

## NUMERICAL DATA

### Responses of greenhouse-gas emissions to land-use change from rice to jasmine production in subtropical China (2019)

Global-warming potential (GWP) of paddy and jasmine fields (average  $\pm$  SE, N = 3) analyzed by mixed models, with plot as a random factor.

Land use	Cumulative greenhouse-gas emission (g m <sup>-2</sup> )			GWP (kg CO <sub>2</sub> -eq ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Total GWP (kg CO <sub>2</sub> -eq ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	
<b>Paddy field</b>	7245 $\pm$ 335a	25.5 $\pm$ 1.3a	0.56 $\pm$ 0.08a	72453 $\pm$ 3352.48a	8865 $\pm$ 428.13a	1667 $\pm$ 2284a	82784 $\pm$ 3421a
<b>Jasmine field</b>	4744 $\pm$ 125b	0.31 $\pm$ 0.44b	3.36 $\pm$ 1.15a	47437 $\pm$ 1245.69b	105 $\pm$ 150b	10013 $\pm$ 3423b	57556 $\pm$ 3056b

Different letters within a column indicate significant differences (P < 0.05).

CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the paddy field was generally higher from April to December (rice growth period, and the beginning of straw return for December, > 264 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) and lower from January to March (fallow period, < 100 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>). CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the jasmine field was generally higher from April to August (jasmine rapid-growth period, > 770 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) and lower from September to March of the next year (jasmine slow-growth period, < 300 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>). Cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> emission was lower in the jasmine than the paddy field (P < 0.05).

**Source:** <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1352231018308896>

### Challenges of Employing Renewable Energy for Reducing Green House Gases (GHGs) and Carbon Footprint (2019)

Different renewable technologies and their emissions

Renewable technology	Basic information	Renewable source	CO <sub>2</sub> emission (gmCO <sub>2</sub> eq/kWh)
<b>Fuel cell</b>	Device which converts chemical energy into electrical energy	Methanol (CH <sub>3</sub> OH), Natural gas, Reforming of CH <sub>4</sub> to H <sub>2</sub> leads to decreased efficiency	50
<b>Photovoltaic (Solar PV)</b>	Generates no heat and produces electricity from solar radiation	Sun	Utility scale - 48 Rooftop - 41
<b>Wind</b>	Converts wind energy to electrical energy by wind turbines.	Wind	Offshore – 12 Onshore – 11
<b>Hydro</b>	Natural Resource	Water	24
<b>Biomass</b>	Biofuel, Waste management system	Biological waste	Dedicated – 230
<b>Geothermal energy</b>	Thermal energy of Earth	Earth Temperature	38
<b>Other renewables</b>	OTEC (Ocean thermal energy conversions)	Temperature difference between cooled water and warm tropical surface waters	17

<sup>a</sup> Source: IET Renew. Power Gener., 2016, vol. 10, Iss. 7, pp. 873–884.

<sup>b</sup> Source: IPCC, 2014. Global warming potential of selected electricity sources.

**Source:** <https://sci-hub.tw/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803581-8.11170-1>

## Challenges of Employing Renewable Energy for Reducing Green House Gases (GHGs) and Carbon Footprint (2019)

### Precipitation change projections for India due to increasing GHGs

Year	Precipitation change (%)			Sea level rise (cm)
	Annual I	Monson	Winter	
2020s	1.36 ± 0.19	1.61 ± 0.16	1.13 ± 0.43	4–8
2050s	6.7 ± 8.9	-2.9 ± 26.3	6.7 ± 8.9	15–38
2080s	<b>11.0 ± 12.3</b>	<b>5.3 ± 34.4</b>	<b>11.0 ± 12.3</b>	46–59

**Source:** Aggarwal, D., Lal, M., 2001. Vulnerability of Indian Coastline to Sea-level Rise, New Delhi: Centre for Atmospheric Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology

### Temperature change projections for India due to increasing GHGs

	Annual I	Monson	Winter
2020s	1.36 ± 0.19	1.61 ± 0.16	1.13 ± 0.43
2050s	2.69 ± 0.41	3.25 ± 0.36	2.19 ± 0.88
2080s	<b>3.84 ± 0.76</b>	<b>4.52 ± 0.49</b>	<b>3.19 ± 1.42</b>

**Source:** Aggarwal, D., Lal, M., 2001. Vulnerability of Indian Coastline to Sea-level Rise, New Delhi: Centre for Atmospheric Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology.

**URL:** <https://sci-hub.tw/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803581-8.11170-1>

## Effects of water deficit stress on agronomic and physiological responses of rice and greenhouse gas emission from rice soil under elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (2018)

Table 1. Representative studies reporting GHG emissions from rice soils under different water management practices.

Author	Environment	GHG Emission		
		CH <sub>4</sub> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	GWP (kg CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Hadi et al., 2010	Continuous flooded	634.2 <sup>a</sup>	3.4 <sup>c</sup>	15,378
	Intermittent drainage	370.9 <sup>a</sup>	4.6 <sup>c</sup>	9706
Tyagi et al., 2010	Continuous flooded	14.45 <sup>b</sup>	–	8153.88
	Intermittent drainage	8.53 <sup>b</sup>	–	4816.25
Xu and Hosen, 2010	Continuous flooded	2.62	–	–
	Irrigation at 79% soil water content	1.7	–	–
Khosla et al., 2011	Continuous flooded	1.3 <sup>b</sup>	–	–
	AWD	0.47 <sup>b</sup>	–	–
Li et al., 2011	Early aeration	1.49	132 <sup>d</sup>	2920
	Prolonged aeration	1.52	85 <sup>d</sup>	2300
Wang et al., 2011	Continuous flooded	–	0.28	–
	Intermittent drainage	–	0.37	–
Wang et al., 2012	Continuous flooded	221	0.16	–
	Intermittent drainage	74	0.22	–
Jain et al., 2014	TPR	22.59	0.61	888.1
	SRI	8.81	0.91	644.3
Li et al., 2014	Early aeration	1.27 <sup>b</sup>	112 <sup>d</sup>	2640
	Prolonged aeration	0.85 <sup>b</sup>	113 <sup>d</sup>	2330
Pandey et al., 2014	Continuous flooded	108	0.31	2784
	AWD	31	0.74	1005
Kumar et al., 2016	Continuous flooded	34.07	1.04	2328.53
	Irrigation at -40 kPa	16.7	0.98	1867.64

- a Value in kg carbon ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>.
- b Value in mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>.
- c Value in kg Nitrogen ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>.
- d Value in µg N<sub>2</sub>O m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>.

Source : <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969718338026>

## Effects of biochar application in forest ecosystems on soil properties and greenhouse gas emissions: a review (2018)

Table 1: Effects of biochar application on the greenhouse gas emissions in forest soils.

Soil type	Study type (scale)	Biochar type	Biochar rate	Time	CO <sub>2</sub> emission (over control)	CH <sub>4</sub> uptake (over control)	N <sub>2</sub> O emission (over control)	Reference
<b>Cambisols</b>	Laboratory	Corn silage (500°C)	1%, w/w	105	No significant difference	No significant difference	Decreased N <sub>2</sub> O emission	Malghani et al. (2013)
<b>Ferralsols</b>	Laboratory	Chicken manure (540°C)	10%, w/w	84	-	Increased CH <sub>4</sub> uptake	-	Yu et al. (2013)
<b>Brunisol</b>	Laboratory	Sugar maple wood (500°C)	5, 10, and 20%, w/w	24	Increased CO <sub>2</sub> emission	-	-	Mitchell et al. (2015)
<b>Humo-ferric podzols</b>	Laboratory	Douglas-fir (420°C)	1 and 10%, w/w	25	Increased CO <sub>2</sub> emission	Decreased CH <sub>4</sub> uptake	No significant difference in the 1% biochar treatment; Increased N <sub>2</sub> O emission by 191% in the 10% biochar treatment	Hawthorne et al. (2017)
<b>Lixisol</b>	Field	Wheat straw (450°C)	30 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1	Decreased CO <sub>2</sub> emission by 31.5%	-	Decreased N <sub>2</sub> O emission by 25.5%	Sun et al. (2014)
<b>Ferralsols</b>	Field	Bamboo leaf (500°C)	5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1	No significant difference	-	-	Wang et al. (2014)
<b>Humo-ferric podzols</b>	Field	Mixed maple and spruce sawdust (350–450 °C)	1 and 10%, w/w	1	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference	Sackett et al. (2015)
<b>Ferralsols</b>	Field	Bamboo leaf (500°C)	5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1	-	-	Decreased N <sub>2</sub> O emission by 20.5%	Xiao et al. (2016b)
<b>Humo-ferric podzols</b>	Laboratory	Douglas-fir slash (420°C)	20 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	3	Increased CO <sub>2</sub> emission by 6.6%	Decreased CH <sub>4</sub> uptake by 8.4%	-	Johnson et al. (2017)
<b>Ultisol</b>	Field	Chicken manure (400°C)/Sawdust (400°C)	24 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1	-	No significant difference	No significant difference	Lin et al. (2017)
<b>Ferralsols</b>	Field	Bamboo (800°C)	10 and 30 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	16	No significance difference	-	-	Zhou et al. (2017)

Source: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11368-017-1906-y>

## Nitrogen fertilization and conservation tillage: a review on growth, yield, and greenhouse gas emissions in cotton. (2017)

Table 1. Reported GHG emission and their fluxes in different countries in cotton.

Place of study	GHG under study	GHG emission	GHG flux	Reference
Pakistan	N <sub>2</sub> O	3.2 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	2.33 g N ha <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	Mahmood et al. (2008)
China	N <sub>2</sub> O	2.6 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	30 µg N m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup>	Liu et al. (2010)
China	NO	0.8 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.8 µg N m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup>	Liu et al. (2010)
Uzbekistan	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.9 to 6 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	3000 µg N m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup>	Scheer et al. (2008a, b)
Australia	CO <sub>2</sub> e	127, 127, and 1634 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> (for solid-plant, double-skip, and irrigated cotton farming systems, respectively)	–	Maraseni et al. (2010)

**Source:** <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-016-7894-4>