



## OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY  
Alexander Nikolov Hristov,  
The Pennsylvania State University (PSU),  
United States

\*CORRESPONDENCE  
Mélissa Duplessis  
✉ melissa.duplessis@agr.gc.ca

RECEIVED 06 September 2023  
ACCEPTED 04 October 2023  
PUBLISHED 16 November 2023

CITATION  
Duplessis M, Terry SA, Pontes LdS and  
Leytem AB (2023) Editorial: Mitigating the  
impact of animal production on the  
environment: the ecosystem integration.  
*Front. Anim. Sci.* 4:1289902.  
doi: 10.3389/fanim.2023.1289902

COPYRIGHT  
© 2023 daS Pontes and Leytem and His  
Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as  
represented by the Minister of Agriculture  
and Agri-Food Canada for the contribution  
of Duplessis and Terry. This is an open-  
access article distributed under the terms of  
the [Creative Commons Attribution License  
\(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or  
reproduction in other forums is permitted,  
provided the original author(s) and the  
copyright owner(s) are credited and that  
the original publication in this journal is  
cited, in accordance with accepted  
academic practice. No use, distribution or  
reproduction is permitted which does not  
comply with these terms.

# Editorial: Mitigating the impact of animal production on the environment: the ecosystem integration

Mélissa Duplessis<sup>1\*</sup>, Stephanie A. Terry<sup>2</sup>, Laíse da S. Pontes<sup>3</sup>  
and April B. Leytem<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sherbrooke Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada, <sup>2</sup>Lethbridge Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, AB, Canada, <sup>3</sup>Animal Production Area, Rural Development Institute of Paraná – IAPAR-Emater, Ponta Grossa, Brazil, <sup>4</sup>Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Kimberly, ID, United States

## KEYWORDS

sustainability, resilience, holistic approach, ecosystem interaction, transdisciplinary team

## Editorial on the Research Topic

### Mitigating the impact of animal production on the environment: the ecosystem integration

Climate change, mainly caused by human activities, is one of the biggest challenges modern civilization is facing (Malhi et al., 2021). Worldwide, there is a multiplication of extreme weather events causing economic and societal pressure. This greatly affects agriculture by impacting crop yields and animal productivity (Rosenzweig et al., 2001). Moreover, the global food demand is continuously increasing as the world population and the urban lifestyle grow. World population is expected to increase 1.3 fold by 2050 (United Nations, 2017), hence increasing the global food demand by 1.5-2 fold (Valin et al., 2014). Transformative and innovative solutions are needed to ensure a resilient and sustainable agriculture for future generations. In the last few years, novel initiatives have been brought forward by different funding agencies, such as promoting living laboratories or the One Health approach. These strategies are intended to respond to emerging problems in an integrated manner with transdisciplinary teams. As such, it is important to consider that a type of management could benefit one part of the ecosystem and be detrimental to the other. This Research Topic aimed to offer a broad overview of research conducted to mitigate the impact of livestock production on the ecosystem. A total of 7 papers have been published from authors all around the globe to address different issues related to ruminant rearing with a same common objective to achieve agriculture sustainability.

Thanks to their ruminal indwelling bacteria, ruminants are able to transform human inedible foods such as forage and high-fiber feeds to high-quality human-edible foods, strengthening the crucial role of ruminants in ecosystem sustainability (Oltjen and Beckett, 1996). Indeed, ruminant products such as milk and meat possess high nutritional value for humans considering their excellent amino acid profile and rich content of vitamin B<sub>12</sub>, amongst others (Pereira and Vicente, 2013; Pereira, 2014). In return, enteric methane, a gas with powerful global warming potential, is produced as a by-product of ruminal fiber and

carbohydrate digestion. On dairy farms, enteric fermentation contributes an average of 46% of greenhouse gas emissions (Jayasundara and Wagner-Riddle, 2014). Over the last few decades, research has been conducted to reduce enteric methane production and increase ruminant feed efficiency. For instance, different feed additives and strategies have shown promising results (Hristov et al., 2022). The effect of palm kernel cake, an agro-industry co-product of palm oil extraction, on enteric methane of buffaloes has been assessed by Amaral Júnior et al. The high content of residual fat of this feed additive modifies ruminal methanogenic bacteria populations. With a dietary inclusion rate of 1% of palm kernel cake, methane emission per kg of meat produced was reduced but further studies should be conducted to evaluate the impact of this co-product on animal performance and feed efficiency. The use of this feed additive also promotes a circular economy, although the oil palm industry has been shown to contribute to negative environmental impacts (Meijaard et al., 2020). Another contribution in the Research Topic by Parra et al. evaluated the addition of 9 feed additives on methane emission under *in vitro* conditions. In some countries, such as Australia, the beef cattle industry targets to be carbon neutral by 2030, although other countries such as Canada set the target by 2050. It is therefore important to evaluate promising feed additives which can reduce enteric methane emission without altering ruminal fermentation and digestion. The 9 feed additives studied were: garlic powder, biochar + nitrates, biochar + *Asparagopsis*, commercial essential oil blend, citral extract, pure Sandalwood essential oil extract, *Bacillus* probiotic additive, and sugar cane extract as powder or liquid compared to a Rhodes grass to replicate Australian beef grazing systems. Of the studied additives, only biochar + nitrates and biochar + *Asparagopsis* successfully decreased methane production without impacting ruminal fermentation characteristics and digestion. Although *in vitro* data should be verified by *in vivo* studies, they are essential to stimulate discussions and new *in vivo* project ideas. Different species of algae has also been reported to decrease enteric methane when given as a dietary supplement (Abbott et al., 2020). Although feed additives or by-products have been shown to reduce enteric methane by ruminants, the work from Lind et al. highlighted that several considerations should be observed before offering them to the ruminants. Indeed, brown macroalgae such as *Laminaria hyperborea* or its by-product after alginate production contain high amount of iodine which can be harmful for animal and human health and increase manure iodine concentration.

Even if the major contributor of methane on a dairy farm is enteric fermentation by cows, manure management accounts for 18% of the total greenhouse gas emissions (Jayasundara and Wagner-Riddle, 2014). Strategies to mitigate methane emission from manure storage is then worth investigating as reported by Feng et al. They evaluated the impact of anaerobic digestion, solid-liquid separation and nutrient recovery of manure on methane emission and other greenhouse gases such as nitrous oxide. The combination of the 3 processing systems decreased methane emissions of liquid manure storage by 87% compared with anaerobic digestion alone. Manure also contains valuable nutrients for crops such as phosphorus and nitrogen coming

from a normal inefficiency of their absorption by ruminants. Moreover, excessive dietary phosphorus and crude protein contents increase phosphorus and nitrogen excretion in manure, respectively. This in turn increases phosphorus runoff and ammoniac emissions that could respectively impact water and air quality. Then, the concept of precision feeding has emerged to decrease phosphorus and nitrogen excretion in the environment by insuring an adequacy between dietary supply and animal requirements. In the case of nitrogen, evaluating nitrogen partitioning requires an evaluation of nitrogen balance with total feces and urine collection which is labour intensive and only measurable in research setting. Khanaki et al. proposed plasma and urine biomarkers to easily estimate nitrogen balance and excretion in small ruminants. Other nutrients such as trace minerals are found in varying concentrations in manure as outlined by Duplessis and Royer. In intensive dairy production, it is common to feed trace minerals above the requirements as an insurance to fulfil cow requirements to offset low absorption and ruminal interactions. Nevertheless, this can have long-term negative impacts on ecosystem as excess trace minerals are excreted in the manure and can accumulate in the environment.

In conclusion, Wattiaux offered a broad perspective of dairy sustainability and stressed on the importance of transdisciplinary research with natural scientists, social scientists, and non-academic partners to tackle issues for a systemic assessment of sustainability. Hence, an integrated approach studying dairy farm sustainability based on economic, environmental, and social impacts is needed and relevant.

## Author contributions

MD: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. ST: Writing – review & editing. LP: Writing – review & editing. AL: Writing – review & editing.

## Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the contribution of authors and reviewers of the Research Topic.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

## References

- Abbott, D. W., Aasen, I. M., Beauchemin, K. A., Grondahl, F., Gruninger, R., Hayes, M., et al. (2020). Seaweed and seaweed bioactives for mitigation of enteric methane: challenges and opportunities. *Animals* 10, 2432. doi: 10.3390/ani10122432
- Hristov, A. N., Melgar, A., Wasson, D., and Arndt, C. (2022). Symposium review: Effective nutritional strategies to mitigate enteric methane in dairy cattle. *J. Dairy Sci.* 105, 8543–8557. doi: 10.3168/jds.2021-21398
- Jayasundara, S., and Wagner-Riddle, C. (2014). Greenhouse gas emissions intensity of Ontario milk production in 2011 compared with 1991. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 94, 155–173. doi: 10.4141/cjas2013-127
- Malhi, G. S., Kaur, M., and Kaushik, P. (2021). Impact of climate change on agriculture and its mitigation strategies: a review. *Sustainability* 13, 1318. doi: 10.3390/su13031318
- Meijaard, E., Brooks, T. M., Carlson, K. M., Slade, E. M., Garcia-Ulloa, J., Gaveau, D. L. A., et al. (2020). The environmental impacts of palm oil in context. *Nat. Plants* 6, 1418–1426. doi: 10.1038/s41477-020-00813-w
- Oltjen, J. W., and Beckett, J. L. (1996). Role of ruminant livestock in sustainable agricultural systems. *J. Anim. Sci.* 74, 1406–1409. doi: 10.2527/1996.7461406x
- Pereira, P. C. (2014). Milk nutritional composition and its role in human health. *Nutrition* 30, 619–627. doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2013.10.011
- Pereira, P. C., and Vicente, A. B. (2013). Meat nutritional composition and nutritive role in the human diet. *Meat Sci.* 93, 586–592. doi: 10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.09.018
- Rosenzweig, C., Iglesias, A., Yang, X. B., Epstein, P. R., and Chivian, E. (2001). Climate change and extreme weather events; implications for food production, plant diseases, and pests. *Global Change Hum. Health* 2, 90–104. doi: 10.1023/A:1015086831467
- United Nations (2017) *World population projected to reach 9.8 billion in 2050, and 11.2 billion in 2100*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/desa/world-population-projected-reach-98-billion-2050-and-112-billion-2100> (Accessed July 21st, 2023).
- Valin, H., Sands, R. D., van der Mensbrugge, D., Nelson, G. C., Ahammad, H., Blanc, E., et al. (2014). The future of food demand: understanding differences in global economic models. *Agric. Econ.* 45, 51–67. doi: 10.1111/agec.12089