2)		
	C	EL	ER	C	EL	ER
<b>Ingredients (g/kg DM)</b>						
Grass silage + cocksfoot hay (45/15)	570	560	560	-	-	-
Cocksfoot grass	-	-	-	790	780	780
Concentrate mixture <sup>1</sup>	430	440	440	210	220	220
<b>Chemical composition (g/kg DM)</b>						
Organic matter	936	937	932	916	913	913
Neutral detergent fibre	372	380	402	359	377	377
Starch	232	214	164	97	39	41
Crude protein (Nitrogen x 6.25)	143	140	157	207	222	221
Ether extract	34.4	64.6	63.1	28.9	48.7	47.9
C16:0	5.4	6.9	6.4	4.2	5.4	5.2
C18:0	0.8	1.8	1.1	0.4	1.2	0.7
C18:1 n-9	4.6	10.1	22.7	2.6	6.5	14.2
C18:2 n-6	13.3	16.8	16.8	5.7	8.6	9.4
C18:3 n-3	6.6	23.9	10.3	11.2	23.4	13.6
Gross energy (MJ/kg DM)	18.9	19.6	19.6	18.5	19.0	19.0

<sup>1</sup>Composition (% DM)

Indoor Period 1

Diet C: 90% ground pelleted wheat, 10% rapeseed meal.

Diet EL: 71.3% ground pelleted wheat, 28.7% extruded linseed/wheat (70/30).

Diet ER: 48.2% ground pelleted wheat, 20% rapeseed meal, 31.8% extruded rapeseed/wheat bran (59/41).

Outdoor Period 2

Diet C: 73.3% ground pelleted wheat, 26.7% rapeseed meal.

Diet EL: 8.9% ground pelleted wheat, 51.1% rapeseed meal, 40% extruded linseed/wheat (70/30).

Diet ER: 8.9% ground pelleted wheat, 51.1% rapeseed meal, 40% extruded rapeseed/wheat bran (59/41).

DM per day of concentrates in equal amounts after morning milking and before evening milking. The quantity of concentrates was calculated to provide approximately 2.5% added fat to the two diets. Ingredients and chemical composition of diets are detailed in Table 1.

### Measurements

During P1, feed intake was measured by weighing individually offered and refused feeds for four consecutive days. During P2, concentrate intake was measured as in P1 whereas grass intake was estimated from height and density of pasture, live weight, body condition score, milk production and concentrate intake of cows (Faverdin *et al.*, 2007). Dry matter content in feeds was measured (80°C for 48 hours) daily for grass silage and grass, and twice a week for hay and concentrates. A sub-sample of each feed was dried (60°C for 72 hours), sieved (0.8-mm screen) and analysed for organic matter (OM), nitrogen (N), neutral detergent fibre

(NDF) and starch, ether extract (EE), and gross energy (GE) as described in Martin *et al.* (2008). Fatty acids (FA) were extracted from ground lyophilized feed samples using chloroform:methanol (2:1) mixture and quantified by gas chromatography (Loor *et al.*, 2004). Milk production was measured every day in each period. One 30 mL aliquot of milk containing Bronopol (2-bromo-2-nitropropane-1,3-diol) was taken twice a week and stored at 4°C until analysed for fat by infrared analysis with a spectrophotometer (Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 1997). Daily CH<sub>4</sub> production was determined on five consecutive days in both periods at two monthly intervals, using the sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) tracer technique as described by Martin *et al.* (2008). A calibrated SF<sub>6</sub> permeation tube was dosed *per os* into the rumen of each cow one week before sampling gas in P1. The permeation rate of SF<sub>6</sub> from the tubes was 1.621 ± 0.051 (standard deviation) mg/day.

Rumen fluid samples were collected once before the morning feeding on the last day of each period of gas collection. A 50 mL sample of rumen liquid was taken by rumenocentesis (Kleen *et al.*, 2004). Rumen liquid was immediately measured for pH using a digital pH-meter, then filtered (250 µm nylon filter). A 0.8 mL filtrate sample was kept at -20°C until volatile fatty acid (VFA) analysis (CP 9002 Gas Chromatograph; Chrompack, Middelburg, Germany) using crotonic acid as the internal standard. A second 3 mL filtrate sample was added to 3 mL of methylgreen-formalin solution (MFS) and stored in the dark until protozoal counting under a microscope. The remainder of the liquid phase was stored at -80°C until total DNA extraction (Yu & Morrison, 2004) and quantification by real time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) of the bacterial and archaeal community (Mosoni *et al.*, 2011). Total bacteria were quantified in duplicate using specific primers targeting the *rrs* gene (Edwards *et al.*, 2008) and methanogenic archaea by

**TABLE 2:** Dry matter (DM) intake, milk production and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) output in dairy cows in response to long-term supplementation with linseed or rapeseed of grass silage- or pasture-based diets. Bolding of P values indicates significance (P <0.05). C = Control diet; EL = Diet supplemented with extruded linseed; ER = Diet supplemented with extruded rapeseed.

Parameter	Grass silage-based diets Indoor (Period 1)			Pasture-based diets Outdoor (Period 2)			Standard error	P value		
	C	EL	ER	C	EL	ER		Diet	Period	Diet* Period
Total DM intake (kg/d)	18.3 <sup>a</sup>	17.0 <sup>b</sup>	19.1 <sup>a</sup>	20.4	20.6	20.3	0.40	0.12	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Forage <sup>1</sup> (kg/d)	10.4	9.5	10.6	16.0	16.1	15.9	0.35	0.34	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.16
Concentrate (kg/d)	7.9 <sup>a</sup>	7.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.5 <sup>b</sup>	4.4	4.5	4.4	0.14	0.06	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Gross energy intake (MJ/d)	346 <sup>a</sup>	333 <sup>a</sup>	375 <sup>b</sup>	377	392	386	7.52	0.09	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Milk yield (kg/d)	26.8	28.0	29.5	24.5	23.8	22.7	1.68	0.98	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.09
4% fat corrected milk (kg/d)	23.0	24.0	26.4	21.6	23.0	22.0	1.50	0.68	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.07
CH <sub>4</sub> (g/d)	480 <sup>a</sup>	383 <sup>b</sup>	547 <sup>c</sup>	467 <sup>a</sup>	395 <sup>b</sup>	557 <sup>c</sup>	23.2	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.83	0.77
CH <sub>4</sub> (g/kg DM intake)	26.2 <sup>a</sup>	22.5 <sup>b</sup>	28.8 <sup>c</sup>	22.9 <sup>a</sup>	19.2 <sup>b</sup>	27.5 <sup>c</sup>	1.18	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.01</b>	0.66
CH <sub>4</sub> (% Gross energy intake)	7.7 <sup>a</sup>	6.3 <sup>b</sup>	8.1 <sup>a</sup>	6.8 <sup>a</sup>	5.6 <sup>b</sup>	8.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.34	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.05</b>	0.54
CH <sub>4</sub> (g/kg milk)	18.7	13.9	18.7	20.2 <sup>ab</sup>	16.8 <sup>b</sup>	25.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.80	0.06	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
CH <sub>4</sub> (g/kg 4% fat corrected milk)	21.9 <sup>a</sup>	16.3 <sup>b</sup>	21.2 <sup>a</sup>	22.7 <sup>a</sup>	17.4 <sup>b</sup>	25.8 <sup>a</sup>	1.98	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.01</b>	0.14

<sup>1</sup>Forage intake for outdoor period was estimated according to the model of Faverdin *et al.* (2007).

Different superscripts within rows, within the same period, indicate significant differences between diets (P <0.05).

**TABLE 3:** Rumen fluid fermentation and microbiota parameters in dairy cows in response to long-term supplementation with linseed or rapeseed of grass silage- or pasture-based diets. Bolding of P values indicates significance (P <0.05). C = Control diet; EL = Diet supplemented with extruded linseed; ER = Diet supplemented with extruded rapeseed.

Parameter	Grass silage-based diets Indoor (Period 1)			Pasture-based diets Outdoor (Period 2)			Standard error	P value		
	C	EL	ER	C	EL	ER		Diet	Period	Diet* Period
pH	6.88	6.83	6.61	6.79	6.84	6.61	0.10	0.12	0.77	0.86
Total VFA (mmol)	109 <sup>a</sup>	99.7 <sup>a</sup>	139 <sup>b</sup>	108 <sup>a</sup>	107 <sup>a</sup>	148 <sup>b</sup>	8.97	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	0.49	0.83
Acetate (% of total)	63.5	61.8	65.2	60.8	60.6	59.7	0.93	0.46	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	0.22
Propionate (% of total)	21.4 <sup>a</sup>	22.9 <sup>a</sup>	17.0 <sup>b</sup>	18.6	18.8	17.7	0.87	0.06	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Butyrate (% of total)	10.5	11.1	13.2	14.0	14.0	16.1	0.90	0.19	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.91
Acetate/propionate	3.0 <sup>a</sup>	2.7 <sup>a</sup>	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	3.4	3.3	3.4	0.17	0.06	0.24	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
(Acetate+butyrate)/propionate	3.5 <sup>a</sup>	3.2 <sup>a</sup>	4.7 <sup>b</sup>	4.1	4.0	4.3	0.22	0.07	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Total protozoa (Log <sub>10</sub> cells/mL)	4.25	4.39	4.81	4.81	4.99	5.14	0.18	0.26	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.56
Holotrichs (Log <sub>10</sub> cells/mL)	3.43	3.24	3.91	3.39	3.50	3.91	0.18	0.10	0.68	0.15
Entodiniomorphs (Log <sub>10</sub> cells/mL)	4.16	4.35	4.74	4.84	4.98	5.10	0.19	0.27	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.64
Total bacteria (rrs Log <sub>10</sub> copies/mL)	11.8	11.8	11.6	12.2	12.4	12.4	0.11	0.51	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.20
Methanogens (mcrA Log <sub>10</sub> copies/mL)	6.67	6.68	6.70	7.78	7.83	7.65	0.15	0.89	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.82

Different superscripts within rows, within the same period, indicate significant differences between diets (P <0.05).

targeting the methyl coenzyme-M reductase (mcrA) gene (Denman *et al.*, 2007). Standard curves (10<sup>8</sup> to 10<sup>3</sup> rrs copies) targeting total bacteria were prepared with equal amounts of the rrs DNA fragment amplified from genomic DNA of *Prevotella bryantii* B14 (DSM 11371). The methanogenic archaea were quantified relative to PCR products corresponding to almost the entire sequence of mcrA gene of *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium* 1093 (DSM).

**Statistical analyses**

Data were analysed using the MIXED procedure of SAS (2000). The statistical model included period, diet and their interaction as fixed effects, and animal as a random effect. Differences between diets were determined by a Tukey t-test. Results were considered significant for P value ≤0.05.

## RESULTS

The measured forage intake and total dry matter intake (DMI) during P1 were significantly lower than the estimated grass and total intake during P2 (Table 2). In contrast, the concentrate intake was higher during P1 than P2, leading to a lower forage/concentrate ratio in P1 compared to P2 (Table 1). In P1, total DMI was similar for C and ER and significantly lower for EL. In P2, estimated intakes of concentrate and forage and estimated total DMI were the same for all diets. Milk and 4% fat corrected milk (FCM) yields were similar between diets, but decreased in P2 ( $P < 0.001$ ; Table 2).

The amount of CH<sub>4</sub> emitted daily by dairy cows differed between diets ( $P < 0.001$ , but there was no significant Diet x Period interaction; Table 2). Methane emissions (g/d and g/kg DMI) for EL were 15-18% lower than C, while those for ER were 15-17% higher ( $P < 0.001$ ). Loss of CH<sub>4</sub> as a percentage of GE intake was similar for C and ER, but was less for EL ( $P < 0.001$ ). Methane emission per kg of milk or kg of 4% FCM was similar for C and ER, but was 26% less for EL ( $P < 0.05$ ).

Rumen pH averaged 6.76 for all diets (Table 3). Total VFA concentration was similar for C and EL and higher for ER ( $P < 0.05$ ). No effect of fat was observed on the molar proportion of acetate and butyrate, but proportion of propionate decreased with ER compared to C in P1 ( $P < 0.01$ ). As a consequence, the (acetate + butyrate)/propionate ratio was higher ( $P < 0.01$ ) with diet ER compared to the two other diets. The VFA profiles of the ruminal fluid differed also between the two periods ( $P < 0.001$ ). There was no effect of fat supplementation on the concentration of total protozoa, total bacteria and methanogens.

## DISCUSSION

The lower forage and DMI intake observed during P1 with EL in comparison to C and ER is consistent with the results of Martin *et al.* (2008) for EL, and Bayourthe *et al.* (2000) for ER added to corn-silage-based diets.

Supplementation with EL significantly decreased the amount of CH<sub>4</sub> per day, per unit of intake and per unit of milk without altering cow milk yield. There was a decrease in CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g/kg DMI) of 6% with each 1% fat added in EL. A similar decrease in CH<sub>4</sub> yield (-4.8% per 1% unit of fat added) was reported previously for dairy cows fed diets supplemented with EL (Martin *et al.*, 2010).

Irrespective of the diet, the effect of fat supplementation on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions differed between the fat sources, but the reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions reported with EL was not observed with ER. The increased CH<sub>4</sub> emission with ER supplementation

does not agree with a recent meta-analysis of the literature that reported a similar effect of fat source ( $n = 65$ ;  $P = 0.46$ ) on CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g/kg DMI) for diets containing up to 80 g fat/kg DM (Grainger & Beauchemin, 2011). In this study, the increment of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions with ER remains difficult to explain.

Supplementation with EL decreased methanogenesis after more than one year of continuous fat supplementation of grass-based diets. These data are the first to report such a long-term effect of fat supplementation on methanogenesis. Woodward *et al.* (2006) reported no effect on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions of a mixture of linseed/fish oil after three months of supplementation in diets of grazing dairy cows. However, their experiment did not have sufficient power in the design to detect the expected reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Grainger *et al.*, 2010). In their review, Grainger & Beauchemin (2011) mentioned a change in the effect of fat supplementation on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions over time in trials carried out over short- and medium-term of one to four months in cattle. The inhibitory effect of whole cottonseed increased from seven to 16 weeks (Holter *et al.*, 1992), and from six to 12 weeks of treatment (Grainger *et al.*, 2010) in dairy cows. Another experiment did not report the significance of the interaction between weeks of treatment and CH<sub>4</sub> reduction using coconut oil fed to beef cattle (Jordan *et al.*, 2006). In our study, we can make no conclusion on a possible interaction with time of EL or ER supplementation on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions because we only measured CH<sub>4</sub> for the first time after 15 months of fat supplementation.

Physico-chemical parameters of pH, VFA concentration and composition, as well as protozoa, bacteria and methanogen numbers in the ruminal fluid pre-feeding were unaffected by EL feeding. Mosoni *et al.* (2008) also reported no effect of 2% to 6% fat as EL fed to dairy cows on the number of protozoa, cellulolytic ruminococci and methanogens from the solid and liquid phase of rumen contents taken before feeding. They explained the observed reduction in methanogenesis with EL by a decrease in protozoal numbers observed after feeding. The study of the microbial mechanisms involved in methanogenesis would have probably been more relevant after feeding when production of CH<sub>4</sub> is maximal. Our work supports the view that the total number of rumen methanogens is not the key factor that affects CH<sub>4</sub> production (Morgavi *et al.*, 2010). A decrease in methanogenesis may be related to a decrease in methanogen's activity and changes in their diversity as observed in bulls fed a starch-rich diet supplemented with EL (Popova *et al.*, 2011). A lower amount of OM fermented in the rumen with EL, related to the lower intake, at least partly resulted in the lower CH<sub>4</sub> production.

In conclusion, this study showed that adding 2-3% fat to dairy cow diets reduced CH<sub>4</sub> output without altering animal performances. This effect was observed with extruded linseed after more than one year of continuous fat supplementation of grass-based diets, highlighting for the first time a long-term effect. This decrease in methanogenesis with linseed was not explained by fermentative and microbial parameters measured in this work. The mitigating effect of fat was not observed for rapeseed. The effects of the two sources of fat tested were similar with both grass silage- and pasture-based diets.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This experiment was funded by the Truefood European Project (No. FOOD-CT-2006-016264). Thanks to the staff of the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique for animal care (M. Barbet *et al.*, UE1296 Monts d'Auvergne) and for the laboratory analyses (L. Genestoux, D. Bany *et al.*, UR1213) as well as to S. Lerch (Ph.D. student) for providing information on the experiment. A special thanks to the New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre for supporting C. Martin to attend the conference.

## REFERENCES

- Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 1997: Official methods of analysis. 16th edition. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA.
- Bayourthe, C.; Enjalbert, F.; Moncoulon, R. 2000: Effects of different forms of canola oil fatty acids plus canola meal on milk composition and physical properties of butter. *Journal of Dairy Science* **83**: 690-696.
- Beauchemin, K.A.; McAllister, T.A.; McGinn, S.M. 2009a: Dietary mitigation of enteric methane from cattle. In: CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutrition and Natural Resources. 4 (035). CAB International, Wallingford, UK, p. 1-18.
- Beauchemin, K.A.; McGinn, S.M.; Benchaar, C.; Holtshausen, L. 2009b: Crushed sunflower, flax, or canola seeds in lactating dairy cows diets: effects on methane production, rumen fermentation, and milk production. *Journal of Dairy Science* **92**: 2118-2127.
- Denman, S.E., Tomkins, N.W., McSweeney, C.S., 2007: Quantitation and diversity analysis of ruminal methanogenic populations in response to the antimethanogenic compound bromochloromethane. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **62**: 313-322.
- Edwards, J. E.; Huws, S. A.; Kim, E. J.; Kingston-Smith, A. H. 2008: Characterization of the dynamics of initial bacterial colonization of nonconserved forage in the bovine rumen. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **63**: 141-142.
- Faverdin, P.; Delagarde, R.; Delaby, L.; Meschy, F. 2007: Alimentation des vaches laitières. In: Alimentation des bovins, ovins et caprins. Besoins des animaux - Valeurs des aliments (Feeding of dairy cows. In: Cattle, sheep and goat feed. Animal needs – Feed values). INRA Tables 200. Quae, Versailles, France. p. 23-55.
- Grainger, C.; Williams, R.; Clarke, T.; Wright, A.D.G.; Eckard, R.J. 2010: Supplementation with whole cottonseed causes long-term reduction of methane emissions from lactating dairy cows offered a forage and cereal grain diet. *Journal of Dairy Science* **93**: 2612-2619.
- Grainger, C.; Beauchemin, K. 2011: Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants be lowered without lowering their production? *Animal Feed Science and Technology* doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.021.
- Holter, J.B.; Hayes, H.H.; Urban, W.E. 1992: Energy balance and lactation response in Holstein cows supplemented with cottonseed with or without calcium soap. *Journal of Dairy Science* **75**: 1480-1494.
- Jordan, E.; Lovett, D.K.; Monahan, F.J.; Callan, J.; Flynn B.; O'Mara, F.P. 2006: Effect of refined coconut oil or copra meal on methane output and on intake and performance of beef heifers. *Journal of Animal Science* **84**: 162-170.
- Kleen, J.L.; Hooijer, G.A.; Rehage, J.; Noordhuizen, J.P. 2004: Rumenocentesis (rumen puncture): a viable instrument in herd health diagnosis. *Deutsche Tierärztliche Wochenschrift* **111**: 458-462.
- Loor, J.J.; Ueda, K.; Ferlay, A.; Chilliard, Y.; Doreau, M. 2004: Biohydrogenation, duodenal flow and intestinal digestibility of trans fatty acids and conjugated linoleic acids in response to dietary forage:concentrate ratio and linseed oil in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* **87**: 2472-2485.
- Machmüller, A.; Ossowski, D.A.; Kreuzer, M. 2000: Comparative evaluation of the effects of coconut oil, oilseeds and crystalline fat on methane release, digestion and energy balance in lambs. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **85**: 41-60.
- Martin, C.; Rouel, J.; Jouany, J.P.; Doreau, M.; Chilliard, Y. 2008: Methane output from dairy cows in response to dietary supplementation of crude linseed, extruded linseed or linseed oil. *Journal of Animal Science* **86**: 2642-2650.
- Martin, C.; Morgavi, D.P.; Doreau, M. 2010: Methane mitigation in ruminants: from microbe to the farm scale. *Animal* **4**: 351-365.
- Morgavi, D.P.; Forano, E.; Martin, C.; Newbold, C.J. 2010: Microbial ecosystem and methanogenesis in ruminants. *Animal* **4**: 1024-1036.
- Mosoni, P.; Martin, C.; Forano, E.; Morgavi, D. P. 2011: Long-term defaunation increases the abundance of cellulolytic ruminococci and methanogens but does not affect the bacterial and methanogen diversity in the rumen of sheep. *Journal of Animal Science* **89**: 783-791.
- Mosoni, P.; Rochette, Y.; Doreau, M.; Morgavi, D.P.; Forano, E.; Ferlay, A.; Chilliard, Y.; Martin, C. 2008: Effect of increasing levels of extruded linseed in the diet of dairy cows on the number of protozoa, cellulolytic bacteria and methanogenic archaea. In: Proceedings of 6th joint Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique – Rowett Research Institute Symposium on the gut microbiome, 18-20 June 2008. Clermont-Ferrand, France. p. 84.
- Popova, M.; Martin, C.; Eugène, M.; Mialon, M.M.; Doreau, M.; Morgavi, D.P. 2011: Diet composition influences methanogenic Archaea diversity and activity in the rumen of feedlot bulls. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.060.
- SAS © User's guide: Statistics, Version 8 Edition. 2000: SAS Inst., Inc., Cary, North Carolina, USA.
- Woodward, S.L.; Waghorn, G.C.; Thomson N.A. 2006: Supplementing dairy cows with oils to improve performance and reduce methane – does it work? *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production* **66**: 176-181.
- Yu, Z.; Morrison, M. 2004: Improved extraction of PCR-quality community DNA from digesta and fecal samples. *Biotechniques* **36**: 808-812.