University of Reading

Methane emissions from cattle: estimates from short-term measurements using a Green Feed system compared with measurements obtained using respiration chambers or sulphur hexafluoride tracer

Article

Accepted Version

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 Methane emissions from cattle: estimates from short-term measurements using a GreenFeed

8 system compared with measurements obtained using respiration chambers or sulphur

9 hexafluoride tracer

10 K.J. Hammond, D.J. Humphries, L.A. Crompton, C. Green, and C.K. Reynolds[*]

11

12 *School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, Centre for Dairy Research, University of*

13 *Reading, PO Box 237, Earley Gate, Reading RG 6AR, United Kingdom*

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 ** Corresponding author. Tel: +44 118 3784684; Fax +44 1183786595*

24 *E-mail address: c.k.reynolds@reading.ac.uk (C.K. Reynolds)*

Abstract

The GreenFeed (GF) system (C-Lock Inc., Rapid City, USA) is used to estimate total daily methane emissions of individual cattle using short-term measurements obtained over several days. Our objective was to compare measurements of methane emission by growing cattle obtained using the GF system with measurements using respiration chambers (RC) or sulphur hexafluoride tracer (SF_6). It was hypothesised that estimates of methane emission for individual animals and treatments would be similar for GF compared to RC or SF_6 techniques. In experiment 1, maize or grass silage-based diets were fed to four growing Holstein heifers, whilst for experiment 2, four different heifers were fed four haylage treatments. Both experiments were a 4 x 4 Latin square design with 33 d periods. GreenFeed measurements of methane emission were obtained over 7 d (days 22-28) and compared to subsequent RC measurements over 4 d (days 29-33). For experiment 3, 12 growing heifers rotationally grazed three swards for 26 d, with simultaneous GF and SF_6 measurements over two 4 d measurement periods (days 15-19 and days 22-26). Overall methane emissions (g/d and g/kg dry matter intake [DMI]) measured using GF in experiments 1 (198 and 26.6, respectively) and 2 (208 and 27.8, respectively) were similar to averages obtained using RC (218 and 28.3, respectively for experiment 1; and 209 and 27.7, respectively, for experiment 2); but there was poor concordance between the two methods (0.1043 for experiments 1 and 2 combined). Overall, methane emissions measured using SF_6 were higher (P < 0.001) than GF during grazing (186 *vs.* 164 g/d), but there was significant (P < 0.01) concordance between the two methods (0.6017). There were fewer methane measurements by GF under grazing conditions in experiment 3 (1.60/d) compared to indoor measurements in experiments 1 (2.11/d) and 2 (2.34/d). Significant treatment effects on methane emission measured using RC and SF_6 were not evident for GF measurements, and the ranking for treatments and individual animals differed using the GF system. We conclude that under our conditions of

50   use the GF system was unable to detect significant treatment and individual animal

51   differences in methane emissions that were identified using both RC and SF_6 techniques, in

52   part due to limited numbers and timing of measurements obtained. Our data suggest that

53   successful use of the GF system is reliant on the number and timing of measurements

54   obtained relative to diurnal patterns of methane emission.

55

56   *Keywords:* Dairy cattle, methane, respiration chamber, SF_6, GreenFeed

57

58   *Abbreviations*: CI, confidence interval; DM(I), dry matter (intake); GF, GreenFeed; LW, live

59   weight; LWG, LW gain; NDIR, non-dispersive infrared; RC, respiration chambers; RFID,

60   radio frequency identification; SF_6, sulphur hexafluoride tracer

1. Introduction

Accurate and robust measurements of methane emissions from individual animals are required for national inventories and assessment of mitigation strategies. There are a number of methods for determining methane emissions from ruminants, including respiration chambers (RC) and sulphur hexafluoride tracer (SF_6) techniques. Precise measurements of methane emission can be obtained by housing animals in RC, which allow direct measurement of total methane emission. However, RC are relatively expensive, have a limited throughput, and are disruptive to normal behaviour as animal by environment interactions that occur within grassland ecosystems are prevented. Respiration chambers are impractical for simulating grazing applications, and if the diet offered in the RC is fresh forage, then diet selection is limited, and eating patterns are likely to be determined by the feeding regime.

The SF_6 technique (Zimmerman, 1993; Johnson et al., 1994) can be used to make estimations of eructated and expired methane emissions from animals which can select their diet in a manner representative of farmed livestock (*e.g.* grazing). However, evaluations have challenged the precision of the SF_6 technique for estimating methane emissions (Vlaming et al., 2007; Pinares-Patiño and Clark, 2008; Pinares-Patiño et al., 2011), with greater between-animal variation compared to RC (Hammond et al., 2009). The SF_6 technique has also provided variable estimates of methane emission from animals on different herbages that have not been corroborated by RC measurements (*e.g.* Hammond et al., 2011; Waghorn et al., 2002; Sun et al., 2011 and 2012). Halter and collection canisters placed on the animal for methane estimates can interfere with grazing (Pinares-Patiño et al., 2008), especially with young animals, and a lower than predicted feed dry matter intake (DMI) will overestimate methane yields (g/kg DMI). Rumen SF_6 boluses must also be administered, and frequent

85 animal handling is needed, all of which can be disruptive to normal behaviour, and is

86 relatively labour intensive.

87   In 2010, the commercial GreenFeed (GF) system (C-Lock Inc., Rapid City, South

88 Dakota, USA) was introduced as a static short-term measurement device that measures

89 methane emission from individual cattle, and uses head position sensors in combination with

90 decision rules to assess the validity of measures obtained. The animal is free to move about

91 and voluntarily enters a hood where a feed supplement (*i.e.* a reward for visiting the GF unit)

92 is delivered. Measurements of methane emission by GF are typically over short (3-7 min)

93 periods, several times within a day, over several days. The system is programmed using C-

94 Lock Inc. software to control timing of feed availability and thus, encourage animals to

95 distribute their voluntary GF visitation and hence methane measurements over a 24 h period

96 so that ultimately a 24 h individual methane emission profile can be extrapolated from several

97 days of short-term measurements. Cattle are typically not handled during GF operation and

98 one GF unit can be used for numerous animals, with manufacturer recommendations of 15-20

99 animals/unit when grazing and 20-25 animals/unit if housed in free stalls. Because the GF

100 system is relatively new, little is known about its operation, precision, accuracy, and the

101 extent to which animal interaction with GF affects methane measurements.

102   The objectives of the present study were addressed across three experiments that

103 included measurements of methane emission from individual growing dairy cattle using a

104 single GF unit. Our objectives were to compare measurements of methane emission by

105 growing dairy cattle obtained using GF with measurements using RC (experiments 1 and 2)

106 and SF_6 (experiment 3). It was hypothesised that estimates of methane emission for

107 individual animals and treatments would be similar for GF and RC or SF_6 techniques.

108

109 **2. Materials and methods**

110   Three experiments were used in this study whereby growing dairy cattle were fed a

111   variety of diets and methane emission was measured using GF, RC and/or SF_6 techniques.

112   Measurements in all experiments were individual DMI and methane production (g/d),

113   calculated methane yield (g/kg DMI), and frequency of GF visitation (*i.e.* methane

114   measurement frequency). All procedures used were approved and monitored under the UK

115   Home Office Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

116

117   *2.1 Experiments*

118   *2.1.1 Experiment 1*

119   Four Holstein Friesian dairy heifers aged 14 months with an initial live weight (LW)

120   of 317 ± 20 kg were fed once daily (10:00 h) either maize or grass silage diets supplemented

121   with or without an extruded linseed product (Lintec; 26% fat) at 6% of ration DM (*n* = 4

122   animals/treatment).

123   Experiment 1 was a 4 x 4 Latin square design with each period 33 d in duration,

124   commencing with 21 d adaptation where access to GF was allowed, and GF data used for

125   analysis was obtained during 7 d (days 22-28), after which animals were confined to RC for

126   measurement of methane emission over 4 d (days 29-33).

127   Feed was offered to achieve target daily LW gains (LWG) of 0.75 kg. Feed intakes

128   were measured on a daily basis using an electronic Calan Broadbent individual feeding

129   system (American Calan Inc., Northwood, New Hampshire, USA) with feed refusals

130   collected once daily before morning feeding. Animals were loose-housed and bedded on

131   wood shavings with rubber mats and had *ad libitum* access to water.

132   *2.1.2 Experiment 2*

133   Four Holstein Friesian dairy heifers, aged 14 months with an initial LW of 339 ± 16

134   kg were fed twice daily (10:00 and 16:00 h in equal amounts), one of four conserved forage

135   (haylage) treatments of ryegrass, clover, trefoil and flowers ($n = 4$ animals/treatment). Further

136   details of these treatments are given in Hammond et al. (2014). Similar to experiment 1,

137   experiment 2 was a 4 x 4 Latin Square design with 33 d periods, with animals fed and housed

138   in a similar manner as detailed for experiment 1.

139   *2.1.3 Experiment 3*

140   Twelve Holstein Friesian dairy heifers aged eight months, with a starting LW of 230

141    $\pm$ 6 kg, grazed the same treatments used to make haylage in experiment 2 (ryegrass, clover

142   and flowers; $n = 12$ animals/treatment; Hammond et al., 2014). Heifers rotationally strip

143   grazed each sward treatment for 26 d in a sequence of flowers, clover, then ryegrass. Each 26

144   d period commenced with 14 d adaptation where GF access was allowed, with simultaneous

145   GF and SF_6 data obtained over two 4-d measurement periods (days 15-19 and days 22-26).

146   Dry matter intake was estimated using a rising plate meter (Farmworks Precision

147   Farming Systems, Feilding, New Zealand) by taking 20 sward height readings before and

148   after each days grazing period. Sward DM yield estimations were calibrated every second day

149   by taking 5 x 0.5 m^2 quadrat cuts of the sward at a target post-grazing height of 6 cm and

150   oven drying (100ºC) the sample to give sward DM yield per m^2 which was applied to each

151   sward height measurement.

152

153   *2.2 Methane measurements*

154   *2.2.1 GreenFeed*

155   The GF system measured methane emission using sensors that identified the animal

156   and its head position within a sampling hood, air flow, and methane and carbon dioxide

157   concentrations in exhaust air. GreenFeed operation was initiated when the animal placed its

158   head inside the hood. A radio frequency identification (RFID) reader identified the animal's

159   ear tag and GF sampling was activated when the animals head (located by an infrared sensor)

160   was in the correct location within the hood, and it was deemed that sufficient time had

161   elapsed since the previous methane measurement for that animal.

162   Animal head position was critical for successful measurements as the animal is free to

163   move its head in and out of the hood and thus only data captured with uninterrupted

164   measurements was retained for statistical analysis. Position of the animals head within the

165   hood was monitored using sensors to ensure complete breath collection. Adequate animal

166   head position resulted in the dispensing of feed pellets which were used for enticement and

167   encouraged the animal to maintain a suitable head position for accurate measurements.

168   Pellets were dispensed from a hopper above the GF using a computer controlled rotating cup

169   dispenser.

170   Animals were able to use the GF unit at any time, provided it was not in use by

171   another animal, however, this did not necessarily generate a measurement of methane. A

172   'visit' is defined as a visit that results in a methane measurement. Thus, a 'visit' is only

173   considered when a certain time has elapsed between visits (as dictated by the user) and a food

174   reward is dropped, generating a methane measurement for that animal.

175   The concentration of the gas emitted by the animal was calculated using background

176   gas concentration, the differential concentration of gas during the animal's time in the GF

177   hood, and the calibration coefficient for concentration. The calibration coefficient was based

178   on nitrogen, carbon dioxide and methane gases used to calculate the response of the sensors.

179   The GF analysers were zeroed and calibrated weekly using zero baseline gas (oxygen-free

180   nitrogen) and a span gas mixture nitrogen containing 5000 ppm carbon dioxide and 1000 ppm

181   methane (BOC Ltd., Manchester, UK). This was to account for any drift in the calibration of

182   the analysers, which was found to be negligible. A known amount of propane or carbon

183   dioxide was released near where the animal's nose would be when feeding to check recovery

184   of expired gases when the physical location of the GF unit changed. There was no recovery

185   correction required in the current study.

186   To measure gas production (mass per unit of time) an extractor fan was used to draw

187   air past the animal's head into an exhaust pipe and airflow rate was measured. Airflow rate

188   was multiplied by the increase in gas concentration when the animals head was in the hood.

189   The duration the animals head was in the GF hood was recorded thus giving the time interval

190   for calculation of mass per unit of time. The concentrations of methane and carbon dioxide

191   gases were measured by non-dispersive infrared (NDIR) sensors, and an air filter was used to

192   filter and remove any fine particulate material from the air that was subsampled to the sensors

193   to prevent damage. The air filter was changed every two weeks. Data from GF was available

194   real-time using mobile phone communication through a web-based data management system

195   provided by C-Lock Inc.

196   For all experiments, the GF was programmed using C-Lock Inc. software to deliver a

197   maximum of five rotations of a feed dispensing cup, delivering approximately 55 g of pellet

198   (as fed) per rotation, with intervals of 45 sec between each rotation, so that 275 g of pellet

199   was delivered during each visit. A maximum of four visits per day (24 h) was allowed, with a

200   minimum of 4 h required between visits. Therefore, if an animal attempted to use the GF less

201   than 4 h from the previous visit pellets would not be dispensed. Commercial calf pellets

202   (Rearer18 Nuts, Wynnstay Group PLC, UK) were used for GF enticement and had a

203   chemical composition (g/kg DM) of ash, 85.1; oil, 46.5; acid detergent fibre, 174; neutral

204   detergent fibre, 289; starch, 259; water soluble carbohydrate, 91.3; nitrogen, 27.3, crude

205   protein, 171; and gross energy (MJ/kg), 18.1. In all experiments total daily feed allocations

206   included 1 kg of expected pellet DM provided by the GF unit.

207   The GF unit was set up indoors for experiments 1 and 2 at one end of animal housing,

208   with gates positioned to restrict access to one animal at a time. Barn ventilation was used to

209   maintain ambient concentrations of methane in background air. For experiment 3, the GF unit

210   was located outdoors under an awning at a point central to the experimental paddocks. The

211   GF was located next to the only available water trough to encourage visitation, and fences

212   and tracks were established to provide continuous access from grazed paddocks.

213   *2.2.2 Respiration chambers*

214   Details of the RC and measurements of methane emission are given by Reynolds et al.

215   (2001) and Cammell et al. (1986). For measurements of gaseous emissions, two open-circuit

216   RC were used (internal volume approximately 21 m^3), with air-locks enabling access for

217   faecal and urine collection (Cammell et al., 1986). An integrative sample of ambient and RC

218   exhaust air was analysed at 4-min intervals, and every 4 h there was a switch to calibration

219   gases (oxygen-free nitrogen and nitrogen carrier with 20.5%, 3000 ppm, and 200 ppm

220   oxygen, carbon dioxide, and methane, respectively) to provide gas analyses with variation

221   coefficients of 5% or less.

222   *2.2.3 Sulphur hexafluoride*

223   Experiment 3 used the SF_6 technique, as detailed previously by Hammond et al.

224   (2014). Two weeks prior to experiment 3 commencing, heifers were each dosed by mouth

225   with a SF_6 permeation tube (supplied by AFBI, Hillsborough, Northern Ireland, UK) into the

226   rumen. The SF_6 gas release rates from the permeation tubes (5.176 $\pm$ 0.248 mg/d) were

227   measured prior to dosing by oven incubation at 39ºC and weighing twice weekly for six

228   weeks. Daily methane emissions from heifers were estimated from analysis of air collected

229   from around the nose and mouth over a 24 h period into a pre-evacuated PVC canister which

230   was suspended under the neck. Based on recommendations given by Berndt et al. (2014), air

231   was sampled using a crimped stainless steel capillary 0.004" ID 10 cm tube, with a flow rate

232   between 0.45 to 0.55 ml/min. Canisters had a volume of approximately 2.3 L and a pre-

233   collection vacuum of 90 kPa. Canisters were changed once daily at the same time each

234   morning and were rejected if vacuum post-collection was > 75 or < 50 kPa. A background air

235   sample was also obtained daily from the paddock adjacent to that being grazed. Samples from

236   canisters were analysed daily in our laboratory using gas chromatography to determine

237   methane and SF_6 concentrations as described by Muñoz et al. (2012).

238

239   *2.3 Data and statistical analyses*

240   Data from GF and RC during periods 1 and 2 of experiment 1 were excluded from the

241   analyses because the methane concentration of the calibration gas used for the GF unit was

242   too low. Thus, comparisons for experiment 1 were restricted to periods 3 and 4 (*n* = 8) which

243   meant treatment effects were not tested due to the limited observations obtained with the

244   Latin Square design experiment. Each animal and period emissions data generated by GF was

245   averaged over 7 d, whereas RC data was averaged over 4 d, with data expressed on a per min

246   basis over 24 h and as a daily average (g/h and g/d).

247   For experiment 2, data from all four animals and periods were analysed statistically (*n*

248   = 16) using the Mixed Models Procedures of SAS (2011) for random effects of animal and

249   fixed effects of period and treatment. Like experiment 1, each animal and period emissions

250   data generated by GF was averaged over 7 d, whereas RC data was averaged over 4 d in

251   experiment 2, with data expressed on a per min basis over 24 h and as a daily average (g/h

252   and g/d).

253   Experiment 3 provided methane data for 12 heifers grazing three fresh forage

254   treatments for two 4-d methane measurement periods and two treatment periods (May to July

255   and August to October; Hammond et al., 2014). Analysis of methane emission data were

256   undertaken on daily averages across 4 d of measurements for both GF and SF_6 techniques

257   (obtained simultaneously) for individual animals during each measurement period. Twelve

258   heifers were used for the first grazing rotation of ryegrass, clover, and flowers, and also for

259 the second rotation of flowers. However, for the second rotation on ryegrass and clover, two

260 animals were removed because there was insufficient sward cover. Therefore, a total of 136

261 GF and SF_6 individual animal average emission rate observations were analysed using Mixed

262 Models Procedure of SAS (2011) for effects of forage treatment and treatment period (1 or

263 2), with 4-d measurement period within forage treatment period as a repeated effect within

264 heifers (Hammond et al., 2014). When significant effects occurred, means of forage mixtures

265 (clover and flowers) were differentiated from ryegrass control using Dunnett's adjusted mean

266 comparisons.

267   Differences in methane emission (g/h, g/d and g/kg DMI) between techniques (GF *vs.*

268 RC and GF *vs.* SF_6) across all experiments were tested using Lin's Concordance Correlation

269 Coefficient analysis (Lin et al., 1998) in GenStat (2010) and the Univariate Procedure of SAS

270 (2011) to determine if the difference between the two methods for each experiment was

271 different from zero.

272   Within each experiment, the Least Squares Mean option of the GLM procedure (SAS,

273 2011) was used to rank individual animals according to their methane emission (g/d and g/kg

274 DMI) for each measurement technique using animal as a fixed effect. In addition, the GLM

275 procedure was used to regress GF measurements against RC or SF_6 measurements (g/d).

276

277 **3. Results**

278 *3.1 General observations*

279 *3.1.1 Experiment 1*

280   As stated previously, experiment 1 included data from four animals with $n = 8$

281 observations (only two periods out of a possible four were used). Dry matter intake during

282 GF and RC measurements was similar (Table 1). Average methane production (g/d) and yield

283 (g/kg DMI), determined using either GF or RC techniques, was similar for individual animals

284 (198 *vs.* 215 g/d, and 26.6 *vs.* 28.3 g/kg DMI, for GF *vs.* RC techniques, respectively) (Table

285 1). Individual animals had a similar methane output regardless of measurement technique

286 used, however methane data (g/d and g/kg DMI) generated by GF and RC techniques ranked

287 heifers differently in numerical order from high to low methane output (data not shown).

288 *3.1.2 Experiment 2*

289   There were four heifers used in experiment 2 with 16 observations (all four periods

290 included). Heifers had a similar DMI during GF and RC measurements (Table 1). Average

291 daily methane production (g/d) and yield (g/kg DMI) did not differ with measurement

292 technique for individual animals (208 *vs.* 209 g/d, and 27.8 *vs.* 27.7 g/kg DMI, for GF *vs.* RC

293 techniques, respectively; Table 1). For both GF and RC methods, animals were significantly

294 (P = 0.05) different to each other in their methane production but not methane yield. Both GF

295 and RC techniques ranked animals in numerical order, from low to high, the same for

296 methane production, but not for methane yield (data not shown).

297 *3.1.3 Experiment 3*

298   Experiment 3 used 12 heifers and had 136 observations. Approximately 88% of SF_6

299 canisters were accepted (478 measurements out of a possible 544), with 12% of

300 measurements unsuccessful due to sampling tube blockages, broken collection tubes, or

301 displacement of canisters from the heifer. Both GF and SF_6 techniques were used

302 simultaneously so DMI was the same with measurement technique. Daily methane

303 production determined by GF for individual heifers was lower (P < 0.001) than SF_6 (164 *vs.*

304 186 g/d, respectively; Table 3). For both GF and SF_6 methods, heifers were significantly (P =

305 0.05) different to each other in their methane production (g/d), and the ranking of animals,

306 from low to high methane production, was different for the two techniques.

307

308 *Insert Table 1 here*

309

310 *3.2 Technique comparisons*

311 *3.2.1 GreenFeed vs. respiration chamber*

312   Combining data from experiments 1 and 2, Lin's Concordance Correlation

313 Coefficient between GF and RC, when used to measure methane production and yield of

314 individual heifers, was 0.1043 and 0.058, respectively, with a non-significant ($P > 0.50$)

315 association between the two techniques, based on the 95% confidence interval (CI) (Fig 1).

316 There were diurnal patterns of methane erucation over a 24 h period for animals in both

317 experiments 1 and 2, measured using GF and in RC (Fig 2). Emissions ranged from about 4

318 g/h immediately before their morning feeding to a maximum of about 15 g/h after feeding, on

319 both silage and haylage diets. The increase in methane production after 10:00 h in experiment

320 1 relates to once daily feeding, whereas the increases just after 10:00 and 16:00 h represent

321 the twice daily feeding regime. Based on all methane measurements, compared to the GF

322 data, there was less variability with the RC emission measurements (g/d) from both

323 experiments, in part because measurements for GF were much less frequent and fewer in

324 number than for RC (Fig 2).

325

326 *Insert Fig 1 here*

327 *Insert Fig 2 here*

328

329 *3.2.2. GreenFeed vs. sulphur hexafluoride*

330   Lin's Concordance Correlation Coefficient between GF and SF_6 techniques, used to

331 measure methane production from individual heifers of experiment 3, was 0.602, with a

332 significant ($P < 0.01$) association between the two techniques, based on the 95% CI (Fig 3).

333

334   *Insert Fig 3 here*

335

336   *3.3 GreenFeed for detecting dietary treatment effects*

337   In experiment 2, DMI and methane production during RC measurements was affected

338   by haylage type (P = 0.045 and P = 0.025, respectively), but this was not evident for GF

339   measurements (Table 2). When methane was expressed in terms of DMI (yield, g/kg DMI),

340   RC detected significant differences (P = 0.020) between haylages, but GF did not. There was

341   no consistency in the relative difference between measurement techniques with dietary

342   treatment. Relative to RC, GF underestimated 15% of methane yield when heifers were fed a

343   ryegrass diet, compared to an overestimation of 12% for heifers on a flower diet (Table 2).

344   For heifers of experiment 3, methane production (g/d) differed significantly with both

345   GF and SF_6 techniques (P = 0.019 and P < 0.001, respectively) for all three forage treatments.

346   However, the ranking of mean estimates for the different forages differed with technique

347   (Table 2). When methane was expressed in terms of DMI (methane yield), noting that the

348   techniques estimated methane simultaneously, the ranking of treatment means was not the

349   same for GF (P = 0.080; flowers > clover = ryegrass) and SF_6 techniques (P = 0.002; clover =

350   ryegrass > flowers). For two out of three dietary treatments fed, GF underestimated methane

351   yield relative to SF_6 by up to 18% (Table 2).

352   *Insert Table 2 here*

353

354   *3.4 GreenFeed visitation*

355   During the 14 d of GF measurements in experiment 1, there were a total of 118 visits

356   to the GF unit, averaging 2.11 visits/d. For the 28 d measurement period in experiment 2,

357   total GF visitation was 262, averaging 2.34 visits/d. During the 48 d of measurements for

358   experiment 3, heifers visited the GF unit 880 times, averaging 1.60 visits/d (Table 3). The

359   average duration (min:sec) of GF measurements for experiments 1, 2, and 3 were 04:44,

360   04:43, and 04:58, respectively.

361   Figure 4 shows the pattern of visits to the GF, according to hour of the day. For all

362   experiments, animals frequented the GF most often between 07:00 and 08:00 h, and between

363   13:00 and 14:00 h, with fewer visits in early morning hours (between 01:00 and 06:00 h).

364   GreenFeed measurements were prevented if another animal was already using the unit, when

365   animals were yarded for other experimental activities such as SF_6 canister changes, and

366   during the allocation of new grazing. The type of diet offered affected GF visitation for

367   experiment 3, but not experiment 2 (Table 2). Heifers in experiment 3 made fewer (P <

368   0.001) visits overall to the GF when on the ryegrass (219) and clover (229) paddocks,

369   compared to the flower (432) paddock.

370

371   *Insert Table 3 here*

372   *Insert Fig 4 here*

373

374   **4. Discussion**

375   *4.1 Comparison of measurement techniques*

376   *4.1.1 GreenFeed vs. respiration chamber*

377   Based on the concordance analysis for methane emission from heifers of experiments

378   1 and 2, GF and RC techniques had a poor agreement, yet average methane emission overall

379   was similar for the two techniques. It is difficult to interpret these conflicting results;

380   however the large amount of variation about the line of equality (Fig 1) is a likely explanation

381   for overall methane means being similar between techniques (Table 1) but having low

382   concordance correlation. The lack of concordance between methods is in part attributable to

383   the relatively small number of short-term measurements obtained by GF on each day of

384   measurement. The concept behind the GF system is that although it is unknown what an

385   animal is eructating when not visiting the GF, the accumulation of data over 24 h can provide

386   a representative pattern (Fig 2). Thus, the GF technique relies on the animal visiting the unit

387   at different times during the day to characterise the daily pattern of methane emission over a

388   number of days. In contrast, RC measurements in this study were based on integrated

389   measurements every 4 min over four consecutive days.

390   The inability of GF to detect changes in methane production due to treatment or

391   animal effects compared to RC (and SF_6) is not unexpected given the methodology the

392   technique employs. Enteric methane production from ruminants typically exhibits a diurnal

393   pattern related to feeding and meal consumption, with methane emission rate varying by as

394   much as five-fold over the course of a day (Crompton et al., 2010). Peak enteric methane

395   production occurs approximately 120 and 60 min after the morning and afternoon feeds,

396   respectively, for a lactating dairy cow fed *ad libitum* twice daily (Crompton et al., 2010).

397   Frequent or continuous measurements over a 24 h period using RC or SF_6 account for any

398   diurnal variation in methane production, but intermittent short-term measurements may vary

399   significantly depending on when those measurements are taken during the day.

400   There was a greater range in absolute emissions for both measurement techniques

401   with experiment 2 data compared to experiment 1 that was associated with greater differences

402   in DMI and methane production. However, when emissions were expressed per unit of feed

403   intake (g/kg DMI), relationships between GF and RC measurements were still weak and

404   variation was large, especially for the GF measurements. The variable relationship suggests

405   that the differences in methane emission due to treatments and animal variation measured by

406   the RC are not correlated with differences measured by GF. In other words, ranking of the

407   animals according to methane production and yield differed between the two techniques,

408   despite substantial differences being observed. The absence of a significant correlation

409   between GF and RC measurements for individual animal observations (Fig 1) casts doubt on

410   the capability of GF to distinguish (and rank) individual animals under the conditions with

411   which GF was used in our experiments. With the exception of daily methane production in

412   experiment 2, GF and RC ranked heifers differently in their methane emission. Daily mean

413   methane production varied from about 160 to 270 g/d measured in RC, and although GF also

414   recorded a similar range, the range was for different heifers on different diets (data not

415   shown).

416   It is possible that the alogrithms used by the GF system for the calculation of methane

417   output, or the timing of visits relative to daily patterns of methane emission, may account for

418   the discrepencies observed between GF and RC data. GreenFeed calculations are based on

419   differences in the concentration of the air exhaled and eructed by the animal, less background

420   air concentrations measured pre- and post-feeding. The GF is able to differentiate emissions

421   of methane in exhaled air above background, so exhaled air is included in the emission

422   calculation. The calculations are reliant on erucation events taking place within the

423   measurement period, and the alogrithms may need to be modified to increase accuracy and

424   reduce variation. For the animals and diets used in our study, more GF measurements were

425   needed over a longer period, and at more frequent intervals, to better represent the diurnal

426   pattern of methane emissions over 24 h. Increased animal visitation to the GF may require

427   longer periods of measurement (more days), more visits per day (and thus greater feed

428   consumption), or the use of an alternative 'bait' (Hegarty, 2013). In addition to this, it has

429   been estimated that 1-2% of methane is voided as flatus (Murray et al., 1976), and it will

430   contribute to methane emissions (Ellis et al., 2008) measured in RC. These considerations for

431   GF measurements are also pertinent to other on-farm breath analysis techniques (*e.g.*

432   Garnsworthy et al., 2012).

433

434 *4.1.2 GreenFeed* vs. *sulphur hexafluoride*

435   GreenFeed and SF_6 techniques had moderate concordance (agreement), in part due to

436 the greater number of observations compared. However, overall methane emissions

437 determined using GF were significantly lower than those measured using the SF_6 technique.

438 Differences between GF and SF_6 techniques are likely due to the duration of methane

439 measurements obtained for each animal. The SF_6 technique is based on integrative sampling

440 with a sampling duration of nearly 1440 min/d (100% of 24 h). In comparison, the GF unit is

441 designed to take intermittent samples, and based on the average of the three experiments

442 presented here, sampling duration (5 min/visit at 2 visits/animal/d) was only 10 min/d (0.7%

443 of 24 h).

444   All tracers have weaknesses (Shipley and Clark, 1972) and the variation associated

445 with SF_6 estimates may be in part a consequence of factors affecting the technique itself

446 (Deighton et al., 2013, 2014a and 2014b), or alternatively the variation might be real. Recent

447 work has found that successful use of the SF_6 technique to detect differences in enteric

448 methane emissions due to diets or between animal species may be confounded by diet or

449 genetic effects on body temperature (Deighton et al., 2014b). In order to accurately determine

450 methane emissions, it is necessary that gases are collected continuously at a constant rate for

451 24 h, however; it has been recently shown by Deighton et al. (2014a) that capillary tubes are

452 unsuitable for use as flow restrictors to achieve this, causing a bias of up to 15.6% in

453 calculated methane emissions. Deighton et al. (2014a) has since proposed a 'modified SF_6

454 technique' which incorporates orifice plate flow restrictors for 24 h sample collection and has

455 found technique error associated with SF_6 release, sample collection and analysis to be

456 reduced.

457

458 *4.2 GreenFeed for detecting dietary treatment effects*

459   Although all three techniques measured significant treatment effects on methane

460   emissions, the ranking of these effects differed with measurement technique. Critically, both

461   the RC and SF_6 techniques found methane yield (g/kg DMI) to be the lowest in both

462   experiments 2 and 3 for animals fed flowers compared to the other dietary treatments

463   (Hammond et al., 2014). GreenFeed on the other hand, was unable to detect treatment effects

464   on methane yield in experiment 2, and ranked the treatments differently to SF_6 for experiment

465   3. This in part reflects the variability of GF measurements attributable to the timing and

466   limited number of short-term measurements obtained in the present experiments.

467

468   *4.3 GreenFeed visitation*

469   Although animals had few problems adapting to the GF and used it willingly, visits

470   were less frequent than permitted, particularly for grazing animals in experiment 3. The lack

471   of GF visits from animals both while out grazing and during early morning, may have

472   negatively biased methane production measured by GF (Fig 3). The low frequency of visits

473   between 09:00 and 13:00 h (Fig 4) is likely to be when peak methane emissions occur in a

474   once daily feeding system, as can be seen from the rise in methane production (g/h) in Fig 4.

475   Thus, the infrequent daily measurements made by the GF system in experiment 1 is a likely

476   explanation for numerically lower methane emissions from the GF compared to RC. In

477   experiment 2, the GF pattern of visitation was better distributed over the course of the day,

478   although a weaker relationship occurred between the two techniques (Fig 2).

479   In all experiments, fewer visits occurred in the early morning hours, and a lack of

480   methane data over this period may have affected the average estimate of daily emissions.

481   Every morning, heifers of experiment 3 were given a new allocation of feed at about 10:30 h

482   after SF_6 canisters were replaced. The allocation of new pasture is likely to have been

483   responsible for the drop in GF visits between 09:00 and 13:00 h. During this period of time,

484   methane emissions would have been at their highest, which must partly account for the 13%

485   greater daily methane emissions determined by the SF_6 technique, compared to the GF

486   system. The lower visitation to the GF by grazing heifers is cause for concern, especially as

487   the GF system relies on having enough daily measurements over the course of an 'average'

488   day to estimate daily emissions. Further evaluations of the GF system should determine the

489   number of days and measurements per day required for GF to provide accurate and precise

490   measures of methane emissions.

491   It would appear that the number of visits to the GF is influenced by dietary treatment

492   (and possibly level of feed intake), with more visits made when heifers were grazing flowers,

493   compared to ryegrass and clover (experiment 3). For experiment 3, this may have been

494   attributable to the location of the GF relative to the paddocks, as well as the DM and nutrient

495   content of the swards grazed. It would appear that less favourable diets may contribute to

496   increased GF visitation when a favourable 'treatment' *i.e.* pelleted concentrates, is rewarded,

497   and this may have consequences for methane estimates on different treatments (different

498   numbers of samples and sampling times for each treatment). This is a concern for nutrition

499   experiments that investigate effects of diet composition on methane emission if diet

500   comparisons are affected by varying amounts of feed reward provided by GF.

501   One concern with the use of the GF under our conditions is the temporal distribution

502   of GF visitation and the potential for bias in methane emission measurements by the GF

503   system. This is because unlike both RC and SF6 techniques the methane measurement

504   obtained from each individual animal by the GF system is voluntary and thus not completely

505   independent. The use of the GF unit by each individual animal within the group, and

506   therefore the temporal distribution of their methane measurement, is affected by their cohorts

507   and environmental circumstances. The inclusion of a given animal in the GF unit causes the

508   exclusion of all other animals within the group. Strictly speaking an individual animal is not

509 totally independent as an experimental unit when the GF system is used and therefore to

510 achieve completely independent experimental replication for individual animals housed as

511 groups in pens or paddocks multiple GF units may be required.

512

513 **5. Conclusions**

514 Overall, the GF system provided an estimate of methane emission by growing dairy

515 cattle that was not different from RC measurements, but significantly lower than for SF_6.

516 However, concordance analyses found no agreement between GF and RC, and only moderate

517 agreement with SF_6. We conclude that as used in our experiments, the GF system was unable

518 to detect significant treatment and individual animal differences in methane emissions that

519 were identified using both RC and SF_6 techniques. The successful use of the GF system is

520 reliant on the number and timing of measurements obtained relative to diurnal patterns of

521 methane emission. Therefore, animal and diet type, intake level and appetite (*e.g. ad libitum*

522 *vs.* restrictive feeding), total feed availability, accessibility of the GF unit relative to other

523 feeds and activities, as well as type, amount, and timing of feed used to elicit GF use all

524 affect GF visitation and thus measurements of methane emission using the GF system.

525 Multiple animals using a GF unit can alter the temporal distribution of measurements for

526 individual animals and this potential bias should also be considered in designing future

527 experiments.

528 Further evaluation of GF is needed to determine how best to deploy the system to

529 meet specific objectives, the number and timing of measurements required for specific

530 measurement conditions, as well as the capacity of the GF to detect significant changes in

531 methane emissions with individuals and treatments. We suggest that in addition to increased

532 frequency of daily GF visits future studies should include longer periods of measurement and

533 a greater number of animals per treatment than is required for RC studies.

541

542 **References**

543 Berndt, A., Boland, T.M., Deighton, M.H., Gere, J.I., Grainger, C., Hegarty, R.S., Iwaasa,

544 A.D., Koolaard, J.P., Lassey, K.R., Luo, D., Martin, R.J., Martin, C., Moate, P.J., Molano,

545 G., Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Ribaux, B.E., Swainson, N.M., Waghorn, G.W., Williams, S.R.O.,

546 2014. Guidelines for use of sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6) tracer technique to measure enteric

547 methane emissions from ruminants. Pp 166. [M.G. Lambert, editor], New Zealand

548 Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre, New Zealand.

549

550 Cammell, S.B., Thomson, D.J., Beever, D.E., Haines, M.J., Dhanoa, M.S., Spooner, M.C.,

551 1986. The efficiency of energy utilization in growing cattle consuming fresh perennial

552 ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* cv. Melle) or white clover (*Trifolium repens* cv. Blanca). Br. J.

553 Nutr. 55, 669-680.

554

555 Crompton, L.A., Mills, J.A.N., Reynolds, C.K. and France, J., 2010. Fluctuations in methane

556 emission in response to feeding pattern in lactating dairy cows. In. Modelling Nutrient

557 Digestion and Utilization in Farm Animals, pp. 176-180 [D. Sauvant, J. Van Milgen, P.

558 Faverdin and N. Friggens, editors]. Wageningen, the Netherlands: Wageningen Academic

559 Publishers.

560

561 Deighton, M.H., O'Loughlin, B.M., Williams, S.R.O., Moate, P.J., Kennedy, E., Boland,

562 T.M., Eckard, R.J., 2013. Declining sulphur hexafluoride permeability of

563 polytetrafluoroethylene membranes causes overestimation of calculated ruminant methane

564 emissions using the tracer technique. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 183, 86-95.

565

566 Deighton, M.H., Williams, S.R.O., Hannah, M.C., Eckard, R.J., Boland, T.M., Wales, W.J.,

567 Moate, P.J., 2014a. A modified sulphur hexafluoride tracer technique enables accurate

568 determination of enteric methane emissions from ruminants. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 197,

569 47-63.

570

571 Deighton, M.H., Williams, S.R.O., Lassey, K.R., Hannah, M.C., Boland, T.M., Eckard, R.J.,

572 Moate, P.J., 2014b. Temperature, but not submersion or orientation, influences the rate of

573 sulphur hexafluoride release from permeation tubes used for estimation of ruminant methane

574 emissions. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 194, 71-80.

575

576 Ellis, J.L., Dijkstra, J., Kebreab, E., Bannink, A., Odongo, N.E., McBride, B.W., France, J.,

577 2008. Aspects of rumen microbiology central to mechanistic modelling of methane

578 production in cattle. J. Agric. Sci. 146, 213-233.

579

580 Garnsworthy, P.C., Craigon, J., Hernandez-Medrano, J.H., Saunders, N., 2012. On-farm

581 methane measurements during milking correlate with total methane production by individual

582 dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 95, 3166-3180.

583

584   Hammond, K.J., Hoskin, S.O., Burke, J.L., Waghorn, G.C., Koolaard, J.P., Muetzel, S., 2011.

585   Effects of feeding fresh white clover (*Trifolium repens*) or perennial ryegrass (*Lolium*

586   *perenne)* on enteric methane emissions from sheep. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 166-167, 398-

587   404.

588

589   Hammond, K.J., Humphries, D.J., Westbury, D.B., Thompson, A., Crompton, L.A., Kirton,

590   P., Green, C., Reynolds, C.K., 2014. The inclusion of forage mixtures in the diet of growing

591   dairy heifers: Impacts on digestion, energy utilisation, and methane emissions. Agric. Eco.

592   Environ. 197, 88-95.

593

594   Hammond, K.J., Muetzel, S., Waghorn, G.C., Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Burke, J.L., Hoskin, S.O.,

595   2009. The variation in methane emissions from sheep and cattle is not explained by the

596   chemical composition of ryegrass. Proc. N. Z. Soc. Anim. Prod. 69, 174-178.

597

598   Hegarty, R.S., 2013. Applicability of short-term emission measurements for on-farm

599   quantification of enteric methane. Anim. 7:s2, 401-408.

600

601   Johnson, K.A., Huyler, M., Westberg, H., Lamb, B., Zimmerman, P., 1994. Measurement of

602   methane emissions from ruminant livestock using a SF_6 tracer technique. Environ. Sci.

603   Technol. 28, 359-362.

604

605   Lin, L., Torbeck, L.D., 1998. Coefficient of accuracy and concordance correlation

606   coefficient: new statistics for methods comparison. J. Pharm. Sci. Technol. 52, 55-59.

607

608   Muñoz, C., Yan, T., Wills, D.A., Murray, S., Gordon, A.W., 2012. Comparison of the sulfur

609   hexafluoride tracer and respiration chamber techniques for estimating methane emissions and

610   correction for rectum methane output from dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 95, 3139-3148.

611

612   Murray, R.M., Bryant, A.M., Leng, R.A., 1976. Rates of production of methane in the rumen

613   and large intestine of sheep. Brit. J. Nutr. 36, 1-14.

614

615   Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Lassey, K.R., Martin, R.J., Molano, G., Fernandez, M., MacLean, S.,

616   Sandoval, E., Luo, D., Clark, H., 2011. Assessment of the sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6) tracer

617   technique using respiration chambers for estimation of methane emissions from sheep. Anim.

618   Feed Sci. Technol. 166-167, 201-209.

619

620   Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Clark, H., 2008. Reliability of the sulfur hexafluoride tracer technique

621   for methane emission measurement from individual animals: an overview. Aust. J. Exp.

622   Agric. 48, 223-229.

623

624   Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Machmuller, A., Molano, G., Smith, A., Vlaming, J.B., Clark, H., 2008.

625   The SF_6 tracer technique for measurements of methane emission from cattle - effect of tracer

626   permeation rate. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 88, 309-320.

627

628   Reynolds, C.K., Cammell, S.B., Humphries, D.J., Beever, D.E., Sutton, J.D., Newbold, J.R.,

629   2001. Effects of postrumen starch infusion on milk production and energy metabolism in

630   dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 84, 2250-2259.

631

632   Shipley, R.A., Clark, R.E., 1972. Tracer Methods for In Vivo Kinetics: Theory and

633   Applications. Academic Press, New York.

634

635   Sun, X.Z., Hoskin, S.O., Muetzel, S., Molano, G., Clark, H., 2011. Effect of chicory

636   (*Cichorium intybus)* and perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*) on methane emissions *in vitro*

637   and from sheep. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 166-167, 391-397.

638

639   Sun, X.Z., Hoskin, S.O., Zhang, G.G., Molano, G., Muetzel, S., Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Clark,

640   H., Pacheco, D., 2012. Sheep fed forage chicory (*Cichorium intybus*) or perennial ryegrass

641   (*Lolium perenne*) have similar methane emissions. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 172, 217-225.

642

643   Vlaming, J.B., Brookes, I.M., Hoskin, S.O., Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Clark, H., 2007. The

644   possible influence of intra-ruminal sulphur hexafluoride release rates on calculated methane

645   emissions from cattle. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 87, 269-275.

646

647   Waghorn, G.C., Tavendale, M.H., Woodfield, D.R., 2002. Methanogenesis from forages fed

648   to sheep. Proc. N. Z. Grassland Assoc. 64, 167-171.

649

650   Zimmerman, P.R., 1993. System for measuring metabolic gas emissions from animals. U.S

651   Patent 5265618, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, November 30, 1993.

652 **Table 1** Dry matter intake (DMI; kg/d), methane production (g/d), and methane yield (g/kg

653 DMI) from growing dairy cattle within three different experiments using GreenFeed (GF),

654 respiration chamber (RC) and sulphur hexafluoride tracer (SF_6) techniques.

	Experiment 1[a]	± SD	Experiment 2[a]	± SD	Experiment 3[b]	± SD
DMI, kg/d						
GF	7.62	0.81	7.60	0.81	9.15	2.67
RC[a] or SF_6[b]	7.66	0.59	7.54	0.94	9.15	2.67
n	8		16		136	
SEM	0.132		0.182		N/A	
P	0.799		0.747		N/A	
Methane, g/d						
GF	198	20.4	208	31.5	164	51.0
RC[a] or SF_6[b]	215	22.3	209	30.9	186	57.3
n	8		16		136	
SEM	9.230		10.59		2.900	
P	0.170		0.940		< 0.001	
Methane, g/kg DMI						
GF	26.6	2.80	27.8	5.62	18.8	6.94
RC[a] or SF_6[b]	28.3	3.01	27.7	1.81	21.5	7.60
n	8		16		136	
SEM	1.365		1.459		0.349	
P	0.255		0.933		< 0.001	

[a] Experiments 1 and 2 used RC for measurement of methane from dairy heifers.
[b] Experiment 3 used SF_6 for estimate of methane from grazing dairy heifers.
[c] DMI was measured using Calan gates for individual animals in experiments 1 and 2, however for experiment 3, DMI was estimated by pre- and post-herbage mass (hence same DMI for animals where both GF and SF_6 were used simultaneously).

655 **Table 2** The difference in methane emission between GreenFeed (GF), respiration chamber (RC), and sulphur hexafluoride tracer (SF_6)

656 techniques with dairy heifers fed different dietary treatments.

658

Experiments	n	Dry matter intake (DMI), kg/d[c]		Methane production, g/d		Methane yield, g/kg DMI			Relative difference between methods (%)
		GF	RC[a] or SF$_6$[b]	GF	RC[a] or SF$_6$[b]	GF	RC[a] or SF$_6$[b]	Difference[d]	
Experiment 2[a]									
Ryegrass	4	8.28	8.13	196	230	24.1	28.4	-4.32	-15
Clover	4	6.86[d]	7.10[b]	202	200[c]	29.5	28.1	1.40	5
Trefoil	4	7.93	7.51	226	218	28.9	29.2	-0.32	-1
Flowers	4	7.34	7.42[c]	209	190[b]	28.8	25.7[c]	3.14	12
SEM		0.377	0.255	17.33	8.890	3.013	0.662	2.844	
P (haylage)		0.180	0.045	0.515	0.025	0.521	0.020	0.298	
Experiment 3[b]									
Ryegrass	44	10.0	10.0	175	204	17.3	21.8	-3.38	-16
Clover	44	8.69[a]	8.69[a]	166	202	18.5	23.0	-4.24	-18
Flowers	48	8.78[b]	8.78[b]	159[b]	159[a]	19.7[c]	19.5[c]	0.48	2
SEM		0.230	0.230	5.420	4.989	0.768	0.734	0.754	
P (forage)		0.001	0.001	0.019	< 0.001	0.080	0.002	< 0.001	

For each parameter, different letters indicate significant differences from the ryegrass control according to Dunnetts test ([a] $P < 0.001$, [b] $P < 0.01$, [c] $P < 0.05$, [d] $P < 0.10$).

[a] Experiment 2 used RC for measurement of methane from dairy heifers

[b] Experiment 3 used SF_6 for estimation of methane from grazing dairy heifers

[c] DMI was measured using calan gates for individual animals in experiment 2, however for experiment 3, DMI was estimated by pre- and post-herbage mass (hence same DMI for animals in experiment 3 with measurement technique)

[d] Difference is generated using GF value less corresponding RC or SF_6 value

659 **Table 3** Animal visitation to the GreenFeed (GF) unit across three different experiments

660

|	Number of measurement days	Total number of GF visits (methane measurements)	Total number of GF visit (methane measurements) per animal per day
Experiment 1			
Total	14	120	2.11
SD			0.49
SEM			0.17
Experiment 2			
Ryegrass		76	2.71
Clover		60	2.14
Trefoil		68	2.43
Flowers		58	2.07
Total	28	262	2.34
SD			1.05
SEM			0.26
P (haylage)			0.425
Experiment 3[*]			
Ryegrass		219	1.24
Clover		229	1.30[d]
Flowers		432	2.26[a]
Total	48	880	1.60
SD			1.09
SEM			0.07
P (forage)			< 0.001

[*] For experiment 3, different letters indicate significant differences from ryegrass control according to Dunnetts test ([a]$P < 0.001$, [d]$P < 0.10$)

661

Fig 1. Relationships between methane production (g/d), determined using GreenFeed (GF) and respiration chamber (RC) techniques, of individual dairy heifers in experiments 1 (open circle symbol; $n = 8$) and 2 (closed triangle symbol; $n = 16$). Solid line indicates y = x. Lin's Concordance value for both experiments combined = 0.1043.

667

668

Fig 2. Comparison of methane emission rate (g/h; minute average) measured using GreenFeed (GF; open square symbol) and respiration chambers (RC; closed diamond symbol) for all dairy heifers in experiments 1 (n = 8) and 2 (n =16). There were 56 d GF and 32 d RC measurements for experiment 1, and 112 d GF and 64 d RC for experiment 2. Arrows indicate time of feeding.

y = 0.41x + 73.1
$r^2 = 0.40$
P < 0.001

Fig 3. Relationship between methane production (g/d), determined using GreenFeed (GF) and sulphur hexafluoride tracer (SF_6) techniques, of individual dairy heifers in experiment 3 ($n = 136$). Solid line indicates y = x. Lin's Concordance value = 0.6017.

Fig 4. Diurnal pattern of GreenFeed (GF) visitation (methane measurements) over 24 h, as a percentage of total visits, by growing dairy cattle of experiments 1 (120 GF visits/14 d), 2 (262 GF visits/28 d) and 3 (880 GF visits/48 d).