

# Methanogenesis in animals with foregut and hindgut fermentation: a review

G. de la Fuente<sup>A</sup>, D. R. Yañez-Ruiz<sup>B</sup>, A. R. Seradj<sup>A</sup>, J. Balcells<sup>A,C</sup> and A. Belanche<sup>B</sup>

<sup>A</sup>Departament de Ciència Animal, Universitat de Lleida, Lleida, Spain.

<sup>B</sup>Estación Experimental del Zaidín, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Granada, Spain.

<sup>C</sup>Corresponding author. Email: balcells@ca.udl.cat

**Abstract.** Methane is the main greenhouse-gas contributor to global warming in the livestock sector; it is generated by anaerobic fermentation in the different sections of the gut, and the methane concentration differs significantly among species. Methane is produced only by certain types of microorganisms called methanogens. The species composition of methanogenic archaea population is largely affected by the diet, geographical location, host and the section of the gut. Consequently, methane production, either measured as total grams emitted per day or per bodyweight mass, differs greatly among animal species. The main difference in methanogenic activity among different gut sections and animal species is the substrate fermented and the metabolic pathway to complete anaerobic fermentation of plant material. The three main substrates used by methanogens are CO<sub>2</sub>, acetate and compounds containing methyl groups. The three dominant orders of methanogens in gut environments are Methanomicrobiales, Methanobacteriales and Methanosarcinales. They normally are present in low numbers (below 3% of total microbiome). The present review will describe the main metabolic pathways and methanogens involved in CH<sub>4</sub> production in the gut of different host-animal species, as well as discuss general trends that influence such emissions, such as geographical distribution, feed composition, section of the gut, host age and diurnal and season variation. Finally, the review will describe animal species (large and small domestic ruminants, wild ruminants, camelids, pigs, rabbits, horses, macropods, termites and humans) specificities in the methanogen diversity and their effects on methane emission.

**Additional keywords:** digestive compartments, emission, methane production, methanogens, microbiota.

Received 13 October 2017, accepted 10 February 2019, published online 13 September 2019

## Introduction

Global warming is one of the main challenges in the world. The current predictions indicate that global temperatures will increase between 1°C and 6°C during the 21st century (IPCC 2015), primarily as a result of the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Methane contributes to 16% of the greenhouse-gas emissions and is particularly aggressive due to its high warming potential, which is 21 times greater than that of carbon dioxide (Scheehle and Kruger 2006). Approximately 36% of the total methane emissions come from natural sources such as wetlands, oceans, termites and wild ruminants, while the remaining 64% originate from anthropogenic sources, including fossil-fuel use, livestock farming, landfill and rice agriculture (Bousquet *et al.* 2006). This human activity has promoted a two-fold increase on the methane concentration over the past 150 years, because its emissions have burdened the natural sinks on Earth (IPCC 2015). Enteric fermentation in farm animals is, after fossil-fuel use, the second-most important source of methane, representing 27% of the anthropogenic methane emissions (Bousquet *et al.* 2006). Hence, there is a need for understanding the complexity of the methanogenesis process in the gut and the methane-producing archaea, so

as to develop cost-effective methane-mitigation strategies (Buddle *et al.* 2011). The present paper aims to provide a comprehensive review on the main biochemistry mechanisms in the methanogenesis, a description of the key microbes involved in this process and a selection of the main drivers that modulate the gut methanogenesis, such as the section of the gut, animal age, geographical location, diet or animal species considered.

## Methanogenesis and methanogens

Methane is generated in the gastrointestinal tract as the end product of anaerobic respiration by a specialised group of microorganisms, the methanogens (Janssen and Kirs 2008). All methanogens are strictly anaerobic archaea belonging to the *Euryarchaeota* phylum and obtain most of their energy from methanogenesis. The methanogenesis pathway is complex and requires unique coenzymes and membrane-bound enzyme complexes (Hedderich and Whitman 2006). Although methanogens are phylogenetically diverse, they can use only a limited number of substrates. These substrates are restricted to the following three major types: CO<sub>2</sub>, acetate and compounds containing methyl groups (Liu and Whitman 2008). Most organic compounds such as carbohydrates and volatile fatty

**Table 1. Description of the enteric methane emissions, most common methanogens and methanogenic pathways for the main livestock species**  
BW, bodyweight; CH<sub>4</sub>, methane; CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide; DMI, dry-matter intake; H<sub>2</sub>, hydrogen


Host species	CH <sub>4</sub> produced in L/kg DMI (L/kg BW in parentheses)	Most abundant microorganisms	Most probable pathway	Reference
Large ruminants (cattle, bison, buffalo)	26–38 (0.56–0.76)	<i>Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter millerae</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter thaueri</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter ruminantium</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter olleyae</i> <i>Methanosphaera stadtmanae</i> <i>Thermoplasma</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub> or reduce methyl groups derived from methanol or methylamines	Patra <i>et al.</i> (2017) Seedorf <i>et al.</i> (2015) Kelly <i>et al.</i> (2016) Henderson <i>et al.</i> (2015)
Small ruminants (sheep, goat, deer)	21–32 (0.40–0.71)	<i>Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter millerae</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter thaueri</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter ruminantium</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter olleyae</i> <i>Methanosphaera stadtmanae</i> <i>Thermoplasma</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub> or reduce methyl groups derived from methanol or methylamines	Patra <i>et al.</i> (2017) Seedorf <i>et al.</i> (2015) Kelly <i>et al.</i> (2016) Henderson <i>et al.</i> (2015)
Camelids	16–24 (0.21–0.33)	<i>Methanobrevibacter millerae</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter ruminantium</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub>	Dittmann <i>et al.</i> (2014) St-Pierre and Wright (2013)
Pigs	2.3 (0.04–0.08)	<i>Methanobrevibacter ruminantium</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter wolini</i> <i>Methanosphaera stadtmanae</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub>	Cao <i>et al.</i> (2016) Gong <i>et al.</i> (2018) Jensen (1996)
Rabbits	2.93 (0.13)	<i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub>	Franz <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Horses	6.1 (0.11–0.15)	<i>Methanocorpusculum labreanum</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub>	Crutzen <i>et al.</i> (1986) Jensen (1996) Lwin and Matsui (2014)
Ostriches	11.6 (0.01–0.16)	<i>Methanocorpusculum spp</i> <i>Methanobrevibacter spp</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub>	Frei <i>et al.</i> (2015) Swart <i>et al.</i> (1993) Videvall <i>et al.</i> (2018)
Humans	0.07–6.67 (0.0006–0.06)	<i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i> <i>Methanosphaera stadtmaniae</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce: (1) CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub> (2) methanol to CH <sub>4</sub>	Gaci <i>et al.</i> (2014) Crutzen <i>et al.</i> (1986) Sahakian <i>et al.</i> (2010)
Macropods	4.9–11.24 (0.08–0.14)	<i>Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii</i> <i>Methanosphaera stadtmanae</i>	Use H <sub>2</sub> to reduce: (1) CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub> (2) methanol to CH <sub>4</sub>	Madsen and Bertelsen (2012) Evans <i>et al.</i> (2009) Klieve <i>et al.</i> (2012)

acids (VFA) are not substrates for methanogens and must be processed by other microbes (bacteria, protozoa or fungi) prior to their utilisation by methanogens. Thus, in all gut environments, most of the available energy is used by non-methanogenic organisms.

The first type of substrate used by methanogens is carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), because most methanogens can reduce CO<sub>2</sub> to methane, with H<sub>2</sub> as the primary electron donor (hydrogenotrophic way). Many hydrogenotrophs can also use formate as an electron donor by the activity of the formate dehydrogenase (Table 1). In hydrogenotrophic methanogenesis, CO<sub>2</sub> is successively reduced to methane through formyl, methylene and methyl, forming C-1 moiety in which methyl coenzyme M reductase catalyses the last step of this metabolic route (Hedderich and Whitman 2006). Two methanogen species can also utilise carbon monoxide (CO) as reductant for methanogenesis from CO<sub>2</sub>, by using CO dehydrogenase. However, growth with CO is slow and the generation time is more than 200 h for *Metanothermobacter*

*thermoautotrophicus* and 65 h for *Metanosarcina barkeri* (Liu and Whitman 2008). Also *Methanosarcina acetivorans* can use CO for growth but by an entirely different and unconventional pathway (Rother and Metcalf 2004). Some hydrogenotrophic methanogens can also oxidise secondary alcohols (i.e. propanol, butanol and cyclopentanol) and few species can use ethanol as an electron donor (Liu and Whitman 2008). These species represent an anomaly in the general rule, which is that methanogens cannot directly metabolise organic compounds.

The second type of substrate mainly used by methanogens is methyl group-containing compounds such as methanol, methylamines and methylsulfides. These methyl groups are transferred to a cognate corrinoid protein and, subsequently, entered into the methanogenesis pathway via coenzyme M, to be further reduced to methane (Ferguson *et al.* 2000). Activation and transfer of the methyl group requires a substrate-specific methyltransferase. Methylotrophic methanogens are limited to the order Methanosarcinales, except for *Methanosphaera*



**Fig. 1.** Schematic anaerobic fermentation of organic matter to methane. The main substrates and microbial groups catalysing the reactions are indicated.

species (order Methanobacteriales). In the methylotrophic methanogenesis, three methyl groups are reduced to methane for every molecule of  $\text{CO}_2$  formed, aspect which is considered an imbalance. Nevertheless, *Methanomicrococcus blatticola* and *Methanosphaera* species are obligated methylotrophic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens that are specialised in reducing methyl groups with hydrogen ( $\text{H}_2$ ).

The third type of substrate is acetate, which is highly abundant in most anaerobic fermentations. As a result, up to two-thirds of the biologically generated methane is derived from acetate (Liu and Whitman 2008). Surprisingly, only two genera are known to use acetate for methanogenesis, namely, *Methanosaeta* and *Methanosarcina*. They conduct an acetoclastic reaction that catalyses acetate, oxidising the carboxyl-group to  $\text{CO}_2$  and reducing the methyl group to methane (Fig. 1).

Despite their limited number of substrates, methanogens are highly diverse and their classification includes five orders (Methanobacteriales, Methanomicrobiales, Methanosarcinales, Methanococcales and Methanopyrales), which differ in more than 82% of their 16S rRNA sequence identity, although recently more orders (i.e. Methanocellales and Methanomassiliicoccales) have been included. These orders have some common features such as their capacity to fluoresce blue-green as a result of the presence of the coenzyme  $\text{F}_{420}$  (Ashby *et al.* 2001) or the absence of peptidoglycan in the cell wall, but also differ on several biological aspects related to the structure of the cell wall, core lipids or substrates used.

(1) Methanobacteriales. Most members of Methanobacteriales use  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  (hydrogenotrophic), but several species can also use formate,  $\text{CO}$  or secondary alcohols as electron donors. Most genera are rods of variable length (0.6–25  $\mu\text{m}$ ) that form filaments. Their cell-wall composition includes pseudomurein and their cellular lipids contain chaeol, archaeol and hydroxyarchaeol as core lipids. Within this order, the main genera of interest in the gut methanogenesis are *Methanobacterium*, *Methanobrevibacter* and *Methanosphaera* (Hook *et al.* 2010).

(2) Methanomicrobiales. Members of this order use  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  (i.e. they are hydrogenotrophic); most species can use formate and some can also use secondary alcohols as electron donors. The genera in this order vary in motility and shape from cocci to rods and sheathed rods. Most species have protein cell walls and some have glycoproteins. The cellular lipids contain archaeol and caldarchaeol. There are three families, with Methanomicrobiaceae being the only one of interest in the gut methanogenesis (Liu and Whitman 2008).

(3) Methanosarcinales. Members of this order are the only methanogens with cytochromes, which are membrane-bound electron carriers that play a role in the oxidation of methyl groups to  $\text{CO}_2$ . Thus, species in the order Methanosarcinales have the widest substrate range, including a methyl group (methylotrophs), acetate (acetoclastic) or  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  (hydrogenotrophic). Cytochromes are membrane-bound electron carriers that play a role in the oxidation of methyl groups to  $\text{CO}_2$ . They all are non-motile and vary in morphology from cocci to pseudosarcinae and sheathed rods. Most species have protein cell walls and the cellular lipids contain archaeol, hydroxyarchaeol and caldarchaeol. The main genera of interest in gut methanogenesis are the following: *Methanosaeta* is a specialist that uses exclusively acetate, even when it is available at low concentrations (5–20  $\mu\text{M}$ ), due to the presence of a high-affinity adenosine monophosphate. On the contrary, *Methanosarcina* is more of a generalist and prefers methanol and methylamine to acetate, unless it is present at high concentrations (1 mM), due to its low-affinity acetate kinase (Jetten *et al.* 1992). These microbes are particularly relevant on the methanogenesis from manure.

(4) Methanococcales. Hydrogenotrophs in this order produce methane by using  $\text{CO}_2$ , formate and  $\text{H}_2$  as electron donors. Cells are small cocci (1–3  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and motile because of flagella. Cell wall has S-layer proteins and lacks glycoproteins and carbohydrates. All species of *Methanococcales* have been isolated from marine habitats and have no relevance in gut methanogenesis.

(5) Methanopyrales. This order is represented by a single hydrogenotrophic species, *Methanopyrus kandleri*. It is motile, rod-shaped, its cell wall contains pseudomurein and lipids contain archaeol. This hyperthermophilic species inhabits only marine ecosystems (Liu and Whitman 2008).

(6) Methanocellales. This is a recently described order of methanogens that was initially identified in rice-field soil (Sakai *et al.* 2008). Methanocellales bacteria are unique among methanogens in their tolerance to  $\text{O}_2$  stress (Yuan *et al.* 2009; Angel *et al.* 2011) and their adaptation to low  $\text{H}_2$  partial pressures (Sakai *et al.* 2009).

(7) Methanomassiliicoccales. Methanomassiliicoccales is phylogenetically distant from all other orders of methanogens and is related to non-methanogenic archaea such as Thermoplasmatales (Tajima *et al.* 2001). All culture-based studies have agreed on a common methanogenic pathway relying on the obligate dependence of the strains on an external  $\text{H}_2$  source to reduce methyl compounds into methane. Methanomassiliicoccales constitutes one of the three dominant archaeal lineages in the rumen (Janssen and Kirs 2008) and, in some ruminants, it represents half or more

of the methanogens (Wright *et al.* 2007). This order is broadly distributed, and not limited to digestive tracts of animals, but is also retrieved in rice paddy fields, natural wetlands or freshwater sediments (Borrel *et al.* 2014).

- (8) Others. Culture-independent approaches have helped discover the existence of methane-metabolising microorganisms outside the phylum Euryarchaeota. These findings comprise uncultured methanogens belonging to phyla Bathyarchaeota (Evans *et al.* 2015) and Verstraetearchaeota (Vanwonterghem *et al.* 2016), both from the branch TACK (Proteoarchaeota; Spang *et al.* 2017).

Methanogens are generally present in the gut in low numbers compared with the rest of microorganisms (<3%; Morgavi *et al.* 2010), possibly because they outcompete with sulfate-reducing, denitrifying and iron-reducing bacteria for H<sub>2</sub> when electron acceptors (other than CO<sub>2</sub>) are present in the system (O<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, Fe<sup>3+</sup> or SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>). This situation probably occurs because these compounds are better electron acceptors than is CO<sub>2</sub>, or thermodynamically more favourable. However, in gut fermentation systems, CO<sub>2</sub> is rarely a limiting factor. In addition to methanogens, homoacetogenic bacteria are also able to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> for energy production. These microbes reduce CO<sub>2</sub> by using H<sub>2</sub> or other substances such as sugars, alcohols, methylated compounds, CO and organic acids during the acetogenesis process. Nonetheless, acetogenesis by H<sub>2</sub> is thermodynamically less favourable than is methanogenesis. This reason may explain the predominance of methanogens in most gut environments, whereas the activity of homoacetogens contributes to explain the importance of acetate as an end product of the gut microbial fermentation. On the contrary, homoacetogens outcompete methanogens in specific gut environments, such as in the hindgut of termites and cockroaches, possibly as a result of their metabolic versatility and lower O<sub>2</sub> sensitivity (Liu and Whitman 2008).

In anaerobic gut environments, a proportion of the feed is degraded to fermentation products, as a result of the cooperation of multiple microbial groups. Plant structural carbohydrates, proteins and other organic polymers contained in feeds ingested by the animal are degraded to their monomer components by the so called primary anaerobic fermenters (i.e. bacteria, fungi and protozoa). These monomers are then further converted into VFA, lactate, ammonia, CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> by both the primary fermenters and other microbes that do not have the capacity to hydrolyse complex polymers by themselves (secondary fermenters or syntrophs). Finally, methanogens catalyse the terminal step in the anaerobic fermentation by converting these latter substrates (CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>, acetate) to methane. However, the activity of the syntrophs is favourable only at low H<sub>2</sub> partial pressures; thus, the H<sub>2</sub>-scavenging conducted by the methanogens is vital to maintain H<sub>2</sub> pressures below 10 Pa (Hedderich and Whitman 2006). The interaction and inter-dependency between H<sub>2</sub>-producing microorganisms (i.e. bacteria, protozoa and fungi) and H<sub>2</sub>-consuming methanogens is named interspecies H<sub>2</sub> transfer.

## Factors affecting methanogenesis

### (a) Geographical distribution

Methanogen diversity can be affected by the inter-animal variation, diet, geographical region, gut sampling and

methodology used (Wright *et al.* 2007; Jeyanathan *et al.* 2011). There are some reports on the geographical distribution of methanogens, most of them by Wright and colleagues (Wright *et al.* 2004, 2006, 2007), suggesting that both diet and geographical location of the mammal host may play an important role in moulding the methanogen population. In a large experiment, Henderson *et al.* (2015) analysed 742 individual animals from around the world, including 32 ruminant species, and a wide range of diets, and found *Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii* and *M. ruminantium* species in almost all samples, accounting for 74% of all rumen archaea. The most abundant methanogens found were *Methanospaera* sp. and two Methanomassiliicoccaceae-affiliated groups, which accounted for 15% of the archaeal community. *Methanomicrobium* has been reported as an abundant (>5%) methanogen in Asia, but it is not universally prevalent. Thus, nearly 90% of the rumen methanogens belonged to the five most dominant groups. These observations suggest that rumen methanogens are much less diverse than are rumen bacteria in terms of taxonomy, but also in the range of substrates they use (Sharp *et al.* 1998). This universality, together with their limited diversity compared with bacteria (Seedorf *et al.* 2015), opens the possibility of developing small-molecule inhibitors to be used as successful methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)-mitigation agents across the globe, as described before (Hristov *et al.* 2015).

### (b) Effect of feed composition

Composition of diet influences CH<sub>4</sub> production in ruminants, since fermentation in the rumen depends entirely on the activity of microorganisms, which require a variety of nutrients, energy, nitrogen and minerals (Moss 1994). Thus, the quality of the diet exerts a clear effect on the activity of the rumen microbiota and, hence, production of metabolites, such as CH<sub>4</sub>, in the rumen. Enteric CH<sub>4</sub> emission is highly reliant on diet composition and tends to decrease with a high protein content in ruminants, while the reverse occurs when fibre content is increased (Johnson and Johnson 1995; Kurihara *et al.* 1997). When dairy cows were fed on high-forage diets, CH<sub>4</sub> production (per kilogram of dry-matter intake, DMI) was 35% higher than when cows were given on high-concentrate feed (Kurihara *et al.* 1997), because the amount of fermented cellulose contributed to CH<sub>4</sub> production more than did the amount of other carbohydrate components (Moe and Tyrrell 1979). Methane production from high-concentrate feed is lower than that from high-forage diet fed at near maintenance (Lovett *et al.* 2003). It is well known that forage type and quality affect the activity of rumen microbes, and, thus, the CH<sub>4</sub> generation from the rumen. Kurihara *et al.* (1995) showed that CH<sub>4</sub> production from cows fed Italian ryegrass hay was lower than that from cows given maize silage. Forages that are highly digestible stay in the rumen for a shorter time, due to the high passage rate, while forages of lower digestibility stay in the foregut comparatively longer and, consequently, lead to higher CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Methane emissions from animals being fed on leguminous forages is reported to be lower than those from animals feeding on grasses, because legumes promote a higher intake and production from the animals (Ramírez-Restrepo and Barry 2005).

Several studies have been conducted on the effect of dietary fibre (DF) on the CH<sub>4</sub> produced in the gastrointestinal tract of pigs (Jørgensen *et al.* 1996; Varel and Yen 1997; Bindelle *et al.*

2008). DF stimulates microbial species within the complex cellulolytic methanogens (Miller and Lin 2002). Moreover, the reductive activity ( $H_2$ ) released during the fibre degradation is used by methanogens to reduce  $CO_2$  to  $CH_4$  (Seradj *et al.* 2014). However, such relationship is masked by the promotion of sulfate-reducing bacteria in the hindgut (Lin and Stewart 1997), which compete with methanogens for the substrate ( $H_2$ ); such competitive relationships between both communities do occur (Ward and Winfrey 1985), although it has been scarcely addressed in the existing literature (Lin and Stewart 1997).

Utilisation of DF is very dependent on the microbiota already present in the hindgut, and, hence, on the development of the GI tract. Both the concentration and synthesis rate of  $CH_4$  are low in caecum and the proximal colon, but they increase gradually in the posterior segments of the hindgut (Jensen and Jørgensen 1994). On the basis of their results, Jensen and Jørgensen (1994) hypothesised that only small net amounts of  $H_2$  were produced in caecum and proximal colon, even though they found a higher microbial activity in these segments and also taking into account that  $H_2$  production is an obligate contributor of anaerobic fermentation in the hindgut.

Pigs fed diets high in neutral detergent fibre tend to emit more  $CH_4$ , but no relevant changes in methanogen concentrations have been detected (Seradj *et al.* 2018); indeed, the link between abundance of methanogens and  $CH_4$  formation in the hindgut ecosystem remains unclear and some results would confirm previous assays conducted by Cao *et al.* (2013, 2016), which showed that the availability neutral detergent fibre improved the diversity, but not abundance, of methanogens.

The extra  $CH_4$  production from aceticlastic archaea may also bias the relationship between fibre availability and  $CH_4$  generation. Presence of the aceticlastic methanogens has been demonstrated previously (Smith and Ingram-Smith 2007); both *Methanosarcina* and *Methanosaetas* species use acetate as a substrate for methanogenesis, but only the latter is known to be specific for acetate utilisation.

Crude protein supply does not seem to alter  $CH_4$  emissions in pigs (Seradj *et al.* 2018), in line with other studies in which no significant differences were detected by lowering the crude protein content in the diet (Le *et al.* 2009; Atakora *et al.* 2011; Osada *et al.* 2011). However, the synchronic competition between methanogens and some ammonia-degrading species cannot be discarded, such as *S. Ruminantium* (Saengkerdsub and Ricke 2014). This competitive mechanism has been described in human gastrointestinal tract where some methanogenic species (*Methanobrevibacter smithii*) compete against the prominent saccharolytic species *B. thetaiotaomicron* for  $NH_4$  assimilation through an upregulation of the ATP-dependent glutamine synthetase–glutamate synthase pathway (Samuel *et al.* 2007). *S. ruminantium* also possesses these ammonia-fixating pathways (Ricke and Schaefer 1996).

### (c) Sections of the digestive tract

The rumen is considered to be the main and most important fermentation chamber in the ruminant animal, whereas microbial breakdown of substrates in the caecum and colon are considered less relevant. However, hindgut fermentation may become relevant in situations in which substrate degradability in the

rumen is decreased (Hoover 1978; Demeyer *et al.* 1996). Depending on the diet profile and the type of animal, between 3% and 14% of starch and between 17% and 35% of fibre ingested can arrive to the large intestine undigested and become available for fermentation (Immig 1996). In this scenario, reductive acetogenesis may become more efficient than methanogenesis, due to three main factors. The first one is the absence of rapidly fermentable carbohydrates; the hindgut is depleted with respect to readily available and easily fermentable carbohydrates, which are the major substrates for acetogenic bacteria in the rumen on a low-fibre diet. This depletion might favour the alternative pathway where acetogenic bacteria use the metabolic  $H_2$  to reduce  $CO_2$  to acetic acid. As methanogens are more limited in their growth substrates than are acetogenic bacteria (Jones 1991), a carbohydrate-depleted rumen or hindgut would enable a microbial environment where both a non-methanogenic and a methanogenic pathway can occur simultaneously, or even a microbial habitat where acetate instead of  $CH_4$  is the  $H_2$  sink. The second factor is the absence of protozoa (Belanche *et al.* 2015); methanogenic bacteria isolated from the rumen clearly show a somatic symbiotic association with ciliate protozoa (Belanche *et al.* 2014), allowing for a more efficient interspecies  $H_2$  transfer from  $H_2$ -producing protozoa to methanogens (Newbold *et al.* 2015). Ciliates can degrade less accessible plant material, thus providing a more sustainable  $H_2$  source for the methanogens (Stumm *et al.* 1982). Finally, the presence of high amounts of free amino-acids from undigested proteins, enzymes, epithelial cells and peptides from cell lysis can initiate reductive acetogenesis (Demeyer *et al.* 1993).

As is known for ruminants, hindgut fermentation in monogastric animals differs from rumen fermentation, with a substantially lower  $CH_4$  production and the presence of reductive acetogenesis or dissimilatory sulfate reduction (Table 1). Sulfate reduction and methanogenesis seem to be mutually exclusive, while methanogenesis and reductive acetogenesis may occur simultaneously in the hindgut. Although acetogenic bacteria have been isolated from the bovine rumen, methanogenesis prevails in the forestomachs.

Since saturation of fatty acids is performed after the ileal–caecal junction (Jørgensen and Just 1988), inclusion of unsaturated oils (such as soy-bean oil) in a basal diet reduce can reduce the amount of  $CH_4$  excreted by pigs, since both metabolites compete for the available  $H_2$  (Christensen and Thorbek 1987). Besides, gut microbial composition in pigs includes acetogenic bacteria (Graeve *et al.* 1990) and sulfate-reducing bacteria (Butine and Leedle 1989). It is accepted that sulfate-reducing bacteria have a higher substrate affinity for  $H_2$  than do methanogenic bacteria when sulfate is available, and, thus,  $CH_4$  emission happens only in the absence of or under limiting sulfate scenario (Lovley *et al.* 1982; Lupton and Zeikus 1984). Moreover, acetogenic bacteria are less competitive than are methanogenic bacteria for available  $H_2$  (Prins and Lankhorst 1977), and, hence, acetogenic bacteria can become active only when both sulfate-reducing bacteria and methanogenic bacteria are less competitive in the  $H_2$  uptake.

Nevertheless, acetogenesis seems to be significant in the caecum and proximal colon of pigs, where pH conditions change, because pH is an important factor in modulating the rate of  $H_2$  uptake (Gibson *et al.* 1990). Both sulfate-reducing and

methanogenic bacteria in human faeces have been shown to be pH sensitive when incubated *in vitro*, and it seems that they prefer neutral or slightly alkaline conditions, whereas acetogenic bacteria reach their maximum capacity at an acidic pH; pH in the caecum and proximal colon of pigs is usually between 5.0 and 5.5, while, in the distal colon, it increases almost up to neutrality (pH 6.5–7.0). In these conditions, acetogenesis appears to be the dominating H<sub>2</sub> sink in the upper segments of the large intestine (caecum and proximal colon), while methanogenesis should be the dominant in the distal colon. Previous studies (Butine and Leedle 1989) have corroborated this hypothesis, showing that the concentration of methanogenic bacteria in pigs was more than 30 times higher in colon than in caecum. Moreover, in a study of Robinson *et al.* (1989), the production of CH<sub>4</sub> was significantly higher (9-fold) in colonic than in caecal samples.

#### (d) Host age

Studies performed by Skillman *et al.* (2004) showed that the establishment of *Methanobrevibacter* populations in young lambs occurred earlier and in a more stable way than did the establishment of *Methanobacterium* populations, which frequently appeared or disappeared as the rumen developed. At 7 weeks after birth, only *Methanobrevibacter* spp. were present in lambs as the detectable methanogens. These results are in accordance with previous reports that *Methanobrevibacter* spp. is the most prevalent methanogen in adult ruminants (Miller 1995; Sharp *et al.* 1998). Studies by Su *et al.* (2014) with piglets of 1–14 days of age showed that the age of the piglets significantly influenced the diversity of methanogens, mainly being dominated by the genus *Methanobrevibacter*. From 1 to 14 days of age, *M. smithii* abundance increased significantly, and that of *M. thaueri* and *M. millerae* decreased significantly. The substitution of *M. smithii* for *M. thaueri*/*M. millerae* did occur in a shorter time in Yorkshire piglets than in Meishan piglets.

In rabbits, methanogenesis appears to be almost absent before weaning, but it starts to increase afterwards (Marounek *et al.* 1999). Comparison of methanogenic activity and archaeal detection between young and adult rabbits lead to non-conclusive results. Using dot-blot hybridisation with 16S rRNA gene-targeted oligonucleotide probes, Bennegadi *et al.* (2003) showed that the archaeal abundance was higher before weaning, while Piattoni *et al.* (1995) reported that, *in vitro*, CH<sub>4</sub> production was negligible before weaning, started to be measurable ~32 days of age and increased further with age. Belenguer *et al.* (2011) detected that only a low proportion of rabbits (2 of 16, 70–80 days of age) produced a significant volume of CH<sub>4</sub> *in vivo*. Nevertheless, despite the proved existence of methanogenic archaea in the rabbit caecum, only some rabbits seem to display an important CH<sub>4</sub> production, which might be related to a potential genetic effect, as suggested by Piattoni *et al.* (1995).

Although culture and breath of CH<sub>4</sub> measurement-based assays have reported that colonisation of the human gut by methanogens does not begin until 2–3 years of age (Rutili *et al.* 1996), methanogens have been detected using molecular techniques during the first months of life (Palmer *et al.* 2007). Some studies have suggested that there may be an increase in the concentration of methanogens in the human colon during the ageing process, as is the case for the rat, in which the faecal

concentrations of methanogenic archaea increase with age (Maczulak *et al.* 1989).

#### (e) Diurnal and seasonal variation

A variety of studies have reported that the CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in wetlands show marked seasonal variation during the growing season (Whalen 2005; Song *et al.* 2009), but to the authors' knowledge, there is not much information regarding the variation of enteric CH<sub>4</sub> production, derived directly from diurnal and seasonal effects. Moreover, most of the experiments have been conducted under controlled conditions on animals kept in pens on constant rations and the observed effect in uncontrolled conditions may be highly influenced by the dietary effect. Evans *et al.* (2009) studied the methanogen populations in the foregut of the wallaby (*Macropus eugenii*) in individuals sampled in May (Australian autumn) and November (Australian spring), so as to investigate the response to a change in the natural diet. In the former group (individuals sampled in Australian autumn), *Methanobrevibacter*-related methanogens were the most abundant (91.6%), and consisted exclusively of *M. gottschalkii*. The second group (methanogens from the Thermoplasmatales-affiliated group) represented only 6.3%. Surprisingly, the opposite structure was observed in individuals from the same colony sampled in spring, with Thermoplasmatales-affiliated methanogens representing 91.7% and *Methanobrevibacter*-related methanogens only 6.2%. However, it is unknown whether this variation in the methanogens is indirectly linked to the inherent seasonal variation in the host diet.

## CH<sub>4</sub> production in different species

### (a) Domestic ruminants

Ruminants are the livestock animals with, by far, the greatest CH<sub>4</sub> emissions both per unit of DMI (21–38 L/kg) and by bodyweight (0.40–0.76 L/kg BW), with minor differences between large (cattle, buffalo and bison) and small (sheep, goat and deer) ruminants (Table 1). In the rumen, the main methanogenic pathway is the hydrogenotrophic one that uses CO<sub>2</sub> as a carbon source and H<sub>2</sub> as the main electron donor (Hungate 1967). Formate can be also considered as a relevant electron donor used by a large population of rumen hydrogenotrophic methanogens and may be responsible for up to 18% of the CH<sub>4</sub> generated in the rumen (Hungate 1967). Other sources for CH<sub>4</sub> production are methylamines and methanol, which are mainly used by methylotrophic methanogens of the order Methanosarcinales and *Methanosphaera* spp. from the order Methanobacteriales (Liu and Whitman 2008). The full contribution of these substrates to methanogenesis has not been fully studied, and, although it has been considered minor (Morgavi *et al.* 2010), it appears to become more relevant when other routes are inhibited (Poulsen *et al.* 2013); this may explain the poor correlation between the observed reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> production and the abundance of most common rumen hydrogenotrophic methanogens (Karnati *et al.* 2009; Tekippe *et al.* 2011). Another way to produce methane in the rumen is the aceticlastic pathway, which uses acetate as a substrate, but this pathway appears to be limited to the members of the order Methanosarcinales (Liu and Whitman 2008) and is very much driven by the H<sub>2</sub> partial pressure, as described below.

Due to the capital importance of H<sub>2</sub> in rumen fermentation (Hungate 1967), the role of methanogens (H<sub>2</sub> utilisers) in both

rumen functioning and animal performance is essential, although their contribution to the formation of rumen microbial biomass is not significant (Janssen and Kirs 2008). Mechanisms to remove the free H<sub>2</sub> help reduce the inhibitory effect of H<sub>2</sub> on the microbial degradation of plant material, and, thus, improve the rate of fermentation (Wolin 1979; McAllister and Newbold 2008). The overall pool of H<sub>2</sub> in the rumen is limited, and the dissolved H<sub>2</sub> concentration comprises 0.014–6.8% of its maximal solubility at 39°C and one atmospheric pressure (0.1–50 µM). The rate and amount of CH<sub>4</sub> production is, therefore, determined by the rate and amount of H<sub>2</sub> passing through the H<sub>2</sub>-dissolved pool (Janssen 2010). The apparent  $K_m$  (half saturation constant in the Michaelis-Menten equation for substrate kinetics) for H<sub>2</sub> in the rumen for CH<sub>4</sub> formation is nearly 1.4 µM; when the H<sub>2</sub> concentration in the rumen increases, the rate of methanogenesis does not necessarily increase proportionally, and, in consequence, CH<sub>4</sub> production per unit feed seems to decrease with an increasing passage rate and starch content of the plant material. Although the available data on H<sub>2</sub> concentration in the rumen are limited, the few available studies have indicated that animals fed on forage diets have a lower H<sub>2</sub> concentration (0.2–1.3 µM) than those fed on grain diets (up to 28 µM; Hungate 1967; Barry *et al.* 1977; Hillman *et al.* 1985). Therefore, it can be speculated that dissolved H<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the rumen appear to be higher when animals are fed readily digestible feed, reaching the higher concentrations directly after feeding. Moreover, H<sub>2</sub> concentration is higher under these conditions, which also promote increased passage rates, decreased CH<sub>4</sub> formation, and a shift to propionate production. Summarising, factors involved in the increased passage rate of feed from the rumen also reduce the amount of CH<sub>4</sub> generated per unit of digested feed, increase the proportion of propionate as a fermentation end product, and increase the concentration of H<sub>2</sub> in the rumen (Janssen 2010). Some practical feeding strategies that have been shown to result in an effective decrease in CH<sub>4</sub> production are (Hristov *et al.* 2013) (1) increasing diet digestibility (i.e. forage quality, grain processing, diets with a high proportion of concentrate) and (2) inclusion of lipids in the diet.

Another key point to consider is the different enzymes used to ultimately produce CH<sub>4</sub> within the methanogenic archaeal population. Across the different metabolic pathways, methanogenic archaea use more than 30 different enzymes to yield CH<sub>4</sub>. To our knowledge, both coenzyme M and methyl-coenzyme M are distinctive of methanogenic archaea (Balch and Wolfe 1979), as well as the enzymes responsible of the formation of methyl-coenzyme M and methyl-coenzyme M reductase. The rest of enzymes and coenzymes involved in methanogenesis are also present in sulfate-reducing archaea (Vorholt *et al.* 1997; Klenk *et al.* 1998).

#### (b) Wild ruminants

Methane production from wild ruminant is quite a hard task to be estimated, basically due to the scarce data on their populations and their voluntary feed-intake level. Crutzen *et al.* (1986) believed that wild ruminants mostly comprise deer and moose, and, as they live entirely on forage and herbs close to maintenance levels, it was assumed that ~9% of the gross energy (GE) intake is lost as CH<sub>4</sub>.

The few studies (Lawler 2002; Hansen 2012) conducted on muskoxen and Norwegian reindeer demonstrated a lower CH<sub>4</sub> production (2.0–3.2% and 5.1–7.6% of GE intake, for muskoxen and Norwegian reindeer respectively) than that of conventional domestic ruminants such as cattle (Woodward *et al.* 2001; 8.6–10.8% of GE).

Salgado (2017) also documented that *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium* and *M. olleyae*, together with *M. smithii*, *M. gottschalkii*, *M. millerae* and *M. thaurei*, were the most abundant methanogens found in these two species of wild ruminant (muskoxen and Norwegian reindeer) where the relative abundance of *M. ruminantium* and *M. olleyae* take lead when animals consume forage-based diets (lichen-based), compared with pelleted concentrate. The same author (Salgado 2017) also concluded that there was a trend between an increase in *M. ruminantium* and *M. olleyae* and a low CH<sub>4</sub> output in the Norwegian reindeer and muskoxen.

#### (c) Camelids

As foregut fermenters, camelids are physiologically similar to ruminants (although present some differences, such as having a three-chambered stomach, compared with a four-chambered stomach of the ruminants), but they are evolutionarily distant from them; moreover, they are known to have a higher productivity on poor-quality vegetation and a lower production of enteric CH<sub>4</sub>. On average, camelids produce approximately one-third less CH<sub>4</sub> per unit of DMI than do their large ruminant counterparts (Table 1). Gut methanogens have been studied in different camelid species with distinct evolutionary lineages (St-Pierre and Wright 2013). In the forestomach of alpacas fed a mixture of timothy, clover and rye, supplemented with fresh fruits, *Methanobrevibacter*-related methanogens appeared to be the most abundant archaea, especially those related to *M. millerae* (St-Pierre and Wright 2012). Hindgut methanogen populations in Bactrian camels were described by Turnbull *et al.* (2012), using faecal samples from animals maintained in captivity. According to that study, *Methanobrevibacter*-related archaea were also the most highly represented group, but, in contrast to the alpaca forestomach, 92.6% of Bactrian faecal 16S rRNA gene sequences were not assigned, although they were related, to *Methanobrevibacter* spp.

#### (d) Pigs

Contrary to ruminants, methanogenesis promotes unsubstantial losses of digestible energy in pigs (Christensen and Thorbek 1987). In a recent study of Jørgensen *et al.* (2011), the average CH<sub>4</sub> production by growing pigs was estimated to be 0.39% of the GE or 0.47% of digestible energy, which is similar to the value for all classes of pigs (0.6% of GE) assumed in the report on emission of greenhouse gases from Danish agriculture (Mikkelsen *et al.* 2011). However, these values can be variable, because both conditions in the fermentation compartment (von Heimendahl *et al.* 2010) and symbiotic microbiota, including methanogens (Cao *et al.* 2016), vary intensely among individuals. Luo *et al.* (2012) studied the diversity of methanogens in Landrace (lean) and Erhualian (obese) pigs. *Methanobrevibacter* was the most abundant genus in both breeds, and *Methanosphaera* the second-most abundant methanogen in Landrace pigs. They also indicated that Landrace pigs have a significantly higher concentration of

methanogens than do the Erhualian pigs. Recent studies by A. R. Seradj, J. Balcells and G. de la Fuente (unpubl. data) also suggest the existence of a breed effect, with pure Duroc animals being higher CH<sub>4</sub> producers than commercial animals, based on Landrace and Large White breeds. This higher production was not followed by an increase in the archaea population in the same animals, in accordance with Luo's work. In both cases, the representative genus was *Methanobrevibacter*.

#### (e) Rabbits

Methanogenic microorganisms have been described in the caecum of adult rabbits and are diverse. Michelland *et al.* (2010) showed differences between the archaeal community present in the rumen of cows and that present in soft and hard faeces of rabbits. Studies of Kušar and Avguštin (2010) suggested that the methanogenic community that inhabits the rabbit's caecum is exclusive, with low complexity and few dominant species, mostly being monopolised by *Methanobrevibacter* sp.

In rabbits, the utilisation of nutrients in the caecum is similar to that observed in other herbivores, but the VFA profile shows a predominance of acetate, followed by butyrate and then by propionate (Gidenne *et al.* 2008), in comparison to the fermentation pattern present in the rumen, where propionate is normally present at a higher concentration than is butyrate. This rabbit-specific VFA pattern seems to be related to the microbiota composition instead of the types of the nutrient entering the caecum (Adjiri *et al.* 1992). Further *in vitro* studies have confirmed the differences in the acetic to propionic ratio from caecum (5.45) and that from rumen contents (2.39) when similar substrate is fermented. Same VFA profile was also observed when comparing wild and domestic rabbits, although lower acetate and higher butyrate proportions were observed in wild rabbits (Abecia *et al.* 2012). This increase in the butyrate concentration can be explained by an increase in butyrate-producing bacteria in the rabbit; these bacteria are well represented across several *Clostridium* clusters (Pryde *et al.* 2002). The greater acetate molar proportion is directly related to the major abundance of acetate-producing bacteria in the rabbit's caecum (Morvan *et al.* 1996).

Competition among the three main H<sub>2</sub>-consuming organisms, namely, methanogenic archaea, acetogenic bacteria and sulfate-reducing bacteria, has been already described in the large intestine. Sulfate-reducing bacteria have a higher substrate affinity for H<sub>2</sub> than do methanogenic archaea, and, thus, have an initial competitive advantage (Gibson *et al.* 1990), but their growth largely depends on sulfate availability. Reductive acetogenesis is an alternative pathway for H<sub>2</sub> disposal, although, theoretically, the relative substrate affinities of methanogens for H<sub>2</sub> ought to promote methanogenesis in a competitive environment (Macfarlane and Gibson 1997). Thus, methanogenesis should generally dominate H<sub>2</sub>-dependent acetate production in anaerobic ecosystems; however, the significant production of acetogenesis in rabbits could be related to the higher acid sensitivity of both sulfate-reducing bacteria and methanogens (Gibson *et al.* 1990). Acetogens are more adapted to grow in a poor-substrate environment and also are more resistant to bile salts (Jezierny *et al.* 2007), which, in fact, gives them a competitive advantage in a digestive tract with a lower pH and a fast passage

rate, compared with methanogens (Morvan *et al.* 1996); this might explain the lower concentration of methanogens in the caecum and colon of rabbits than in the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) of other host species. Similarly, there are no published studies on the presence of protozoa in rabbit species; protozoa play a central role in the H<sub>2</sub> metabolic transfer with the archaeal community in the rumen as well as bacteria concentration in the cell. This absence of protozoa could partially explain the higher concentration of bacteria present in the rabbit caecum than in the rumen (Abecia *et al.* 2004).

#### (f) Horses

Methane losses in horses range between 1.9% and 4.2% of GE, depending on the performance status of the animal (Kienzle *et al.* 2010). This is a lower amount than the predicted value for ruminants. However, CH<sub>4</sub> production by equids (horses, mules and asses) is considerable (up to 80 L per animal per day) compared with that for other monogastric animals. As it has been shown in the case of the rabbit, the main difference between hindgut and rumen fermentation is the predominance of reductive acetogenesis in the former, compared with the latter (Váradyová *et al.* 2000), which provides more energy in the form of VFA than does the methanogenic pathway. The study of Morvan *et al.* (1996) showed a higher concentration of acetogenic bacteria in the caecum than in rumen fluids of horses. Subsequently, some studies performed *in vitro* with semi-continuous culture systems using either equine caecum content (Zeyner *et al.* 2007) or equine faeces (Müller 2009) suggested that equine hindgut fermentation is more similar to bovine hindgut fermentation than to rumen fermentation, since the production of CH<sub>4</sub> remained low when rapidly fermentable carbohydrates were added to hay, even if the pH value within the fermenters was kept stable.

In 1996, archaea were identified in the horse caecum (Morvan *et al.* 1996), and after more than 20 years, the information available is still limited. The prokaryotic methanogen community was 10<sup>4</sup>–10<sup>6</sup> cells/g fresh matter of equine caecal contents (Morvan *et al.* 1996). In a more recent study, the ratio of methanogenic archaea versus total bacteria (MA:TB) was measured by quantitative polymerase chain reaction (Dougal *et al.* 2012) and showed some differences between sections of the GIT, being greater in the right dorsal colon than in the caecum.

Methanogenic archaea are affiliated with the orders Methanobacteriales, Methanomicrobiales and Methanoplasmatales. Recent data have reported different genera in the faecal ecosystem of the horse (*Methanocorpusculum*, *Methanobrevibacter*, *Methanosphaera*, *Methanobacterium*, *Sulfolobus* and *Methanosarcina*; Fernandes *et al.* 2014; Lwin and Matsui 2014). The few studies focused on different regions of the horse GIT have shown that archaeal diversity may differ between faeces and colon, and, as also is the case for other species, faeces as the representatives of equine gut microbiome should be accepted with caution (Fliegerova *et al.* 2016).

#### (g) Others species

##### *Macropods*

Due to their geographical isolation, macropod marsupials have evolved separately from other major herbivore groups such



as ruminants and camelids. Similarly to camelids, their low to undetectable levels of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and their higher productivity on vegetation of poor quality than for ruminants have led to an increased interest in their microbiota composition (Kempton *et al.* 1976; von Engelhardt *et al.* 1978; Dellow *et al.* 1988).

Of particular interest is the gut system of some native Australian macropods such as kangaroos and wallabies. These marsupials exhibit foregut fermentation analogous to that of the rumen; however, they appear to emit minimal amounts of CH<sub>4</sub> compared with ruminants. The mechanisms behind this are poorly understood and could be physiological, such as body temperature, retention time of feed in the gut or host regulation of microorganisms in the gut (von Engelhardt *et al.* 1978). However, potentially, acetogenesis acts in concert with methanogenesis in these animals. Acetogens have been isolated from eastern grey (*Macropus giganteus*) and red (*Macropus rufus*) kangaroos (Ouwkerk *et al.* 2009), as well as from the forestomach of the tammar wallaby (Gagen *et al.* 2014), and all isolates are potent hydrogenotrophs. The recently isolated tammar wallaby acetogen has also demonstrated mixotrophic capabilities, as well as the ability to grow and consume H<sub>2</sub> when in co-culture with a methanogen, with H<sub>2</sub> available at high partial pressures (e.g. >5 mM H<sub>2</sub>; Gagen *et al.* 2014). Furthermore, when grown in co-culture with a methanogen, the tammar wallaby acetogen has been found to recycle H<sub>2</sub> generated from fermentative growth rather than release it for methanogenesis. Isolates such as these, with favourable metabolic characteristics, may be a contributing factor to lower CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in other gut ecosystems and could potentially be useful for strategies to reduce CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ruminants and redirect the otherwise lost energy into acetate.

### Humans

Human methanogenesis is mostly H<sub>2</sub>-dependent for the reduction of both CO<sub>2</sub> and methyl compounds; thus, a reduction in H<sub>2</sub> concentration improves the fermentation and induces alternatives in the metabolic pathways of fermentative bacteria (Nakamura *et al.* 2010). Besides methanogens, this reduction is also performed by two types of hydrogenotrophic microorganism, namely, the reductive acetogenic bacteria (e.g. *Ruminococcus* spp.; Bernalier-Donadille 2010) and the sulfate-reducing bacteria (e.g. *Desulfovibrio* spp.; Rey *et al.* 2013). Hydrogenotrophic methanogenesis from CO<sub>2</sub> utilises 4 mol of H<sub>2</sub> and 1 mol of CO<sub>2</sub> per mol of produced CH<sub>4</sub>, and, thus, efficiently decreases the gas partial pressure in the colon. Methanogenic archaea were discovered more than 30 years ago in the human digestive tract through the detection of CH<sub>4</sub> in the breath and two methanogenic species belonging to the order Methanobacteriales, namely, *Methanobrevibacter smithii* and *Methanosphaera stadtmanae*, have been isolated (Gaci *et al.* 2014). *M. smithii* uses H<sub>2</sub> (or formate) to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> and *M. stadtmanae* uses H<sub>2</sub> to reduce methanol. *M. smithii* was also shown to compete efficiently for the nitrogenous nutrient pool (Samuel *et al.* 2007) and be capable to using different end products from the organic-matter degradation in the gut (Samuel *et al.* 2007). Moreover, it is important to highlight that almost all sequenced human GIT-associated methanogens possess the genes *mtaABC* encoding methyl-transferases

required for methanol utilisation, highlighting the importance of this metabolism for gut methanogens. In the case of *M. stadtmanae*, it is clear that these genes are involved in methanogenesis (Fricke *et al.* 2006), but their role remains less clear for *Methanobrevibacter* spp.

### Termites

The genus *Methanobrevibacter* (Methanobacteriales) is the most abundant methanogen colonising the hindgut of lower termites (Ohkuma *et al.* 1999; Shinzato *et al.* 2001); in contrast, higher termites present a more diverse methanogenic community, mainly composed of Methanobacteriales, Methanomicrobiales and Methanosarcinales (Miyata *et al.* 2007). Some studies based on phylogenetic analyses have shown that these groups are also present in wood-feeding cockroaches (Hara *et al.* 2002) and scarab beetle larvae (Egert *et al.* 2003); however, aceticlastic methanogenesis could not be verified in any of these animals. It can be hypothesised that a shorter retention time in the digestive tract might prevent or hinder the colonisation of slow-growing aceticlastic methanogens (Liu and Whitman 2008).

### Conclusions

The present paper is a comprehensive review that has highlighted the similarities and differences between the methanogenic composition and metabolic pathways used across foregut- and hindgut-fermenting animals. Foregut fermenters (ruminants and camelids), on average, produce between 3.65 and 5.44 times more CH<sub>4</sub> than do hindgut fermenters (pigs, rabbits, horses and ostriches; Seradj *et al.* 2018). This is explained by differences in the diet, digestive physiology and more diverse metabolic routes in hindgut to direct H<sub>2</sub> produced from plant-component fermentation. Deeper understanding of the key microbial groups and pathways will be necessary to develop future methane-mitigation strategies.

### Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### Acknowledgements

This work was supported by FEDER/Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades - Agencia Estatal de Investigación (grant number AGL2017-89289) and European Union's H2020 program under National Institutes of Health (Feed-a-Gene, grant number 633531).

### References

- Abecia L, McEwan N, Newbold C, Fondevila M, Balcells J (2004) Molecular profiling of the major bacterial species in the rabbit caecum as affected by therapeutical doses of antibiotics. In '8th world rabbit congress', Puebla, Mexico. p. 63.
- Abecia L, Rodríguez-Romero N, Yañez-Ruiz D, Fondevila M (2012) Biodiversity and fermentative activity of caecal microbial communities in wild and farm rabbits from Spain. *Anaerobe* **18**, 344–349. doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2012.04.004
- Adjiri D, Bouillier-Oudot M, Lebas F, Candau M (1992) Simulation *in vitro* des fermentations cœcales du lapin en fermenteur à flux semi-continu. I. Rôle du prétraitement du substrat alimentaire. *Reproduction, Nutrition, Development* **32**, 351–360. doi:10.1051/rnd:19920405

- Angel R, Matthies D, Conrad R (2011) Activation of methanogenesis in arid biological soil crusts despite the presence of oxygen. *PLoS One* **6**, e20453. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020453
- Ashby KD, Casey TA, Rasmussen MA, Petrich JW (2001) Steady-state and time-resolved spectroscopy of F420 extracted from methanogen cells and its utility as a marker for fecal contamination. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* **49**, 1123–1127. doi:10.1021/jf000689r
- Atakora JKA, Moehn S, Ball RO (2011) Enteric methane produced by finisher pigs is affected by dietary crude protein content of barley grain based, but not by corn based, diets. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **166–167**, 412–421. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.029
- Balch W, Wolfe R (1979) Specificity and biological distribution of coenzyme M (2-mercaptoethanesulfonic acid). *Journal of Bacteriology* **137**, 256–263.
- Barry T, Thompson A, Armstrong D (1977) Rumen fermentation studies on two contrasting diets. 1. Some characteristics of the *in vivo* fermentation, with special reference to the composition of the gas phase, oxidation/reduction state and volatile fatty acid proportions. *The Journal of Agricultural Science* **89**, 183–195. doi:10.1017/S0021859600027362
- Belanche A, de la Fuente G, Newbold CJ (2014) Study of methanogen communities associated with different rumen protozoal populations. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **90**, 663–677. doi:10.1111/1574-6941.12423
- Belanche A, de la Fuente G, Newbold CJ (2015) Effect of progressive inoculation of fauna-free sheep with Holotrich protozoa and total-fauna on rumen fermentation, microbial diversity and methane emissions. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **362**, 1–10.
- Belenguer A, Fondevila M, Balcells J, Abecia L, Lachica M, Carro M (2011) Methanogenesis in rabbit caecum as affected by the fermentation pattern: *in vitro* and *in vivo* measurements. *World Rabbit Science* **19**, 75–83. doi:10.4995/wrs.2011.826
- Bennegadi N, Fonty G, Millet L, Gidenne T, Licois D (2003) Effects of age and dietary fibre level on caecal microbial communities of conventional and specific pathogen-free rabbits. *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* **15**, 23–32. doi:10.1080/08910600310015574
- Bernalier-Donadille A (2010) Fermentative metabolism by the human gut microbiota. *Gastroenterologie Clinique et Biologique* **34**, S16–S22. doi:10.1016/S0399-8320(10)70016-6
- Bindelle J, Leterme P, Buldgen A (2008) Nutritional and environmental consequences of dietary fibre in pig nutrition: a review. *Biotechnologie, Agronomie, Société et Environnement* **12**, 69–80.
- Borrel G, Parisot N, Harris HM, Peyretailade E, Gaci N, Tottey W, Bardot O, Raymann K, Gribaldo S, Peyret P, O'Toole PW, Brugère J-F (2014) Comparative genomics highlights the unique biology of Methanomassiliicoccales, a Thermoplasmatales-related seventh order of methanogenic archaea that encodes pyrrolysine. *BMC Genomics* **15**, 679. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-15-679
- Bousquet P, Ciais P, Miller J, Dlugokencky EJ, Hauglustaine DA, Prigent C, Van der Werf GR, Peylin P, Brunke EG, Langenfelds RL, Lathièrre J, Papa F, Ramonet M, Schmidt M, Steele LP, Tyler SC, White J (2006) Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability. *Nature* **443**, 439. doi:10.1038/nature05132
- Buddle BM, Denis M, Attwood GT, Altermann E, Janssen PH, Ronimus RS, Pinares-Patiño CS, Muetzel S, Wedlock DN (2011) Strategies to reduce methane emissions from farmed ruminants grazing on pasture. *Veterinary Journal (London, England)* **188**, 11–17. doi:10.1016/j.tvjl.2010.02.019
- Butine TJ, Leedle J (1989) Enumeration of selected anaerobic bacterial groups in cecal and colonic contents of growing–finishing pigs. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **55**, 1112–1116.
- Cao Z, Gong YL, Liao XD, Liang JB, Yu B, Wu YB (2013) Effect of dietary fiber on methane production in Chinese Lantang gilts. *Livestock Science* **157**, 191–199. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2013.06.022
- Cao Z, Liang JB, Liao XD, Wright ADG, Wu YB, Yu B (2016) Effect of dietary fiber on the methanogen community in the hindgut of Lantang gilts. *Animal* 1–11.
- Christensen K, Thorbek G (1987) Methane excretion in the growing pig. *British Journal of Nutrition* **57**, 355–361. doi:10.1079/BJN19870043
- Crutzen PJ, Aselmann I, Seiler W (1986) Methane production by domestic animals, wild ruminants, other herbivorous fauna, and humans. *Tellus. Series B, Chemical and Physical Meteorology* **38**, 271–284. doi:10.3402/tellusb.v38i3-4.15135
- Dellow D, Hume I, Clarke R, Bauchop T (1988) Microbial activity in the forestomach of free-living macropodid marsupials: comparisons with laboratory studies. *Australian Journal of Zoology* **36**, 383–395. doi:10.1071/ZO9880383
- Demeyer D, Locquet N, de Graeve K (1993) Effect van aminozuren op hooifermentie door pens-en caecuminhoud van runderen. In 'Proceedings of the 18de studiedag der Nederlandstalige Voedingsonderzoekers', CTL Gent, 16 April 1993.
- Demeyer DI, Fiedler D, DeGraeve KG (1996) Attempted induction of reductive acetogenesis into the rumen fermentation *in vitro*. *Reproduction, Nutrition, Development* **36**, 233–240. doi:10.1051/md:19960301
- Dittmann MT, Runge U, Lang RA, Moser D, Galeffi C, Kreuzer M, Clauss M (2014) Methane emission by camels. *PLoS One* **9**, e94363. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094363
- Dougal K, Harris PA, Edwards A, Pachebat JA, Blackmore TM, Worgan HJ, Newbold CJ (2012) A comparison of the microbiome and the metabolome of different regions of the equine hindgut. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **82**, 642–652. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2012.01441.x
- Egert M, Wagner B, Lemke T, Brune A, Friedrich MW (2003) Microbial community structure in midgut and hindgut of the humus-feeding larva of *Pachnoda ephippiata* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **69**, 6659–6668. doi:10.1128/AEM.69.11.6659-6668.2003
- Evans PN, Hinds LA, Sly LI, McSweeney CS, Morrison M, Wright A-DG (2009) Community composition and density of methanogens in the foregut of the Tammar wallaby (*Macropus eugenii*). *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **75**, 2598–2602. doi:10.1128/AEM.02436-08
- Evans PN, Parks DH, Chadwick GL, Robbins SJ, Orphan VJ, Golding SD, Tyson GW (2015) Methane metabolism in the archaeal phylum Bathyarchaeota revealed by genome-centric metagenomics. *Science* **350**, 434–438. doi:10.1126/science.aac7745
- Ferguson DJ, Gorlatova N, Grahame DA, Krzycki JA (2000) Reconstitution of dimethylamine: coenzyme M methyl transfer with a discrete corrinoid protein and two methyltransferases purified from *Methanosarcina barkeri*. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* **275**, 29053–29060. doi:10.1074/jbc.M910218199
- Fernandes KA, Kittelmann S, Rogers CW, Gee EK, Bolwell CF, Bermingham EN, Thomas DG (2014) Faecal microbiota of forage-fed horses in New Zealand and the population dynamics of microbial communities following dietary change. *PLoS One* **9**, e112846. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112846
- Fliegerova K, Mura E, Mrázek J, Moniello G (2016) A comparison of microbial profiles of different regions of the equine hindgut. *Livestock Science* **190**, 16–19. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2016.05.015
- Franz R, Soliva CR, Kreuzer M, Hummel J, Clauss M (2011) Methane output of rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) and guinea pigs (*Cavia porcellus*) fed a hay-only diet: implications for the scaling of methane production with body mass in non-ruminant mammalian herbivores. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* **158**, 177–181. doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2010.10.019
- Frei S, Dittmann MT, Reutlinger C, Ortmann S, Hatt JM, Kreuzer M (2015) Methane emission by adult ostriches (*Struthio camelus*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* **180**, 1–5. doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2014.10.019
- Fricke WF, Seedorf H, Henne A, Krüer M, Liesegang H, Hedderich R, Gottschalk G, Thauer RK (2006) The genome sequence of

- Methanospaera stadmanae* reveals why this human intestinal archaeon is restricted to methanol and H<sub>2</sub> for methane formation and ATP synthesis. *Journal of Bacteriology* **188**, 642–658. doi:10.1128/JB.188.2.642-658.2006
- Gaci N, Borrel G, Tottey W, O'Toole PW, Brugère J-F (2014) Archaea and the human gut: new beginning of an old story. *World Journal of Gastroenterology* **20**, 16062. doi:10.3748/wjg.v20.i43.16062
- Gagen EJ, Wang J, Padmanabha J, Liu J, Carvalho IPC, Liu J, Webb RI, Al Jassim R, Morrison M, Denman SE, McSweeney CS (2014) Investigation of a new acetogen isolated from an enrichment of the tammar wallaby forestomach. *BMC Microbiology* **14**, 314. doi:10.1186/s12866-014-0314-3
- Gibson G, Cummings J, Macfarlane G, Allison C, Segal I, Vorster H, Walker A (1990) Alternative pathways for hydrogen disposal during fermentation in the human colon. *Gut* **31**, 679–683. doi:10.1136/gut.31.6.679
- Gidenne T, Combes S, Licois D, Carabaño R, Badiola I, Garcia J (2008) Ecosystème caecal et nutrition du lapin: interactions avec la santé digestive. *INRA Productions Animales* **21**, 239–250.
- Gong YL, Liang JB, Jahromi MF, Wu YB, Wright AG, Liao XD (2018) Mode of action of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* in enteric methane mitigation in pigs. *Animal* **12**, 239–245.
- Graeve KD, Grivet J, Durand M, Beaumatin P, Demeyer D (1990) NMR study of <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> incorporation into short-chain fatty acids by pig large-intestinal flora. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* **36**, 579–582. doi:10.1139/m90-101
- Hansen KK (2012) Methane emissions from reindeer: do reindeer fed lichens emit less methane than reindeer on a pelleted feed diet? MSc Thesis, Universitetet i Tromsø, Norway.
- Hara K, Shinzato N, Seo M, Oshima T, Yamagishi A (2002) Phylogenetic analysis of symbiotic archaea living in the gut of xylophagous cockroaches. *Microbes and Environments* **17**, 185–190. doi:10.1264/jsm2.17.185
- Hedderich R, Whitman WB (2006) Physiology and biochemistry of the methane-producing *Archaea*. In 'The prokaryotes: prokaryotic physiology and biochemistry'. (Eds E Rosenberg, EF DeLong, S Lory, E Stackebrandt, F Thompson) pp. 635–662. (Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg)
- Henderson G, Cox F, Ganesh S, Jonker A, Young W, Collaborators GRC, Janssen PH (2015) Rumen microbial community composition varies with diet and host, but a core microbiome is found across a wide geographical range. *Scientific Reports* **5**, 14567. doi:10.1038/srep14567
- Hillman K, Lloyd D, Williams AG (1985) Use of a portable quadrupole mass spectrometer for the measurement of dissolved gas concentrations in ovine rumen liquor *in situ*. *Current Microbiology* **12**, 335–339. doi:10.1007/BF01567893
- Hook SE, Wright A-DG, McBride BW (2010) Methanogens: methane producers of the rumen and mitigation strategies. *Archaea* 1–11. doi:10.1155/2010/945785
- Hoover WH (1978) Digestion and absorption in the hindgut of ruminants. *Journal of Animal Science* **46**, 1789–1799. doi:10.2527/jas1978.4661789x
- Hristov AN, Oh J, Firkins JL, Dijkstra J, Kebreab E, Waghorn G, Makkar HPS, Adesogan AT, Yang W, Lee C, Gerber PJ, Henderson B, Tricarico JM (2013) Special topics: mitigation of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from animal operations: I. A review of enteric methane mitigation options. *Journal of Animal Science* **91**, 5045–5069. doi:10.2527/jas.2013-6583
- Hristov AN, Oh J, Giallongo F, Frederick TW, Harper MT, Weeks HL, Branco AF, Moate PJ, Deighton MH, Williams SRO, Kindermann M, Duval S (2015) An inhibitor persistently decreased enteric methane emission from dairy cows with no negative effect on milk production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **112**, 10663–10668. doi:10.1073/pnas.1504124112
- Hungate R (1967) Hydrogen as an intermediate in the rumen fermentation. *Archives of Microbiology* **59**, 158–164.
- Immig I (1996) The rumen and hindgut as source of ruminant methanogenesis. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **42**, 57–72. doi:10.1007/BF00394042
- IPCC (2015) 'Climate change 2014: mitigation of climate change.' (Eds O Edenhofer, R Pichs-Madruga, Y Sokona, E Farahani, S Kadner, K Seyboth, A Adler, I Baum, S Brunner, P Eickemeier, B Kriemann, J Savolainen, S Schlömer, C von Stechow, T Zwickel, JC Minx) (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK; New York, NY)
- Janssen PH (2010) Influence of hydrogen on rumen methane formation and fermentation balances through microbial growth kinetics and fermentation thermodynamics. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **160**, 1–22. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2010.07.002
- Janssen PH, Kirs M (2008) Structure of the archaeal community of the rumen. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **74**, 3619–3625. doi:10.1128/AEM.02812-07
- Jensen BB (1996) Methanogenesis in monogastric animals. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **42**, 99–112. doi:10.1007/BF00394044
- Jensen BB, Jørgensen H (1994) Effect of dietary fiber on microbial activity and microbial gas production in various regions of the gastrointestinal tract of pigs. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **60**, 1897–1904.
- Jetten MS, Stams AJ, Zehnder AJ (1992) Methanogenesis from acetate: a comparison of the acetate metabolism in *Methanotherx soehngenii* and *Methanosarcina* spp. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **88**, 181–197. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.1992.tb04987.x
- Jeyanathan J, Kirs M, Ronimus RS, Hoskin SO, Janssen PH (2011) Methanogen community structure in the rumens of farmed sheep, cattle and red deer fed different diets. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **76**, 311–326. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2011.01056.x
- Jezierny D, Steingäß H, Drochner W (2007) *In vitro* gas formation and fermentation parameters using different substrates and pig faecal inocula affected by bile extract. *Livestock Science* **109**, 145–148. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2007.01.127
- Johnson KA, Johnson DE (1995) Methane emissions from cattle. *Journal of Animal Science* **73**, 2483–2492. doi:10.2527/1995.7382483x
- Jones W (1991) 'Diversity and physiology of methanogens.' In 'Microbial production and consumption of greenhouse gases; methane, nitrogen oxide and halomethane'. (Eds JE Rogers, WB Whitman) pp. 39–51. (American Society for Microbiology: CA)
- Jørgensen H, Just A (1988) Effect of different dietary components on site of absorption/site of disappearance of nutrients. In 'Proceedings of the IVth international symposium on digestive physiology in pigs', Institute of Animal Physiology and Nutrition, Jablonna, Poland. (Eds L Buraczewska, S Buraczewski, B Pastuszewska, T Zebrowska) pp. 230–239.
- Jørgensen H, Zhao X-q, Eggum BO (1996) The influence of dietary fibre and environmental temperature on the development of the gastrointestinal tract, digestibility, degree of fermentation in the hind-gut and energy metabolism in pigs. *British Journal of Nutrition* **75**, 365–378. doi:10.1079/BJN19960140
- Jørgensen H, Theil PK, Knudsen KEB (2011) Enteric methane emission from pigs. In 'Planet earth 2011: global warming challenges and opportunities for policy and practice'. (Ed. E Carayannis) pp. 605–622. (InTech: London, UK)
- Karnati SKR, Yu Z, Firkins JL (2009) Investigating unsaturated fat, monensin, or bromoethanesulfonate in continuous cultures retaining ruminal protozoa. II. Interaction of treatment and presence of protozoa on prokaryotic communities. *Journal of Dairy Science* **92**, 3861–3873. doi:10.3168/jds.2008-1437
- Kempton T, Murray R, Leng R (1976) Methane production and digestibility measurements in the grey kangaroo and sheep. *Australian Journal of Biological Sciences* **29**, 209–214. doi:10.1071/BI9760209

- Kelly WJ, Li D, Lambie SC, Cox F, Attwood GT, Altermann E, Leahy SC (2016) Draft genome sequence of the rumen methanogen *Methanobrevibacter olleyae* YLM1. *Genome Announcements* **4**, e00232-16. doi:10.1128/genomeA.00232-16
- Kienzle E, Coenen M, Zeyner A (2010) Maintenance metabolisable energy requirements in horses. *Übersichten zur Tierernährung* **38**, 33–54.
- Klenk H-P, Clayton RA, Tomb J-F, White O, Nelson KE, Ketchum KA, Dodson RJ, Gwinn M, Hickey EK, Peterson JD, Richardson DL, Kerlavage AR, Graham DE, Kyrpides NC, Fleischmann RD, Quackenbush J, Lee NH, Sutton GG, Gill S, Kirkness EF, Dougherty BA, McKenney K, Adams MD, Loftu B, Peterson S, Reich CI, McNeil LK, Badger JH, Glodek A, Zhou L, Overbeek R, Gocayne JD, Weidman JF, McDonald L, Utterback T, Cotton MD, Spriggs T, Artiach P, Kaine BP, Sykes SM, Sadow PW, D'Andrea KP, Bowman C, Fujii C, Garland SA, Mason TM, Olsen GJ, Fraser CM, Smith HO, Woese CR, Venter JC (1998) Corrections: the complete genome sequence of the hyperthermophilic, sulphate-reducing archaeon *Archaeoglobus fulgidus*. *Nature* **394**, 101.
- Klieve A, Ouwerkerk D, Maguire A (2012) Archaea in the foregut of macropod marsupials: PCR and amplicon sequence-based observations. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **113**, 1065–1075. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2012.05428.x
- Kurihara M, Kume S, Aii T, Takahashi S, Shibata M, Nishida T (1995) Feeding method for dairy cattle to cope with global warming: technical assessment based on energy metabolism. *Bulletin of the Kyushu National Agricultural Experiment Station (Japan)* **29**, 21–107.
- Kurihara M, Shibata M, Nishida T, Purnomoadi A, Terada F (1997) Methane production and its dietary manipulation in ruminants. In 'Rumen microbes and digestive physiology in ruminants'. (Eds R Onodera, H Itabashi, K Ushida, H Yano, Y Sasaki) pp. 199–208. (Japan Scientific Societies Press: Tokyo)
- Kušar D, Avguštin G (2010) Molecular profiling and identification of methanogenic archaeal species from rabbit caecum. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **74**, 623–630. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2010.00980.x
- Lawler JP (2002) Heat increment and methane production by muskoxen fed browse. PhD Thesis. University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Le PD, Aarnink AJA, Jongbloed AW (2009) Odour and ammonia emission from pig manure as affected by dietary crude protein level. *Livestock Science* **121**, 267–274. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2008.06.021
- Lin JT, Stewart V (1997) Nitrate assimilation by bacteria. *Advances in Microbial Physiology* **39**, 1–30. doi:10.1016/S0065-2911(08)60014-4
- Liu Y, Whitman WB (2008) Metabolic, phylogenetic, and ecological diversity of the methanogenic archaea. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1125**, 171–189. doi:10.1196/annals.1419.019
- Lovett D, Lovell S, Stack L, Callan J, Finlay M, Conolly J, O'Mara F (2003) Effect of forage/concentrate ratio and dietary coconut oil level on methane output and performance of finishing beef heifers. *Livestock Production Science* **84**, 135–146. doi:10.1016/j.livprodsci.2003.09.010
- Lovley DR, Dwyer DF, Klug MJ (1982) Kinetic analysis of competition between sulfate reducers and methanogens for hydrogen in sediments. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **43**, 1373–1379.
- Luo Y-h, Su Y, Wright A-DG, Zhang L-l, Smidt H, Zhu W-y (2012) Lean breed Landrace pigs harbor fecal methanogens at higher diversity and density than obese breed Erhualian pigs. *Archaea (Vancouver, B.C.)* **2012**, 605289. doi:10.1155/2012/605289
- Lupton FS, Zeikus JG (1984) Physiological basis for sulfate-dependent hydrogen competition between sulfidogens and methanogens. *Current Microbiology* **11**, 7–11. doi:10.1007/BF01567568
- Lwin K-O, Matsui H (2014) Comparative analysis of the methanogen diversity in horse and pony by using *mcrA* gene and archaeal 16S rRNA gene clone libraries. *Archaea (Vancouver, B.C.)* **2014**, 483574. doi:10.1155/2014/483574
- Macfarlane GT, Gibson GR (1997) Carbohydrate fermentation, energy transduction and gas metabolism in the human large intestine. In 'Gastrointestinal microbiology'. (Eds RI Mackie, BA White) pp. 269–318. (Springer: Boston, MA)
- Maczulak AE, Wolin M, Miller TL (1989) Increase in colonic methanogens and total anaerobes in aging rats. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **55**, 2468–2473.
- Madsen J, Bertelsen MF (2012) Methane production by red-necked wallabies (*Macropus rufogriseus*). *Journal of Animal Science* **90**, 1364–1370. doi:10.2527/jas.2011-4011
- Marounek M, Fievez V, Mbanzamihigo L, Demeyer D, Maertens L (1999) Age and incubation time effects on *in vitro* caecal fermentation pattern in rabbits before and after weaning. *Archives of Animal Nutrition* **52**, 195–201.
- McAllister TA, Newbold CJ (2008) Redirecting rumen fermentation to reduce methanogenesis. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* **48**, 7–13. doi:10.1071/EA07218
- Michelland RJ, Monteils V, Combes S, Cauquil L, Gidenne T, Fortun-Lamothe L (2010) Comparison of the archaeal community in the fermentative compartment and faeces of the cow and the rabbit. *Anaerobe* **16**, 396–401. doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2010.04.004
- Mikkelsen MH, Albrektsen R, Gyldenkaerne S (2011) 'Danish emission inventories for agriculture: inventories 1985–2009.' (National Environmental Research Institute, Aarhus University: Aarhus, Denmark)
- Miller TL (1995) Ecology of methane production and hydrogen sinks in the rumen. In 'Ruminant physiology: digestion, metabolism, growth and reproduction'. (Eds W von Engelhardt, S Leonhard-Marek, G Breves, D Giesecke) pp. 317–331. (Ferdinand Enke Verlag: Stuttgart, Germany)
- Miller TL, Lin C (2002) Description of *Methanobrevibacter gottschalkii* sp. nov., *Methanobrevibacter thaueri* sp. nov., *Methanobrevibacter woesei* sp. nov. and *Methanobrevibacter wolinii* sp. nov. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **52**, 819–822.
- Miyata R, Noda N, Tamaki H, Kinjyo K, Aoyagi H, Uchiyama H, Tanaka H (2007) Phylogenetic relationship of symbiotic archaea in the gut of the higher termite *Nasutitermes takasagoensis* fed with various carbon sources. *Microbes and Environments* **22**, 157–164. doi:10.1264/jsm.2.22.157
- Moe P, Tyrrell H (1979) Methane production in dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* **62**, 1583–1586. doi:10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(79)83465-7
- Morgavi DP, Forano E, Martin C, Newbold CJ (2010) Microbial ecosystem and methanogenesis in ruminants. *Animal* **4**, 1024–1036. doi:10.1017/S1751731110000546
- Morvan B, Bonnemoy F, Fonty G, Gouet P (1996) Quantitative determination of H<sub>2</sub>-utilizing acetogenic and sulfate-reducing bacteria and methanogenic archaea from digestive tract of different mammals. *Current Microbiology* **32**, 129–133. doi:10.1007/s002849900023
- Moss A (1994) Methane production by ruminants: literature review. I. Dietary manipulation to reduce methane production; II. Laboratory procedures for estimating methane potential of diets. *Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews Series B* **64**, 786–806.
- Müller CE (2009) Long-stemmed vs. cut haylage in bales: effects on fermentation, aerobic storage stability, equine eating behaviour and characteristics of equine faeces. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **152**, 307–321. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2009.04.016
- Nakamura N, Lin HC, McSweeney CS, Mackie RI, Gaskins HR (2010) Mechanisms of microbial hydrogen disposal in the human colon and implications for health and disease. *Annual Review of Food Science and Technology* **1**, 363–395. doi:10.1146/annurev.food.102308.124101
- Newbold CJ, de la Fuente G, Belanche A, Ramos-Morales E, McEwan NR (2015) The role of ciliate protozoa in the rumen. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **6**, 1–14. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01313
- Ohkuma M, Noda S, Kudo T (1999) Phylogenetic relationships of symbiotic methanogens in diverse termites. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **171**, 147–153. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.1999.tb13425.x

- Osada T, Takada R, Shinzato I (2011) Potential reduction of greenhouse gas emission from swine manure by using a low-protein diet supplemented with synthetic amino acids. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **166**–167, 562–574. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.079
- Ouwerkerk D, Maguire A, McMillen L, Klieve A (2009) Hydrogen utilising bacteria from the forestomach of eastern grey (*Macropus giganteus*) and red (*Macropus rufus*) kangaroos. *Animal Production Science* **49**, 1043–1051. doi:10.1071/EA08294
- Palmer C, Bik EM, DiGiulio DB, Relman DA, Brown PO (2007) Development of the human infant intestinal microbiota. *PLoS Biology* **5**, e177. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050177
- Patra A, Park T, Kim M, Yu Z (2017) Rumen methanogens and mitigation of methane emission by anti-methanogenic compounds and substances. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology* **8**, 13. doi:10.1186/s40104-017-0145-9
- Piattoni F, Maertens L, Demeyer D (1995) Age dependent variation of caecal contents composition of young rabbits. *Archives of Animal Nutrition* **48**, 347–355.
- Poulsen M, Schwab C, Jensen BB, Engberg RM, Spang A, Canibe N, Højberg O, Milinovich G, Fragner L, Schleper C, Weckwerth W, Lund P, Schramm A, Ulrich T (2013) Methylophilic methanogenic Thermoplasmata implicated in reduced methane emissions from bovine rumen. *Nature Communications* **4**, 1428. doi:10.1038/ncomms2432
- Prins R, Lankhorst A (1977) Synthesis of acetate from CO<sub>2</sub> in the cecum of some rodents. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **1**, 255–258. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.1977.tb00627.x
- Pryde SE, Duncan SH, Hold GL, Stewart CS, Flint HJ (2002) The microbiology of butyrate formation in the human colon. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **217**, 133–139. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.2002.tb11467.x
- Ramírez-Restrepo C, Barry T (2005) Alternative temperate forages containing secondary compounds for improving sustainable productivity in grazing ruminants. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **120**, 179–201. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2005.01.015
- Rey FE, Gonzalez MD, Cheng J, Wu M, Ahern PP, Gordon JI (2013) Metabolic niche of a prominent sulfate-reducing human gut bacterium. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **110**, 13582–13587. doi:10.1073/pnas.1312524110
- Ricke S, Schaefer D (1996) Growth and fermentation responses of *Selenomonas ruminantium* to limiting and non-limiting concentrations of ammonium chloride. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* **46**, 169–175. doi:10.1007/s002530050800
- Robinson JA, Smolenski WJ, Ogilvie ML, Peters JP (1989) *In vitro* total-gas, CH<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>, volatile fatty acid, and lactate kinetics studies on luminal contents from the small intestine, cecum, and colon of the pig. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **55**, 2460–2467.
- Rother M, Metcalf WW (2004) Anaerobic growth of *Methanosarcina acetivorans* C2A on carbon monoxide: an unusual way of life for a methanogenic archaeon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **101**, 16929–16934. doi:10.1073/pnas.0407486101
- Rutili A, Canzi E, Brusa T, Ferrari A (1996) Intestinal methanogenic bacteria in children of different ages. *The New Microbiologica* **19**, 227–243.
- Saengkerdsut S, Ricke SC (2014) Ecology and characteristics of methanogenic archaea in animals and humans. *Critical Reviews in Microbiology* **40**, 97–116. doi:10.3109/1040841X.2013.763220
- Sahakian AB, Jee S-R, Pimentel M (2010) Methane and the gastrointestinal tract. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* **55**, 2135–2143. doi:10.1007/s10620-009-1012-0
- Sakai S, Imachi H, Hanada S, Ohashi A, Harada H, Kamagata Y (2008) *Methanocella paludicola* gen. nov., sp. nov., a methane-producing archaeon, the first isolate of the lineage ‘Rice Cluster I’, and proposal of the new archaeal order *Methanocellales* ord. nov. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **58**, 929–936. doi:10.1099/ijs.0.65571-0
- Sakai S, Imachi H, Sekiguchi Y, Tseng I-C, Ohashi A, Harada H, Kamagata Y (2009) Cultivation of methanogens under low-hydrogen conditions by using the coculture method. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **75**, 4892–4896. doi:10.1128/AEM.02835-08
- Salgado AF (2017) Gut metagenomics in relation to diet and methanogenesis in arctic herbivores. PhD Thesis. The Arctic University of Norway.
- Samuel BS, Hansen EE, Manchester JK, Coutinho PM, Henrissat B, Fulton R, Latreille P, Kim K, Wilson RK, Gordon JI (2007) Genomic and metabolic adaptations of *Methanobrevibacter smithii* to the human gut. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **104**, 10643–10648. doi:10.1073/pnas.0704189104
- Scheehle EA, Kruger D (2006) Global anthropogenic methane and nitrous oxide emissions. *Energy Journal* **27**, 33–44.
- Seedorf H, Kittelmann S, Janssen PH (2015) Few highly abundant operational taxonomic units dominate within rumen methanogenic archaeal species in New Zealand sheep and cattle. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **81**, 986–995. doi:10.1128/AEM.03018-14
- Seradj A, Abecia L, Crespo J, Villalba D, Fondevila M, Balcells J (2014) The effect of Bioflavex® and its pure flavonoid components on *in vitro* fermentation parameters and methane production in rumen fluid from steers given high concentrate diets. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **197**, 85–91. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2014.08.013
- Seradj AR, Balcells J, Morazan H, Alvarez-Rodriguez J, Babet D, De la Fuente G (2018) The impact of reducing dietary crude protein and increasing total dietary fiber on hindgut fermentation, the methanogen community and gas emission in growing pigs. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **245**, 54–66. doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2018.09.005
- Sharp R, Ziemer CJ, Stern MD, Stahl DA (1998) Taxon-specific associations between protozoal and methanogen populations in the rumen and a model rumen system. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **26**, 71–78. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.1998.tb01563.x
- Shinzato N, Matsumoto T, Yamaoka I, Oshima T, Yamagishi A (2001) Methanogenic symbionts and the locality of their host lower termites. *Microbes and Environments* **16**, 43–47. doi:10.1264/jisme.2.2001.43
- Skillman LC, Evans PN, Naylor GE, Morvan B, Jarvis GN, Joblin KN (2004) 16S ribosomal DNA-directed PCR primers for ruminal methanogens and identification of methanogens colonising young lambs. *Anaerobe* **10**, 277–285. doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2004.05.003
- Smith KS, Ingram-Smith C (2007) Methanosaeta, the forgotten methanogen? *Trends in Microbiology* **15**, 150–155. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2007.02.002
- Song C, Xu X, Tian H, Wang Y (2009) Ecosystem-atmosphere exchange of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O and ecosystem respiration in wetlands in the Sanjiang Plain, northeastern China. *Global Change Biology* **15**, 692–705. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01821.x
- Spang A, Caceres EF, Etema TJ (2017) Genomic exploration of the diversity, ecology, and evolution of the archaeal domain of life. *Science* **357**, eaaf3883. doi:10.1126/science.aaf3883
- St-Pierre B, Wright A-DG (2012) Molecular analysis of methanogenic archaea in the forestomach of the alpaca (*Vicugna pacos*). *BMC Microbiology* **12**, 1. doi:10.1186/1471-2180-12-1
- St-Pierre B, Wright A-D (2013) Diversity of gut methanogens in herbivorous animals. *Animal* **7**, 49–56. doi:10.1017/S1751731112000912
- Stumm C, Gijzen H, Vogels G (1982) Association of methanogenic bacteria with ovine rumen ciliates. *British Journal of Nutrition* **47**, 95–99. doi:10.1079/BJN19820013
- Su Y, Bian G, Zhu Z, Smidt H, Zhu W (2014) Early methanogenic colonisation in the faeces of Meishan and Yorkshire piglets as determined by pyrosequencing analysis. *Archaea* **2014**, 547908. doi:10.1155/2014/547908
- Swart D, Siebrits FK, Hayes JP (1993) Utilization of metabolizable energy by ostrich (*Struthio camelus*) chicks at two different concentrations of dietary energy and crude fibre originating from lucerne. *South African Journal of Animal Science* **23**, 136–141.

- Tajima K, Nagamine T, Matsui H, Nakamura M, Aminov RI (2001) Phylogenetic analysis of archaeal 16S rRNA libraries from the rumen suggests the existence of a novel group of archaea not associated with known methanogens. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **200**, 67–72. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.2001.tb10694.x
- Tekippe J, Hristov A, Heyler K, Cassidy TW, Zheljzkov VD, Ferreira JFS, Karnati SK, Varga GA (2011) Rumen fermentation and production effects of *Origanum vulgare* L. leaves in lactating dairy cows. *Journal of Dairy Science* **94**, 5065–5079. doi:10.3168/jds.2010-4095
- Turnbull KL, Smith RP, St-Pierre B, Wright A-DG (2012) Molecular diversity of methanogens in fecal samples from Bactrian camels (*Camelus bactrianus*) at two zoos. *Research in Veterinary Science* **93**, 246–249. doi:10.1016/j.rvsc.2011.08.013
- Vanwonderghem I, Evans PN, Parks DH, Jensen PD, Woodcroft BJ, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW (2016) Methylophilic methanogenesis discovered in the archaeal phylum Verstraetearchaeota. *Nature Microbiology* **1**, 16170. doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.170
- Váradyová Z, Zeleňák I, Siroka P (2000) *In vitro* study of the rumen and hindgut fermentation of fibrous materials (meadow hay, beech sawdust, wheat straw) in sheep. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **83**, 127–138. doi:10.1016/S0377-8401(99)00121-2
- Varel V, Yen JT (1997) Microbial perspective on fiber utilization by swine. *Journal of Animal Science* **75**, 2715–2722. doi:10.2527/1997.75102715x
- Videvall E, Song SJ, Bensch HM, Strandh M, Engelbrecht A, Serfontein N, Hellgren O, Olivier A, Cloete S, Knight R, Cornwallis CK (2018) The development of gut microbiota in ostriches and its association with juvenile growth. *bioRxiv* 270017. doi:10.1101/270017
- von Engelhardt W, Wolter S, Lawrenz H, Hemsley J (1978) Production of methane in two non-ruminant herbivores. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part A, Physiology* **60**, 309–311. doi:10.1016/0300-9629(78)90254-2
- von Heimendahl E, Breves G, Abel H (2010) Fiber-related digestive processes in three different breeds of pigs. *Journal of Animal Science* **88**, 972–981. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-2370
- Vorholt JA, Hafenbradl D, Stetter KO, Thauer RK (1997) Pathways of autotrophic CO<sub>2</sub> fixation and of dissimilatory nitrate reduction to N<sub>2</sub>O in *Ferroglobus placidus*. *Archives of Microbiology* **167**, 19–23. doi:10.1007/s002030050411
- Ward D, Winfrey M (1985) Interactions between methanogenic and sulfate-reducing bacteria in sediments. *Advances in Aquatic Microbiology* **3**, 141–179.
- Whalen S (2005) Biogeochemistry of methane exchange between natural wetlands and the atmosphere. *Environmental Engineering Science* **22**, 73–94. doi:10.1089/ees.2005.22.73
- Wolin MJ (1979) The rumen fermentation: a model for microbial interactions in anaerobic ecosystems. In 'Advances in microbial ecology'. (Ed. M Alexander) pp. 49–77. (Springer: Boston, MA)
- Woodward S, Waghorn G, Ulyatt M, Lassey K (2001) Early indications that feeding *Lotus* will reduce methane emissions from ruminants. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production* **61**, 23–26.
- Wright A-DG, Williams AJ, Winder B, Christophersen CT, Rodgers SL, Smith KD (2004) Molecular diversity of rumen methanogens from sheep in Western Australia. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **70**, 1263–1270. doi:10.1128/AEM.70.3.1263-1270.2004
- Wright A-DG, Toovey AF, Pimm CL (2006) Molecular identification of methanogenic archaea from sheep in Queensland, Australia reveal more uncultured novel archaea. *Anaerobe* **12**, 134–139. doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2006.02.002
- Wright A-DG, Auckland CH, Lynn DH (2007) Molecular diversity of methanogens in feedlot cattle from Ontario and Prince Edward Island, Canada. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **73**, 4206–4210. doi:10.1128/AEM.00103-07
- Yuan Y, Conrad R, Lu Y (2009) Responses of methanogenic archaeal community to oxygen exposure in rice field soil. *Environmental Microbiology Reports* **1**, 347–354. doi:10.1111/j.1758-2229.2009.00036.x
- Zeyner A, Engelmann W, Dill B, Markuske K, Aschenbach J (2007) Effects of slowly increasing fructan load on equine caecum content in a semi-continuous *in vitro* technique (Caesitec). In '11th congress of the European Society of Veterinary and Comparative Nutrition', Leipzig, Germany. p. 51.

Handling editor: Zoey Durmic