

Enhanced nitrous oxide emission factors due to climate change increase the mitigation challenge in the agricultural sector

Linchao Li¹, Chaoqun Lu^{1*}, Wilfried Winiwarter^{2,3}, Hanqin Tian^{4,5}, Josep G Canadell⁶, Akihiko Ito^{7,8}, Atul K. Jain⁹, Sian Kou-Giesbrecht¹⁰, Shufen Pan^{11,4}, Naiqing Pan⁴, Hao Shi¹², Qing Sun¹³, Nicolas Vuichard¹⁴, Shuchao Ye¹, Sönke Zaehle¹⁵, Qing Zhu¹⁶

¹ Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA

² International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

³ Institute of Environmental Engineering, University of Zielona Góra, 65-417 Zielona Góra, Poland

⁴ Center for Earth System Science and Global Sustainability, Schiller Institute for Integrated Science and Society, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA

⁵ Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA

⁶ CSIRO Environment, Canberra, ACT, Australia

⁷ Graduate School of Life and Agricultural Sciences, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8657, Japan

⁸ Earth System Division, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba 305-8506, Japan

⁹ Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

¹⁰ Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada B3H 4R2

¹¹ Department of Engineering and Environmental Studies Program, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA

¹² Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100085, China

¹³ Climate and Environmental Physics, Physics Institute and Oeschger Centre for Climate Change Research, University of Bern, 3012 Bern, Switzerland

¹⁴ Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE, CEA CNRS, UVSQ UPSACLAY, 91198 Gif sur Yvette, France

¹⁵ Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, 07701 Jena, Germany

¹⁶ Climate and Ecosystem Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Abstract

Effective nitrogen ~~fertilization-fertilizer~~ management is crucial for reducing nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions while ensuring food security within planetary boundaries. However, climate change might also interact with management practices to alter N₂O emission and emission factors (EF), ~~which brings additionaladding further~~ uncertainties to estimating mitigation potentials. Here, we developed a new hybrid modeling framework that integrates a machine-learning model with an ensemble of eight process-based models to project EFs under different climate and nitrogen policy scenarios. Our findings reveal that EFs are dynamically modulated by environmental changes, including climate, soil properties, and nitrogen management practices. Under low-ambition nitrogen regulation policies, EF would increase from 1.18-1.22% in 2010 to 1.27-1.34% by 2050, representing a relative increase of 4.4-11.4% and exceeding the IPCC tier-1 EF of 1%. This trend is particularly pronounced in tropical and subtropical regions with high nitrogen inputs, where EFs could increase by 0.14-0.35% (relative increase of 11.9-17%). In contrast, high-ambition policies have the potential to mitigate the increases in EF caused by climate change, possibly leading to slight decreases in EFs. Furthermore, our results demonstrate that global EFs are expected to continue rising due to warming and regional drying-wetting cycles, even in the absence of changes in nitrogen management practices. This asymmetrical influence of nitrogen fertilizers on EFs, driven by climate change, underscores the urgent need for immediate N₂O emission reductions and further assessments of mitigation potentials. We believe this hybrid modeling framework offers a computationally efficient approach to projecting future N₂O emissions across various climate, soil, and nitrogen management scenarios, facilitating socio-economic assessments and policy-making efforts.

1. Introduction

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is one of the powerful and long-lived greenhouse gases (GHG). Its atmospheric concentration has increased by approximately 24.8% from pre-industrial levels to 2023 (Lan et al., 2024). Among all known N₂O surface emission sources, agricultural soil accounts for around 50% of the anthropogenic N₂O emissions (Shcherbak et al., 2014; Tian et al., 2020). Emissions of N₂O from soil have been rising, particularly in recent decades, largely due to increased nitrogen (N) inputs from fertilizers (Lu et al., 2022; Thompson et al., 2019). Although sufficient N fertilizer application is essential for food supply (Ahvo et al., 2023), overfertilization gives rise to N pollution leading to annual global economic costs of around 200 - 2000 billion US\$ (Kanter et al., 2020b; Sutton et al., 2013), especially for the financial expenses associated with mitigating N₂O emissions (Feng and Li, 2023). Furthermore, a wide variety of studies argue that the effectiveness of GHG mitigation is likely to decrease due to global warming (Köberle et al., 2021; Shaaban, 2024; Xu et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2024), suggesting an urgency of early mitigation (Peng and Guan, 2021). Many studies seek to develop mitigation strategies that balance crop yields with reduced GHG emissions without compromising crop productivity in specific regions (Burney et al., 2010; Lamb et al., 2016; Lugato et al., 2018). Several mitigation pathways have been developed (Gu et al., 2023; Kanter et al., 2020a; Sutton et al., 2021), which provide general insights into how current N policies impact future environmental scenarios and targeted interventions for N pollution reduction. However, the applicability of these regionally specific hypotheses has not been fully tested on global scales, which limits our understanding of hotspot areas for N₂O emission mitigation. More importantly, how effective different N regulating policies will be under the future climate has not been systematically investigated. This knowledge gap may lead to missing key timing for actions to effectively reduce


N₂O emissions, that is relevant for simultaneously achieving both Goal 2 (Zero Hunger) and Goal 13 (Climate Action) of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (United Nation, 2015).

The N₂O emission factor (EF) is a widely used bottom-up approach for estimating anthropogenic soil N₂O emissions from N fertilizer input. The recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) suggests a default EF (tier-1) (Hergoualc'h et al., 2019; Klein, 2006) and more detailed country-specific EFs (tier-2) to guide the N₂O emission assessment. Despite being easy to use, this approach overlooks the large variance and long-term dynamics of EF due to different environmental conditions such as climate, soil, and management (Lesschen et al., 2011; Shcherbak et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2020a). EF change is mainly attributed to factors like environmental conditions, N fertilizer input rate, soil properties, or carbon substrates (Hu et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2016; Shcherbak et al., 2014; Venkiteswaran et al., 2014). However, these attribution analyses are often based on short-term field observations that may not fully represent the long-term impacts of climate change (Harris et al., 2022) and evolving nitrogen management practices on EF dynamics. Although evaluating the spatial patterns of EF based on statistical models and field observations could provide insights into mitigation potentials and N₂O emission projections (Cui et al., 2021; Harris et al., 2022), EF dynamics under climate change are not adequately addressed in the existing EF maps. This oversight may result in biases in EF-based estimates of N₂O emissions and lead to a failure in identifying the optimal timing for implementing effective mitigation strategies (Harris et al., 2022). Such a lapse not only impedes the accuracy of global N₂O estimations but also hampers policymakers from developing more effective mitigation strategies over both short- and long-term periods.

Process-based models represent another bottom-up approach to dynamically project N input-induced N₂O emissions by simulating biological and biogeochemical processes [in croplands and pasture lands, where N fertilizer is a primary input source](#), under climate change and different management practices (Del Grosso et al., 2022; Tian et al., 2018; Tian et al., 2019). These models provide dynamic predictions of N₂O emissions driven by climate and environmental data. However, their application is limited by the requirement for input data preparation, extensive model calibration and validation ([Ouatahar et al., 2021](#); [Sandor et al., 2018](#)), process representation, and substantial computational resources, particularly when various N management scenarios and future climate scenarios are assessed for N₂O emission projection (Perlman et al., 2014; Tian et al., 2018). In the era of big data, artificial intelligence has become increasingly influential in fields based on large datasets (Delavaux et al., 2023; Ham et al., 2019; Reichstein et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024). However, these approaches (e.g., machine learning and deep learning) can mainly provide references for responses under current conditions (Franke et al., 2020), and projects integrating different potential future N management and climate scenarios are challenging. Furthermore, statistical models can be misleading due to the lack of detailed understanding of processes and causal relationships (Feng et al., 2019). Thus, it may be of interest to develop a hybrid approach that combines the advancement of process-based models and machine learning to emulate the process-based model behaviors (Xiao et al., 2024). Such statistical emulations could offer an efficient and timely approach to estimating the efficacy of mitigation strategies under different climate scenarios.

Here, we develop a modeling framework that employs machine learning to emulate the behavior of eight state-of-the-art process-based terrestrial biosphere model ensembles from the global Nitrogen/N₂O Model Inter-comparison Project phase 2 (NMIP2) (Tian et al., 2024). This approach can dynamically evaluate global EF for N fertilizer input-induced N₂O emission projections with improved accuracy, effectively combining the two bottom-up methods. We then perform an

123 attribution analysis of EF change based on our dynamic EF (Dym-EF) model. Finally, we estimate
 124 the potential change of EF based on seven N management scenarios from 2010 to 2050, each N
 125 management scenario with a corresponding climate scenario based on 37 global climate models
 126 (GCMs) (Figure 1). The objectives of this study are to (1) explore the key factors influencing EFs
 127 and their potential changes over time; (2) reveal the nonlinear relationships between EFs and
 128 environmental factors; (3) dynamically project EF under various nitrogen mitigation strategies and
 129 climate scenarios; (4) identify the opportunities and hotspots with high EF reduction potentials from
 130 seven nitrogen regulation policies at three ambition levels that have been developed under the
 131 International Nitrogen Management System (INMS) project (Kanter et al., 2020b). The INMS
 132 scenarios combine specific policies to reduce nitrogen pollution with the Shared Socioeconomic
 133 Pathways (SSP: Riahi et al. (2017)) and the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP: Van
 134 Vuuren et al. (2011)) developed under the IPCC. This study can improve our understanding of
 135 balancing policies, N₂O emission, and food production under future climate scenarios, which is
 136 crucial for developing effective mitigation strategies. Moreover, this Dym-EF modeling framework
 137 offers flexibility and can easily extend to other different nitrogen management scenarios, providing a
 138 broader and timely evaluation of global GHG mitigation potentials.



139 **Figure 1 Modeling framework integrating machine learning and process-based model**
 140 **ensembles (NMIP2) for assessing global nitrogen fertilizer input-induced nitrous**
 141 **oxide (N₂O) emission factors (EF) and projecting EF Change under various climate**
 142 **and N management scenarios.** The NMIP2 was performed under 0.5°×0.5° resolution.
 143 This modeling framework was used to emulate the NMIP2 ensemble behaviors rather
 144 than individual NMIP2 models. RF, Random Forest model; 7 scenarios including INMS1,
 145 Business as usual; INMS2, Low N regulation (Low ambition); INMS3, Medium N
 146 regulation (Moderate ambition); INMS4, High N regulation (High ambition); INMS5,
 147 Best-case (High ambition); INMS6, Best-case plus (High ambition); INMS7, Bioenergy
 148 (High ambition); NMIP, Global N₂O model intercomparison project. Dym-EF, Dynamic
 149 EF.
 150

2. Data and Methods

2.1 Estimating the N₂O emission factor (EF) by learning the non-linear EF dynamics from the NMIP2 model ensemble

In this study, we estimate the N₂O emission factors (EF) based on eight process-based Terrestrial Biosphere models that participate in N₂O Model Intercomparison Project phase 2 (NMIP2) (Tian et al., 2024; Tian et al., 2018), including CLASSIC, DLEM, ELM, ISAM, LPX-Bern, OCN, ORCHIDEE, and VISIT. These models integrate the impacts of atmospheric N deposition, biological N fixation, manure N application, and N fertilizer use on the nitrogen cycle processes related to N₂O emissions (Tian et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2019). Each of the models use a "Demand and Supply-driven" approach for plant N uptake. Differences in how models represent nitrification and denitrification processes and their contributions to N₂O emissions with the modification of climate and agricultural management practices are a main source of uncertainty in our estimates. For a detailed description of the process associated with N₂O emission approaches of each model in Tian et al. (2024). A set of factorial simulations was performed to disentangle the respective contribution of drivers to the N₂O emissions. Among these simulations, the SH1 aims to estimate the dynamics of N₂O emission in response to changes in Climate + CO₂ + Land cover + Irrigation + N deposition + N Fertilizer + Manure N; while the SH3 yields the estimates of N₂O emissions without considering N fertilizer input, that is estimations driven by changes in Climate + CO₂ + Land cover + Irrigation + N deposition + Manure N. To estimate the EF, we first obtain the N₂O emissions directly resulting from N fertilizer inputs that were calculated using SH1 - SH3 (i.e., simulations with vs without N fertilizer input). We estimate the annual EF from 1961-2020 allowing us to assess how changes in warming trends and nitrogen application rates have influenced the variation in EFs. *The NMIP2 models were driven by consistent input datasets, including nitrogen inputs, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, daily climate variables, irrigation, and land cover changes, ensuring a standardized basis for comparison and analysis of global N₂O estimation. Most models output monthly N₂O estimates (Tian et al., 2024). The complete list of abbreviations is shown in Table S1.*

2.2 N regulation scenarios

Optimizing management practices can improve N use efficiency (NUE) and reduce N₂O emissions (Winiwarter et al., 2018). This N policy data has been used to estimate the N pollution globally (Cui et al., 2024; Kanter et al., 2020a). Thus, understanding the potential changes in N₂O emissions from food production under future land management scenarios (based on current and potential technological advancements) is essential for developing more comprehensive and cohesive nitrogen strategies; while additionally reducing the conflicts in food production and its environmental impacts (Gu et al., 2023; Kanter et al., 2020a). They have been formalized by Kanter et al. (2020b), who developed seven scenarios within the SSP/RCP framework that include three different levels of policy ambition to tackle nitrogen pollution in general (low, moderate, and high ambitions to remove nitrogen pollution, See Table 1), as part of the project Towards an International Nitrogen Management System (INMS: see <https://www.inms.international>). In this paper, we use projections of synthetic N fertilizer consumption as implemented in the GAINS model (Amann et al., 2011; Winiwarter et al., 2018) and in accordance to these seven scenarios.

High ambition N regulation scenarios: The high-ambition scenarios align with the Sustainable Development Goals, which extend to 2030. These ambition levels include four distinct approaches: high N regulation (INMS4, under RCP4.5 and SSP2), the “best case” (INMS5, under RCP4.5 and SSP1), the “best-case plus” (INMS6, under RCP4.5 and SSP1), and bioenergy (INMS7, under

RCP2.6 and SSP1). The high ambition N regulation level represents technological advancements within the period of the Sustainable Development Goals until 2030. The "best case" scenario envisages ambitious climate action combined with a strong commitment to sustainable agriculture and low-meat diets in line with the expectations under SSP1. The best-case "plus" scenario extends this ambition further, incorporating significant dietary changes and reducing food loss. As for the bioenergy scenario, improving bioenergy production is likely crucial for achieving the targets of a 1.5 °C and 2 °C world. From a N perspective, the RCP 4.5 scenario appears to be more favorable than RCP 2.6, unless substantial efforts are undertaken to improve NUE in bioenergy production in RCP 2.6. Generally, the high nitrogen policy ambition is expected to achieve the target NUE by 2030 and maintain it through to 2100 (Kanter et al., 2020b).

Moderate ambition N regulation scenario: The moderate ambition (Medium N regulation, INMS3, under RCP4.5 and SSP2) scenario aims to achieve the same goals but over a longer period, either by 2050 or 2070. It expects countries to continue their current high-input, low-efficiency N fertilizer for 30 years before making improvements.

Low ambition N regulation scenarios: The low ambition scenarios indicate no significant improvement and a stagnant NUE. The INMS1 scenario assumes a continuation of past trends (RCP8.5 and SSP5) while INMS2 considers climate policy (RCP4.5 and SSP2) but little policy attention to N pollution.

To integrate the seven scenarios, we employed the relative change metrics, comparing the future period (2011-2050) against a baseline period (1990-2010). This approach was used to align with the NMIP2 nitrogen (N) input data, which includes synthetic N fertilizer. Since the NMIP-derived EFs used to train our Dym-EF model were based on specific NMIP N fertilizer data, the nitrogen regulation pathways from INMS1-7 could not be directly applied as inputs to project future EFs. Consequently, we adapted the seven scenarios to align with the NMIP inputs as follows:

$$NFe_{S_NMIP} = NFe_{H_NMIP} + RN \times NFe_{H_NMIP} \quad (1)$$

$$RN = \frac{(S_INMS - His_INMS)}{His_INMS} \quad (2)$$

where the NFe_{S_NMIP} represents the synthetic fertilizer N input for the seven NMIP-compatible scenarios (2011-2050), NFe_{H_NMIP} is the historical NMIP synthetic fertilizer N input data (1990-2010), RN is the relative change, S_INMS represents the seven future scenarios (Table 1), and His_INMS is the historical N input data for these N regulation scenarios during 1990-2010. We developed the N management data at gridded scales with 0.5° by 0.5° grids. Through the above approach, we have developed a set of N input data tailored to these seven future scenarios for NMIP2. This ensures that the scenarios are appropriately linked to the current NMIP's N input data, thereby facilitates the creation of a series of detailed N input scenarios. Figure S1 shows the total N inputs under 7 scenarios during 1961-2050.

231 **Table 1** The seven future climate, land use, diet, and N management scenarios.

Name	Scenario	Climate	Land use regulation	Productivity	Diet	Ambition level
INMS1	Business-as-usual	RCP8.5	Medium	High	Meat & dairy-rich	Low
INMS2	Low nitrogen regulation	RCP4.5	Medium	Medium	Medium meat & dairy	Low
INMS3	Medium nitrogen regulation	RCP4.5	Medium	Medium	Medium meat & dairy	Moderate
INMS4	High nitrogen regulation	RCP4.5	Medium	Medium	Medium meat & dairy	High
INMS5	Best-case	RCP4.5	Strong	High	Low meat & dairy	High
INMS6	Best-case “Plus”	RCP4.5	Strong	High	Ambitious diet shift and food loss/waste reductions	High
INMS7	Bioenergy	RCP2.6	Strong	High	Low meat & dairy diet	High

232 *Modified from Kanter et al. (2020b).

233

234 2.3 Climate data

235 We collect monthly temperature and precipitation data from 37 GCMs under SSP126 (SSP1,
 236 RCP2.6), SSP245 (SSP2, RCP4.5), and SSP585 (SSP5, RCP8.5) of CMIP6 (Table S2). The use of
 237 37 Global Climate Models (GCMs) allows for comprehensive coverage of the range of Equilibrium
 238 Climate Sensitivity (ECS) and Transient Climate Response (TCR) values (Meehl et al., 2020). This
 239 breadth is crucial for adequately representing the spectrum of potential climate change scenarios. To
 240 match the resolution of NMIP2 input, we resample these GCMs to 0.5° by 0.5° grids. Since the
 241 historical data from the GCMs exhibit discrepancies when compared with NMIP2 inputs, we employ
 242 the delta approach for bias correction at grid scales:

$$243 \text{GCM}_b = \text{GCM}_{\text{raw}} + \text{Delta} \quad (3)$$

244 where the GCM_b is the bias-corrected GCMs during 2011-2050, GCM_{raw} is the raw GCMs climate
 245 variable (seasonal temperature and precipitation, and annual aridity index) during 2011-2050, and
 246 Delta is Observed Historical Data–Model Historical during 1980-2010. In a few small arid regions
 247 where bias correction resulted in negative precipitation values, we adjusted these to zero. NMS1
 248 corresponds to SSP5 ('Fossil-fueled Development'), INMS2-4 corresponds to SSP2 ('Middle of the
 249 Road'), and INMS5-7 corresponds to SSP1 ('Sustainability'). However, since SSP1-4.5 is not
 250 available for all GCMs (O'Neill et al., 2016), we use climate projections from SSP2-4.5 to
 251 approximate it and assemble the scenarios of best-case and Best-case+ (INMS5-6) as the combination
 252 of moderate-mitigation climate, sustainable development (SSP1), and high ambition N regulation
 253 policies. More details can be found in Kanter et al. (2020b). Figures S2 and S3 show the time series
 254 for precipitation and temperature, and their changes over areas of nitrogen application. Generally,
 255 there is a significant increase in temperature across various scenarios, especially under SSP585.

Precipitation demonstrates a slight increase, with SSP126 marginally exceeding SSP245 and SSP585 during 2011-2050.

2.4 Developing an explainable model to project EF change

The process-based models are capable of estimating non-linear responses of N₂O emissions through various biophysical processes, such as nitrification and denitrification. These models consider factors that potentially impact N₂O emissions and EFs, such as soil properties (including soil pH, initial soil organic carbon content, bulk density, and clay content), as well as environmental conditions like precipitation and temperature, along with management practices. Several studies have compared N₂O models in agriculture under historical conditions (Ehrhardt et al., 2018; Fuchs et al., 2020). However, for future projections, these models require substantial computational resources (Franke et al., 2020) and are challenging to apply directly to a large number of GCMs for assessing the N₂O dynamics under climate change scenarios. Statistical models can capture the nonlinear relationship between N₂O emissions and environmental variables. However, these statistically-based models do not incorporate biophysical processes, and their performance largely depends on the quality and quantity of the available data. (Li et al., 2023). Thus, there is growing interest in developing a hybrid model (or statistical emulation) that combines the advantages of both approaches, providing a more efficient and flexible method for estimating N₂O emissions.

In this study, we use the Random Forest (RF) model to reproduce the multi-model median of NMIP2 EF based on the NMIP2 input data (Tian et al., 2024). The climate data includes seasonal temperature and precipitation and yearly aridity index (AI). The soil data consisted of pH, initial soil organic carbon content (DOM_SOC), soil bulk density (BULK_DEN), percentage of sandy content (PCT_SAND), and clay content (PCT_CLAY). Management data included synthetic nitrogen fertilizer (N_{Fer}) and irrigation (Irr). We excluded grids where both cropland and pasture cover are less than 10%. In addition, we find the EF from the NMIP2 ensemble is highly sensitive to nitrogen inputs when the N input was less than 0.1 kg N/ha/yr. To ensure the accuracy of the Dym-EF model, we exclude data grids with extremely high EF caused by a lower N input, as well as those grids where the N input was less than 0.1 kg N/ha/yr, noting that atmospheric deposition alone often exceeds this level in many regions. Such extremely high EFs for low fertilizer inputs are likely artifacts from the NMIP2 models. Notably, to encompass a wider range of environmental conditions, our Random Forest (RF) model was trained on yearly data spanning 60 years (1961-2020) from NMIP2. This training allows us to dynamically generate annual EFs at a high spatial resolution of 0.5° × 0.5°.

We performed the RF model using the “ranger” package in R 4.1.1, optimizing the two hyperparameters (n_{tree} and m_{try}) with the ‘caret’ package. The n_{tree} parameter is the number of decision trees in the RF model, and the m_{try} parameter determines the number of features to consider at each split. The extensive size of our dataset, which was comprised of over one million data sets made tuning hyperparameters with the entire dataset challenging. Therefore, we used data from the most recent ten years (2011-2020) as a representative subset to calibrate the hyperparameters. We set the range for ' m_{try} ' from 1 to 9 in steps of 2, and for ' n_{tree} ' from 100 to 900 in steps of 200 (refer to Figure S4). We find that when m_{try} was set as 7 and n_{tree} at 700 or ' m_{try} ' at 5 and ' n_{tree} ' at 900, the model can achieve optimal performance with RMSE is 0.32 and the R^2 is 0.775. However, there is a trade-off between model performance and computational demand. Although such hyperparameters can provide better performance, they require significant computational resources. A setting of ' n_{tree} ' at 500 and ' m_{try} ' at 7 offered a similar performance (RMSE of 0.32 % and R^2 of 0.774) but with a significantly reduced computational load. Consequently, we selected these values ($m_{try} = 7$ and $n_{tree} = 500$) as the

final hyperparameters for our model. To evaluate our model's performance at each grid, we conducted a leave-ten-year-out cross-validation for each decade. Then we aggregated the results from these periods to assess the overall performance through R^2 and RMSE across the 60 years (1961-2020). Our approach showed reliable model performance with an R^2 higher than 0.9 and an RMSE lower than 0.1 in most regions (Figure S5-S6). Although N fertilizer is known to significantly influence EF (Akiyama et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2011), it casts doubt on the models' efficacy when solely using N fertilizer for EF estimation. Therefore, we compared the model performance of estimating EF using only N rates with using multiple environmental variables. The results showed that the predictions based solely on N fertilizer were not as reliable as those using multi-source environmental data (Figure S5-S6). This indicates that EF is affected not only by N management but also significantly by different environmental conditions. Generally, our modeling framework demonstrates reliable performance both at the grid level and in the combined overall assessment.

2.5 Attribution analysis

To identify the dominant factors influencing the EF, the Shapley additive explanations (SHAP) value was used to quantify the contribution of each predictor. We explain the overall impact of different predictors of estimating the EF using the mean absolute SHAP value. For a more granular and detailed explanation at the grid level, the SHAP values are more efficient to explain the dominant factors influencing the EF across different time intervals. The SHAP can isolate the impact of different variables on the EF. This approach, based on work in game theory (Lundberg and Lee, 2017), is used to determine how each individual factor affects a team's overall performance. It has been extensively applied in quantifying the marginal contributions of each predictor to the target variable (Chen et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023). The management and climate change significantly between different periods, especially for N input. Thus, in our study, to effectively capture how different environmental conditions influence the EF, we divide the study period into three time intervals: 1961-1990, 1991-2020, and 2021-2050. The period of 2021-2050 was analyzed using multi-GCM model ensembles under various future scenarios (INMS1-7). Since INMS5 (best-case scenario) and INMS6 (best-case 'plus') exhibit similar characteristics, we chose INMS6 to represent both in our analysis. We use the absolute value of SHAP values and select the highest values as the dominant factor.

2.6 Partial dependence

We use the partial dependence plots (PDPs) to analyze the marginal effects of predictors, including soil, climate, and management variables, on the EF. The PDP plots can effectively capture the non-linear relationship between different environmental variables and EF. In this study, we use the 'pdp' package of R 4.1.1 to analyze their non-linear impact on EF (Greenwell, 2017).

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Dominant drivers in influencing EF

We developed a Dym-EF model by learning the relationship between the median ensemble estimates of eight process-based models from NMIP2 and a time-series gridded database of key environmental factors such as climate, soil properties, and agricultural management at a spatial resolution of 0.5 degrees during 1961-2020. The grid-based RF model is proven to have a great performance in reproducing NMIP2 EF estimates over space and time (see Methods and Figure S4-5). For temporal variation, we assessed the R^2 and RMSE for each grid with a great performance for most regions (Figure S6). We found that temperature in June, July, and August (T_{JJA}), nitrogen

343 fertilizer (N_{Fer}), precipitation in June, July, and August (Pr_JJA), and precipitation in September,
 344 October, and November (Pr_SON), are the most important factors influencing EF (Figure S7).
 345 Summer temperature and summer/fall precipitations have a higher importance in determining EF
 346 dynamics than climate variables in other seasons, possibly because the NMIP2 model ensembles do
 347 not have information on fertilizer application timing in the input data and models assume one
 348 application without side-dressing or equal daily distribution of fertilizer input during crop growing
 349 season. N_{Fer} directly influences soil nitrogen content, significantly impacting EF. However, the
 350 combined effects of various seasonal climate variables are higher than the influence of N fertilizer
 351 alone in determining EF. The climate conditions in the northern summer months (JJA) are crucial for
 352 the growth of summer crops like corn and soybean, which frequently undergo nitrogen management
 353 (Lu et al., 2022; Maier et al., 2022). In addition, the warmer temperature and high soil moisture in
 354 summer can also create a suitable environment condition for nitrification and denitrification processes
 355 in the soil and thus increase the EF. In autumn (SON), cumulative precipitation often leads to soil
 356 saturation throughout the year, creating anaerobic conditions, especially when combined with
 357 residual nitrogen from fertilizers applied during the growing season, thus, increasing the
 358 denitrification and N₂O emissions (Glenn et al., 2021; Perego et al., 2016; Vinzent et al., 2018). Our
 359 results showed that climate factors and N fertilizer are more important in altering EF than the initial
 360 soil properties. This is probably because soil conditions and processes are cumulatively impacted by
 361 long-term climate variables (e.g., temperature and precipitation) and management, which might
 362 overshadow the effects of initial soil properties. More importantly, changes in climate and
 363 management practices could further enhance their dominance in influencing the long-term trends of
 364 EFs (Baral et al., 2022).

365 In this study, we found the dominant factors influencing EF are not constant but change with
 366 different environmental conditions (e.g., climate and management) (Figure 2a), particularly in high
 367 EF and N input regions. For instance, in Southeast Asia, the dominant drivers have shifted from spring
 368 temperature (T_MAM) and N fertilizer to summer temperature possibly due to increased heatwaves.
 369 The increasing temperature combined with wet conditions enhances nitrification and denitrification
 370 rates, leads to an increase in both the abundance and activity of ammonia oxidizers and denitrifiers,
 371 and thereby amplifies N₂O emissions (Dai et al., 2020; Griffis et al., 2017). Similarly, Central Europe,
 372 the US Corn-Belt and Rice-Belt areas, Southeast Asia, and Southwest China exhibited a shift in
 373 dominant EF drivers from N_{Fer} to summer precipitation (T_JJA) and temperature. This change
 374 suggests that in areas with high nitrogen input levels, EF is likely more sensitive to environmental
 375 change due to the increased interaction of increased nitrogen input and climate change (Xu et al.,
 376 2020b). By contrast, in South America and Africa, where N input has been historically low, we found
 377 a significant shift from temperature being the dominant driver during 1961-1990 to the N fertilizer
 378 use rate during 1991-2020. This indicated that enhanced N input may be more important in explaining
 379 the EF dynamics. Moreover, increased nitrogen leads to faster soil organic matter decomposition (Li
 380 et al., 2017), and changes in agriculture management practices with different nitrogen uptake
 381 efficiencies (Sainju et al., 2020; Thapa et al., 2016). In several regions (e.g., BRA and SAS), climate
 382 variables tend to become the predominant factors influencing EF when nitrogen inputs are increased.
 383 We found that T_SON is the dominant factor influencing EFs across most regions during 1961-1990,
 384 while summer temperatures (T_JJA) emerged as the primary influence in most regions during the
 385 period 1991-2020 (Figure 2b). This transition is likely due to global warming's intensified effects
 386 during the summer months in recent decades (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013; Xu et al., 2020a), making

summer conditions, along with heightened nitrogen inputs, more impactful on EFs compared to the relatively cooler autumn. Similarly, the summer precipitation also increased the dominance of EF in many regions (Figure 2b), likely because the recent increase in precipitation has raised soil moisture levels, thereby enhancing microbial activities such as nitrification and denitrification, which in turn, elevate N₂O emissions (Yue et al., 2024). This finding is crucial in understanding the combined effects of climate change and nitrogen management on EF, which is key to developing effective strategies for reducing N₂O emissions.





Figure 2 The dominant driver of N₂O emission factor (EF) at each pixel and the partial dependence of EF on different variables. a, Spatial map showing the primary factors influencing EF, with pie charts depicting the percentage area of dominant factors across different time intervals and scenarios. b, Chord diagram to demonstrate the shift of the dominant factor in influencing EF from T1 (1961-1990, upper half of circle) to T2 (1991-2020, lower half of circle). Numbers represent the percentage of the area influenced by each variable, with different colors indicating different variables. Linked variables (such as T_SON_T1 to NFer_T2) illustrate the shift in dominant factors from T1 to T2. Variables consist of Irr (irrigation rate), NFer (nitrogen fertilizer), Pr_MAM (total precipitation in March, April, and May), Pr_JJA (total precipitation in June, July, and August), Pr_SON (total precipitation in September, October, and November), Pr_DJF (total precipitation in December, January, and February), T_MAM (mean temperature in March, April, and May), T_JJA (mean temperature in June, July, and August), T_SON (mean temperature in September, October, and November), T_DJF (mean temperature in December, January, and February), and AI (aridity index); DOM_SOC, soil organic carbon; BULK_DEN, soil bulk density.

3.2 Relationships between EF and multiple environmental factors

The non-linear relationships reveal the effects of various environmental variables on EF (Figure 3), which may increase and decrease by up to ten percent or even more due to a single variable. Although the EF has a positive relationship with temperature, they have different response curves in different seasons. In JJA and SON, EF largely increases when temperatures exceed 2-6 °C, whereas in spring month (MAM), EF increases consistently with temperature (Figure 3). In early spring, soil freeze-thaw cycles, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere, significantly drive N₂O emissions through different mechanisms such as enhanced biological denitrification, changes in microbial

419 composition and enzyme activity, and the release of trapped N₂O (Del Grosso et al., 2022; Wagner-
 420 Riddle et al., 2017). Therefore, EF can still increase with temperature even in a cold condition.
 421 However, it's important to note that these dynamics may not be fully captured by NMIP2 models,
 422 unlike those that have improved processes such as Del Grosso et al. (2022). EF's response to seasonal
 423 precipitation shows an increase up to a specific threshold, beyond which additional precipitation has
 424 little impact on EF. This threshold varies by season, likely influenced by the soil's water-holding
 425 capacity, different plant growth stages and their water uptake, and the seasonally varying rates of
 426 evaporation due to temperature changes (Bell et al., 2016; Cayuela et al., 2017). The EF also increases
 427 with N₂ use level, albeit at a slower rate when annual fertilizer input is higher. Compared with
 428 different soil properties, soil pH is the most critical factor influencing EF (Figure S7). It is possibly
 429 because the soil PH mainly impacts EF the denitrifier community composition (Qiu et al., 2024). EF
 430 shows a negative relationship with pH, particularly when pH is above 5-5.3 (Figure 3), similar to
 431 previous studies (Russenes et al., 2016; Shang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2018). In moderately acidic
 432 soils, alterations in soil microbial communities and chemical reactions favor N₂O-producing
 433 microorganisms, potentially increasing N₂O emissions (Qiu et al., 2024). Additionally, these
 434 conditions enhance processes such as denitrification, leading to higher N₂O emissions even at lower
 435 nitrate levels (Tierling and Kuhlmann, 2018; Zhang et al., 2021). The higher presence of ammonium
 436 (NH₄⁺) coupled with conditions conducive to denitrification can lead to elevated emissions of nitrous
 437 oxide (N₂O). Consequently, soil acidification in the future may significantly increase the risk of N₂O
 438 emissions (Chen et al., 2023a).



439
 440 **Figure 3 Partial dependence plots for annual EF change across different predictors (ranked by**
 441 **feature importance see figure S7). The smooth black lines depict the average model's**
 442 **response, alongside fitted values for the calibration data. Histograms display the probability**

distributions for the indices of SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 scenarios in 2050. The blue shaded area denotes calibration data ranging between the 5th and 95th percentiles.

3.3 Projecting EF under different scenarios

Our projections up to 2050, including for the SSP585, generally fall within the historical data range, indicating the reliability of our near-future projections based on our Dym-EF model. For historical periods, we found that the multi-model ensemble estimates of EFs in 2010 had exceeded the IPCC's default average value of 1% in most regions. Compared to the generalized IPCC Tier-1 EF of 1%, spatially detailed EFs enable the identification of regional hotspots with significant N₂O mitigation potential. Areas with higher EFs often correspond to higher nitrogen inputs, potentially leading to an underestimation of N₂O emissions when using the uniform IPCC Tier-1 EF. Furthermore, in humid areas, EFs are consistent with or exceed the IPCC suggested average of 1.6% (IPCC default at humid regions) (Hergoualc'h et al., 2019), and in tropical regions like southern Asia, eastern Asia, and Central America, EFs often surpass 2-2.5% (Figure 4). The relatively higher EF in humid and warm areas is attributable to the climate acceleration of microbial processes like nitrification and denitrification (Griffis et al., 2017). Higher soil moisture and temperature create conditions conducive to denitrifying microbes. Moreover, in humid regions where anaerobic conditions are more prevalent, denitrification becomes a dominant process and subsequently elevates EFs (Griffis et al., 2017; Rowlings et al., 2015; Veldkamp et al., 1998).




Figure 4 Projected N₂O emission factor (EF) across various subregions in 2030 (white area) and 2050 (blue-shaded area). The spatial map indicates the median EF estimated by NMIP ensembles in 2010. The black dashed line in each panel represents the Tier-1 EF (1%), and the blue dashed line indicates the 2010 emission factors based on a multi-model median (extracted from the central map). INMS1-4 represents four nitrogen management scenarios (Table 1). Box boundaries show the 25th and 75th percentiles of EF estimates, and whiskers below and above the box indicate the estimate range driven by climate data from 37 GCMs. The median is indicated by the black line within each box. BRA, Brazil; CAM, Central

America; CAN, Canada; CAS, Central Asia; CHN, China; EQAF, Equatorial Africa; EU, Europe; KAJ, Korea and Japan; MIDE, Mideast; NAF, Northern Africa; NSA, Northern South America; OCE, Oceania; RUS, Russia; SAF, Southern Africa; SAS, South Asia; SEAS, Southeast Asia; SSA, Southwest South America; USA, The United States of America.

The EFs under various scenarios over the future periods are projected to change significantly, compared with 2010. This is mainly attributed to the changes in alternative N regulation practices and future climatic scenarios (Figure 4 and S8). [Detailed information about these different scenarios is provided in Table 1.](#) Under the INMS scenarios 1-3 (i.e., Business-as-usual, low, and mediate ambition N regulation), the global average EFs by 2030 are projected to increase to 1.22-1.29% among different GCMs (relative increase of 0.5-8.0% from 2010 levels of 1.18-1.22%), 1.22-1.28% (relative increase of 0.03-6.3%), and 1.18-1.24% (relative increase of 0.01-2.5%), respectively, compared with 2010. By 2050, the EF is expected to increase to 1.27-1.34% (4.4%-11.4%), 1.24-1.31% (2.8%-9.9%), and around 1.18-1.25% (0.01-3.2%). Under the INMS4 (high ambition N regulation) scenario, EF is projected to decrease to 1.15-1.21 (0-5%) by 2030, aligning with INMS3's projection by 2050 (Figure S9). The EF changes under INMS5-7 (Best-case, Best-case “plus”, and Bioenergy) would be similar to INMS4, yet slightly lower than INMS4 due to further reduction in N input. This raises the question here: why do high-ambition strategies with reduced N input only slightly decrease or sometimes even increase EFs? It is likely caused by the high sensitivity of EFs to climate (Griffis et al., 2017); as climate change intensifies (Figure S2-S3), the increases in EFs might offset the benefits of high-ambition strategies. The INMS1 and INMS2 scenarios are characterized by a lack of dedicated nitrogen management, which will not change Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) and, with increased production, greater nitrogen loss, thus increasing EFs (Baral et al., 2017). The EF under INMS1 is slightly higher than INMS2 perhaps because more N input and higher temperature under SSP585 will further amplify the EF due to increased soil N mineralization and denitrification rates (Kanter et al., 2016; Revell et al., 2015). The moderate and high-ambition scenarios, aimed at minimizing N loss and increasing NUE, are projected to keep crop N surpluses within planetary boundaries until 2050 (Kanter et al., 2020b; Zhang et al., 2015), which potentially decreases EF. In addition, the high ambition scenarios (INMS4-7) also consider dietary shifts, like reduced meat consumption and waste (Geyik et al., 2023; Revell et al., 2015). These changes could lower the demand for N-intensive animal feed crops, reducing N use and consequently reducing N₂O emissions and EFs (Figure 4 and Figure S8).

Compared with the IPCC's default value (Hergoualc'h et al., 2019), our Dym-EF modeling characterizes EF variability over space and time by taking into account the effects of environmental factors, and various climate scenarios and ambition levels of N intervention over the coming decades. This improved methodology is crucial for making informed management decisions in mitigation strategies. Relying on a stationary EF fails to capture the various impacts of climate change, soil properties, and management practices. For example, if the EF increased from 1% to 1.1% due to climate warming, keeping EF unchanged could lead to a 10% underestimation of N₂O emissions. The underestimation would be more pronounced when nitrogen inputs are increased. Our results showed that densely populated areas in developing countries typically exhibit large differences across the three ambition level scenarios, likely due to their high food demand leading to increased N inputs (Ramírez-Melgarejo et al., 2019; Springmann et al., 2018). For instance, in 2030, under the INMS1 and INMS4 scenarios, we find the EFs could be approximately 1.75-1.86% and 1.45-1.5% in


515 Northern South America (NSA), 1.5-1.56% and 1.42-1.47% in Equatorial Africa (EQAF), 1.22-1.36%
516 and 0.93-1.07% in China (CHN), and 2.11-2.24% and 1.93-2.07% in Southeast Asia (SEAS). The
517 large EF difference between BAU and high ambition N regulation scenarios indicates a large potential
518 in reducing N₂O emission. These areas, especially in tropical regions (e.g., NSA, EQAF, and SEAS),
519 are expected to see EF increases of around 0.17-0.28% under low ambition policies by 2050, which
520 is equivalent to 12-17% of EF in 2010. Therefore, to meet the Goal 13 (climate action) of United
521 Nations' Sustainable Development Goal (United Nation, 2015), intensified efforts are needed in such
522 regions to reduce N₂O emissions by improving NUE and reducing N loss (van Vuuren et al., 2015;
523 Zhang et al., 2015).

524 It is important to note that there is a trade-off between accessibility and accuracy in the EF
525 estimation approaches such as the IPCC Tire-1 and our Dym-EF. The IPCC Tire-1 is designed to be
526 generic and easily adopted without a need to provide any detailed local information, which is
527 accessible for a wide range of applications. As for Dym-EF, although it provides more accurate EF
528 projections and is easier to apply than process-based models, it still requires specific input data,
529 limiting its scalability and accessibility. To enhance the accessibility of our model, we have used
530 publicly available and commonly used datasets in global modeling, ensuring that input data is easily
531 accessible to potential users. However, uncertainties remain due to potential variations in datasets.
532 We suggest downscaling and bias-correcting the data to better match local information. Generally,
533 balancing accuracy with ease of use is crucial to enhance broader applicability.

534 3.4 Potential for N₂O mitigation

535 The spatial maps of EF changes provide quantitative insights for pinpointing hotspots requiring
536 mitigation efforts (Figure 5). In low ambition scenarios (INMS1 to INMS2), we predict significant
537 EF increases in regions such as Northeast and North China, the Midwest US, northern South America,
538 northern Brazil, and parts of northern Africa, driven by the substantial increase in nitrogen (N) inputs
539 from population growth and escalating food demands. Targeting reduction efforts in these high-
540 emission hotspots is more effective than solely focusing on the largest country emitters (West et al.,
541 2014). The moderate ambition scenario (INMS3) demonstrates a slight decrease in EF in southeastern
542 China, RUS, part of SEAS, and the EU by 2030, with notable reductions in these areas by 2050.
543 These are hotspots characterized by high N input and high EF at the current stage (Fig 4), but they
544 are projected to have huge potential in EF reduction under moderate and high ambition N regulation
545 scenarios (INMS4 to INMS7). However, slight increases are noted in regions like Vietnam, EQAF,
546 and SEAS, even under high-ambition scenarios, attributed to increased food demands. The 'best-case'
547 and 'bioenergy' scenarios (INMS5 to INMS7) illustrate that further reductions in EF can be achieved
548 through reduced N input by High N use efficiency, adoption of low meat diets, and food waste
549 reduction efforts (Kanter et al., 2020b). To meet the food gap and address N₂O mitigation needs,
550 various studies have explored potential optimal management practices (Gerber et al., 2016; Shang et
551 al., 2024), while climate change potentially impacts the effectiveness of mitigations (Carlson et al.,
552 2016). Our study quantifies the potential of reducing global agricultural soil EF as one of nature-
553 based climate solutions, underscoring the need to consider EF changes under future climate and N
554 regulation scenarios. It is important to clarify that higher EF reduction doesn't necessarily yield higher
555 N₂O reduction and that lower EFs do not necessarily lead to lower N₂O emissions, given that EF
556 change direction may not consistently align with nitrogen input changes in some cases. The actual
557 N₂O emissions are the product of EF and the amount of anthropogenic nitrogen inputs. For instance,
558 regions identified as hotspots for high EF (e.g., RUS and EQAF) in our study (Figure 4) may often


559 differ from the areas with the highest soil N₂O emissions in the global N₂O budget study (Tian et al.,
560 2024; Tian et al., 2019).



561
562 **Figure 5 The projected EF changes at global and regional scales.** The maps illustrate the changes
563 in EF in 2030 and 2050, respectively, compared to 2010 under [INMS1 to INMS4](#).
564

565 The temporal and spatially varying EFs are important in determining the effectiveness of
566 mitigation efforts. We found the EFs were expected to increase under future climate change even
567 without increasing N fertilizer input (Figure 6a). This is because the EFs are positively correlated
568 with temperature and precipitation (Figure S8), which are projected to increase (Figure S2-S3),
569 resulting in increased EFs. Although the temperature under SSP126 does not show a substantial rise,
570 the increased precipitation under this scenario significantly amplifies the EFs. Consequently, the
571 relationship between N input and EFs is asymmetric due to the impacts of climate change. This
572 asymmetry leads to substantial EF increases when higher N input (INMS1-2), is combined with
573 climate change effects (Figure 6b). Conversely, reductions in N input alone may not fully buffer the
574 EF increase caused by warmer climates and changed precipitation patterns, especially in some
575 climate-sensitive regions. Among the four high-ambition policy scenarios, our findings indicate that,
576 despite INMS7 containing a best-case climate scenario (SSP126), EFs are not always projected to be
577 the lowest among the ‘best-case’ climate scenarios by 2030 even with similar N input to current
578 management? (Figure S1). This discrepancy may arise from varying temperature and precipitation

579 patterns (Figure 3), which could elevate EFs by 2030 (Figures S2-S3). However, by 2050, rising
 580 temperatures in INMS 5-6 could lead to higher EFs even in the ‘best-case’ climate scenarios (Figure
 581 6b).



582
 583 **Figure 6 Global cropland and pasture EF changes under different scenarios.** This figure displays
 584 smoothed lines reflecting changes in EF. **a**, the change in EF compared to the average EF
 585 during 1990-2010, excluding nitrogen fertilizer impacts under scenarios SSP126, SSP245,
 586 and SSP585. **b**, the change in EF compared to the average EF during 1990-2010 including
 587 nitrogen fertilizer effects under scenarios INMS1 to INMS7.

588 Our study highlights the urgency to take relatively stringent N regulation practices as early as
 589 possible, as delays could exacerbate the challenges of mitigating N₂O emissions due to climate-
 590 induced increases in EFs. In addition, it is important to account for the impact of future climate
 591 changes on effective evaluations and to harness the potential for identifying easily achievable targets
 592 (e.g., prioritized mitigation goals, specific regions, and feasible practices) across the globe. More
 593 comprehensive strategies need to be considered, including cost-effective mitigation measures, which
 594 are essential to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while ensuring the stability of food
 595 production (Gu et al., 2023; Peng and Guan, 2021; Ren et al., 2023). Furthermore, crop switching is
 596 proposed to be an effective strategy for sustainable agriculture (Rising and Devineni, 2020; Xie et al.,
 597 2023). This approach holds the potential for reducing N₂O emissions and enhancing crop productivity
 598 in the context of future climate change (Jägermeyr et al., 2021; Peng and Guan, 2021). However, the
 599 impact of crop switching on dietary diversity and nutritional intake remains a critical question
 600 (Carlson et al., 2016; West et al., 2014). Consequently, international food trade becomes crucial in
 601 striking a balance between maintaining food diversity and adapting to climate change (Janssens et al.,
 602 2022; Janssens et al., 2020). Generally, collective action by different organizations is critical for us
 603 to achieve the climate mitigation goal in a race against time.

604 3.5 Limitations and future framework

605 Our study comprehensively explores N₂O emission under different policy interventions and
 606 climate scenarios, identifying the direction towards achieving Sustainable Development Goals.
 607 However, we understand that there are several uncertainties in this study. Different process-based
 608 models have different structures and algorithms to represent non-linear N₂O responses to key
 609 environmental drivers. Although the cross-model divergence can be minimized by using the model
 610 ensemble median estimates of EF as the learned variable, the uncertainties in projections derived from
 611 model inputs and structure still persist (Tian et al., 2024). Extensive measurements of soil N₂O
 612 emissions could help improve the parameterization of individual NMIP2 models and better constrain
 613 their estimates of EF in various climate and soil conditions. The method of emergent constraint can

614 be effective in reducing uncertainties in process-based models (Wang et al., 2020b), as applied in
615 studies on crop yield changes (Li et al., 2023), soil carbon (Varney et al., 2020), and land
616 evapotranspiration based on field observed data (Lian et al., 2018). However, no such work is
617 available for EF.

618 The machine learning-based approaches have a common challenge in extrapolating, especially
619 beyond the training dataset. In this study, to cover the range of potential future conditions, we trained
620 our model on a large dataset spanning a wide range of time periods (1961-2020), covering the period
621 with rapid changes in climate and human activities, such as enhanced anthropogenic N input in
622 particular. However, the learning effort is still limited by the availability of input data and how
623 process-based modeling has handled them. For example, some detailed information on nitrogen
624 management practices, such as the seasonal application of nitrogen, the use of organic amendments,
625 or slow-release forms of nitrogen, are either missing at the global level or over-simplified in the N₂O
626 modeling assessment. Incorporating a broader range of data and management practices will enhance
627 the robustness of this hybrid model and make it more practical for future users who have more detailed
628 information.

629 For N fertilizer input, the EFs associated with manure deposition and application were not
630 considered despite their significant role in N₂O emissions (Charles et al., 2017; Walling and
631 Vaneeckhaute, 2020). The changes in synthetic fertilizer and manure application rates vary
632 substantially across different policy scenarios, influenced by dietary shifts, and changed NUE.
633 Synthetic fertilizers are widely used in crop production, enhancing crop yield efficiently but
634 increasing the risk of N pollution. Although changes in synthetic fertilizer composition (e.g.,
635 ammonium versus nitrate) might affect outcomes, this aspect was not explored in our study. Manure,
636 while beneficial for soil health and providing a more sustainable N source, adds challenges in
637 managing N₂O emissions and N leaching. Selection between them should balance efficiency,
638 environmental impact, and soil health considerations. Since data on N₂O emissions induced by
639 manure was not available for all the eight participant models in NMIP2, we did not include manure-
640 induced N₂O emissions and the potential change in EFs for manure. Incorporating manure EFs into
641 future studies could further optimize nitrogen inputs by balancing the trade-offs between synthetic
642 fertilizers and manure. In addition, we mainly focus on annual EFs, derived from NMIP2 model
643 ensembles that handle annual fertilizer input in various ways and assumptions without knowing how
644 fertilizer application timings vary across the globe and over time. This may not fully capture the
645 interactive effects of seasonal climate variations and nitrogen application on EFs.

646 Considering crop-specific variations in using N and releasing N₂O from soils (e.g., wheat, maize,
647 and rice) could provide more nuanced guidance (Cui et al., 2021; Shang et al., 2024), an aspect not
648 covered in our current study. Future work ought to explore how different policy ambition levels
649 influence N₂O emissions for different crops under future climate scenarios. This will offer targeted
650 recommendations, helping to bridge these knowledge gaps and enhance our comprehension and
651 management of N₂O mitigation strategies.

652 4. Conclusions

653 In this study, we have developed a novel hybrid modeling framework that incorporates machine
654 learning with process-based modeling to predict the non-linear dynamics of EF under various climate,
655 soil, and management conditions across global agricultural lands. This approach provides new
656 insights into global EF changes that can improve our understanding of N₂O mitigation potential under
657 different climate and policy scenarios. Our results provide a strong indication of a future increase in

658 N₂O EF due to climate change, independent of N management. The increase of EFs when coupled
659 with increased N input and climate change impacts is largely higher than the EF reductions through
660 decreased N input. This asymmetry between nitrogen input and EFs poses additional challenges for
661 N₂O mitigation in the future, highlighting the urgency of nitrogen reductions as delayed actions could
662 increase mitigation costs. Such information might not be fully captured by studies using country-
663 specific EFs, which are considered appropriate for "tier 2" approaches in national inventories.
664 Furthermore, although the EFs are impacted by different environmental factors, optimizing N inputs
665 to crop needs remains the most effective mitigation option. Our finding is a critical step towards
666 achieving sustainable development goals, by improving the current static EF (IPCC tiers 1-2)
667 approach with a more precise N₂O emissions estimation under global change scenarios. Future efforts
668 in enhancing measurement and data analysis with a uniform protocol would be helpful to reduce the
669 EF estimation uncertainty from process-based modeling, and to improve the database used for
670 dynamic EF learning and mitigation potential assessment under various management options.
671

672 **Acknowledgments**

673 This work is supported by the [OECD Co-operative Research Program fellowship](#), Iowa
674 Nutrient Research Center, the Postdoc seed Grant award of Iowa State University, NSF Grant
675 (1903722), and NSF CAREER (1945036). We acknowledge the modeling groups for making their
676 simulations available for this analysis. [We thank two anonymous reviewers for their valuable
677 feedback in improving this manuscript. This study contributes to the Global Nitrous Oxide Budget
678 Synthesis, a joint international initiative of the Global Carbon Project in collaboration with the
679 International Nitrogen Initiative.](#)

680

681 **Data availability**

682 All data required to evaluate the conclusions in this paper are available within the paper itself or
683 its Supplementary Materials. Historical climate data is accessible at
684 <https://data.ceda.ac.uk/badc/cru/data/>. CMIP6 data can be found at [https://esgf-node.
685 llnl.gov/projects/cmip6/](https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/cmip6/). Soil properties data are provided by the Harmonized World Soil Database
686 v1.2, available at [https://www.fao.org/soils-portal/data-hub/soil-maps-and-databases/harmonized-
687 world-soil-database-v12/](https://www.fao.org/soils-portal/data-hub/soil-maps-and-databases/harmonized-world-soil-database-v12/). NMIP data is accessible at <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2023-401>, and
688 the cropland area dataset from the History Database of the Global Environment v3.2 (HYDE 3.2)
689 is available at <ftp://ftp.pbl.nl/hyde>.

690

691 **Reference**

- 692 Ahvo, A. et al., 2023. Agricultural input shocks affect crop yields more in the high-yielding areas of the world. Nat
693 Food.
- 694 Akiyama, H., Yan, X. and Yagi, K., 2006. Estimations of emission factors for fertilizer-induced direct N₂O emissions
695 from agricultural soils in Japan: Summary of available data. Soil Science and Plant Nutrition, 52(6): 774 -
696 787.
- 697 Amann, M. et al., 2011. Cost-effective control of air quality and greenhouse gases in Europe: Modeling and policy
698 applications. Environmental Modelling & Software, 26(12): 1489-1501.
- 699 Baral, K.R., Jayasundara, S., Brown, S.E. and Wagner-Riddle, C., 2022. Long-term variability in N₂O emissions and
700 emission factors for corn and soybeans induced by weather and management at a cold climate site. Sci
701 Total Environ, 815: 152744.
- 702 Baral, K.R., Labouriau, R., Olesen, J.E. and Petersen, S.O., 2017. Nitrous oxide emissions and nitrogen use efficiency
703 of manure and digestates applied to spring barley. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 239: 188-198.
- 704 Bell, M.J. et al., 2016. How do emission rates and emission factors for nitrous oxide and ammonia vary with manure
705 type and time of application in a Scottish farmland? Geoderma, 264: 81-93.
- 706 Burney, J.A., Davis, S.J. and Lobell, D.B., 2010. Greenhouse gas mitigation by agricultural intensification. Proc Natl
707 Acad Sci U S A, 107(26): 12052-7.
- 708 Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E.M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R. and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., 2013. Nitrous oxide
709 emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls? Philosophical
710 Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 368(1621): 20130122.
- 711 Carlson, K.M. et al., 2016. Greenhouse gas emissions intensity of global croplands. Nature Climate Change, 7(1):
712 63-68.
- 713 Cayuela, M.L. et al., 2017. Direct nitrous oxide emissions in Mediterranean climate cropping systems: Emission
714 factors based on a meta-analysis of available measurement data. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment,
715 238: 25-35.
- 716 Charles, A. et al., 2017. Global nitrous oxide emission factors from agricultural soils after addition of organic
717 amendments: A meta-analysis. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 236: 88-98.
- 718 Chen, C., Xiao, W. and Chen, H.Y.H., 2023a. Mapping global soil acidification under N deposition. Glob Chang Biol,

29(16): 4652-4661.

Chen, H., Lundberg, S.M. and Lee, S.I., 2022. Explaining a series of models by propagating Shapley values. *Nat Commun*, 13(1): 4512.

Chen, Y., Cheng, X., Liu, A., Chen, Q. and Wang, C., 2023b. Tracking lake drainage events and drained lake basin vegetation dynamics across the Arctic. *Nat Commun*, 14(1): 7359.

Cui, X. et al., 2024. The global potential for mitigating nitrous oxide emissions from croplands. *One Earth*, 7(3): 401-420.

Cui, X. et al., 2021. Global mapping of crop-specific emission factors highlights hotspots of nitrous oxide mitigation. *Nat Food*, 2(11): 886-893.

Dai, Z. et al., 2020. Elevated temperature shifts soil N cycling from microbial immobilization to enhanced mineralization, nitrification and denitrification across global terrestrial ecosystems. *Glob Chang Biol*, 26(9): 5267-5276.

Del Grosso, S.J. et al., 2022. A gap in nitrous oxide emission reporting complicates long-term climate mitigation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 119(31): e2200354119.

Delavaux, C.S. et al., 2023. Native diversity buffers against severity of non-native tree invasions. *Nature*, 621(7980): 773-781.

Ehrhardt, F. et al., 2018. Assessing uncertainties in crop and pasture ensemble model simulations of productivity and N(2) O emissions. *Glob Chang Biol*, 24(2): e603-e616.

Feng, P., Wang, B., Liu, D.L., Waters, C. and Yu, Q., 2019. Incorporating machine learning with biophysical model can improve the evaluation of climate extremes impacts on wheat yield in south-eastern Australia. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 275: 100-113.

Feng, R. and Li, Z., 2023. Current investigations on global N(2)O emissions and reductions: Prospect and outlook. *Environ Pollut*, 338: 122664.

Franke, J.A. et al., 2020. The GGCM Phase-2 emulators: global gridded crop model responses to changes in CO₂, temperature, water, and nitrogen (version 1.0). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13(9): 3995-4018.

Fuchs, K. et al., 2020. Multimodel Evaluation of Nitrous Oxide Emissions From an Intensively Managed Grassland. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 125(1).

Gerber, J.S. et al., 2016. Spatially explicit estimates of N₂ O emissions from croplands suggest climate mitigation opportunities from improved fertilizer management. *Glob Chang Biol*, 22(10): 3383-94.

Geyik, O., Hadjikakou, M. and Bryan, B.A., 2023. Climate-friendly and nutrition-sensitive interventions can close the global dietary nutrient gap while reducing GHG emissions. *Nat Food*, 4(1): 61-73.

Glenn, A.J., Moulin, A.P., Roy, A.K. and Wilson, H.F., 2021. Soil nitrous oxide emissions from no-till canola production under variable rate nitrogen fertilizer management. *Geoderma*, 385.

Greenwell, B.M., 2017. pdp: An R package for constructing partial dependence plots. *R J*, 9(1): 421.

Griffis, T.J. et al., 2017. Nitrous oxide emissions are enhanced in a warmer and wetter world. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114(45): 12081-12085.

Gu, B. et al., 2023. Cost-effective mitigation of nitrogen pollution from global croplands. *Nature*, 613(7942): 77-84.

Ham, Y.G., Kim, J.H. and Luo, J.J., 2019. Deep learning for multi-year ENSO forecasts. *Nature*, 573(7775): 568-572.

Harris, E. et al., 2022. Warming and redistribution of nitrogen inputs drive an increase in terrestrial nitrous oxide emission factor. *Nat Commun*, 13(1): 4310.

Hergoualc'h, K. et al., 2019. N₂O emissions from managed soils, and CO₂ emissions from lime and urea application.

Hu, M., Chen, D. and Dahlgren, R.A., 2016. Modeling nitrous oxide emission from rivers: a global assessment. *Glob Chang Biol*, 22(11): 3566-3582.

Jägermeyr, J. et al., 2021. Climate impacts on global agriculture emerge earlier in new generation of climate and crop models. *Nature Food*.

Janssens, C. et al., 2022. A sustainable future for Africa through continental free trade and agricultural development. *Nature Food*, 3(8): 608-618.

Janssens, C. et al., 2020. Global hunger and climate change adaptation through international trade. *Nat Clim Chang*, 10: 829-835.

Kanter, D.R., Chodos, O., Nordland, O., Rutigliano, M. and Winiwarer, W., 2020a. Gaps and opportunities in nitrogen pollution policies around the world. *Nature Sustainability*, 3(11): 956-963.

771 Kanter, D.R. et al., 2020b. Nitrogen futures in the shared socioeconomic pathways 4. *Glob Environ Change*, 61:
772 102029.

773 Kanter, D.R., Zhang, X., Mauzerall, D.L., Malyshev, S. and Shevliakova, E., 2016. The importance of climate change
774 and nitrogen use efficiency for future nitrous oxide emissions from agriculture. *Environmental Research*
775 *Letters*, 11(9).

776 Klein, D., 2006. N₂O emissions from managed soils, and CO₂ emissions from lime and urea application. (No Title):
777 1.

778 Köberle, A.C. et al., 2021. The cost of mitigation revisited. *Nature Climate Change*, 11(12): 1035-1045.

779 Lamb, A. et al., 2016. The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Nature*
780 *Climate Change*, 6(5): 488-492.

781 Lan, X., Thoning, K.W. and Dlugokencky, E.J., 2024. Trends in globally-averaged CH₄, N₂O, and SF₆ determined
782 from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory measurements.

783 Lesschen, J.P., Velthof, G.L., de Vries, W. and Kros, J., 2011. Differentiation of nitrous oxide emission factors for
784 agricultural soils. *Environ Pollut*, 159(11): 3215-22.

785 Li, L. et al., 2023. Integrating machine learning and environmental variables to constrain uncertainty in crop yield
786 change projections under climate change. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 149.

787 Li, W. et al., 2022. Widespread increasing vegetation sensitivity to soil moisture. *Nat Commun*, 13(1): 3959.

788 Li, X.G. et al., 2017. Nitrogen fertilization decreases the decomposition of soil organic matter and plant residues
789 in planted soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 112: 47-55.

790 Lian, X. et al., 2018. Partitioning global land evapotranspiration using CMIP5 models constrained by observations.
791 *Nature Climate Change*, 8(7): 640-646.

792 Lu, C. et al., 2022. Century-long changes and drivers of soil nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions across the contiguous
793 United States. *Glob Chang Biol*, 28(7): 2505-2524.

794 Lugato, E., Leip, A. and Jones, A., 2018. Mitigation potential of soil carbon management overestimated by
795 neglecting N₂O emissions. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(3): 219-223.

796 Lundberg, S.M. and Lee, S.-I., 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural*
797 *information processing systems*, 30.

798 Maier, R., Hortnagl, L. and Buchmann, N., 2022. Greenhouse gas fluxes (CO₂, N₂O and CH₄) of pea and maize
799 during two cropping seasons: Drivers, budgets, and emission factors for nitrous oxide. *Sci Total Environ*,
800 849: 157541.

801 Meehl, G.A. et al., 2020. Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient climate response
802 from the CMIP6 Earth system models. *Science Advances*, 6(26): eaba1981.

803 Nelson, M.B., Martiny, A.C. and Martiny, J.B., 2016. Global biogeography of microbial nitrogen-cycling traits in soil.
804 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 113(29): 8033-40.

805 O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2016. The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6. *Geoscientific*
806 *Model Development*, 9(9): 3461-3482.

807 Ouatahar, L., Bannink, A., Lanigan, G. and Amon, B., 2021. Modelling the effect of feeding management on
808 greenhouse gas and nitrogen emissions in cattle farming systems. *Science of The Total Environment*, 776.

809 Peng, B. and Guan, K., 2021. Harmonizing climate-smart and sustainable agriculture. *Nature Food*, 2(11): 853-854.

810 Perego, A. et al., 2016. Field evaluation combined with modelling analysis to study fertilizer and tillage as factors
811 affecting N₂O emissions: A case study in the Po valley (Northern Italy). *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*
812 *Environment*, 225: 72-85.

813 Perlman, J., Hijmans, R.J. and Horwath, W.R., 2014. A metamodeling approach to estimate global N₂O emissions
814 from agricultural soils. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23(8): 912-924.

815 Qiu, Y. et al., 2024. Intermediate soil acidification induces highest nitrous oxide emissions. *Nat Commun*, 15(1):
816 2695.

817 Ramírez-Melgarejo, M., Gassó-Domingo, S. and Güereca, L.P., 2019. Evaluation of N₂O Emissions in Wastewater
818 Treatment Systems: a Comparative Analysis of Emission Between Case Studies of Developed and
819 Developing Countries. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 230(2).

820 Reichstein, M. et al., 2019. Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature*,
821 566(7743): 195-204.

822 Ren, C. et al., 2023. Climate change unequally affects nitrogen use and losses in global croplands. *Nature Food*:

1-11.

Revell, L.E., Tummon, F., Salawitch, R.J., Stenke, A. and Peter, T., 2015. The changing ozone depletion potential of N₂O in a future climate. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(22).

Riahi, K. et al., 2017. The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: An overview. *Global environmental change*, 42: 153-168.

Rising, J. and Devineni, N., 2020. Crop switching reduces agricultural losses from climate change in the United States by half under RCP 8.5. *Nat Commun*, 11(1): 4991.

Rowlings, D., Grace, P., Scheer, C. and Liu, S., 2015. Rainfall variability drives interannual variation in N₂O emissions from a humid, subtropical pasture. *Science of the Total Environment*, 512: 8-18.

Russenes, A.L., Korsæth, A., Bakken, L.R. and Dörsch, P., 2016. Spatial variation in soil pH controls off-season N₂O emission in an agricultural soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 99: 36-46.

Sainju, U.M., Ghimire, R., Mishra, U. and Jagadamma, S., 2020. Reducing nitrous oxide emissions and optimizing nitrogen-use efficiency in dryland crop rotations with different nitrogen rates. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 116(3): 381-395.

Sandor, R. et al., 2018. The use of biogeochemical models to evaluate mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from managed grasslands. *Sci Total Environ*, 642: 292-306.

Shaaban, M., 2024. Microbial pathways of nitrous oxide emissions and mitigation approaches in drylands. *J Environ Manage*, 354: 120393.

Shang, Z. et al., 2024. Global cropland nitrous oxide emissions in fallow period are comparable to growing-season emissions. *Global Change Biology*, 30(2).

Shcherbak, I., Millar, N. and Robertson, G.P., 2014. Global metaanalysis of the nonlinear response of soil nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions to fertilizer nitrogen. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 111(25): 9199-204.

Springmann, M. et al., 2018. Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. *Nature*, 562(7728): 519-525.

Sutton, M.A. et al., 2013. Our nutrient world. The challenge to produce more food & energy with less pollution, Centre for Ecology & Hydrology.

Sutton, M.A. et al., 2021. The nitrogen decade: mobilizing global action on nitrogen to 2030 and beyond. *One Earth*, 4(1): 10-14.

Thapa, R., Chatterjee, A., Awale, R., McGranahan, D.A. and Daigh, A., 2016. Effect of Enhanced Efficiency Fertilizers on Nitrous Oxide Emissions and Crop Yields: A Meta-analysis. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 80(5): 1121-1134.

Thompson, R.L. et al., 2019. Acceleration of global N₂O emissions seen from two decades of atmospheric inversion. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(12): 993-998.

Tian, H. et al., 2024. Global nitrous oxide budget (1980–2020). *Earth System Science Data*.

Tian, H. et al., 2020. A comprehensive quantification of global nitrous oxide sources and sinks. *Nature*, 586(7828): 248-256.

Tian, H. et al., 2018. The Global N₂O Model Intercomparison Project. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 99(6): 1231-1251.

Tian, H. et al., 2019. Global soil nitrous oxide emissions since the preindustrial era estimated by an ensemble of terrestrial biosphere models: Magnitude, attribution, and uncertainty. *Glob Chang Biol*, 25(2): 640-659.

Tierling, J. and Kuhlmann, H., 2018. Emissions of nitrous oxide (N₂O) affected by pH-related nitrite accumulation during nitrification of N fertilizers. *Geoderma*, 310: 12-21.

United Nation, 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2011. The representative concentration pathways: an overview. *Climatic change*, 109: 5-31.

van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2015. Pathways to achieve a set of ambitious global sustainability objectives by 2050: Explorations using the IMAGE integrated assessment model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 98: 303-323.

Varney, R.M. et al., 2020. A spatial emergent constraint on the sensitivity of soil carbon turnover to global warming. *Nat Commun*, 11(1): 5544.

Veldkamp, E., Keller, M. and Nuñez, M., 1998. Effects of pasture management on N₂O and NO emissions from soils in the humid tropics of Costa Rica. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 12(1): 71-79.

875 Venkiteswaran, J.J., Rosamond, M.S. and Schiff, S.L., 2014. Nonlinear response of riverine N₂O fluxes to oxygen
876 and temperature. *Environ Sci Technol*, 48(3): 1566-73.

877 Vinzent, B., Fuß, R., Maidl, F.-X. and Hülsbergen, K.-J., 2018. N₂O emissions and nitrogen dynamics of winter
878 rapeseed fertilized with different N forms and a nitrification inhibitor. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &
879 Environment*, 259: 86-97.

880 Wagner-Riddle, C. et al., 2017. Globally important nitrous oxide emissions from croplands induced by freeze-thaw
881 cycles. *Nature Geoscience*, 10(4): 279-283.

882 Walling, E. and Vaneekhaute, C., 2020. Greenhouse gas emissions from inorganic and organic fertilizer production
883 and use: A review of emission factors and their variability. *J Environ Manage*, 276: 111211.

884 Wang, H. et al., 2023. Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972): 47-60.

885 Wang, J., Xiong, Z. and Yan, X., 2011. Fertilizer-induced emission factors and background emissions of N₂O from
886 vegetable fields in China. *Atmospheric Environment*, 45(38): 6923-6929.

887 Wang, Q. et al., 2020a. Data-driven estimates of global nitrous oxide emissions from croplands. *Natl Sci Rev*, 7(2):
888 441-452.

889 Wang, X. et al., 2020b. Emergent constraint on crop yield response to warmer temperature from field experiments.
890 *Nature Sustainability*, 3(11): 908-916.

891 Wang, Y. et al., 2018. Soil pH as the chief modifier for regional nitrous oxide emissions: New evidence and
892 implications for global estimates and mitigation. *Glob Chang Biol*, 24(2): e617-e626.

893 West, P.C. et al., 2014. Leverage points for improving global food security and the environment. *Science*, 345(6194):
894 325-328.

895 Winiwarter, W., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Klimont, Z., Schöpp, W. and Amann, M., 2018. Technical opportunities to
896 reduce global anthropogenic emissions of nitrous oxide. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(1).

897 Xiao, L. et al., 2024. Spatiotemporal co-optimization of agricultural management practices towards climate-smart
898 crop production. *Nat Food*, 5(1): 59-71.

899 Xie, W. et al., 2023. Crop switching can enhance environmental sustainability and farmer incomes in China. *Nature*.

900 Xu, P. et al., 2020a. Spatial Variation of Reactive Nitrogen Emissions From China's Croplands Codetermined by
901 Regional Urbanization and Its Feedback to Global Climate Change. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(12).

902 Xu, P. et al., 2024. Fertilizer management for global ammonia emission reduction. *Nature*.

903 Xu, R. et al., 2020b. Global N₂O Emissions From Cropland Driven by Nitrogen Addition and Environmental Factors:
904 Comparison and Uncertainty Analysis. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 34(12).

905 Xu, S. et al., 2022. Delayed use of bioenergy crops might threaten climate and food security. *Nature*, 609(7926):
906 299-306.

907 Yao, Z. et al., 2024. A global meta-analysis of yield-scaled N₂O emissions and its mitigation efforts for maize,
908 wheat, and rice. *Glob Chang Biol*, 30(2): e17177.

909 Yue, P. et al., 2024. The effect of nitrogen input on N₂O emission depends on precipitation in a temperate desert
910 steppe. *Sci Total Environ*, 924: 171572.

911 Zhang, X. et al., 2015. Managing nitrogen for sustainable development. *Nature*, 528(7580): 51-9.

912 Zhang, Y. et al., 2021. Microbial pathways account for the pH effect on soil N₂O production. *European Journal of
913 Soil Biology*, 106: 103337.

914