Answers to Referee #1:

General comments

Rice agriculture is an important source of atmospheric methane (CH4). The estimations of CH4 emission from rice fields on a national or global scale have been relatively well documented by using the inventory-based methods or model-based approaches. Due to more and more field measurements of CH4 emission were available from the monsoon Asian countries and the rest of the world in last ten years, the effect of various factors (management practices like water management, nitrogen (N) fertilizer use, organic input and rice varieties, etc.) on CH4 emission from rice fields would be different in statistics from previous reports. However, no information is available on this issue in global scale. The authors updated the dataset from monsoon Asian countries as described previously (Yan et al., 2005) to over the world (1089 measurements from 122 rice fields across the world) in this study. They reassessed the impacts of major variables controlling CH4 emission from rice fields and found that water management and organic fertilizer application were the top two controlling variables. They developed the region- and country-specific emission factors and also estimated the default EFs at regional and country levels. Overall, the topic of this work was very important and timely to gain an insight into CH4 emission inventory, which would help to assess regional and national agricultural CH4 budget with low uncertainties. Good job! The manuscript was well written too. I recommend this work to be acceptable after minor revisions for publication in Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics.

Answer: We would like to thank referee #1 for his/her positive and critical comments on our work. We are glad that referee #1 recognized the importance of our work and we would like to take the opportunity to address concerns of referee #1.

Minor comments

1. Abstract Please give more information (e.g., EFs or SFs) about the CH4 emission as affected by the region. In other words, the authors should pay much more attention to the regional CH4 emission or emission factors (EFs) besides the management practices.

Answer: We followed this suggestion. Results on organic amendment and global or regional emission factors of CH4 were added in the abstract.

2. Materials and Methods

- Please show the units for all dependent and independent variables in Eqns (1) and (2). - How to quantify the preseason water status (PW) and water regime (WR) in Eqns (1) and (2)? - What’s the difference between OM and AOM in Eqn (1)? - It’s hard to figure out what the climate variables are. Do the agroecological zones (AEZ) represent climates? If no climate variables were involved in these two equations, I would suggest deleting the CL but showing AEZ.

Answer: We appreciate these thoughtful suggestions. -The units for all dependent and independent variables in Eqns (1) and (2) were added. -We added the brief description in the section 2.2 to explain how we quantified the preseason water status and water regime during the rice-growing season when we were collecting data. The detailed description can be found in Table 1. -As stated in the revised manuscript, OM and AOM represent the type and amount of organic amendments added, respectively. -We followed this suggestion and changed 'CL' to 'AEZ' throughout the manuscript.

3. Results and Discussion - Suggest changing '3.3 Development of region- or country-specific emission factors ' to '3.3 Region- and country-specific emission factors' - Please make further discussion to compare the emission factors in this study with IPCC default emission factors.

Answer: We appreciate this thoughtful suggestion. Regarding the region- or country-specific emission factor, we did our best to make comparisons between our estimates and these values which are being often used in their national inventory reports. However, there were not many studies to add in discussion for the comparison between reginal emission factors with other studies. Because most countries do not have country-specific emission factors till present, we evaluated our results by the following ways: one is to use the scaling factors as shown in Table 3 to derive seasonal CH4 emission as it is often presented in their national communication reports to UNFCCC, and the other one is to make indirect comparison between the national CH4 inventory estimated using the 2006 IPCC guideline (Yan et al., 2009) and their national inventory reports.

Answer to Referee #2

Still some language issues, e.g. title is awkward and could deter readers/interest in the paper, many other sentences have unclear meaning and/or awkward language. Paper would definitely benefit from a thorough editing for clarity and language in general.

Answer: We appreciate and followed this suggestion. We have sent our manuscript for language editing service (as shown in Figure 1).

Specific issues:

1. the authors already know that ln[SOC] and OMx ln[1 + AOM] will be modeled, but we don't know where that information is from.

Answer: We appreciate the referee #2 raised this concern. In fact, the initial form of the model is an exponential relationship between emission flux and controlling factors: $\mathrm{flux} = e^{constant+\sum_i factor(i)}$, as suggested in previous studies (Bouwman et al., 2002; Yan et al., 2005). The SOC content (%) and the type and amount (t/ha) of organic amendments were factors in the above equation. It has been long recognized that CH4 flux is proportional to both SOC content and the application rate of organic amendment. As CH4 flux data do not fit a normal distribution, they fit a log-normal distribution. Thus, by fitting log-transformed flux data of CH4, the above equation was revised to the Eqn (1) in this study.? That’s the reason why OM*ln(1+AOM) is modeled was added.

2. Not sure that treating pH as categorical variable is at all justified or appropriate. Why was this done? Was pH reported from the different field sites in broad categories, or measured with crude litmus paper or similar? That might be a reason, but still. . . Authors state that the relationship of pH to emissions is ‘not monotonic’ but from Table 2, I don’t see strong enough evidence of that, especially given the questionable shoe-horning into many ns from a ranked relationship of pH with emissions simply be error? Did the authors try converting pH to concentrations of H+ ions or otherwise back-log-transforming pH values, or other logical numerical ways to treat this definitely-not-categorical variable? I don’t think this statement in lines 213-215, “However, soils with a pH of 5.0-5.5 showed a much higher emission than other soils”, is really true. It looks to me like soils with the lowest pH values (below 4.5) had the largest effect on CH4 emissions, and the small blips at 5- 5.5 and 7 – 7.5 are not necessarily a big deal. No other literature besides the authors’ 2005 paper is cited regarding a more complicated relationship between pH and CH4 emissions to support this idea.

Answer: We appreciate the referee #2 raised this thoughtful concern. Firstly, the reason why soil pH was treated as categorical variable is that previous findings have been suggested the existence of optimum soil pH for CH4 emission, albeit the inconsistency of reported values (Parashar et al., 1991; Wang et al., 1993). As shown in the below figure (Figure 2), soil pH values were broadly distributed across the listed range in the text in our data set. Secondly, we found that the relationship between soil pH and CH4 flux was not monotonic. In our data set, we used pH(water) as the soil pH values for most cases. As shown in the below figure and also described in the manuscript, the largest effects of soil pH below 4.5 may not be reliable because of the limited number of observations from only two studies with large variability. The effects of soil pH above 6.0 were not significantly different from each other. Indeed, soils with a pH of 5.0-5.5 showed a much higher emission that soils with 4.5-5.0 and 5.5-6.0. Collectively, we considered the soil pH as a categorical variable which may be at least appropriate in terms of our current data sets.

3. How did the authors arrive at the weights for the organic matter additions (.2 and 1)? Not clear why this is needed or justified.

Answer: We added explanation. There is an assumption that in cases where the amount of organic amendment is zero (i.e., no organic material added), it is the result of each type of organic material at zero application rate. By this, more data points in the analysis will have than the actual size of real observations. To ameliorate this problem, we weighted the residual of observations with organic amendment as 1 and those without as 0.2 (as the observational result was repeated five times for the five types of organic materials).

4. The authors state several times that because emissions estimates from different authors' inventory assessments, that this means the results are correct/reliable, e.g. line 70, and lines 173-175 where EDGAR estimates are similar to IPCC 2006. This is a truism, though, because doesn't EDGAR use IPCC 2006 defaults to calculate their emissions estimates?

Answer: We appreciate the referee's comment on this. In fact, the method to estimate CH4 emission from rice fields using the IPCC methodology were different among studies. For example, in Yan et al. (2009), not only the default EF used for countries where country-specific EFs were not available but also the country-specific EF derived from various scaling factors were applied when estimating CH4 emission from global rice fields. However, in the Emission Database of Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), only the IPCC default EF was used (EDGAR, 2017). In addition, we have revised the sentences for clarify.

References:

Bouwman, A. F., Boumans, L. J. M. and Batjes, N. H.: Modeling global annual N_2O and NO emissions from fertilized fields, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 16(4), 28-1-28–9, doi:10.1029/2001GB001812, 2002.

EDGAR: Global Emissions EDGAR v4.3.2: part I: the three main greenhouse gases CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O, [online] Available from: http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=432_GHG&SECURE=123 (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

Parashar, D.C., Rai, J., Gupta, P.K., Singh, N.: Parameters affecting methane emission from paddy fields. Indian J. Radio Space Phys, 20, 12–17, 1991.

Wang, Z.P., DeLaune, R.D., and Masscheleyn, P.H: Soil redox and pH effects on methane production in a flooded rice soil, Soil Sci. Soci. America J., 57, 382–385, 1993.

Yan, X., Ohara, T. and Akimoto, H.: Statistical modeling of global soil NO_X emissions, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19(3), 1–15, doi:10.1029/2004GB002276, 2005.

Yan, X., Akiyama, H., Yagi, K. and Akimoto, H.: Global estimations of the inventory and mitigation potential of methane emissions from rice cultivation conducted using the 2006 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidelines, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 23(2), doi:10.1029/2008GB003299, 2009.

Figure 1

WILEY Wiley Editing Services

LANGUAGE EDITING

CERTIFICATE

This document certifies that the manuscript listed below was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English speaking editors at Wiley Editing Services.

Manuscript title:
Controlling variables and emission factors of methane from global rice fields

Authors:
J. Wang, H. Akiyama, K. Yagi, X. Yan

Date Issued:
June 19, 2018

Certificate Verification Key:
AA4D-0E7D-A98F-3063-C60A

This certificate may be verified at https://secure.wileyeditingservices.com/certificate. This document certifies that the manuscript listed above was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style. Neither the research content nor the authors' intentions were altered in any way during the editing process. Documents receiving this certification should be English-ready for publication; however, the author has the ability to accept or reject our suggestions and changes. If you have any questions or concerns about this document or certification, please contact help@wileyeditingservices.com.

Wiley Publishing Services is a service of Wiley Publishing. Wiley's Scientific, Technical, Medical, and Scholarly (STMS) business serves the world's research and scholarly communities, and is the largest publisher for professional and scholarly societies. Wiley is committed to providing high quality services for researchers. To find out more about Wiley Editing Services, visit wileyeditingservices.com. To learn more about our other author services provided by Wiley Publishing, visit authorservices.wiley.com.

Figure 2


Soil pH
>8
7.5-8.0
7.0-7.5
6.5-7.0
6.0-6.5
5.5-6.0
5.0-5.5
4.5-5.0
<4.5
0
100
200
300
Number of samples
-0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
Estimate

Controlling variables and emission factors of methane from global rice fields

Jinyang Wang[1,2], Hiroko Akiyama[3], Kazuyuki Yagi[3], and Xiaoyuan Yan[1]

[1]State Key Laboratory of Soil and Sustainable Agriculture, Institute of Soil Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing 210008, People's Republic of China

[2]Environment Centre Wales, School of the Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University, Bangor LL57 2UW, United Kingdom

[3]Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, National Agriculture and Food Research Organization, 3-1-3, Kannondai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8604, Japan

Correspondence to: X.Y. Yan (yanxy@issas.ac.cn)

Abstract

Rice cultivation has long been known as one of the dominant anthropogenic contributors to methane (CH_4) emissions, yet there is still uncertainty when estimating its emissions at the global/regional scale. An increasing number of rice field measurements have been conducted globally, which allow us to reassess the major variables controlling CH_4 emissions and develop region- and country-specific emission factors (EFs). The results of our statistical analysis show that the CH_4 flux from rice fields was closely related to organic amendments, the water regime during and before the rice-growing season, soil properties and agroecological conditions. The average CH_4 flux from fields with single and multiple drainages were 71% and 55% of that from continuously flooded rice fields. The CH_4 flux from fields that were flooded in the previous season were 2.4 and 2.7 times that from fields previously drained for a short and long season, respectively. Rice straw applied at 6 t ha^{-1} in the preseason can decrease the half amount of CH_4 emission when compared to shortly before rice transplanting. The global default EF was estimated to 1.19 kg CH_4 ha^{-1}d^{-1} with a 95% confidence interval of 0.80 to 1.76 kg CH_4 ha^{-1}d^{-1} for continuously flooded rice fields without organic amendment and with a preseason water status of short drainage. The lower EFs were found in countries from South Asia (0.85

Deleted: How methane emission from rice paddy is affected by management practices and region?

Deleted: the

Deleted: R

Deleted: n

Deleted: were

Deleted: -

Deleted: climate

Formatted: Subscript

Deleted: Contrary to the previously reported optimum soil pH of around neutrality, paddy soils with pH of 5.0–5.5 gave the maximum CH_4 emission. Rice straw applied at 6 t ha^{-1} shortly before rice transplanting can increase CH_4 emission by 3.2 times, while it increases CH_4 emission by only 1.6 times when applied in the previous season.

kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) and North America (0.65 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) relative to other regions, indicative of geographical variations at sub-regional and country levels. We conclude that these default EFs and scaling factors can be used to develop national or regional emission inventories.

Deleted: The default EFs at sub-regional and country levels were also estimated.

1 Introduction

Atmospheric methane (CH_4) is an important greenhouse gas (GHG), and its global mean concentration has increased by a factor of 2.5 since the pre-industrial era (Dlugokencky et al., 2011). It has long been recognized that rice cultivation is one of the dominant anthropogenic contributors to CH_4 emissions (Ciais et al., 2013; Koyama, 1963). Over the last century, the observed expansion of rice fields was the dominant factor for the increase of global CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation (Fuller et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2016). Owing to the increasing area of rice grown globally, the increase in CH_4 emission is expected to continue in the near future (EPA, 2012; FAO, 2016).

While the total global CH_4 source is relatively well known, the strength of each source component and their trends remain uncertain. Over the last three decades, substantial progress has been made in estimating CH_4 emissions from global rice fields, but large discrepancies in magnitude exist among various studies (range: 20.8 to 170 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}; Cicerone and Oremland, 1988; EPA, 2012; Frankenberg, 2005; Neue et al., 1990; Yan et al., 2009). Previous studies have shown that the magnitude of estimated CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation turned out a downward trend, suggesting that the estimated accuracy has been improved. In general, the estimations from top-down approaches (31−112 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}) (IPCC, 2007) were much higher than those from both inventory (25.6−41.7 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}) (EPA, 2012; FAO, 2016; Yan et al., 2009) and bottom-up (18.3−44.9 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}) approaches (Ito and Inatomi, 2012; Spahni et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2016). These disparities may be the result of the higher estimation of prior information on either rice field distribution or the estimated CH_4 emissions being used in the top-down studies. Furthermore, anthropogenic sources were dominant over natural sources to global CH_4 emissions in the top-down studies, while they were of the same magnitude in the bottom-up models and inventories (Ciais et al., 2013).

Deleted: s

Deleted: Although

Deleted: over the last three decades

Deleted:

Deleted: For example, time series (1990-2012) estimation of CH_4 emissions from global rice fields by Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) (http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/part_CH4.php) was higher than those reported by FAO (http://faostat3.fao.org/home/E) and Environmental Protection Agency (http://epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html). Such discrepancies

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: are

Deleted: are

For national-level reporting of GHG emissions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), a range of methodological approaches was endorsed in IPCC guidelines (i.e., 1996, 2000, 2003, and 2006), which were specified under inventory- (i.e., Tier 1 and Tier 2) or model-based approaches (Tier 3). Accordingly, a range of approaches at various tiers is applied in the UNFCCC GHG dataset, which provides emissions data communicated by member countries (UNFCCC, 2017). At the country level, the inventory-based approach is often used for estimating CH_4 emissions from rice fields. For most countries (i.e., South and Southeast Asian countries), either the Tier 1 or Tier 2 method has been used to compute CH_4 emissions from rice fields in their national communications. Although the Tier 2 method requires more specific national values, country-specific emission factors (EFs) and/or scaling factors (SFs) obtained therein are simply adjusted based on those default values used in the Tier 1 method. In contrast, the Tier 3 method to date has been used by a few countries to estimate CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation in their national GHG inventory reports, including China, the United States, Japan and India (UNFCCC, 2017). Moreover, to estimate the CH_4 emissions from rice fields on a global scale, studies using the IPCC 2006 guidelines showed comparable results (EPA, 2017; FAO, 2016; Tubiello et al., 2013; Yan et al., 2009). Thus, these findings indicate that the inventory-based methods are useful in providing a reliable estimate of CH_4 emissions from rice fields.

Deleted: is

Deleted: are

Deleted: T

Deleted: By

Deleted: to

Deleted: provide

Deleted: ion

The net CH_4 flux is determined by both the production from methanogens and the consumption from methanotrophs (Conrad, 2007). Previous studies have shown that CH_4 emissions from rice fields were influenced by water management (Wang et al., 2012; Zou et al., 2005), nitrogen (N) fertilizer use (Banger et al., 2012), organic input (Feng et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013) and rice varieties (Jiang et al., 2017; Watanabe et al., 1995). Using a statistical analysis of a large data set of field measurements, Yan et al. (2005a) revealed that the primary factors that control CH_4 emissions were organic amendments, the agroecological zone, water regimes during and before the rice -growing season and soil properties. These factors have been accounted for in the current IPCC guidelines, where EFs and SFs for CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation were revised accordingly (Lasco et al., 2006).

Deleted: By

After more than a decade since Yan et al. (2005a) was published, numerous field measurements in Asian countries have become available. For the rest of the world, many studies to date have investigated the impact of various factors on CH_4 emissions from rice fields, while they were not included in the previous analysis (Yan et al., 2005a). Through an updated analysis, the objectives of this study were therefore (1) to reassess the impacts of major variables controlling CH_4 emissions from rice fields and (2) to develop the region- and country-specific EFs for which sufficient number of measurements were available.

Deleted: Since Yan et al. (2005) was published, t
Deleted: there are
Deleted: a
Deleted: therefore,
Deleted: ,
Deleted: are

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Data compilation

Since 2004, there has been a large body of field measurements of CH_4 emissions from rice fields across the world. With a cut-off date of June 31, 2017, the data set of Yan et al. (2005a) was updated and expanded to include all available observations of CH_4 emissions from rice fields in the world. We conducted a comprehensive search of the literature reporting the field measurements of CH_4 as described previously (Yan et al., 2005a). This included a keyword search using the ISI Web of Science (Thomson Reuters, New York, NY, USA) and Google Scholar (Google, Mountain View, CA, USA). For individual studies, the following documented information was compiled: the average CH_4 flux in the rice-growing season, integrated seasonal emission, the water regime during and before the rice-growing season, the timing, type and amount of organic amendments, soil properties (i.e., SOC and soil pH), location, the agroecological zone, year, duration and season of measurement. As suggested previously (Yan et al., 2005a), hourly or daily flux can be a better index of emission strength than seasonal integrated emission. When the average seasonal CH_4 flux was not directly reported, it was thus estimated from integrated seasonal emissions and the measurement period, and *vice versa*. The raw data were either obtained directly from tables and texts or extracted by digitizing graphs using the G3DATA software (http://www.frantz.fi/software/g3data.php).

Deleted: wereare
Deleted: on
Deleted: (
Deleted: ,
Deleted: ere
Deleted: N fertilization,

As shown in Table 1, the water regime in the rice-growing season was determined as continuous flooding, single drainage, multiple drainage, wet season rainfed, dry season rainfed, or deep water. The preseason water status was classified as flooded, long drainage, short drainage, two drainage. Note that although we tried our best to judge the water status of rice fields from the papers, the water regimes in both the rice-growing season and preseason could still not be determined for some studies; thus, a level of ‘unknown’ was assigned. For organic amendments, the materials used in the original papers were classified as compost, farmyard manure, green manure or straw. The timing of rice straw application was distinguished as on-season or off-season. The amount of organic amendment was recorded directly from the original papers with dry weight for straw and fresh weight for other materials. To account for the spatial variability of CH_4 emissions on the global scale, experimental sites were classified into different zones based on their climatic conditions. On the basis of temperature and rainfall differences, rice fields in Asia were placed into seven agroecological zones (AEZs 1-3 and 5-8) in the FAO zoning system (IRRI, 2002). Rice fields from regions of Latin America, Europe and the United States were grouped into three zones.

Because of the limited availability of information on other properties, only SOC and soil pH as continuous variables were included in our data set. If soil organic matter content rather than SOC was reported, it was converted to SOC using a Bemmelen index value of 0.58. In order to meet the requirement of the statistical model, we excluded these measurements with the absence of available information for these three continuous variables (SOC, soil pH and the amount of organic amendment). Thus, the final data set included 1089 measurements from 122 rice fields across the world, that were used in our analysis. In this data set, measurements from Asian rice fields increased from 554 (Yan et al., 2005a) to 942, and 147 from the other regions of the world were newly added (Data set S1, Figure 1).

2.2 The statistical model for controlling factors

The CH_4 emission data sets did not arise from systematically designed experimental results; rather, we used them because they were available. It has been suggested that a linear mixed

Deleted: still

Deleted: ,

Deleted: so

Deleted: a

Deleted: re

Deleted: ,

Deleted: are

Deleted: are

Deleted: consisted of

Deleted: of which 388 field measurements taken from Asian rice fields since 2004

Deleted: field measurements

Deleted: rest

Deleted: S

Formatted: Subscript

Deleted: are

model is suitable for analyzing unbalanced data, that is, data having unequal numbers of observations in the subclasses (Speed et al., 2013). For example, Bouwman et al. (2002) and Yan et al. (2005b) used a linear mixed model to analyze log-transformed data of nitrogenous gas emissions from both agricultural and global soils, respectively. The data set of this study is of this nature, therefore, in line with our previous study (Yan et al., 2005a), a linear mixed model is thus used to explore the effect of controlling variables on CH_4 flux from rice fields. Fluxes of CH_4 do not fit a normal distribution, they fit a log-normal distribution. The linear model was used to analyze the log-transformed data of CH_4 flux as follows:

$$\ln(flux) = constant + a \times \ln(SOC) + pH_h + PW_i + WR_j + AEZ_k + OM_l \times \ln(1 + AOM_l), \quad (1)$$

where *flux* is the average CH_4 flux (mg CH_4 $m^{-2}h^{-1}$) during the rice-growing season; *SOC* and *a* represent the SOC content (%) and its effect, respectively; pH_h is the effect of soil pH which was treated as a categorical variable and grouped into the following classes (*h*): <4.5, 4.5-5.0, 5.0-5.5, 5.5-6.0, 6.0-6.5, 6.5-7.0, 7.0-7.5, 7.5-8.0 and ≥8.0; PW_i is the effect of the preseason water status (*i* is flooded, long drainage, short drainage, double drainage, or unknown); WR_j is the effect of the water regime in the rice-growing season (*j* is continuous flooding, single drainage, multiple drainage, wet season rainfed, dry season rainfed, deepwater, or unknown); AEZ_k is the effect of the agroecological zone; OM_l is the effect of added organic materials (*l* is compost, farmyard manure, green manure, rice straw used on-season, or rice straw used off-season); and AOM_l is the amount of the corresponding organic material added in t ha^{-1}. These variables are described in detail in Table 1.

The last part of Eqn. (1) reflects the effect of organic amendments on the CH_4 flux from rice fields, which is an interaction of the type and amount of organic materials used. In cases where the amount of organic amendment is zero in the analysis, it is assumed to be the result of each type of organic material at zero application rate. Obviously, this assumption will result in more data points in the analysis than there were in real observations. To ameliorate this problem, the residuals of observations were weighted with organic amendments as 1 and those

Deleted: Consistent with

Deleted: It has been suggested that such a model is suitable for analyzing unbalanced data, that is, data having unequal numbers of observations in the subclasses (Speed et al., 2013). The data set of this study is of this nature, as they were collected simply from non-systematically designed experimental results.

Deleted: *CL*

Formatted: Font:Italic

Formatted: Font:Italic

Deleted:

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Font:Italic

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Font:Italic

Deleted: ,

Deleted: CL_k

Formatted: Font:Italic

Deleted: ,

Deleted: and

Formatted: Font:Italic

Deleted: represent the effects of soil pH, preseason water status, water regime in the rice-growing season, climate and organic amendment, respectively;

Deleted: amendment

Deleted: we

Deleted: are

Deleted: In this model soil pH was treated as a categorical variable and grouped into the following classes (*h*): <4.5, 4.5-5.0, 5.0-5.5, 5.5-6.0, 6.0-6.5, 6.5-7.0, 7.0-7.5, 7.5-8.0 and ≥8.0.

Deleted: For other categorical variables, their corresponding sublevels (*i*, *j*, *k*, *l*) are shown in Table 1.

Deleted: To ameliorate the problem induced by the assumption that the treatment without organic amendment is the result of each type of organic material at zero application rate, we weighted the residual of observations with organic amendment as 1 and those without as 0.2 (as the

... [1]

without as 0.2 (as the observational result was repeated five times for the five types of organic materials). The effects of the controlling variables on the CH_4 flux were computed by fitting Eqn. (1) to field observations using the SPSS Mixed Model procedure (version 24.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

2.3 Developing global and region-/country-specific emission factors

The estimated effects of various variables were used to derive a default EF. In the model, the CH_4 emissions from rice fields are a combination of the effects of SOC and soil pH, preseason water status, the water regime in the rice-growing season, organic amendments and the agroecological conditions. An assumption was made to provide a default EF, that is, all observations in the data set have a water regime of continuous flooding, a preseason water status of short drainage and no organic amendments, while keeping other conditions as stated in the original papers. Then, we derived a default EF (kg CH_4 ha^{-1}d^{-1}) for continuously flooded rice fields with a preseason water status of short drainage and without organic amendments using Eqn. (2):

$$\mathrm{EF} = e^{constant} \times \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} SOC_i^a \times e^{pH_i} \times e^{AEZ_i}\right) \times e^{PW_{short\ draiange}} \times e^{WR_{\text{continuous flooding}}} \times 24/100, \quad (2)$$

where '*constant*' and '*a*' are the values estimated in Eqn. (1), *n* is the total number of observations in the data set, pH_i and AEZ_i are the effects of pH and agroecological zone of the *i*th observation, respectively, and $PW_{short\ drainage}$ and $WR_{continuous\ flooding}$ are the effects of preseason short drainage and continuous flooding in the rice season, respectively.

In the 2006 IPCC guidelines, the Tier 1 method is meant to be applied to countries in which CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation are not a key category or for which country-specific EFs do not exist (Lasco et al., 2006). Thus, in the Tier 2 method the use of country-specific EFs is encouraged. To take advantage of the estimated effects of various variables at the global

Deleted: (

Deleted:)

Deleted: V

Deleted: is

Deleted: values

Deleted: climate

Deleted: to

Deleted: *CL*

Deleted: CL_i

Deleted: -

Deleted: climate

Deleted: ;

level, region- or country-specific EFs can be developed for some regions where sufficient number of CH$_4$ emission measurements from rice fields to date are available.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 The advantages of the statistical model

An advantage of this linear mixed model is that it can handle many variables together, and makes use of the large number of unsystematic field measurements (Jørgensen and Fath, 2001; Yan et al., 2005a). The results of our previous modeling analysis (Yan et al., 2005a) have been adopted by the 2006 IPCC guidelines as the inventory-based (i.e., Tier 1 and 2 methods) approaches in which a baseline default EF and various SFs were estimated (Lasco et al., 2006). Moreover, the results of Yan et al. (2009) suggest that the estimated global CH$_4$ inventory from rice cultivation using the 2006 IPCC guidelines was comparable to other estimations (Tubiello et al., 2013; EDGAR, 2017). Although empirical or mechanistic models are also encouraged to be used for estimating CH$_4$ emissions during rice cultivation, only a few countries such as China (CH4MOD) (Huang et al., 2004), the United States (DAYCENT) (Cheng et al., 2014) and Japan (DNDC-Rice) (Katayanagi et al., 2016) used this approach in their submitted national communications to the Conference of the Parties (UNFCCC, 2017). For most countries, either the default or country-specific EFs (if available) are used to develop their national inventories of CH$_4$ emissions from rice fields. Thus, it is still necessary to develop a global default or region-/country-specific EFs with statistical modeling.

The variables considered in the present model were SOC, soil pH, the preseason water status, water regime in the rice-growing season, organic amendments and the agroecological conditions (Table 2). Although the CH$_4$ emissions from rice fields can also be influenced by many other factors such as other soil properties, N fertilization, and the rice cultivar (Aulakh et al., 2001; Banger et al., 2012; Conrad, 2007), those factors were not considered here because either contradictory reports on their effects or very limited information on the variables *per se* are available. For instance, to date there is no single consensus on the impacts of N fertilization

Deleted: R

Deleted: our

Deleted: are

Deleted: the estimation of

Deleted: using the 2006 IPCC guidelines (Yan et al., 2009)

Deleted: i

Deleted: i

Deleted: s

Deleted: we are aware of that

Deleted: 2006

Deleted: ,

Deleted: the

Deleted: the

Deleted: V

Deleted: are

Deleted: climate

Deleted:

Deleted: are

Deleted: there are

Deleted: ,

Deleted: is

Deleted: impacts

on CH_4 emissions from rice fields. It is likely attributed to the highly complex nature of the effect of N fertilizer on CH_4 emissions, which can strongly interact with other factors such as the amount and type of N fertilizer and the water regime (Schimel, 2000; Banger et al., 2012). Furthermore, very few countries (i.e., Indonesia) considered the effects of soil type and rice cultivar on CH_4 emissions from rice fields in their national communications. There is also large inter-annual variability in the CH_4 flux (Shang et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2012), which cannot be reflected in the current model. Nevertheless, the selected variables in the current model can account for 50% of the variability in CH_4 emissions on the global scale.

3.2 Effects of controlling variables

At the global scale, SOC and soil pH were the soil properties controlling CH_4 emissions from rice fields, while the contribution of SOC to the variance was the smallest among all variables considered here ($F_{(1,\ 3391)} = 39.8$, $P < 0.0001$; Table 2). This finding may indicate that the controlling effect of SOC on CH_4 emissions from rice fields on a global scale may be outweighed by other variables (i.e., organic amendments). For example, although a recent synthesis by Banger et al. (2012) showed a positive but weaker ($R^2 = 0.21$) relationship between the SOC content and the CH_4 flux, they did not consider CH_4 emissions from rice fields with organic amendments. Furthermore, in a Chinese double rice-cropping system, the long-term (*c.* 11 yr) organic amendment-induced increase in SOC may be responsible for the observed significant correlation between SOC and CH_4 emissions (Shang et al., 2011). Previous studies have also suggested that the content of readily mineralizable carbon rather than SOC was significantly correlated with CH_4 emissions from rice fields (Yagi and Minami, 1990). Thus, we believe that a weak relationship between SOC and CH_4 emissions at the global scale can be largely attributed to the fact that the dominant factors controlling CH_4 emissions are labile C substrates derived from inherent and exogenous sources (Wang et al., 2013; Yagi and Minami, 1990).

Deleted: are

Deleted: in

Deleted: is

Deleted: overweighed

The effect of soil pH on controlling CH_4 emission from rice fields was not monotonic ($F_{(8,\ 3391)} = 75.3$, $P < 0.0001$; Table 2), which was consistent with the previous results (Yan et al.,

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

2005a). It is often accepted that CH$_4$ production under anoxic conditions is very sensitive to variations in soil pH, as the activity of methanogens is usually optimum around neutrality or under slightly alkaline conditions (Aulakh et al., 2001; Garcia et al., 2000). However, soils with a pH of 5.0-5.5 showed much higher emissions than other soils, which corroborates the observed relationship between soil pH and CH$_4$ emissions in Indonesian rice fields (Yan et al., 2003). The largest effects of soil pH below 4.5 may not be reliable because of limited observations from only two studies with distinct water regimes, soil properties and organic amendments. Given that methanogens and methanotrophs are tolerant to pH variations in soil (Dunfield et al., 1993), and CH$_4$ emission is the result of its production, consumption and transfer in soil to the atmosphere (Conrad, 2007), we suppose that it is not soil pH itself, but some other soil properties or microbial activities correlated with soil pH that control these processes. Thus, we conclude that such correlation between soil pH and CH$_4$ emission at the global scale may be reasonable.

As expected, water regime in the rice-growing season was a main factor controlling CH$_4$ emissions from rice fields ($F_{(6,\ 3391)} = 80.5$, $P < 0.0001$; Table 2). Relative to continuous flooding, the average seasonal CH$_4$ flux in the rice-growing season can be reduced by 29% and 45% by single and multiple drainage, respectively (Table 3). In the updated data set, the magnitude of reducing CH$_4$ emissions following single drainage was smaller than in previous results (Yan et al., 2005a). This may be due not only to *c.* 3-fold increment of available observations (Data set S1) but also to the inevitable confusion in identifying the water regime from different studies. The average CH$_4$ fluxes from wet-season and dry-season rainfed rice fields were 54% and 16%, respectively, of that from continuously flooded fields, lower than the IPCC values of 80% and 40% for flood-prone rainfed and drought-prone rainfed rice fields, respectively (IPCC, 1997). Compared with the previous results (Yan et al., 2005a), the greater average CH$_4$ flux from wet-season rice fields was mainly attributed to the observed high fluxes from rainfed rice fields in Thailand and India (Kaewpradit et al., 2008; Kantachote et al., 2016; Rath et al., 1999). However, the CH$_4$ flux from deep water rice, only 6% of that from

Deleted: a

Deleted: is

Deleted: ing

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: times

Deleted: S

Deleted: y

Deleted: for

Deleted: are

Deleted: is

Deleted: Yet

continuously flooded rice fields, remained less reliable due to the lack of sufficient observational data in the current analysis.

This statistical model clearly identified the effects of preseason water status on CH_4 emissions in the rice-growing season ($F_{(4,\ 3391)} = 94.9$, $P < 0.0001$; Table 2). A negative correlation was found between CH_4 emissions and the drainage period before the rice season, such that the average CH_4 flux from a rice field that was flooded in the previous season was 2.4−4.1 times as high as that from fields that experienced different durations of drained season (Table 3). As shown in Table 1, the preseason water status was determined mainly by the crop rotation system, except in rice fields that are flooded during the fallow season. This effect of preseason water conditions can explain some of the regional and seasonal differences of CH_4 emissions from rice fields and suggested that crop rotation of rice and upland crops have the potential to mitigate CH_4 emissions from rice fields.

Among all the selected variables, the effect of organic amendments was the largest ($F_{(5,\ 3391)} = 181.5$, $P < 0.0001$), suggesting that the use of organic materials is the main variable controlling CH_4 emissions from rice fields. Among all the organic materials, straw used on-season showed the strongest stimulating effect on CH_4 emissions, followed by green manure. Such a difference may be attributed not only to the decomposition but also to the different moisture contents of organic materials recorded in the literature (Table 1). If rice straw was applied at a rate of 6 t ha^{-1} (dry weight) before rice transplanting, the CH_4 emissions were 3.2 times that from fields without any organic amendment (Figure 2). However, when this amount of rice straw was incorporated into the soil immediately after harvest in the previous year and left unflooded, the stimulating effect on CH_4 emissions was only 1.6 times. This indicates that straw applied off-season was an effective way to reduce CH_4 emissions from rice fields. The stimulating effects of compost and farmyard manure were comparable to that of rice straw applied off-season.

Although the agroecological zones affected CH_4 emission significantly ($F_{(9,\ 3391)} = 52.4$, $P < 0.0001$), their contribution to the variance was smaller than other factors considered in the

Deleted: s

Deleted: ly

Deleted: s

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: , and also

Deleted: s

Deleted: cultivating rice alternately with

Deleted: considerably may contribute to

Deleted: a

Deleted: ing

Deleted: is

Deleted: biggest

Deleted: shows

Deleted: was

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: are

Deleted: climate

Deleted: its

Deleted: is

model. This was probably because the model considered soil properties and the water regime during and before the rice-growing season, which partially reflected the effect of agroecological conditions. As shown in Table 2, the highest effect of AEZ 1 with extremely large variability was still unreliable, because there was no new data added in our data set. The higher CH_4 emissions can be identified clearly for AEZ 2 and 6 and Europe as the 95% confidence intervals of their effects did not overlap with others.

3.3 Region- or country-specific emission factors

Globally, for continuously flooded rice fields with the preseason water status of short drainage without organic amendment, the EF was estimated to be 1.19 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ with an error range of 0.80-1.76 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ (Table 4). We find that our estimate is lower and has relatively small variation when compared with the latest IPCC default EF (mean: 1.30 CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$, error range: 0.80-2.20 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) (Lasco et al., 2006; Yan et al., 2005a). Such a difference could be mainly attributed to the number of field measurements in the present data set, approximately two times greater than in the previous study. As shown in Table 4, we estimated the region- or country-specific EFs for which sufficient number of CH_4 emission measurements from rice fields were available.

East Asia Approximately 90% of the world's rice fields are located in Asia, of which 23% occur in East Asia (FAO, 2016). In our data set, about half of CH_4 emission measurements were compiled from this region (Figure 1; Data set S1). The region-specific EF for East Asia is estimated to 1.32 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$, and there were differences in the country-specific EF in the order of South Korea > China > Japan (Table 4). For China, as the largest rice producer in the world, there is a growing body of CH_4 emission measurements from rice fields since the late 1980s (Figure 1). We collated 388 field observations conducted on more than 40 sites in China, which allowed us to make a relatively reliable estimate of the country-specific EF. Although the EF of 1.30 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ (error range: 0.88-1.93 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) is the same as the latest IPCC default EF, its variability is smaller than the latter one with an error range of 0.80-2.20 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ as noted above (Lasco et al., 2006). This was supported by the

Deleted: It is likely
Deleted: s
Deleted: ,
Deleted: climate
Deleted: an
Deleted: is
Deleted: is
Deleted: are
Deleted: were not
Deleted: overlapp
Deleted: ed
Deleted: Development of r
Deleted: is
Deleted: This estimate is lower than 1.30 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ of Yan et al. (2005) which had relatively large variation (0.80-2.20 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$)
Deleted: about
Deleted: their
Deleted: are
Deleted: are occurred
Deleted: this
Deleted: are
Deleted: S
Deleted: are
Deleted: biggest
Deleted: for
Deleted: 84
Deleted: 87
Deleted: to
Deleted: IPCC
Deleted: is

evidence that the CH$_4$ emissions from Chinese rice fields estimated using the Tier 1 method in the 2006 IPCC guidelines or country-specific EF were almost identical (7.22-8.64 Tg yr^{-1}) (Yan et al., 2003, 2009). Even though the estimate of CH$_4$ emission is beyond the scope of this study, we believe, to some extent, that developing and using the country-specific EF should be a promising approach for national CH$_4$ inventory. For example, using the process-based model (CH4MOD) and empirical methods to account for different EFs in various rice ecosystems, CH$_4$ emissions from rice cultivation in year 2012 were estimated to be 8.46 Tg yr^{-1} in China's First Biennial Update Report (BUR) to its National Communications (NDRC of China, 2016). These estimates accounting for various EFs under different conditions, fall into the range of 4.98-14.19 Tg yr^{-1} from other reports (EDGAR, 2017; EPA, 2017; FAO, 2016).

In the latest National Communication under the Convention of Japan, country-specific EFs for rice fields under different water regimes during the rice-growing season were estimated using the DNDC-Rice model (Katayanagi et al., 2016; MoE of Japan, 2017). For comparison, the length of the single rice season in East Asia was assumed to be 130 days (Yan et al., 2005a), and we found that our estimate (1.06 kg CH$_4$ ha^{-1}d^{-1}, error range: 0.72-1.56 kg CH$_4$ ha^{-1}d^{-1}) falls into a range of the model-derived EF ranging from 0.06 to 1.79 kg CH$_4$ ha^{-1}d^{-1} for continuously flooded rice fields without organic amendment across Japan (Katayanagi et al., 2016). Likewise, using the Tier 1 method Yan et al. (2009) estimated the CH$_4$ emission in year 2000 from Japanese rice fields to be 407 Tg yr^{-1}, which was lower than the 510 Tg yr^{-1} in their latest report (MoE of Japan, 2017). We argued that such a discrepancy may be primarily related to different classifications for intermittently flooded (i.e., single drainage vs. multiple drainage) and type and amount of organic amendments used in their estimations. As such, we believe that when reliable information regarding water management and organic amendment becomes available, there is still merit in using the current country-specific EF for national CH$_4$ emission from rice cultivation. Additionally, it could be the case for South Korea, because CH$_4$ emission estimate using the Tier 1 method appears comparable to that of their National Communications (Yan et al., 2009).

Deleted: are

Deleted: as

Deleted: is

Deleted: s

Deleted: is

Deleted: the

Deleted: using the Tier 1 method

Deleted: as

Deleted: is

Deleted: Also

South Asia The rice harvest area of countries in South Asia accounts for 42% of the Asian total rice harvest for the year 2010 (FAO, 2016). India is currently thought to have the second largest CH_4 emissions from rice cultivation in the world. In the present study, the estimated EF of CH_4 from Indian rice fields was 0.85 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ (error range: 0.57-1.25 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$). We find that our estimate agrees with the overall average of 0.59 ± 0.35 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ (± standard deviation, the length of the rice season was assumed to be 125 days), which was used for the CH_4 emission inventory from Indian rice cultivation (MoEFCC of India, 2015). Interestingly, if the SFs (Table 3) were applied for subcategories of water regime during the rice-growing season as in the Tier 1 method (Lasco et al., 2006), our estimates for irrigated rice fields were almost identical to those of Manjunath et al. (2009), which have been consistently used in their national CH_4 inventory. By contrast, the values for rainfed and deep water fields were greatly underestimated. This discrepency is primarily because peer-reviewed studies from India were only considered in our current data set, while 471 observations collected from farmers’ fields over India were used by Manjunath et al. (2009). The aforementioned limited data points from wet and dry-season rainfed rice fields may also lead to biased estimates, despite the fact that approximately about half of rice cultivation is under rainfed conditions in India’s first BUR. Therefore, further available observations of CH_4 emissions from rainfed and deep water rice fields are required to improve the statistical estimates.

For Bangladesh, albeit based on one study, the estimated EF (0.97 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) of CH_4 emission from rice fields became available for the first time. Previous studies often used an EF value from neighboring countries for CH_4 emission estimates from rice cultivation (FAO, 2016; Manjunath et al., 2014; Yan et al., 2003, 2009). Interestingly, our estimate was similar to the seasonally integrated EF value of 10 g CH_4 m^{-2} used in their national communications (MoEF of Bangladesh, 2012) or other reports (FAO, 2016). Furthermore, previous studies have shown that the national CH_4 estimates were comparable when using the EF from their neighboring countries (Manjunath et al., 2014; Yan et al., 2009). Thus, either the region (0.85 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) or these country-specific EFs could be used for CH_4 emission estimates from the rest

Deleted: SD

Deleted: is

Deleted: are

Deleted: are

Deleted: has

Deleted: are

Deleted: due to the fact that

Deleted: are

Deleted: ’s

Deleted: are

Deleted: This indcates that

Deleted: our

Deleted: is

Deleted: for

Deleted: available

Deleted: vaule

Deleted: r

Deleted: is

of the countries of South Asia, *viz*., Pakistan, Sir Lanka and Nepal where direct measurements to date were not available or insufficient (Table 4).

Deleted: are

Southeast Asia In Southeast Asia, the total CH_4 emission from rice cultivation accounted for 21.5% of the world total (Yan et al., 2009). The EF of 1.22 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ for this region was close to the global default value but differed among countries (Table 4). Country-specific EFs (kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) for each country were estimated to be *viz*. Indonesia (1.18), the Philippines (0.60) and Viet Nam (1.13). For Indonesia, an EF with an average of 160.9 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}season^{-1}$ was used for CH_4 inventory from rice cultivation, despite the existence of large variation in field measurements (6.7-798.6 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}season^{-1}$) (MoEF of Indonesia, 2015). Given that the length of the rice season in Southeast Asian countries varies from 99 to 115 days, our estimate was close to the default EF used in their first BUR (MoEF of Indonesia, 2015). For the Philippines, our estimate was much lower than 3.46 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ estimated by Yan *et al.* (2003) based on observations from only two sites. Using the Tier 1 method in the 2006 IPCC guidelines, Yan et al. (2009) found the estimates of CH_4 emission from rice fields in the Philippines and Viet Nam agreed reasonably well with the values reported in their National Communications. The larger EFs estimated for Thailand and Cambodia (data not shown) had big uncertainties because they were essentially developed from very limited observations.

Deleted: is

Deleted: differs

Deleted: are

Deleted: the

Deleted: is

Deleted: Because

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: rice fields

Deleted: ve

Deleted: are

Americas Rice cultivation in Brazil and the United States accounts for approximately 60% of the total in the Americas (FAO, 2016). In our data set, there were only three countries from this region that had available measurements which allowed us to make country-specific EF estimates (Table 4). The country-specific EFs were estimated to be 0.65, 1.62 and 0.80 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$ for the United States, Brazil and Uruguay, respectively. By contrast, the assigned values of the seasonally integrated EF for the corresponding countries were 35, 6.5 and 28 g CH_4 m^{-2} in the FAOSTAT emission database (FAO, 2016). Using the IPCC Tier 1 method, the CH_4 emission estimate for these countries tends to be lower than that of their national inventory reports (NIRs), suggesting the importance of the country-specific EFs since differential conditions for rice cultivation being considered. For example, in the United States' latest NIR,

Deleted: about

Deleted: are

Deleted: having

Deleted: are

Deleted: are

Deleted: as

Deleted: s

there was an approximately 25% increase in CH_4 emission from rice cultivation relative to the previous estimates (EPA, 2017). This change could be the result of unified continuous flooding in the rice season and the impact of winter flooding considered in the IPCC Tier 3 method (DAYCENT model). Thus, the underestimated CH_4 emission using the IPCC Tier 1 method for United States can be explained by different assumptions made for water regimes in rice cultivation (Yan et al., 2009). Nevertheless, our results should be treated with caution, because very limited observations are available for these countries.

Europe As the major rice cultivating countries in Europe, the country-specific EFs for Italy and Spain were estimated to be 1.66 and 1.13 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$, respectively (Table 4). However, a seasonally integrated EF of 50.4 g CH_4 m^{-2} was assigned for these two countries in the FAOSTAT emission database (FAO, 2016), which was far higher than our estimates as well the values used in their NIRs. In the Italy's NIR (National Inventory Report of Italy, 2017), the EFs for continuously flooded fields without organic amendments for single and multiple drainage were 2.0 and 2.7 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$, respectively. It is interesting to note that these values contradict our expectation that the CH_4 emission should be lower from rice fields with multiple compared to single drainage (Table 3). A possible reason for this was that they were based on experimental measurements from different rice field studies in Italy (Leip et al., 2002; Meijide et al., 2011). In the latest NIR of Spain (National Inventory Report of Spain, 2017), the global default EF (1.30 kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) is used for CH_4 emission estimate from rice cultivation, which is close to our estimate.

4 Conclusions

Through extending the database of CH_4 emission from global rice fields, we present the update of the findings of Yan et al. (2005a). In the statistical model those selected variables that had significant effects on CH_4 emission from global rice fields agree well with results of the previous analysis. In the updated data set, the estimated values of default EF and SFs have changed in some cases; for instance, the average CH_4 fluxes from rice fields with single drainage was 71% rather than 58% of that from continuously flooded rice fields. More

Deleted: is

Deleted: be resulted from

Deleted: in a previous study (Yan et al., 2009),

Deleted: of

Deleted: as

Deleted: ed

Deleted: are

Deleted: is

Deleted: is

Deleted: are

Deleted: multiple than

Deleted: is

Deleted: are

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 ch

Deleted: In this study,

Deleted: through extending the database of CH_4 emission from global rice fields

Deleted: ,

Deleted: having

importantly, not only the global default EF was updated but also the region- or country-specific EFs were for the first time developed for countries where sufficient number of CH$_4$ emission measurements from rice fields were available. Overall, these default EFs and SFs for different water regimes and organic amendments can be used to develop national or regional emission inventories.

Deleted: is

Deleted: ,

Deleted: are

Deleted: are

Deleted: Thus

Acknowledgments

Jinyang Wang acknowledges the European Commission under Horizon 2020 for support by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions COFUND Fellowship (663830-BU-048), and the financial support provided by the Welsh Government and Higher Education Funding Council for Wales through the Sêr Cymru National Research Network for Low Carbon, Energy and Environment.

References

Aulakh, M. S., Wassmann, R. and Rennenberg, H.: Methane emissions from rice fields—quantification, mechanisms, role of management, and mitigation options, Adv. Agron., 70(C), 193–260, doi:10.1016/S0065-2113(01)70006-5, 2001.

Banger, K., Tian, H. and Lu, C.: Do nitrogen fertilizers stimulate or inhibit methane emissions from rice fields?, Glob. Chang. Biol., 18(10), 3259–3267, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02762.x, 2012.

Ciais, P., Sabine, C., Bala, G., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Canadell, J., Chhabra, A., DeFries, R., Galloway, J., Heimann, M., Jones, C., Quéré, C. Le, Myneni, R. B., Piao, S. and Thornton, P.: Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles, in Climate Change 2013 - The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, pp. 465–570, Cambridge University Press., 2013.

Cicerone, R. J. and Oremland, R. S.: Biogeochemical Aspects of Atmophseric Methane, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 2(4), 299–327, 1988.

Conrad, R.: Microbial Ecology of Methanogens and Methanotrophs, Adv. Agron., 96, 1–63, doi:10.1016/S0065-2113(07)96005-8, 2007.

Dlugokencky, E. J., Nisbet, E. G., Fisher, R. and Lowry, D.: Global atmospheric methane: budget, changes and dangers, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., 369(1943), 2058–2072, doi:10.1098/rsta.2010.0341, 2011.

Dunfield, P., Knowles, R., Dumont, R. and Moore, T. R.: Methane Production and Consumption in Temperate and Sub-Arctic Peat Soils - Response to Temperature and Ph, Soil Biol. Biochem., 25(3), 321–326, doi:10.1016/0038-0717(93)90130-4, 1993.

EDGAR: Global Emissions EDGAR v4.3.2: part I: the three main greenhouse gases CO2, CH4 and N2O, [online] Available from: http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=432_GHG&SECURE=123 (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

EPA: Global Anthropogenic Non-CO_2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions: 1990-2030, US EPA Washington, DC. [online] Available from: http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/EPAactivities/EPA_Global_NonCO2_Projections_Dec2012.pdf%5Cnhttp://www.epa.gov/climatechange/economics/international.html#global_anthropogenic, 2012.

EPA: Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2015., 2017.

FAO: FAOSTAT Emissions Database, Agriculture, Rice Cultivation, [online] Available from: http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/GR (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2016.

Feng, J., Chen, C., Zhang, Y., Song, Z., Deng, A., Zheng, C. and Zhang, W.: Impacts of cropping practices on yield-scaled greenhouse gas emissions from rice fields in China: A meta-analysis, Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 164, 220–228, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2012.10.009, 2013.

Frankenberg, C.: Assessing Methane Emissions from Global Space-Borne Observations, Science (80-.)., 308(5724), 1010–1014, doi:10.1126/science.1106644, 2005.

Fuller, D. Q., van Etten, J., Manning, K., Castillo, C., Kingwell-Banham, E., Weisskopf, A., Qin, L., Sato, Y.-I. and Hijmans, R. J.: The contribution of rice agriculture and livestock pastoralism to prehistoric methane levels, edited by W. F. Ruddiman, M. C. Crucifix, and F. A. Oldfield, The Holocene, 21(5), 743–759, doi:10.1177/0959683611398052, 2011.

Garcia, J.-L., Patel, B. K. . and Ollivier, B.: Taxonomic, Phylogenetic, and Ecological Diversity of Methanogenic Archaea, Anaerobe, 6(4), 205–226, doi:10.1006/anae.2000.0345, 2000.

Huang, Y., Zhang, W., Zheng, X., Li, J. and Yu, Y.: Modeling methane emission from rice paddies with various agricultural practices, J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos., 109(8), 1–12, doi:10.1029/2003JD004401, 2004.

IPCC: Greenhouse Gas Inventory Reference Manual, in Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, vol. 3, pp. 1–140, Bracknell (United Kingdom) IPCC/OECD/IEA. [online] Available from: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gl/invs6.html%5Cnhttp://books.google.com/books?id=QMeiYgEACAAJ, 1997.

Deleted:

IRRI: Rice Almanac: Source Book for the Most Important Economic Activity on Earth, Third., edited by J. L. Maclean, D. C. Dawe, B. Hardy, and G. P. Hettel, CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK., 2002.

Ito, A. and Inatomi, M.: Use of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty, Biogeosciences, 9(2), 759–773, doi:10.5194/bg-9-759-2012, 2012.

Jiang, Y., van Groenigen, K. J., Huang, S., Hungate, B. A., van Kessel, C., Hu, S., Zhang, J., Wu, L., Yan, X., Wang, L., Chen, J., Hang, X., Zhang, Y., Horwath, W. R., Ye, R., Linquist, B. A., Song, Z., Zheng, C., Deng, A. and Zhang, W.: Higher yields and lower methane emissions with new rice cultivars, Glob. Chang. Biol., 23(11), 4728–4738, doi:10.1111/gcb.13737, 2017.

Jørgensen, S. E. and Fath, B. D.: Fundamentals of Ecological Modelling, Elsevier., 2001.

Kaewpradit, W., Toomsan, B., Vityakon, P., Limpinuntana, V., Saenjan, P., Jogloy, S., Patanothai, A. and Cadisch, G.: Regulating mineral N release and greenhouse gas emissions by mixing groundnut residues and rice straw under field conditions, Eur. J. Soil Sci., 59(4), 640–652, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2008.01021.x, 2008.

Kantachote, D., Nunkaew, T., Kantha, T. and Chaiprapat, S.: Biofertilizers from Rhodopseudomonas palustris strains to enhance rice yields and reduce methane emissions, Appl. Soil Ecol., 100, 154–161, doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.12.015, 2016.

Katayanagi, N., Fumoto, T., Hayano, M., Takata, Y., Kuwagata, T., Shirato, Y., Sawano, S., Kajiura, M., Sudo, S., Ishigooka, Y. and Yagi, K.: Development of a method for estimating total CH4 emission from rice paddies in Japan using the DNDC-Rice model, Sci. Total Environ., 547, 429–440, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.12.149, 2016.

Koyama, T.: Gaseous metabolism in lake sediments and paddy soils and the production of atmospheric methane and hydrogen, J. Geophys. Res., 68(13), 3971–3973, doi:10.1029/JZ068i013p03971, 1963.

Lasco, R. D., Ogle, S., Raison, J., Verchot, L., Wassman, R., Yagi, K., Bhattacharya, S., Brenner, J., Partson Daka, J. and Gonzalez, S.: Chapter 5: Cropland, 2006 IPCC Guidel. Natl. Greenh. Gas Invent., 2006.

Leip, A., Bidoglio, G., Smith, K. A., Conen, F., Russo, S., van Ham, J., Baede, A. P. M., Guicherit, R. and Williams-Jacobse, J. G. F. M.: Rice cultivation by direct drilling and delayed flooding reduces methane emissions., Non-CO2 Greenh. gases Sci. understanding, Control options policy Asp. Proc. Third Int. Symp. Maastricht, Netherlands, 21-23 January 2002., 457–458 [online] Available from: http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/20033041375.html, 2002.

Manjunath, K. R., Panigrahy, S., Adhya, T. K., Beri, V., Rao, K. V and Parihar, J. S.: Rice-ecosystems of India in the context of methane emission, Int. Arch. Photogram. Rem. Sens. Spat. Inform. Syst, 38(Part 8), W3, 2009.

Manjunath, K. R., More, R., Chauhan, P., Vyas, A., Panigrahy, S. and Parihar, J. S.: Remote sensing based methane emission inventory Vis-A-Vis rice cultural types of South Asia, Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci. - ISPRS Arch., 40(8), 821–826, doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-8-821-2014, 2014.

Meijide, A., Manca, G., Goded, I., Magliulo, V., Di Tommasi, P., Seufert, G. and Cescatti, A.: Seasonal trends and environmental controls of methane emissions in a rice paddy field in Northern Italy, Biogeosciences, 8(12), 3809–3821, doi:10.5194/bg-8-3809-2011, 2011.

Neue, H. U., Becker-Heidmann, P. and Scharpenseel, H. W.: Organic matter dynamics, soil properties, and cultural practices in ricelands and their relationship to methane production, Soils Greenh. Eff., 457–466, 1990.

MoEF of Bangladesh (Ministry of Environment and Forests): Second National Communication of Bangladesh to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/items/10124.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2012.

MoEFCC of India (Ministry of Environments, Forests and Climate Change): First Biennial Update Report to the United Framework Convention on Climate Change of India [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/reporting_on_climate_change/items/8722.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2015.

MoEF of Indonesia (Ministry of Environment and Forestry): First Biennial Update Report under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change of Indonesia [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/reporting_on_climate_change/items/8722.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2015.

MoE of Japan (Ministry of the Environment): National Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report of Japan [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/items/10116.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

National Inventory Report of Italy: Italian Greenhouse Gas Inventory 1990-2015 [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/items/101

16.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

National Inventory Report of Spain: National Inventory of Emissions of Greenhous Gases 1990-2015 [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/items/10116.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

NDRC of China (National Development and Reform Commission): The People's Republic of China First Biennial Update Report on Climate Change [Online]. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/reporting_on_climate_change/items/8722.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2016.

Rath, A. K., Swain, B., Ramakrishnan, B., Panda, D., Adhya, T. K., Rao, V. R. and Sethunathan, N.: Influence of fertilizer management and water regime on methane emission from rice fields, Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 76(2–3), 99–107, doi:10.1016/S0167-8809(99)00080-8, 1999.

Schimel, J.: Rice, microbes and methane, Nature, 403(6768), 375–377, doi:10.1038/35000325, 2000.

Shang, Q., Yang, X., Gao, C., Wu, P., Liu, J., Xu, Y., Shen, Q., Zou, J. and Guo, S.: Net annual global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity in Chinese double rice-cropping systems: A 3-year field measurement in long-term fertilizer experiments, Glob. Chang. Biol., 17(6), 2196–2210, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02374.x, 2011.

Spahni, R., Wania, R., Neef, L., Van Weele, M., Pison, I., Bousquet, P., Frankenberg, C., Foster, P. N., Joos, F., Prentice, I. C. and Van Velthoven, P.: Constraining global methane emissions and uptake by ecosystems, Biogeosciences, 8(6), 1643–1665, doi:10.5194/bg-8-1643-2011, 2011.

Speed, F. M., Hocking, R. R. and Hackney, P.: Methods of Analysis of Linear Models with Unbalanced Data, J. Am. Stat. Assoc., 73(361), 105–112, 2013.

Tubiello, F. N., Salvatore, M., Rossi, S., Ferrara, A., Fitton, N. and Smith, P.: The FAOSTAT database of greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture, Environ. Res. Lett., 8(1), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/015009, 2013.

UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change): National Inventory submissions. Available from: http://unfccc.int/national_reports/items/1408.php (Accessed 1 November 2017), 2017.

Wang, J., Zhang, X., Xiong, Z., Khalil, M. A. K., Zhao, X., Xie, Y. and Xing, G.: Methane emissions

Deleted:

Deleted:

from a rice agroecosystem in South China: Effects of water regime, straw incorporation and nitrogen fertilizer, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems, 93(1), 103–112, doi:10.1007/s10705-012-9503-3, 2012.

Wang, J., Chen, Z., Ma, Y., Sun, L. and Shen, Q.: Methane and nitrous oxide emissions as affected by organic–inorganic mixed fertilizer from a rice paddy in southeast China, J. Soils Sediments, 13, 1408–1471, 2013.

Watanabe, A., Kajiwara, M., Tashiro, T. and Kimura, M.: Influence of rice cultivar on methane emission from paddy fields, Plant Soil, 176(1), 51–56, doi:10.1007/BF00017674, 1995.

Yagi, K. and Minami, K.: Effect of organic matter application on methane emission from some Japanese paddy fields, Soil Sci. Plant Nutr., 36(4), 599–610, doi:10.1080/00380768.1990.10416797, 1990.

Yan, X., Ohara, T. and Akimoto, H.: Development of region-specific emission factors and estimation of methane emission from rice fields in the East, Southeast and South Asian countries, Glob. Chang. Biol., 9(2), 237–254, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.2003.00564.x, 2003.

Yan, X., Yagi, K., Akiyama, H. and Akimoto, H.: Statistical analysis of the major variables controlling methane emission from rice fields, Glob. Chang. Biol., 11(7), 1131–1141, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00976.x, 2005a.

Yan, X., Ohara, T. and Akimoto, H.: Statistical modeling of global soil NO_x emissions, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19(3), 1–15, doi:10.1029/2004GB002276, 2005b.

Yan, X., Akiyama, H., Yagi, K. and Akimoto, H.: Global estimations of the inventory and mitigation potential of methane emissions from rice cultivation conducted using the 2006 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidelines, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 23(2), doi:10.1029/2008GB003299, 2009.

Zhang, B., Tian, H., Ren, W., Tao, B., Lu, C., Yang, J., Banger, K. and Pan, S.: Methane emissions from global rice fields: Magnitude, spatiotemporal patterns, and environmental controls, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 30(9), 1246–1263, doi:10.1002/2016GB005381, 2016.

Zou, J., Huang, Y., Jiang, J., Zheng, X. and Sass, R. L.: A 3-year field measurement of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from rice paddies in China: Effects of water regime, crop residue, and fertilizer application, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19(2), 1–9, doi:10.1029/2004GB002401, 2005.

Formatted: English (US)

Formatted: Subscript

Figure 1. Global distribution of field experiments measuring the CH_4 flux from rice fields. The circle and triangle indicate experimental sites newly added in this study and included in Yan et al. (2005a), respectively.



Figure 2. Simulated effect of different organic amendments on CH_4 emissions from rice fields. The CH_4 flux for the field without any organic amendments is assumed to be 1.



Table 1. Description of the selected variables controlling the CH_4 emission from rice fields

Variables	Description
Preseason water status	
Flooded	Permanently flooded rice fields are assumed to have a preseason water regime of ‘flooded’. Late rice in China is usually planted immediately after early rice on the same field and is therefore regarded as having a preseason water regime of ‘flooded’.
Long drainage	If rice is planted once a year and the field is not flooded in the non-rice growing season, the preseason water regime is classified as long drainage.
Short drainage	Rice is planted more than once a year, but there is more than one month fallow time between the two seasons, short drainage is usually taken as preseason drainage.
Two drainage	For measurements conducted on rice fields that are preceded by two upland crops or an upland crop and a drained fallow season, the preseason water of such experiments is classified as two drainage.
Water regime in the rice-growing season	
Continuous flooding	Rice is cultivated under continuously flooded condition but sometimes an end-season drainage before rice harvest included.
Single drainage	One mid-season drainage and an end-season drainage are adopted over the entire rice-growing season.
Multiple drainage	It refers to the water regime is called 'intermittent irrigation' but the number of drainages was not clear. Alternate wetting and drying (AWD) is included in multiple drainage.
Rainfed, wet season	Rice cultivation rely on rainfall for water, in this case the field is flood prone during the rice-growing season.
Rainfed, dry season	Rice cultivation rely on rainfall for water, in this case the field is drought prone during the rice-growing season.
Deep water	Rice grown in flooded conditions with water depth more than 50 cm deep.
Organic amendment	

Deleted: on

Straw on-season	Straw applied just before rice transplanting as on-season; straw that is left on the soil surface in the fallow season and incorporated into the soil before the next rice transplanting is also categorized as on-season. The amount of straw return is expressed in dry weight.
Straw off-season	Straw incorporated into soils in the previous season (upland crop or fallow) is categorized as off-season. The amount of straw return is expressed in dry weight.
Compost, farmyard manure, green manure	The amount of organic materials is expressed in fresh weight.
Agroecological zone	
AEZ 1	Warm arid and semiarid tropics
AEZ 2	Warm subhumid tropics
AEZ 3	Warm humid tropics
AEZ 5	Warm arid and semiarid subtropics with summer rainfall
AEZ 6	Warm subhumid subtropics with summer rainfall
AEZ 7	Warm/cool humid subtropics with summer rainfall
AEZ 8	Cool subtropics with summer rainfall

Table 2. Statistical results for fixed effects obtained by fitting the model to the observed log-transformed CH_4 fluxes (mg CH_4 $m^{-2}h^{-1}$)

						95% confidence interval	
Effect	Estimate	Standard error	df	*t*-value	*P*-value	Lower	Upper
Constant	-0.478	0.171	3391	-2.79	0.005	-0.814	-0.142
SOC[a]	0.190	0.030	3391	6.31	0.000	0.131	0.249
pH							
< 4.5	2.045	0.210	3391	9.75	0.000	1.634	2.456
4.5−5.0	1.124	0.106	3391	10.60	0.000	0.916	1.332
5.0−5.5	1.299	0.094	3391	13.88	0.000	1.116	1.483
5.5−6.0	0.825	0.091	3391	9.09	0.000	0.647	1.004
6.0−6.5	0.312	0.084	3391	3.69	0.000	0.146	0.477
6.5−7.0	0.151	0.088	3391	1.73	0.085	-0.021	0.323
7.0−7.5	0.181	0.097	3391	1.86	0.063	-0.010	0.372
7.5−8.0	0.099	0.093	3391	1.07	0.285	-0.083	0.280
≥ 8.0	0[d]						
Preseason water status							
Flooded	0.763	0.064	3391	11.94	0.000	0.638	0.888
Long drainage	-0.228	0.054	3391	-4.20	0.000	-0.335	-0.122
Short drainage	-0.116	0.061	3391	-1.90	0.058	-0.237	0.004
Two drainages	-0.648	0.184	3391	-3.52	0.000	-1.008	-0.287
Unknown	0[d]						
Water regime							
Continuous flooding	0.851	0.138	3391	6.16	0.000	0.580	1.122
Deepwater	-1.897	0.309	3391	-6.14	0.000	-2.503	-1.291
Multiple drainage	0.247	0.142	3391	1.74	0.082	-0.032	0.525
Single drainage	0.505	0.147	3391	3.45	0.001	0.218	0.793
Rainfed, wet season	0.236	0.161	3391	1.46	0.144	-0.081	0.552
Rainfed, dry season	-0.972	0.199	3391	-4.89	0.000	-1.361	-0.582
Unknown	0[d]						

Deleted: 0[c]

Deleted: 0[c]

Deleted: 0[c]

Organic amendment							
Compost	0.218	0.047	3391	4.65	0.000	0.126	0.309
Farmyard manure	0.247	0.028	3391	8.90	0.000	0.193	0.302
Green manure	0.400	0.026	3391	15.47	0.000	0.349	0.450
Straw on-season[b]	0.591	0.022	3391	27.49	0.000	0.549	0.633
Straw off-season[b]	0.228	0.036	3391	6.39	0.000	0.158	0.299
Unknown	0[d]						
Agroecological zone[c]							
AEZ 1	1.523	0.508	3391	3.00	0.003	0.528	2.518
AEZ 2	1.005	0.089	3391	11.24	0.000	0.829	1.180
AEZ 3	0.307	0.074	3391	4.17	0.000	0.163	0.451
AEZ 5	0.525	0.098	3391	5.38	0.000	0.334	0.717
AEZ 6	1.127	0.070	3391	16.00	0.000	0.989	1.265
AEZ 7	0.605	0.076	3391	7.94	0.000	0.455	0.754
AEZ 8	0.526	0.078	3391	6.76	0.000	0.373	0.678
South America	0.403	0.150	3391	2.68	0.007	0.108	0.697
Europe	1.321	0.101	3391	13.08	0.000	1.123	1.520
North America	0[d]						

[a] Soil organic carbon is expressed as % in the model.

[b] The effect of the organic amendment is the interaction of organic material type and application rate (t ha^{-1}). Straw on-season indicates straw applied shortly before rice transplanting, and straw off-season indicates straw applied in the previous season. Note that rice straw that was left in situ and incorporated into soil just before rice transplanting is classified as straw on-season.

[c] Experimental sites are classified as one of the agroecological zones according to the FAO zoning system.

[d] For each categorical variable, the effect of one subclass is set to zero.

Deleted: season[a]

Deleted: season[a]

Deleted: 0[c]

Deleted: zone[b]

Deleted: 0[c]

Formatted: Font:Not Italic, Not Superscript/ Subscript

Deleted: [a]The

Deleted: just

Deleted: season

Deleted: before the rice season

Deleted: [b]

Deleted: [c]

Table 3. Relative fluxes for different water regimes in the rice-growing season and for different preseason water statuses

Variables	Relative flux	95% confidence interval	
		Lower	Upper
Water regime in rice season			
Continuously flooded	1[a]		
Deepwater	0.06	0.03	0.12
Multiple drainage	0.55	0.41	0.72
Single drainage	0.71	0.53	0.94
Rainfed, wet season	0.54	0.39	0.74
Rainfed, dry season	0.16	0.11	0.24
Preseason water status			
Short drainage	1[a]		
Long drainage	0.89	0.80	0.99
Two drainages	0.59	0.41	0.84
Flooded	2.41	2.13	2.73

[a] Supposing the fluxes of 'continuously flooded' and 'short drainage' to be 1.

Table 4. The regional- and country-specific emission factors for CH_4 emission (kg CH_4 $ha^{-1}d^{-1}$) from flooded rice fields with a preseason water status of short drainage and without organic amendments

			95% confidence interval[a]				95% confidence interval[a]	
Region		Emission factor	Lower	Upper	Country	Emission factor	Lower	Upper
World		1.19	0.80	1.76				
Asia	East Asia	1.32	0.89	1.96	China	1.30	0.88	1.93
					Japan	1.06	0.72	1.56
					South Korea	1.83	1.24	2.71
	South Asia	0.85	0.58	1.26	India	0.85	0.57	1.25
					Bangladesh	0.97	0.65	1.43
	Southeast Asia	1.22	0.83	1.81	Philippines	0.60	0.41	0.89
					Viet Nam	1.13	0.76	1.67
					Indonesia	1.18	0.80	1.74
America	North America	0.65	0.44	0.96	USA			
	South America	1.27	0.86	1.88	Brazil	1.62	1.10	2.40
					Uruguay	0.80	0.54	1.18
Europe		1.56	1.06	2.31	Spain	1.13	0.77	1.68
					Italy	1.66	1.12	2.46

[a] Including the uncertainties of the effects of continuous flooding and preseason water status

Page 12: [1] Deleted **Akiyama** **6/13/18 2:00:00 PM**

To ameliorate the problem induced by the assumption that the treatment without organic amendment is the result of each type of organic material at zero application rate, we weighted the residual of observations with organic amendment as 1 and those without as 0.2 (as the observational result was repeated five times for the five types of organic materials).