

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

Article

Supplemental Material

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

van Lingen, H. J., Niu, M., Kebreab, E., Valadares Filho, S. C., Rooke, J. A., Duthie, C. A., Schwarm, A., Kreuzer, M., Hynd, P. I., Caetano, M., Eugène, M., Martin, C., McGee, M., O'Kiely, P., Hünerberg, M., McAllister, T. A., Berchielli, T. T., Messana, J.D, Peiren, N., Chaves, A. V., Charmley, E., Cole, N. A., Hales, K. E., Lee, S. S., Berndt, A., Reynolds, Chris, Crompton, Les, Bayat, A. R., Yáñez-Ruiz, D. R., Yu, Z., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., Casper, D. P. and Hristov, A. N. (2019) Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment*, 283. 106575. ISSN 0167-8809 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/84405/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

## **CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Data references**

- 2 Caetano, M., Wilkes, M.J., Pitchford, W.S., Lee, S.J., Hynd, P.I., 2016. Efficacy of methane-  
3 reducing supplements in beef cattle rations. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 56, 276-281.
- 4 Caetano, M., Wilkes, M.J., Pitchford, W.S., Lee, S.J., Hynd, P.I., 2018. Energy relations in cattle  
5 can be quantified using open-circuit gas-quantification systems. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 58, 1807-  
6 1813.
- 7 Castro-Montoya, J., Peiren, N., Cone, J.W., Zweifel, B., Fievez, V., De Campeneere, S., 2015. In  
8 vivo and in vitro effects of a blend of essential oils on rumen methane mitigation. *Livest.*  
9 *Sci.* 180, 134-142.
- 10 Chaves, A.V., Thompson, L.C., Iwaasa, A.D., Scott, S.L., Olson, M.E., Benchaar, C., Veira, D.M.,  
11 McAllister, T.A., 2006. Effect of pasture type (alfalfa vs. grass) on methane and carbon  
12 dioxide production by yearling beef heifers. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 86, 409-418.
- 13 De Carvalho, I.P.C., Fiorentini, G., Berndt, A., De Souza Castagnino, P., Messana, J.D., Frighetto,  
14 R.T.S., Reis, R.A., Berchielli, T.T., 2016. Performance and methane emissions of Nellore  
15 steers grazing tropical pasture supplemented with lipid sources. *Revista Brasileira de*  
16 *Zootecnia* 45, 760-767.
- 17 De Mulder, T., Peiren, N., Vandaele, L., Ruttink, T., De Campeneere, S., Van de Wiele, T.,  
18 Goossens, K., 2018. Impact of breed on the rumen microbial community composition and  
19 methane emission of Holstein Friesian and Belgian Blue heifers. *Livest. Sci.* 207, 38-44.
- 20 Doreau, M., Van der Werf, H.M.G., Micol, D., Dubroeuq, H., Agabriel, J., Rochette, Y., Martin,  
21 C., 2011. Enteric methane production and greenhouse gases balance of diets differing in  
22 concentrate in the fattening phase of a beef production system. *J. Anim. Sci.* 89, 2518-2528.
- 23 Duthie, C-A., Rooke, J.A., Hyslop, J.J., Waterhouse, A., 2015. Methane emission from two breeds  
24 of beef cows offered diets containing barley straw with either grass silage or brewers'  
25 grains. *Animal* 9, 1680-1687.
- 26 Duthie, C-A., Haskell, M., Hyslop, J.J., Waterhouse, A., Wallace, R.J., Roehe, R., Rooke, J.A.,  
27 2017. The impact of divergent breed types and diets on methane emissions, rumen  
28 characteristics and performance of finishing beef cattle. *Animal* 11, 1762-1771.

- 29 Eugène, M., Martin, C., Mialon, M.M., Krauss, D., Renand, G., Doreau, M., 2011. Dietary linseed  
30 and starch supplementation decreases methane production of fattening bulls. *Anim. Feed*  
31 *Sci. Technol.* 166-167, 330-337.
- 32 Fiorentini, G., Carvalho, I.P.C., Messina, J.D., Castagnino, P.S., Berndt, A., Canesin, R.C.,  
33 Frighetto, R.T.S., Berchielli, T.T., 2014. Effect of lipid sources with different fatty acid  
34 profiles on the intake, performance, and methane emissions of feedlot Nellore steers. *J.*  
35 *Anim. Sci.* 92, 1613-1620.
- 36 Haaland, G.L., Tyrrell, H.F., Moe, P.W., 1981. The effect of dietary protein level and cattle breed  
37 on energy utilization of corn-corn silage diets for growth assessed by respiration  
38 calorimetry. *J. Anim. Sci. Supplement* 1, 449.
- 39 Hales, K.E., Cole, N.A., MacDonald, J.C., 2012. Effects of corn processing method and dietary  
40 inclusion of wet distillers grains with solubles on energy metabolism, carbon-nitrogen  
41 balance, and methane emissions of cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 90, 3174-3185.
- 42 Hales, K.E., Cole, N.A., MacDonald, J.C., 2013. Effects of increasing concentrations of wet  
43 distillers grains with solubles in steam-flaked, corn-based diets on energy metabolism,  
44 carbon-nitrogen balance, and methane emissions of cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 91, 819-828.
- 45 Hales, K.E., Brown-Brandl, T.M., Freetly, H.C., 2014. Effects of decreased dietary roughage  
46 concentration on energy metabolism and nutrient balance in finishing beef cattle. *J. Anim.*  
47 *Sci.* 92, 264–271.
- 48 Hales, K.E., Foote, A.P., Brown-Brandl, T.M., Freetly, H.C., 2015. Effects of dietary glycerin  
49 inclusion at 0, 5, 10, and 15 percent of dry matter on energy metabolism and nutrient  
50 balance in finishing beef steers. *J. Anim. Sci.* 93, 348–356.
- 51 Hünnerberg, M., McGinn, S.M., Beauchemin, K.A., Okine, E.K., Harstad, O.M., McAllister, T.A.,  
52 2013a. Effect of dried distillers' grains plus solubles on enteric methane emissions and  
53 nitrogen excretion from growing beef cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 91, 2846-2857.
- 54 Hünnerberg, M., McGinn, S.M., Beauchemin, K.A., Okine, E.K., Harstad, O.M., McAllister, T.A.,  
55 2013b. Effect of dried distillers' grains with solubles on enteric methane emissions and  
56 nitrogen excretion from finishing beef cattle. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 93, 377-385.

- 57 Lage, J.F., San Vito, E., Reis, R.A., Dallantonia, E.E., Simonetti, L.R., Carvalho, I.P.C., Berndt,  
58 A., Chizzotti, M.L., Friguetto, R.T.S., Berchielli, T.T., 2016. Methane emissions and  
59 growth performance of young Nellore bulls fed crude glycerine- v. fibre-based energy  
60 ingredients in low or high concentrate diets. *J. Agric. Sci.* 154, 1280-1290.
- 61 Lapierre, H., Tyrrell, H.F., Reynolds, C.K., Elsasser, T.H., Gaudreau, P., Brezeau, P., 1992. Effects  
62 of growth hormone-releasing factor and feed intake on energy metabolism in growing beef  
63 steers: whole-body energy and nitrogen metabolism. *J. Anim. Sci.* 70, 764-772.
- 64 McGeough, E.J., O’Kiely, P., Hart, K.J., Moloney, A.P., Boland, T.M., Kenny, D.A., 2010.  
65 Methane emissions, feed intake, performance, digestibility, and rumen fermentation of  
66 finishing beef cattle offered whole-crop wheat silages differing in grain content. *J. Anim.*  
67 *Sci.* 88, 2703-2716.
- 68 McGeough, E.J., O’Kiely, P., Foley, P.A., Hart, K.J., Boland, T.M., Kenny, D.A., 2010. Methane  
69 emissions, feed intake, and performance of finishing beef cattle offered maize silages  
70 harvested at 4 different stages of maturity. *J. Anim. Sci.* 88, 1479-1491.
- 71 Kennedy, P.M., Charmley, E., 2012. Methane yields from Brahman cattle fed tropical grasses and  
72 legumes. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 52, 225-239.
- 73 Pinares-Patiño, C.S., Baumont, R., Martin, C., 2003. Methane emissions by Charolais cows  
74 grazing a monospecific pasture of timothy at four stages of maturity. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 83,  
75 769-777.
- 76 Reynolds, C.K., Casper, D.P., Harmon, D.L., Milton, C.T., 1992. Effect of CP and ME intake on  
77 visceral nutrient metabolism in beef steers. *J. Anim. Sci. Supplement I*, 315.
- 78 Reynolds, C.K., Tyrrell, H.F., 2000. Energy metabolism in lactating beef heifers. *J. Anim. Sci.* 78,  
79 2696-2705.
- 80 Reynolds, C.K., Tyrrell, H.F., Reynolds, P.J., 1991. Effects of diet forage-to-concentrate ratio and  
81 intake on energy metabolism in growing beef heifers: whole body energy and nitrogen  
82 balance and visceral heat production. *J. Nutr.* 121, 994-1003.
- 83 Ribeiro, A.F., Messana, J.D., José Neto, A., Lage, J.F., Fiorentini, G., Bieira, B.R., Berchielli, T.T.,  
84 2018. Enteric methane emissions, intake, and performance of young Nellore bulls fed

85 different sources of forage in concentrate-rich diets containing crude glycerine, *Anim. Prod.*  
86 *Sci.* 58, 517-522.

87 Rooke, J.A., Wallace, R.J., Duthie, C-A., McKain, N., De Souza, S.M., Hyslop, J.J., Ross, D.W.,  
88 Waterhouse, T., Roehe, R., 2014. Hydrogen and methane emissions from beef cattle and  
89 their rumen microbial community vary with diet, time after feeding and genotype. *Brit. J.*  
90 *Nutr.* 112, 398-407.

91 Rossi, L.G., Fiorentini, G., Vieira, B.R., Jose Neto, A., Messana, J.D., Malheiros, E.B., Berchielli,  
92 T.T., 2017. Effect of ground soybean and starch on intake, digestibility, performance, and  
93 methane production of Nellore bulls. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 226, 39-47.

94 Rumsey, T.S., Tyrrell, H.F., Dinius, D.A., Moe, W.P., Cross, H.R., 1981. Effects of  
95 diethylstilbestrol on tissue gain and carcass merit of feedlot beef steers. *J. Anim. Sci.* 53,  
96 589-600.

97 San Vito, E., Lage, J.F., Messana, J.D., Dallantonia, E.E., Frighetto, R.T.S., Reis, R.A., Neto, A.J.,  
98 Berchielli, T.T., 2016. Performance and methane emissions of grazing Nellore bulls  
99 supplemented with crude glycerin. *J. Anim. Sci.* 94, 4728–4737.

100 Silva, R.A., Fiorentini, G., Messana, J.D., Lage, J.F., Castagnino, P.S., San Vito, E., Carvalho,  
101 I.P.C., Berchielli, T.T., 2018.. Effects of different forms of soybean lipids on enteric  
102 methane emission, performance and meat quality of feedlot Nellore. *J. Agric. Sci.* 156,  
103 427-436.

104 Smith, N.E., Baldwin, R.L., 1974. Effects of breed, pregnancy, and lactation on weight of organs  
105 and tissues in dairy cattle. *J. Dairy Sci.* 47, 1055-1060.

106 Staerfl, S.M., Zeitz, J.O., Kreuzer, M., Soliva, C.R., 2012. Methane conversion rate of bulls  
107 fattened on grass or maize silage as compared with the IPCC default values, and the long-  
108 term methane mitigation efficiency of adding acacia tannin, garlic, maca and lupine. *Agric.*  
109 *Ecosyst. Environ.* 148, 111-120.

110 Tomkins, N., Parker, A.J., Hepworth, G., Callaghan, M.J., 2018. Nitrate supplementation has  
111 marginal effects on enteric methane production from *Bos indicus* steers fed Flinders grass  
112 (*Iseilema* spp.) hay, but elevates blood methaemoglobin concentrations. *Anim. Prod. Sci.*  
113 58, 262-270.

- 114 Troy, S.M., Duthie, C-A., Hyslop, J.J., Roehe, R., Ross, D.W., Wallace, R.J., Waterhouse, A.,  
115 Rooke, J.A., 2015. Effectiveness of nitrate addition and increased oil content as methane  
116 mitigation strategies for beef cattle fed two contrasting basal diets. *J. Anim. Sci.* 93, 1815-  
117 1823.
- 118 Tyrrell, H.F., Moe, P.W., 1972. Net energy value for lactation of a high and low concentrate ration  
119 containing corn silage. *J. Dairy Sci.* 55, 1106-1112.
- 120 Tyrrell, H.F., Moe, P.W., 1974. Net energy value of a corn and a barley ration for lactation. *J.*  
121 *Dairy Sci.* 57, 451.
- 122 Zanetti, D., Godoi, L.A., Estrada, M.M., Engle, T.E., Silva, B.C., Alhadas, H.M., Chizzotti, M.L.,  
123 Prados, L.F., Rennó, L.N., Valadares Filho, S.C., 2017. Estimating mineral requirements  
124 of Nellore beef bulls fed with or without inorganic mineral supplementation and the  
125 influence on mineral balance. *J. Anim. Sci.* 95, 1696-1706.

126 Table S1. Variable summary statistics of Brazilian higher-forage (BRZ-HF; data associated with diets containing  $\geq 25\%$  forage), all growing and  
 127 higher-forage growing cattle entries of the GLOBAL NETWORK beef cattle database.

Item*	BRZ-HF ( <i>n</i> = 104)				All growing ( <i>n</i> = 488)				Higher-forage growing ( <i>n</i> = 373)			
	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD
DMI (kg d <sup>-1</sup> )	9.55	5.38	17.5	1.88	9.50	2.47	17.4	2.22	9.16	2.47	17.4	2.27
GEI (MJ d <sup>-1</sup> )	168	92.6	300	32.4	176	44	317	43.6	166	43.8	317	46.3
Diet composition (% of DM)												
CP	14.6	10.0	18.1	2.07	14.1	6.19	19.2	2.27	14.0	6.19	19.2	2.45
EE	2.87	2.12	3.64	0.410	3.43	0.372	7.02	1.36	3.17	0.372	7.02	1.16
Ash	6.31	3.50	9.10	1.89	6.09	3.50	11.4	2.01	6.48	3.50	11.4	2.04
NDF	32.1	17.2	45.9	6.56	35.8	17.2	73.9	11.9	39.2	17.2	73.9	11.5
STA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.9	5.90	44.4	10.4	25.7	5.90	39.2	8.83
Forage proportion	45.8	27.0	70	12.5	52.2	8.00	100	29.9	65.3	27.0	100	21.1
ADG (kg d <sup>-1</sup> )	1.30	0.295	2.26	0.371	1.27	0.10	3.38	0.418	1.21	0.10	3.38	0.425
BW (kg)	398	228	491	70.7	526	133	768	147	510	133	768	142
Methane emissions												
CH <sub>4</sub> (g d <sup>-1</sup> )	162	91.8	232	29.2	188	40.9	372	67.9	197	40.9	372	71.3
CH <sub>4</sub> /DMI (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	17.4	9.83	29.8	3.92	19.5	8.16	35.1	5.58	21.3	9.93	35.1	5.18
CH <sub>4</sub> /ADG (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>‡</sup>	4.75	3.31	5.79	0.388	4.98	3.31	6.68	0.522	5.08	3.31	6.68	0.528
Y <sub>m</sub> (% of GEI) <sup>§</sup>	5.5	3.2	9.6	1.2	6.0	2.4	10.3	1.6	6.4	3.0	10.3	1.5

128 \*DM = dry matter, DMI = dry matter intake, GEI = gross energy intake, CP = dietary crude protein, EE = dietary ether extract, Ash = dietary ash,

129 NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber, STA = dietary starch, ADG = average daily body weight gain, BW = body weight.

130 ‡Min = minimum, Max = maximum, SD = standard deviation.

131 † ln transformed values.

132 §Methane conversion factor (%): energy of CH<sub>4</sub> as a proportion of GEI; the specific energy of CH<sub>4</sub> is 55.65 MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>.



133 Table S2. Brazilian higher-forage data CH<sub>4</sub> emission (g d<sup>-1</sup> animal<sup>-1</sup>) prediction equations and model performance based on root mean square  
 134 prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square  
 135 prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Category§	Model development			Model performance					
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[48]	DMI_C, Global_C	104 (15) + 5.60 (1.50) × DMI	104	BRZ-HF	75	19.2	1.03	2.45	9.05	0.16
[49]	DMI+NDF_C	126 (26) + 5.58 (1.49) × DMI – 0.707 (0.652) × NDF	104	BRZ-HF	75	19.8	1.06	1.22	14.31	0.14
[50]	DMI+EE_C	150 (28) + 6.31 (1.52) × DMI – 18.2 (9.4) × EE	104	BRZ-HF	104	19.8	1.10	0.43	18.87	0.10
[51]	Diet_C, Animal_C	154 (18) + 6.00 (1.46) × DMI – 8.86 (2.25) × Ash	93	BRZ-HF	75	17.7	1.00	10.60	9.20	0.40
[52]	Animal_no_DMI_C	209 (19) – 1.11 (0.35) × For	104	BRZ-HF	75	21.8	1.21	0.71	32.87	-0.09
[53]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.055 (0.002) × GEI] / 0.05565	104	BRZ-HF	75	23.6	1.27	0.06	44.28	0.29
[9]	IPCC Tier 2, 2006¶	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	104	BRZ-HF♯	75	33.7	1.81	39.72	33.70	0.21

136 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI\_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section. No

137 DMI+STA\_C and Animal\_no\_DMI\_C equations available.

138 \* Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d<sup>-1</sup>), DMI = dry matter intake  
 139 (kg d<sup>-1</sup>), NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), Ash = dietary Ash (% of DM), For = dietary  
 140 forage (% of DM).

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

142 ‡BRZ-HF = Brazilian data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%.

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

144 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

145 ♯ Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

146 Table S3. All-data CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g [kg DMI]<sup>-1</sup>) prediction equations for various categories and model performance across the data (sub)sets based on  
 147 root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and  
 148 SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Category§	Model development			Model performance					
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[54]	NDF_C	11.7 (0.9) + 0.230 (0.021) × NDF	1021	All-data	743	24.1	0.98	0.15	2.98	0.20
				Higher-forage	633	23.1	1.03	2.22	7.53	0.15
				Lower-forage	110	32.2	1.26	32.81	5.96	-0.03
[55]	STA_C	26.5 (0.9) – 0.192 (0.019) × STA	704	All-data	704	27.0	1.06	2.34	11.29	0.13
				Higher-forage	575	25.5	1.21	10.56	21.74	0.06
				Lower-forage	129	36.5	1.28	38.75	1.27	0.02
[56]	EE_C	23.6 (0.9) – 1.18 (0.23) × EE	754	All-data	743	25.0	1.01	1.52	2.81	0.07
				Higher-forage	633	23.1	1.03	0.00	6.16	0.02
				Lower-forage	110	39.2	1.54	51.38	7.08	0.03
[57]	Diet_no_DMI_C, Animal_no_DMI_C	15.1 (1.3) + 0.111 (0.011) × For – 0.681 (0.223) × EE + 0.178 (0.127) × Ash	743	All-data	743	23.9	0.97	2.89	6.84	0.35
				Higher-forage	633	23.6	1.05	3.21	12.31	0.22
				Lower-forage	110	25.9	1.02	1.16	4.68	-0.02
[58]	Global_no_DMI_C	9.44 (1.26) + 0.121 (0.008) × For + 0.278 (0.076) × CP	1021	All-data	743	23.8	0.96	1.38	7.92	0.37
				Higher-forage	633	23.5	1.05	1.51	13.59	0.23
				Lower-forage	110	25.3	0.99	0.69	0.46	0.06

149 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, NDF\_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

150 \* Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA =  
 151 dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM, Ash = dietary ash (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), CP = dietary crude  
 152 protein (% of DM).

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

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

156 †*p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

157 Table S4. Higher-forage CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g [kg DMI]<sup>-1</sup>) prediction equations for various categories and model performance using the higher-forage  
 158 subset based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope  
 159 bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Category§	Model development		Model performance						
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[59]	NDF_C	17.8 (1.0) + 0.0763 (0.0234) × NDF	882	Higher-forage	633	22.3	1.00	0.23	0.31	0.03
[60]	STA_C	23.2 (0.8) – 0.0512 (0.0206) × STA	575	Higher-forage	575	21.8	1.04	0.79	7.70	-0.04
[61]	EE_C	22.8 (1.0) – 0.767 (0.238) × EE	644	Higher-forage	633	22.9	1.03	0.63	4.44	-0.01
[62]	Diet_no_DMI_C, Animal_no_DMI_C, Global_no_DMI_C	17.3 (0.9) + 0.0565 (0.0115) × For	882	Higher-forage	633	22.0	0.98	0.06	0.46	0.10

160 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, NDF\_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

161 \* Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber (% of DM), STA =  
 162 dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), Ash = dietary ash extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM).

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

164 ‡ Higher-forage = data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%.

165 †*p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

166 Table S5. All-data growing cattle data log transformed CH<sub>4</sub> intensity (g [kg ADG]<sup>-1</sup>) prediction equations for various categories and model  
 167 performance across the data (sub)sets based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-  
 168 ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Category§	Model development		Model performance						
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[63]	DMI_C	4.72 (0.15) + 0.0189 (0.0127) × DMI	488	All-data	471	64.6	1.08	10.39	10.20	-0.03
				Higher-forage	356	65.5	1.13	19.20	7.70	-0.03
				Lower-forage	115	44.0	1.11	18.53	0.77	0.00
[64]	DMI+NDF_C	3.48 (0.20) + 0.0363 (0.0116) × DMI + 0.0292 (0.0028) × NDF	488	All-data	471	63.1	1.05	7.38	8.58	0.21
				Higher-forage	356	63.9	1.10	7.72	12.66	0.13
				Lower-forage	115	43.8	1.10	10.18	9.20	-0.04
[65]	DMI+STA_C	5.33 (0.17) + 0.0357 (0.0127) × DMI – 0.0252 (0.0022) × STA	323	All-data	323	56.8	1.08	13.08	5.18	0.15
				Higher-forage	218	57.1	1.23	17.24	17.31	-0.04
				Lower-forage	105	41.1	1.03	4.66	1.59	0.02
[66]	DMI+ EE_C	5.64 (0.26) + 0.0150 (0.0122) × DMI – 0.308 (0.060) × EE	288	All-data	288	62.9	1.42	0.11	52.01	0.16
				Higher-forage	197	55.7	1.31	2.01	41.15	0.15
				Lower-forage	91	83.8	2.18	3.29	77.39	0.12
[67]	Diet_C, Animal_C	4.01 (0.16) + 0.0313 (0.0114) × DMI + 0.0103 (0.0009) × For	488	All-data	471	59.6	0.99	13.94	0.00	0.23
				Higher-forage	356	59.9	1.03	12.56	0.17	0.13
				Lower-forage	115	47.7	1.20	33.34	0.24	0.03
[68]	Animal_no_DMI_C	4.32 (0.11) + 0.0100 (0.0009) × For	488	All-data	471	60.2	1.00	14.39	0.07	0.22
				Higher-forage	356	60.4	1.04	12.72	0.44	0.11
				Lower-forage	115	49.2	1.24	36.00	0.02	0.01
[69]	Global_C	3.79 (0.19) + 0.0102 (0.0009) × For + 0.00106 (0.00031) × BW	471	All-data	471	57.3	0.96	9.04	0.25	0.25
				Higher-forage	356	57.9	1.00	9.26	0.01	0.15
				Lower-forage	115	42.4	1.07	13.17	0.37	0.02

169 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI\_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

170 \* Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d<sup>-1</sup>), NDF = dietary neutral  
171 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), For = dietary forage  
172 (% of DM).  
173 †*n* = number of observations used to fit model equations.  
174 ‡All-data = all growing cattle data, higher-forage = growing cattle data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%, lower-forage = growing cattle data  
175 associated with a forage content ≤ 18%.  
176 †*p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

177 Table S6. Higher-forage growing cattle data log transformed CH<sub>4</sub> intensity (g [kg ADG]<sup>-1</sup>) prediction equations for various categories and model  
 178 performance using the higher-forage subset based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-  
 179 deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).  
 180 Model performance was evaluated using back-transformed values of CH<sub>4</sub> intensity.

Eq.	Category§	Model development			Model performance					
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[70]	DMI_C	4.69 (0.17) + 0.0274 (0.0143) × DMI	373	Higher-forage	356	64.3	1.11	15.15	7.18	-0.03
[71]	DMI+NDF_C	4.15 (0.24) + 0.0290 (0.0141) × DMI + 0.0139 (0.0046) × NDF	373	Higher-forage	356	61.7	1.06	12.78	0.62	0.05
[72]	DMI+STA_C	5.44 (0.18) – 9.74·10 <sup>-3</sup> (15.08·10 <sup>-3</sup> ) × DMI – 8.31·10 <sup>-3</sup> (3.11·10 <sup>-3</sup> ) × STA	218	Higher-forage	218	52.8	1.14	12.51	20.50	-0.10
[73]	DMI+EE_C	5.11 (0.30) – 0.00120 (0.01422) × DMI – 0.0747 (0.0748) × EE	197	Higher-forage	197	47.2	1.11	8.94	12.58	-0.07
[74]	Diet_C	4.49 (0.16) + 0.0718 (0.0166) × Ash	362	Higher-forage	345	65.0	1.12	15.90	4.82	-0.01
[75]	Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C	3.75 (0.22) + 0.0739 (0.0164) × Ash + 1.49·10 <sup>-3</sup> (0.35·10 <sup>-3</sup> ) × BW	345	Higher-forage	345	63.3	1.09	9.63	6.62	0.01
[76]	Global_C	3.61 (0.27) + 0.0149 (0.0044) × NDF + 1.58·10 <sup>-3</sup> (0.34·10 <sup>-3</sup> ) × BW	356	Higher-forage	356	59.5	1.03	7.96	0.62	0.09

181 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI\_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

182 \* Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d<sup>-1</sup>), NDF = dietary neutral  
 183 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), Ash = dietary  
 184 Ash (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg).

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

186 ‡ Higher-forage = growing cattle data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%.

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

188 Figure S1. Observed *vs.* predicted plots for Brazilian higher-forage cattle methane emission ( $\text{g d}^{-1}$ )  
189 prediction equations at different categories, *viz.*, dry matter intake (DMI\_C), dry matter intake and neutral  
190 detergent fiber (DMI+NDF\_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE\_C), dietary (Diet\_C),  
191 animal without DMI (Animal\_no\_DMI\_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, and IPCC Tier 2 (2006). The  
192 gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and  
193 predicted values and the identity line ( $y = x$ ), respectively.

194

195 Figure S2. Observed *vs.* predicted plots for higher-forage methane yield ( $\text{g [kg DMI]}^{-1}$ ) prediction  
196 equations at different categories, *viz.*, neutral detergent fiber (NDF\_C), starch (STA\_C), ether extract  
197 (EE\_C), dietary composition (Diet\_no\_DMI\_C) and global without DMI (Global\_no\_DMI\_C). The gray  
198 and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and  
199 predicted values, and the identity line ( $y = x$ ), respectively.

200

201 Figure S3. Observed *vs.* predicted plots for all-data cattle methane yield ( $\text{g [kg DMI]}^{-1}$ ) prediction  
202 equations at different categories, *viz.*, neutral detergent fiber (NDF\_C), starch (STA\_C), ether extract  
203 (EE\_C) and dietary composition (Diet\_no\_DMI\_C). The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted  
204 regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values and the identity line ( $y = x$ ),  
205 respectively.

206

207 Figure S4. Observed *vs.* predicted plots for all growing cattle data log transformed methane intensity ( $\text{g [kg ADG]}^{-1}$ )  
208 prediction equations at different categories, *viz.*, dry matter intake (DMI\_C), dry matter  
209 intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF\_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA\_C), dry  
210 matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE\_C), dietary (Diet\_C), and animal without DMI  
211 (Animal\_no\_DMI\_C) and global (Global\_C). The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted  
212 regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ( $y = x$ ),  
213 respectively.

214

215 Figure S5. Observed *vs.* predicted plots for higher-forage growing cattle data log transformed methane  
216 intensity ( $\text{g [kg ADG]}^{-1}$ ) prediction equations at different categories, *viz.*, dry matter intake (DMI\_C), dry  
217 matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF\_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA\_C),  
218 dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE\_C), dietary (Diet\_C), animal without DMI  
219 (Animal\_no\_DMI\_C), and global (Global\_C). The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted  
220 regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values and the identity line ( $y = x$ ),  
221 respectively.