

Note: This is a reference cited in AP 42, *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I Stationary Point and Area Sources*. AP42 is located on the EPA web site at www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/

The file name refers to the reference number, the AP42 chapter and section. The file name "ref02_c01s02.pdf" would mean the reference is from AP42 chapter 1 section 2. The reference may be from a previous version of the section and no longer cited. The primary source should always be checked.

AP42 Section:	9.2.1
Background Ch	4
Reference:	45
Title:	K. Minami, "The Effect of Nitrogen Fertilizer Use and Other Practices on Methane Emission from Flooded Rice," <i>Fertilizer Research</i> , 40:71-84, 1995.

The effect of nitrogen fertilizer use and other practices on methane emission from flooded rice

K. Minami

Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences, Tsukuba, 305 Japan

Received 7 June 1994; accepted in revised form 8 November 1994

Key words: agricultural practices, methane emission, methane flux factors, mitigation, nitrogen fertilizer, rice paddy fields

Abstract

Methane (CH_4) flux measurements from rice paddy fields in the world and its controlling factors, especially fertilizer effects are summarized. The measurements at rice paddy fields in various locations of the world showed that there were large temporal variations of CH_4 flux and that the flux differed markedly with climate, characteristics of soil and paddy, application of organic matter and mineral fertilizer, and agricultural practices. From the data, it appears that identifying and controlling CH_4 flux factors have a potential to reduce CH_4 emission from rice cultivation. Potential mitigation options include: the form and amount of nitrogen and other chemical fertilizers, the method of fertilizer applications, the application of other chemical amendments, water management and cultivation practices.

Introduction

Methane (CH_4) is one of the most abundant organic gases in the atmosphere. Recently the importance of CH_4 as a greenhouse gas has been recognized and studies have been carried out to assess its contribution to global warming.

More than thirteen years have passed since the first evidence for an increase in the concentration of atmospheric CH_4 was reported [39]. Several time-series measurements of the trend of atmospheric CH_4 have been carried out in various locations of the world up to present time. The results obtained show that the average increase of atmospheric CH_4 during last decade was about 1% per year [3,41]. Analysis of ancient air trapped in polar ice cores reveal that the concentration of atmospheric CH_4 remained almost constant at less than about half of the present concentration until 300 years ago, with an increase in the concentration starting in the 19th century [10,20,40]. Although the rate of increase has slowed down in the last decade [22,42,53], the above concerns still require research to construct an accurate budget relating sources and sinks of CH_4 to atmospheric concentrations.

Methane plays an important role in the photochemical reactions of the troposphere and the stratosphere, and the changes of its concentration exert a strong influence over the atmospheric chemistry [54]. In addition, CH_4 is a so-called greenhouse gas along with CO_2 , CFCs and N_2O , which have strong absorption bands and trap part of the thermal radiation from the earth's surface [58]. Therefore, the increasing concentration of CH_4 may affect significantly the global heat balance and cause a possible elevation of the global surface temperature [11,38]. Methane accounts for almost 20% of the radiative forcing added to the atmosphere [14].

Atmospheric CH_4 is produced by a wide variety of natural and anthropogenic processes. Major sources of atmospheric CH_4 have been estimated by several investigators [2,8,12,14,15,52]. However, there are uncertainties in the estimated value of individual sources and sinks, and in the leading causes of the increasing concentration of atmospheric CH_4 .

Rice paddy fields are considered as an important source for the observed changes in atmospheric CH_4 concentration because of the recent increase in world area. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [15] estimated the global emission rate from paddy

fields to be from 20 to 150 Tg yr⁻¹, averaging 60 Tg yr⁻¹ which accounts for about 5–30% of the total emissions from all sources. This figure is mainly based on the field measurement of CH₄ flux from paddy fields in the United States, Spain, Italy, China, India, Australia and Japan.

The measurements in rice paddy fields in various locations of the world show that there are large temporal variations of CH₄ flux and that the flux differs markedly with climate, characteristics of soil and paddy, application of organic matter and mineral fertilizer, and agricultural practices. In this paper, I summarize research on factors that affect CH₄ emissions and discuss the effects of fertilizer use on CH₄ emission from flooded rice. Table 1 shows the results of the CH₄ flux measurements from rice paddy fields in the world, including partial data, pot data and laboratory data. Additional information on CH₄ production and oxidation in soils and emission from rice paddy fields were discussed in previous paper [33].

Methane emissions

Diurnal, seasonal and annual variation in CH₄ emission

A very clear dependence on temperature is observed in the diurnal variation of CH₄ emission. The temperature dependence of seasonal emission patterns is not as obvious. Variations in CH₄ emission during the growing season have been correlated with soil temperature in some studies but not in others. Three seasonal maxima were found in Italy [49], the first shortly after flooding, the second during the vegetative stage of the rice plants, and the third during the grain filling and maturation stage. Although cultivation practice has a strong influence on CH₄ emission levels, three seasonal maxima were also observed in Japan [60]. In China, both two-maxima and three-maxima seasonal patterns have been observed [57]. In Texas, although different in absolute emission values, seasonal patterns in three soils over three years had similar characteristics [43,44,45,48]. Sass and Fisher [48] compared methane emissions over three years from two paddy fields. Methane emission rates differed each year. There was a 2 to 3 fold variation in CH₄ emission over three years. Table 2 shows the annual variations in CH₄ emission for two to four years in three studies [49,61,63]. It shows that CH₄ emission rates vary

every year when agricultural management practice is under the same conditions.

CH₄ emission rates and soil characteristics

Methane emission from soil bacterial activity in agricultural wetlands is influenced by physical, chemical and biological properties of soil, organic residues in soil and water (including fertilizers and other chemical additives), water regime and management, temperature (including wet-dry season and planting date), root exudates and plant physiology.

Yagi and Minami [60] investigated the effect of different soils on CH₄ emission in the same areas. Emission rates differed markedly with the soil type as shown in Table 1. Peaty soil fields recorded the highest rates, followed by Gley soil and then Andosol. Other studies in Thailand [16,62] showed that CH₄ emission rates differed markedly with the soil textures (C, CL, SiC, HC and LFS) as shown in Table 1. Seasonal CH₄ emissions showed a clear inverse relation to clay content of soils as shown in Table 3 [48].

CH₄ emission rates and the form and amount of chemical fertilizers

Urea and ammonium sulfate account for 80–90% of total nitrogen fertilizer required in rice cultivation [13]. The effects of urea, ammonium sulfate and other N fertilizer have on methanogenesis are not clearly understood and are often contradictory. [59]. Methane fluxes appear to be strongly influenced by the type, rate and method of N fertilizer application to rice paddies.

Cicerone and Shetter [6] reported ammonium sulfate addition to California rice paddies increased CH₄ emissions 5-fold compared to control plots (unfertilized). Schutz *et al.* [49] evaluated fertilizer applications to rice paddy fields in Italy over a 3-year cropping period. Based on seasonal averages, fluxes measured from ammonium sulfate treated plots were lower by 5–60% depending upon method of application. Addition of urea to the Italian paddies reduced emissions by 18% compared to controls but fluxes were strongly influenced by the application method.

Lindau *et al.* [27,28] observed fluxes of CH₄ from ammonium sulfate and potassium nitrate treated fields. These were much lower than urea treated fields over the 21-day sampling period. Lindau *et al.* [29] reported emissions increased as urea-N rate increased in a Louisiana field experiment. Lindau [32] measured CH₄ emission rates as affected by the form of N fertilizer (urea, ammonium sulfate, and potassium nitrate)

Table 1. Methane flux measurements from rice fields

Study	Country	Soil	Rice Cultiver Grain (g m ⁻²)	N-fertilizer (kg N ha ⁻¹)	Treatment Amendment (t ha ⁻¹)	Days mg m ⁻²	Flux hr ⁻¹		
1	USA	C	M101	Compound+U	113	100	10.4		
2	Spain			Urea+AN	200	125	4.0		
3	Italy	SL	Roma	No		118	10.6		
				CaCN ₂ (rake)	200	118	12.5		
				Urea(rake)	100	118	9.6		
				Urea(rake)	200	118	9.6		
				Urea(inco)	200	113	7.9		
				Urea(surf)	200	113	15.8		
				AS(inco)	50	105	7.5		
				AS(inco)	100	105	8.8		
				AS(inco)	200	109	5.6		
				AS(rake)	200	118	6.7		
				AS(surf)	200	113	12.5		
					RS(inco)	3	105	9.6	
					RS(inco)	5	118	24.2	
					RS(inco)	6	109	13.5	
					RS(inco)	12	110	22.1	
					RS(inco)	24	113	18.8	
				CaCN ₂	37.5	RS	2.5	118	11.7
				CaCN ₂	75	RS	5	118	17.9
				AS	200	RS	12	109	20.6
				Urea	200	RS	6	113	20.0
				Urea	200	RS	12	113	25.0
					Comp	60	113	27.5	
4	Japan	SCL (Gley soil)	Koshi- hikari	No		119	2.8		
				Compound	90	118	2.9		
				Compound	90	Compo	12	112	3.9
				Compound	90	RS	6	117	9.6
		CL (Peaty soil)		Compound	85	RS	6	115	16.3
		L (Andosol)		No		122	1.4		
				Compound	80		125	1.2	
				Compound	80	Compo	12	129	1.9
				Compound	80	RS	6	128	3.2
				Compound	80	RS	9	128	4.1
		L (Andosol)		Compound	100		125	0.2	
				Compound	100	RS	6	115	0.4
5	Japan	CL (Eutric Gleysols)		AS 150 percolation 0 mm/day		148	2.6		
				AS 150 percolation 5 mm/day		148	1.4		
				AS 150 percolation 20 mm/day		148	0.1		

Table 1. continued

Study	Country	Soil	Rice Cultiver Grain (g m^{-2})	Treatment		Days	Flux
				N-fertilizer (kg N ha^{-1})	Amendment (t ha^{-1})	$\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{ hr}^{-1}$	
6		China		Late rice, average		62	26.4
				Early rice, average		70	6.6
7	China					120	36.6
8, 9	USA	C	Jasmine 85	(600g) Urea	190	85	2.2
	(Entic Pelludert)			(516g) Urea	102	86	5.5
	C			(700g) Urea	149	85	7.8
	(Typic Pelludert)			(490g) Urea	102	86	15.0
10	USA	SiC	Jasmine 85	(994g) Urea	190	85	18.3
	(Vertic Ochraqualf)			(850g) Urea	190	81	11.8
				(770g) Urea	190	76	12.0
				(846g) Urea	190	85	23.5
				(784g) Urea	190	81	18.3
				(668g) Urea	190	76	12.7
11	USA	SiL	Lemont	No		86	10.2
	(Typic Albaqualf)			Urea	100	86	14.5
				Urea	200	86	15.0
				Urea	300	86	17.9
12	USA	SiC		Compound+U	114	111	4.0
	C			No		128	0.5
				Urea	78	128	0.9
				Urea	78 RS	128	3.0
				Urea	78 RS	128	13.9
					RS	128	6.4
					RS	128	18.9
13	USA	SiCL (Vertic Ochraqualf)	Jasmine	85	Urea	165	
		Normal flood irr.	(825g)			87	4.4
		Mid-season aeration	(820g)			87	2.3
		Multiple aeration	(813g)			87	0.6
		Late season flood irr.	(640g)			99	6.3
14,15	Japan	SCL	Koshi-hikari	1988 Compound	90	118	2.9
				1989 Compound	90	105	7.1
		(Eutric Gleysol)		1990 Compound	90	121	14.0
				1991 Compound	90	106	6.0
		Int.rrr		1988 Compound	90 RS	117	9.6
				1989 Compound	90 RS	105	7.9
				1990 Compound	90 RS	121	14.8
				1991 Compound	90 RS	106	8.1

Table 1. continued

Study	Country	Soil	Rice Cultiver Grain (g m ⁻²)	N-fertilizer (kg N ha ⁻¹)	Treatment	Amendment (t ha ⁻¹)	Days	Flux mg m ⁻² hr ⁻¹		
16	China	L	Huang j	(545g) NH ₄ HCO ₃ [*]	610	Horse dung	15	79	14.6	
				(440g) NH ₄ HCO ₃ [*]	900			79	17.5	
				(522g) NH ₄ HCO ₃ [*]	610	Horse dung	15	79	35.9	
				(470g) NH ₄ HCO ₃ [*]	710	Horse dung	30	79	48.9	
				Dry seeded NH ₄ HCO ₃ [*]	610	Horse dung	15	79	0	
			Yellow-brow earth S63	(676g) Urea	190	Barn M	15	101	10.8	
				(676g)		Barn M	45	101	9.5	
				(661g) AS*	600			101	2.6	
				(706g) Urea	190	Rape S	3	101	14.3	
				(661g) Urea	190	Barn M	15	101	6.6	
17	USA (Typic Albaqualf)	SiL	Texmont	No				77	13.0	
				Urea	100	(no plant)		77	2.7	
				Urea	100			77	18.4	
		Ratoon plants	No			73	12.6			
			Urea	84			73	29.7		
			Urea	84	RS	10	73	80.6		
18	USA (Typic Albaqualf)	SiL	Oryza s	Urea	128			70	43.3	
				Urea	128	CaSO ₄	1	70	30.7	
				Urea	128	CaSO ₄	2	70	23.5	
19	Thailand		Oryza s	(Sulfic Tropaquest) C DS	Compound	120		83	4.0	
				(Veric Tropaquest) C DS	Compound	85		109	19.5	
				WS	Compound	90		97	32.2	
				(Aeric Tropaquest) CL WS	Compound	80		94	1.8	
20	Japan	SCL	Koshihikari	Flooded	(538g) 1991 Compound	90		73	8.4	
				Flooded	(570g) 1993 Compound	90		131	3.0	
				Int. irr (4+6 days)	(504g) 1991 Compound	90		73	4.9	
				(7-day + int.)	(589g) 1993 Compound	90		131	1.7	
21	Thailand	Oryza s	SiC	Unhulled	(270g) No			77	3.2	
					(450g) Compound	50		77	7.3	
		(Fulvic Tropaquent)			(390g) Compound	50	Sesbania R	30	77	42.5
					(230g) No			75	10	
		HC	Unhulled	(350g) Compound	35			75	0.4	
				(310g) Compound	35	RS	2	75	12.4	
		(Thionic Tropaquest)			(190g) No			79	21.9	
					(280g) Compound	44		79	24.5	
		LFS	Unhulled	(270g) Compound	44	Sesbania R	3.1	79	15.0	

Table 1. continued

Study	Country	Soil	Rice Cultiver Grain (g m^{-2})	Treatment N-fertilizer (kg N ha^{-1})	Amendment (t ha^{-1})	Days $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{hr}^{-1}$	Flux
22	Indonesia	LiC	IR64	(580g) Urea+AS 300 (550g) Urea 250 (570g) AS 500 (640g) Urea 250 (610g) Urea 250 (630g) Urea 250	RS 5 Sesba R 5 Cow DM 5	60 60 60 60 60 60	27.5 22.5 21.8 32.8 27.1 23.7
23	USA (Typic Albaqualf)	SiL	Lacussine	No AS 60 AS 120 KNO ₃ 60 KNO ₃ 120 Urea 60 Urea 120		93 93 93 93 93 93 93	2.6 3.1 4.5 3.6 4.0 4.9 9.9
24	Japan Int. irr (7-day + int.)	SCL	Koshihikari	Compound 90		122	3.2
25	India	34	sites			44-113	0-2.8
26	Philippines (Aquandic Epiqualt)	C	IR72	(582g) DS Urea 117 (520g) WS Urea 60 (560g) WS Urea 60	RS 5	82 105 105	8.0 3.6 7.3
<i>Partial data</i>							
27	USA						1.3-7.8
28	China						1-50
29	India	SL, SiCL, CL, SL, SCL					0.07-80
30	USA (Typic Albaqualf)	SiL	Lemont	No Urea 120 KNO ₃ 120		21 21 21	0-1041 0-1375 0-342
31	USA (Typic Albaqualf)	SiL	Oryza s	No Urea 120 (NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄ 120 KNO ₃ 120		21 21 21 21	96-1850 0-3141 0-354 62-746
32	China			No K ₂ SO ₄ /KCl 694 K ₂ SO ₄ /KCl 694	RSC 1 RSC 1		7.4-47.0 7.7-35.4 7.9-44.0 6.0-50.6
<i>Pot data</i>							
33	Japan	LiC	(Typic Haploaquept) Oriza s 1/50m ² pot				
	Broadcasting		(27.5g/pot) AS	150		109	25.8
	Broadcasting		(24.9g/pot) NH ₄ Cl	150		109	29.0
	Broadcasting		(23.9g/pot) Urea	150		109	33.6
	Foliar spray		(21.0g/pot) AS	150		109	14.2
	Foliar spray		(15.8g/pot) NH ₄ Cl	150		109	11.5
	Foliar spray		(21.4g/pot) Urea	150		109	26.9

Table 1. continued

Study	Country	Soil	Rice Cultiver Grain (g m^{-2})	Treatment N-fertilizer (kg N ha^{-1})	Amendment (t ha^{-1})	Days $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{ hr}^{-1}$	Flux
34	USA	(Glossoboric Hapludalf)			RS	105	17.8
					GM	105	62.6
					GM+RS	105	58.7
		(Aeric Hapluquept)			RS	105	28.2
					GM	105	40.9
					GM+RS	105	46.5
<i>Laboratory data</i>							
35	Philippines	CH ₄ production during incubation (CH ₄ mg kg^{-1} soil, 20°C)					
	Pila:	LiC	No			56	71
					Compo	56	41
					RS	56	371
					GM	56	459
	Maahas:	HC	No			56	1.2
					Compo	56	1.6
					RS	56	57
					GM	56	117
	Luisiana:	HC	No			56	5.7
					Compo	56	5.9
					RS	56	79
					GM	56	160
<i>Inhibited data</i>							
36	Australia	C	Urea 80 decreased from 12.4 g to 3 g CH ₄ $\text{ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ decreased Nitrapyrin and CCC decreased from 15.4 g to .5.8, 2.8 g CH ₄ $\text{ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$				

Study: 1) Cicerone *et al.*, 1983; 2) Seiler *et al.*, 1984; 3) Schutz *et al.*, 1989; 4) Yagi and Minami, 1990; 5) Minami, 1994; 6) Schutz *et al.*, 1990; 7) Khalil and Rasmussen, 1991; 8) Sass *et al.*, 1990; 9) Sass *et al.*, 1991a; 10) Sass *et al.*, 1991b; 11) Lindau *et al.*, 1991; 12) Cicerone *et al.*, 1992; 13) Sass *et al.*, 1992; 14) Yagi and Minami, 1993; 15) Kumagai *et al.*, 1993; 16) Chen *et al.*, 1993; 17) Lindau and Billich, 1993; 18) Lindau, *et al.*, 1993; 19) Yagi *et al.*, 1993; 20) Yagi *et al.*, 1994a; 21) Jermasawadipong *et al.*, 1994; 22) Nugroho *et al.*, 1994; 23) Lindau, 1994; 24) Tsuruta *et al.*, 1994; 25) Parashar *et al.*, 1994; 26) Neue *et al.*, 1994; 27) Cicerone and Shatter, 1981; 28) Khalil *et al.*, 1990; 29) Parashar *et al.*, 1991; 30) Lindau *et al.*, 1990b; 31) Lindau *et al.*, 1990a; 32) Wassmann *et al.*, 1993; 33) Kimura *et al.*, 1992; 34) Lauren and Duxbury, 1993; 35) Tsutsuki and Ponnampetuma, 1987; 36) Keerthisinghe *et al.*, 1993

Grain: Grain yield (g m^{-2}), Days: Number of days that CH₄ actually was measured from the rice paddied.

Compound: compound mineral fertilizer, AP: ammonium phosphate, U: urea

AS: ammonium sulfate

HC: heavy clay, C: clay, LiC: light clay, SiC: silty clay, SCL: sandy clay loam, CL: clay loam, SiCL: silty clay loam, SL: sandy loam, L: loam, SiL: silt loam, LFS: loamy fine sand

RS: rice straw, GM: green manure, Comp: compost, Pasp S: paspalum straw, Barn M: barnyard manure, Rape S: rape straw, Sesba R: Sesbania rostrata, Cow DM: cow dung manure, RSC: rape seed cake

inco: incorporated, rake: raked into the soil, surf: surface applied Int. irr: Intermittently irrigated, irr: irrigated

DS: dry season, WS: wet season

Huang j: Huang jinguang, S63: Sanyou 63

*: not N, total

and the rate of application (0, 60 or 120 Kg N ha^{-1}). High ammonium sulfate and potassium nitrate usage reduced CH₄ emissions by 55 and 59%, respectively, compared to fluxes measured from the high urea application. Urea application recorded the highest emission

rates, followed by potassium nitrate and then ammonium sulfate in low N rate, and followed by ammonium sulfate and then potassium nitrate in high N rate.

Kimura *et al.* [24] measured CH₄ emission rates as affected by the application methods of broadcast-

Table 2. Annual variations in CH₄ emission

Study	Country	Soil	Year	Treatment		Days	Flux (mg m ⁻² h ⁻¹)
				N-fertilizer (kg N ha ⁻¹)	Amendment (t ha ⁻¹)		
3	Italy	SL	1985	AS (inco)	200	109	6.3
			1986	AS (inco)	200	109	5.6
			1985		RS (inco)	6	109
			1986		RS (inco)	6	109
			1985		RS (inco)	12	110
			1986		RS (inco)	12	110
20	Japan	SCL	1991	Compound	90	73	8.4
			1993	Compound	90	131	3.0
14,15	Japan	SCL	1988	Compound	90	118	2.9
			1989	Compound	90	105	7.1
			1990	Compound	90	121	14.0
			1991	Compound	90	106	6.0
			1988	Compound	90	RS	6
			1989	Compound	90	RS	6
			1990	Compound	90	RS	6
			1991	Compound	90	RS	6

Study: See footnotes in Table 1.

Table 3. Methane flux measurements from Texas, USA [48]

Average seasonal CH ₄ emission (g m ⁻²)	Soil clay (%)	Soil type
14	65	Entic Pelludent (Beaumont)
26	35	Typic Pelludent (Lake Charles)
31	25	Vertic Ochraqualf (Bernard-Morey)

ing and foliar spray with a pot experiment. Among the broadcasting treatments, the emission rate for the ammonium sulfate treatment was the lowest, followed by ammonium chloride and then urea. Foliar spray reduced CH₄ emission in each fertilizer treatment compared to broadcasting method, with a reduction of 45, 60, and 20% in ammonium sulfate, ammonium chloride and urea, respectively.

CH₄ emission rates and the method of chemical fertilizer applications

Mineral nitrogen fertilizers are commonly used in rice cultivation to increase yields. Schutz *et al.* [49] compared CH₄ emission rates associated with the method of nitrogen fertilizer application, including raked into

the soil, incorporated into the soil and applied to the surface, using urea and ammonium sulfate. The influence of fertilization with urea and ammonium sulfate on CH₄ emission is heavily dependent on the mode of fertilizer application. In general, CH₄ emission rate were much higher in the fields with surface application than in raked and incorporated applications as shown in Table 4.

In the pot experiments, Kimura *et al.* [24] compared CH₄ emission rates of various topdressing of nitrogen fertilizer applications, such as broadcasting and foliar spray, using with ammonium sulfate, ammonium chloride and urea. Although foliar spraying decreased CH₄ emission compared with broadcasting on the soil, grain yield of the former also decreased. The emission

Table 4. CH₄ emission rates on the methods of chemical fertilizer application [49]

Application Mode	Fertilizer	Application Rates (kg N ha ⁻¹)	Days	Flux (mg m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)
raked into the soil	Urea	200	118	9.6
incorporated	Urea	200	113	7.9
surface applied	Urea	200	113	15.8
raked into the soil	(NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄	200	109	5.6
incorporated	(NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄	200	118	6.7
surface applied	(NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄	200	113	12.5

rate was lowest with ammonium sulfate, followed by ammonium chloride and urea fertilization plots by both broadcasting and foliar spray as shown in Table 1.

CH₄ emission rates and mineral fertilizer and amendment applications

The production and emission of CH₄ from rice fields to the atmosphere is the result of a complex array of soil processes involving plant-microbe interactions. Major substrates for the methanogenic bacteria are derived from root exudates, lysates, litter, and to a lesser extent, dead organic material such as derived from incorporated vegetation [43,45]. The substrates from organic matter in the soil are characterized by Yagi and Minami [60] as readily mineralizable carbon (RMC) and are the main factors affecting CH₄ emission from flooded soils. RMC is defined as the total amount of CO₂ carbon and CH₄ carbon produced after 28 days of fresh soil incubation. Carbon dioxide and CH₄ are produced by microorganisms present in the anaerobic paddy soil by the degradation of plant-derived material. A small content of specific low molecular weight organic substrates are produced in the process of mineralization that are in turn converted to CH₄ by methanogenic bacteria. Thus variations in the rate of CH₄ production ultimately may be dependent on the kind and rate of organic matter applied to rice paddy fields.

Additions of rice straw to flooded rice paddy fields has been shown to greatly increase CH₄ emissions. Rice straw applied to Italian and Japanese rice fields increased CH₄ emission rates by factors of 2 to 4 times compared with control plots [49,60]. Although applications of rice straw to Japanese rice fields strongly increased CH₄ emission, application of compost slightly increased the CH₄ emission [47,60]. Grass straw applied to Texas rice fields also increased CH₄ emission, but decreased grain yield [45]. Added organic

matter to California paddy fields was the major factor affecting methane emissions, showing that the total methane emission over the growing season varied from 1.2 g CH₄ m⁻² (with no added organic matter) to 58.2 g CH₄ m⁻² (with largest organic matter treatments) [9].

Many other experiments [5,16,31,34,35,59,61] also showed that the application of organic matters strongly increased CH₄ emission from rice paddy fields. The emission rates depend on the amount and kind of organic materials.

Tsutsuki and Ponnampetuma [56] measured CH₄ and CO₂ formed from three added organic materials, compost, rice straw, and green manure, in 8 weeks of submergence at 20 and 30°C under laboratory experiments. The amount of CH₄ produced from green manure is the highest, followed by rice straw and then compost. Methane production may depend on the content of RMC in the organic matter.

CH₄ emission rates and wet-dry season

Neue *et al.* [34] measured methane fluxes in wetland rice fields of Philippines and observed that methane emission fluxes are higher in the dry than in the wet season. The elevated methane production and emission in the dry season was related to higher solar radiation and produced better rice growth. Yagi *et al.* [62,64] reported that there were differences in the emission rates of CH₄ between dry and wet seasons. For example, the estimated emission rates for one cultivation period were 19.5 and 32.2 mg m⁻² h⁻¹ in dry and wet season, respectively at Suphan Buri, Thailand.

CH₄ emission rates and rice planting date

Sass and Fisher [48] showed CH₄ emission rates are dependent on rice planting date as shown in Table 5. Rice fields were planted on three separate dates: April

Table 5. Solar radiation, seasonal methane flux, and rice yield for three different planting dates, without and with incorporated straw [48]

Planting date, straw addition	Average solar radiation ($\text{Ei m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$)	Seasonal CH_4 emission (g m^{-2})	Rice grain yield (g m^{-2})
April 13, 1990			
No straw	49.3	37.3	994
Straw	49.3	47.9	846
May 18, 1990			
No straw	44.2	22.8	850
Straw	44.2	35.6	784
June 18, 1990			
No straw	39.2	22.0	770
Straw	39.2	23.5	668

13, May 18 and June 18 of 1990 to create a range in plant and soil temperatures, solar radiation and microbial substrates. Experiments were performed on a Verland silty clay loam in Texas. They pointed out that CH_4 emission rates, measured through the cultivation period, varied markedly with planting date and straw addition. The highest emission rate originated from the earliest planted straw-supplemented field. In general, CH_4 emission decreased with later plantings that received less solar radiation. Annual emission rates of CH_4 and rice grain yields from individual fields were positively correlated with accumulated solar radiation for both straw-incorporated and control plots.

CH_4 emission rates on water treatment

Sass *et al.* [46,48] investigated the effects of different water management programs on CH_4 and rice grain yield using four treatments: normal permanent flood (49 days post planting), normal flood with mid-season drainage aeration, normal flood with multiple drainage aeration, and late flood (76 days post planting). Methane emission rates varied markedly with water regime, showing the lowest seasonal total emission ($1.2 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$, $0.6 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$) with the multiple-aeration treatment and the highest ($14.9 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$, $6.3 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$) with the late flood as shown in Table 1. These results indicate that, with sufficient water to allow for draining and reflooding the rice fields at intervals of 2–3 weeks, CH_4 emissions from flooded rice fields can be essentially eliminated without seriously affecting rice grain yield.

Minami [33] summarized the results of water percolation effect on methane emission in Japan. The CH_4

flux from the lysimeter without water percolation plot (0 mm per day) increased with progressive reduction of soil and the increase of soil temperature. Compared with the case of 0 mm per day per plot, the fluxes from the lysimeters with water percolation, even at the rate of 5 mm per day per plot, were significantly reduced. In the plot of 20 mm per day percolation, the flux was maintained at quite a low level throughout the flooding period. During the 1989 cultivation period, emission rates of CH_4 from the lysimeter paddy fields percolated at the rates of 0, 5 and 20 mm per day were 2.6, 1.4 and $0.1 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{per h}$, respectively.

Yagi *et al.* [63] also investigated the effects of different water management programs on CH_4 emission and rice grain yield under field experiments using an automated chamber method. Compared with the case of continuously flooded plots, the fluxes from the intermittently drained plots (1991: 4 and 6 days, 1993: 7 days and interval irrigation) were significantly reduced. During the cultivation periods, CH_4 emission rates from the continuously flooded plot and intermittently irrigated plot were 8.4 and $4.9 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$ in 1991, and 3.0 and $1.7 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$ in 1993, respectively.

The results of these experiments suggest that CH_4 emission from paddy fields is able to be controlled with water management.

CH_4 emission rates and other chemical amendments

One of our continuing goals is to characterize all factors that influence the emission of CH_4 from rice fields. To attain the goal there is one way to use the chemical amendments application to rice fields.

Lindau *et al.* [30] measured CH_4 fluxes associated with the application of a common soil amendment, calcium sulfate, at rates of 0, 1 and 2 t ha^{-1} to flooded rice fields treated with urea (128 kg ha^{-1}). They found that the low and high rate of CaSO_4 reduced CH_4 emission 29 and 46%, respectively, compared to control fields as shown in Table 1.

The effectiveness of wax-coated carbide (as a slow-release source of acetylene) and nitrapyrin in inhibiting emission of CH_4 was evaluated in a microplot study with dry-seeded, flooded rice grown on a grey clay in Australia [17]. Their results showed that the application of nitrapyrin and wax-coated calcium carbide significantly reduced CH_4 emission by the flooded soil from 15.4 g $\text{ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ in the control treatment to 5.8 and 2.8 g $\text{CH}_4 \text{ ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$, respectively.

CH₄ emission rates and plant growth

Sass and Fisher [48] summarized the relationship between CH_4 emission and biomass production of rice for different soils over a period of three years, for three different planting dates without and with incorporated straw (Table 5), for various straw residue treatments (Table 6), and for various water management procedures (Table 7) [44,45,46]. Annual emission rates of CH_4 and the amount of rice grain yield from individual fields were positively correlated with accumulated solar radiation for both straw-incorporated and control plots. Straw incorporation resulted in decreased grain yield and increased CH_4 emission in all three fields. They postulate that solar radiation and hence photosynthetic activity of the rice plant correlates with CH_4 production and grain yield through partitioning of non-structural carbohydrates to the root system and grain panicle [48].

Four water management schedules were investigated as described before [48]: normal permanent flood with a mid-season drainage aeration, normal flood drainage aeration of 2–3 days each, and late flood as shown in Table 7. Methane emission rates varied markedly with water regime showing the lowest seasonal total emission with multiple aeration. The multiple-aeration treatment, relative to conventional floodwater treatment, reduced CH_4 emission by almost 90% with no decrease in grain yield in return for a four-fold increase in water usage.

Although there are some field experiments that investigated the relationship between CH_4 emission and grain yield in China, Japan, Thailand and Indonesia [5,16,24,35,63], the results are not necessarily in agree-

ment. In general, when organic matter was applied to the fields, CH_4 emission rates strongly increased, but the rice yield was not higher compared to chemical fertilizer application.

Mitigation of methane flux from rice paddy fields

Human requirements for food and fiber have led to widespread conversion of natural ecosystems to agricultural use. This extensive land use change, coupled with agricultural production practices and other anthropogenic effects, has had a substantial impact on the biogeochemical cycles that determine atmospheric concentrations of CO_2 , CH_4 and N_2O [14]. Among the activities contributing to current anthropogenic emissions of CH_4 , IPCC [15] estimated the global emission rate from paddy fields ranged from 20 to 150 Tg yr^{-1} , averaging 60 Tg yr^{-1} , and accounts for about 5–30% of total emission from all sources.

The IGAC CH_4 from rice paddy working group evaluated possibilities for reducing CH_4 emissions in the National Inventories of CH_4 and N_2O Workshop [23]. They concluded that four principles must be followed in recommending or testing any proposal to reduce CH_4 emissions from rice agriculture:

- 1) The yield should not be decreased, and probably increased, by a mitigation practice.
- 2) There should be some additional benefit to the farmer, such as better water utilization or reducing of labor.
- 3) The rice varieties used should be desired by local consumers.
- 4) The mitigation practice should not increase emissions of other greenhouse gases, particularly N_2O .

The factors of CH_4 emission control also form the basis for development of practices to decrease CH_4 emissions. Currently available technology includes floodwater control and type of N fertilizers. It seems that different rice cultivars have different capacities for CH_4 emissions as shown in Table 1. Experiments using ammonium sulfate and coated calcium carbide decrease CH_4 emissions [30]. Fertilizing with ammonium sulfate supplies is to supply N and sulfate which maintains the soil Eh above -200mV because CH_4 is produced at less than -200mV of soil Eh. Coated calcium carbide is used to slowly produce small quantities of acetylene over time [1,4,17] to limit nitrification and CH_4 production.

Table 6. Seasonal CH₄ flux, rice yield and aboveground biomass production for various straw residue treatments [48]

Resident treatment	Seasonal CH ₄ emission (g m ⁻²)	Rice grain yield (g m ⁻²)	Total aboveground biomass (g m ⁻²)
Fallow (Control)	13.11	832	2344
Late tillage	15.81	803	2290
Not tillage	16.51	853	2412
Burned straw	18.01	859	2244
Early tillage	14.22	874	2240

Table 7. Seasonal CH₄ flux, rice yield and aboveground biomass production for various water management procedures [48]

Water treatment	Seasonal CH ₄ emission (g m ⁻²)	Rice grain yield (g m ⁻²)	Total aboveground biomass (g m ⁻²)
Late flood	14.98	640	1610
Normal flood	9.27	825	2410
Mid season aeration	4.86	820	2346
Multiple aeration	1.15	813	2428

Conclusion

Recent research has begun to identify various agricultural management practices that could reduce CH₄ emission from rice paddy fields. Table 1 shows that identifying and controlling the effects described above has the potential to reduce CH₄ emission from rice cultivation: the form and amount of nitrogen and other chemical fertilizers, the method of fertilizer applications, the application of another chemical amendments, water management, cultivar selection and cultivation practices. However, we need much additional research to establish and demonstrate practices that will maintain or increase rice productivity using nitrogen fertilizer while reducing CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation.

References

1. Banerjee NK and Mosier AR (1989) Coated calcium carbide as a nitrification inhibitor in upland and flooded soils. *J Indian Soc Soil Sci* 37: 306-313
2. Bingemer HG and Crutzen PJ (1987) The production of methane from solid wastes. *J Geophys Res* 92(D): 2181-2187
3. Blake DR and Rowland FS (1988) Continuing worldwide increase in tropospheric methane, 1978 to 1987. *Science* 239: 1129-1131
4. Bronson KF and Mosier AR (1991) Effect of encapsulated calcium carbide on dinitrogen, nitrous oxide, methane and carbon dioxide emission from flooded rice. *Biol Fertil Soils* 11: 116-120
5. Chen Z, Li D, Shao K and Wang B (1993) Features of CH₄ emission from rice paddy fields in Beijing and Nanjing. *Chemosphere* 26: 239-245
6. Cicerone RJ and Shetter JD (1981) Sources of atmospheric methane: measurements in rice paddies and a discussion. *J Geophys Res* 86: 7203-7209
7. Cicerone RJ, Shetter JD and Delwiche CC (1983) Seasonal variation of methane flux from a California rice paddy. *J Geophys Res* 88: 11022-11024
8. Cicerone RJ and RS Oremland (1988) Biogeochemical aspects of atmospheric methane. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 2: 299-327
9. Cicerone RJ, Delwiche CC, Tyler SC and Zimmerman PR (1992) Methane emissions from California rice paddies with varied treatments. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 6: 233-248
10. Craig H and Chou CC (1982) Methane: the record in polar ice core. *Geophys Res Lett* 9: 1221-1224
11. Dickison RE and Cicerone RJ (1986) Future global warming from atmospheric trace gases. *Nature* 319: 109-115
12. Ehhalt DH and Schmidt U (1978) Sources and sinks of atmospheric methane. *Pure Appl Geophys* 116: 452-464
13. FAO (1989) Production Yearbook
14. International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (1990) Climate Change, the IPCC Scientific Assessment. Houghton JT,

- Jenkins GT and Ephraums JJ (eds.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
15. International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (1992) Climate Change 1992, The Supplementary Reports to The IPCC Scientific Assessment. Houghton JT, Callander BA and Varney SK (eds.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
 16. Jermasawatdipong P, Murase J, Parabuddham P, Hasathon Y, Chinda M, Chaiwatana B, Khomthong N, Sattawatananon S, Naklang K, Watanabe A, Haraguchi H and Kimura M (1994) Methane emission from plots with differences in fertilizer application in Thai paddy fields. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 40: 63-71
 17. Keerthisinghe DG, Freney JR and Mosier AR (1993) Effect of wax-coated calcium carbide and nitraphyrin on nitrogen loss and methane emission from dry-seeded flooded rice. *Biol Fert Soils* 16: 71-75
 18. Khalil MAK and Rasmussen RA (1983) Sources, sinks and seasonal cycles of atmospheric methane. *J Geophys Res* 88: 5131-5144
 19. Khalil MAK, Rasmussen RA, Wang MX and Ren L (1990) Emission of trace gases from Chinese rice fields and biogas generators: CH₄, N₂O, CO₂, chlorocarbons and hydrocarbons. *Chemosphere* 20: 206-207
 20. Khalil MAK and Rasmussen RA (1990) Atmospheric methane: Recent global trends. *Environ Sci Technol* 24: 549-553
 21. Khalil MAK and Rasmussen RA (1991) Methane emissions from rice fields in China. *Environ Sci Technol* 25: 979-981
 22. Khalil MAK and Rasmussen RA (1993) Decreasing trend of methane: unpredictability of future concentrations. *Chemosphere* 26: 803-814
 23. Khalil MAK (1993) Working group report: methane emissions from rice fields. In: van Amstel AR (ed.) Methane and Nitrous Oxide: methods in national emissions inventories and options for control Proceedings, pp. 239-244. RIVM, de Bilt, the Netherlands
 24. Kimura M, Asai K, Watanabe A, Murase J and Kuwatsuka S (1992) Suppression of methane fluxes from flooded paddy soil with rice plants by foliar spray of nitrogen fertilizers. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 38: 735-740
 25. Kumagai K, Yagi K, Tsuruta H and Minami K (1993) Emission, changes in production and oxidation of methane from Japanese rice paddy fields. *Jap J Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 64: 368-376 (*In Japanese*)
 26. Lauren JG and Duxbury JM (1993) Methane emissions from flooded rice amended with a green manure. In: Agricultural Ecosystem Effects on Trace Gases and global Climate Change, pp 182-192. ASA Special Publication Number 55, Madison, Wisc
 27. Lindau CW, Delaune RD, Patrick Jr WH and Bollich PK (1990a) Fertilizer effects on dinitrogen, nitrous oxide, and methane emissions from lowland rice. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 54: 1789-1794
 28. Lindau CW, Patrick Jr WH, Delaune RD and Reddy KR (1990b) Rate of accumulation and emission of N₂, N₂O and CH₄ from flooded rice soil. *Plant and Soil* 129: 269-276
 29. Lindau CW, Bollich PK, Delaune RD, Patrick Jr WH and Law VJ (1991) Effect of urea fertilizer and environmental factors on CH₄ emissions from a Louisiana, USA rice field. *Plant and Soil* 136: 195-203
 30. Lindau CW, Alford DP, Bollich PK and Linscombe SD (1993) Inhibition of methane evolution by calcium sulfate addition to flooded rice. *Plant and Soil* 158: 299-301
 31. Lindau CW and Bollich PK (1993) Methane emissions from Louisiana first and ratoon crop rice. *Soil Sci* 156: 42-48
 32. Lindau CW (1994) Methane emissions from Louisiana rice fields amended with nitrogen fertilizers. *Soil Biol Biochem* 26: 353-359
 33. Minami K (1994) Methane from rice production. *Fert Res* 37: 167-180
 34. Neue HU, Latin RS, Wassmann R, Aduna JB, Alberto CR and Andales MJF (1994) Methane emission from rice soils of the Philippines. In: Minami K, Mosier A and Sass R (eds.) CH₄ and N₂O; Global Emissions and Controls from Rice Fields and Other Agricultural and Industrial Sources, pp 55-63. Yokendo, Tokyo
 35. Nugroho SG, Lumbanraja J, Suprpto H, Sunyoto, Ardjasa WS, Haraguchi H and Kimura M (1994) Methane emission from Indonesian paddy field with several fertilizer treatments. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 41 (*In press*)
 36. Parashar DC, Prabhat JR, Gupta K and Singh N (1991) Parameters affecting methane emission from paddy fields. *Indian J Radio Space Physics* 20: 12-17
 37. Parashar DC *et al.* (1994) Methane Budget from Indian paddy fields. In: Minami K, Mosier A and Sass R (eds.) CH₄ and N₂O; Global Emissions and Controls from Rice Fields and Other Agricultural and Industrial Sources, pp 27-39. Yokendo, Tokyo
 38. Ramanathan V, Cicerone RJ, Singh HB and Kiehl JT (1985) Trace gas trends and their potential role in climate change. *J Geophys Res* 90 (D): 5547-5566
 39. Rasmussen RA and Khalil MAK (1981) Increase in the concentration of atmospheric methane. *Atmos Environ* 15: 883-886
 40. Rasmussen RA and Khalil MAK (1984) Atmospheric methane in the recent and ancient atmospheres: concentrations, trends, and interhemispheric gradient. *J Geophys Res* 89(D): 11599-11605
 41. Rowland FS (1991) Stratospheric ozone in the 21st century, The chlorofluorocarbon problem. *Environ Sci Technol* 25: 622-628
 42. Rudolph J. (1994) Anomalous methane. *Nature* 368: 19-20
 43. Sass RL, Fisher FM and Harcombe PA (1990) Methane production and emission in a Texas rice field. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 4: 47-68
 44. Sass RL, Fisher FM, Harcombe PA and Turner FT (1991a) Mitigation of methane emissions from rice fields: Possible adverse effects of incorporated rice straw. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 5: 275-287
 45. Sass RL, Fisher FM, Turner FT and Jund MF (1991b) Methane emission from rice fields as influenced by solar radiation, temperature, and straw incorporation. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 5: 335-350
 46. Sass RL, Fisher FM, Wang YB, Turner FT and Jund MF (1992) Methane emission from rice fields: The effect of floodwater management. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 6: 249-262
 47. Sass R, Denmead OT, Conrad R, Freney J, Klug M, Minami K, Mosier A, Neue HU, Rennenberg H, Su WH and Wang MX (1992) Exchange of methane and other trace gases in rice cultivation. *Ecol Bull* 42: 199-206
 48. Sass RL and Fisher FM (1994) CH₄ emission from paddy fields in the United States gulf coast area. In: Minami K, Mosier A and Sass R (eds.) CH₄ and N₂O; Global Emissions and Controls from Rice Fields and Other Agricultural and Industrial Sources, pp 65-77. Yokendo, Tokyo
 49. Schutz H, Holzapfel-Pschorn, Conrad R, Rennenberg H and Seiler W (1989) A 3-year continuous record on the influence of daytime, season and fertilizer treatment on methane emission rates from an Italia rice paddy. *J Geophys Res* 94: 16405-16416

50. Schutz H, Seiler H and Rennenberg H (1990) Soil and land use related sources and sinks of methane (CH_4) in the context of the global methane budget. In: Bouwman AF (ed), pp 269-285. J Wiley and Sons, New York
51. Seiler W, Holzapfel-Pdchorn A, Conrad R and Scharffe D (1984) Methane emissions from rice paddies. *J Atmos Chem* 1: 241-268
52. Sheppard JC, Westberg H, Hopper JF, Ganesan K and Zimmerman P (1982) Inventory of global methane sources and their production rates. *J Geophys Res* 87(C): 1305-1312
53. Steele JC, Westberg EJ, Lang PM, Tans PP, Martin RC and Masarie KA (1992) Slowing down of the global accumulation of atmospheric methane during the 1980s. *Nature* 358: 313-316
54. Thompson AM and Cicerone RJ (1986) Possible perturbations to atmospheric CO , CH_4 and OH . *J Geophys Res* 91(D): 10858-10864
55. Tsuruta H, Kanda K and Yagi K (1994) Measurement of trace gas exchange between rice paddy fields and the atmosphere through all seasons. *Res Rep Div Environ Planning, Nat Inst Agro-Environ Sci* 10: 43-56 (*In Japanese*)
56. Tsutsuki K and Ponnampetuma FN (1987) Behavior of anaerobic decomposition products in submerged soils. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 33: 13-33
57. Wang MX, Dai A, Shangguan X, Ren L, Shen R, Seiler W, Rasmussen RA and Khalil MAK (1994) Sources of methane in China. In: Minami K, Mosier A and Sass R (eds) CH_4 and N_2O : Global Emissions and Controls from Rice Fields and Other Agricultural and Industrial Sources, pp 9-26. Yokendo, Tokyo
58. Wang WC, Yung YL, Lacis AA, Mo JE and Hansen JE (1976) Greenhouse effects due to man-made perturbations of trace gases. *Science* 194: 685-690
59. Wassmann R, Papen H and Rennenberg H (1993) Methane emission from rice paddies and possible mitigation strategies. *Chemosphere* 26: 201-217
60. Yagi K and Minami K (1990) Effect of organic matter application on methane emission from some Japanese paddy fields. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 36: 599-610
61. Yagi K and Minami K (1993) Spatial and temporal variations of methane flux from a rice paddy field. In: Oremland RS (ed) *Biogeochemistry and Global Change*. pp 353-368. Chapman & Hall, New York
62. Yagi K, Chairaj P, Tsuruta H, Cholitkul W and Minami K (1993) Methane emission from rice paddy fields in the central plain of Thailand. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 40: 29-37
63. Yagi K, Tsuruta H and Kanda K (1994a) Effect of water management on methane emission from rice paddy field. *Res Rep Div Environ Planning, Nat Inst Agro-Environ Sci* 10: 61-70 (*In Japanese*)
64. Yagi K, Tsuruta H and Minami K (1994b) Methane emission from Japanese and Thai paddy. In: Minami K, Mosier A and Sass R (eds) CH_4 and N_2O : Global Emissions and Controls from Rice Fields and Other Agricultural and Industrial Sources, pp 41-46. Yokendo, Tokyo