



Title	Addition of ginkgo fruit to cattle feces and slurry suppresses methane production by altering the microbial community structure
Author(s)	Shintani, Risa; Oh, Seongjin; Suzuki, Yutaka; Koike, Satoshi; Kobayashi, Yasuo
Citation	Animal science journal, 92(1), e13620 https://doi.org/10.1111/asj.13620
Issue Date	2021
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/87355
Rights	This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Shintani, R., Oh, S., Suzuki, Y., Koike, S., & Kobayashi, Y. (2021). Addition of ginkgo fruit to cattle feces and slurry suppresses methane production by altering the microbial community structure. Animal Science Journal, 92(1), e13620., which has been published in final form at http://doi.org/10.1111/asj.13620 . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.
Type	article (author version)
File Information	Animal science journal_92_e13620.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

1 **Addition of ginkgo fruit to cattle feces and slurry suppresses methane production by**
2 **altering the microbial community structure**

3

4 **Risa Shintani, Seongjin Oh, Yutaka Suzuki, Satoshi Koike, and Yasuo Kobayashi***

5

6 Graduate School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-8589,
7 Japan

8

9 *Correspondence: Yasuo Kobayashi

10 Graduate School of Agriculture

11 Hokkaido University

12 Kita, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060–8589, Japan

13 Email: kyas@anim.agr.hokudai.ac.jp

14

15

16 **Abstract**

17 The effect of ginkgo fruit addition on methane production potential of cattle feces and
18 slurry was assessed in relation to other fermentation products and the microbial
19 community. Holstein cattle fresh feces and slurry were left at 30°C for 0, 30, 60, 90, and
20 180 days with/without ginkgo fruit to monitor the effect on fermentation potential. With
21 the addition of ginkgo fruit, methane production potential of feces was reduced on day 30
22 and thereafter, and that of slurry was consistently reduced over the experimental period.
23 As a general trend, ginkgo fruit addition resulted in decreased acetate and increased
24 propionate in feces and acetate accumulation in slurry. With ginkgo fruit addition, Miseq
25 analyses indicated decreases in methanogen (in particular *Methanocorpusculum*),
26 Ruminococcaceae, and Clostridiaceae populations and increases in Bacteroidaceae and
27 Porphylloromonadaceae populations, which essentially agreed with qPCR assay results.
28 These data indicate that direct addition of ginkgo fruit to cattle excreta is useful for
29 reducing methane emissions by altering the microbial community structure. The
30 application of ginkgo fruit to lower methane emissions from cattle excreta is, therefore,
31 useful in cases in which the excreta is left without special management for a long period
32 of time.

33

34 **Key words:** feces, ginkgo fruit, methane, microbiota, slurry

35 1 | INTRODUCTION

36 Although methane emissions from ruminant animals derive primarily from rumen
37 fermentation, emissions from feces are not negligible (Husted, 1994; Khan et al., 1997).
38 Indeed, yearly global methane emissions from cattle feces are 7,500,000 tons, which is
39 equivalent to 10-11% of all methane of rumen origin (FAO, 2006). Feces can be used as
40 a source for biogas production worldwide to generate methane as a fuel (USEPA, 2004).
41 However, such biogas facilities are not widely distributed due to the high cost of
42 construction, even for smaller and less mechanically sophisticated facilities. As a result,
43 feces are often left on the ground or piled up without special treatment for a long period
44 of time, a practice that is common in developing countries. Such a situation allows for
45 continuous emission of methane under natural conditions (Rastogi et al., 2008), which
46 could contribute to the progression of global warming. Even in biogas facilities,
47 significant amounts of methane can be emitted from fecal slurry deposited in pre-
48 fermentation tanks (Mer et al., 2001; Feng et al., 2018), leading to greenhouse gas release
49 in addition to loss of usable energy. These observations suggest that a strategy for
50 minimizing methane emission from untreated animal excreta is needed.

51 Methane production from feces depends on both temperature and the duration of
52 storage (Gupta et al. 2007); longer storage and higher temperatures promote methane
53 synthesis (Zeeman, 1994). Previous attempts to manipulate methane emissions have
54 examined the usefulness of regulating the carbon/nitrogen ratio in animal manure by
55 adding wheat straw (Yamulki, 2005) and the effect of storing manure under cool
56 conditions (Monteny et al., 2006). The rumen and feces differ in terms of anaerobicity,
57 temperature, and moisture content, which impact the respective microbial communities.
58 After excretion, the properties of feces change from anaerobic to aerobic, with a reduced

59 moisture content, leading to the dominance of aerobic bacteria (Wong et al., 2016). With
60 regard to methanogens, fresh feces are dominated by hydrogenotrophic
61 Methanobacteriales and Methanomicrobiales populations, whereas feces left untreated
62 for 8-24 months is dominated by acetoclastic methanogens (Rastogi et al., 2008). Thus,
63 methane generation processes can change as the storage period becomes longer, leading
64 to structural changes in the microbial community.

65 Ginkgo (*Ginkgo biloba*) fruit extract was found to suppress methane production in
66 the rumen by altering the rumen microbiota (Oh et al., 2017a). This effect was consistent,
67 irrespective of dietary conditions (Oh et al., 2017b). As the preparation of ginkgo fruit
68 extract is laborious and costly, a better option could be direct application of the fruit
69 (which is considered a useless byproduct in the ginkgo nut industry) to cattle excreta.
70 However, whether addition of ginkgo fruit to cattle feces and slurry effectively mitigates
71 methane emissions remains to be determined.

72 The present study hypothesized that adding ginkgo fruit to cattle excreta changes the
73 fermentation pattern toward a decrease in methane generation by altering the microbial
74 community structure. The effect of ginkgo fruit addition on methane production potential
75 was therefore evaluated using in vitro cultures, monitoring changes in fermentation
76 products and microbes in feces and slurry from Holstein cattle left untreated for varying
77 periods of time.

78

79 **2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS**

80 **2.1 | Samples and incubations**

81 All protocols regarding fecal sampling from cattle followed The Act on Welfare
82 and Management of Animals (2005) and were conducted according to the Animal Study

83 Guidelines of Hokkaido University (2007) with the approval by Animal Care and Use
84 Committee of Hokkaido University (no.15-0122).

85 Ginkgo fruit (cultivar name, Kyuju) was obtained from a private ginkgo farm in
86 Sobue, Aichi Prefecture, Japan, which is a major ginkgo nut producing area, and then
87 physically mashed and separated using a hand-made machine. The ginkgo fruit samples
88 were frozen at -30°C prior to shipping to the laboratory. The frozen material was thawed
89 at room temperature prior to experimental use.

90 Fresh feces was sampled just before morning feeding (0830 hours) directly from
91 the rectum of 3 Holstein milking cows (723 ± 39 kg body weight) at the Experimental
92 Farm, Field Science Center, Hokkaido University. The cows had been given the TMR
93 consisting of corn silage and commercial formula feed (17% crude protein (CP) and 72%
94 total digestible nutrients). Collected feces were equally mixed and separated into 10
95 portions, each of which was placed in a plastic container ($150 \times 100 \times 40$ mm). The
96 containers were divided into 2 groups, one of which was supplemented with ginkgo fruit
97 (treatment), whereas the other group served as the un-supplemented control (control).
98 Ginkgo fruit was added at 6.4% (12.8 g ginkgo fruit/200 g feces), a value determined
99 from pilot study results confirming methane mitigation. All containers were covered with
100 a plastic lid and left for 0, 30, 60, 90, or 180 days in an incubator at 30°C . After incubation
101 for the above specified period, samples were taken from the treatment and control
102 containers and used for the following batch culture study to monitor fermentation
103 products and microbiota. The day zero sample consisted of feces mixed with ginkgo fruit
104 and analyzed immediately without incubation. Cattle slurry (1.5 L) was sampled from a
105 slurry tank at the same farm, thoroughly mixed, and employed for the study in the same
106 manner as the fecal samples.

107 On the specified days, samples were removed from the containers after mixing and
108 dispensed into a Hungate tube with McDougal's buffer (McDougal, 1948) at a 1:1 ratio,
109 and the headspace was flushed with N₂ gas. The tubes were fitted with a butyl rubber
110 stopper and a plastic screwcap, and then incubated at 39°C for 24 h to monitor
111 fermentation parameters. Quadruplicate (n=4) samples were incubated per treatment.

112

113 **2.2 | Chemical analysis**

114 Major components of experimental feeds and ginkgo fruit were analyzed according
115 to AOAC (2016) and Van Soest et al. (1991). Alkylphenolics in ginkgo fruit (anacardic
116 acids, cardanol, and cardol) were quantified by HPLC as described by Watanabe et al.
117 (2010). Gases (H₂, CH₄, and CO₂) in batch cultures were analyzed using a GC-8A gas
118 chromatograph (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) equipped with parallel Porapak Q columns
119 (Waters, Milford, MA USA), Molecular Sieve 13X (Restek, Bellefonte, PA USA), and a
120 thermal conductivity detector. Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) were analyzed as
121 described by Oh et al. (2017a). In brief, culture fluid was mixed with 25% meta-
122 phosphoric acid at a 5:1 ratio, incubated overnight at 4°C, and centrifuged at 10,000 × g
123 at 4°C. The supernatant was mixed with crotonic acid as an internal standard and injected
124 into a GC-14B gas chromatograph (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) equipped with an ULBON
125 HR-20M fused silica capillary column (0.53 mm i.d. × 30 m length, 3.0 μm film, Shinwa,
126 Kyoto, Japan) and a flame ionization detector. Culture pH and ammonia nitrogen
127 concentration were determined using an electrode (pH meter F21, Horiba, Kyoto, Japan)
128 and spectrophotometrically using the indophenol reaction (Weatherburn, 1967),
129 respectively.

130

131 **2.3 | Microbial analysis**

132 Samples for microbiological analysis were taken from each culture and
133 immediately frozen and kept at -80°C . DNA was extracted for microbial analysis using
134 the RBB+C (repeated bead beating plus column) method described by [Yu and Morrison](#)
135 [\(2004\)](#). The DNA was subjected to quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR) to determine the
136 abundance of representative bacterial groups, including total bacteria, total methanogens,
137 Ruminococcaceae, *Clostridium leptum* subgroup, and *Bacteroides-Prevotella-*
138 *Porphyromonas*. All qPCR details, such as primers, standards, PCR conditions, and
139 calculations, were as described by [Myint et al. \(2017\)](#), [Watabe et al. \(2018\)](#), and [Yamada](#)
140 [et al. \(2020\)](#). In brief, standard plasmids encoding the respective target gene sequences
141 were obtained by PCR cloning using target-specific primer sets. The copy number of each
142 standard plasmid was calculated using the molecular weight of nucleic acid and the length
143 (base pairs) of the cloned standard plasmid, as described by [Koike et al. \(2007\)](#). A
144 LightCycler system and a FirstStart DNA master SYBR I reaction kit (Roche, Penzberg,
145 Germany) were used with 10-fold serial dilutions of standard plasmid for the respective
146 target (16S rDNA sequence specific to each target microbe). Microbial quantity was
147 calculated using amplification curves obtained from both standards and samples. The
148 specificity of PCR amplification was confirmed by melting curve analysis of the PCR
149 products by increasing the temperature from 70°C to 95°C at a rate of $0.1^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{s}$. Microbial
150 abundance was shown by copy number of rDNA for total bacteria, or by relative
151 proportion of the total bacterial copy number for a specific microbial group.

152 To comprehensively analyze the microbial community, DNA samples were
153 analyzed using MiSeq (Illumina, San Diego, CA USA). The employed samples were
154 cultures from slurry left for 30 d with or without ginkgo fruit, as methane mitigation was

155 most apparent (*see* Results). Sequencing was performed by Hokkaido System Science
156 Co., Ltd. (Sapporo, Japan). The V3 to V4 regions were amplified using two primer sets,
157 S-D-Bact-0341-b-S-17 (5'-CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG-3') and S-D-Bact-0785-a-A-
158 21 (5'-GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC-3') for bacterial rDNA ([Herlemann et al.,](#)
159 [2011](#)), and arch349F (5'-GYGCASCAGKCGMGAAW-3') and arch806R (5'-
160 GGACTACVSGGGTATCTAAT-3') for archaeal rDNA ([Takai and Horikoshi, 2000](#)).
161 PCR was carried out in 50 μ L total volume: 10 μ L 5 \times PrimeSTAR Buffer, 4 μ L dNTP
162 mixture (2.5 mM each), 0.5 μ L PrimeSTAR HS DNA polymerase (Takara Bio Inc.,
163 Kusatsu, Japan), 1 μ L each primer (10 pmol/ μ L), 32.5 μ L dH₂O, and 1 μ L template DNA
164 (10 ng/ μ L). The following PCR conditions were used: 30 cycles for bacteria and 40 cycles
165 for archaea, consisting of denaturation at 98°C (10 s), annealing at 55°C (15 s), and
166 extension at 72°C (30 s). Amplicon sequencing was carried out using MiSeq as described
167 by [Caporaso et al. \(2012\)](#). Data quality control and analyses were performed using the
168 QIIME pipeline, ver. 1.8.0 ([Caporaso et al., 2010](#)). Operational taxonomical units (OTUs)
169 were generated from sequences clustered at a 97% similarity threshold using the
170 UCLUST algorithm ([Edgar, 2010](#)). Chimeric sequences were removed from the analysis
171 using the ChimeraSlayer algorithm. Taxonomy was assigned using the Greengenes
172 database (ver. 13.8) at a 90% similarity threshold. Differences in biodiversity between
173 control and treatment were compared using alpha diversity metrics: Chao1, Ace, Shannon,
174 Simpson, and observed number of OTUs. The sequences obtained were deposited in the
175 DNA Data Bank of Japan nucleotide sequence database under accession no.
176 PRJNA684980.

177

178 **2.4 | Statistical analysis**

179 The data regarding fermentation profiles and microbiota with and without ginkgo
180 fruit addition (n=4) were analyzed using the Student t-test of SPSS (version 16.0 J, Tokyo,
181 Japan). Statistical significance and trends were declared at $P<0.05$ and $P<0.10$,
182 respectively.

183

184 **3 | RESULTS**

185 The experimental ginkgo fruit had 80.0% moisture and contained 6.6% CP, 20.0%
186 neutral detergent fiber, 33.8% non-fibrous carbohydrate, and 35.8% ether extract (all on
187 a dry matter basis). The fruit also contained 54.32 $\mu\text{g/g}$ total alkyl-phenols, of which the
188 proportions of C13:1, C15:1, and C17:1 anacardic acid were 9.5, 54.1, and 21.4%,
189 respectively, whereas those of C15:1 caldol and C15:1 cardanol were 12.7 and 2.2%,
190 respectively.

191 Gas production potentials assessed in batch cultures are shown in [Table 1](#). In fecal
192 cultures, ginkgo fruit addition increased the production potentials of total gas, CO_2 , and
193 CH_4 for the day 0 samples. However, production of all of these gases decreased with
194 ginkgo fruit addition in feces left for 30 d or longer. In slurry cultures, similar responses
195 to ginkgo fruit addition were observed, with the exception that the methane production
196 potential of slurry decreased with ginkgo addition even in the day 0 samples. No hydrogen
197 was detected in any sample throughout the experiment, irrespective of ginkgo fruit
198 addition.

199 [Table 2](#) shows the SCFAs, ammonia, and pH of the cultures prepared from feces
200 and slurry left for different periods of time with or without ginkgo fruit addition. On day
201 0, the concentrations of total SCFAs and individual SCFAs increased with ginkgo fruit
202 addition in both fecal and slurry cultures. These changes were accompanied by decreases

203 in pH and ammonia. In feces left for ≥ 30 days with ginkgo fruit addition, acetate
204 decreased, whereas propionate and ammonia increased, even though some exceptions
205 were observed. In slurry left for ≥ 30 days, SCFA levels were below the quantification
206 limit for the control, but a small amount of acetate was detected in cultures with ginkgo
207 fruit addition.

208 Microbes identified in feces and slurry by qPCR analysis are listed in [Table 3](#).
209 Similar responses to ginkgo fruit addition were observed in both feces and slurry. The
210 abundance of total bacteria, total methanogens, and Ruminococcaceae was lowered by
211 ginkgo fruit, whereas that of *Bacteroides-Prevotella-Porphyromonas* was increased
212 almost consistently in feces and slurry left for different periods of time. For the *C. leptum*
213 subgroup, the response to ginkgo fruit addition differed between feces and slurry, showing
214 that the abundance of the *C. leptum* subgroup varied with ginkgo fruit in feces, whereas
215 it decreased consistently in slurry throughout the experimental period.

216 MiSeq analysis of cultures prepared from slurry left for 30 d gave a satisfactorily
217 high number of reads: 14,657-18,779 (control) and 20,120-22,945 (ginkgo) for bacteria,
218 and 8,897-9,758 (control) and 14,377-16,670 (ginkgo) for methanogens. The diversity of
219 bacteria and methanogens in slurry is illustrated in [Figure 1](#). All indices, including Chao
220 1, Ace, Shannon, Simpson, and OTUs, gave higher values in slurry cultures with ginkgo
221 fruit added.

222 The bacterial community structure of slurry was markedly influenced by ginkgo
223 fruit addition, as shown in [Figure 2](#). At the family level, the detection frequency of
224 unclassified Bacteroidales, Clostridiaceae, Ruminococcaceae, and other families
225 decreased with ginkgo fruit addition, whereas that of Synergistaceae,
226 Porphyromonadaceae, Bacteroidaceae, and other families increased.

227 **Figure 3** shows changes in the methanogenic archaeal community structure in slurry
228 resulting from ginkgo fruit addition. At the genus level, although *Methanocorpusculum*
229 was dominant in control cultures, *Methanoplanus* and *Methanobrevibacter* became
230 dominant in slurry cultures with ginkgo fruit added. In addition, *Methanogenium* and
231 *Methanosarcina* increased in slurry cultures with ginkgo fruit added.

232

233 **4 | DISCUSSION**

234 On day 0, all gas production potentials in feces and slurry increased with ginkgo
235 fruit addition (**Table 1**), which could have been caused by fermentation of the added fruit
236 itself. The increase in SCFA concentrations on day 0 (**Table 2**) reflects this assumption.
237 Indeed, ginkgo fruit contains carbohydrates ([Oh et al., 2017a](#)) that could be preferentially
238 fermented by fecal and slurry microbes. However, on day 30 and thereafter, the gas
239 production potentials, in particular that of methane, decreased consistently in both feces
240 and slurry (**Table 1**). Although changes in SCFA profiles with ginkgo fruit addition were
241 not consistent, propionate in feces increased in proportion on day 60 and after, whereas
242 acetate was dominant in slurry (**Table 2**). Thus, ginkgo fruit addition can modulate excreta
243 fermentation toward methane mitigation with changes in the SCFA profile, possibly by
244 influencing the microbiota (discussed below), as described for rumen fermentation ([Oh](#)
245 [et al. 2017a; 2017b](#)). Ginkgo fruit is a source of anti-bacterial alkyl-phenols, including
246 anacardic acid, which selectively inhibits gram-positive bacteria ([Kubo et al., 1993](#)).
247 Another source of alkyl-phenols is cashew nut shells, which are already in use as a feed
248 additive to modulate rumen fermentation ([Kobayashi et al., 2016](#)). With regard to ginkgo
249 fruit, [Oh et al. \(2017a\)](#) proposed the use of fruit extract to mitigate rumen-derived
250 methane in ruminant livestock. Furthermore, the present results suggest that direct

251 application of ginkgo fruit itself to animal excreta (rather than ginkgo fruit extract) works
252 as a mitigating agent for methane production from feces and slurry.

253 Changes in the microbial community with ginkgo fruit addition were very similar
254 between feces and slurry according to qPCR results; ginkgo fruit decreased populations
255 of methanogens and bacteria possibly involved in hydrogen/formate production, such as
256 Ruminococcaceae and the *C. leptum* subgroup, and increased *Bacteroides-Prevotella-*
257 *Porphyromonas* (gram-negatives, including bacteria related to propionate production)
258 (Table 3). These selective effects of ginkgo fruit can alter the excreta fermentation pattern
259 by, for example, changing the hydrogen-utilization pathway to reduce methane
260 production (Schink 1997).

261 The present qPCR results essentially agreed with the MiSeq results for slurry.
262 Microbial populations that decreased with ginkgo fruit addition included Clostridiaceae
263 and Ruminococcaceae, whereas populations that increased were represented by
264 Porphyromonadaceae and Bacteroidaceae (Fig. 2). All of these changes are quite
265 reasonable when considering the inhibitory action of alkyl-phenols against gram-positive
266 organisms (Kubo et al. 1993; Watanabe et al. 2010; Oh et al. 2017a).

267 The methanogen community of slurry was also dramatically changed with ginkgo
268 fruit addition (Fig. 3). The most dominant group in the control, *Methanocorpusculum*,
269 was replaced by *Methanoplanus* and *Methanobrevibacter* with ginkgo fruit addition.
270 *Methanocorpusculum* is common in feces of Holstein cattle (Liu et al., 2018), Altay sheep
271 (Liu et al., 2012), and Korean native cattle (Daquiado et al., 2014) as a hydrogenotrophic
272 methanogen. The susceptibility of various methanogen species to alkyl-phenols was
273 examined to find that specific methanogens are sensitive to those compounds, particularly
274 anacardic acid (Wakai et al. unpublished results). *Methanocorpusculum* might be one

275 such sensitive methanogen. When ginkgo fruit was added, *Methanoplanus* became
276 dominant (Fig. 3), which is in good agreement with results reported for the bovine rumen
277 in the presence of alkyl-phenol-containing cashew nut shell liquid (Su et al., 2021).
278 Methanomicrobiaceae, including *Methanoplanus*, express S-layer protein on the cell
279 surface (Sowers 2009), which might act as a barrier against surfactant alkyl-phenols (Su
280 et al., 2021).

281 *Methanosarcina* and *Methanosaeta* are acetoclastic methanogens that convert
282 acetate to methane (Schink et al., 1997). Ginkgo fruit addition to slurry lowered the
283 detection frequency of *Methanosaeta* and increased that of *Methanosarcina* (Fig. 3). The
284 former change could explain in part the acetate accumulation in slurry with ginkgo fruit
285 added (Table 2). In the genus *Methanosarcina*, *Methanosarcina mobile* is tolerant to
286 alkyl-phenols (Wakai et al., unpublished results), although the contribution of this
287 methanogen to acetate accumulation is unclear due to limited information regarding its
288 metabolic activity.

289 Increased microbial diversity resulting from ginkgo fruit addition (Fig.1) could be
290 caused in part by exogenous fruit-associated microbes. However, most of these organisms
291 would be aerobic, and few methanogens are likely associated with fruit because
292 methanogens are enriched only in the plant rhizosphere (Borrel et al., 2020). As the
293 bacterial and methanogenic archaeal community consisted mostly of anaerobic organisms
294 (Table 3, Figs. 2 & 3), it is reasonable to conclude that community changes resulting from
295 ginkgo fruit addition are primarily induced by the selection of indigenous microbes in
296 feces and slurry (not by fruit-associated microbes).

297 As indicated by gas and SCFA production results (Tables 1 & 2), ginkgo fruit serves
298 as an extra substrate for microbes in feces and slurry, in particular slurry in which little

299 fermentable substrate remains. Even in such cases, methane production was suppressed
300 by ginkgo fruit addition, indicating that this agricultural byproduct works well for
301 mitigating methane production originating from animal excreta left untended for a long
302 period of time (at least 30 d). This effect is due to the selection of microbes in animal
303 excreta. However, these possibilities must be experimentally confirmed in a practical-
304 scale study at a facility equipped with a large manure storage area and slurry tanks.

305

306 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

307 The authors are grateful to Mr. Kyo Nagashima, Agri-Bio Technology Section,
308 Agri-Bio Business Department, Idemitsu Kosan Co., Ltd., Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan, for
309 his assistance in the analysis of ginkgo fruit alkyl-phenols. This study was supported in
310 part by the Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, Cross-ministerial Moonshot Agriculture,
311 Forestry and Fisheries Research and Development Program, “Technologies for Smart
312 Bio-industry and Agriculture” (no. JPJ009237), and by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific
313 Research (B) to Y.K. (no. 18H02322) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports,
314 Science and Technology, Japan.

315

316 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

317 We certify that there is no conflict of interest related to the present study.

318

319 **REFERENCES**

320 AOAC. 2016. *Official methods of analysis*, 20th edn. Association of Official Analytical
321 Chemistry, USA.

322 Borrel, G., Brugère, J.F., Gribaldo, S., Schmitz, R.A. & Moissl-Eichinger, C. (2020).
323 The host-associated archaeome. *Nature Review Microbiology*, 18, 622–636.
324 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-020-0407-y>

325 Caporaso, J.G., Kuczynski, J., Stombaugh, K., Bittinger, K., Bushman, F.D., Costello,
326 E.K., Fierer, N., Peña, A.G., Goodrich, J.K., Gordon, J.I., Huttley, G.A., Kelley,
327 S.T. , Knights, D., Koenig, J.E. , Ley, R.E., Lozupone, C.A., McDonald, D.,
328 Muegge, B.D., Pirrung, M., Reeder, J., Sevinsky, J.R., Turnbaugh, P.J., Walters,
329 W.A , Widmann, J., Yatsunenko, T., Zaneveld, J., & Knight, R. (2010). QIIME
330 allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nature Methods*, 7,
331 335-336.

332 Caporaso, J. G., Lauber, C. L., Walters, W. A., Berg-Lyons, D., Huntley, J., Fierer, N.,
333 Owens, S. M., Betley, J., Fraser, L., Bauer, M., Gormley, N., Gilbert, J. A., Smith,
334 G., & Knight, R. (2012). Ultra-high-throughput microbial community analysis on
335 the Illumina HiSeq and MiSeq platforms. *ISME Journal*, 6, 1621–1624. DOI:
336 10.1038/ismej.2012.8

337 Daquiado, A.R., Cho, K.M., Kim, T.Y., Kim, S.C., Chang, H.H. & Lee, Y.B. (2014).
338 Methanogenic archaea diversity in Hanwoo (*Bos taurus coreanae*) rumen fluid,
339 rectal dung, and barn floor manure using a culture-independent method based on
340 *mcrA* gene sequences. *Anaerobe*, 27, 77-81.

341 Edgar, R.C. (2010). Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.
342 *Bioinformatics*, 26, 2460–2461. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461

343 Feng, L., Ward, A.J., Moset, V., & Møller, H.B. (2018). Methane emission during on-
344 site pre-storage of animal manure prior to anaerobic digestion at biogas plant:

345 Effect of storage temperature and addition of food waste. *Journal of Environmental*
346 *Management*, 225, 272–279.

347 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2006). Livestock's
348 Long Shadow. Part 3. Livestock's role in climate change and air pollution. pp 80-
349 99.

350 Guputa, P.K., Jha, A.K., Koul, S., Sharma, P., Pradhan, V., Guputa, V., Sharma, C. &
351 Singh, N. (2007). Methane and nitrous oxide emission from bovine manure
352 management practices in India. *Environmental Pollution*, 146, 219-224.

353 Herlemann, D. P. R., Labrenz, M., Jürgens, K., Betilsson, S., Waniek, J.J. & Andersson,
354 A.F. (2011). Transition in bacterial communities along the 2000 km salinity
355 gradient of the Baltic sea. *ISME Journal*, 5, 1571–1579. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2011.41

356 Husted, S. (1994). Seasonal variation in methane emission from stored slurry and solid
357 manures. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 23, 585–592.

358 Khan, R.Z., Muller, C. & Sommer, S.G. (1997). Micrometeorological mass balance
359 technique for measuring CH₄ emission from stored cattle slurry. *Biology and*
360 *Fertility of Soils*, 24, 442–444.

361 Kobayashi, Y., Oh, S., Myint, H. & Koike, S. (2016). Use of Asian selected agricultural
362 byproducts to modulate rumen microbes and fermentation. *Journal of Animal*
363 *Science and Biotechnology*, 7, 70.

364 Koike, S., Yabuki, H., & Kobayashi, Y. (2007). Validation and application of real-time
365 polymerase chain reaction assays for representative rumen bacteria. *Animal Science*
366 *Journal*, 78, 135-141.

367 Kubo, I., Muroi, H., Himejima, M. Yamagiwa, Y., Mera, H., Tokushima, K., Ohta, S. &
368 Kamikawa, T. (1993). Structure-antibacterial activity relationships of anacardic
369 acids. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 41, 1016-1019.

370 Liu, C., Guo, T.J., Chen, Y.X., Meng, Q.H., Zhu, C.X. & Huang, H.K. (2018).
371 Physicochemical characteristics of stored cattle manure affect methane emissions
372 by inducing divergence of methanogens that have different interactions with
373 bacteria. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 253, 38-47.

374 Liu, C., Zhu, Z.P., Liu, Y.F., Guo, T.J. & Dong, H.M. (2012). Diversity and abundance
375 of the rumen and fecal methanogens in Altay sheep native to Xinjiang and the
376 influence of diversity on methane emissions. *Archives of Microbiology*, 194, 353-
377 361.

378 McDougall, E. I. (1948). Studies on ruminant saliva. *Biochemical Journal*, 43, 99-109.

379 Mer, J.L., & Roger, P. (2001). Production, oxidation, emission and consumption of
380 methane by soils: A review. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 37, 25-50.

381 Monteny, G.J., Bannink, A. & Chadwick, D. (2006). Greenhouse gas abatement
382 strategies for animal husbandry. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 112,
383 163-170.

384 Myint, H., Iwahashi, Y., Koike, S., Kobayashi, Y. (2017). Effect of soybean husk
385 supplementation on the fecal fermentation metabolites and microbiota of dogs.
386 *Animal Science Journal*, 88, 1730-1736.

387 Oh, S., Shintani, R., Koike, S. & Kobayashi, Y. (2017a). Ginkgo fruit extract as an
388 additive to modify rumen microbiota and fermentation and to mitigate methane
389 production. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 100, 1923-1934.

390 Oh, S., Koike, S., & Kobayashi, Y. (2017b). Effect of ginkgo extract supplementation
391 on in vitro rumen fermentation and bacterial profiles under different dietary
392 conditions. *Animal Science Journal*, 88, 1737-1743.

393 Rastogi, G., Ranade, D.R., Yeole, T.Y., Gupta, A.K., Patole, M.S. & Shouche, Y.S.
394 (2008). Molecular analyses of methanogen diversity associated with cattle dung.
395 *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 24, 2973-2979.

396 Schink, B. (1997). Energetics of syntrophic cooperation in methanogenic degradation.
397 *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 61, 262-280.

398 Sowers, K.R. (2009). Methanogenesis, pp.265-286, in *Encyclopedia of Microbiology*
399 (Third Edition), Academic Press. DOI: 10.1016/B978-012373944-5.00079-1

400 Su, C. Shinkai, T., Miyazawa, N., Mitsumori, M., Enishi, O., Nagashima, K., Koike, S.
401 & Kobayashi, Y. (2021). Microbial community structure of the bovine rumen as
402 affected by feeding cashew nut shell liquid, a methane-inhibiting and propionate-
403 enhancing agent. *Animal Science Journal*, 92, e13503.

404 Takai, K., & Horikoshi, K. (2000). Rapid detection and quantification of members of
405 the archaeal community by quantitative PCR using fluorogenic probes. *Applied and*
406 *Environmental Microbiology*, 66, 5066–5072. DOI: 10.1128/AEM.66.11.5066-
407 5072.2000<https://doi.org/10.1111/asj.13503>

408 United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). (2004). AgSTAR handbook:
409 A manual for developing biogas systems at commercial farms in United States.
410 Chapter1. Overview of Biogas Technology. pp. 1-6. Accessed January 17, 2020.
411 <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P1008VFM.PDF?Dockey=P1008VFM.PDF>

412 Van Soest, P.J., Robertson, J.B., & Lewis, B.A. (1991). Methods for dietary fiber,
413 neutral detergent fiber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal
414 nutrition. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *74*, 3583–3597.

415 Watabe, Y., Suzuki, Y., Koike, S., Shimamoto, S., & Kobayashi, Y. (2018). Cellulose
416 acetate, a new candidate feed supplement for ruminant animals: In vitro
417 evaluations. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *101*, 10929-10938.

418 Watanabe, Y., Suzuki, R., Koike, S., Nagashima, K., Mochizuki, M., Forster, R.J., &
419 Kobayashi, Y. (2010). *In vitro* evaluation of cashew nut shell liquid as a methane-
420 inhibiting and propionate-enhancing agent for ruminants. *Journal of Dairy Science*,
421 *93*, 5258-5267.

422 Weatherburn, M. W. (1967). Phenol-hypochloride reaction for determination of
423 ammonia. *Analytical Chemistry*, *39*, 971-974.

424 Wong, K., Shaw, T.I., Oladeinde, A., Glenn, T.C., Oakley, B., & Molina, M. (2016).
425 Rapid microbiome changes in freshly deposited cow feces under field conditions.
426 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *7*, 500.

427 Yamada, H., Watabe, Y., Suzuki, Y., Koike, S., Shimamoto, S., & Kobayashi, Y.
428 (2020). Chemical and microbial characterization for fermentation of water-soluble
429 cellulose acetate in human stool cultures. *Journal of the Sciences of Food and*
430 *Agriculture*, *101*, 2950-2960.

431 Yamulki, S. (2005). Effect of straw addition on nitrous oxide and methane emissions
432 from stored farmyard manures. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *112*,
433 140–145.

434 Yu, Z., & Morrison, M. (2004). Improved extraction of PCR-quality community DNA
435 from digesta and fecal samples. *BioTechniques*, *36*, 808-812.

436 Zeeman, G. (1994). Methane production/emission in storages for animal manure.

437 *Fertilizer Research*, 37, 207-211.

438

439 **Figure captions**

440 Figure 1. Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on diversity indices of bacteria (top) and

441 methanogenic archaea (bottom) in cattle slurry, as assessed by MiSeq analysis.

442 Asterisk shows significant difference from control ($P < 0.05$). Samples used were

443 cultures from slurry left for 30 d with or without ginkgo fruit.

444

445 Figure 2. Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on bacteria of cattle slurry, as assessed by

446 MiSeq analysis.

447 Data are shown at the phylum (top) and family (bottom) levels. Arrows in red and

448 blue indicate significant ($P < 0.05$) increase and decrease, respectively. Samples used

449 were cultures from slurry left for 30 d with or without ginkgo fruit.

450

451 Figure 3. Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on methanogenic archaea of cattle slurry, as

452 assessed by MiSeq analysis.

453 Data are shown at the phylum (top) and genus (bottom) levels. Arrows in red and blue

454 indicate significant ($P < 0.05$) increase and decrease, respectively. Samples used were

455 cultures from slurry left for 30 d with or without ginkgo fruit.

456

457

458

459

TABLE 1 Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on in vitro gas production potential of cattle feces and slurry left for different periods

Incubation period	Treatment	Gases from feces (ml/g feces)			
		Total gas	CO ₂	CH ₄	H ₂
0 day	Control	0.62	0.50	0.12	-
	Ginkgo	1.04 *	0.90 *	0.14 *	-
30 day	Control	0.43	0.28	0.15	-
	Ginkgo	0.29 *	0.23 *	0.06 *	-
60 day	Control	0.57	0.22	0.35	-
	Ginkgo	0.22 **	0.18 *	0.03 **	-
90 day	Control	0.37	0.27	0.1	-
	Ginkgo	0.24 **	0.22 †	0.02 **	-
180 day	Control	0.39	0.35	0.04	-
	Ginkgo	0.37	0.35	0.02 **	-

Incubation period	Treatment	Gases from slurry (ml/g slurry)			
		Total gas	CO ₂	CH ₄	H ₂
0 day	Control	0.69	0.50	0.19	-
	Ginkgo	1.09 *	0.97 *	0.12 *	-
30 day	Control	0.17	0.09	0.07	-
	Ginkgo	0.07 *	0.07 *	trace *	-
60 day	Control	0.11	0.08	0.03	-
	Ginkgo	0.06 †	0.06	trace *	-
90 day	Control	0.13	0.12	0.02	-
	Ginkgo	0.13	0.12	trace *	-
180 day	Control	0.22	0.22	0.01	-
	Ginkgo	0.27 **	0.26 **	trace *	-

Gas production potential was measured after incubating feces or slurry left for 0 - 180 days at 30°C with or without ginkgo fruit.

†, *, **: Significantly different from control at $P < 0.1$, 0.05 and 0.01, respectively.

460

461

462

TABLE 2 Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on in vitro short chain fatty acid (SCFA) and ammonia production potential of cattle feces and slurry left for different periods

Incubation period	Treatment	Fermentation products from feces				Ammonia (mg N/g feces)	pH
		Total SCFA	Acetate (mmol/g feces)	Propionate	n-Butyrate		
0 day	Control	0.34	0.23	0.07	0.02	0.22	7.03
	Ginkgo	0.56 *	0.37 *	0.12 *	0.06 *	0.17 †	6.61 *
30 day	Control	0.23	0.20	0.17	-	0.26	7.54
	Ginkgo	0.1 *	0.08 *	0.16 *	0.01	0.30 *	7.68 *
60 day	Control	0.01	0.01	trace	-	0.11	7.73
	Ginkgo	0.07 *	0.05 *	0.01 *	-	0.16 *	7.78 †
90 day	Control	0.04	0.04	trace	-	0.11	7.70
	Ginkgo	0.04	0.03 **	0.01 **	-	0.17 *	7.73 †
180 day	Control	0.04	0.04	trace	-	0.11	7.83
	Ginkgo	0.04 *	0.03 **	0.01 **	-	0.15 *	7.81 *

Incubation period	Treatment	Fermentation products from slurry				Ammonia (mg N./g slurry)	pH
		Total SCFA	Acetate (mmol/g slurry)	Propionate	n-Butyrate		
0 day	Control	0.33	0.27	0.03	-	1.09	7.13
	Ginkgo	0.54 *	0.36 *	0.14 *	-	0.90 *	6.74 *
30 day	Control	trace	trace	trace	-	0.05	7.90
	Ginkgo	0.04 *	0.04 *	0.01 *	-	0.06	7.95 *
60 day	Control	trace	trace	-	-	0.02	7.96
	Ginkgo	0.01 *	0.01 *	-	-	0.02	8.04 **
90 day	Control	trace	trace	-	-	0.01	7.90
	Ginkgo	0.01 **	0.01 **	-	-	0.01	7.86 †
180 day	Control	trace	trace	-	-	0.01	7.93
	Ginkgo	0.01 **	0.01 **	-	-	0.01	7.87

Fermentation parameters were measured after incubating feces or slurry left for 0 - 180 days at 30°C with or without ginkgo fruit.

†, *, **: Significantly different from control at $P < 0.1$, 0.05 and 0.01, respectively.

463

464

465

466

467

TABLE 3 Effect of ginkgo fruit addition on bacterial abundance of cattle feces and slurry left for different periods

Incubation period	Treatment	Microbes in feces				
		Total bacteria	Methanogens	Rumino-coccaceae	<i>Clostridium leptum</i> subgroup	<i>Bacteroides-Prevotella-Porphyromonas</i>
		(log copy number of 16S rDNA/g feces)	(relative % of total bacteria)			
0 day	Control	11.50	2.01	17.96	8.79	19.29
	Ginkgo	11.23 **	1.04 **	3.35 **	2.25 **	19.44
30 day	Control	11.50	6.45	3.40	2.66	5.20
	Ginkgo	11.34 *	2.99 **	3.97	3.34 **	14.33 **
60 day	Control	11.55	6.00	2.01	1.71	8.63
	Ginkgo	11.37 **	1.63 **	2.06 **	1.88 †	10.11 †
90 day	Control	11.38	5.45	2.19	2.02	3.88
	Ginkgo	11.41	1.39 **	1.64 *	1.40 **	9.38 **
180 day	Control	11.28	3.65	1.98	1.43	1.35
	Ginkgo	11.42 *	2.86 **	1.90	1.56 †	3.23 **

Incubation period	Treatment	Microbes in slurry				
		Total bacteria	Methanogens	Rumino-coccaceae	<i>Clostridium leptum</i> subgroup	<i>Bacteroides-Prevotella-Porphyromonas</i>
		(log copy number of 16S rDNA/g feces)	(relative % of total bacteria)			
0 day	Control	11.66	2.91	9.00	3.81	16.11
	Ginkgo	11.49 **	0.70 **	4.15 **	2.39 **	12.98 **
30 day	Control	11.62	11.44	4.72	2.23	6.80
	Ginkgo	11.51 *	2.49 **	2.75 **	1.41 **	7.35 *
60 day	Control	11.75	36.31	2.79	1.39	6.67
	Ginkgo	11.59 **	4.98 **	1.82 **	0.81 **	16.75 **
90 day	Control	11.96	32.01 **	2.35	1.05	5.76
	Ginkgo	11.69 **	3.84	1.12 **	0.67 **	13.78 **
180 day	Control	11.75	45.60	1.28	0.64	5.68
	Ginkgo	11.71	7.18 **	0.66 **	0.40 **	17.93 **

Microbes were measured by quantitative PCR after incubating feces or slurry left for 0 - 180 days at 30°C with or without ginkgo fruit.

†, *, **: Significantly different from control at $P < 0.1, 0.05$ and 0.01 , respectively.


Chao1

Ace


Shannon

Simpson

Observed OTU



Methanogenic archaea

■ Control ■ Ginkgo *: $P < 0.05$

