

Scotland's Rural College

## The impact of divergent breed types and diets on methane emissions, rumen characteristics and performance of finishing beef cattle

Duthie, C-A; Haskell, MJ; Hyslop, JJ; Waterhouse, A; Wallace, RJ; Roehe, R; Rooke, JA

*Published in:*  
Animal

*DOI:*  
[10.1017/S1751731117000301](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731117000301)

First published: 22/02/2017

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Duthie, C.-A., Haskell, MJ., Hyslop, JJ., Waterhouse, A., Wallace, RJ., Roehe, R., & Rooke, JA. (2017). The impact of divergent breed types and diets on methane emissions, rumen characteristics and performance of finishing beef cattle. *Animal*, 11(10), 1762 - 1771. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731117000301>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**The impact of divergent breed types and diets on methane emissions, rumen characteristics and performance of finishing beef cattle**

C-A. Duthie<sup>1</sup>, M. Haskell<sup>2</sup>, J.J. Hyslop<sup>3</sup>, A. Waterhouse<sup>1</sup>, R.J. Wallace<sup>4</sup>, R. Roehe<sup>1</sup> and J.A. Rooke<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Beef and Sheep Research Centre, Future Farming Systems Group, SRUC, Kings Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Animal Behaviour and Welfare, Animal and Veterinary Sciences Group, SRUC, Kings Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG, UK*

<sup>3</sup>*Beef and Sheep Select, SAC Consulting Ltd., SRUC, Kings Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG, UK*

<sup>4</sup>*Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill, Aberdeen AB16 5BD, UK*

Corresponding author: Carol-Anne Duthie. E-mail: Carol-Anne.Duthie@sruc.ac.uk

Short title: Methane emissions and performance of beef cattle

26 **Abstract**

27 This study was undertaken to further develop our understanding of the links between  
28 breed, diet and the rumen microbial community and determine their effect on  
29 production characteristics and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from beef cattle. The  
30 experiment was of a two × two factorial design, comprising two breeds (CHX,  
31 crossbred Charolais; LU, purebred Luing) and two diets (concentrate-straw or silage-  
32 based). In total, 80 steers were used and balanced for sire within each breed, farm of  
33 origin, and BW across diets. The diets (fed as total mixed rations) consisted of (g/kg  
34 dry matter (DM)) forage to concentrate ratios of either 500:500 (Mixed) or 79:921  
35 (Concentrate). Steers were adapted to the diets over a four week period and  
36 performance and feed efficiency were then measured over a 56 day test period.  
37 Directly after the 56 day test, CH<sub>4</sub> and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions were  
38 measured (six steers / week) over a 13 week period. Compared to LU steers, CHX  
39 steers had greater average daily gain (ADG;  $P<0.05$ ) and significantly ( $P<0.001$ )  
40 lower residual feed intake. CHX steers had superior conformation and fatness scores  
41 ( $P<0.001$ ) than LU steers. Although steers consumed, on a DM basis, more  
42 Concentrate than Mixed diet ( $P<0.01$ ), there were no differences between diets in  
43 either ADG or feed efficiency during the 56 day test. At slaughter, however,  
44 Concentrate-fed steers were heavier ( $P<0.05$ ) and had greater carcass weights than  
45 Mixed-fed steers ( $P<0.001$ ). Breed of steer did not influence CH<sub>4</sub> production, but it  
46 was substantially lower when the Concentrate rather than Mixed diet was fed  
47 ( $P<0.001$ ). Rumen fluid from Concentrate-fed steers contained greater proportions of  
48 propionic acid ( $P<0.001$ ) and lower proportions of acetic acid ( $P<0.001$ ), fewer  
49 archaea ( $P<0.01$ ) and protozoa ( $P=0.09$ ) but more *Clostridium* Cluster XIVa ( $P<0.01$ )  
50 and *Bacteroides* plus *Prevotella* ( $P<0.001$ ) than Mixed-fed steers. When the CH<sub>4</sub> to

51 CO<sub>2</sub> molar ratio was considered as a proxy method for CH<sub>4</sub> production (g/kg DM  
52 intake), only weak relationships were found within diets. In conclusion, while feeding  
53 Concentrate and Mixed diets produced substantial differences in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and  
54 rumen characteristics, differences in performance were influenced more markedly by  
55 breed.

56

57 **Keywords:** beef cattle, concentrate, forage, methane, performance

58

### 59 **Implications**

60 The effects of diet and breed on steer performance and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions  
61 were measured. Methane emissions on a high concentrate (920 g/kg DM) diet were  
62 less (0.68) when compared to a mixed forage / concentrate (500 g/kg DM) diet.  
63 Although energy lost as CH<sub>4</sub> was reduced on the high concentrate diet, animal  
64 performance and carcass quality did not differ between diets. The CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio in  
65 expired air did not relate well to daily CH<sub>4</sub> production and may therefore have limited  
66 use as a proxy for daily CH<sub>4</sub> production.

67

### 68 **Introduction**

69 Ruminant livestock systems are under continued political pressure to reduce their  
70 greenhouse gas (GHG) outputs. Worldwide, beef production systems generate 2.9  
71 Mt of CO<sub>2</sub>-Equivalent emissions per year and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions accounted for 44% of  
72 total GHG emissions (Gerber *et al.*, 2013b). The global human population is  
73 expected to exceed 9 billion by 2050, with meat consumption projected to increase  
74 by more than 75% compared to 2005 (Alexandratos and Bruinsma, 2012). Achieving

75 this level of production, whilst reducing the environmental impact of ruminant  
76 livestock production, represents a considerable challenge.

77 Ruminants play a crucial role in food security, being able to convert forages  
78 and non-human edible food into products for human consumption through enteric  
79 fermentation of cellulosic carbohydrates. However, enteric fermentation is the main  
80 source of ruminant emissions, as CH<sub>4</sub> is one end product of the microbial digestion  
81 process. Methane formation in the rumen depends both on a supply of hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>)  
82 from fermentation of feed by bacteria and protozoa and the subsequent conversion of  
83 H<sub>2</sub> and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) to CH<sub>4</sub> by methanogenic archaea. Enteric CH<sub>4</sub>  
84 emissions also represent a loss of gross energy to the animal (estimated at 6-10%),  
85 which could be used by the animal for production (e.g. deposition of lean meat)  
86 (Cottle *et al.*, 2011; Gerber *et al.*, 2013a and 2013b). Understanding the mechanisms  
87 of methanogenesis and the microorganisms involved is important for devising  
88 sustainable mitigation strategies to lower the environmental impact of ruminant  
89 livestock production.

90 Recently Rooke *et al.* (2014) reported that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were less (0.62 of  
91 mixed diet) when a diet containing 900 g concentrates / kg dry matter (DM)  
92 (concentrate diet) was fed compared to a diet containing 500 g concentrates /kg DM  
93 (mixed diet); further, rumen microbial communities were influenced by the genotype  
94 and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions by the sire of cattle (Roehe *et al.*, 2016). In the same study,  
95 Wallace *et al.* (2014) demonstrated a positive relationship between the relative  
96 abundance of archaea in rumen samples taken at slaughter and the quantities of CH<sub>4</sub>  
97 produced by individual animals. Furthermore, Wallace *et al.* (2015) has previously  
98 demonstrated the influence of microbial communities on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, and Roehe  
99 *et al.* (2016) the impact of the host genetics on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Although accurate

100 measurements of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions using respiration chambers are required to develop  
101 and test the effectiveness of CH<sub>4</sub> mitigation strategies, for genetic selection of cattle  
102 producing lower CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, methods capable of screening large numbers of  
103 animals are required such as sampling animals at slaughter (Wallace *et al.*, 2014). In  
104 the present study, the same nutritional strategy of Rooke *et al.* (2014) was used. The  
105 hypotheses addressed were that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions expressed on a live-weight gain or  
106 carcass yield basis would be lower on a high concentrate diet and that differences  
107 between breeds in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions would be greater when genetically more diverse  
108 breeds of cattle (Charolais and Luings) were tested.

109

## 110 **Material and methods**

111 This study was conducted at the Beef and Sheep Research Centre, SRUC, UK. The  
112 experiment was approved by the Animal Experiment Committee of SRUC and was  
113 conducted in accordance with the requirements of the UK Animals (Scientific  
114 Procedures) Act 1986.

115

### 116 *Experimental design, animals and diets*

117 The experiment was of a two × two factorial design, comprising two breeds (CHX,  
118 crossbred Charolais; LU, purebred Luings) and two diets (concentrate-based or  
119 silage-based). The breed types were selected to represent two commercially relevant  
120 breeds where CHX cattle represent a beef breed known for fast growth and excellent  
121 carcass conformation, whilst the LU breed is a more extensively managed hardy hill  
122 and upland breed. Two diets (as total mixed rations) were generated using a diet  
123 mixing wagon and consisted of (g/kg DM) forage to concentrate ratios of either  
124 500:500 (Mixed) or 79:921 (Concentrate). The ingredient and chemical composition

125 of the experimental diets are given in Table 1 and the chemical composition of  
126 individual components in Table 2. The DM contents of individual components were  
127 determined on duplicate samples twice weekly. Bulk feed samples (four per  
128 component) were analysed for DM, ash, crude protein, acid detergent fibre, neutral  
129 detergent fibre, acid hydrolysed ether extract (AHEE), starch and neutral cellulase  
130 and gammanase digestibility (NCGD) (Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food,  
131 1992) and gross energy by adiabatic bomb calorimetry. ME values (Thomas, 2004),  
132 were either estimated from near infra red spectroscopy (silage and whole crop barley  
133 silage), from NCGD and AHEE (barley and wheat distillers dark grains) or from  
134 tabulated values for feed composition (straw and molasses).

135 In total, 80 steers were used (n=40 per diet) and each diet was allocated to  
136 two pens (four pens in total; 20 steers per pen). Pens were balanced for sire within  
137 each breed, farm of origin and BW and were balanced across diets at the start of the  
138 experiment. Fresh water was provided *ad libitum* using a water trough, and diets  
139 were offered at approximately 1.05 times average daily intake to all steers using 32  
140 electronic feeders (HOKO, Insentec, Marknesse, The Netherlands). All steers were  
141 bedded on wood fibre and sawdust to ensure that consumption of bedding did not  
142 contribute to nutrient intake. All steers were fed the Mixed diet before being adapted  
143 to diets. Steers allocated the Concentrate diet, were adapted to the full concentrate  
144 inclusion over four weeks. Forage to concentrate ratios were increased at weekly  
145 intervals such that ratios of 38:62, 25:75, 13:87 and 8:92 were offered during  
146 adaptation. During this period, steers were trained to use the electronic feed intake  
147 recording equipment.

148

149 *56-day performance test*

150 After adaptation to the experimental diets, performance and feed efficiency were  
151 characterised for all steers over a 56 day test period (day 0 to day 56). Animals were  
152 maintained under controlled conditions, where group sizes within the pen remained  
153 constant. Individual DM intakes (DMI, kg/day) were recorded for each animal using  
154 the electronic feeding equipment and BW measured weekly before fresh feed was  
155 offered using a calibrated weigh scale. Ultrasonic fat depth was obtained at the  
156 12th/13th rib at the start (FD0) and end (FD1) of the 56 day test using industry-  
157 standard equipment (Aloka 500, BCF Technology LTD, Scotland, UK). Images were  
158 analysed using Matrox Inspector 8 software (Matrox Video and Imaging Technology  
159 Europe Ltd., Middlesex, UK).

160

#### 161 *Emissions measurement in respiration chambers*

162 Directly after the 56 day performance test, 72 steers were allocated to six respiration  
163 chambers over a 12 week period using a randomised block design (six chambers  
164 times four weeks) which was repeated three times. Within each block, each  
165 treatment of the two × two factorial (breed × diet) experimental design was replicated  
166 once in each respiration chamber. Steers were allocated to blocks to minimise  
167 variation in BW (mean BW (kg) 617, SEM 6.6) on entry to the respiration chambers.  
168 The steers remained in the respiration chambers for three days, during which time  
169 they were fed once daily and had *ad-libitum* access to feed. Data for DMI during the  
170 three day chamber measurement period were averaged per animal. One chamber  
171 malfunctioned during weeks 6 to 10, which resulted in the requirement for an  
172 additional week of chamber measurement; thus measurements were made from 73  
173 steers.

174 Full details of the six indirect open-circuit respiration chambers (No Pollution  
175 Industrial Systems Ltd., Edinburgh, UK) and their operation are given in Rooke *et al.*  
176 (2014) and Troy *et al.* (2015). In addition to CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were also  
177 measured by infrared absorption spectroscopy (MGA3000, Analytical Development  
178 Co. Ltd., Hoddesdon, UK) after calibration with a gas mixture of known composition.  
179 Prior to the beginning of the experiment, gas recoveries were measured by releasing  
180 CO<sub>2</sub> at a constant rate into each chamber. To accustom the steers to the chamber  
181 environment, six days prior to chamber measurements groups of steers were moved  
182 to the building in which chambers were located and loose-housed in single pens (4 ×  
183 3 m) of identical design to pens within the chambers. After six days, the steers were  
184 then moved to the chambers and remained there for 72 h, with CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>  
185 measurements recorded in the final 48 h used in further analysis. Steers were fed (at  
186 approximately 1.05 times average daily intake) once daily and weight of feed within  
187 the bins recorded at 10 sec intervals using load cells. Front doors of chambers were  
188 briefly opened at about 08.00 h daily to remove feed bins and again to replace bins  
189 with fresh feed at approximately 09.00 h. The pens were cleaned daily between  
190 08.00 and 09.00 h. The exact times when doors were opened were recorded.

191

#### 192 *Rumen sampling, volatile fatty acid and microbial analyses*

193 Immediately after the steers (within two hours) left the respiration chambers, samples  
194 of rumen fluid were obtained (one per animal) by inserting a tube (16 × 2700 mm  
195 Equivet Stomach Tube, Jørgen Kruuse A/S, Langeskov, Denmark) nasally and  
196 aspirating manually. Approximately 50 mL fluid were strained through two layers of  
197 muslin and samples prepared for VFA analysis and DNA extraction prior to storage at  
198 -20 °C as previously described (Rooke *et al.*, 2014). Similarly, DNA extraction was

199 carried out using a method based on repeated bead beating plus column filtration  
200 and qPCR methodology to quantify relative abundance of microbial groups in rumen  
201 samples (Rooke *et al.*, 2014).

202

### 203 *Pre-slaughter measurements and carcass quality*

204 Other than for measurements of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions within the respiration chamber  
205 facility, steers remained within the same pens from the end of the 56 day test to  
206 slaughter. All steers remained on the same diet throughout the experiment. On the  
207 day before slaughter, ultrasonic fat depth (FD2) at the 12th/13th rib was measured in  
208 all steers as described above. Steers were slaughtered in five batches of 6, 21, 18,  
209 15 and 19 steers on days 71, 92, 113, 134 and 155, respectively. Steers were  
210 selected for slaughter based on BW and visual assessment of fatness. Steers had  
211 access to feed until they left the premises. The steers were transported  
212 (approximately 1 h) to a commercial abattoir and slaughtered within 2 h of arrival.  
213 Cattle were stunned using a captive bolt, exsanguinated and subject to low voltage  
214 electrical stimulation. Following hide removal, carcasses were split in half down the  
215 mid-line and dressed to UK specification (see Meat and Livestock Commercial  
216 Services Limited beef authentication manual, [www. mlcsl.co.uk](http://www.mlcsl.co.uk), for full description).  
217 EUROP conformation and fat classifications (Fisher, 2007), based on the UK scale,  
218 were allocated to all carcasses through visual assessment using a trained assessor.

219 Video Image Analysis (VIA) was used to estimate EUROP classifications  
220 (conformation and fat), total lean (kg) and total fat (kg) content of the whole carcass.  
221 The VIA systems in use in the EU are automatic machines that perform carcass  
222 evaluation based on images of the half carcass. The VBS 2000 system used in this  
223 study (E+V technology GmbH, Oranienburg, Germany) has been approved by the

224 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) for use in the UK since  
225 2010. The system operated at the end of the slaughter line after all necessary  
226 dressing and trimming had been completed. A pneumatically operated cradle  
227 presented the left half side of each carcass for imaging. The VIA camera took two  
228 images of the half carcass, a 2-dimensional image and a pseudo 3-dimensional  
229 image using structured light (Craigie *et al.*, 2012). The VBS 2000 required  
230 information on the category of the carcass (i.e., steer) and hot carcass weight (kg)  
231 and, by combining this information with data automatically captured by the VIA  
232 system (i.e., carcass dimensions, angles, areas, colour), predicted EUROP  
233 classification and total lean and fat content of the whole carcass.

234

#### 235 *Calculations and statistical analysis*

236 Data from two steers during the 56 day test period and one steer at slaughter were  
237 unavailable as the animals were removed from the trial for health reasons  
238 unconnected to the diets imposed. Growth was modelled by linear regression of BW  
239 against test date, to obtain ADG, mid-test BW (mid-BW) and mid-test metabolic BW  
240 (mid-MBW,  $BW^{0.75}$ ). Mean DMI over the 56 day period was expressed as kg/day or  
241 as a proportion of mid-BW and mid-MBW. Feed conversion ratio (FCR) was  
242 calculated as average DMI per day (kg/d) divided by ADG. Residual feed intake (RFI)  
243 was calculated as deviation of actual DMI (kg/d) from DMI predicted based on linear  
244 regression of actual DMI on ADG, mid-MBW and FD1 (Basarab *et al.*, 2003). Cold  
245 carcass weight (CCW) was calculated as a percentage of slaughter BW (SBW) to  
246 determine killing out percentage (KO). To allow for statistical comparison, the  
247 EUROP carcass classification values were expressed on the equivalent 15 point  
248 scale (Kempster *et al.*, 1986). Statistical analyses of performance and carcass data

249 were conducted using the mixed procedure of SAS software with the fixed effects of  
250 breed and diet, and the random effect of pen (and slaughter batch for carcass traits).  
251 In addition, in the analysis of FD1 and FD2 the deviation from the breed mean of FD0  
252 was included as a covariable. The interaction effects of breed x diet were included in  
253 the model when these effects proved significant ( $P<0.05$ ).

254 The respiration chamber measurements from three steers were discarded as  
255 the DMI decreased substantially ( $> 30\%$ ) whilst being housed in the respiration  
256 chamber, leaving data from a total of 70 individual steers. Rumen fluid samples were  
257 not obtained for two steers and therefore 68 individual animal observations were  
258 available. Data were analysed using SAS software using linear mixed models. The  
259 fixed effects were breed and diet, while the random effects were week and chamber.  
260 The effect of the breed x diet interaction was also included in the model when this  
261 proved significant ( $P<0.05$ ).

262 Data are reported as means with their SEM unless indicated otherwise.  
263 Differences between means were tested using a least square means comparison  
264 test. Probability values were deemed significant where  $P<0.05$  and indicated a  
265 tendency when probability values were between  $P=0.05$  and  $P=0.1$ . The numbers of  
266 steers in treatments are given in each Table for clarity.

267

## 268 **Results**

### 269 *Performance test*

270 Although there were no differences in age at the start of the trial, CHX steers were  
271 significantly ( $P<0.001$ ) heavier than LU steers (Table 3). However, there were no  
272 differences between breeds in daily DMI and therefore on a BW basis, LU steers  
273 consumed more DM (g/kg BW or  $\text{g/kg}^{0.75}$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) than CHX steers. Compared to

274 LU steers, CHX steers had greater ADG ( $P<0.05$ ) throughout the performance trial  
275 and lower FD1 ( $P<0.01$ ) at the end of the trial. CHX steers were more efficient than  
276 LU steers as measured by numerically lower FCR and significantly ( $P<0.001$ ) lower  
277 RFI than LU steers.

278 Although steers consumed more of the Concentrate than Mixed diet ( $P<0.01$ ),  
279 there were no differences between diets in either ADG or feed efficiency (expressed  
280 as either FCR or RFI). Fat depth (FD1) tended to be lower ( $P=0.06$ ) on the  
281 Concentrate than Mixed diet.

282

### 283 *Carcass traits*

284 CHX steers were superior to LU steers for most carcass traits recorded (Table 4).  
285 Thus, CHX were heavier at slaughter with greater KO resulting in greater CCW (all  
286  $P<0.001$ ). Regardless of measurement method, CHX steers had superior  
287 conformation and fatness scores ( $P<0.001$ ) which were reflected in greater carcass  
288 meat and lower carcass fat yields (predicted by VIA).

289 Concentrate-fed steers were heavier at slaughter ( $P<0.05$ ) and had greater  
290 CCW than Mixed-fed steers ( $P<0.001$ ). Although there were no differences in  
291 carcass scores when visually assessed, the VIA system predicted superior  
292 conformation scores ( $P<0.05$ ) and meat yields ( $P<0.01$ ) for Concentrate-fed steers.

293

### 294 *Methane and carbon dioxide production*

295 Breed of steer did not influence either CH<sub>4</sub> or CO<sub>2</sub> production. Methane production  
296 (Table 5), whether expressed as g/day, g/kg DMI or kJ/MJ GE intake, was  
297 substantially lower when the Concentrate rather than the Mixed diet was fed

298 ( $P<0.001$ ). There were no differences between diets in total daily CO<sub>2</sub> production but  
299 CO<sub>2</sub> production expressed as g/kg DMI was greater when the Mixed diet was fed.

300 The ratio of CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> production (mole/mole) was greater on the Mixed than  
301 Concentrate diet ( $P<0.001$ ). Although, there was a strong linear relationship between  
302 CH<sub>4</sub> production (g/kg DMI) and CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> molar ratio ( $P<0.001$ ) when all animals  
303 were considered, this was largely due to between–diet differences as within diets, the  
304 relationships were much weaker (Fig. 1). However, and irrespective of whether data  
305 from all animals were considered together or within diets, essentially most of the  
306 variation in CH<sub>4</sub> (g/kg DMI) was explained when both CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio and CO<sub>2</sub>  
307 production (g/kg DMI) were included in models.

308

309 Overall: CH<sub>4</sub> (g/kgDMI) = 159 (16.3) CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> molar ratio + 0.0099 (0.00135) CO<sub>2</sub>  
310 (g/kg DMI);  $r^2$  0.74,  $P<0.001$ .

311

### 312 *Rumen fluid VFA and microbial populations*

313 Rumen fluid from Concentrate-fed steers (Table 6) contained greater proportions of  
314 propionic and valeric (both  $P<0.001$ ) acids but lower proportions of acetic ( $P<0.001$ )  
315 and butyric ( $P<0.01$ ) acids than Mixed-fed steers. There were no differences in VFA  
316 between breeds. Breed did not influence rumen microbial populations (Table 6).  
317 Rumen fluid from Concentrate-fed steers had a lower abundance of archaea  
318 ( $P<0.01$ ) and protozoa ( $P=0.09$ ) but more bacteria ( $P<0.001$ ). There were no  
319 differences between diets in abundance of *Clostridium* Cluster IV in rumen fluid, but  
320 rumen fluid from Concentrate-fed steers contained more *Clostridium* Cluster XIVa  
321 and *Bacteroides* plus *Prevotella* than Mixed-fed steers. When the relationship  
322 between CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (g/kg DMI) and archaea populations (expressed as ratio of

323 archaea to total bacteria, Wallace *et al.*, 2014) was explored the relationship was  
324 significant ( $P<0.001$ , Fig. 2) but when the Mixed and Concentrate diets were  
325 considered individually the relationships were weaker and only significant ( $P<0.05$ )  
326 for the Concentrate diet.

327

## 328 **Discussion**

### 329 *Performance*

330 *Diets.* There were few differences in performance traits between the Mixed (500 g  
331 concentrate DM / kg total DM) and Concentrate diets in the present study. Feed  
332 intake was significantly and ADG numerically greater for the Concentrate than Mixed  
333 diet but neither FCR nor RFI differed between diets. Since there were also few  
334 differences in carcass composition, after differences in slaughter weight were  
335 accounted for, there was little evidence for any underlying differences between diets  
336 in the energy content of deposited tissue. These results are similar to the study of  
337 Duthie *et al.* (2016) who used the same breeds and similar diets and experimental  
338 protocols to the present study. Thus, FCR did not differ between diets and there was  
339 little evidence of differences in carcass composition particularly fat content in either  
340 study and therefore, there was no advantage to the Concentrate diet in animal  
341 performance either in BW, CCW or energetic terms. This lack of difference between  
342 diets is in contrast to the expectation from the literature. For example, Lovett *et al.*  
343 (2003) reported that heifers offered a concentrate diet (900 g concentrate / kg DM)  
344 consumed similar DMI but grew faster (1.1 v. 0.8 kg/d) and had superior FCR (8.5 v.  
345 11.4 kg DMI/ kg ADG) than heifers fed a 600 g concentrate / kg DM diet. The  
346 predicted efficiencies of utilisation of metabolisable energy for growth (AFRC 1993;  
347 0.50 and 0.54 for Mixed and Concentrate diets) would suggest that the Concentrate

348 diet could support superior performance and the higher molar proportion of propionic  
349 acid on the Concentrate diet would have supplied more precursors for  
350 gluconeogenesis and lean tissue deposition. A likely explanation for the lack of  
351 difference between the two diets is that the numerically greater ADG for steers fed  
352 the Concentrate diet were the maximum ADG possible.

353

354 *Breeds.* The differences in performance between CHX and LU in the present study  
355 were similar to Duthie *et al.* (2016). That is, the CHX steers had greater daily ADG  
356 and superior FCR. The differences between breeds in slaughter characteristics were  
357 also similar between studies; CHX had greater carcass weights and superior EUROP  
358 conformation (visually assessed or predicted from VIA) and lower fat depth. In the  
359 present study, the quantitative differences between the breeds in performance were  
360 lower. In particular, in Duthie *et al.* (2016) LU steers had greater DMI than CHX, but  
361 there were no differences in the present study. The reason for this difference is likely  
362 that in Duthie *et al.* (2016), steers entered the performance study at the same BW but  
363 LU steers were approximately 30 days older and thus nearer maturity especially  
364 since LU steers would reach maturity at a younger age than CHX. In this context, if  
365 LU are classified as a medium maturing cattle type compared to the CHX, a late  
366 maturing type, then from AFRC (1993) the energy value of gain would be 22.2 and  
367 23.3 MJ/kg ADG for CHX and LU respectively. Using these values, the net energy  
368 requirements for the observed ADG of 36.8 and 36.6 MJ net energy / day for CHX  
369 and LU respectively are little different. Thus in terms of energy efficiency there is little  
370 difference between the breeds.

371

372 *Methane emissions*

373 *Diets*. In an experiment of similar design to that reported here (Rooke *et al.*, 2014)  
374 but using different breeds of cattle, mean CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (g/kg DMI) were similar  
375 (present experiment v. Rooke *et al.*, 2014; Concentrate, 13.9 v. 13.6; Mixed, 20.4 v.  
376 21.8). This difference between diets was consistent with both the literature (Hristov *et*  
377 *al.*, 2013) and the observed changes in VFA proportions: increased molar proportions  
378 of propionate (hydrogen consuming) and decrease proportions of acetate (hydrogen  
379 producing) on the Concentrate diet. Based on many studies, equations to predict CH<sub>4</sub>  
380 yield which include the proportion of concentrate in the diet have been developed.  
381 The equation of Sauvant and Giger-Reverdin (2009) predicted CH<sub>4</sub> yields (expressed  
382 as kJ CH<sub>4</sub> / MJ total GE) of 48 and 79 kJ CH<sub>4</sub> /MJ GE intake for the Concentrate and  
383 Mixed diets respectively compared to observed means of 42 and 60. The more  
384 recent equation for non-lactating cattle developed by Hristov *et al.* (2013) produced  
385 values of 59 and 65 kJ CH<sub>4</sub> / MJ GE intake. Both equations thus over-predicted CH<sub>4</sub>  
386 produced from the Concentrate diet. This may be because of under-representation or  
387 absence of high concentrate diets from the prediction data sets. Rooke *et al.* (2014)  
388 noted that the value of 39 kJ CH<sub>4</sub> / MJ GE for the Concentrate was higher than  
389 values observed for North American feedlot diets (20 – 30 kJ MJ CH<sub>4</sub> / MJ GE) based  
390 on maize grain and that this was due to the greater cell wall concentration in barley  
391 grain (Beauchemin *et al.*, 2005; Doreau *et al.*, 2011). For the Mixed diet, the value  
392 predicted by Hristov *et al.* (2013) was in closer agreement with the observed value  
393 than that from Sauvant and Giger-Reverdin (2009) likely because the Hristov *et al.*  
394 (2013) equation included terms for NDF and ether extract which more accurately  
395 described the nutrient composition of the diet.

396 Breed had no overall effect on CH<sub>4</sub> yield in the present experiment. This was  
397 in agreement with our own (Rooke *et al.*, 2014; Duthie *et al.*, 2015; Troy *et al.*, 2015)

398 and other previous studies (Boadi and Wittenberg 2002; Fraser *et al.*, 2014;  
399 Richmond *et al.*, 2015) using different breeds. However, Hristov *et al.* (2013) have  
400 argued that emissions intensity (CH<sub>4</sub> produced per unit animal product) most  
401 accurately represented the potential of a mitigation strategy. Since detailed animal  
402 performance records and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were measured in this experiment, it was  
403 appropriate to estimate emissions intensities for the diets fed. In so-doing the  
404 limitations imposed by recording animal performance, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and carcass  
405 characteristics consecutively should be noted. As an example, feed intakes  
406 expressed as a proportion of BW were greater during the performance trial than the  
407 CH<sub>4</sub> measurement period and therefore CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (g/kg DMI) during the  
408 performance measurement would likely have been less than those measured later  
409 (e.g. Sauvant and Giger-Reverdin 2009). Table 7 shows that whilst the difference  
410 between diets within breed remained relatively independent of the method of  
411 measurement, the effect of breed was substantial particularly when CH<sub>4</sub> emissions  
412 were based on carcass and estimated meat weights with the LU cattle fed the Mixed  
413 diet producing nearly twice the amount of CH<sub>4</sub> on a carcass meat basis than CHX  
414 cattle fed the Concentrate diet.

415

416 *Rumen microbiota.* In Rooke *et al.* (2014), there was a significant relationship  
417 between archaea populations (ratio of archaea to total bacteria) and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions  
418 (Wallace *et al.*, 2014) and there were also differences in rumen microbiota between  
419 breeds (Rooke *et al.*, 2014). In the present study, there was a similar relationship  
420 between CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and archaeal populations (Fig. 2) to Wallace *et al.* (2014)  
421 where the relationship was positive and significant for the Concentrate but not the  
422 Mixed diet, suggesting that the archaea populations and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were limited

423 by available hydrogen on the Concentrate diet (Janssen, 2010). However, in contrast  
424 to Rooke *et al.* (2014) there were no differences in rumen microbiota or CH<sub>4</sub>  
425 emissions between breeds of cattle. This was despite the fact that the breeds used in  
426 the present experiment (CHX and LU) were more genetically divergent than the  
427 genotypes used by Rooke *et al.* (2014; Limousin x Aberdeen Angus and Aberdeen  
428 Angus x Limousin). A possible explanation for this difference may be the source of  
429 the cattle used. Whereas the steers used by Rooke *et al.* (2014) were raised on the  
430 farm in which the experiment was carried out, in the present experiment, steers were  
431 obtained from nine different farms. It is thus possible that the different farm  
432 environments the cattle used in the present experiment were derived from had a  
433 greater effect on rumen microbiota than differences between breeds.

434

#### 435 *Methane and carbon dioxide emissions*

436 Quantifying CH<sub>4</sub> emissions using respiration chambers is a costly and relatively low  
437 throughput procedure and there is therefore considerable interest in establishing  
438 proxy procedures which are low cost, more rapid and more applicable to the normal  
439 farm environment. A possible option within dairy systems is the measurement of CH<sub>4</sub>  
440 and CO<sub>2</sub> concurrently from sampling points for example in the dairy parlour (Lassen  
441 *et al.*, 2012; Bell *et al.*, 2014b). Both the above studies concluded that the CH<sub>4</sub> to  
442 CO<sub>2</sub> phenotype was repeatable. It was proposed by Madsen *et al.* (2010) that by  
443 calculating heat production by the animal and converting heat production to CO<sub>2</sub>  
444 production, CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios could be converted to daily CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. However  
445 Bell *et al.* (2014b) found only a poor relationship between average CO<sub>2</sub> production  
446 estimated according to Madsen *et al.* (2010) and measured CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.  
447 Factors proposed to explain this lack of agreement by Bell *et al.* (2014b) were animal

448 to animal variation including differences in diurnal pattern of CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio, feed  
449 intake and fasting heat production itself. This is confirmed in the present study where  
450 measurements were made over a 48 h period thus excluding short-term changes in  
451 breath CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. Further, since all animals were gaining weight,  
452 CO<sub>2</sub> derived from body tissue mobilisation would not have influenced the results. The  
453 diets fed influenced CO<sub>2</sub> production and therefore CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio with CO<sub>2</sub>  
454 production (g/kg DMI) being greater for the Mixed diet as expected from differences  
455 in VFA pattern. More importantly and particularly within diets, the correlation between  
456 CH<sub>4</sub> production (g/kg DMI) and CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio was poor (Fig. 1) but variation in  
457 CO<sub>2</sub> production in conjunction with CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio explained most of the variation in  
458 CH<sub>4</sub> production. Thus although the phenotype of CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio may be  
459 repeatable, the present experiment suggests that it may not relate well to daily CH<sub>4</sub>  
460 production because of animal to animal variation in extent of digestion, efficiency of  
461 utilisation of absorbed nutrients and tissue CO<sub>2</sub> turnover.

462

## 463 **Conclusions**

464 This large scale, integrative study reported animal performance including carcass  
465 characteristics together with measurement of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and characterised  
466 rumen VFA and microbial abundance. In agreement with previous studies (Rooke *et*  
467 *al.*, 2014; Duthie *et al.*, 2016) CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were less (0.68 of mixed diet) when a  
468 high concentrate diet was fed compared to a mixed forage:concentrate diet.  
469 However, although energy lost as CH<sub>4</sub> was reduced by 18 KJ/MJ gross energy  
470 intake, there were no differences in animal performance or carcass characteristics  
471 between the diets fed. Although breed of steer had no effect on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, ADG  
472 was less and feed conversion efficiency was poorer for LU compared to CHX steers.

473 Assessment of the CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio as a proxy measurement for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions  
474 made using respiration chambers, suggests that the ratio may not relate well to daily  
475 CH<sub>4</sub> production because of animal to animal variation in digestion and utilisation of  
476 feed.

477

## 478 **Acknowledgements**

479 The authors are grateful to all support staff at SRUC's Beef and Sheep Research  
480 Centre and to Nest McKain at the Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, for their  
481 technical assistance. SRUC receives funding from Scottish Government's Rural and  
482 Environmental Science and Analytical Services Division. The research was funded  
483 by the Scottish Government and the UK Department for Environment, Food and  
484 Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the devolved administrations through the UK Agricultural  
485 Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Platform (<http://www.ghgplatform.org.uk>).

486

## 487 **References**

488 Agriculture and Food Research Council 1993. Energy and protein requirements of  
489 ruminants. An advisory manual prepared by the AFRC Technical Committee on  
490 Responses to Nutrients. CAB International, Wallingford.

491 Alexandratos N and Bruinsma J 2012. World agriculture towards 2030/2050: the  
492 2012 revision. ESA Working paper No. 12-03. Rome, FAO.

493 Basarab JA, Price MA, Aalhus JL, Okine EK, Snelling WM and Lyle KL 2003.  
494 Residual feed intake and body composition in young growing cattle. Canadian  
495 Journal of Animal Science 83, 189–204.

496 Beauchemin KA and McGinn SM 2005. Methane emissions from feedlot cattle fed  
497 barley or corn diets. Journal of Animal Science 83, 653-661.

498 Bell MJ, Potterton SL, Craigon J, Saunders N, Wilcox RH, Hunter M, Goodman JR  
499 and Garnsworthy PC 2014a. Variation in enteric methane emissions among  
500 cows on commercial dairy farms. *Animal* 8, 1540-1546.

501 Bell MJ, Saunders N, Wilcox RH, Homer EM, Goodman JR, Craigon J and  
502 Garnsworthy PC 2014b. Methane emissions among individual dairy cows during  
503 milking quantified by eructation peaks or ratio with carbon dioxide. *Journal of*  
504 *Dairy Science* 97, 6536-6546.

505 Boadi DA and Wittenberg KM 2002. Methane production from dairy and beef heifers  
506 fed forages differing in nutrient density using the sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)  
507 tracer gas technique. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science* 82, 201-206.

508 Cottle DJ, Nolan JV and Wiedemann SG 2011. Ruminant enteric methane mitigation:  
509 a review. *Animal Production Science* 51, 491-514.

510 Craigie CR, Navajas EA, Purchas RW, Maltin CA, Bunger L, Hoskin SO, Ross DW,  
511 Morris ST and Roehe R 2012. A review of the development and use of video  
512 image analysis (VIA) for beef carcass evaluation as an alternative to the current  
513 EUROP system and other subjective systems. *Meat Science* 92, 307-318.

514 Doreau M, van der Werf HMG, Micol D, Dubroeuq H, Agabriel J, Rochette Y and  
515 Martin C 2011. Enteric methane production and greenhouse gases balance of  
516 diets differing in concentrate in the fattening phase of a beef production system.  
517 *Journal of Animal Science* 89, 2518-2528.

518 Duthie C-A, Rooke JA, Hyslop JJ and Waterhouse A 2015. Methane emissions from  
519 two breeds of beef cows offered diets containing barley straw with either grass  
520 silage or brewers' grains. *Animal* 9, 1680-1687.

521 Duthie C-A, Rooke JA, Troy S, Hyslop JJ, Ross DW, Waterhouse A and Roehe R  
522 2016. Impact of adding nitrate or increasing the lipid content of two contrasting

523 diets on blood methaemoglobin and performance of two breeds of finishing beef  
524 steers. *Animal* 10, 786-795.

525 Fisher AL 2007. Beef carcass classification in the EU: an historical perspective. In:  
526 Lazzaroni, C., S. Gigli, and D. Gabiña. (Eds.), *Evaluation of Carcass and Meat*  
527 *Quality in Beef and Sheep*, Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen,  
528 pp.19–30. (EAAP publication No. 123).

529 Fraser MD, Fleming HR and Moorby JM 2014. Traditional vs modern: role of breed  
530 type in determining enteric methane emissions from cattle grazing as part of  
531 contrasting grassland-based systems. *Plos One* 9, e107861.

532 Garnsworthy PC, Craigon J, Hernandez-Medrano JH and Saunders N 2012.  
533 Variation among individual dairy cows in methane measurements made on farm  
534 during milking. *Journal of Dairy Science* 95, 3181-3189.

535 Gerber PJ, Hristov AN, Henderson B, Makkar H, Oh J, Lee C, Meinen R, Montes F,  
536 Ott T, Firkins J, Rotz A, Dell C, Adesogan AT, Yang WZ, Tricarico JM, Kebreab  
537 E, Waghorn G, Dijkstra J and Oosting S 2013a. Technical options for the  
538 mitigation of direct methane and nitrous oxide emissions from livestock: a  
539 review. *Animal* 7 (Supplement s2), 220–234.

540 Gerber PJ, Steinfeld H, Henderson B, Mottet A, Opio C, Dijkman J, Falcucci A and  
541 Tempio G 2013b. *Tackling climate change through livestock - A global*  
542 *assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities*, Food and Agriculture  
543 Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

544 Goopy JP, Robinson DL, Woodgate RT, Donaldson AJ, Oddy VH, Vercoe PE and  
545 Hegarty RS 2016. Estimates of repeatability and heritability of methane  
546 production in sheep using portable accumulation chambers. *Animal Production*  
547 *Science* 56, 116-122.

548 Grainger C and Beauchemin K 2011. Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants  
549 be lowered without lowering their production? *Animal Feed Science and*  
550 *Technology* 166-67, 308-320.

551 Hernandez-Sanabria E, Goonewardene LA, Wang Z, Zhou M, Moore SS and Guan  
552 LL 2013. Influence of Sire Breed on the Interplay among Rumen Microbial  
553 Populations Inhabiting the Rumen Liquid of the Progeny in Beef Cattle. *PLoS*  
554 *One* 8, e58461.

555 Hristov AN, Oh J, Lee C, Meinen R, Montes F, Ott T, Firkins J, Rotz A, Dell C,  
556 Adesogan A, Yang W, Tricarico J, Kebreab E, Waghorn G, Dijkstra J and  
557 Oosting S 2013. Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions in livestock production  
558 – A review of technical options for non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. (Ed. PJ Gerber, B  
559 Henderson B and HPS Makkar) *FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No.*  
560 *177*. FAO, Rome, Italy.

561 Janssen PH 2010. Influence of hydrogen on rumen methane formation and  
562 fermentation balances through microbial growth kinetics and fermentation  
563 thermodynamics. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 160, 1-22.

564 Kempster AJ, Cook GL and Grantley-Smith M 1986. National estimates of the body  
565 composition of British cattle, sheep and pigs with special reference to trends in  
566 fatness: a review. *Meat Science* 17, 107–138.

567 King EE, Smith RP, St-Pierre B and Wright AD 2011. Differences in the Rumen  
568 Methanogen Populations of Lactating Jersey and Holstein Dairy Cows under  
569 the Same Diet Regimen. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 77, 5682-  
570 5687.

571 Lassen J, Lovendahl P and Madsen J 2012. Accuracy of noninvasive breath  
572 methane measurements using Fourier transform infrared methods on individual  
573 cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* 95, 890-898.

574 Lovett D, Lovell S, Stack L, Callan J, Finlay M, Conolly J and O'Mara FP 2003. Effect  
575 of forage/concentrate ratio and dietary coconut oil level on methane output and  
576 performance of finishing beef heifers. *Livestock Production Science* 84, 135-  
577 146.

578 Madsen J, Bjerg BS, Hvelplund T, Weisbjerg MR and Lund P 2010. Methane and  
579 carbon dioxide ratio in excreted air for quantification of the methane production  
580 from ruminants. *Livestock Science* 129, 223-227.

581 Malmuthuge N, Griebel PJ, Guan IL 2014. Taxonomic identification of commensal  
582 bacteria associated with the mucosa and digesta throughout the gastrointestinal  
583 tracts of preweaned calves. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 80, 2021-  
584 2028.

585 Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1992. *Analysis of Agricultural*  
586 *Materials*, 2nd. Her Majesty's Stationary Office., London.

587 Pinares-Patino C, Hickey S, Young E, Dodds K, MacLean S, Molano G, Sandoval E,  
588 Kjestrup H, Harland R, Hunt C, Pickering N and McEwan J 2013. Heritability  
589 estimates of methane emissions from sheep. *Animal* 7, 316-321.

590 Richmond AS, Wylie ARG, Laidlaw AS and Lively FO 2014. Methane emissions from  
591 beef cattle grazing on semi-natural upland and improved lowland grasslands.  
592 *Animal* 9, 130-137.

593 Roehe R, Dewhurst RJ, Duthie C-A, Rooke JA, McKain N, Ross DW, Hyslop JJ,  
594 Waterhouse A, Freeman TC, Watson M and Wallace RJ 2016. Bovine host  
595 genetic variation influences rumen microbial methane production with best

596 selection criterion for low methane emitting and efficiently feed converting hosts  
597 based on metagenomic gene abundance . PLOS Genetics 12, e1005846.

598 Rooke JA Wallace RJ, Duthie C-A, McKain N, de Souza SM, Hyslop JJ, Ross DW,  
599 Waterhouse T and Roehe R 2014. Hydrogen and methane emissions from beef  
600 cattle and their rumen microbial community vary with diet, time after feeding and  
601 genotype British Journal of Nutrition, 112, 398-407.

602 Sauvant D and Giger-Reverdin S 2009. Modelling of digestive interactions and  
603 methane production in ruminants. Productions Animales 22, 375-384.

604 Troy SM, Duthie C-A, Hyslop JJ, Roehe R, Ross DW, Wallace RJ, Waterhouse A  
605 and Rooke JA 2015. Effectiveness of nitrate addition and increased oil content  
606 as methane mitigation strategies for beef cattle fed two contrasting basal diets.  
607 Journal of Animal Science 93, 1815-1823.

608 Wallace RJ, Rooke JA, Duthie C-A, Hyslop JJ, Ross DW, McKain N, de Souza SM,  
609 Snelling TJ, Waterhouse A and Roehe R 2014. Archaeal abundance in post-  
610 mortem ruminal digesta may help predict methane emissions from beef cattle.  
611 Scientific Reports 4, 5892.

612 Wallace RJ, Rooke JA, McKain N, Duthie C-A, Hyslop JJ, Ross DW, Waterhouse A,  
613 Watson M and Roehe R 2015. The rumen microbial metagenome associated  
614 with high methane production in cattle. BMC genomics 16, 839.

615 Yanez-Ruiz DR, Abecia L and Newbold CJ 2015. Manipulating rumen microbiome  
616 and fermentation through interventions during early life: a review. Frontiers in  
617 Microbiology 6, 1133.

618

619

620

621 **Table 1** *Ingredient composition and calculated chemical composition of experimental diets*

Diet	Mixed	Concentrate
Ingredient composition, g/kg DM <sup>1</sup>		
Grass silage	215	-
Whole crop barley silage	285	-
Barley straw	-	79
Barley	388	713
Wheat Distillers Dark Grains	103	175
Molasses	-	23
Minerals <sup>2</sup>	9	10
Chemical composition, g/kg DM <sup>3</sup>		
Dry matter (g/kg)	437	862
CP	138	135
ADF	207	112
NDF	337	248
AHEE	39	47
Starch	284	415
Ash	53	32
ME (MJ/kg DM)	12.0	12.8
GE (MJ/kg DM)	19.2	18.6

622 <sup>1</sup>Ingredient composition is the mean of the daily diets received by the animals across the  
 623 experiment.

624 <sup>2</sup>Contained (mg/kg): Fe, 6036; Mn, 2200; Zn, 2600; Iodine, 200; Co, 90; Cu, 2500; Se 30;  
 625 (µg/kg): vitamin E, 2000; vitamin B12, 1000; vitamin A, 151515; vitamin D, 2500

626 <sup>3</sup>Chemical composition is the mean of 4 analyses per diet, apart from DM which is the mean  
 627 of 44 analyses.

628 CP, crude protein; ADF, acid detergent fibre; NDF, neutral detergent fibre; AHEE, acid  
 629 hydrolysed ether extract; ME, metabolisable energy; GE, gross energy.

630

631

632

633 **Table 2** *Chemical composition of feeding stuffs (g/kg DM)*

	Grass silage	WCBS	Straw	Barley	WDG	Molasses
DM (g/kg)	288	298	830	862	851	786
CP	149	111	16	106	321	89
ADF	337	336	547	60	149	0
NDF	393	535	867	169	339	0
Starch	6.0	199.8	16.0	574.3	26.4	0.0
AHEE	37	17	14	33	126	0
Ash	91	66	37	22	58	134
NCGD (% DM)			45	89	78	
ME (MJ /kg DM)	11.9	9.9	6.3	13.3	14.1	12.7
GE (MJ /kg DM)	20.6	19.2	18.1	18.2	22.1	15.5
pH	4.2	4.3				

634 WCBS, whole crop barley silage; WDG, Wheat Distillers Dark Grains; DM, dry matter; CP,

635 crude protein; ADF, acid detergent fibre; NDF, neutral detergent fibre; AHEE, acid

636 hydrolysed ether extract; NCGD, neutral cellulase and gammanase digestibility; ME,

637 metabolisable energy; GE, gross energy

638

639

640

641

642 **Table 3** Effect of breed (B), diet (D) on growth, feed intake and feed efficiency of Charolais-sired (CHX) and purebred Luing (LU) steers fed  
 643 either a high concentrate (Concentrate) or mixed forage:concentrate (Mixed) diet during a 56-day performance trial

Diet	Mixed		Concentrate		SEM	Significance			
	CHX	LU	CHX	LU		B	D	B × D	
n of steers	19	19	21	19					
AgeST (days)	394	393	391	391	6.8				
Mid-test BW (kg)	540	476	560	477	13.3	***			
Mid-test MBW (kg <sup>0.75</sup> )	112	102	115	102	2.1	***			
ADG (kg/day)	1.59	1.49	1.73	1.63	0.228	*			
DMI (kg/day)	10.61	10.67	11.73	11.15	0.256		**		
DMI / BW (g/kg)	19.66	22.58	20.95	23.51	1.067	***			
DMI / MBW (g/kg <sup>0.75</sup> )	94.67	105.08	101.87	109.48	4.212	***			
FCR (kg DMI/ kg ADG)	6.74	7.26	6.84	6.97	0.210				
RFI (kg)	-0.643	0.091	0.148	0.427	0.4833	***		†	
FD1 (mm) <sup>1</sup>	6.60	7.74	5.98	7.05	0.341	**	†		

644 AgeST, Age at start of test; MBW, mid-test metabolic BW; ADG, average daily gain; DMI, dry matter intake; FCR, feed conversion ratio; RFI,  
 645 residual feed intake; FD1, fat depth at the 12/13th<sup>†</sup> rib at the end of the 56 d test; B×D, breed × diet

646 <sup>1</sup>Deviation from breed mean of FD0 (measured at start of 56-d performance test) fitted as covariable

647 \*\*\*, P<0.001; \*\*, P<0.01; \*, P<0.05; †, P<0.1.

648

649 **Table 4** Effect of breed (B) and, diet (D) and their interaction on carcass traits of Charolais-sired (CHX) and purebred Luig (LU) steers fed  
 650 either mixed forage-concentrate (Mixed) or high concentrate-based (Concentrate) diets

Diet	Mixed		Concentrate		SEM	Significance		
	CHX	LU	CHX	LU		B	D	B × D
n of steers	19	20	21	19				
FD2 (mm) <sup>1</sup>	6.92	9.50	7.57	10.4	0.42	***	†	
CCW (kg)	378	305	401	312	7.6	***	***	†
KO (%)	57.3	51.9	57.9	52.3	2.11	***		
SBW (kg)	661	588	694	597	9.3	***	*	
CONF	9.6	7.7	9.6	7.8	0.51	***		
FAT	8.6	10.6	9.3	10.5	0.64	***		†
CONF (VIA)	10.3	7.6	10.8	8.0	0.23	***	*	
FAT (VIA)	6.5	9.3	6.9	8.7	0.75	***		†
TOTAL FAT (kg)	28.03	36.18	34.14	33.75	3.771	*		*
TOTAL MEAT (kg)	270.2	204.7	283.5	214.8	8.95	***	**	

651 FD2, pre-slaughter fat depth at the 12/13<sup>th</sup> rib; CCW, cold carcass weight; KO, killing out %; SBW, slaughter BW; CONF, EUROP conformation  
 652 (15 pt scale) assigned by visual assessor; FAT, EUROP fatness (15pt scale) assigned by visual assessor; CONF (VIA), conformation grade  
 653 (15pt scale) assigned by VIA; FAT (VIA), fatness grade (15pt scale) assigned by VIA; TOTAL FAT; total fat content predicted by VIA; TOTAL  
 654 MEAT, total meat content predicted by VIA.

655 <sup>1</sup>Deviation from breed mean of FD0 (measured at start of 56-d performance test) fitted as covariable

656 \*\*\*, P<0.001; \*\*, P<0.01; \*, P<0.05; †, P<0.1.

657 **Table 5** Dry matter intakes and methane production from Charolais-sired (CHX) and  
 658 purebred Luing (LU) steers fed either a high concentrate (Concentrate) or mixed  
 659 forage:concentrate (Mixed) diets

Diet (D)	Mixed		Concentrate		SEM	Significance		
	CHX	LU	CHX	LU		B	D	B x D
No of steers	17	19	18	16				
DMI								
kg/day	9.0	9.0	11.0	9.9	0.49		***	†
g/kg BW	14.2	15.8	16.2	16.9	0.78	*	**	
Methane								
g/day	193	184	144	150	11.0		***	
g/kg DMI	20.2	20.7	13.2	14.7	0.64		***	
kJ/MJ GEI	59.1	60.6	39.4	43.6	1.88		***	
Carbon dioxide								
g/day	7468	7034	7685	7376	548.5			
g/kg DMI	788	795	710	730	62.2		*	
Molar ratio								
CH <sub>4</sub> :CO <sub>2</sub>	0.071	0.072	0.052	0.056	0.004		***	

660 DMI, dry matter intake; GEI, gross energy intake; CH<sub>4</sub>, methane; CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide

661 \*\*\*, P<0.001; \*\*, P<0.01; \*, P<0.05; †, P<0.1.

662

663

664 **Table 6** Volatile fatty acid molar proportions (mmol/mol) and microbial abundance in  
 665 rumen fluid samples obtained from Charolais-sired (CHX) and purebred Luing (LU) steers  
 666 fed either a high concentrate (Concentrate) or mixed forage:concentrate (Mixed) diets

Diet (D)	Mixed		Concentrate		Significance			
	CHX	LU	CHX	LU	SEM	B	D	B x D
No of steers	17	19	18	16				
Acetic	645	657	561	577	9.0		***	
Propionic	174	178	293	257	20.7		***	
Butyric	130	118	95	112	17.7		**	†
Valeric	14	14	17	18	0.8		***	
Branched chain <sup>A</sup>	38	34	34	36	10.0			
Copy number (x 10 <sup>3</sup> ) / ng DNA								
Archaea	15.4	11.6	7.4	8.3	3.16		**	
Protozoa	45.8	47.2	34.2	40.5	11.35		†	
Total bacteria	501	565	980	964	69.8		***	
<i>Clostridium</i>								
Cluster IV	156	178	211	289	101.1			
Cluster XIVa	147	174	241	320	87.0		**	
<i>Bacteroides</i> plus <i>Prevotella</i>	374	435	994	854	64.4		***	

667 <sup>A</sup>Branched chain: iso-butyric plus isovaleric acids

668 Significance, \*\*\*, P<0.001; \*\*, P<0.01; \*, P<0.05; †, P<0.1.

669

670

671

672

673

674

675 **Table 7** *The effect of different metrics on methane emissions from Charolais-sired (CHX)*  
 676 *and purebred Luing (LU) steers fed either a high concentrate (Concentrate) or mixed*  
 677 *forage:concentrate (Mixed) diets. Values expressed as a proportion of those for CHX*  
 678 *steers fed the Mixed diet are given in brackets.*

Diet	Mixed		Concentrate	
Breed	CHX	LU	CHX	LU
Methane				
g / kg DMI	20.2 (1.53)	20.7 (1.57)	13.2 (1.00)	14.7 (1.11)
g/ kg LWG	134 (1.51)	148 (1.66)	90 (1.00)	102 (1.12)
g/kg cold carcass weight	0.567 (1.47)	0.724 (1.88)	0.386 (1.00)	0.525 (1.36)
g/kg total carcass meat	0.794 (1.46)	1.083 (1.99)	0.545 (1.00)	0.762 (1.40)

679

680

681

682 **Figure Captions**

683

684 **Figure 1** Relationships between methane production (g/kg DM intake) and methane to  
685 carbon dioxide molar ratio for steers fed Concentrate (solid line and solid circles;  $\text{CH}_4 =$   
686  $7.23 + 124 \text{ CH}_4 / \text{CO}_2$  molar ratio,  $r^2$  0.22,  $P=0.005$ ) and Mixed (broken line and open  
687 circles,  $\text{CH}_4 = 10.3 + 141 \text{ CH}_4/\text{CO}_2$  molar ratio,  $r^2$  0.10,  $P=0.060$ ) diets.

688

689 **Figure 2** Relationships between methane yield and archaea to bacteria ratio for samples  
690 from cattle fed Concentrate (solid line and solid circles  $\text{CH}_4 = 12.5 + 160$  Archaea to  
691 Bacteria ratio,  $r^2$  0.10,  $P<0.05$ ) and Mixed (open circles,  $P>0.05$ ) diets.

692