Benchmarking Performance Metrics of Methane Monitoring Technologies in Simulated Environments

SEMIU TEMIDAYO FASASI[1], OLUWAPELUMI JOSEPH ADEBOWALE[2], ABDULMALIQ ABDULSALAM[3], ZAMATHULA QUEEN SIKHAKHANE NWOKEDIEGWU[4]
[1]*Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria*
[2]*Independent Researcher, USA*
[3]*Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, University of Lagos, Nigeria*
[4]*Independent Researcher, Durban, South Africa*

Abstract- Methane is a critical greenhouse gas whose effective monitoring is essential for climate mitigation and industrial safety. This paper presents a comprehensive benchmarking framework to evaluate the performance of methane monitoring technologies within controlled simulated environments. Key performance metrics including accuracy, detection limits, sensitivity, response time, reliability, and operational robustness are systematically assessed. The study compares diverse sensor types, ranging from high-precision optical sensors to cost-effective catalytic and semiconductor devices, and discusses their detection principles alongside inherent strengths and limitations. Standardized testing procedures and rigorous data analysis methods ensure reproducible and objective evaluation. The findings highlight important trade-offs between performance and operational factors, informing technology selection tailored to specific monitoring needs. This benchmarking effort supports improved methane detection practices, regulatory compliance, and the advancement of sensor innovation. Recommendations for future assessments emphasize integration of field validation, advanced analytics, and cross-sector collaboration to strengthen monitoring efficacy. Overall, this work contributes a foundational methodology for assessing methane monitoring technologies that can accelerate emission reduction efforts and support sustainable industrial operations.

Index Terms : Methane Monitoring, Performance Benchmarking, Sensor Technologies, Detection Accuracy, Response Time, Operational Robustness

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential approximately 28-36 times greater than carbon dioxide over a 100-year period (Howarth, 2015). Its significant contribution to climate change, combined with the increasing recognition of the need for greenhouse gas mitigation, has driven global efforts to monitor and reduce methane emissions (Pettus, 2009, Balcombe et al., 2018). These emissions predominantly originate from oil and gas operations, agriculture, landfills, and natural sources such as wetlands (Council et al., 2011). Effective monitoring is critical to accurately quantify emissions, identify leak sources, and inform mitigation strategies. Given methane's short atmospheric lifetime relative to carbon dioxide, prompt detection and intervention can have rapid climate benefits (Howarth, 2014, Ussiri and Lal, 2017).

Monitoring methane not only supports environmental and regulatory compliance but also enables operational efficiency improvements and safety enhancements (Sejian et al., 2016). Early leak detection prevents loss of valuable product and reduces risks associated with explosive concentrations. Methane monitoring is thus essential for both environmental stewardship and industrial management (Rajkishore et al., 2015). As international policies tighten around emissions reductions, the demand for reliable and effective methane monitoring technologies has intensified. This background underscores the urgent need to rigorously evaluate these technologies to guide their deployment in diverse operational contexts (Dean et al., 2018, Yusuf et al., 2012).

Furthermore, the dynamic nature of methane release, characterized by intermittent leaks and variable concentrations, challenges monitoring efforts (White et al., 2005). Accurate assessment demands technologies capable of capturing transient events and providi (Tang et al., 2019) ng actionable data. Consequently, developing robust benchmarking frameworks that evaluate key performance parameters is fundamental to advancing methane monitoring practices and supporting global climate goals (Johnson et al., 2016, Fox et al., 2019).

1.2 Overview of Methane Monitoring Technologies

Methane monitoring technologies span a wide spectrum of detection principles, ranging from optical sensors and spectroscopy to catalytic and semiconductor-based devices (Tang et al., 2019). Among the most commonly used are laser-based instruments that exploit absorption spectroscopy, such as Tunable Diode Laser Absorption Spectroscopy (TDLAS) and Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy (CRDS) (Chen et al., 2010). These techniques offer high sensitivity and precision, enabling detection of low methane concentrations even in complex environments. They are frequently deployed in fixed monitoring stations and mobile platforms (Adhikari and Majumdar, 2004, Du et al., 2019).

Other approaches include gas chromatography and sensor arrays employing metal-oxide semiconductors, which provide cost-effective solutions for continuous monitoring but may trade off sensitivity and selectivity. Remote sensing methods, including satellite and aerial sensing, offer spatial coverage advantages but often lack the resolution needed for localized leak detection (Korotcenkov, 2013). Emerging technologies integrate artificial intelligence and machine learning to enhance data interpretation and anomaly detection, further diversifying the technology landscape (Soundarrajan and Schweighardt, 2008, Boulart, 2008).

The diversity of these technologies reflects varying operational requirements such as detection threshold, response time, deployment environment, and cost constraints. Selecting the appropriate technology necessitates comprehensive understanding of its strengths and limitations in relation to monitoring objectives. This overview provides the foundation for systematic benchmarking to compare these heterogeneous technologies on consistent performance criteria (Liu, 2015).

1.3 Objectives and Significance

The principal objective of benchmarking methane monitoring technologies is to establish standardized, quantitative criteria that enable objective performance comparison. By rigorously evaluating metrics such as detection accuracy, sensitivity, response time, and operational reliability within controlled simulated environments, benchmarking elucidates each technology's capabilities and limitations under repeatable conditions. This facilitates informed decision-making by stakeholders including regulators, operators, and technology developers.

Benchmarking also drives innovation by identifying performance gaps and guiding technology improvements. Transparent and reproducible evaluations help build confidence among users and support the adoption of effective monitoring solutions. Moreover, as methane monitoring becomes a regulatory requirement in many jurisdictions, benchmarking provides a scientifically sound basis for compliance verification and certification.

Finally, the significance of benchmarking extends to climate mitigation efforts. Reliable detection and quantification of methane emissions underpin accurate emission inventories and enable timely interventions to reduce leaks. By aligning technology performance with monitoring needs, benchmarking contributes directly to environmental protection and sustainable industrial practices. Consequently, this study aims to contribute a robust benchmarking framework that informs best practices in methane monitoring technology assessment.

II. PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR METHANE MONITORING

2.1 Accuracy and Detection Limits

Accuracy is a fundamental metric that reflects how closely a methane monitoring technology can measure the true concentration of methane in its environment. High accuracy ensures that reported values closely represent actual emissions, reducing false positives and negatives that can lead to misinformed decisions (Fox et al., 2019, Garnsworthy et al., 2019). It is typically evaluated by comparing sensor outputs against known reference standards or calibration gases. Detection limits refer to the smallest methane concentration a device can reliably identify above its noise threshold. Technologies with low detection limits can identify even trace methane emissions, which is crucial for early leak detection and environmental compliance (Gardiner et al., 2017).

These metrics are interrelated: an instrument with high accuracy but poor detection limits might fail to identify low-level leaks, while one with excellent sensitivity but poor accuracy could produce unreliable data. Thus, benchmarking must consider both aspects to provide a comprehensive assessment (Lamb et al., 2015). Detection limits vary across technology types, with laser-based spectroscopic methods often achieving parts-per-billion sensitivity, while less sophisticated sensors may only detect parts-per-million levels. The operating environment also affects accuracy; factors like humidity, temperature fluctuations, and interfering gases can impact readings, emphasizing the need for controlled benchmarking environments to isolate performance (Rey et al., 2019).

Establishing clear accuracy and detection limit thresholds aids stakeholders in selecting technologies tailored to specific monitoring needs, balancing cost with performance. In sum, these metrics underpin the credibility and utility of methane monitoring systems in real-world applications.

2.2 Sensitivity and Response Time

Sensitivity describes a monitoring technology's ability to detect changes in methane concentration quickly and distinctly. A highly sensitive device can discern small variations, which is critical for identifying intermittent leaks and transient emission events. Sensitivity directly impacts the reliability of continuous monitoring systems, where rapid detection enables timely response and mitigation. It is typically quantified as the change in sensor output per unit change in methane concentration (Kamieniak et al., 2015, Boulart et al., 2010).

Response time complements sensitivity by measuring how quickly a technology registers a change in methane levels. Fast response times reduce lag between emission occurrence and detection, allowing operators to react promptly. Slow response devices risk missing short-lived leaks or underestimating emission rates. Response time depends on sensor design, data processing algorithms, and deployment configuration. For instance, remote sensing methods may exhibit longer delays compared to in situ sensors due to signal processing requirements (Fox et al., 2019, Honeycutt et al., 2019).

Together, sensitivity and response time shape the practical effectiveness of monitoring technologies in dynamic industrial environments where methane concentrations fluctuate rapidly. During benchmarking, evaluating these metrics under controlled conditions reveals a technology's capability to provide actionable data. Optimizing sensitivity and response time is essential for operational safety and environmental performance, highlighting their critical role in methane monitoring technology assessment (Liu et al., 2012, Thompson et al., 2015).

2.3 Reliability and Operational Robustness

Reliability refers to the consistency and dependability of methane monitoring technologies over extended periods and varying operational conditions. A reliable system consistently delivers accurate data without frequent downtime, calibration drift, or failures. This metric is crucial for long-term monitoring programs where maintenance opportunities may be limited, and uninterrupted data streams are necessary for regulatory compliance and emission management (Honeycutt, 2017, Boulart, 2008).

Operational robustness describes a device's ability to function effectively under diverse environmental stressors such as temperature extremes, humidity, dust, and mechanical vibra (Honeycutt, 2017, Boulart, 2008) tions. Robust technologies withstand harsh field conditions common in oil and gas facilities, waste management sites, or agricultural environments. Failure to maintain operational integrity under such conditions compromises monitoring efficacy and increases maintenance costs (Gbabo et al., Ogunnowo).

Benchmarking these aspects requires exposing technologies to controlled environmental variations and measuring performance degradation or failure rates. Robustness tests also assess ease of calibration, maintenance requirements, and sensor lifespan. High reliability and robustness reduce operational risks and costs, making these metrics indispensable for technology selection. Collectively, they ensure methane monitoring systems provide durable, trustworthy performance that supports sustained emission reduction efforts (Okuh et al., Okuh et al.).

III. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR BENCHMARKING

3.1 Design of Simulated Environment Tests

Simulated environment tests are central to benchmarking methane monitoring technologies as they provide controlled, repeatable conditions that isolate performance factors. These environments mimic real-world operational settings such as oil and gas facilities, landfills, or agricultural sites, but with precise control over methane concentration levels, environmental variables, and interference sources. Designing such tests requires careful consideration of spatial layout, methane dispersion patterns, and background gas composition to ensure relevance and comparability (Moore et al., 2009).

A well-designed simulated environment incorporates adjustable methane release mechanisms that replicate both steady-state leaks and transient emission events. This enables assessment of how technologies perform across a range of realistic scenarios. Environmental parameters like temperature, humidity, and airflow must be controlled or monitored, given their known effects on sensor response and accuracy. Test chambers or outdoor test beds equipped with reference measurement systems serve as benchmarks to validate sensor readings (d'Orey and Ferreira, 2013, Gernaey and Jeppsson, 2014).

The design aims to minimize external variability while maximizing representativeness. This balance ensures that performance metrics derived from tests are both reliable and generalizable. Moreover, standardized simulated environments support repeatability across multiple benchmarking exercises and facilitate direct comparison among competing technologies, strengthening the validity of performance assessments (Fox et al., 2019).

3.2 Standardized Evaluation Procedures

Standardized evaluation procedures underpin the fairness and rigor of benchmarking efforts by establishing consistent protocols for technology assessment. These procedures define the sequence of tests, measurement intervals, calibration routines, and data validation methods. Adhering to standardized methods ensures that performance results are comparable, reproducible, and free from procedural bias (Drummond et al., 2008).

Procedures typically start with device calibration using certified methane standards to establish baseline accuracy. Following calibration, each technology undergoes exposure to controlled methane releases at predefined concentration levels and durations. Multiple repetitions under identical conditions improve statistical confidence and account for variability. Environmental conditions are either stabilized or systematically varied according to protocol to examine performance robustness (on Energy et al., 2018, Boulart et al., 2010).

Data handling protocols include real-time monitoring, logging frequency, and error checking. Performance metrics such as detection accuracy, sensitivity, and response time are calculated using standardized formulas. Reporting formats are also prescribed to facilitate clear communication of results. By codifying these evaluation steps, benchmarking frameworks promote transparency, enabling stakeholders to interpret results confidently and compare technologies objectively (Yang et al., 2014, Diallo et al., 2012).

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis Approaches

Effective data collection and analysis are vital to extracting meaningful insights from benchmarking tests. Data acquisition systems must capture sensor outputs with appropriate temporal resolution to track dynamic methane variations accurately. Synchronization with reference instruments ensures alignment for direct performance comparison. Data integrity measures, including noise filtering and outlier detection, preserve the quality of recorded information (Kayastha et al., 2014, Syafrudin et al., 2018).

Collected datasets undergo statistical analysis to quantify performance metrics and assess variability. Descriptive statistics summarize accuracy, detection limits, sensitivity, response time, and reliability indicators. More advanced techniques such as regression analysis or error modeling may be applied to understand sensor behavior under differing environmental conditions. Confidence intervals and uncertainty quantification provide measures of result robustness (Ali et al., 2019, Rautenhaus et al., 2017).
Data visualization tools, including time series plots and scatter diagrams, aid in interpreting sensor response patterns. Comparative analysis highlights strengths and weaknesses across technologies. Additionally, data archiving ensures transparency and facilitates future reanalysis or benchmarking updates. Collectively, rigorous data collection and analysis methodologies enhance the credibility and usefulness of benchmarking outcomes for stakeholders (Steiger et al., 2014).

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGIES

4.1 Sensor Types and Detection Principles

Methane monitoring technologies rely on diverse sensor types and detection principles, each influencing performance characteristics and suitability for specific applications. Optical sensors, including Tunable Diode Laser Absorption Spectroscopy (TDLAS) and Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy (CRDS), detect methane by measuring the absorption of laser light at methane-specific wavelengths (Liu et al., 2012). These technologies offer high precision, low detection limits, and fast response times, making them ideal for continuous, high-sensitivity monitoring in controlled environments (Kamieniak et al., 2015, Boulart et al., 2010).

Catalytic sensors, also known as pellistors, detect methane through oxidation reactions that generate heat, changing the sensor's electrical resistance. These sensors are robust and cost-effective but typically exhibit higher detection limits and slower response times compared to optical sensors (Knobelspies et al., 2016). Semiconductor sensors, often using metal-oxide materials, operate by detecting changes in conductivity caused by methane adsorption. While affordable and portable, their accuracy and selectivity can be compromised by environmental factors and interfering gases (Fox et al., 2019, Hodgkinson and Tatam, 2012).

Remote sensing technologies, including satellite and drone-mounted sensors, use spectral imaging to identify methane plumes over large areas. Although valuable for spatial coverage, they usually have coarser resolution and longer response times. Emerging sensor systems combine multiple detection principles with data analytics to improve overall performance. Understanding these varied sensor types and principles is essential for benchmarking, as it contextualizes performance differences observed in controlled tests (Floridia et al., 2019).

4.2 Strengths and Limitations Based on Metrics

Performance benchmarking reveals that each methane monitoring technology exhibits distinct strengths and limitations when evaluated against key metrics. Optical sensors excel in accuracy and low detection limits, capable of detecting methane concentrations down to parts-per-billion levels. Their fast response times and high sensitivity enable timely leak detection. However, these instruments tend to be expensive, require careful calibration, and may be sensitive to environmental interference such as dust and moisture.

Catalytic sensors offer operational robustness and lower cost, making them suitable for harsh environments and widespread deployment. Yet, their relatively high detection limits reduce effectiveness for identifying low-level emissions, and they exhibit slower response times, potentially delaying leak identification. Semiconductor sensors provide a balance of affordability and portability but often suffer from cross-sensitivity to other gases, impacting accuracy and reliability, especially in complex atmospheric conditions (Zhang and Li, 2012).

Remote sensing technologies provide unparalleled spatial coverage and the ability to monitor inaccessible sites but generally cannot match the precision or temporal resolution of ground-based sensors. They also face challenges in quantifying emission rates accurately. Recognizing these trade-offs is critical when interpreting benchmarking results and selecting technologies aligned with monitoring goals and operational constraints (Potyrailo et al., 2011).

4.3 Implications for Technology Selection

The comparative analysis of methane monitoring technologies underscores that technology selection must align with specific monitoring objectives, environmental conditions, and resource constraints. For applications requiring high precision and rapid detection, such as leak detection at critical infrastructure, optical sensors present the most suitable option despite higher upfront costs and maintenance demands. Their superior accuracy and responsiveness support stringent regulatory compliance and safety goals.

In contrast, catalytic or semiconductor sensors may be preferable for large-scale, cost-sensitive deployments where robustness and ease of maintenance are prioritized over ultra-low detection limits. These technologies enable broad coverage with acceptable performance for routine monitoring but may require complementary methods to capture low-level or intermittent emissions effectively. Remote sensing technologies complement ground-based systems by providing macro-scale surveillance, useful for regional emission inventories and identifying large-scale emission hotspots. Ultimately, benchmarking results facilitate informed technology selection by quantifying performance trade-offs and contextualizing operational requirements. Decision-makers benefit from understanding how metrics such as accuracy, sensitivity, and robustness translate into practical advantages or limitations. This alignment ensures methane monitoring strategies maximize environmental impact and operational efficiency.

CONCLUSION

This benchmarking study systematically evaluated methane monitoring technologies using defined performance metrics within controlled simulated environments. The analysis revealed significant variation in accuracy, detection limits, sensitivity, response time, and operational robustness across sensor types. Optical sensing technologies demonstrated superior precision and rapid detection capabilities, excelling in identifying low-concentration methane emissions. Conversely, catalytic and semiconductor sensors offered advantages in cost-effectiveness and environmental durability but with trade-offs in sensitivity and response speed. Remote sensing methods provided valuable spatial coverage but lagged in temporal resolution and detection accuracy.

The methodological framework, emphasizing standardized testing procedures and rigorous data analysis, ensured reliable and reproducible comparisons. This approach highlighted the critical importance of selecting metrics aligned with operational goals and environmental conditions. By quantifying these performance differences, benchmarking clarifies the capabilities and limitations inherent in diverse methane monitoring solutions, providing a transparent basis for technology evaluation and deployment.

The insights gained from benchmarking significantly inform methane monitoring practices by guiding stakeholders in technology selection and deployment strategies. Accurate knowledge of each technology's strengths and constraints enables more effective allocation of resources and optimization of monitoring networks. Rapid detection technologies facilitate timely leak mitigation, enhancing environmental protection and operational safety, while cost-effective sensors support broader surveillance coverage.

Moreover, benchmarking underpins regulatory compliance efforts by establishing objective performance standards and promoting confidence in reported emissions data. The ability to compare technologies on a level playing field fosters competition and drives innovation toward improved sensor designs. Overall, this study supports more robust, transparent, and effective methane monitoring programs, advancing both environmental and industrial objectives.

Future technology assessments should build upon this benchmarking foundation by incorporating longer-term field evaluations to capture real-world variability and operational challenges. Integrating advancements in data analytics, such as machine learning algorithms, can enhance anomaly detection and interpretive capabilities. Expanding benchmarking frameworks to include cost-benefit analyses and lifecycle assessments will provide a more comprehensive understanding of technology viability.

Additionally, collaboration across industry, academia, and regulatory bodies is essential to develop universally accepted standards and protocols. Such cooperation will facilitate data sharing, improve benchmarking consistency, and accelerate technology adoption. Continuous reassessment is necessary to keep pace with evolving technologies and emerging monitoring needs. Ultimately, sustained efforts in rigorous technology evaluation will be crucial to advancing methane emission reduction and climate change mitigation goals.

REFERENCES

[1] ADHIKARI, B. & MAJUMDAR, S. 2004. Polymers in sensor applications. Progress in polymer science, 29, 699-766.

[2] ALI, M., ALQAHTANI, A., JONES, M. W. & XIE, X. 2019. Clustering and classification for time series data in visual analytics: A survey. IEEE Access, 7, 181314-181338.

[3] BALCOMBE, P., SPEIRS, J. F., BRANDON, N. P. & HAWKES, A. D. 2018. Methane emissions: choosing the right climate metric and time horizon. Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 20, 1323-1339.

[4] BOULART, C. 2008. Methane in deep sea Hydrothermal Plumes. Development of a new in-situ methane sensing technology. University of Southampton.

[5] BOULART, C., CONNELLY, D. & MOWLEM, M. 2010. Sensors and technologies for in situ dissolved methane measurements and their evaluation using Technology Readiness Levels. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 29, 186-195.

[6] CHEN, H., WINDERLICH, J., GERBIG, C., HOEFER, A., RELLA, C., CROSSON, E., VAN PELT, A., STEINBACH, J., KOLLE, O. & BECK, V. 2010. High-accuracy continuous airborne measurements of greenhouse gases (CO 2 and CH 4) using the cavity ring-down spectroscopy (CRDS) technique. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 3, 375-386.

[7] COUNCIL, N. R., EARTH, D. O., STUDIES, L., SCIENCES, B. O. A. & CONCENTRATIONS, C. O. S. T. F. A. G. G. 2011. Climate stabilization targets: emissions, concentrations, and impacts over decades to millennia, National Academies Press.

[8] D'OREY, P. M. & FERREIRA, M. 2013. ITS for sustainable mobility: A survey on applications and impact assessment tools. IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 15, 477-493.

[9] DEAN, J. F., MIDDELBURG, J. J., RÖCKMANN, T., AERTS, R., BLAUW, L. G., EGGER, M., JETTEN, M. S., DE JONG, A. E., MEISEL, O. H. & RASIGRAF, O. 2018. Methane feedbacks to the global climate system in a warmer world. Reviews of Geophysics, 56, 207-250.

[10] DIALLO, O., RODRIGUES, J. J. & SENE, M. 2012. Real-time data management on wireless sensor networks: A survey. Journal of Network and Computer Applications, 35, 1013-1021.

[11] DRUMMOND, M. F., SCHWARTZ, J. S., JÖNSSON, B., LUCE, B. R., NEUMANN, P. J., SIEBERT, U. & SULLIVAN, S. D. 2008. Key principles for the improved conduct of health technology assessments for resource allocation decisions. International journal of technology assessment in health care, 24, 244-258.

[12] DU, Z., ZHANG, S., LI, J., GAO, N. & TONG, K. 2019. Mid-infrared tunable laser-based broadband fingerprint absorption spectroscopy for trace gas sensing: A review. Applied sciences, 9, 338.

[13] FLORIDIA, C., ROSOLEM, J. B., FRACAROLLI, J. P. V., BASSAN, F. R., PENZE, R. S., PEREIRA, L. M. & DA MOTTA RESENDE, M. A. C. 2019. Evaluation of environmental influences on a multi-point optical fiber methane leak monitoring system. Remote Sensing, 11, 1249.

[14] FOX, T. A., BARCHYN, T. E., RISK, D., RAVIKUMAR, A. P. & HUGENHOLTZ, C. H. 2019. A review of close-range and screening technologies for mitigating fugitive methane emissions in upstream oil and gas. Environmental Research Letters, 14, 053002.

[15] GARDINER, T., HELMORE, J., INNOCENTI, F. & ROBINSON, R. 2017. Field validation of remote sensing methane emission measurements. Remote Sensing, 9, 956.

[16] GARNSWORTHY, P. C., DIFFORD, G. F., BELL, M. J., BAYAT, A. R., HUHTANEN, P., KUHLA, B., LASSEN, J., PEIREN, N., PSZCZOLA, M. & SORG, D. 2019. Comparison of methods to measure methane for use in genetic evaluation of dairy cattle. Animals, 9, 837.

[17] GBABO, E. Y., OKENWA, O. K. & CHIMA, P. E. Integrating CDM Regulations into Role-Based Compliance Models for Energy Infrastructure Projects.

[18] GERNAEY, K. V. & JEPPSSON, U. 2014. Benchmarking of control strategies for wastewater treatment plants, IWA publishing.

[19] HODGKINSON, J. & TATAM, R. P. 2012. Optical gas sensing: a review. Measurement science and technology, 24, 012004.

[20] HONEYCUTT, W. T. 2017. Development and applications of chemical sensors for the detection of atmospheric carbon dioxide and methane. Oklahoma State University.

[21] HONEYCUTT, W. T., LEY, M. T. & MATERER, N. F. 2019. Precision and limits of detection for selected commercially available, low-cost carbon dioxide and methane gas sensors. Sensors, 19, 3157.

[22] HOWARTH, R. W. 2014. A bridge to nowhere: methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas. Energy Science & Engineering, 2, 47-60.

[23] HOWARTH, R. W. 2015. Methane emissions and climatic warming risk from hydraulic fracturing and shale gas development: implications for policy. Energy and Emission Control Technologies, 45-54.

[24] JOHNSON, D. R., COVINGTON, A. N. & CLARK, N. N. 2016. Design and use of a Full Flow Sampling System (FFS) for the quantification of methane emissions. Journal of Visualized Experiments: JoVE, 54179.

[25] KAMIENIAK, J., RANDVIIR, E. P. & BANKS, C. E. 2015. The latest developments in the analytical sensing of methane. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 73, 146-157.

[26] KAYASTHA, N., NIYATO, D., HOSSAIN, E. & HAN, Z. 2014. Smart grid sensor data collection, communication, and networking: a

tutorial. Wireless communications and mobile computing, 14, 1055-1087.

[27] KNOBELSPIES, S., BIERER, B., PEREZ, A. O., WÖLLENSTEIN, J., KNEER, J. & PALZER, S. 2016. Low-cost gas sensing system for the reliable and precise measurement of methane, carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide in natural gas and biomethane. Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical, 236, 885-892.

[28] KOROTCENKOV, G. 2013. Handbook of gas sensor materials. Conventional approaches, 1, 19-23.

[29] LAMB, B. K., EDBURG, S. L., FERRARA, T. W., HOWARD, T., HARRISON, M. R., KOLB, C. E., TOWNSEND-SMALL, A., DYCK, W., POSSOLO, A. & WHETSTONE, J. R. 2015. Direct measurements show decreasing methane emissions from natural gas local distribution systems in the United States. Environmental Science & Technology, 49, 5161-5169.

[30] LIU, X. 2015. A deployment strategy for multiple types of requirements in wireless sensor networks. IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, 45, 2364-2376.

[31] LIU, X., CHENG, S., LIU, H., HU, S., ZHANG, D. & NING, H. 2012. A survey on gas sensing technology. Sensors, 12, 9635-9665.

[32] MOORE, T. S., MULLAUGH, K. M., HOLYOKE, R. R., MADISON, A. S., YÜCEL, M. & LUTHER III, G. W. 2009. Marine chemical technology and sensors for marine waters: potentials and limits. Annual review of marine science, 1, 91-115.

[33] OGUNNOWO, E. O. A Conceptual Framework for Digital Twin Deployment in Real-Time Monitoring of Mechanical Systems.

[34] OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., IFECHUKWUDE, P., EGBUMOKEI, I. N. D. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. Creating a Sustainability-Focused Digital Transformation Model for Improved Environmental and Operational Outcomes in Energy Operations.

[35] OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., IFECHUKWUDE, P., EGBUMOKEI, I. N. D. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. An Integrated Lean Six Sigma Model for Cost Optimization in Multinational Energy Operations.

[36] ON ENERGY, B., ON AGRICULTURE, B., NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES, E. & MEDICINE 2018. Methane emission measurement and monitoring methods. Improving characterization of anthropogenic methane emissions in the United States. National Academies Press (US).

[37] PETTUS, A. 2009. Methane: Tapping the untapped potential. CleanAIR: Boston, MA, USA.

[38] POTYRAILO, R. A., SURMAN, C., NAGRAJ, N. & BURNS, A. 2011. Materials and transducers toward selective wireless gas sensing. Chemical reviews, 111, 7315-7354.

[39] RAJKISHORE, S., VIGNESH, N., DORAISAMY, P. & MAHESWARI, M. 2015. Methane emission from rice ecosystems: 100 years of research. Ecoscan, 9, 181-193.

[40] RAUTENHAUS, M., BÖTTINGER, M., SIEMEN, S., HOFFMAN, R., KIRBY, R. M., MIRZARGAR, M., RÖBER, N. & WESTERMANN, R. 2017. Visualization in meteorology—a survey of techniques and tools for data analysis tasks. IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics, 24, 3268-3296.

[41] REY, J., ATXAERANDIO, R., RUIZ, R., UGARTE, E., GONZÁLEZ-RECIO, O., GARCIA-RODRIGUEZ, A. & GOIRI, I. 2019. Comparison between non-invasive methane measurement techniques in cattle. Animals, 9, 563.

[42] SEJIAN, V., BHATTA, R., MALIK, P. K., MADIAJAGAN, B., AL-HOSNI, Y. A. S., SULLIVAN, M. & GAUGHAN, J. B. 2016. Livestock as sources of greenhouse gases and its significance to climate change. Greenhouse gases. IntechOpen.

[43] SOUNDARRAJAN, P. & SCHWEIGHARDT, F. 2008. Hydrogen sensing and detection. Hydrogen Fuel. CRC Press.

[44] STEIGER, M., BERNARD, J., MITTELSTÄDT, S., LÜCKE-TIEKE, H., KEIM, D., MAY, T. & KOHLHAMMER, J. Visual analysis of time-series similarities for anomaly detection in sensor networks. Computer graphics forum, 2014. Wiley Online Library, 401-410.

[45] SYAFRUDIN, M., ALFIAN, G., FITRIYANI, N. L. & RHEE, J. 2018. Performance analysis of IoT-based sensor, big data processing, and machine learning model for real-time monitoring system in automotive manufacturing. Sensors, 18, 2946.

[46] TANG, J., LI, B. & WANG, J. 2019. High-precision measurements of nitrous oxide and methane in air with cavity ring-down spectroscopy at 7.6 μm. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 12, 2851-2861.

[47] THOMPSON, D., LEIFER, I., BOVENSMANN, H., EASTWOOD, M., FLADELAND, M., FRANKENBERG, C., GERILOWSKI, K., GREEN, R., KRATWURST, S. & KRINGS, T. 2015. Real-time remote detection and measurement for airborne imaging spectroscopy: a case study with methane. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 8, 4383-4397.

[48] USSIRI, D. & LAL, R. 2017. Historical and Contemporary Global Methane Cycling. Carbon Sequestration for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. Springer.

[49] WHITE, C. M., SMITH, D. H., JONES, K. L., GOODMAN, A. L., JIKICH, S. A., LACOUNT, R. B., DUBOSE, S. B., OZDEMIR, E., MORSI, B. I. & SCHROEDER, K. T. 2005. Sequestration of carbon dioxide in coal with enhanced coalbed methane recovery a review. Energy & Fuels, 19, 659-724.

[50] YANG, C., LIU, C., ZHANG, X., NEPAL, S. & CHEN, J. 2014. A time efficient approach for detecting errors in big sensor data on cloud. IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, 26, 329-339.

[51] YUSUF, R. O., NOOR, Z. Z., ABBA, A. H., HASSAN, M. A. A. & DIN, M. F. M. 2012. Methane emission by sectors: a comprehensive review of emission sources and mitigation methods. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 16, 5059-5070.

[52] ZHANG, J. & LI, C. M. 2012. Nanoporous metals: fabrication strategies and advanced electrochemical applications in catalysis, sensing and energy systems. Chemical Society Reviews, 41, 7016-7031.