Managing nitrogen for sustainable development

Xin Zhang^{1,2,3}, Eric A. Davidson³, Denise L. Mauzerall^{1,4}, Tim D. Searchinger¹,

Patrice Dumas^{5,6}, Ye Shen⁷

1. Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
2. Princeton Environmental Institute, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
3. Appalachian Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Frostburg, MD, USA
4. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
5. Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD), Paris, France
6. Centre International de Recherche sur l'Environnement et le Developpement (CIRED), Paris, France
7. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

18 **Preface**

19 Improvements in nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) in crop production are critical for
20 addressing the triple challenges of food security, environmental degradation, and
21 climate change. Such improvements depend not only on technological innovation,
22 but also on poorly understood socio-economic factors. Here we analyze historical
23 patterns of agricultural NUE and find a broad range of national pathways of
24 agricultural development and related pollution. We estimate examples of NUE and
25 yield targets by geographic region and crop type required to meet global food
26 demand and environmental stewardship goals in 2050. Furthermore, we discuss
27 socio-economic policies and technological innovations that may help achieve them.
28

29 **The nitrogen challenge**

30 More than half the world's people are nourished by crops grown with
31 synthetic nitrogen (N) fertilizers, which were made possible in the early 20th
32 century by the invention of the Haber-Bosch process to reduce atmospheric
33 nitrogen gas (N₂) to reactive forms of N (ref. 1). A reliable supply of N and other
34 nutrients essential for plant growth have allowed farmers to greatly increase crop
35 production per unit land over the past 100 years, thus promoting economic
36 development, allowing larger populations, and sparing forests that would likely
37 otherwise have been converted to agriculture to meet food demand². Despite this
38 progress, nearly one billion people remain undernourished³. In addition, the global
39 population will increase by 2-3 billion by 2050, implying that demands for N
40 fertilizers and agricultural land are likely to grow substantially^{2,4}. While there are
41 many causes of undernourishment and poverty, careful N management will be
42 needed to nourish a growing population while minimizing adverse environmental
43 and health impacts.

44 Unfortunately, unintended adverse environmental and human health impacts
45 result from reactive N escaping agricultural soils, including groundwater
46 contamination, eutrophication of freshwater and estuarine ecosystems,
47 tropospheric pollution related to nitrogen oxides and ammonia gas emissions, and
48 accumulation of the potent greenhouse gas and stratospheric ozone depleting
49 substance, nitrous oxide⁵⁻⁹ (Fig. 1). Some of these environmental consequences,
50 such as climate change and tropospheric ozone pollution, can also negatively affect

crop yields^{10,11} and human health¹². Hence, too little N means lower crop productivity, poor human nutrition, and soil degradation¹³, but too much N leads to environmental pollution and its concomitant threats to agricultural productivity, food security, ecosystem health, human health, and economic prosperity.

Improving nitrogen use efficiency (NUE), namely the fraction of N input harvested as product, is one of the most effective means of increasing crop productivity while decreasing environmental degradation^{14,15}. Indeed, NUE has been proposed as an indicator for assessing progress in achieving the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)¹⁶. Fortunately, we have a large and growing knowledge base and technological capacity for managing N in agriculture¹⁷, and awareness is growing among both agricultural and environmental stakeholder groups that N use is both essential and problematic¹⁵. This growing recognition from multiple stakeholders and ongoing advances in agricultural technology are creating a possible turning point where knowledge-based N management could advance substantially throughout the world. However, improving NUE requires more than technical knowledge. Poorly understood cultural, social, and economic incentives for and impediments to farmer adoption of NUE technologies and best management practices are also needed and are only beginning to receive attention¹⁵.

Here we analyze historical patterns (1961 – 2011) of agricultural N use in 113 countries to demonstrate a broad range of pathways of socio-economic development and related N pollution. Our analysis suggests that many countries show a pattern similar to an Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), in which N

pollution first increases and then decreases with economic growth¹⁸⁻²¹. So far, most EKC analyses have focused on pollution from industrial and transportation sectors^{19,22,23}; the present study is one of few to consider agricultural N pollution in the EKC context^{24,25}, and to apply it globally. However, the patterns of N pollution are neither automatic nor inevitable. Socio-economic circumstances and policies vary widely among countries, affecting factors such as fertilizer to crop price ratios and crop mixes, which, as our analysis shows, influence the turning points of the EKC. While technological and socio-economic opportunities for NUE improvement vary regionally, our analysis shows that average global NUE in crop production needs to improve from ~0.4 to ~0.7 to meet the dual goals of food security and environmental stewardship in 2050.

Patterns of nitrogen pollution

As a useful indicator of potential losses of N to the environment from agricultural soils^{26,27}, N surplus (N_{sur}) is defined as the sum of N inputs (fertilizer, manure, biologically fixed N, and N deposition in kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) minus N outputs^{28,29} (the N removed within the harvested crop products, N_{yield} in kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, Fig. 1). Some of the N_{sur} recycles within the soil, but most N_{sur} is lost to the environment over the long term, because the difference between annual inputs and outputs is usually large relative to changes in soil N stocks. The related term of NUE, also called the output-input ratio of N, is mathematically defined as the dimensionless ratio of the sum of all N removed in harvest crop products (outputs or N_{yield}) divided by the sum of all N inputs to a cropland^{30,31} (Fig. 1). The N_{sur} , NUE, and

N_{yield} terms can serve as environmental pollution, agricultural efficiency, and food security targets^{32,33}, respectively, which are inherently interconnected through their mathematical definitions³³ and their real world consequences (Fig. 1).

Variable turning points on the Kuznets curve

As an indicator of the extent of environmental degradation, N_{sur} aggregated to a national average for all crops ($\text{kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) is closely related to income growth, mainly in two contrasting pathways: On one hand, increasing income enables demand for more food consumption³³, which drives up both production intensity and extensity and consequently results in more N lost to the environment. On the other hand, increasing income is often accompanied by a societal demand for improved environmental quality, such as clean water and clean air, and is also accompanied by access to advanced technology^{18,19}. Consequently, governments may impose regulatory policies or offer subsidies and incentives targeted at reducing local or regional N pollution, and farmers may adopt more efficient technologies.

Therefore, we hypothesize that N_{sur} follows a pattern similar to the EKC: N_{sur} increases with income growth and the quest for food security at early stages of national agricultural development (first phase), but then decreases with further income growth during a more affluent stage (second phase), eventually approaching an asymptote determined by the theoretical limit of the NUE of the crop system (third phase, Fig. 2). Sustainable intensification of agriculture has been advanced as the key to achieving the second phase of the EKC, including use of cultivars best adapted to the local soil and climate conditions, improved water management,

balancing N application with other nutrient amendments, precision timing and placement of fertilizer and manure applications to meet crop demands, the use of enhanced efficiency fertilizers, and support tools to calculate proper dosing^{14,17,34}. While N_{sur} is the EKC environmental degradation indicator, the mathematical relationship between N_{sur} and NUE results in nearly mirror images in Fig. 2 (although see Section 1 in Supplementary Information for a discussion of situations in which N_{sur} and NUE can both increase simultaneously).

Among the three phases of the N_{sur} trend, it is the second phase of sustainable intensification with increasing affluence that is of greatest contemporary interest, while the first phase of agricultural expansion is well documented^{30,31}, and the third phase cannot yet be evaluated. So far, no country has yet approached the third phase, nor do we know how close to 100% efficiency the use of N inputs could become. For the first phase, as incomes rise, virtually all countries initially increase fertilizer use, N_{yield} , and N_{sur} while NUE decreases^{30,31}. To test the existence of the second phase, we examine whether the relationship between GDP per capita and N surplus breaks away from the linearly (or exponentially) increasing trend and follows more of a bell-shaped pattern over the long term.

We tested the existence of a sustainable intensification phase (or an EKC pattern) with a five-decade record (1961-2011) of N_{sur} and GDP per capita^{28,35-40} with a fixed effects model⁴¹⁻⁴³ across 113 countries for which sufficient data were available and a regression model for each individual country^{18,44-46} (See Sections 1 and 2 in Supplementary Information). The fixed effects model shows a significant

quadratic relationship between GDP per capita and N_{sur} ($p < 0.001$, Supplementary Table 9). Regressions between GDP per capita and N_{sur} for each individual country fall into five response types (examples of each group are shown in Fig. 3). Of the 113 countries, 56 countries (Group 1) show bell-shaped relationships between N_{sur} and GDP per capita, indicating that N_{sur} increased and then leveled off or decreased as economic development proceeded, as expected for an EKC (two examples are illustrated in Fig. 3a). Those 56 countries account for about 87% of N fertilizer consumption and about 70% of harvested area of all 113 countries. These data provide support for an EKC pattern for N pollution from agriculture, although as we show below, the potential causes of EKC shapes and turning points are complex. Furthermore for 28 of the 56 countries, by 2011 the rate of increase in N_{sur} had only slowed or leveled off and had not yet actually decreased, indicating likely but still uncertain conformance with an EKC (Supplementary Tables 5 and 6).

Countries with a linear or accelerating increase in N_{sur} (Group 3 and most countries in Group 2) as GDP per capita grew have not yet approached an EKC turning point (e.g., Fig. 3b), but could still follow an EKC in the future as their N input growth slows and NUE increases. Most countries showing an insignificant relationship between N_{sur} and GDP per capita (Group 4) or with a negative N_{sur} (Group 5) have had such little income growth and use so little N that the EKC concept cannot be evaluated yet due to limited change in the country's GDP per capita (e.g., Fig. 3b).

Classic empirical studies on EKC, such as Grossman and Krueger (ref. 19), have been criticized due to concerns regarding statistical analyses of time series

data that may be non-stationary⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹. Therefore, we examined the stationarity of our data (Supplementary Table 7) and used the Autoregressive Distributed Lag modeling approach (ARDL)⁵⁰, which is the most frequently used method for the cointegration test in EKC empirical studies published in the last decade⁴³, to test cointegration on a subset of the data. The ARDL regression models showed the same long-term relationships between N_{sur} and GDP per capita as presented above for all tested countries (Supplementary Table 8). The application of the ARDL method in EKC studies has also been criticized recently for including the quadratic term in the cointegration test, and some new methods have been proposed^{51,52}. Further evaluation is needed on the limitations and performance of the ARDL and newly proposed methods for EKC analyses.

Another common criticism of the EKC concept is that the turning point for transitioning to declining environmental degradation is highly variable among pollutants and among countries^{18,53,54}. Consistent with those observations, no specific value of GDP per capita was a good predictor of turning points for N_{sur} on the EKC among countries in the present study. For example, N_{sur} in Germany and France started to decline when GDP per capita reached about \$25,000 in the 1980s, while N_{sur} in the USA leveled off and started to decline more recently when GDP per capita reached about \$40,000. Our analysis also shows that countries have widely different values of NUE and N_{sur} even when yields are similar. Some of this variation is likely due to underlying biophysical conditions, such as rainfall variability and soil quality, which influence crop choices, yield responses, and NUE.

However, cultural, social, technological, economic and policy factors also likely affect the turning points on the EKC trajectory of each country.

The turning point in European Union (EU) countries appears to have been driven at least in part by policies⁵⁵. Beginning in the late 1980s and through the early 2000s, increases in NUE and decreases in N_{sur} in several EU countries coincided with changes in the EU Common Agricultural Policy, which reduced crop subsidies, and adoption of the Nitrates Directive, which limited manure application rates on cropland^{56,57}. Relying mostly on volunteer approaches in the USA, the leveling off and modest decrease in N_{sur} since the 1990s is largely the result of increasing crop yields while holding N inputs steady (Fig. 4a), which has resulted from improved crop varieties, increased irrigation and other technological improvements^{57,58}. A few state regulatory programs have required nutrient management plans, placed limitations on fertilizer application dates and amounts, and required soil and plant testing, with varying degrees of success⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰. Concerns about water and air quality, estuarine hypoxic zones, stratospheric ozone depletion, and climate change have also stimulated many outreach efforts by governments, fertilizer industry groups, retailers, and environmental organizations to provide farmers with information, training and innovative financial incentives to voluntarily improve NUE (refs 15,59,61,62).

Fertilizer to crop price ratios

Policy can impact NUE not only through regulation and outreach, but also by affecting prices at the farm gate. The ratio of fertilizer to crop prices (R_{fc}) has been widely used in combination with data on yield responses to fertilizer application to

210 advise farmers on fertilizer application rates that yield optimal economic returns⁶³.
 211 ⁶⁵. In addition to influencing fertilizer application rates, R_{fc} also affects farmer
 212 decisions regarding their choice of technologies and practices for nutrient
 213 management, all of which affect NUE and N_{sur} (ref. 33). We tested whether the
 214 influence of R_{fc} appears at the national level using two methods: one examines the
 215 correlation coefficient of R_{fc} and NUE for individual countries, and the other applies
 216 a fixed effects model to all data to test the correlation between R_{fc} and NUE with
 217 and without considering GDP per capita and crop mix (see Section 2.3 in
 218 Supplementary Information). Because both the fertilizer and crop prices are at the
 219 farm gate, they include the effects of government subsidies³⁵. The results for maize,
 220 for which the most data are available, indicate that the fertilizer to maize price ratio
 221 is positively correlated with NUE using both statistical approaches (Supplementary
 222 Table 12). We also found that maize prices are linearly correlated with prices of
 223 most major crops, so we infer that the fertilizer to maize price ratio is likely a good
 224 index for the long-term trend of R_{fc} for all crops. Indeed, we found a significant
 225 positive correlation between historical values of R_{fc} for maize and the NUE
 226 aggregated for all other crops. Moreover, this correlation is still significant after
 227 adjusting for the effect of GDP per capita and crop mix (Supplementary Table 11).
 228 Increases in R_{fc} since the 1990s, in both France and the USA (Fig. 4c),
 229 coincided with increases in NUE (ref. 57) and may have affected the EKC turning
 230 point. At the other extreme, both China and India have had declining values of R_{fc}
 231 (Fig. 4c), owing to heavily subsidized fertilizer prices^{25,66}. Fertilizer subsidies

reached \$18 billion in China in 2010 (ref. 66). Rates of N inputs have now reached levels of diminishing returns for crop yield in China (Fig. 4a), and China has the largest N_{sur} and one of the lowest nationally averaged NUE values in the world (Table 1). The very low R_{fc} in China incentivizes farmers to attempt to increase crop yield by simply adding more N or by choosing more N-demanding cropping systems (e.g. change from cereal production to greenhouse vegetable production⁶⁷) instead of adopting more N-efficient technologies and management practices.

Not all fertilizer subsidies are inappropriate. Where infrastructure for producing and transporting fertilizers is poor, as is the case for most of Africa, the cost can be so high that fertilizer use is prohibitively expensive for small holder farmers, resulting in low yield and small, even negative (soil mining) N surplus. In these cases, there is room for fertilizer subsidies to increase N inputs, because significant increases in N inputs could be absorbed and greatly increase crop yields without much immediate risk of N pollution⁶⁸⁻⁷⁰. When properly drawn, temporary fertilizer subsidies structured to build up the private delivery network and with a built-in exit strategy can be an appropriate step⁷¹. The longer term question for these countries will be whether they can “tunnel through” the EKC by shifting crop production directly from a low-yield-high-NUE status to a high-yield-high-NUE status. This shift will require leapfrogging over historical evolution of agricultural management practices by employing technologies and management practices that promote high NUE before N surpluses grow to environmentally degrading levels. Acquiring and deploying such technologies, such as improved seed, balanced

nutrient amendments, and water management, will require investments in technology transfer and capacity building.

Importance of crop mix

Another factor that may confound EKC trajectories is the mix of crops countries grow over time, which is affected by both demand and trade policies⁷². For example, changing patterns of crop mixes help explain some of the differences between China and the USA. Since the 1990s an increasing percentage of agricultural land in China has been devoted to fruit and vegetable production, and N application to fruits and vegetables now accounts for about 30% of total fertilizer consumption^{38,73}, with an average NUE of only about 0.10 (which is below the globally averaged NUE for fruits and vegetables of 0.14, and well below the global averages for other major crops; Table 1)^{74,75}. At the same time, China has been increasingly relying on imported soybeans, a N fixing plant that has very low N_{sur} (Table 1)⁷⁶. By contrast, US soybean production has been growing and now accounts for about 30% of the harvested area for crop production (excluding land devoted to forage production) in the USA. While fertilizer subsidies in China likely account for much of the low NUE there, our analysis shows that the difference in crop mix also accounts for nearly half of the NUE difference between China and USA (Fig. 4b).

To address this issue globally, we tested the relationship between NUE and the fraction of harvested area for fruits and vegetables with a fixed effects model for the 113 countries (Supplementary Table 11). The fraction of harvested area for

fruit and vegetable production negatively correlates with NUE, and that relationship is still significant even after adjusting for the effect of GDP per capita.

Meeting the growing challenge

Agriculture is currently facing unprecedented challenges globally. On one hand, crop production needs to increase by about 60-100% from 2007 to 2050 to meet global food demand^{3,77-79}. On the other hand, anthropogenic reactive N input to the biosphere has already exceeded a proposed planetary boundary^{5,80}, and the increasing demand for food and biofuel is likely to further drive up N inputs. Therefore, it is critical to establish global and national goals for N use in crop production and to use those goals as reference points to evaluate progress made and guide NUE improvement.

Global and national goals

The planetary boundary for human use of reactive N that can be tolerated without causing unsustainable air and water pollution has been defined in mainly two ways: 1) as the maximum allowable amount of anthropogenic newly fixed N in agriculture that can be introduced into the earth system ($62\text{-}82 \text{ Tg N yr}^{-1}$)^{5,80}, and 2) as the maximum allowable N surplus released from agricultural production to the environment. Calculations of planetary boundaries according to the first definition require assumptions about nutrient use efficiency in agriculture. As NUE increases, more N inputs would be manageable while still remaining within air and water pollution limits as more applied N would be taken up by harvested crops. Therefore, rather than focusing on a planetary boundary of allowable newly-fixed-N, which

varies depending on the NUE assumption, we follow the second approach by estimating what NUE would be needed to produce the food demand projected for 2050 (ref 3; Table 1) while keeping N_{sur} within bounds estimated for acceptable air and water quality. Over 60% of N pollution is estimated to originate from crop production⁷⁸, so this is the primary sector that must be addressed to reduce N pollution. Based on an analysis of the implications of N cycling in several “shared socio-economic pathways”⁸¹, Bodirsky et al. (ref. 78) calculated that global agricultural N_{sur} should not exceed about 50-100 Tg N yr⁻¹. Thus we use 50 Tg N yr⁻¹ as an estimate of the global limit of N_{sur} from crop production.

Meeting the 2050 food demand of 107 Tg N yr⁻¹ projected by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, ref. 3) while reducing N_{sur} from the current 100 Tg N yr⁻¹ to a global limit of 50 Tg N yr⁻¹ (ref. 78) requires very large across-the-board increases in NUE. Globally, NUE would increase from ~0.4 to ~0.7, while the crop yield would increase from 74 to 107 Tg N yr⁻¹ (Table 1). Recognizing regional differences in crop production and development stage, this average could be achieved if average NUE rose to 0.75 in the EU and USA, to 0.60 in China and the rest of Asia (assuming they continue to have a high proportion of fruits and vegetables in their crop mix), and to 0.70 in other countries, including not dropping below 0.70 in Sub-Saharan Africa as it develops (Table 1). Similarly, NUE targets could be established for individual crops, such as improving the global average from 0.14 to 0.40 for fruits and vegetables, and increasing the global average NUE for maize from 0.50 to 0.70 (Table 1).

The challenges in achieving these ambitious goals differ among countries. Fig. 5 shows the trajectories of major crop producing countries on the yield-NUE map for the last five decades. The x and y axes show the two efficiency terms in crop production, while the grey scale displays N_{sur} . To compare the N_{sur} expressed on the field scale in Fig. 5 ($\text{kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) to a global limit of 50-100 Tg N yr^{-1} , the average N_{sur} target would need to be 39-78 $\text{kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ across the 2010 harvested area of 1.3 billion ha. For the examples shown, the USA, France, and Brazil appear to be on this trajectory, although further progress is still needed. In contrast, China and India not only have not yet found an EKC turning point, but also have much ground to make up to reduce their N_{sur} once they turn the corner on their EKC. Although a great challenge, this could also be seen as an opportunity to reduce fertilizer expenditures while increasing agricultural productivity. Malawi, like many Sub-Saharan African countries and other least developed countries, has been on a classic downward trajectory of decreasing NUE as it has started to increase N inputs, although evidence from recent years suggest that this decline may have reversed, which would be a necessary first step to tunnel through the EKC (Fig. 5).

Achieving nitrogen use efficiency targets

Achieving ambitious NUE targets while also increasing yields to meet future food demands requires implementation of technologies and management practices at the farm scale, which has been described widely and in considerable detail in the agricultural, environmental, and development literature¹⁷. Some common principles include the “4Rs” approach of applying the *right* source, at the *right* rate, in the *right* time, at the *right* place³⁴. However, the appropriate technologies and

management practices to achieve the 4Rs vary regionally depending on the local cropping systems, soil types, climate, and socio-economic situations. Where improvements in plant breeding, irrigation, and application of available 4R technologies have already made large gains, new technological developments may be needed to achieve further gains, such as more affordable slow-release fertilizers, nitrification and urease inhibitors, fertigation, and high-tech approaches to precision agriculture⁵⁸. It is promising that the development and the combination of information technology, remote sensing, and ground measurements will make the information about precision farming more readily available, accessible, affordable, and site-specific⁸². In many cases, large gains could still be made with more widespread adoption of existing technologies, but a myriad of social and economic factors affecting farmer decision making regarding nutrient management have only recently begun to receive attention and are critical in improving NUE (ref. 15). Socio-economic impediments, often related to cost and perceived risk, as well as lack of trust in recommendations by agricultural extension agents, often discourage farmers from adopting improved nutrient management practices^{59,60,83,84}. Experience has shown that tailoring regulations, incentives, and outreach to local conditions, administered and enforced by local entities, and where local trust and “buy-in” has been obtained is essential for the success of efforts designed to improve NUE (ref. 15).

While much of the work must be done at the farm scale, there are important policies that should be implemented on national and multi-national scales. First, improving NUE should be adopted as one of the Sustainable Development Goals

(SDGs)¹⁶ and should be used in conjunction with crop yield and perhaps other soil health parameters to measure the sustainability of crop production systems. As part of their commitments to achieve a SDG on NUE, countries should be strongly encouraged to routinely collect data on their N management in crop and livestock production. These data should be used to trace trajectories of the three indices of agricultural N pollution, agricultural efficiency, and food security targets (i.e. N_{sur} , NUE, and N_{yield}), as we have done here (Fig. 5) to demonstrate where progress is being made and where stronger local efforts are needed. The data used to construct Fig. 5 have served to demonstrate trends, but both improved data quality and international harmonization of data standards are needed. Regular attention should be given to these trends to establish national and local targets and policies. Just as protocols established by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change permit nations to gage their progress and commitment for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, protocols for measuring and reporting on a SDG pertaining to NUE could enable governments to assess their progress in achieving food security goals while maintaining environmental quality.

Second, more attention is needed on nutrient management in livestock operations and on human dietary choices. Here we have focused entirely on crop production, largely because of availability of data, but the N_{sur} , NUE, and N_{yield} indices are equally important in livestock management⁸⁵. Indeed, soybeans and some cereals have high NUE as crops, but when fed to livestock, efficient recycling of the manure-N is challenging, resulting in lower integrated NUE for the crop-livestock production system⁸⁶. The crop production scenario used here for 2050

(Table 1) makes assumptions about future dietary choices³, which are beyond the scope of this study, but we note that future trends in diet will affect the demand for crop and livestock products, the crop mixes grown, and hence the NUE and N_{sur} of future agricultural systems⁷².

Third, a similar approach to efficiency analysis would also be valuable for phosphorus (P) fertilizer management, interactions of N and P management, and reducing both N and P loading into aquatic ecosystems⁸⁷⁻⁹⁰.

Fourth, national and international communities should facilitate technology transfer and promote agricultural innovation. Stronger international collaborations and investments in research, extension, and human resources are urgently needed for sharing knowledge and experience to create political and market environments that help incentivize the development and implementation of more efficient technologies. Technology transfer and capacity building will be needed to enable Sub-Saharan African countries to tunnel through the EKC (Fig. 5).

These solutions to improving NUE will require cross-disciplinary and cross-sectorial partnerships, such as: (1) integrating research and development of innovative agricultural technology and management systems with socio-economic research and outreach needed for such innovations to be socially and economically viable and readily adopted by farmers; (2) analyzing the nexus of food, water, nutrients, and energy management to avoid pollution swapping and to optimize the net benefits to farmers, the environment, and society; (3) promoting knowledge and data sharing among private and public sectors to advance science-based nutrient management; and (4) training the next generation of interdisciplinary agronomic

and environmental scientists equipped with broad perspectives and skills
pertaining to food, water, energy, and environment issues.

The Environmental Kuznets Curve has often been described as an optimist's
view of a world with declining environmental degradation. Here we have shown
that there is evidence, indeed, hope for the EKC pattern of declining N pollution with
improving efficiencies in agriculture. However, we have also shown that
continuation of progress to date is neither inevitable nor sufficient to achieve
projected 2050 goals of both food security and environmental stewardship. Turning
points and trajectories of national agricultural EKC's will depend largely on
agricultural, economic, environmental, educational, and trade policies, and these
will largely dictate the food and pollution outputs of future agriculture.

References:

- 1 Erisman, J. W., Sutton, M. A., Galloway, J., Klimont, Z. & Winiwarter, W. How a century of ammonia synthesis changed the world. *Nature Geosci.* **1**, 636-639, doi: 10.1038/Ngeo325 (2008).
- 2 Foley, J. A. *et al.* Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature* **478**, 337-342, doi: 10.1038/Nature10452 (2011).
- 3 Alexandratos, N. & Bruinsma, J. World agriculture towards 2030/2050: the 2012 revision. *ESA Work. Pap* **3** (2012).
- 4 Mueller, N. D. *et al.* Closing yield gaps through nutrient and water management. *Nature* **490**, 254-257, doi:10.1038/nature11420 (2012).
- 5 Steffen, W. *et al.* Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 1259855 (2015).
This paper provides the most recent updates on the research under the planetary boundaries framework.
- 6 Galloway, J. N. *et al.* The nitrogen cascade. *Bioscience* **53**, 341-356, doi: 10.1641/0006-3568(2003)053[0341:Tnc]2.0.Co;2 (2003).
This is a classic paper on the many interacting environmental impacts of reactive forms of nitrogen as they move through the biosphere.
- 7 Galloway, J. N. *et al.* Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science* **320**, 889-892 (2008).
- 8 Reay, D. S. *et al.* Global agriculture and nitrous oxide emissions. *Nat. Clim. Change* **2**, 410-416, doi:10.1038/nclimate1458 (2012).
- 9 Griffis, T. J. *et al.* Reconciling the differences between top-down and bottom-up estimates of nitrous oxide emissions for the U.S. Corn Belt. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **27**, 746-754, doi:10.1002/gbc.20066 (2013).
- 10 Avnery, S., Mauzerall, D. L., Liu, J. & Horowitz, L. W. Global crop yield reductions due to surface ozone exposure: 1. Year 2000 crop production losses and economic damage. *Atmos. Environ.* **45**, 2284-2296 (2011).
- 11 Robertson, G. P. *et al.* Nitrogen-climate interactions in US agriculture. *Biogeochemistry* **114**, 41-70 (2013).
- 12 Jerrett, M. *et al.* Long-term ozone exposure and mortality. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **360**, 1085-1095 (2009).
- 13 Sanchez, P. A. & Swaminathan, M. Hunger in Africa: the link between unhealthy people and unhealthy soils. *The Lancet* **365**, 442-444 (2005).
- 14 Cassman, K. G., Dobermann, A., Walters, D. T. & Yang, H. Meeting cereal demand while protecting natural resources and improving environmental quality. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **28**, 315-358, doi: 10.1146/Annurev.Energy.28.040202.122858 (2003).
- 15 Davidson, E. A., Suddick, E. C., Rice, C. W. & Prokopy, L. S. More Food, Low Pollution (Mo Fo Lo Po): A Grand Challenge for the 21st Century. *J. Environ. Qual.* **44**, 305-311 (2015).
This paper reports outcomes of an interdisciplinary conference on the technical, social, and economic impediments to improving nitrogen use

467 **efficiency in crop and animal production systems, and it introduces a**
468 **series of papers addressing this issue.**
469 16 SDSN. Indicators and a monitoring framework of for Sustainable
470 Development Goals – Revised working Draft, 16 January 2015. A report by
471 the Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
472 Sustainable Development Solutions Network. Available on-line:
473 <http://unsdsn.org/resources> (2015).
474 17 Newell Price, J. *et al.* An inventory of mitigation methods and guide to their
475 effects on diffuse water pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and ammonia
476 emissions from agriculture. *Report prepared as part of Defra Project WQ0106,*
477 *ADAS and Rothamsted Research North Wyke* (2011).
478 18 Dinda, S. Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis: A survey. *Ecol. Econ.* **49**,
479 431-455, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.02.011 (2004).
480 19 Grossman, G. M. & Krueger, A. B. Economic-Growth and the Environment.
481 *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **110**, 353-377, doi: 10.2307/2118443 (1995).
482 **This was among the first set of studies to provide empirical evidence for**
483 **the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis.**
484 20 Arrow, K. *et al.* Economic growth, carrying capacity, and the environment.
485 *Science* **15**, 91-95 (1995).
486 21 Panayotou, T. Empirical tests and policy analysis of environmental
487 degradation at different stages of economic development. (International
488 Labour Organization, 1993).
489 22 Cole, M. A., Rayner, A. J. & Bates, J. M. The environmental Kuznets curve: an
490 empirical analysis. *Environment and development economics* **2**, 401-416
491 (1997).
492 23 Brock, W. A. & Taylor, M. S. Economic growth and the environment: a review
493 of theory and empirics. *Handbook of economic growth* **1**, 1749-1821 (2005).
494 24 Li, F., Dong, S., Li, F. & Yang, L. Is there an inverted U-shaped curve? Empirical
495 analysis of the Environmental Kuznets Curve in agrochemicals. *Frontiers of*
496 *Environmental Science & Engineering*, 1-12 (2014).
497 25 Singh, A. P. & Narayanan, K. Impact of economic growth and population on
498 agrochemical use: evidence from post-liberalization India. *Environment,*
499 *Development and Sustainability*, 1-17 (2015).
500 26 Van Beek, C., Brouwer, L. & Oenema, O. The use of farmgate balances and soil
501 surface balances as estimator for nitrogen leaching to surface water. *Nutr.*
502 *Cycl. Agroecosyst.* **67**, 233-244 (2003).
503 27 Van Groenigen, J., Velthof, G., Oenema, O., Van Groenigen, K. & Van Kessel, C.
504 Towards an agronomic assessment of N₂O emissions: a case study for arable
505 crops. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* **61**, 903-913 (2010).
506 28 Bouwman, L. *et al.* Exploring global changes in nitrogen and phosphorus
507 cycles in agriculture induced by livestock production over the 1900–2050
508 period. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 20882-20887
509 (2013).
510 29 Liu, J. *et al.* A high-resolution assessment on global nitrogen flows in
511 cropland. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **107**, 8035-8040
512 (2010).

- 513 30 Lassaletta, L., Billen, G., Grizzetti, B., Anglade, J. & Garnier, J. 50 year trends in
514 nitrogen use efficiency of world cropping systems: the relationship between
515 yield and nitrogen input to cropland. *Environmental Research Letters* **9**,
516 105011 (2014).
517 **This paper presents the 50-year trend of nitrogen use efficiency and**
518 **the yield response to nitrogen input on country scale.**
- 519 31 Conant, R. T., Berdanier, A. B. & Grace, P. R. Patterns and trends in nitrogen
520 use and nitrogen recovery efficiency in world agriculture. *Global*
521 *Biogeochemical Cycles* **27**, 558-566, doi: 10.1002/Gbc.20053 (2013).
522 **This study creates a global N input database by country and several**
523 **major crops and found no convergence in N use among countries.**
- 524 32 Brouwer, F. Nitrogen balances at farm level as a tool to monitor effects of
525 agri-environmental policy. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.* **52**, 303-308 (1998).
- 526 33 Zhang, X., Mauzerall, D. L., Davidson, E. A., Kanter, D. R. & Cai, R. The economic
527 and environmental consequences of implementing nitrogen-efficient
528 technologies and management practices in agriculture. *J. Environ. Qual.* **44**,
529 312-324 (2015).
530 **This paper develops a bio-economic model to examine how**
531 **technological and socioeconomic factors influence farmer's decision**
532 **and the resulting environment impact.**
- 533 34 Snyder, C., Davidson, E., Smith, P. & Venterea, R. Agriculture: sustainable crop
534 and animal production to help mitigate nitrous oxide emissions. *Current*
535 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **9**, 46-54 (2014).
- 536 35 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAOSTAT online
537 database, <http://faostat.fao.org/> (accessed by April 2014 and January
538 2015).
- 539 36 World Bank Group. *World Development Indicators 2012*. World Bank
540 Publications (2012).
- 541 37 Lassaletta, L. *et al.* Food and feed trade as a driver in the global nitrogen
542 cycle: 50-year trends. *Biogeochemistry* **118**, 225-241 (2014).
- 543 38 Heffer, P. Assessment of fertilizer use by crop at the global level. *International*
544 *Fertilizer Industry Association, Paris*, [http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/Home-](http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/Home-Page/LIBRARY/Publication-database.html/Assessment-of-Fertilizer-Use-by-Crop-at-the-Global-Level-2006-07-2007-08.html2)
545 [Page/LIBRARY/Publication-database. html/Assessment-of-Fertilizer-Use-by-](http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/Home-Page/LIBRARY/Publication-database.html/Assessment-of-Fertilizer-Use-by-Crop-at-the-Global-Level-2006-07-2007-08.html2)
546 [Crop-at-the-Global-Level-2006-07-2007-08. html2](http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/Home-Page/LIBRARY/Publication-database.html/Assessment-of-Fertilizer-Use-by-Crop-at-the-Global-Level-2006-07-2007-08.html2) (2009).
- 547 39 Monfreda, C., Ramankutty, N. & Foley, J. A. Farming the planet: 2. Geographic
548 distribution of crop areas, yields, physiological types, and net primary
549 production in the year 2000. *Global biogeochemical cycles* **22** (2008).
- 550 40 Herridge, D. F., Peoples, M. B. & Boddey, R. M. Global inputs of biological
551 nitrogen fixation in agricultural systems. *Plant Soil* **311**, 1-18, doi:
552 10.1007/S11104-008-9668-3 (2008).
- 553 41 Jayanthakumaran, K., Verma, R. & Liu, Y. CO 2 emissions, energy
554 consumption, trade and income: a comparative analysis of China and India.
555 *Energy Policy* **42**, 450-460 (2012).
- 556 42 He, J. & Wang, H. Economic structure, development policy and environmental
557 quality: An empirical analysis of environmental Kuznets curves with Chinese
558 municipal data. *Ecol. Econ.* **76**, 49-59 (2012).

559 43 Al-Mulali, U., Saboori, B. & Ozturk, I. Investigating the environmental Kuznets
560 curve hypothesis in Vietnam. *Energy Policy* **76**, 123-131 (2015).

561 44 Alam, M. S. & Kabir, N. Economic growth and environmental sustainability:
562 empirical evidence from East and South-East Asia. *International Journal of*
563 *Economics and Finance* **5** (2013).

564 45 Diao, X., Zeng, S., Tam, C. M. & Tam, V. W. EKC analysis for studying economic
565 growth and environmental quality: a case study in China. *Journal of Cleaner*
566 *Production* **17**, 541-548 (2009).

567 46 Song, M.-L., Zhang, W. & Wang, S.-H. Inflection point of environmental
568 Kuznets curve in Mainland China. *Energy policy* **57**, 14-20 (2013).

569 47 Wagner, M. The carbon Kuznets curve: a cloudy picture emitted by bad
570 econometrics? *Resource and Energy Economics* **30**, 388-408 (2008).

571 48 Müller-Fürstenberger, G. & Wagner, M. Exploring the environmental Kuznets
572 hypothesis: Theoretical and econometric problems. *Ecol. Econ.* **62**, 648-660
573 (2007).

574 49 Chow, G. C. & Li, J. Environmental Kuznets curve: Conclusive econometric
575 evidence for CO₂. *Pacific Economic Review* **19**, 1-7 (2014).

576 50 Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y. & Smith, R. J. Bounds testing approaches to the
577 analysis of level relationships. *Journal of applied econometrics* **16**, 289-326
578 (2001).

579 51 Wagner, M. The environmental Kuznets curve, cointegration and
580 nonlinearity. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* (2014).

581 52 Wagner, M. & Hong, S. H. Cointegrating Polynomial Regressions: Fully
582 Modified OLS Estimation and Inference. *Econometric Theory*, 1-27 (2015).

583 53 Stern, D. I. The rise and fall of the environmental Kuznets curve. *World*
584 *Development* **32**, 1419-1439, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.03.004 (2004).

585 54 Cavlovic, T. A., Baker, K. H., Berrens, R. P. & Gawande, K. A meta-analysis of
586 environmental Kuznets curve studies. *Agricultural and Resource Economics*
587 *Review* **29**, 32-42 (2000).

588 55 Sutton, M. A. *et al.* *The European Nitrogen Assessment*. Cambridge University
589 Press, (2011).

590 56 Van Grinsven, H. *et al.* Management, regulation and environmental impacts of
591 nitrogen fertilization in northwestern Europe under the Nitrates Directive: a
592 benchmark study. *Biogeosciences* **9**, 5143-5160 (2012).

593 57 Van Grinsven, H. J. *et al.* Losses of Ammonia and Nitrate from Agriculture and
594 Their Effect on Nitrogen Recovery in the European Union and the United
595 States between 1900 and 2050. *J. Environ. Qual.* (2015).

596 58 Ferguson, R. B. Groundwater Quality and Nitrogen Use Efficiency in
597 Nebraska's Central Platte River Valley. *J. Environ. Qual.* (2014).

598 59 Osmond, D. L., Hoag, D. L., Luloff, A. E., Meals, D. W. & Neas, K. Farmers' Use of
599 Nutrient Management: Lessons from Watershed Case Studies. *J. Environ.*
600 *Qual.* (2014).

601 60 Perez, M. R. Regulating farmer nutrient management: A three-state case
602 study on the Delmarva Peninsula. *J. Environ. Qual.* **44**, 402-414 (2015).

603 61 International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA). The global "4R" nutrient
604 stewardship framework. Developing fertilizer best management practices for

605 delivering economic, social, and environmental benefits. IFA Task Force on
606 Fertilizer Best Management Practices. Paris, France. AgCom/09/44. (2009).
607 62 Davidson, E., Galloway, J., Millar, N. & Leach, A. N-related greenhouse gases in
608 North America: innovations for a sustainable future. *Current Opinion in*
609 *Environmental Sustainability* **9**, 1-8 (2014).
610 63 Sawyer, J. E. *et al.* Concepts and Rationale for Regional Nitrogen Rate
611 Guidelines for Corn. Iowa State University Extension, Ames, IA (2006).
612 64 Robertson, G. P. & Vitousek, P. M. Nitrogen in Agriculture: Balancing the Cost
613 of an Essential Resource. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **34**,
614 97-125, doi: 10.1146/Annurev.Environ.032108.105046 (2009).
615 65 Setiyono, T. D. *et al.* Maize-N: A Decision Tool for Nitrogen Management in
616 Maize. *Agron. J.* **103**, 1276-1283, doi: 10.2134/Agronj2011.0053 (2011).
617 66 Li, Y. *et al.* An analysis of China's fertilizer policies: Impacts on the industry,
618 food security, and the environment. *J. Environ. Qual.* **42**, 972-981 (2013).
619 67 Ju, X., Kou, C., Christie, P., Dou, Z. & Zhang, F. Changes in the soil environment
620 from excessive application of fertilizers and manures to two contrasting
621 intensive cropping systems on the North China Plain. *Environ. Pollut.* **145**,
622 497-506 (2007).
623 68 Hickman, J. E., Tully, K. L., Groffman, P. M., Diru, W. & Palm, C. A. A potential
624 tipping point in tropical agriculture: Avoiding rapid increases in nitrous
625 oxide fluxes from agricultural intensification in Kenya. *Journal of Geophysical*
626 *Research: Biogeosciences* (2015).
627 69 Hickman, J. E., Havlikova, M., Kroeze, C. & Palm, C. A. Current and future
628 nitrous oxide emissions from African agriculture. *Current Opinion in*
629 *Environmental Sustainability* **3**, 370-378 (2011).
630 70 Zhou, M. *et al.* Regional nitrogen budget of the Lake Victoria Basin, East
631 Africa: syntheses, uncertainties and perspectives. *Environmental Research*
632 *Letters* **9**, 105009 (2014).
633 71 Jayne, T. S. & Rashid, S. Input subsidy programs in sub - Saharan Africa: a
634 synthesis of recent evidence. *Agricultural Economics* **44**, 547-562 (2013).
635 72 Billen, G., Lassaletta, L. & Garnier, J. A vast range of opportunities for feeding
636 the world in 2050: trade-off between diet, N contamination and international
637 trade. *Environmental Research Letters* **10**, 025001 (2015).
638 73 Heffer, P. Assessment of fertilizer use by crop at the global level 2010-
639 2010/11. *International Fertilizer Industry Association, Paris*,
640 http://www.fertilizer.org/En/Statistics/Agriculture_Committee_Databases.aspx
641 (2013).
642 74 Shi, W.-M., Yao, J. & Yan, F. Vegetable cultivation under greenhouse
643 conditions leads to rapid accumulation of nutrients, acidification and salinity
644 of soils and groundwater contamination in South-Eastern China. *Nutr. Cycl.*
645 *Agroecosyst.* **83**, 73-84 (2009).
646 75 Ju, X.-T. *et al.* Reducing environmental risk by improving N management in
647 intensive Chinese agricultural systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
648 *of Sciences* **106**, 3041-3046 (2009).

649 76 Drinkwater, L. E., Wagoner, P. & Sarrantonio, M. Legume-based cropping
650 systems have reduced carbon and nitrogen losses. *Nature* **396**, 262-265
651 (1998).

652 77 Searchinger, T. *et al.* Creating a Sustainable Food Future: A Menu of Solutions
653 to Sustainably Feed More than 9 Billion People by 2050. *World Resources*
654 *Report* **14** (2013).

655 78 Bodirsky, B. L. *et al.* Reactive nitrogen requirements to feed the world in
656 2050 and potential to mitigate nitrogen pollution. *Nature communications* **5**
657 (2014).

658 79 Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J. & Befort, B. L. Global food demand and the
659 sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**,
660 20260-20264, doi:10.1073/pnas.1116437108 (2011).

661 80 de Vries, W., Kros, J., Kroeze, C. & Seitzinger, S. P. Assessing planetary and
662 regional nitrogen boundaries related to food security and adverse
663 environmental impacts. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **5**,
664 392-402 (2013).

665 81 Nakicenovic, N. & Swart, R. Special report on emissions scenarios. *Special*
666 *Report on Emissions Scenarios, Edited by Nebojsa Nakicenovic and Robert*
667 *Swart, pp. 612. ISBN 0521804930. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press,*
668 *July 2000.* **1** (2000).

669 82 Mulla, D. J. Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key
670 advances and remaining knowledge gaps. *Biosyst. Eng.* **114**, 358-371 (2013).

671 83 David, M. B. *et al.* Navigating the socio-bio-geo-chemistry and engineering of
672 nitrogen management in two Illinois tile-drained watersheds. *J. Environ. Qual.*
673 (2014).

674 84 Weber, C. & McCann, L. Adoption of Nitrogen-Efficient Technologies by US
675 Corn Farmers. *J. Environ. Qual.* (2014).

676 85 Powell, J., Gourley, C., Rotz, C. & Weaver, D. Nitrogen use efficiency: A
677 potential performance indicator and policy tool for dairy farms.
678 *environmental science & policy* **13**, 217-228 (2010).

679 86 Powell, J. & Rotz, C. Measures of nitrogen use efficiency and nitrogen loss
680 from dairy production systems. *J. Environ. Qual.* **44**, 336-344 (2015).

681 87 MacDonald, G. K., Bennett, E. M., Potter, P. A. & Ramankutty, N. Agronomic
682 phosphorus imbalances across the world's croplands. *Proceedings of the*
683 *National Academy of Sciences* **108**, 3086-3091 (2011).

684 88 MacDonald, G. K., Bennett, E. M. & Taranu, Z. E. The influence of time, soil
685 characteristics, and land - use history on soil phosphorus legacies: a global
686 meta - analysis. *Global Change Biology* **18**, 1904-1917 (2012).

687 89 Cordell, D., Drangert, J.-O. & White, S. The story of phosphorus: global food
688 security and food for thought. *Global environmental change* **19**, 292-305
689 (2009).

690 90 Schoumans, O. *et al.* Mitigation options to reduce phosphorus losses from the
691 agricultural sector and improve surface water quality: A review. *Sci. Total*
692 *Environ.* **468**, 1255-1266 (2014).

Acknowledgements

We thank Gene M. Grossman, Mark W. Watson, Gregory Chow, Zhentao Shi, Oscar Torres-Reyna, and Yulong Wang for their advice on economic data analysis. We thank Elena Shevliakova, Fernando Gonzalez Taboada, David R. Kanter for comments. This study was supported by the program in Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, the United States Department of Agriculture (grant 2011-67003-30373), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, United States Department of Commerce (award NA14OAR4320106). The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Department of Commerce, or the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This is Scientific Contribution number 5080 of the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science Appalachian Laboratory.

Author contributions

X.Z., E.A.D., D.L.M., and T.D.S. designed the research. X.Z., T.D.S., and P.D. compiled the N database. X.Z., Y.S., and E.A.D. carried out the statistical analysis. X.Z. and E.A.D. led the writing of the paper with substantial input from D.L.M., T.D.S., P.D., and Y.S..

Author Information

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints. The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to xzhang@al.umces.edu and edavidson@umces.edu.

716 Table

717 Table 1. Nitrogen budget and Nitrogen Use Efficiency in crop production for different regions and major crop categories in
 718 2010 and projected for 2050. The 2010 record is aggregated from our N budget database (see Supplementary Information
 719 Section 1 for detailed methodologies and data sources used for developing this database). The 2050 projected Harvested-N is
 720 derived from a FAO projection of crop production to meet a scenario of global food demand³. The calculated target NUE values
 721 for 2050 are not meant to be prescriptive for particular countries or crops; rather, they are presented to illustrate the types of
 722 NUE values that would be needed, given this assumption of food demand³, while limiting N surplus near the lower bound (50
 723 Tg N yr⁻¹) of allowable N pollution estimated in planetary boundary calculations⁷⁸. Harvest-, input-, and surplus-N values are
 724 rounded to the nearest Tg N yr⁻¹.

	Current (2010)				Projected (2050)			
	Harvest-N Tg N yr ⁻¹	Input-N Tg N yr ⁻¹	NUE	Surplus-N Tg N yr ⁻¹	Projected Harvest-N* Tg N yr ⁻¹	Target NUE	Required Input-N Tg N yr ⁻¹	Resulting Surplus-N Tg N yr ⁻¹
<i>by region§</i>								
China	13	51	0.25	38	16	0.60	27	11
India	8	25	0.30	18	11	0.60	19	8
USA and Canada	14	21	0.68	7	19	0.75	25	6

Europe	7	14	0.52	7	10	0.75	13	3
Former Soviet Union	4	6	0.56	3	6	0.70	8	2
Brazil	6	11	0.53	5	10	0.70	15	4
Latin America (except Brazil)	7	12	0.52	6	10	0.70	15	4
Middle East and North Africa	3	5	0.48	3	4	0.70	5	2
Sub-Saharan Africa	4	5	0.72	2	9	0.70	13	4
Other OECD countries	1	2	0.52	1	2	0.70	2	1
Other Asian countries	8	19	0.41	11	10	0.60	17	7
Total	74	174	0.42	100	107	0.67	160	52
<i>by crop type¶</i>								
Wheat	13	30	0.42	17	18	0.70	25	8
Rice	11	29	0.39	18	14	0.60	23	9
Maize	13	28	0.46	15	19	0.70	28	8
Other Cereal crops	5	9	0.53	4	7	0.70	11	3
Soybean	16	20	0.80	4	24	0.85	28	4
Oil Palm	1	1	0.46	1	1	0.70	2	1
Other Oil Seed	4	10	0.43	6	8	0.70	11	3
Cotton	2	5	0.37	3	3	0.70	5	1
Sugar Crops	1	5	0.19	4	2	0.40	4	2
Fruits and Vegetables	3	25	0.14	21	5	0.40	11	7
Other Crops	5	11	0.41	7	7	0.70	10	3
Total	74	174	0.42	100	107	0.68	157	50

* The projected Harvest-N is based on an FAO scenario³ for 2050 that assumes 9.1 billion people and increases in average caloric consumption to 3200 kcal/capita in Latin America, China, the Near East, and North Africa, and an increase to 2700 kcal/capita in Sub Saharan African and India. Consumption of animal products increases in developing countries, but differences between regions remain.

§ The definition of the country group is in Supplementary Table 13

¶ The crop group is defined according to IFA's report on fertilizer use by crop³⁸

Figures

Figure 1. An illustration of the N budget in crop production and resulting N species released to the environment. Inputs to agriculture are shown as blue arrows and harvest output as a green arrow. Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) is defined as the ratio of outputs (green) to inputs (blue). The difference between inputs and outputs is defined as the N surplus, which is shown here as red arrows for N losses to the environment and as N recycling within the soil (orange box). Abbreviations include: biological nitrogen fixation (BNF), ammonia (NH_3), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), nitrous oxide (N_2O), dinitrogen gas (N_2), ammonium (NH_4^+), nitrate (NO_3^-), dissolved organic nitrogen (DON), and particulate organic nitrogen (PON).

Figure 2 An illustration of an idealized Environmental Kuznets Curve for (a) N surplus and (b) the related curve for Nitrogen Use Efficiency. The theoretical limit for NUE (assuming no soil mining of nutrients) is unknown, but no biological system is 100% efficient, so the aspirational NUE limit is shown as close to but less than unity.

Figure 3. Examples of historical trends of the relationship between GDP per capita and N surplus. The observations are the record of annual N surplus ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for each country; the model results are the outcome of the regression using the following model: $Y = a + bX + cX^2$, where the dependent variable (Y) is the country's N_{sur} ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and the independent variable (X) is the country's GDP per capita. We categorized the 113 countries into 5 groups, based on the significance and sign of the regression coefficients “ b ” and “ c ” (see Supplemental Information sections 2.1 and 3.1). In this figure, we present (a)

France and USA as examples of group 1, which have significantly positive “ c ”, thus indicating that N_{sur} has started to level off or has declined; and (b) Brazil, Thailand, Malawi and Algeria as the example of group 2 to 5, which increase non-linearly, increase linearly, have no significant correlation, or have a negative surplus in 2007-2011, respectively (see Supplementary Tables 5 and 6). The results for all countries can be found in the Supplementary Figures.

Figure 4. A comparison of historical trends of (a) maize yield responses to N fertilizer input (b) Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) averaged across crops in China and the USA, and (c) fertilizer to crop price ratios for China, India, USA, and France. The dashed blue line in panel (a) shows a typical yield response function for maize based on fertilizer response trials^{33,63}, which demonstrates diminishing return in yield as N inputs increase. Note that the historical trend for China follows a similar pattern as a typical yield response function, indicating that further increases in N application rates will result in diminishing yield returns in China. In contrast, maize yield has increased in the USA since 2001 without increasing nationally averaged N input rates, suggesting the yield improvement has been achieved by adopting more efficient technologies or management practices that enable shifting the yield response curve upwards³³. The dashed pink line in panel (b) shows what the NUE in China would be if it achieved NUE values realized in the USA for all crops, but with the crop mix in China. The gap between the dashed pink line and the black line (USA record) is the difference between countries in NUE attributable to the differences in crop mixes. The fertilizer to crop price ratio shown in panel (c) is determined by the nitrogen price in urea divided by the nitrogen price in maize product (see Section 1.6 in

Supplementary Information for data sources and methodologies). The data are smoothed using a ten-year window.

Figure 5. Historical trends of Yield-N, Nitrogen Use Efficiency, and N surplus, for a sample of countries examined in this study. The grey scale shows the level of N surplus. The data have been smoothed by ten years to limit the impact of year-to-year variation in weather conditions. Curves moving towards the lower right indicate that those countries are achieving yield increases by sacrificing NUE and increasing N surplus, whereas curves moving towards the upper right indicate countries achieving yield increases by increasing NUE and steady or decreasing N surplus.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

Figure 4.

Figure 4.

Figure 5. N_{sur} (kg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹)