Nitrogen Management Affects Nitrous Oxide Emissions under Varying Cotton Irrigation Systems in the Desert Southwest, USA (2018)

Table 1. Nitrous oxide emissions as affected by N management in overhead sprinkler–irrigated 'DP 1044 RR F' cotton, Maricopa, AZ, 2014 and 2015.

Nitrogen treatment	Fertilize r source	Fertilizer rate		Seasonal N <sub>2</sub>	O flux	N₂O emission factor	
		2014	2015	2014	201 5	2014	2015
		kg N ha <sup>−1</sup>		gN₂O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> 91d <sup>-1</sup>	gN <sub>2</sub> O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> 113d 1	%	
1. Zero-N		0	0	75 b†	285 c	_	_
2. Soil test-based N‡	UAN§	179	131	1123 a	1620 b	0.58 a	1.01 a
3. 1.3*soil test- based N‡	UAN	233	170	1240 a	2830 a	0.53 a	1.05 a
4. Soil test-based N‡	UAN + Agrotain Plus	179	131	269 b	856 bc	0.15 a	0.44 a
5. Reflectance- based N-1	UAN	90	66	1013 ab	783 c	1.11 a	0.77 a
6. Reflectance- based N-2#	UAN	116	85	705 ab	1099 bc	0.60 a	0.95 a
7. Reflectance- based N-1	UAN + Agrotain Plus	90	66	646 ab	761 c	0.71 a	0.72 a
8. Reflectance- based N-2#	UAN + Agrotain Plus	116	85	532 b	935 bc	0.45 a	0.72 a
SE				269	332	0.3	0.4

† Means in a column followed by a similar letter are not statistically different at P = 0.05.

\* Based on lint yield goal of 2240 kg ha-1 and a 224 kg N ha-1 N requirement minus 0- to 90-cm soil NO3–N and estimated irrigation input of 22 kg N ha-1 (estimated 100-cm irrigation of 2 mg L-1 NO3–N water). UAN, urea ammonium nitrate.

First split equals 50% treatment 2; second and third splits based on normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) relative to treatment 2.

First split equals 50% treatment 2, second and third splits based on NDVI relative to treatment 3.

Source:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322459549\_Nitrogen\_Management\_Affects\_Nitrous\_Oxide\_E missions\_under\_Varying\_Cotton\_Irrigation\_Systems\_in\_the\_Desert\_Southwest\_USA

## Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Turfgrass Receiving Different Irrigation Amounts and Nitrogen Fertilizer Forms (2018)

Table 1: Analysis of fertilizer main effect, irrigation main effect, and fertilizer ' irrigation interaction on cumulative N2O emissions during the summer periods (June–August) in Year 1 (2015), Year 2 (2016), and both summers combined.

	Cumulative summer N <sub>2</sub> O emissions						
Source of variation	Year 1	Ye	ear 2	Total			
		— N <sub>2</sub>	O-N kg ha <sup>−1</sup>				
Fertilizer							
Urea	1.82a†		1.77a†	3.59a†			
Polymer-coated urea (PCU)	1.18b		1.35b	2.53b			
Unfertilized (UF)	0.974c		1.31b	2.28c			
Irrigation‡							
Medium	1.36a§	1.53a¶ 2.88a#		2.88a#			
Low	1.29b		1.42 b	2.71b			
Fertilizer ´ irrigation							
Urea ´ medium	1.84		1.84	3.68a§			
Urea ´ low	1.80	1.70		3.50b			
PCU ´ medium	1.26		1.42	2.68c			
PCU ´ low	1.10	1.27 2.37d		2.37d			
UF ´ medium	0.975		1.32	2.29d			
UF ´ low	0.973		1.29	2.27d			
	ANOVA						
Source		р	-value††				
Fertilizer	<0.0001	_	<0.0001	<0.0001			
Irrigation	0.0289		0.0027	0.0006			
Fertilizer x Irrigation	0.0901		0.2046	0.0437			
<u> </u>							

† Within fertilizer main effect, means in column with different letters are significantly different according Fisher's LSD (P £ 0.0001).

‡ Medium irrigation level was at 72% reference evapotranspiration (ET0) replacement in 2014, at 68% ET0 replacement from 1 June to 19 July in 2015, and then at 66% ET0 replacement from 20 July to 1 September in 2015 and entire summer period in 2016. The low irrigation level was at 54% ET0 replacement in 2014, at 45% ET0 replacement from 1 June to 19 July in 2015, and then at 33% ET0 replacement from 20 July to 1 September in 2015 and entire summer period in 2016. Within the source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.05).

¶ Within the source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.01).

# Within the source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pounds$  0.001).

†† Bolded p-values are significant at either the 0.05, 0.01, or 0.001 probability level.

## Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Turfgrass Receiving Different Irrigation Amounts and Nitrogen Fertilizer Forms (2018)

Table 1:Analysis of fertilizer main effect, irrigation main effect, and fertilizer ' irrigation interaction on 2-yr total cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for the summer periods (June– August), offseason period (September–May), and the combined total of the entire 2-yr period.

	Cumulative N <sub>2</sub> O emissions					
Source of variation	Total summer	Total offseason	Combined total for entir period			
	N	$ON_2$ kg ha <sup>-1</sup>				
Fertilizer						
Urea	3.59a†	2.03a‡	5.62a‡			
Polymer-coated urea (PCU)	2.53b	1.97a	4.50b			
Unfertilized (UF)	2.28c	1.78b	4.06c			
Irrigation						
Medium	2.88a§	1.89	4.77			
Low	2.71b	1.97	4.68			
Fertilizer ´ irrigation						
Urea ´ medium	3.68a¶	1.95	5.63			
Urea ´ low	3.50b	2.11	5.61			
PCU ´ medium	2.68c	1.96	4.64			
PCU ´ low	2.37d	1.99	4.36			
UF ´ medium	2.29d	1.75	4.04			
UF Í low	2.27d	1.80	4.07			
		ANOVA				
Source	p-value#					
Fertilizer	<0.0001	0.0011	<0.0001			
Irrigation	0.0006	0.1404	0.2180			
Fertilizer x Irrigation	0.0437	0.5550	0.2093			

 $\dagger$  Within a source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.0001).

 $\ddagger$  Within a source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.01).

§ Within a source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.001).

¶ Within a source of variation, means in columns with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher's LSD (P  $\pm$  0.05).

# Bolded p-values are significant at either the 0.05, 0.01, or 0.001 probability level.

## Management of pig manure to mitigate NO and yield-scaled $N_2O$ emissions in an irrigated Mediterranean crop (2017)

Table 1: Cumulative  $N_2O$ -N emissions over the different periods of field experiment and total cumulative NO-N, CH<sub>4</sub>-C and, CO<sub>2</sub>-C fluxes in the different fertilizer (C, control, U, urea, COM, compost, LFPS, liquid fraction of pig slurry, LFPSI, liquid fraction of pig slurry + DMPP) and irrigation (S, sprinkler, D, drip) treatments.

Effect	$N_2O$ cumulative emission (g $N_2O$ -N ha $^1$ )			Total N <sub>2</sub> O-N	NO cumulative emission	CH <sub>4</sub> cumulative emission	CO <sub>2</sub> cumulative emission
	Period I	Period II	Period III	$(g N_2O-$ N ha <sup>1</sup> y <sup>1</sup> )	$(kg NO-N ha^{1} y^{1})$	$(g CH_4-C ha^1 y^1)$	$(Mg CO_2$ -C ha <sup>1</sup> y <sup>1</sup> )
Irrigation x fertilizer	P = 0.200	P = 0.042	P = 0.238	P = 0.026	P = 0.03	P = 0.652	P = 0.32
S.E.	13.7	80.8	31.0	91.1	0.3	102.6	0.1
Irrigation	P = 0.867	P = 0.000	P = 0.032	P = 0.000	P = 0.000	P = 0.000	P = 0.000
S	69.5	517.7 b	123.7 b	710.8 b	2.4 a	358.3 a	0.69 b
D	53.9	130.6 a	65.5 a	261.2 a	3.8 b	96.0 b	0.25 a
S.E.	6.2	36.1	13.8	40.7	0.1	45.9	0.03
Fertilizer	P = 0.000	P = 0.001	P = 0.157	P = 0.000	P = 0.000	P = 0.070	P = 0.006
С	21.5 a	53.3 a	60.9	138.6 a	2.4 a	163.8 ab	0.44 a
U	20.6 a	634.1 c	126.6	781.9 c	3.1 bc	332.1 a	0.43 a
СОМ	122.7 c	421.1 bc	113.9	664.7 bc	3.5 c	112.1 b	0.61 b
LFPS	95.3 c	327.2 bc	104.7	529.1 b	3.9 c	163.1 ab	0.37 a
LFPSI	48.2 b	198.7 ab	66.8	315.9 a	2.6 ab	365.1 a	0.50 a
S.E.	9.7	57.1	21.9	64.4	0.2	72.5	0.04

Different letters within columns indicate significant differences by applying the Tukey's honest significance test at P < 0.05.

Standard Error (S.E.) is given for each effect.

The variables  $N_2O$  (Period II), total  $N_2O$ , NO and  $CO_2$  were log-transformed before the ANOVA.

Source: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016788091630473X